Activity and Safety of the Antiestrogen EM-800, the Orally Active Precursor of Acolbifene, in Tamoxifen-Resistant Breast Cancer

Fernand Labrie, Pierre Champagne, Claude Labrie, Jean Roy, Jacques Laverdière, Louise Provencher, Martin Potvin, Yvan Drolet, Michael Pollak, Lawrence Panasci, Bernard L'Espérance, Jean Dufresne, Jean Latreille, Jean Robert, Benoît Samson, Jacques Jolivet, Louise Yelle, Lionel Cusan, Pierre Diamond, and Bernard Candas

A B S T R A C T

Purpose
To determine the efficacy and safety of EM-800 (SCH-57050), the precursor of acolbifene, a new, highly potent, orally active, pure antiestrogen in the mammary gland and endometrium, for the treatment of tamoxifen-resistant breast cancer.

Patients and Methods
Forty-three post menopausal/ovariectomized women with breast cancer who had received tamoxifen, either for metastatic disease or as adjuvant to surgery for $\geq$ 1 year, and had relapsed were treated in a prospective, multicenter, phase II study with EM-800 (20 mg/d [n = 21] or 40 mg/d [n = 22] orally).

Results
Thirty-seven patients had estrogen receptor (ER)-positive tumors (>10 fmol/mg; mean, 146 fmol/mg cytosolic protein), three patients had ER-negative/progesterone receptor-positive tumors, and three patients had undetermined ER status. The objective response rate to EM-800 was 12%, with one complete response and four partial responses. Ten patients (23%) had stable disease for $\geq$ 3 months, and 7 patients (16%) had stable disease for $\geq$ 6 months. With a median follow-up of 29 months, median duration of response was 8 months (range, 7 to 71+ months). Treatment with EM-800 was well tolerated. No significant adverse events related to the study drug were observed clinically or biochemically.

Conclusion
EM-800 produced responses in a significant proportion of patients with tamoxifen-resistant breast cancer, thus showing that this highly potent, selective estrogen receptor modulator, which lacks estrogenic activity in the mammary gland and endometrium, has incomplete cross-resistance with tamoxifen, thus suggesting additional benefits in the treatment of breast cancer.

INTRODUCTION

Although 30% to 40% of patients with advanced breast cancer show an initial response to tamoxifen, the duration of response is usually limited to 12 to 18 months, with subsequent development of resistance to further administration of the antiestrogen [1]. Based on many clinical observations [2-6], and demonstrated in a series of studies performed with human breast cancer cell lines in vitro as well as in vivo with xenografts, it is believed that the loss of positive response to tamoxifen in breast cancer patients is as a result, at least in part, of the intrinsic estrogenic activity of the compound or its metabolites [7-12]. It has also been shown that the inhibitory effect of tamoxifen is limited to the hormone-dependent activation function (AF) of the estrogen receptor, known as AF-2, while this compound does not inhibit the hormone-independent pathway of activation known as AF-1 [13,14]. Therefore, to test the hypothesis that a more specific and potent antiestrogen completely devoid of estrogenic

activity in human breast or endometrial carcinoma cells [14-30] would have improved clinical efficacy, we have administered the novel, orally active antiestrogen EM-800 (SCH-57050) to women who had experienced tamoxifen therapy failure.

EM-800 is the precursor of EM-652 [16]. This compound acts as a pure and highly potent antiestrogen in human breast and uterine cancer cells in vitro as well as in vivo in nude mice [15-30]. In fact, EM-800 is the most potent of the known antiestrogens and, to our knowledge, it is the only nonsteroidal antiestrogen shown to have no estrogenic activity either in human Ishikawa endometrial carcinoma cells, as assessed by changes in alkaline phosphatase activity, or in human breast carcinoma cells, as shown in cell proliferation studies [14-16,19,20,23-30]. Moreover, as mentioned above, EM-800 blocks both the AF-1 and AF-2 activities of the estrogen receptor [14], thus potentially decreasing the resistance to hormonal therapy.

The high potency of EM-800 derives in part from the high affinity of its active metabolite (EM-652 [SCH-57068]) for the estrogen receptor (ER) [24,26]. In fact, EM-652 has the highest affinity for ER of any known compound to date, with a low dissociation constant of 0.05 nmol/L. In fact, EM-652 is 1.5- to 3.0-fold more potent than 17 beta-estradiol and diethylstibestrol in displacing [^{3}H]estradiol from the ER in human breast cancer and normal uterine tissue. EM-652 is 200-fold more potent than tamoxifen, and is five-fold more potent than hydroxytamoxifen (the active metabolite of tamoxifen). In comparison to other antiestrogens. EM-800 has also demonstrated high potency in vivo. In a murine model, EM-800 was at least 30-fold more potent than tamoxifen in inhibiting estrogen-stimulated uterine growth. In addition, the maximal inhibitory effect on uterine weight achieved with EM-800 is 2.5-fold greater than the maximum effect achieved with tamoxifen [18].

The clinical potential of an antiestrogen more potent and more specific than tamoxifen is supported by the finding that tamoxifen-resistant human breast cancer cell lines remain sensitive to compounds showing pure antiestrogenic activity on cell proliferation in the mammary gland, under in vitro conditions [10,31-33] and when grown as xenografts in nude mice [12,15,34,35]. This compound has been shown to inhibit human breast cancer tumor growth in nude mice below the inhibition achieved with tamoxifen [15,27,28]. The current phase II study was conducted to assess the activity and safety of EM-800 in patients with tamoxifen-resistant breast carcinoma.

PATIENTS AND METHODS

Patients

Forty-two post menopausal or ovariectomized women and one premenopausal woman with tamoxifen-resistant breast cancer were enrolled between March 21, 1996, and June 13, 1997. The study was approved by the institutional review board of each hospital or university, and all patients gave informed consent. Eligible patients had progressive metastatic or locally advanced biopsy-proven or fine needle aspiration-proven inoperable breast cancer that had responded to tamoxifen (complete response [CR] or partial response [PR]) or had remained stable for at least 6 months before progression. Thus, 21 patients had acquired tamoxifen resistance while being treated with tamoxifen for advanced disease. Patients originally treated with adjuvant tamoxifen for at least 1 year after surgery who subsequently progressed either while on tamoxifen (18 patients) or after its discontinuation (four patients) were also eligible. For these 22 patients, differentiation between acquired and de novo tamoxifen resistance could not be made since a possible response before progression cannot be detected. In fact, this tamoxifen resistance could be acquired or existing (de novo) before the start of treatment. Tamoxifen therapy must have been discontinued at least 1 month before initiating treatment with EM-800, unless the investigator judged that the disease was rapidly progressing. Eligible patients could not have received previous treatment for metastatic disease (including systemic cytostatic or hormonal treatment) other than tamoxifen. Adjuvant chemotherapy was allowed but must have been completed ≥ 1 year before study entry. Eligible patients had Eastern Cooperative Oncology Group performance status of ≤ 2, a life expectancy ≥ 6 months, and measurable lesion(s) according to WHO criteria [36]. Tumors had to be ER-positive, progesterone receptor-positive (>10 fmol/mg cytosolic protein or positive by immunocytochemistry), or of unknown status. All patients underwent a baseline staging evaluation. Baseline hematology, clinical chemistry, and urinalysis had to be normal according to the accepted values of each hospital.

Exclusion criteria included cancer other than breast carcinoma (except successfully treated in situ carcinoma of the cervix or skin carcinoma other than melanoma), CNS involvement by cancer, lymphangitic pulmonary metastases, severe infection, and severe liver or kidney disease. Patients with neutropenia or thrombocytopenia unrelated to chemotherapy were also excluded.

Treatment

Patients were treated with a daily oral dose (20 or 40 mg) of EM-800. The drug was administered with 240 mL of tap water in the evening (at bedtime, at least 2 hours after the last meal) for 6 months or until progression or unacceptable toxicity. The first eight patients were treated with 20 mg/d EM-800. Following confirmation by an independent review board of the tolerance and safety of the 20-mg dose in at least four patients treated for at least 1 month, a second group of eight patients were treated with 40 mg/d EM-800. Thereafter, patients were randomly allocated to receive either 20 mg or 40 mg EM-800. Patients and investigators were blinded to the dose level. Patients were to be removed from the study for any of the following: development of serious drug-related adverse event, poor compliance (ie, treatment interruption for 7 consecutive days), or disease progression confirmed on two observations at least 1 month apart.

Evaluation of Response

Tumor response was evaluated according to the WHO criteria [36]. Chest radiography, computed tomography scan of lung for lesions less than 2 cm in diameter, abdominal ultrasound and computed tomography scan of liver (in cases having a positive ultrasound), bone radiography, and isotopic bone scan were performed at start of treatment. In patients with locally advanced

Table 1. Patient Characteristics at Study Entry

Baseline Characteristics	
Age, years	
Mean	66
Range	43-86
ER status, No. of patients	
ER positive*	37
ER negative/PR positive*	3
Not determined	3
ER level, fmol/mg†	
Mean	146
Range	7-686
Time to relapse from start of tamoxifen, weeks	
Median	34
Range	5-159
Setting of prior tamoxifen therapy, No. of patients	
Adjuvant therapy	22
Advanced metastatic disease	16
Adjuvant and metastatic disease	5

Abbreviations: ER, estrogen receptor; PR, progesterone receptor.
*>10 fmol/mg cytosolic protein or positive by immunocytochemistry.
†Based on 34 patients for whom a quantitative measurement of ER level was made.

disease with no evidence of metastases, these tests were repeated after 6 months of treatment unless the patient developed particular signs or symptoms of progression during the study. If exams were positive for metastases at the start of treatment, the exams were repeated at 1, 3, and 6 months for evaluation of response. Superficial or palpable lesions (cutaneous metastases, lymph nodes) were measured in two dimensions at monthly intervals. Hematology and blood chemistry analysis, as well as urinalysis, were performed at start of treatment, at 1, 2, and 4 weeks, and at monthly intervals thereafter. Vital signs were measured and a tolerability questionnaire was filled out at the same time intervals.

RESULTS

Patient and Treatment Characteristics

Forty-three patients were enrolled; 21 patients received 20 mg/d EM-800, and 22 patients received 40 mg/d EM-800. The demographic and baseline clinical characteristics of the patients are shown in Table 1. The median age was 66 years (range, 43 to 86 years). Thirty-seven patients had

ER-positive tumors (> 10 fmol/mg cytosolic protein), three patients had ER-negative/progesterone receptor-positive tumors, and three patients were of unknown ER status. The mean ER level was 146 fmol/mg (range, 7 to 686 fmol/mg) in 34 patients for whom a quantitative determination was available. Twenty-two patients had been treated with tamoxifen in the adjuvant setting only, 16 patients had been treated with tamoxifen for advanced metastatic disease only, and five patients had received the antiestrogen both as adjuvant therapy and then for advanced metastatic disease. The median time to relapse from the start of tamoxifen therapy was 34 weeks (range, 5 to 159 weeks).

Response to Therapy

In the total study population, objective tumor responses were observed in five of 43 (12%) patients (Table 2), including one CR and four PRs; 10 patients (23%) had stable disease (SD) for at least 3 months, and seven patients (16%) had SD for at least 6 months. With a median follow-up of 29 months, the median duration of response for the five responders was 8 months (range, 7 to 71+ months); one of the five responders (20%) continues to respond after 71 months. Among the patients treated with 20 mg EM-800, two patients (10%) had a PR, with a response duration of 8 to 71+ months, and three patients (14%) had SD for a duration of 8 to 10 months. Among patients treated with 40 mg EM-800, one patient had a CR and responded for 57 months; two patients (9%) had a PR, with a response duration of 7 and 8 months, while seven patients (32%) had SD, with a duration of 3 to 77+ months. Two patients continue to respond at 71 and 77 months, respectively. No significant dose effect was observed.

Patterns of Failure

At the start of EM-800 administration, the predominant sites of metastasis following tamoxifen failure were (in decreasing order of occurrence): bone (29 patients), lymph nodes (15 patients), liver (11 patients), lung (10 patients), skin (five patients) and breast (two patients; Table 3). Metastases were present at other sites in six patients. Progression was present at only one site in 19 patients, at two sites in 17 patients, and at three sites or more in seven patients at the start of EM-800 treatment. Most responses were observed

Table 2. Best Response to EM-800 and Response Durations by Dose

Best Response	20 mg (n = 21)			40 mg (n = 22)		
	No.	%	Response Duration (months)	No.	%	Response Duration (months)
CR	0	0	—	1	5	57
PR	2	10	8, 71+	2	9	7, 8
SD	3	14	8, 9, 10	7	32	3, 4, 5, 16, 16, 17, 77+
PD	16	76	—	12	54	—

Abbreviations: CR, complete response; PR, partial response; SD, stable disease; PD, progressive disease; +, response still ongoing.

Table 3. Disease Site(s) at Start and at Failure to EM-800 Therapy and Best Response by Disease Site

Site(s) of Disease	At Start of Treatment	CR	PR	SD	PD (any site)	At Failure to EM-800
		Best Response				
Bone(s)	29	—	1	7	21	17
Node(s)	15	1	3	1	10	5
Liver	11	—	—	2	9	9
Lung	10	—	1	1	8	5
Skin	5	—	1	2	2	2
Breast	2	—	1	—	1	—
Others	6	—	—	2	2	3
One organ site	19	1	2	6	10	—
Two organ sites	17	—	1	3	13	—
Three organ sites	7	—	1	1	5	—

Abbreviations: CR, complete response; PR, partial response; SD, stable disease; PD, progressive disease.
NOTE. Eighteen patients had progressed while receiving tamoxifen while four progressed following cessation of tamoxifen.

in patients with bone, skin, breast, and/or nodal metastases (Table 3). No CRs or PRs were observed in patients with liver metastases. Nine of 11 (82%) patients with liver metastases and eight of 10 (80%) patients with lung metastases at start of treatment progressed at those initial sites of disease. Seventeen of 29 (59%) patients with progression in the bones at start of study progressed at the same site during the study. In the majority of cases, patients who failed EM-800 therapy progressed at the same site(s) where they were progressing at the start of EM-800 treatment.

Response Based on Previous Tamoxifen Therapy

No correlation was observed between response to EM-800 therapy and duration of prior tamoxifen therapy. The single CR occurred after 2 months of treatment with 40 mg EM-800 in a patient who had progressed in a right axillary lymph node while receiving tamoxifen after 42 months of adjuvant tamoxifen therapy. Among the four PRs, three patients had received adjuvant tamoxifen therapy for 5, 61, and 64 months, respectively, while one patient had received tamoxifen for advanced disease for 8 months. Among the five patients who responded to EM-800, three progressed

while receiving tamoxifen (one CR and two PR) while two progressed 3 and 3.5 years after having received tamoxifen for 5 years, 4 years, and 3 months, respectively. Among patients with SD, two patients had received adjuvant tamoxifen therapy for 70 and 73 months, six patients had received tamoxifen for advanced disease for periods ranging from 10 to 92 months, and two patients had received tamoxifen both as adjuvant therapy and for advanced disease.

With respect to any association between response to EM-800 and the disease stage before tamoxifen therapy, four of five (80%) objective tumor responses to EM-800 were observed in patients who had received adjuvant tamoxifen therapy (Table 4). However, when SD is included in the comparison, the proportion of responding patients (improvement or stabilization of disease following EM-800 treatment) was similar between subgroups: six of 22 (27%) patients who had received tamoxifen as adjuvant therapy, and seven of 16 (44%) patients who had received tamoxifen for advanced disease. Both of these subgroups were well balanced with respect to sites of metastases, with 43% of patients in each group having liver or lung metastases.

Table 4. Best Response Based on Disease Stage of Previous Tamoxifen Therapy

Previous Treatment Setting	No. of Patients	CR	PR	SD	PD
		Best Response			
Adjuvant	22*	1[†]	3[‡]	2	16
Advanced disease	16	—	1	6	9
Adjuvant + advanced disease	5	—	—	2	3

Abbreviations: CR, complete response; PR, partial response; SD, stable disease; PD, progressive disease.
*Eighteen patients had progressed while receiving tamoxifen while four progressed following cessation of tamoxifen.
[†]was progressing under tamoxifen.
[‡]One patient was progressing under tamoxifen, while one progressed 3 years and 5 months after having received tamoxifen for 4 years and 3 months, while the other patient had progressed 3 years after having received tamoxifen for 5 years.

| | 20 mg (n = 21) | | 40 mg (n = 22) | | | |
| | Grade I/II | | Grade I/II | | Grade III/IV | |
Adverse Event	No. of Patients	%	No. of Patients	%	No. of Patients	%
Bone/muscle pain	14	67	15	68	2	9
Nausea	7	33	9	41	2	9
Fatigue	5	24	10	45	—	—
Asthenia	4	19	7	32	—	—
Vomiting	5	24	3	14	3	14
Hot flashes	4	19	3	14	—	—
Heartburn	2	10	5	23	—	—
Abdominal pain	2	10	3	14	1	5
Flu-like symptoms	2	10	4	18	—	—
Decreased appetite	3	14	3	14	—	—
Constipation	2	10	3	18	1	5
Depression	2	10	4	18	—	—
Diarrhea	3	14	1	5	—	—
Headache	5	24	5	23	—	—
Soft stools	2	10	—	—	—	—
Urinary tract infection	2	10	—	—	—	—
Decreased hemoglobin	2	10	—	—	—	—
Paresthesias	2	10	—	—	—	—

Table 5. Summary of Adverse Events Occurring in ≥10% of Patients at Either Dose Level by WHO Grade

Safety

No clinically significant adverse event (AE) related to the study drug was observed at either dose level. Commonly reported AEs are shown in Table 5. At the 20-mg dose level, no WHO grade 3/4 AE was observed. Bone and muscle pain was the most common grade 1/2 AE, occurring in 14 patients (67%). Headache, vomiting, and fatigue each occurred in five patients (24%). At the 40-mg dose level, grade 3/4 vomiting occurred in three patients (14%), while severe nausea and bone/muscle pain each occurred in two patients (9%). The most common grade 1/2 AE was also bone/muscle pain reported in 15 patients (68%) in the 40-mg dose group. The next most frequent mild to moderate AEs were fatigue, nausea, and asthenia that occurred in 10 (45%), nine (41%), and seven (32%) patients, respectively. No patient complained of vaginal dryness or altered libido. In long-term follow-up of patients who remained on EM 800 therapy for at least 2 years, 10 various AEs were reported by eight patients, including nausea and vomiting (two patients), pleural effusion (two patients), bone pain, dyspnea, melena, chest pain, back pain, abdominal pain, and constipation (one patient each). One death from breast cancer occurred in the 40-mg dose group within 30 days of treatment interruption.

DISCUSSION

The present data show that EM-800, a novel selective estrogen receptor modulator (SERM) having pure antiestrogenic activity in the mammary gland, was well tolerated and induced clinical responses in a significant proportion of patients with advanced-stage, tamoxifen-resistant breast cancer. A 12% objective response rate (CRs + PRs) was observed, with a median response duration of 8 months at 29 months of median follow-up, with one of these five patients continuing to respond at 71 months. In addition, 23% of patients had SD for a median duration of 9 months, one of these seven patients still responding at 77 months. Similar results were observed in a series of 19 tamoxifen-resistant patients treated with monthly intramuscular injections of the pure steroidal antiestrogen fulvestrant [37]. In that small preliminary study, seven patients (36%) had a PR, and six patients (31%) had SD for a median duration of 25 months. In two large-scale studies performed in a comparable population of patients who had failed tamoxifen and received the pure steroidal antiestrogen fulvestrant, 44.6% and 42.2% had clinical benefit rates (CR + PR + SD ≥ 24 weeks), respectively. [38,39].

These results appear superior to those obtained with other antiestrogens or SERMs that have been investigated as salvage therapy in tamoxifen-resistant patients. For example, two large phase II studies of high-dose toremifene in patients with tamoxifen-refractory advanced breast cancer demonstrated objective response rates of only 4% and 5%, thus leading the authors to conclude that there is significant cross-resistance between toremifene and tamoxifen [40,41]. Salvage therapy with raloxifene in 14 patients produced no CR or PR, although five patients (36%) had SD [42].

As mentioned above, these studies performed with fulvestrant have shown an efficacy comparable to the aromatase inhibitor anastrazole in women who had failed endocrine therapy [38,39]. While both acolbifene (EM-652, EM-800) and fulvestrant exert pure antiestrogenic activity in the mammary gland and uterus, the possible advantages of EM-652 are its oral bioavailability and its protective effect on bone loss [16,43]. In addition to its protective effect on bone, the other potential advantages of EM-652 compared to aromatase inhibitors are the observations that aromatase inhibitors do not completely block the stimulatory effect of estrogen precursors on human breast cancer cells (MCF-71S6) [44] and do not prevent the stimulatory effect of the estrogenic steroid androstene-3 beta, 17 beta-diol [45], two effects achieved with EM-652.

The responses to EM-800 observed in the present study, and those observed with fulvestrant, are consistent with the suggestion that progression in patients treated with tamoxifen may be as a result, at least in part, of the partial estrogenic effects of tamoxifen, which can lead to stimulation of the proliferation of breast cancer cells [4-16,23,25-29]. A potentially important mechanism of tamoxifen resistance is related to the finding that tamoxifen does not inhibit the ligand-independent AF-1 activity of ER, whereas EM-800 does [14]. This observation further suggests a possible mechanism by which EM-800 and fulvestrant can induce responses in patients with tamoxifen-refractory tumors.

Consistent with other studies, most responses occurred in patients with bone, lymph node, skin, and breast metastases, whereas no objective tumor response was observed in patients with liver metastases. Others have also documented the unfavorable prognosis of patients with liver metastases [5]. There was, however, no apparent association between EM-800 response and the duration of previous tamoxifen therapy. Although the numbers are small, patients treated with tamoxifen in the adjuvant setting appeared more likely to achieve an objective response to EM-800; the proportion of patients who achieved an objective response or SD was 27% in the patients who had tamoxifen in the advanced disease state compared to 44% in the adjuvant setting. It might be proposed that patients who experienced adjuvant tamoxifen failure may have had less advanced disease than patients who failed to respond to tamoxifen for the treatment of advanced metastatic disease. However, a comparison of these subgroups reveals no major differences in sites of disease. In the two groups, 45% and 38% of patients had liver and/or lung metastases. Moreover, no clear association was observed between best response and the number of sites of progression at the start of EM-800 treatment. Finally, no clear dose-response relationship was observed in this study; two objective responses occurred in the 20-mg, while three were observed in the 40-mg dose group.

The majority of the AEs observed in the present study were mild to moderate in severity and were not considered by the investigators to be related to the study drug. Although nausea and vomiting were considered possibly related to treatment with EM-800, phase I studies performed in normal healthy women showed a similar incidence of nausea and vomiting in the EM-800 and placebo groups (unpublished data). Serious AEs, including grade 3/4 bone and/or muscle pain, nausea, abdominal pain, vomiting, and constipation occurred in a total of nine patients in the 40-mg dose group but were not considered by the investigators to be related to the study drug. These results are consistent with the absence of significant findings in preclinical toxicology studies performed in female rats and monkeys with EM-800 (25 mg/kg body weight), a dose approximately 35-fold higher than the highest dose used in the present study. No toxic effects were observed in animals tested daily for 12 months other than the endocrine changes expected from a pure antiestrogen. EM-800 was also well tolerated in a phase I study in 145 normal postmenopausal women who received daily doses of EM-800 up to 40 mg for up to 14 days. As indicated above, long-term follow-up of patients in the present study who remained on EM-800 therapy for more than 5 years also demonstrates the safety of EM-800 during long-term use. The AEs observed in the present study are not different from those observed in two large studies comparing fulvestrant and anastrozole in a similar category of patients [38,39]. Fulvestrant and anastrozole were also well tolerated, with the most common AEs being nausea, vasodilatation, asthenia, vomiting, and bone pain.

The present data are supported by numerous preclinical studies. In fact, while hormonal therapy of breast cancer was believed to be limited to a tumorostatic action as originally described with tamoxifen [7,8], it has recently been observed that alcobifene (EM-652) achieves the cure of 60% of human breast tumors in nude mice [30]. Probably as a result of a more complete inhibition of the estrogen receptor [14,16,19,20,26], the tumorocidal action of alcobifene is a new paradigm of estrogen blockade. Moreover, alcobifene and fulvestrant not only completely inhibit the stimulatory effect of estradiol on the proliferation of MCF-7/S6 cells but further inhibit cell growth by 80% below basal values [44].

Taken together, these data suggest that EM-800 may improve the rate, quality, and duration of responses in patients with tamoxifen-resistant advanced breast cancer. In addition, given the highly potent antiestrogenic activity, lack of any estrogenic stimulatory effect in the mammary gland and endometrium, as well as the good tolerability demonstrated in preclinical and clinical studies, EM-800 or its active metabolite EM-652 should also be investigated in the neoadjuvant and adjuvant settings and as front-line therapy for metastatic disease. It is reasonable to expect that EM-800 may be more effective than tamoxifen for the front-line treatment of breast and endometrial cancer, and its use should also decrease or eliminate the risk of carcinogenicity associated with the long-term use of tamoxifen [46]. EM-800 has been shown to pre-

vent bone loss in the ovariectomized rat [16,43] and to decrease serum cholesterol and triglycerides in the rat [47].

In conclusion, this orally bioavailable, nonsteroidal SERM having pure and highly potent antiestrogenic activity in the mammary gland has a number of important advantages over all other antiestrogens and should be actively investigated for the treatment of ER-positive breast cancer and other estrogen-sensitive malignancies. Moreover, the characteristics of EM-800 make it an ideal compound for prevention of breast and endometrial cancer because of the potential added benefits in terms of prevention of osteoporosis and cardiovascular disease in postmenopausal women.

■ ■ ■

REFERENCES

1. Ingle JN, Ahmann DL, Green SJ, et al: Randomized clinical trial of diethylstilbestrol versus tamoxifen in postmenopausal women with advanced breast cancer. N Engl J Med 304:16-21, 1981

2. Pritchard KI, Thomson DB, Myers RE, et al: Tamoxifen therapy in premenopausal patients with metastatic breast cancer. Cancer Treat Rep 64:787-796, 1980

3. Hoogstraten B, Gad el Mawla N, Maloney TR, et al: Combined modality therapy for first recurrence of breast cancer. A Southwest Oncology Group study. Cancer 54:2248-2256, 1984

4. Canney PA, Griffiths T, Latief TN, et al: Clinical significance of Tamoxifen withdrawal response. Lancet 1:36, 1987

5. Howell A, Dodwell DJ, Anderson H, et al: Response after withdrawal of tamoxifen and progestogens in advanced breast cancer. Ann Oncol 3:611-617, 1992

6. Wiebe VJ, Osborne CK, Fuqua SA, et al: Tamoxifen resistance in breast cancer. Crit Rev Oncol Hematol 14:173-188, 1993

7. Gottardis MM, Jordan VC: Development of tamoxifen-stimulated growth of MCF-7 tumors in athymic mice after long-term antiestrogen administration. Cancer Res 48:5183-5187, 1988

8. Gottardis MM, Wagner RJ, Borden EC, et al: Differential ability of antiestrogens to stimulate breast cancer cell (MCF-7) growth in vivo and in vitro. Cancer Res 49:4765-4769, 1989

9. Poulin R, Merand Y, Poirier D, et al: Antiestrogenic properties of Keoxifene trans-4-hydroxytamoxifen, and ICI 164384, a new steroidal antiestrogen, in ZR-75-1 human breast cancer cells. Breast Cancer Res Treat 14:65-76, 1989

10. Lykkesfeldt AE, Sorensen EK: Effect of estrogens and antiestrogens on cell proliferation and synthesis of secreted proteins in the human breast cancer cell line MCF-7 and tamoxifen resistant variant subline, AL 1. Acta Oncol 31:131-138, 1992

11. DeFriend DJ, Anderson E, Bell J, et al: Effects of 4-hydroxytamoxifen and a novel pure antioestrogen (ICI 182780) on the clonogenic growth of human breast cancer cells in vitro. Br J Cancer 70:204-211, 1994

12. Osborne CK, Coronado Heinsohn EB, Hilsenbeck SG, et al: Comparison of the effects of a pure steroidal antiestrogen with those of tamoxifen in a model of human breast cancer. J Natl Cancer Inst 87:746-750, 1995

13. Berry M, Metzger D, Chambon P: Role of the two activating domains of the oestrogen receptor in cell-type and promoter-context dependent agonistic activity of the anti-oestrogen 4-hydroxytamoxifen. EMBO J 9:2811-2818, 1990

14. Tremblay A, Tremblay GB, Labrie C, et al: EM-800, a novel antiestrogen, acts as a pure antagonist of the transcriptional functions of estrogen receptors α and β. Endocrinology 139: 111-118, 1998

15. Couillard S, Gutman M, Labrie C, et al: Comparison of the effects of the antiestrogens EM-800 and Tamoxifen on the growth of human breast ZR-75-1 cancer xenografts in nude mice. Cancer Res 58:60-64, 1998

16. Labrie F, Labrie C, Bélanger A, et al: EM-652 (SCH 57068), a third generation SERM acting as pure antiestrogen in the mammary gland and endometrium. J Steroid Biochem Mol Biol 69:51-84, 1999

17. Luo S, Martel C, Gauthier S, et al: Long term inhibitory effects of a novel antiestrogen on the growth of ZR-75-1 and MCF-7 human breast cancer tumors in nude mice. Int J Cancer 73:735-739, 1997

18. Luo S, Martel C, Sourla A, et al: Comparative effects of 28-day treatment with the new antiestrogen EM-800 and tamoxifen on estrogen-sensitive parameters in the intact mouse. Int J Cancer 73:381-391, 1997

19. Simard J, Labrie C, Bélanger A, et al: Characterization of the effects of the novel nonsteroidal antiestrogen EM-800 on basal and estrogen-induced proliferation of T-47D, ZR-75-1 and MCF-7 human breast cancer cells in vitro. Int J Cancer 73:104-112, 1997

20. Simard J, Sanchez R, Poirier D, et al: Blockade of the stimulatory effect of estrogens, OH-tamoxifen, OH-toremifene, droloxifene and raloxifene on alkaline phosphatase activity by the antiestrogen EM-800 in human endometrial adenocarcinoma Ishikawa cells. Cancer Res 57: 3494-3497, 1997

21. Sourla A, Luo S, Labrie C, et al: Morphological changes induced by six-month treatment of intact and ovariectomized mice with tamoxifen and the pure antiestrogen EM-800. Endocrinology 138:5605-5617, 1997

22. Tremblay GB, Tremblay A, Copeland NG, et al: Cloning, chromosomal localization and functional analysis of the murine estrogen receptor beta. Mol Endocrinol 11:353-365, 1997

23. Couillard S, Labrie C, Bélanger A, et al: Effect of dehydroepiandrosterone and the antiestrogen EM-800 on the growth of human ZR-75-1 breast cancer xenografts. J Natl Cancer Inst 90:772-778, 1998

24. Martel C, Provencher L, Li X, et al: Binding characteristics of novel nonsteroidal antiestrogens to the rat uterine estrogen receptors. J Steroid Biochem Mol Biol 64:199-205, 1998

25. Tremblay A, Tremblay GB, Labrie F, et al: Ligand-independent recruitment of SRC-1 to estrogen receptor beta through phosphorylation of activation function AF-1. Mol Cell 3:513-519, 1999

26. Gauthier S, Caron B, Cloutier J, et al: (S)-(+)-4-[7-(2,2-dimethyl-1-oxopropoxy)-4-methyl-2-[4-[2-(1-piperidinyl)-ethoxy]phenyl]-2H-1-benzopyran-3-yl]-phenyl 2,2-dimethylpropanoate (EM-800): a highly potent, specific, and orally active nonsteroidal antiestrogen. J Med Chem 40:2117-2122, 1997

27. Labrie F, Simard J, Labrie C, et al: EM-652 (SCH 57068), a pure SERM in the mammary gland and endometrium. Références en Gynécologie Obstétrique 8:331-336, 2001

28. Gutman M, Couillard S, Roy J, et al: Comparison of the effects of EM-652 (SCH 57068), Tamoxifen, toremifene, droloxifene, idoxifene, GW-5638 and Raloxifene on the growth of human ZR-75-1 breast tumors in nude mice. Int J Cancer 99:273-278, 2002

29. Labrie F, Labrie C, Bélanger A, et al: Third and fourth generation SERMs, in Manni A, Verderame M (eds): Selective Estrogen Receptor Modulators: Research and Clinical Applications. Contemporary Endocrinology. Totowa, NJ, Humana Press Inc, 2002, pp 167-187

30. Roy J, Couillard S, Gutman M, et al: A novel pure SERM achieves complete regression of the majority of human breast cancer tumors in nude mice. Breast Cancer Res Treat: in press, 2004

31. Brunner N, Frandsen TL, Holst-Hansen C, et al: MCF7/LCC2: a 4-hydroxytamoxifen resistant human breast cancer variant that retains sensitivity to the steroidal antiestrogen ICI 182,780. Cancer Res 53:3229-3232, 1993

32. Coopman P, Garcia M, Brunner N, et al: Anti-proliferative and anti-estrogenic effects of ICI 164,384 and ICI 182,780 in 4-OH-tamoxifen-resistant human breast-cancer cells. Int J Cancer 56:295-300, 1994

33. Lykkesfeldt AE, Madsen MW, Briand P: Altered expression of estrogen-regulated genes in a tamoxifen-resistant and ICI 164,384 and ICI 182,780 sensitive human breast cancer cell line, MCF-7/TAMR-1. Cancer Res 54:1587-1595, 1994

34. Gottardis M, Jiang S, Jeng M, et al: Inhibition of tamoxifen-stimulated growth of an MCF-7 tumor variant in athymic mice by novel steroidal antiestrogens. Cancer Res 49:4090-4093, 1989

35. Osborne CK, Coronado EB, Allred DC, et al: Acquired tamoxifen resistance: Correlation with reduced breast tumor levels of tamoxifen and isomerization of trans-4-hydroxytamoxifen. J Natl Cancer Inst 83:1477-1482, 1991

36. Miller AB, Hoogstraten B, Staquet M, et al: Reporting results of cancer treatment. Cancer 47:207-214, 1981

37. Howell A, DeFriend DJ, Robertson JF, et al: Pharmacokinetics, pharmacological and anti-tumour effects of the specific anti-oestrogen ICI 182780 in women with advanced breast cancer. Br J Cancer 74:300-308, 1996

38. Howell A, Robertson J, Quaresma Albano J, et al: Fulvestrant, formerly ICI 182,780, is as effective as anastrozole in postmenopausal women with advanced breast cancer progression after prior endocrine treatment. J Clin Oncol 20:3396-3403, 2002

39. Osborne CK, Pippen J, Jones SE, et al: Double-blind, randomized trial comparing the efficacy and tolerability of Fulvestrant versus anastrozole in postmenopausal women with advanced breast cancer progressing on prior endocrine therapy: Results of a North American Trial. J Clin Oncol 20:3386-3395, 2002

40. Pyrhonen S, Valavaara R, Vuorinen J, et al: High dose toremifene in advanced breast cancer resistant to or relapsed during tamoxifen treatment. Breast Cancer Res Treat 29:223-228, 1994

41. Vogel CL, Shemano I, Schoenfelder J, et al: Multicenter phase II efficacy trial of toremifene in tamoxifen-refractory patients with advanced breast cancer. J Clin Oncol 11:345-350, 1993

42. Buzdar AU, Marcus C, Holmes F, et al: Phase II evaluation of LY156758 in metastatic breast cancer. Oncology 45:344-345, 1988

43. Martel C, Picard S, Richard V, et al: Prevention of bone loss by EM-800 and raloxifene in the ovariectomized rat. J Steroid Biochem Mol Biol 74:45-56, 2000

44. Jensen J, Kitlen JW, Briand P, et al: Effect of antiestrogens and aromatase inhibitor on basal growth of the human breast cancer cell line MCF-7 in serum-free medium. J Steroid Biochem Mol Biol 84:469-478, 2003

45. Poulin R, Labrie F: Stimulation of cell proliferation and estrogenic response by adrenal C19-delta 5-steroids in the ZR-75-1 human breast cancer cell line. Cancer Res 46:4933-4937, 1986

46. Vancutsem PM, Lazarus P, Williams GM: Frequent and specific mutations of the rat p53 gene in hepatocarcinomas induced by tamoxifen. Cancer Res 54:3864-3867, 1994

47. Luo S, Labrie C, Labrie F: Prevention of development of dimenthylbenz(a)anthracene (DMBA)-induced mammary carcinoma in the rat by the new nonsteroidal antiestrogen EM-800 (SCH 57050). Breast Cancer Res Treat 49:1-11, 1998