Immunohistochemistry of KRAS Protein in Colorectal Cancer
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Abstract: PCR assays are used for the detection of KRAS mutations in colorectal cancer (CRC). However, there are some disadvantages in the clinical application such as the high-cost value and specific codon properties of this method. Our study aimed to evaluate the effectivity of immunohistochemistry (IHC) in assessing ras gene aberration in CRC before PCR testing. Paraffin-embedded tissue samples from 45 CRC patients were stained immunohistochemically using anti-KRAS protein polyclonal antibody. KRAS protein expression was assessed and correlated with clinicopathological features. A chi-square test was performed to evaluate the results statistically. KRAS protein positivity was observed in 31.1% of cases. The positivity was correlated with female predominance (p=0.03). No significant correlation between KRAS protein expression with age, tumor topography, lymph node metastases, TNM staging, and tumor differentiation. In conclusion, IHC was regarded as cost-effective, non-specific for codons, and may complement PCR in the detection of KRAS gene mutation.

1 INTRODUCTION

Colorectal cancer (CRC) is one of the most common cancers worldwide and is the second leading cause of cancer deaths (Jemal et al., 2011). Sporadic CRC frequently arises through the activation of oncogenes such as KRAS and BRAF as well as inactivation of tumor suppressor and mismatch repair genes (Raskov, Pommergaard, Burcharth, & Rosenberg, 2014). KRAS mutation is one of the first alterations that occur in colorectal tumorigenesis (Rajagopalan et al., 2002). Mutation of KRAS occurs approximately in 14%-50% of CRC and frequently detected in codon 12 and codon 13 (Sammoud et al., 2012).

Anti-epidermal growth factor receptor (EGFR) antibody such as cetuximab and panitumumab has been approved for CRC treatment. It engaged with the extracellular domain of EGFR, blocks ligand binding, and leads to inhibition of downstream RAS-RAF-MEK-ERK signaling pathway (Porru, Pompili, Caruso, Birocchio, & Leonetti, 2018). However, this therapy is not recommended for use in patients with KRAS mutation because of anti-EGFR antibody resistance (De Roock et al., 2010). Therefore, KRAS status becomes an important biomarker for patient selection.

PCR is an established assay for KRAS mutation detection since this analysis has favorable sensitivity even in samples with low tumor cells (Cree, 2016). However, there are some weaknesses of PCR assays in the clinical setting such as high-cost value and specific codon properties of this method. Immunohistochemistry (IHC) has been suggested as the prior screening method before genetic testing (Wan Juhari et al., 2015). It has been a part of routine service in most of the pathology laboratories which not as expensive as molecular detection screening.

In the detection of MMR defects, IHC showed high sensitivity and specificity compared to molecular MSI-testing (Shia, 2008). However, in the screening of ras gene aberration, several previous studies revealed conflicting results (Elshabah & Adel, 2013; Piton, Borrini, Bolognese, Lamy, & Sabourin, 2015). In this study, we evaluated the
immunoexpression of KRAS proteins in CRC. We discuss the result of KRAS immunohistochemistry and its relationship with some of the clinicopathological features.

2 MATERIALS AND METHODS

This study was approved by the Research Ethics Committee of Faculty of Medicine Universitas Jenderal Soedirman. A total of 45 Formalin-fixed paraffin-embedded (FPPE) tissue blocks of CRC patients underwent colectomy were collected from Margono Soekarjo Hospital and private pathology laboratory from January to December 2019.

FPPE tissue blocks were subjected to staining by immunohistochemical assays. Sections of FPPE tissue blocks (4 µm) were transferred to positively charged slides. Then, they were subjected to deparaffinized, rehydration, and blocking with hydrogen peroxide and antigen retrieval (Dako target retrieval solution, citrate buffer pH 6.0) at 100 °C for 10 minutes. After a short rinsed in phosphate-buffered saline (PBS), slides then incubated overnight at room temperature with primary antibody against KRAS oncoprotein (orb53139 KRAS polyclonal antibody: dilution 1:100, UK). Slides were washed with PBS, then incubated for 30 minutes with labeled secondary antibody. Product visualization (Dako) was performed with diaminobenzidine substrate as the chromogen. The slides were counterstained with Mayer’s hematoxylin and washed once each with distilled water and PBS. Finally, slides dehydrated with ethanol, cleared in xylene, and mounted under a coverslip.

Slides were evaluated under a light microscope by pathologists subjectively. Sample with no primary antibody added was used as a negative control. Cytoplasmic expression of KRAS protein was assessed using the previously established criteria of Allred et al (Allred, Harvey, Berardo, & Clark, 1998). We considered positive expression if the score of more than 2 in tumor cells.

The corresponding clinical and pathological data including sex, age, tumor topography, lymph node metastases, TNM staging, and tumor differentiation were obtained from a review of patient records. Association between clinicopathological parameters and KRAS protein immunostaining was statistically examined by the Chi-square test, and p-value < 0.05 was considered significant.

3 RESULTS

Table 1 shows the clinicopathological features of CRC cases. More than half of the patients were male. The mean age of the patients was 52.2±12.5 years, and most of them were >40 years old age. The majority of the CRC were located on the distal colonic, and most of them were in stage 3 with well/moderate differentiation.

Table 1: Association between KRAS protein expression and clinicopathological features of CRC.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Features</th>
<th>KRAS protein expression</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Positive</td>
<td>Negative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sex</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>5(35.7)</td>
<td>22(71)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>9(64.3)</td>
<td>9(29)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>0.63</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>≤40</td>
<td>3(21.4)</td>
<td>7(22.6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt;40</td>
<td>11(78.6)</td>
<td>24(77.4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Topography</td>
<td>0.62</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proximal colon</td>
<td>5(35.7)</td>
<td>11(35.5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Distal colon</td>
<td>9(64.3)</td>
<td>20(64.5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lymph Node Status</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Positive</td>
<td>7(50)</td>
<td>9(29)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negative</td>
<td>7(50)</td>
<td>22(71)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staging</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stage 2</td>
<td>7(50)</td>
<td>9(29)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stage 3</td>
<td>7(50)</td>
<td>22(71)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Differentiation</td>
<td>0.69</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Well and moderate</td>
<td>14(100)</td>
<td>30(96.8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>0(0)</td>
<td>1(3.2)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 1: Representative photomicrographs of KRAS immunostaining in CRC tissues (A. Negative expression; B. Positive expression; 400x magnification).

Positive KRAS protein expression was found in 14(31.1%) of cases (Figure 1). We found a significant association between positive KRAS protein expression and female predominance. Nevertheless, our study did not reveal any statistical association between KRAS protein expression with age,
topography, lymph node status, tumor staging, and tumor differentiation.

4 DISCUSSION

Mutation of RAS proto-oncogenes is frequently found in human cancer. In colorectal carcinogenesis, mutation of KRAS leads to uncontrolled proliferation and malignant transformation. Nowadays, the determination of the KRAS mutation is mandatory for treatment with anti-EGFR therapy in patients with CRC. KRAS and BRAF mutations play a pivotal role in colorectal carcinogenesis and are related to the main resistance to anti-EGFR therapy (Larki et al., 2017). Unfortunately, mutation of KRAS has only been detected commonly in codon 12, 13, and 61 (Lee et al., 2017). Therefore, expanding RAS testing in CRC to analyze more mutations may better predict benefit from anti-EGFR therapy.

However, increase testing volume will increase testing costs which may have economic implications. Previous studies revealed that single standard KRAS exon 2 testing was more than threefold costly than single antibody IHC assay (Kircher, Mohindra, & Nimeiri, 2015; Muirhead, Aoun, Powell, Juncker, & Mollerup, 2010). Thus, the morphological study followed by protein detection using IHC appears to be an alternative to molecular screening. IHC of KRAS might be useful as a prognostic and predictive marker in CRC. KRAS positive protein expression was associated with the disease aggressiveness of CRC. There was a significantly reduced relapse-free survival (RPS) in rectal cancer patients with KRAS positive protein expression (Kanik, Gajjar, & Ghosh, 2018).

In the present study, we detected KRAS protein expression in 31.1% of CRC cases. This result was close to study in Europe (33%) (Piton et al., 2015) but lower than study in Egypt (42.3%) (Elsabah & Adel, 2013). This KRAS IHC positivity was also close to a study that revealed KRAS mutation in 32.8% of CRC cases previously (Liu, Jakubowski, & Hunt, 2011). However, other studies found mutation positivity range between 14% to 50% (Sammoud et al., 2012). These differences were reported because of several weaknesses of mutation analysis such as codon specific mutation sites, ethnic variations (Zhang et al., 2015), diet, and lifestyle factors (Hughes, Simons, van den Brandt, van Engeland, & Weijenberg, 2017).

Our data demonstrated the predominance of KRAS protein expression in female CRC patients. This finding was in line with several previous studies that reported a correlation between mutated KRAS and the female gender in CRC (Li et al., 2015; Tong et al., 2014). However, other reports using IHC assays did not demonstrate such a relationship (Kanik et al., 2018; Sammoud et al., 2012). A possible explanation for our result is likely complex and multifactorial including lifestyle factors and the composition of gut microbiota which varies among gender (Kostic et al., 2011). Female sex hormones are related to colorectal carcinogenesis by their effects on the production of bile acid, bowel transit time, and bacterial fermentation (Sammoud et al., 2012).

In this recent study, we did not find an association between KRAS protein expression and the age of patients. This is in keeping with some previous reports both using IHC or molecular testing (Elsabah & Adel, 2013; Rosty et al., 2013). However, another study reported that ras p21 IHC overexpression was relatively related to the advanced age of patients (Sammoud et al., 2012). This difference result might be caused by different classification of the patient's age.

Besides, we did not discover any significant relationship between KRAS protein expression and other clinicopathological parameters such as topography, lymph node status, stage, and differentiation of the tumors. Our result was in agreement with previous studies using either IHC (Elsabah & Adel, 2013; Piton et al., 2015) or PCR assays (Sammoud et al., 2012). Nevertheless, other reports detected an association between mutant KRAS with mucinous subtype and greater differentiation of CRC (Zhang et al., 2015). Unfortunately, in our study, we only had one sample of poorly differentiated CRC, and showing negative KRAS protein staining.

5 CONCLUSIONS

The prevalence of positive KRAS protein in CRC was relatively the same as the prevalence of KRAS mutation. However, the use of polyclonal antibody which not specific to detect KRAS mutant became one of the limitations of KRAS IHC assays. Therefore, the development of a monoclonal antibody designed against the mutated KRAS domain is necessary. This could greatly assist the screening of CRC patients for anti-EGFR therapies. In the future, IHC could become a promising tool in diagnostic and prognostic decisions.
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