

The Continued Relevance of the Seed and Soil Hypothesis to Metastatic tumor Dissemination, Distribution, and Therapy Resistance with an Emphasis on Liver Metastasis in Castration-Resistant Prostate Cancer

Bruce Montgomery¹, Ilsa M. Coleman², Sam Lindergren³, Lori Kollath³, Lisha Brown³, Mohamed Adil², HyunJung Lee², Erolcan Sayar², Helen Richards², Dapei Li², Eva Corey³, Hung Ming Lam³, Daniel W. Lin^{2,3}, Heather H. Cheng¹, Michael T. Schweizer¹, Evan Y. Yu¹, Celestia Higano¹, Jessica E. Hawley¹, Funda Vakar-Lopez⁴, Martine Roudier³, Xiaotun Zhang³, Meagan Chambers⁴, Gavin Ha², Paul H. Lange³, Robert L. Vessella³, Lawrence D. True⁴, Peter S. Nelson^{1,2,5}, Michael C. Haffner^{2,4}, and Colm Morrissey^{3*}

¹Department of Medicine, Division of Medical Oncology, University of Washington, Seattle, WA

²Division of Human Biology, Fred Hutchinson Cancer Center, Seattle, WA

³Department of Urology, University of Washington, Seattle, WA

⁴Department of Laboratory Medicine and Pathology, University of Washington, Seattle, WA

⁵Division of Clinical Research, Fred Hutchinson Cancer Center, Seattle, WA

Abstract:

Background: Patients with liver metastasis have a poor prognosis and liver metastasis have been associated with the emergence of neuroendocrine prostate cancer post androgen receptor (AR) pathway inhibitors (ARPIs), such as enzalutamide and abiraterone. Leveraging the prostate cancer post-mortem rapid tissue collection program at the University of Washington, we set out to determine (i) the distribution of metastasis in patients, (ii) the prevalence of liver metastasis, (iii) when they occur in the disease history, (iv) whether abiraterone treatment is effective in patients with liver metastasis, (v) whether the emergence of AR negative disease in castration-resistant prostate cancer (CRPC) is associated with liver metastasis, and (vi) if there is a biological event that promotes liver metastasis in patients with CRPC.

Methods: Tissue samples were obtained from patients who participated in the post-mortem rapid tissue collection study and gross and microscopic analyses of metastatic sites were performed. Patients were grouped based on sites of metastasis. To identify the AR negative tumor phenotype, RNASeq was conducted on metastases with confirmatory immunohistochemistry (IHC). Clinical histories were used to identify differences between patients with and without liver metastasis at death. RNASeq, ctDNA methylation, and IHC were used to identify differentially expressed genes and proteins.

Results: Sixty-one percent of patients in our cohort (n=143) had liver metastasis at death. The median occurrence of liver metastasis was 177 days prior to death. There was an association of liver metastasis with increased incidence of visceral metastasis including lung (62% vs. 34%), adrenal (34% vs. 13%) and spleen (11% vs. 2%) metastasis. AR negative disease was predominantly observed in patients who had liver metastasis (30%) versus no liver metastasis (5%) at death. Patients who died without liver metastasis were more responsive to abiraterone treatment than patients with liver metastasis (p=0.0286). Patients with AR negative disease had shorter survival compared to AR positive disease (p=0.0325). Cytokeratin 19 was identified as a biomarker associated with liver metastasis independent of AR status (p<0.0001).

Conclusions: There are distinct metastatic molecular phenotypes that grow in distinct organ sites. Prevalence of liver metastasis at death is significantly higher than documented in premortem scans and clinical trials. Loss of AR expression in response to ARPIs is confined to patients with liver metastasis, signifying a marker for the AR negative phenotype and predicted for lower response to AR-targeted

agents. The expression of cytokeratin 19 may be a biomarker for metastasis to the liver independent of AR status.

Funding Acknowledgements: We would like to thank the patients and their families who generously donated tissue that made this research possible. We acknowledge the tireless work of the post-mortem rapid tissue collection teams for their contributions to the University of Washington Prostate Cancer Donor Rapid Autopsy Program. This work was supported by the Pacific Northwest Prostate Cancer SPORE P50CA97186, a program project grant PO1CA163227, DOD/CDMRP: W81XWH-17-2-0043, W81XWH-14-2-0183, generous donation from Bob and Ann Vessella through the Institute for Prostate Cancer Research, and the Prostate Cancer Foundation.

Conflicts of Interest: BM served on advisory boards for Daiichi-Sankyo and Janssen and received research funding from Janssen, Merck, Immune Bio and Clovis. EC served as a paid consultant to DotQuant and received Institutional sponsored research funding unrelated to this work from AstraZeneca, AbbVie, Gilead, Sanofi, Zenith Epigenetics, Bayer Pharmaceuticals, Forma Therapeutics, Genentech, GSK, Janssen Research, Kronos Bio, Foghorn Therapeutics, K36 Therapeutics, and MacroGenics. MTS has received research funding from Novartis, Zenith Epigenetics, Eli Lilly, BMS, Merck, Immunomedics, Tmunity, SignalOne Bio, Epigenetix, Xencor, Incyte, Ambrx, Oric Pharmaceuticals, AstraZeneca, Janssen, and Pfizer and is on the advisory board for Sanofi, Fibrogen and Daiichi Sankyo. HHC has received research funds from Clovis Oncology, Color Genomics, Janssen, Medivation, Promontory Pharmaceuticals, and Sanofi. EYY served as a consultant for Astellas, Johnson & Johnson, AZ, Tolmar, Merck, Bayer, Lantheus, Bristol-Myers Squibb and Loxo, and research funding from Dendreon, Merck, SeaGen, Blue Earth, Bayer, Lantheus and Tyra. PSN served as a paid advisor for Bristol Myers Squibb, Pfizer, Genentech, AstraZeneca, and Janssen. JEH is now employed by J&J Innovative Medicine. LDT is co-founder and owner of equity in Alpenglowl Biosciences. MCH served as a paid consultant/received honoraria from Pfizer and AstraZeneca and has received research funding from Merck, Novartis, Genentech, Promicell, and Bristol Myers Squibb. CM has received research funds from Genentech and Novartis.