

ORIGINAL ARTICLE

Neutrophils-to-lymphocytes, lymphocytes to-monocytes and platelets-to-lymphocytes ratios - predictive biomarkers for response to neoadjuvant chemotherapy in breast cancer

Alexandra Caziuc¹, Diana Schlanger², Giorgiana Amarinei¹, George-Calin Dindelegan¹

¹First Surgical Clinic, University of Medicine and Pharmacy "Iuliu Hatieganu" Cluj-Napoca, Romania; ²Student, University of Medicine and Pharmacy "Iuliu Hatieganu" Cluj-Napoca, Romania.

Summary

Purpose: Several biomarkers have been reported to correlate with neoadjuvant chemotherapy response. Our aim was to establish the correlation between neutrophils-to-lymphocytes (NLR), lymphocytes-to-monocytes (LMR), and platelets-to-lymphocytes ratios (PLR) and the Miller Payne grade (MPG) and Residual Cancer Burden Score (RCB), as indicators to response to chemotherapy.

Methods: Data were retrospectively collected from the First Surgical Clinic database between January 2016 and December 2018.

Results: 96 patients were included in the study. The multivariate regression analysis showed a statistical correlation between oestrogen (ER) and progesterone receptor (PR) sta-

tus, Ki67 over 15%, and tumour infiltrating lymphocytes (TILs) and MPG and RCB. For the three studied ratios, p value was statistical not significative. ROC curve showed a cut-off value of 2.7 NLR, for which correlation with the pathological complete response to chemotherapy (pCR) was significative (p=0.03).

Conclusions: Our findings suggest that NLR can be a predictive biomarker for pCR. Further studies, on larger sample size, are necessary to establish the correlation with MPG and RCB.

Key words: biomarker, breast cancer, Miller Payne grade, neoadjuvant chemotherapy, pCR, residual cancer burden

Introduction

As the incidence of breast cancer continues to remain elevated, it is important to study and understand the immunological response in the development and progression of this disease. Neoadjuvant chemotherapy is the standard treatment in locally advanced tumours. Chemo-resistance represents a crucial problem of breast cancer. The chemo-responsiveness of the tumour is determined by patient-related factors as well as by intrinsic tumour characteristics [1,2].

Many studies tried to establish the correlation between immunological markers and the response to neoadjuvant chemotherapy [3-4]. Moreover,

pathological complete response (pCR) to chemotherapy is associated with lower recurrence rates and better overall survival [5].

Many biomarkers were proposed as predictive. NLR, LMR and PLR were among the most studied, the results showing a strong correlation between the three ratios with pCR and survival.

However, since the outcome of patients can be influenced not only by a pCR, the objective of our study was to determine their correlation with the most known parameters for evaluating the response to neoadjuvant chemotherapy, the Miller Payne grade (MPG) and the Residual Cancer Burden Score (RCB).

Methods

Study cohort

We identified all patients with locally advanced breast cancer that received neoadjuvant chemotherapy and subsequent breast surgery at the First Surgical Clinic, Cluj-Napoca, Romania, between January 2016 and December 2018. We excluded all patients with stage IV disease or inflammatory breast cancer, and also patients

without available pathology reports and laboratory test results. Data of 96 patients were analyzed. From the electronic medical records, we extracted information about age, menopausal status, tumour characteristics (stage and grade, intrinsic molecular subtype, histopathological features and TILs), lymph node status, chemotherapy regimen, type of surgical intervention, and laboratory data (absolute number of neutrophils, lymphocytes, monocytes, and platelets - all values from blood samples taken before the initiation of chemotherapy).

Table 1. Characteristics of patients included in the study and their correlation with Miller Payne grade and Residual Cancer Burden score

| Characteristics n=96 | n (%) | Miller Payne grade p | RCB score p |
|--|------------------|-------------------------|----------------|
| Age at diagnosis (years), median (range) | 54.93 (27-76) | 0.19 | 0.5 |
| Menopausal status | | 0.35 | 0.77 |
| Premenopausal | 24 (25) | | |
| Postmenopausal | 72 (75) | | |
| Tumour size | | 0.04 | 0.01 |
| T1 | 8 (8.33) | | |
| T2 | 42 (43.75) | | |
| T3 | 25 (26.04) | | |
| T4 | 21 (21.87) | | |
| Lymph nodes status | | 0.04 | 0.03 |
| N0 | 3 (3.12) | | |
| N1 | 65 (67.70) | | |
| N2 | 25 (26.04) | | |
| N3 | 3 (3.12) | | |
| Histological subtype | | 0.07 | 0.21 |
| Ductal | 88 (91.66) | | |
| Lobular | 3 (3.12) | | |
| Other | 5 (5.20) | | |
| Tumour grade | | 0.07 | 0.01 |
| G1 | 20 (20.83) | | |
| G2 | 48 (50) | | |
| G3 | 28 (29.16) | | |
| Estrogen receptor positivity | 62 (64.58) | <0.05 | <0.05 |
| Progesteron receptor positivity | 52 (54.16) | <0.05 | <0.05 |
| HER-2 receptor positivity | 29 (30.20) | 0.36 | 0.73 |
| Ki67 >15% | 60 (62.50) | 0.02 | <0.05 |
| Intrinsic subtype (IHC 4) | | 0.01 | <0.05 |
| Luminal A | 23 (23.95) | | |
| Luminal B | 39 (40.62) | | |
| HER-2 enriched | 9 (9.37) | | |
| Triple negative | 25 (26.04) | | |
| TILs | | 0.01 | <0.05 |
| 0 | 3 (3.12) | | |
| 1 | 31 (32.29) | | |
| 2 | 48 (50) | | |
| 3 | 14 (14.58) | | |
| NLR, median (range) | 2.70 (0.63-6.88) | 0.17 | 0.82 |
| LMR, median (range) | 2.70 (0.59-8.24) | 0.35 | 0.90 |
| PLR, median (range) | 28.71 (6.28-104) | 0.56 | 0.93 |

For TILs, the Klintrup score was used. Therefore, the patients were scored with 0 for absent inflammatory cells, 1 for mild and patchy inflammatory cells, 2 for prominent band-like inflammatory cells, and 3 for rich, cup-like inflammatory cells. All data were taken from the pre-treatment pathology reports.

For each patient we calculated NLR as the ratio between neutrophils and lymphocytes values, LMR as the ratio between lymphocytes and monocytes values, and PLR as the ratio between platelets and lymphocytes values.

Table 1 summarises the characteristics of the studied population.

Treatment

The neoadjuvant chemotherapy regimen consisted of 4 cycles of doxorubicin (60 mg/m²) and cyclophosphamide (600 mg/m²), followed by 4 cycles of docetaxel (75 mg/m²). Some patients received doxorubicin (60 mg/m²) plus docetaxel (75 mg/m²) or doxorubicin (60 mg/m²) plus cyclophosphamide (600 mg/m²) by intravenous infusion every 3 weeks for 6 cycles. After 4-6 weeks the patients were admitted for surgical treatment: either breast-conserving surgery, or mastectomy with axillary lymph node dissection (ALND).

Histopathological response assessment

The histopathological response was evaluated on the surgical excision sample by Miller-Payne grade and Residual Cancer Burden score.

Statistics

The statistical analysis was performed using Epi-Info version 7.2.2.6.

We evaluated the correlation between age, menopausal status, tumour size pre-chemotherapy, lymph nodes status, histological subtype, tumour grade, receptors status, intrinsic subtype, and TILs with the MPG and RCB using Cox multivariate regression analysis.

For NLR, LMR and PLR we analyzed the correlation with the MPG and RCB score using linear regression. To establish the capacity of NLR, LMR and PLR on predicting a pCR we calculated the cut-off values using the receiver operating characteristics (ROC) curve. For each ratio sensitivity, specificity, positive predictive value (PPV), and negative predictive values (NPV) were calculated. The relation between cut-off values and pCR was evaluated with Fisher test. A p value under 0.05 was considered statistically significant.

Results

The 96 patients included in the study had a mean age at the time of the treatment of 54.93 years, 75% of them being postmenopausal. Of all patients 96.87% presented with lymph node infiltration (N1-N3). The majority of the cases were ductal carcinomas (91.66%) and luminal B (40.62%). Table 1 presents the histological and immunohistological characteristics of the tumours.

Regarding neoadjuvant chemotherapy regimens, we used anthracycline-based therapy in 26 (27.08%) cases, taxanes-based therapy in 21 (21.87%) cases and combined anthracycline and taxanes therapy in 49 (51.04%) cases. No significant statistical correlation was determined between chemotherapy regimen and MPG and RCB ($p > 0.05$). pCR was obtained in 25 (26.04%) cases. 35 (36.45%) of the patients underwent breast-conserving therapy and ALND and 61 (63.54%) underwent modified radical mastectomy.

The linear regression analysis showed a significant statistical correlation between tumour size, lymph node status and MPG and RCB ($p < 0.05$). For both scores we determined a significant correlation with ER and PR positivity (Table 1), ki67 over 15% (Table 1), and with the intrinsic subtype ($p = 0.01$ for MPG and $p < 0.05$ for RCB), triple-negative tumours having the worst response to neoadjuvant chemotherapy. Another factor that determined the response to neoadjuvant chemotherapy was TILs. We obtained a p value < 0.05 for both MPG and RCB (Table 1).

No statistically significant correlation was obtained between NLR, LMR, PLT and MPG, and RCB ($p > 0.05$, Table 1) on linear regression analysis.

ROC curve analysis suggested that the optimum cut-off point of NLR, LMR, and PLR for obtaining pCR were 2.7 (95% CI, estimated standard error 0.06, $p = 0.03$ Fisher Test), 2.1 (95% CI, estimated standard error 0.05, $p = 0.35$ Fisher Test), and 21.82 (95% CI, estimated standard error 0.06, $p = 0.81$ Fisher Test). Table 2 shows the accuracy, specificity, sensitivity, PPV, and NPV calculated for the cut-off points.

Table 2. Cut off points analysis for NLR, LMR, and PLR

| | Accuracy (%) | Specificity (%) | Sensitivity (%) | PPV (%) | NPV (%) |
|-------------|--------------|-----------------|-----------------|---------|---------|
| NLR (2.7) | 58.33 | 53.52 | 72.00 | 35.29 | 84.44 |
| LMR (2.1) | 44.74 | 23.53 | 88.00 | 36.07 | 80.00 |
| PLR (21.82) | 51.04 | 49.30 | 56.00 | 28.00 | 76.09 |

PPV: positive predictive value, NPV: negative predicted value. For other abbreviations see text.

Discussion

This study showed no significant relationship between NLR, LMR, and PLR and MPG or RCB. However, the analysis between the cut-off point value of NLR (2.7) determined by ROC curve analysis and the pCR showed a significant correlation between increased NLR (over 2.7) and pCR to neoadjuvant chemotherapy. Also the obtained NPV and sensitivity values were considerable high. We couldn't find any significant correlation between LMR or PLR and pCR ($p > 0.05$).

Neutrophils, lymphocytes, monocytes and platelets have different inflammatory roles. Neutrophils increase the turnover proliferation, favouring invasion and secreting factors that promote tumour growth. Monocytes differentiate into tumour-associated macrophages, promoting proliferation, invasion, metastasis, neovascularisation, and recurrence. Platelets release factors that activate angiogenesis, stimulating tumour progression. Lymphocytes, especially cytotoxic T cells, have an antitumor immune response, stimulating apoptosis of tumor cells and suppressing their growth [6-8]. These functions motivate the study of NLR, LMR, and PLR as prognostic factors to tumor response in neoadjuvant chemotherapy.

Many studies tried to determine the correlation between the 3 ratios with pCR to neoadjuvant chemotherapy and long term survival.

For NLR, increased values prior to neoadjuvant chemotherapy were associated with lower rates of pCR [9,10]. No cut-off value was determined, with studies showing that either a value over 3.33 [11], or over 2.05 [12,13] can be considered statistically significant. In our study the cut-off point value for which we obtained statistically significant correlation was 2.7. In 2018 Duan et al published a meta-analysis on 21 studies that demonstrated that NLR can be considered a predictive biomarker for overall survival prognosis in patients with breast cancer [14], in relation with other prior published results [15,16].

We couldn't find a significant statistical correlation between LMR and response to neoadjuvant chemotherapy, although we obtained high values for sensitivity (88%) and NPV (80%) for a cut-off point value calculated at 2.1. Some authors published significant results for values higher to 5.2 regarding both chemotherapy response and survival [17] while others reported that a LMR over 4.7 can

be significantly associated with a better outcome in early stage breast cancer [18].

Studies comparing NLR and LMR as predictive factors for chemotherapy response and survival showed better correlations for NLR [19].

PLR was proposed as a predictive and prognostic biomarker, especially for triple-negative breast cancers [20,21]. The cut-off values proposed by other studies vary between 138.19 and 292 [22-24]. However, our study determined a cut-off value of 21.82 and no significant correlation was obtained.

We showed a significant correlation between ER and PR, and proliferation rate described by ki67 and neoadjuvant chemotherapy response evaluated by MPG and RCB. To our knowledge, this is the first study to consider MPG and RCB in the study of factors predictive for chemotherapy response. Although the importance of TILs for pCR is recognised [25], we managed to demonstrate the significant correlation between TILs and MPG and RCB ($p < 0.05$), showing that a high Klintrup score is associated with a better response to chemotherapy.

Despite pCR is associated with a better outcome and overall survival [26,27], we consider that a stratified analysis according to MPG and RCB needs to be done. Preliminary published results show a different outcome according to RCB score [28].

Our study has some limitations. First, it is a single-centre retrospective study. Many data were unavailable and this resulted in a small sample size. Second, the neoadjuvant therapy was not standardised and because of small sample size we couldn't perform an analysis differentiating the three specific regimens. Third, NLR, LMR and PLR can be influenced by various comorbidities, data that we didn't include in our analysis. Therefore, the results that we obtained can be biased by these three limitations of our study.

Further studies with larger sample size are necessary to establish the relationship between the three biomarkers, NLR, LMR, and PLR, and the response to neoadjuvant chemotherapy evaluated by MPG and RCB. Also TILs can be considered as a predictive biomarker due to its correlation with MPG and RCB.

Conflict of interests

The authors declare no conflict of interests.

References

1. Sotiriou C, Neo SY, McShane LM et al. Breast cancer classification and prognosis based on gene expression profiles from a population-based study. *Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A* 2003;100:10393-8.
2. Cocquyt VF, Blondeel PN, Depypere HT et al. Different responses to preoperative chemotherapy for invasive lobular and invasive ductal breast carcinoma. *Eur J Surg Oncol* 2003;29:61-67.
3. Koh CH, Bhoo-Pathy N, Ng KL et al. Utility of pre-treatment neutrophil-lymphocyte ratio and platelet-lymphocyte ratio as prognostic factors in breast cancer. *Br J Cancer* 2015;113:150-8.
4. Hennessy BT, Hortobagyi GN, Rouzier R et al. Outcome after pathologic complete eradication of cytologically proven breast cancer axillary node metastases following primary chemotherapy. *J Clin Oncol* 2005;23:9304-11.
5. Spring L, Greenup R, Niemierko A et al. Pathologic Complete Response After Neoadjuvant Chemotherapy and Long-Term Outcomes Among Young Women With Breast Cancer. *J Natl Compr Canc Netw* 2017;15:1216-23.
6. Cuello-López J, Fidalgo-Zapata A, López-Agudelo L, Vásquez-Trespacios E. Platelet-to-lymphocyte ratio as a predictive factor of complete pathologic response to neoadjuvant chemotherapy in breast cancer. *PLoS One* 2018;13:e0207224.
7. Kaya V, Yildirim M, Demirpençe O et al. Prognostic significance of basic laboratory methods in non-small-cell- lung cancer. *Asian Pac J Cancer Prev* 2013;14:5473-6.
8. Goldhirsch A, Winer EP, Coates AS et al. Personalizing the treatment of women with early breast cancer: highlights of the St Gallen International Expert Consensus on the Primary Therapy of Early Breast Cancer 2013. *Ann Oncol* 2013;24:2206-23.
9. Jung MR, Park YK, Jeong O et al. Elevated preoperative neutrophil to lymphocyte ratio predicts poor survival following resection in late stage gastric cancer. *J Surg Oncol* 2011;104:504-10.
10. Xu J, Ni C, Ma C et al. Association of neutrophil/lymphocyte ratio and platelet/lymphocyte ratio with ER and PR in breast cancer patients and their changes after neoadjuvant chemotherapy. *Clin Transl Oncol* 2017;19:989-96.
11. Marín Hernández C, Piñero Madrona A, Gil Vasquez PJ et al. Usefulness of lymphocyte-to-monocyte, neutrophil-to-monocyte and neutrophil-to-lymphocyte ratios as prognostic markers in breast cancer patients treated with neoadjuvant chemotherapy. *Clin Transl Oncol* 2018;20:476-83.
12. Liu C, Huang Z, Wang Q et al. Usefulness of neutrophil-to-lymphocyte ratio and platelet-to-lymphocyte ratio in hormone-receptor-negative breast cancer. *Onco Targets Ther* 2016;9:4653-60.
13. Eryilmaz MK, Mutlu H, Salim DK, Musri FY, Tural D, Coskun HS. The neutrophil to lymphocyte ratio has a high negative predictive value for pathologic complete response in locally advanced breast cancer patients receiving neoadjuvant chemotherapy. *Asian Pac J Cancer Prev* 2014;15:7737-40.
14. Duan J, Pan L, Yang M. Preoperative elevated neutrophil-to-lymphocyte ratio (NLR) and derived NLR are associated with poor prognosis in patients with breast cancer: A meta-analysis. *Medicine (Baltimore)* 2018;97:e13340.
15. Ethier JL, Desautels D, Templeton A, Shah PS, Amir E. Prognostic role of neutrophil-to-lymphocyte ratio in breast cancer: a systematic review and meta-analysis. *Breast Cancer Res* 2017;19:2.
16. Koh CH, Bhoo-Pathy N, Ng KL et al. Utility of pre-treatment neutrophil-lymphocyte ratio and platelet-lymphocyte ratio as prognostic factors in breast cancer. *Br J Cancer* 2015;113:150-8.
17. Ji H, Xuan Q, Yan C, Liu T, Nanding A, Zhang Q. The prognostic and predictive value of the lymphocyte to monocyte ratio in luminal-type breast cancer patients treated with CEF chemotherapy. *Oncotarget* 2016;7:34881-9.
18. He J, Lv P, Yang X, Chen Y, Liu C, Qiu X. Pretreatment lymphocyte to monocyte ratio as a predictor of prognosis in patients with early-stage triple-negative breast cancer. *Tumour Biol* 2016;37:9037-43.
19. Jia W, Wu J, Jia H et al. The Peripheral Blood Neutrophil-To-Lymphocyte Ratio Is Superior to the Lymphocyte-To-Monocyte Ratio for Predicting the Long-Term Survival of Triple-Negative Breast Cancer Patients. *PLoS One* 2015;10:e0143061.
20. Ramos-Esquivel A, Rodriguez-Porras L, Porras J. Neutrophil-lymphocyte ratio and platelet-lymphocyte ratio as prognostic factors in non-metastatic breast cancer patients from a Hispanic population. *Breast Dis* 2017;37:1-6.
21. Ulas A, Avci N, Kos T et al. Are neutrophil/lymphocyte ratio and platelet/lymphocyte ratio associated with prognosis in patients with HER2-positive early breast cancer receiving adjuvant trastuzumab? *JBUON* 2015;20:714-22.
22. Zhang M, Huang XZ, Song YX, Gao P, Sun JX, Wang ZN. High Platelet-to-Lymphocyte Ratio Predicts Poor Prognosis and Clinicopathological Characteristics in Patients with Breast Cancer: A Meta-Analysis. *Biomed Res Int* 2017;2017:9503025.
23. Asano Y, Kashiwagi S, Onoda N et al. Platelet-Lymphocyte Ratio as a Useful Predictor of the Therapeutic Effect of Neoadjuvant Chemotherapy in Breast Cancer. *PLoS One* 2016;11:e0153459.
24. Rafee S, McHugh D, Grealley M et al. Neutrophil-to-lymphocyte ratio (NLR) and platelet-to-lymphocyte ratio (PLR) as predictive biomarkers of pathologic complete response (pCR) in neoadjuvant breast cancer: an Irish Clinical Oncology Group study (ICORG 16-20). *Ann Oncol* 2016;27(Suppl 6):1538P.
25. Denkert C, von Minckwitz G, Darb Esfahani S et al. Tumour-infiltrating lymphocytes and prognosis in different subtypes of breast cancer: a pooled analysis of 3771 patients treated with neoadjuvant therapy. *Lancet Oncol* 2018;19:40-50.

26. Hatzis C, Symmans WF, Zhang Y et al. Relationship between Complete Pathologic Response to Neoadjuvant Chemotherapy and Survival in Triple-Negative Breast Cancer. *Clin Cancer Res* 2016;22:26-33.
27. Spring L, Greenup R, Niemierko A et al. Pathologic Complete Response After Neoadjuvant Chemotherapy and Long-Term Outcomes Among Young Women With Breast Cancer. *J Natl Compr Canc Netw* 2017;15:1216-23.
28. Symmans WF, Wei C, Gould R et al. Long-Term Prognostic Risk After Neoadjuvant Chemotherapy Associated With Residual Cancer Burden and Breast Cancer Subtype. *J Clin Oncol* 2017;35:1049-60.