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Abstract: Clinical management of breast cancer is increasingly personalized and based on molecular profiling. Often, primary tumors are used as proxies for systemic disease at the time of recurrence. However, recent studies have revealed substantial discordances between primary tumors and metastases, both with respect to traditional clinical treatment targets and on the genomic and transcriptomic level. With the increasing use of molecularly targeted therapy, discordance of actionable molecular targets between primary tumors and recurrences can result in nonoptimal treatment or unnecessary side effects. The purpose of this review is to illuminate the extent of cancer genome evolution through disease progression and the degree of molecular concordance between primary breast cancers and matched metastases. We present an overview of the most prominent studies investigating the expression of endocrine receptors, transcriptomics, and genome aberrations in primary tumors and metastases. In conclusion, biopsy of metastatic lesions at recurrence of breast cancer is encouraged to provide optimal treatment of the disease. Furthermore, molecular profiling of metastatic tissue provides invaluable mechanistic insight into the biology underlying metastatic progression and has the potential to identify novel, potentially druggable, drivers of progression.
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Breast cancer is the leading cause of cancer death in women worldwide (1). In spite of extensive treatment, about 30% of breast cancer patients will experience spread of the malignant disease to distant organs like liver, lungs, bone, and brain (2). The metastatic process of breast cancer is highly complex and to a large degree unexplored. Cancer cells are characterized by genomic instability and are believed to evolve in accordance with Darwinian positive selection and therefore further genetic evolution throughout progression might be expected (3). The term oncogene addiction (4) describes the cancer cell dependence of particular driver genes for the maintenance of the malignant phenotype and provides the rationale for targeted therapy. However, the distinction between driver and passenger mutations is dynamic due to the shifting demands and challenges of a cancer cell, and a shift in oncogenic drivers can develop during progression (5). Genomic and transcriptomic discordances between primary tumors and metastases have the potential to reveal novel drivers of metastatic progression and, thus, biopsies of metastatic tissue are important for driving cancer research forward.

From the clinical perspective, the question of genetic disparity between a primary tumor and its recurrences becomes highly relevant not only to confirm the malignant diagnosis and preclude nonbreast malignancy but also due to the use of molecularly targeted therapy. Optimal management of cancer presupposes knowledge of actionable molecular targets in the malignant cells and therefore potential genomic discordance between primary tumors and recurrences poses a clinical challenge. Thus, genomic, transcriptomic, and proteomic concordance between primary tumors and metastases are highly relevant from both an academic and a clinical perspective.

Due to the extreme complexity of cancer biology, the complete overview of all genetic, epigenetic, tran-
scriptomic, and proteomic manifestations is very difficult to manage within one single study. Different technical approaches at each layer of biology result in a varying degree of detail and each study typically uncovers only a fraction of the complete picture.

The aim of this study was to provide an overview of the research field of concordance between primary breast tumors and matched metastases. The current review is not exhaustive of all published studies in the field, but presents a selection of the most prominent work. Comprehensive literature searches were conducted in PubMed with combinations of the following search terms “breast cancer”, “breast carcinoma”, “biopsy”, “metastasis”, “metastases”, “recurrence”, “concordance”, “discordance”, “ER, HER2”, “gene expression profiling” “CGH”, “aCGH”, “next generation sequencing”, and “epigenetics”. Only studies comparing matched primary tumors and metastases were considered. Studies were screened by titles and abstracts and evaluated according to relevance, scientific method, and impact in the research field.

ENDOCRINE RECEPTORS

From a clinical point of view, focused investigations of targetable molecular markers are highly relevant. Tables 1 and 2 display selections of studies evaluating concordance of estrogen receptor (ER), progesterone receptor (PR), and human epidermal growth factor receptor 2 (HER2), respectively, between paired primary tumors and metastases. The studies quite consistently show surprisingly high discordance rates. It has been debated whether receptor discordance is due to technical issues such as poor reproducibility of the immunohistochemical technique, inter- or intraobserver variance, or reflect a true biological phenomenon. Obviously, correct tissue handling and fixation is crucial and the current recommendations for clinical testing should be met (6,7), however, analytical errors cannot account for all of the discordances. Aurilio et al. performed a meta-analysis of 48 articles evaluating ER, PR, and HER2 receptor discordance between primary breast cancer and metastases (8). The meta-analysis included 4200 patients evaluating ER status and found pooled proportions of tumors shifting from positive to negative and negative to positive ER status of 24% and 14%, respectively. For PR status the same figures were 46% and 15%, and for HER2 status 13% and 5%, and these data were based on a total of 2,739 and 2,987 patients, respectively. This clearly signals that a loss of receptor is more frequent than gain of receptor, confirming a biological phenomenon.

Most of the studied asynchronous metastases have been subject to adjuvant treatment, which may explain the high discordance rates. Cancer cell populations evolve dynamically and may be molded by the selective pressures provided by treatment. Stratification of patients allows insight into the phenomenon. Lindström et al. reported that the proportion of patients losing ER was highest in the group of patients treated with endocrine therapy alone or in combination with chemotherapy, lower in the group treated with chemotherapy alone, and lowest in the

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Author (ref)</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Method</th>
<th>No. patients</th>
<th>Analyzed metastatic site</th>
<th>Intervening treatment between primary tumor and metastases</th>
<th>Gain of ER, %</th>
<th>Loss of ER, %</th>
<th>Gain of PR, %</th>
<th>Loss of PR, %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Simmons et al. (51)</td>
<td>2009</td>
<td>IHC</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>Asynchronous metastases</td>
<td>Yes, in some patients</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amir et al.* (52)</td>
<td>2012</td>
<td>IHC</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>Asynchronous metastases</td>
<td>Yes, in some patients</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lindström et al.* (9)</td>
<td>2012</td>
<td>IHC</td>
<td>459/430</td>
<td>Asynchronous metastases</td>
<td>Yes, in some patients</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jensen et al. (53)</td>
<td>2012</td>
<td>IHC</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>Asynchronous metastases</td>
<td>Yes, in some patients</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heitz et al. (54)</td>
<td>2013</td>
<td>IHC</td>
<td>411</td>
<td>Asynchronous metastases</td>
<td>Yes, in some patients</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Curti et al. (55)</td>
<td>2013</td>
<td>IHC</td>
<td>235</td>
<td>Asynchronous metastases</td>
<td>Yes, in some patients</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ibrahim et al. (57)</td>
<td>2013</td>
<td>IHC</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>Asynchronous metastases</td>
<td>Not specified</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aurilio et al. (8)</td>
<td>2013</td>
<td>MA</td>
<td>4,200/2,739</td>
<td>Asynchronous metastases</td>
<td>Yes, in some patients</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hoefnagel et al. (15)</td>
<td>2013</td>
<td>IHC</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>Several asynchronous metastases</td>
<td>Not specified</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yang et al. (12)</td>
<td>2014</td>
<td>IHC</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>Asynchronous metastases</td>
<td>Yes, in some patients</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Qu et al. (58)</td>
<td>2014</td>
<td>IHC</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>Asynchronous metastases</td>
<td>Yes, in some patients</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Included in the meta-analysis by Aurilio et al.
IHC, immune histochemistry; MA, meta-analysis.
group of patients who received no treatment ($p < 0.01$) (9). A similar effect for HER2 expression was reported by Nakamura et al. showing that the negative conversion rate of HER2 expression in metastatic lesions was 37% in patients treated with trastuzumab and only 6% in patients not treated with trastuzumab ($p < 0.05$) (10). This illustrates how receptor positive cancers develop therapy-resistant metastases due to positive selection of receptor negative cancer cells. That receptor discordance is highly influenced by selective pressures of treatment is supported by the low number of discordant cases in a study by Leni et al. comparing primary tumors and synchronous metastases, i.e., without intervening treatment (11).

Recently, Yang et al. found that among 105 patients ER discordance and HER2 discordance between primary tumors and distant metastases resulted in a worse overall survival and postrecurrence survival ($p < 0.05$) compared with concordant cases (12). Concordantly, Niikura et al., in a study including only patients with HER2-positive primary tumors, found that patients with discordance of HER2 status had shorter overall survival than did patients with concordant HER2 status ($p = 0.003$) (13). Lindström et al. reported that women with ER-positive primary tumors that changed to ER-negative tumors had a significant 48% increased risk of death compared with women with stable ER-positive tumors (9). This intuitively makes sense, as tumors that are able to evade targeted treatment by altering the expression of receptors are more difficult to eradicate.

Conclusively, changes in ER and HER2 receptor expression seem to be a frequent phenomenon in breast cancer progression correlating with worse prognosis and, thus, having both prognostic and clinical implications. American guidelines recommend HER2 receptor status to be reevaluated at recurrence by biopsy at the metastatic site (7). The European Society for Medical Oncology (ESMO) second international consensus guideline for advanced breast cancer (Nov. 2013) states that a biopsy of a metastatic lesion should be per-

### Table 2. Selection of Studies Analyzing Discordance of the HER2 Receptor Between Primary Tumors and Matched Metastases

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Author (Ref)</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Method</th>
<th>No. patients</th>
<th>Analyzed metastatic site</th>
<th>Intervening treatment between primary tumor and metastases</th>
<th>Gain of HER2, %</th>
<th>Loss of HER2, %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Leni et al. (11)</td>
<td>2014</td>
<td>IHC, FISH</td>
<td>148</td>
<td>Synchronous ALN metastases</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Simmons et al. (51)</td>
<td>2009</td>
<td>FISH</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>Asynchronous metastases</td>
<td>2% of patients received trastuzumab</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amir et al.* (52)</td>
<td>2012</td>
<td>IHC, FISH</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>Asynchronous metastases</td>
<td>4% of patients received trastuzumab</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lindström et al.* (9)</td>
<td>2012</td>
<td>IHC, FISH</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>Asynchronous metastases</td>
<td>Not specified</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jensen et al. (53)</td>
<td>2012</td>
<td>IHC, FISH, CISH</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>Asynchronous metastases</td>
<td>One patient received adjuvant trastuzumab. The two patients that lost HER2 positivity had not received trastuzumab</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chan et al. (59)</td>
<td>2012</td>
<td>SISH, FISH</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>Asynchronous metastases</td>
<td>8% of patients had received adjuvant trastuzumab, including the patient who was HER2 discordant</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Niikura et al. (13)</td>
<td>2012</td>
<td>IHC, FISH</td>
<td>182</td>
<td>Asynchronous metastases</td>
<td>41% of patients had received adjuvant trastuzumab</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nakamura et al. (10)</td>
<td>2013</td>
<td>IHC</td>
<td>156</td>
<td>Asynchronous metastases</td>
<td>Adjuvant trastuzumab/no treatment</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heitz et al. (54)</td>
<td>2013</td>
<td>IHC, FISH</td>
<td>411</td>
<td>Asynchronous metastases</td>
<td>3% of patients had received adjuvant trastuzumab</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Curtit et al. (55)</td>
<td>2013</td>
<td>IHC, FISH</td>
<td>235</td>
<td>Asynchronous metastases</td>
<td>3% of patients had received adjuvant trastuzumab</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aurilio et al. (56)</td>
<td>2013</td>
<td>IHC, FISH</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>Asynchronous metastases</td>
<td>One patient received adjuvant trastuzumab</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ibrahim et al. (57)</td>
<td>2013</td>
<td>IHC</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>Asynchronous metastases</td>
<td>None of the patients had received adjuvant trastuzumab</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aurilio et al. (8)</td>
<td>2013</td>
<td>MA</td>
<td>2,987</td>
<td>Asynchronous metastases</td>
<td>Not specified</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hoefnagel et al. (15)</td>
<td>2013</td>
<td>IHC, SISH</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>Several asynchronous metastases</td>
<td>Not specified</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yang et al. (12)</td>
<td>2014</td>
<td>IHC, FISH</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>Asynchronous metastases</td>
<td>9% of patients received trastuzumab</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Qu et al. (58)</td>
<td>2014</td>
<td>IHC</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>Asynchronous metastases</td>
<td>Not specified</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Included in the meta-analysis by Aurilio et al.

IHC, immune histochemistry; CISH, chromogenic in situ hybridization; FISH, fluorescence in situ hybridization; SISH, silver in situ hybridization; MA, meta-analysis.
formed, if clinically feasible, to reassess biomarkers (especially ER and HER2) at least once in the metastatic setting (14). Addressing the issue of discordance between primary tumors and metastases, it is recommended at the level of an expert opinion, to consider use of targeted therapy when receptors are positive in at least one biopsy, regardless of timing (14).

It is, however, important to stress that biopsies from different metastatic sites may be discordant. A study by Hoefnagel et al. reports significant discordance in ER status and PR status across different metastases within the same patient (15). Thus, a single metastatic site may not be representative of all disseminated cancer cells and therefore, e.g., loss of ER expression in a single metastatic biopsy does not necessarily indicate that the patient will no longer benefit from anti-estrogen treatment. Expression of the ER receptor is in many cases epigenetically, thus reversibly regulated and influenced by anti-estrogen treatment and therefore re-expression of the receptor is possible if endocrine treatment is discontinued. The effect of changing the treatment according to biopsy results at recurrence needs to be evaluated in large patient cohorts.

**GENE EXPRESSION PROFILING**

Few studies have performed gene expression profiling of primary breast cancers and matched axillary lymph node metastases (16–19) as seen in Table 3.

Most studies have found gene expression patterns of primary tumors and matched lymph node metastases to be strikingly similar. Despite the high similarity, some studies conclude that breast cancer metastases are molecularly distinct from their primary tumors, and genes differentially expressed between primary tumors and metastases are reported. However, a very small overlap exists between the lists of genes reported to be associated with the metastasis phenotype between each study.

Very few studies have performed the comparison using asynchronous distant metastatic tissue. Weigelt et al. compared pairs of primary tumors and matched distant metastases and reported highly similar gene expression patterns (20), a metastasis-specific gene expression profile was not found, and the study concluded that metastatic capabilities were an inherent feature of the primary tumor.

The contradictory results might reflect the shortcomings of gene expression assays to resolve the puzzle. Breast cancer is an extremely heterogeneous disease and displays both intertumor heterogeneity and intratumor heterogeneity. The pattern of somatic mutations and copy number alterations as well as epigenetic modifications is highly unique to each cancer genome and, thus, the transcriptional differences between two breast cancer patients, even within the same subtype, may be greater than the transcriptional differences arising through progression of the disease and therefore remain elusive in many gene expression studies. Moreover, gene expression profiling does not allow identification of subpopulations within the cancer tissue and report the mixed picture of transcriptomes of cancer cells and stromal cells. Hao et al. show that the expression at the transcript level does not always correspond to expression at the protein level (17), thus emphasizing the caution to be taken when conclusions are drawn from gene expression studies.

Woditschka et al. performed gene expression profiling of matched primary tumors and brain metastases and found two genes to be differentially expressed (21). Studies of this nature address the issue of organotropism, the phenomenon of special affinity of cancer cells to particular organs, and have the potential to reveal novel drivers of metastatic progression.

**NONCODING RNA AND EPIGENETICS**

Gene expression regulation by noncoding RNAs and epigenetic mechanisms are likely to play key roles in the metastatic process as the identified metastasis suppressor genes are known to be transcriptionally downregulated, rather than being hit by inactivating mutations (22). Very few studies have explored differences in the expression of noncoding RNAs (23,24) and epigenetic mechanisms including methylation patterns (25–28) or histone acetylation comparing primary tumors and metastases. Differences in the expression levels of miRNAs between matched primary tumors and metastases have been found (23) and also long noncoding RNAs like HOTAIR have been shown to be differentially expressed (24). HOTAIR promotes metastasis by inducing chromatin conformational changes and methylation changes leading to gene expression patterns favorable for metastasis. Thus, the effect of increased transcription of a single long noncoding RNA can influence the expression of many genes and thereby set an entirely altered cell state. Also, DNA methylome changes during can-
Cancer progression are still highly unexplored, but likely contribute massively to the metastatic phenotype. A recent study profiling the DNA methylome of 44 matched primary tumors and regional metastases was able to identify a metastasis-specific methylation signature (25).

**TARGETED GENOMIC APPROACHES**

Different targeted approaches have been employed to address the issue of genomic concordance between primary tumors and metastases, as seen in Table 4.

Moelans et al. investigated the copy number concordance between 55 primary tumors and corresponding distant metastases of 21 established oncogenes and tumor suppressor genes using multiplex ligation-dependent probe amplification (29). The study found overall no significant difference in copy numbers, concluding that there was overall little genomic progression from primary breast tumors to their distant metastases. Conversely, other targeted studies have reported discordances. A targeted study based on Snapshot genotyping of 100 primary tumors and paired recurrences evaluating concordance of PIK3CA mutations found a net gain mutation rate in metastatic disease (30) as 21 patients changed genotype from wild type to mutant, compared with 11 patients who lost the mutation allele in the metastasis. Moreover, laser capture microdissection revealed microheterogeneity for the PIK3CA mutation in primary tumors, confirming subclonality among cancer cells. A recent study including 73 patients with matched primary tumors and asynchronous metastases identified five pairs with PIK3CA mutation in metastatic tissue but not primary tumor and two patients with mutation in primary tumor but not in the metastatic sample (31).

Using targeted next-generation sequencing (NGS), Meric-Bernstam et al. investigated the concordance of primary breast tumors to their distant metastases. Conversely, other targeted studies have reported discordances. A targeted study based on Snapshot genotyping of 100 primary tumors and paired recurrences evaluating concordance of PIK3CA mutations found a net gain mutation rate in metastatic disease (30) as 21 patients changed genotype from wild type to mutant, compared with 11 patients who lost the mutation allele in the metastasis. Moreover, laser capture microdissection revealed microheterogeneity for the PIK3CA mutation in primary tumors, confirming subclonality among cancer cells. A recent study including 73 patients with matched primary tumors and asynchronous metastases identified five pairs with PIK3CA mutation in metastatic tissue but not primary tumor and two patients with mutation in primary tumor but not in the metastatic sample (31).

### Table 3. Selection of Studies Based on Gene Expression Profiling and DNA Methylation Profiling

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Author (Ref)</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Method</th>
<th>No. patients</th>
<th>Analyzed metastatic site</th>
<th>Result</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Weigelt et al. (20)</td>
<td>2003</td>
<td>GEP</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>Asynchronous distant metastases</td>
<td>Highly similar gene expression profiles of primary tumors and metastases</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hao et al. (17)</td>
<td>2004</td>
<td>GEP, TMA</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>Synchronous ALN metastases</td>
<td>Some genes differentially expressed between primary tumors and metastases</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suzuki and Tarin (18)</td>
<td>2007</td>
<td>GEP</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Synchronous ALN metastases</td>
<td>Very similar gene expression profiles. A small number of genes were differentially expressed between primary tumors and metastases</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vecchi et al. (19)</td>
<td>2008</td>
<td>TMA</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>Synchronous ALN metastases</td>
<td>Some genes differentially expressed between primary tumors and metastases</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ellsworth et al. (16)</td>
<td>2008</td>
<td>GEP</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>Synchronous ALN metastases</td>
<td>51 differentially expressed genes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feng et al. (27)</td>
<td>2010</td>
<td>MP</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>Synchronous ALN metastases</td>
<td>Investigation of six putative tumor suppressor genes suggests that hypermethylation of tumor suppressor genes is extended from primary tumors to metastases</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barekati et al. (28)</td>
<td>2012</td>
<td>MP</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>Synchronous ALN metastases</td>
<td>Investigation of 12 breast cancer candidate genes reveals methylation heterogeneity between primary tumors and metastases</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gravgaard et al. (23)</td>
<td>2012</td>
<td>miRNA microarray</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>ALN metastases, distant metastases</td>
<td>15 miRNAs were differentially expressed between primary tumors and corresponding distant metastases</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chisholm et al. (24)</td>
<td>2012</td>
<td>IncRNA in situ hybridization</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>Unspecified metastases</td>
<td>The IncRNAs HOTAIR and EZH2 had increased expression in metastases compared with matched primary tumors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Woditschka et al. (21)</td>
<td>2014</td>
<td>GEP of 502 cancer-related genes</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>Brain metastases</td>
<td>Two genes, BARD and RAD51, were overexpressed in brain metastases compared with both matched primary tumors and compared with unlinked systemic metastases</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reyngold et al. (25)</td>
<td>2014</td>
<td>MP, GEP</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>Regional metastases</td>
<td>Integrated analysis of methylation and gene expression identified genes whose expression correlated with metastasis-specific methylation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moarri et al. (26)</td>
<td>2014</td>
<td>MP</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>Synchronous ALN metastases, local recurrences, contralateral breast carcinomas</td>
<td>Methylation patterns can help to distinguish local recurrences from new primary tumors</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

GEP, gene expression profiling; TMA, tissue microarray analysis; ALN, axillary lymph node; LncRNA, long noncoding RNA; MP, methylation profiling.
182 cancer-related genes in 33 paired primary tumors and recurrences (32). The study found that 86.6% of the somatic mutations and 62.3% of the copy number aberrations were concordant between primary tumors and recurrences and that actionable molecular targets to be lost or gained in the metastases compared with matched primary tumors.

GLOBAL GENOMIC APPROACHES

A number of studies have applied comparative genomic hybridization (CGH) to detect copy number discordances between primary breast tumors and matched metastases, as seen in Table 5, with rather contradictory results. Some studies found a significantly higher number of aberrations in metastases compared with primary tumors (33,34), whereas others did not (35–38). Using CGH, Torres et al. found extensive clonal divergence between primary tumors and metastases and higher frequency of alterations in primary breast cancers with metastases compared with tumors with no metastatic spread (38). This finding is also reported by Desouki et al. using array CGH (39). Conversely, also using array CGH, Poplawski et al. found 20% higher number of aberrations in primary tumors compared with metastases (40). This result is quite surprising as the general assumption is that additional genetic aberrations can accumulate through cancer progression due to the inherent genomic instability underlying cancer. One explanation might be the heterogeneity within the primary tumor, where several subclones with adverse aberrations coexist, whereas metastases are seeded from one of these subclones and therefore contains
only a subset of aberrations. Another explanation may be a higher degree of normal cell admixture within the metastases, resulting in lower sensitivity. The inconclusiveness of the studies is likely due to the relatively poor resolution of the CGH technique which renders this assay obsolete compared with copy number analysis using NGS, or arrayCGH/SNP-array technology.

Using whole-genome sequencing, Shah et al. sequenced a distant metastasis, biopsied from a pleural effusion, of one breast cancer patient with ER-positive, HER2-negative lobular breast cancer, and found 32 somatic nonsynonymous coding mutations (41). Five of the mutations were present in the corresponding primary tumor, 6 mutations were present subclonally in the primary tumor, 19 were not detected in the primary tumor, and 2 were undetermined. The study confirms molecular heterogeneity within the primary tumor and substantial further genomic evolution of the metastasis. The patient had been treated with adjuvant anti-estrogen therapies, but received no neo-adjuvant or adjuvant chemotherapy. A mediating factor for the genomic discordance between primary tumor and recurrence may be the great time span of 9 years between the primary tumor and the recurrence in addition to the selective pressures provided by anti-estrogen therapies.

A study by Ding et al. based on a single breast cancer patient performed whole-genome sequencing of a basal-like (ER negative, PR negative, and HER2 negative) primary breast cancer, a brain metastasis, a xenograft, and matched peripheral blood (42). The

### Table 5. Selection of Studies Comparing Primary Tumors and Metastatic Lesions Using Global Genomic Approaches

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Author (Ref)</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Method</th>
<th>No. patients</th>
<th>Analyzed metastatic site</th>
<th>Result</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Nishizaki et al. (34)</td>
<td>1997</td>
<td>CGH</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>Local recurrences, ALN metastases, or distant metastases</td>
<td>The total number of aberrations detected exclusively in the lymph node metastases or distant metastases was higher than that for the primary tumors (2.5 versus 0.7 p &lt; 0.05)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kuukasjärvi et al. (35)</td>
<td>1997</td>
<td>CGH</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>Asynchronous metastases</td>
<td>Mean number of changes detected by CGH was 8.7 (range 0–20) in primary tumors and 9.0 (range 1–24) in metastases—no significant difference. Pairwise clonality analysis of matched primary tumors and metastases revealed that 69% of the metastases were highly similar to their primary tumor and 31% of the metastases were genetically different from their primary tumor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Torres et al. (38)</td>
<td>2007</td>
<td>CGH</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>ALN metastases</td>
<td>No significant difference in the number of genomic imbalances between primary tumors and metastases. Clustering analysis showed extensive clonal divergence between primary tumors and metastases. Higher frequency of alterations in breast cancers with metastases than in tumors without metastases</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friedrich et al. (33)</td>
<td>2008</td>
<td>CGH</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>Local recurrences, ALN metastases, systemic metastases</td>
<td>Significant higher number of chromosomal imbalances in local recurrences (22.6 versus 16.2 p = 0.02), ALN metastases (21.5 versus 18.0 p = 0.03) and systemic metastases (28.1 versus 22.4 p = 0.02) compared with primary tumors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Li et al. (36)</td>
<td>2008</td>
<td>CGH</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>ALN metastases</td>
<td>26 of 29 pairs clustered together in unsupervised hierarchical clustering</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Santos et al. (37)</td>
<td>2008</td>
<td>CGH</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>SLN metastases</td>
<td>No significant difference in copy number aberrations between primary tumors and SLN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shah et al. (41)</td>
<td>2009</td>
<td>NGS</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Asynchronous distant metastasis</td>
<td>Of 32 coding, nonsynonymous mutations detected in the distant metastasis, 5 mutations were present in the primary tumor, 6 mutations were subclonally present in the primary tumor, 19 mutations were not detected in the primary tumor, and 2 were undetermined</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poplawski et al. (40)</td>
<td>2010</td>
<td>aCGH</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>Synchronous ALN metastases</td>
<td>20% higher number of aberrations in primary tumors (mean 33) compared with metastases (mean 27)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Desouki et al. (39)</td>
<td>2010</td>
<td>aCGH</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>Synchronous ALN metastases</td>
<td>Higher frequency of copy number alterations in breast cancers with metastases than in tumors without metastases. Similar number of copy number alterations in primary tumors and ALN metastases</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ding et al. (42)</td>
<td>2010</td>
<td>NGS</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Asynchronous distant metastasis and xenograft</td>
<td>Two de novo mutations and a large deletion exclusively found in the distant metastasis, 20 shared mutations at higher frequency in the distant metastasis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Krøigård et al. (43)</td>
<td>2015</td>
<td>NGS</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Asynchronous distant metastasis</td>
<td>In the distant metastasis, 17 additional nonsynonymous point mutations were found. The distant metastasis retained all previous copy number aberrations and displayed 18 copy number loss and 18 copy number gain events in addition to the early acquired copy number events</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

CGH, comparative genomic hybridization; aCGH, array comparative genomic hybridization; ALN, axillary lymph node; SLN, sentinel lymph node; CSFTC, cerebrospinal fluid-derived tumor cells; DTCs, disseminated tumor cells; NGS, next-generation sequencing.
The patient had been treated with neo-adjuvant chemotherapy. The time interval from the primary surgery till appearance of the brain metastasis was 8 months and in this time span the patient received radiation therapy. The xenograft tumor line was generated from a sample of the primary tumor biopsied before treatment. Of the 50 validated point mutations and small indels detected, 48 were present in all three tumors. The metastasis contained two de novo mutations and a large deletion not present in the primary tumor and significant enrichment of 20 shared mutations. The two de novo mutations private to the metastasis were not likely to be essential to the metastatic process, as one of them was a silent mutation and both mutations were absent in the xenograft, which nevertheless displayed full metastatic abilities. Hence, the metastasis-enabling mutations were most likely to be present already within the genome of the primary tumor. The study found that 96.11% and 93.98% of copy number aberrations found in the primary tumor were retained in the metastasis and the xenograft, respectively, indicating that most primary tumor copy number aberrations are preserved during disease progression. The quite high percentages imply that very few copy number events are evolved in the primary tumor after dissemination, rendering them private to the primary tumor. This suggests that dissemination of the successful metastatic cell most likely occurred relatively late in molecular time from the most advanced clone of the primary tumor. Conversely, only 80.65% of metastasis and 61.29% of xenograft copy number aberrations were found in the primary tumor, revealing substantial additional development of copy number events after dissemination from the primary tumor. Thus, copy number aberrations constitute the largest degree of genomic discordance between the primary tumor and the metastasis in this study. All five detected translocations were concordant between primary tumor and metastasis. The relatively small genomic discordance between the primary tumor and metastasis in this study may be explained by the relatively short time span of 8 months between the primary tumor and metastasis.

A recent study reports the genome evolution of one breast cancer patient with ER-positive, HER2-negative invasive ductal carcinoma including two pre-invasive regions, a primary tumor, and a distant metastasis located in a contralateral periclavicular lymph node, representing recurrence after 4 years (43). The patient had been treated with neo-adjuvant and adjuvant chemotherapy and adjuvant anti-estrogen therapy. This study similarly found the metastasis to be seeded from the most advanced clone in the primary tumor, thus relatively late in molecular time. The study revealed substantial mutational discordance between the primary tumor and metastasis with 17 additional somatic nonsynonymous point mutations and 36 additional copy number aberrations in the metastasis, whereas early acquired copy number aberrations were kept as imprints in the genome. The genomic evolution presented in this study may be strongly influenced by the selective pressures provided by the adjuvant treatment.

Studies with broad or global approaches detecting discordances between primary tumors and metastases may provide novel insight into genes or pathways playing a role in the metastatic process.

**LIQUID BIOPSY**

An appealing alternative for biopsy of metastatic lesions is the minimally invasive “liquid biopsy” with molecular characterization of circulating tumor cells (CTCs) (44) or tumor cell derived cell-free DNA (cfDNA) in plasma (45). Circulating tumor DNA levels are found to correlate with tumor burden (46) and may be used to monitor treatment response, detect subclinical residual disease, and for directing therapy decisions.

These methods actually address the heterogeneity of breast cancer as the CTCs and cfDNA in plasma originates from all malignant lesions within the patient. This is supported in recent studies comparing primary tumors, metastases, and CTCs or cfDNA (47–49). However, the methods are dependent on the detection of cancer-specific genetic changes and rely on the assumption that the cancer genomes does not evolve to an extent where it loses identifiable markers. Another concern is that the cell-free DNA originates from apoptotic cancer cells, i.e., the cancer cells succumbing to therapy, whereas the viable subset of cancer cells may be more difficult to detect (50), thus demanding a high sensitivity of the assay.

**CONCLUSION**

The increasing use of molecularly targeted therapy in breast cancer treatment emphasizes the importance of establishing whether primary tumors may be used as surrogates of disseminated disease. Discordance of
actionable molecular targets has great clinical implications for optimal patient care and the avoidance of unnecessary side effects. Naturally, influencing factors of genomic, transcriptomic, and proteomic discordance between primary tumors and metastases include selective forces provided by treatment, the degree of genomic instability of the cancer genome, and the time span in which genomic alterations can take place. Explanations of the inconsistencies of the reported studies include methodological issues, relatively low numbers of studied patients, and maybe most importantly the heterogeneity of breast cancer. Due to clonal heterogeneity a small section of a primary tumor might not be representative of the entire clonality of the tumor, leaving small subclones undetected, and the selective pressures provided by treatment can entail positive selection of initially overlooked cancer cell populations. Moreover, it is likely that the different subtypes of breast cancer may be more or less prone to further genomic, transcriptomic, and proteomic evolution.

Overall, the studies reveal substantial discordances between primary tumors and metastases, which stresses the need for analysis of metastatic tissue at recurrences. International guidelines state that a biopsy of a metastatic lesion should be performed, if clinically feasible. It should, however, be kept in mind that evidence of the clinical impact of changes in treatment based on biopsy of metastases have yet to be evaluated and that one biopsy may not be representative of all disseminated cancer cells.

In addition to the direct clinical advantages of biopsy of recurrences, the molecular characterization of metastatic lesions and the molecular differences between matched primary tumors and metastatic lesions have the potential to reveal novel, potentially targetable, drivers of metastatic progression. The extreme complexity of cancer biology necessitates analysis not only on a single level, as the novel targets for molecularly targeted therapy can be revealed at the DNA, RNA, protein level, or epigenetically. Liquid biopsies with analysis of CTCs or tumor-derived cfDNA are likely to play an increasing role in cancer patient monitoring and have the advantage of addressing the issue of genetic heterogeneity.
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