Effect of Estrogen Receptor Expression Level and Hormonal Therapy on Prognosis of Early Breast Cancer

Kyung-Hwak Yoon

Seoul National University Bundang Hospital <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-6206-7767>

Yeshong Park

Seoul National University Bundang Hospital

Eunyoung Kang

Seoul National University Bundang Hospital

Eun-Kyu Kim

Seoul National University Bundang Hospital

Jee Hyun Kim

Seoul National University Bundang Hospital

Se Hyun Kim

Seoul National University Bundang Hospital

Koung Jin Suh

Seoul National University Bundang Hospital

Sun Mi Kim

Seoul National University Bundang Hospital

Mijung Jang

Seoul National University Bundang Hospital

Bo La Yun

Seoul National University Bundang Hospital

So Yeon Park

Seoul National University Bundang Hospital

Hee-Chul Shin (✉ dradam77@naver.com)

Seoul National University Bundang Hospital <https://orcid.org/0000-0001-6512-2218>

Research Article

Keywords: breast cancer, hormone receptor, estrogen receptor, ER, hormonal therapy

Posted Date: July 16th, 2021

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.21203/rs.3.rs-703131/v1>

License: © ⓘ This work is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License. [Read Full License](#)

Version of Record: A version of this preprint was published at Cancer Research and Treatment on November 17th, 2021. See the published version at <https://doi.org/10.4143/crt.2021.890>.

Abstract

Purpose

Estrogen receptor (ER) expression in breast cancer plays an essential role in carcinogenesis and disease progression. Recently, tumors with low level (1-10%) of ER expression have been separately defined as ER Low Positive (ER^{low}). It is suggested that ER^{low} tumors might be morphologically and behaviorally different from tumors with high ER expression (ER^{high}).

Methods

Retrospective analysis of a prospective cohort database was performed. Patients who underwent curative surgery for early breast cancer and had available medical records were included for analysis. Difference in clinicopathological characteristics, endocrine responsiveness and five-year recurrence-free survival was evaluated between different ER subgroups (ER^{high}, ER^{low}, and ER-negative (ER⁻)).

Results

A total of 2162 breast cancer patients were included in the analysis, Tis and T1 stage. Among them, 1654 (76.5%) were ER^{high}, 54 (2.5%) were ER^{low}, and 454 (21.0%) were ER⁻ patients. ER^{low} cases were associated with smaller size, higher histologic grade, positive human epidermal growth factor receptor 2 (HER2), negative progesterone receptor, and higher Ki-67 expression. Recurrence rate was highest in ER⁻ tumors and was inversely proportional to ER expression. Recurrence-free survival was not affected by hormonal therapy in the ER^{low} group ($P = 0.418$).

Conclusion

ER^{low} breast cancer showed distinct clinicopathological features. ER^{low} tumors seemed to have higher recurrence rates compared to ER^{high} tumors, and they showed no significant benefit from hormonal therapy. Future large scale prospective studies are necessary to validate the treatment options for ER^{low} breast cancer.

Introduction

Breast cancer, the most common malignancy in women worldwide, is considered a heterogeneous disease with high degree of diversity.¹ Risk stratification for recurrence after surgery depends on various clinicopathological factors including patient age, tumor size, lymph node involvement, and hormone receptor expression.² Since the discovery of hormone receptors in the 1960s, estrogen receptor (ER) and progesterone receptor (PR) expression has remained essential in the decision-making algorithm for breast cancer treatment.³

ER positivity is closely associated with major hormonal risk factors of breast cancer.⁴ At the same time, ER-positive (ER⁺) disease exhibits distinct clinicopathological features such as older age, smaller size, lower grade, and most importantly, favorable prognosis.^{5,6} Yet the hallmark of ER expression is its predictive role in hormonal therapy response; adjuvant tamoxifen therapy for ER⁺ breast cancer has led to a significant decrease in recurrence and mortality.⁷

It is undebatable that ER-negative (ER⁻) patients do not benefit from hormonal therapy; however, defining ER positivity with a clear cutoff point remains challenging.⁸ The traditional cutoff value for ER⁺ disease was over 10% of cells staining, which was later lowered to 1%; however, a recent update in the American Society of Clinical Oncology (ASCO)/College of American Pathologists (CAP) guideline recommends defining samples with low level (1%-10%) of ER expression separately as ER Low Positive (ER^{low}).⁹ Recent reports in the literature suggest that ER^{low} tumors might be morphologically and behaviorally different from tumors with high ER expression (ER^{high}).¹⁰⁻¹² In the present study, we aim to compare ER^{high}, ER^{low}, and ER⁻ subtypes of early breast cancer in terms of clinicopathological characteristics, endocrine responsiveness, and prognosis.

Patients And Methods

Study population

Retrospective analysis was performed on a prospective cohort of 2411 patients who underwent curative surgery for early stage breast cancer between January 2005 and December 2015 at (blinded for review). The inclusion criteria for the current study were as follows: (i) histologically confirmed stage 0 of ductal carcinoma in situ (DCIS) or stage 1 of invasive ductal carcinoma (IDC), (ii) available surgical records and pathology reports, and (iii) available immunohistochemistry (IHC) staining results on ER, PR, human epidermal growth factor receptor 2 (HER2) and Ki-67. Patients with contralateral advanced stage breast cancer were excluded from the study. A total of 2162 patients were included for analysis. This study was approved by the institutional review board of (blinded for review) (IRB No. B-2105-682-103).

Data collection

Demographic information of study participants was obtained through review of medical records. Surgical records were reviewed for operation date, method, and extent of axillary dissection. Information on tumor size, histological type, histological grade, lymphovascular invasion (LVI), lymph node metastasis, and pathological stage was retrieved from pathology reports. IHC staining was routinely performed for ER, PR, HER2, and Ki-67. Follow-up data was collected until each patient's last visit to the hospital and included adjuvant therapy (radiation therapy, hormonal therapy, chemotherapy), recurrence status (date of recurrence, initial recurrence site, additional treatment), and survival status (date and cause of death). 5-year recurrence-free survival (RFS) was analyzed by censoring events at 5 years.

Immunohistochemistry staining

Hormone receptor status was determined by our pathologists who are fully dedicated to breast cancer pathology. Patients were separated into three groups based on IHC result of ER staining: (i) ER^{high}, when $\geq 10\%$ of tumor cell nuclei were immunoreactive, (ii) ER^{low}, with 1% – 9% of cells staining, and (iii) ER⁻, if less than 1% of tumor cells showed IHC staining for ER.

Statistical analysis

All statistical analyses were performed using SPSS (version 23.0, IBM Inc., Armonk, NY, USA). Continuous variables were compared using Student's t-test; categorical variables were compared using Chi-squared test or Fisher's exact test. Survival analysis was conducted using Kaplan-Meier method and log-rank test. Hazard ratio for recurrence was obtained through Cox regression analysis. Subgroup analysis was performed for DCIS and IDC patients separately. All *P*-values were two-sided, and *P* < 0.05 was considered statistically significant.

Results

Among the 2162 patients included in the study, 1654 (76.5%) were ER^{high}, 54 (2.5%) were ER^{low}, and 454 (21.0%) were ER⁻. Clinicopathological characteristics of the study participants are summarized in Table 1. When compared to ER^{high} cases, ER^{low} patients were associated with higher grade, negative PR, positive HER2, and higher Ki-67 expression. When compared to ER⁻ cases, ER^{low} patients were associated with younger age, lower grade, positive PR, positive HER2, and lower Ki-67 expression. ER^{low} breast cancer was smaller in size than both ER^{high} and ER⁻ groups (*P* < 0.001 and *P* = 0.010, respectively).

Table 1
Clinicopathological characteristics according to ER expression in early breast cancer patients.

	ER				P-value		
	ER ⁻	ER ^{low}	ER ^{high}	Total (N = 2162)	All	ER ^{low} vs ER ⁻	ER ^{low} vs ER ^{high}
	(N = 454)	(N = 54)	(N = 1654)				
Age, years					< 0.001	0.001	0.570
Mean (SD)	54.0 (11.1)	48.9 (10.5)	51.2 (11.0)	51.7 (11.1)			
Median (range)	54 (25– 85)	49 (29– 72)	49 (25– 88)	50 (25– 88)			
Sex (N (%))					0.326	-	1.000
Female	454 (100.0)	54 (100.0)	1644 (99.4)	2152 (99.5)			
Male	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	10 (0.6)	10 (0.5)			
Operation (N (%))					< 0.001	0.366	0.003
Breast conserving surgery	281 (61.9)	30 (55.6)	1217 (73.6)	1528 (70.7)			
Total mastectomy	173 (38.1)	24 (44.4)	437 (26.4)	634 (29.3)			
Axillary dissection (N (%))					< 0.001	0.130	0.482
Not done	40 (8.8)	9 (16.7)	299 (18.1)	348 (16.1)			
Sentinel lymph node biopsy	399 (87.9)	43 (79.6)	1324 (80.0)	1766 (81.7)			
Axillary lymph node dissection	15 (3.3)	2 (3.7)	31 (1.9)	48 (2.2)			
Size, cm					< 0.001	0.010	< 0.001
Mean (SD)	1.0 (0.7)	0.8 (0.6)	1.2 (0.6)	1.1 (0.6)			
Median (range)	1.1 (0.1– 2.0)	0.6 (0.1– 2.0)	1.2 (0.0– 2.0)	1.1 (0.0– 2.0)			
Type (N (%))					0.001	0.404	0.870
Ductal carcinoma in situ	86 (18.9)	13 (24.1)	457 (27.6)	556 (25.7)			
Invasive ductal carcinoma	357 (78.6)	39 (72.2)	1131 (68.4)	1527 (70.6)			
Others	11 (2.4)	2 (3.7)	66 (4.0)	79 (3.7)			

ER, estrogen receptor; ER⁻, estrogen receptor negative; ER^{low}, estrogen receptor low positive; ER^{high}, estrogen receptor high positive; HER2, human epidermal growth factor receptor 2

ER					Pvalue		
T stage (N (%))					<i>< 0.001</i>	0.270	<i>< 0.001</i>
Tis	86 (18.9)	13 (24.1)	457 (27.6)	556 (25.7)			
T1mic	81 (17.8)	13 (24.1)	81 (4.9)	175 (8.1)			
T1a	41 (9.0)	6 (11.1)	117 (7.1)	164 (7.6)			
T1b	56 (12.3)	8 (14.8)	325 (19.6)	389 (18.0)			
T1c	190 (41.9)	14 (25.9)	647 (40.7)	878 (40.6)			
N stage (N (%))					<i>< 0.001</i>	0.249	0.904
Nx	41 (9.0)	8 (14.8)	297 (18.0)	346 (16.0)			
N0	408 (89.9)	45 (83.3)	1311 (79.3)	1764 (81.6)			
N1mic	5 (1.1)	1 (1.9)	46 (2.8)	52 (2.4)			
Stage (N (%))					<i>< 0.001</i>	0.579	0.877
0	86 (18.9)	13 (24.1)	457 (27.6)	556 (25.7)			
IA	363 (80.0)	40 (74.1)	1152 (69.6)	1555 (71.9)			
IB	5 (1.1)	1 (1.9)	45 (2.7)	51 (2.4)			
Grade (N (%))					<i>< 0.001</i>	<i>< 0.001</i>	<i>0.017</i>
G1	3 (0.7)	5 (9.3)	418 (25.3)	426 (19.7)			
G2	88 (19.4)	17 (31.5)	513 (31.0)	618 (28.6)			
G3	221 (48.7)	12 (22.2)	200 (12.1)	433 (20.0)			
Unknown	142 (31.3)	20 (37.0)	523 (31.6)	685 (31.7)			
Lymphovascular invasion (N (%))					0.055	0.057	0.056
Present	41 (9.0)	1 (1.9)	184 (11.1)	226 (10.5)			
Absent	284 (62.6)	31 (57.4)	959 (58.0)	1274 (58.9)			
Unknown	129 (28.4)	22 (40.7)	511 (30.9)	662 (30.6)			
Progesterone receptor (N (%))					<i>< 0.001</i>	<i>< 0.001</i>	<i>< 0.001</i>
Positive	16 (3.5)	22 (40.7)	1491 (90.1)	1529 (70.7)			
Negative	438 (96.5)	32 (59.3)	163 (9.9)	633 (29.3)			
HER2 (N (%))					<i>< 0.001</i>	0.269	<i>< 0.001</i>

ER, estrogen receptor; ER⁻, estrogen receptor negative; ER^{low}, estrogen receptor low positive; ER^{high}, estrogen receptor high positive; HER2, human epidermal growth factor receptor 2

	ER				P-value		
Negative	102 (22.5)	9 (16.7)	584 (35.3)	695 (32.1)			
Equivocal	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	4 (0.2)	4 (0.2)			
Positive	66 (14.5)	12 (22.2)	71 (4.3)	149 (6.9)			
Not done	286 (63.0)	33 (61.1)	995 (60.2)	1314 (60.8)			
Ki-67, %							
Mean (SD)	26.7 (19.0)	18.1 (13.9)	9.1 (9.0)	13.0 (13.9)	< 0.001	< 0.001	< 0.001
Median (range)	20 (0–90)	15 (5–60)	5 (0–70)	7 (0–90)			
Radiotherapy (N (%))					< 0.001	0.508	0.009
Done	263 (57.9)	27 (50.0)	1138 (68.8)	1428 (66.0)			
Not done	186 (38.8)	25 (46.3)	488 (29.5)	689 (31.9)			
Unknown	15 (3.3)	2 (3.7)	28 (1.7)	45 (2.1)			
Hormonal therapy (N (%))					< 0.001	< 0.001	< 0.001
Done	20 (4.4)	37 (68.5)	1441 (87.1)	1498 (69.3)			
Not done	434 (95.6)	17 (31.5)	213 (12.9)	664 (30.7)			
Chemotherapy (N (%))					< 0.001	0.045	0.005
Done	242 (53.3)	21 (38.9)	373 (22.6)	636 (29.4)			
Not done	212 (46.7)	33 (61.1)	1281 (77.4)	1526 (70.6)			
Recurrence (N (%))					0.001	0.587	0.357
Yes	44 (9.7)	4 (7.4)	84 (5.1)	132 (6.1)			
Local	16 (3.5)	2 (3.7)	34 (2.1)	52 (2.4)			
Regional	7 (1.5)	0 (0.0)	5 (0.3)	12 (0.6)			
Systemic	13 (2.9)	1 (1.9)	21 (1.3)	35 (1.6)			
ER, estrogen receptor; ER [−] , estrogen receptor negative; ER ^{low} , estrogen receptor low positive; ER ^{high} , estrogen receptor high positive; HER2, human epidermal growth factor receptor 2							

Postoperative treatment data was available for all cases. 87.1% (1441/1654) of ER^{high} patients, 68.5% (37/54) of ER^{low} patients, and 4.4% (20/454) of ER[−] patients received hormonal therapy ($P < 0.001$ between all groups). Hormonal therapy included selective estrogen receptor modulators and aromatase inhibitors. 22.6% (373/1654) of ER^{high} patients, 38.9% (21/54) of ER^{low} patients, and 53.3% (242/454) of ER[−] patients received adjuvant chemotherapy ($P < 0.001$ between all groups).

Follow-up information was available for 2161 patients (mean follow-up of 6.59 years, range 0.01–15.79 years). Five-year RFS was 5.1% (84/1654), 7.4% (4/54), and 9.7% (44/454) in ER^{high}, ER^{low}, and ER[−] groups, respectively ($P < 0.001$). Recurrence data included local recurrence, regional recurrence, and systemic recurrence. When two groups were compared to each other

independently, RFS was significantly worse in ER⁻ cases compared to ER^{high} cases ($P < 0.001$), but there was no statistically significant difference between ER^{low} and ER^{high} cases ($P = 0.597$) or ER^{low} and ER⁻ cases ($P = 0.400$) (Fig. 1). Similar results were found in subgroup analysis of IDC patients; only ER⁻ patients showed worse RFS compared to ER^{high} patients ($P < 0.001$), and no significant difference in recurrence was observed between ER^{low} and ER^{high} patients ($P = 0.613$) or ER^{low} and ER⁻ patients ($P = 0.385$) (Fig. 2).

To evaluate endocrine responsiveness of ER^{high} and ER^{low} patients, 5-year RFS was compared between patients with and without hormonal therapy (Fig. 3). ER⁻ patients were excluded from this analysis as hormonal therapy was routinely not included in their treatment plan. ER^{high} patients showed significantly worse prognosis when hormonal therapy was omitted ($P = 0.020$). This difference was not observed in ER^{low} cases; there was no difference in recurrence between patients who received hormonal therapy and those who did not receive the treatment ($P = 0.418$).

Risk factors for recurrence in the study population were analyzed by Cox proportional regression (Table 2). In univariate analysis, younger age, higher grade, ER⁻ status, higher Ki-67 expression, and omission of hormonal therapy were associated with increased risk of recurrence. In multivariate analysis, all factors except ER⁻ status and Ki-67 expression remained statistically significant. Subgroup analysis was performed for DCIS and IDC patients. In the DCIS group, only age was associated with recurrence ($P = 0.007$). In the IDC group, univariate analysis revealed that younger age, higher grade, ER⁻ status, lower PR expression, higher Ki-67 expression, and omission of hormonal therapy were associated with higher recurrence rate. In multivariate analysis, only age and hormonal therapy remained statistically significant.

Table 2
Cox regression model for risk factors of recurrence in early breast cancer.

	HR (95% CI)	P- value	HR (95% CI)	P- value	HR (95% CI)	P- value	HR (95% CI)	P- value	HR (95% CI)	P- value	HR (95% CI)	P- value
Age, years												
< 50	Ref.		Ref.		Ref.		Ref.		Ref.		Ref.	
≥ 50	0.51 (0.35– 0.73)	< 0.001	0.46 (0.32– 0.66)	< 0.001	0.29 (0.12– 0.72)	0.007	0.29 (0.12– 0.72)	0.007	0.57 (0.38– 0.86)	0.007	0.53 (0.36– 0.80)	0.002
Type												
DCIS	Ref.											
IDC	1.20 (0.80– 1.80)	0.390										
Grade												
1	Ref.		Ref.						Ref.		Ref.	
2	2.06 (1.10– 3.87)	0.025	1.90 (1.00– 3.61)	0.050					2.06 (1.10– 3.87)	0.025	1.89 (0.99– 3.61)	0.054
3	3.07 (1.65– 5.73)	< 0.001	2.18 (1.05– 4.52)	0.036					3.08 (1.65– 5.73)	< 0.001	2.12 (0.99– 4.54)	0.052
LVI												
No	Ref.								Ref.			
Yes	1.46 (0.90– 2.37)	0.131							1.46 (0.90– 2.37)	0.130		
ER												
ER ^{high}	Ref.		Ref.		Ref.				Ref.		Ref.	
ER ^{low}	1.34 (0.49– 3.65)	0.571	0.95 (0.50– 1.82)	0.882	1.31 (0.18– 9.63)	0.793			1.36 (0.43– 4.33)	0.606	1.09 (0.29– 4.14)	0.897
ER [–]	1.96 (1.35– 2.85)	< 0.001	0.94 (0.34– 2.64)	0.907	0.74 (0.23– 2.46)	0.626			2.29 (1.52– 3.44)	< 0.001	1.27 (0.36– 4.44)	0.707
PR												
Positive	Ref.				Ref.				Ref.		Ref.	
Negative	1.20 (1.00– 1.43)	0.054			0.81 (0.48– 1.37)	0.426			1.62 (1.09– 2.42)	0.018	0.52 (0.21– 1.33)	0.175
HER2												

DCIS, ductal carcinoma in situ; IDC, invasive ductal carcinoma; HR, hazard ratio; CI, confidence interval; LVI, lymphovascular invasion; ER, estrogen receptor; ER⁺, estrogen receptor positive; ER^{low}, estrogen receptor low positive; ER[–], estrogen receptor negative; PR, progesterone receptor; HER2, human epidermal growth factor receptor 2; HT, hormonal therapy; CT, chemotherapy

Positive	Ref.						Ref.			
Negative	0.76 (0.27– 2.19)	0.613					0.77 (0.38– 1.57)	0.477		
Ki-67										
< 14	Ref.		Ref.		Ref.		Ref.		Ref.	
≥ 14	1.66 (1.18– 2.34)	0.004	1.00 (0.64– 1.57)	0.989	1.13 (0.46– 2.76)	0.794	1.79 (1.21– 2.64)	0.003	0.99 (0.60– 1.65)	0.971
HT										
No	Ref.		Ref.		Ref.		Ref.		Ref.	
Yes	0.50 (0.35– 0.70)	< 0.001	0.45 (0.25– 0.79)	0.006	0.75 (0.37– 1.54)	0.754	0.40 (0.27– 0.59)	< 0.001	0.30 (0.12– 0.77)	0.012
CT										
No	Ref.						Ref.			
Yes	1.06 (0.73– 1.52)	0.777					1.00 (0.67– 1.50)	0.985		
DCIS, ductal carcinoma in situ; IDC, invasive ductal carcinoma; HR, hazard ratio; CI, confidence interval; LVI, lymphovascular invasion; ER, estrogen receptor; ER ⁺ , estrogen receptor positive; ER ^{low} , estrogen receptor low positive; ER [−] , estrogen receptor negative; PR, progesterone receptor; HER2, human epidermal growth factor receptor 2; HT, hormonal therapy; CT, chemotherapy										

Discussion

ER plays an important role in the signaling pathway for breast cancer carcinogenesis and disease expression.¹³ Hormonal therapy targeting ER including selective estrogen receptor modulators, aromatase inhibitors, ER down-regulators, and ovarian suppression has led to significant improvement in the clinical outcome of breast cancer treatment.⁷ ER⁺ tumors show excellent response to hormonal therapy, and therapeutic effect depends on the proportion of ER expression.^{14,15} In contrast, ER[−] tumors show no response to hormonal therapy; however, these tumors respond relatively better to chemotherapy compared to ER⁺ tumors.¹⁶ Therefore, it is critical to set an optimal cutoff point for ER positivity to properly select patients eligible for individualized treatment options.¹⁷

In 2010, the cutoff value for ER positivity was lowered to 1% from 10% by the ASCO/CAP guideline update.¹⁸ Although the currently accepted cutoff is 1%, multiple studies have since reported that ER^{low} tumors with ER expression less than 10% show characteristics closer to ER[−] tumors, including questionable response to hormonal therapy.^{10–12} The latest recommendation of the ASCO/CAP guideline to report these tumors separately as ER Low Positive reflects this concern. If ER^{low} breast cancer is indeed a distinct disease subtype closer to ER[−], ER^{low} patients currently classified as ER⁺ will not only receive unnecessary hormonal treatment with potential side effects, but they might also fail to receive chemotherapy that is needed.¹⁷

Several studies have addressed the clinicopathological features of ER^{low} tumors. Compared to ER^{high}, ER^{low} breast cancer is associated with younger age, advanced stage, larger tumor size, higher HER2 expression, and lower PR expression.^{19,20} When morphologically analyzed, ER^{low} tumors exhibit features previously described for basal-like and triple-negative tumors, including higher grade, higher proliferation index, sheet-like growth pattern, intratumoral lymphocytic inflammatory infiltrate, and necrosis.¹² In our current study, we focused specifically on early stage breast cancer, a novel approach not presented in previous literature. ER^{low} tumors showed higher grade, positive HER2, negative PR, and higher proliferation index compared to ER^{high}

tumors, which was consistent with previous studies. Age at diagnosis showed no statistically significant difference between ER^{low} and ER^{high} groups, and tumor size was smallest in the ER^{low} group compared to both ER^{high} and ER⁻ patients. Detailed morphological analysis was not performed in this study. Patients with ER^{high} tumors were more likely to receive hormonal therapy compared to ER^{low} and ER⁻ groups; in contrast, a significantly small proportion of ER^{high} patients received chemotherapy in comparison to their ER^{low} or ER⁻ counterparts. This result was in concordance with previous literature.^{17,19,20}

Although limited data is available on the survival outcome of ER^{low} breast cancer, a few previous studies showed that ER^{low} patients exhibit significantly worse disease-free and overall survival rates compared to ER^{high} patients, but similar to those who are ER⁻.^{11,21,22} In the current study, the ER^{low} group had a slight, but not statistically significant, survival benefit over the ER⁻ group. At the same time, ER^{low} tumors showed worse prognosis compared to ER^{high} tumors, yet also with no statistical significance. Recurrence rate showed a proportional decrease with ER expression level. In multivariate regression analysis, we failed to prove the effect of ER expression level on recurrence. This study was confined to DCIS and stage 1 IDC, and the overall recurrence rate was low. It is possible that the low proportion of recurrent cases hindered to show a clear difference between ER subgroups. Future prospective studies with larger cohorts might validate the difference in survival outcome between ER^{low} and ER^{high} groups.

Most breast cancers exhibit either strong ER expression or its complete absence, and the number of patients in the ER^{low} subgroup is limited.²³ Therefore, prospective data on the endocrine responsiveness of ER^{low} tumors is scarce.¹⁹ Yet many retrospective studies have suggested that primary breast cancer patients with low ER expression might not benefit significantly from hormonal therapy.¹⁷ Viale et al.²¹ compared disease-free and overall survival of ER^{low} and ER⁻ groups and reported that hormonal therapy had no effect on survival outcomes. In HER2-negative stage II/III breast cancer, ER^{low} tumors showed limited benefit from hormonal therapy and better response to neoadjuvant chemotherapy.²⁴ In our current study, we found that hormonal therapy had no effect on recurrence in ER^{low} patients; on the contrary, ER^{high} patients showed clear endocrine responsiveness. This suggests that hormonal therapy might have limited apparent benefit in early stage ER^{low} breast cancer.

ER⁺ tumors have been subjected to multigene assays to identify more aggressive types that are expected to benefit from additional chemotherapy.¹² Our study sheds light on the possibility that early stage ER^{low} breast cancer might be a high risk subtype and potential candidate for chemotherapy. It is suggested that treatment options for ER⁻ tumors may be appropriate for some ER^{low} tumors; however, endocrine responsiveness of primary breast cancer patients with low ER expression needs to be further explored in prospective studies.²⁰

This study has certain limitations. First, the study was limited by its retrospective design, and treatment options were not assigned in a randomized manner. Second, although the current study was performed on a large cohort, the sample size of the ER^{low} group was relatively small. It is known that majority of breast cancers show either completely absent or strongly positive ER staining, and tumors with low ER expression are rare. Future studies with larger study populations could possibly overcome this limitation and provide more information on ER^{low} tumors.

In conclusion, ER^{low} breast cancer shows distinct clinicopathological features compared to ER^{high} and ER⁻ types. ER^{low} tumors seem to have higher recurrence rates compared to ER^{high} tumors, although future large scale prospective studies are necessary. Similar to patients with ER⁻ tumors, those with ER^{low} tumors do not appear to benefit from hormonal therapy. Treatment options for ER^{low} breast cancer should be reconsidered, including omission of hormonal therapy and addition of adjuvant chemotherapy.

Declarations

Funding: Not applicable.

Conflict of interest: The authors declare that they have no conflict of interest.

Availability of data and material: The datasets generated during and/or analysed during the current study are available from the corresponding author on reasonable request.

Code availability: Not applicable

Ethical Approval: All procedures performed in studies involving human participants were in accordance with the ethical standards of the institutional and/or national research committee and with the 1964 Helsinki declaration and its later amendments or comparable ethical standards. The study was approved by the institution's review board (IRB No. B-2105-682-103).

Consent to participate: Informed consent was obtained from all individual participants included in the study.

Consent for publish: Patients signed informed consent regarding publishing their data.

Authors' contributions: Study concept and design: Eunyong Kang, Eun-Kyu Kim, and Hee-Chul Shin. Acquisition of data: Sun Mi Kim, Mijung Jang, Bo La Yun, and So Yeon Park. Analysis and interpretation of data: Kyung-Hwak Yoon and Yeshong Park. Drafting of the manuscript: Kyung-Hwak Yoon and Yeshong Park. Critical revision of the manuscript for important intellectual content: Jee Hyun Kim, Se Hyun Kim, and Koung Jin Suh. Study supervision: Hee-Chul Shin. All authors have contributed to, read and approved the final manuscript for submission.

References

1. Polyak K (2011) Heterogeneity in breast cancer. *J Clin Invest* 121(10):3786–3788
2. Sestak I (2019) Risk stratification in early breast cancer in premenopausal and postmenopausal women: integrating genomic assays with clinicopathological features. *Curr Opin Oncol* 31(1):29–34
3. Yip C-H, Rhodes A (2014) Estrogen and progesterone receptors in breast cancer. *Future Oncol* 10(14):2293–2301
4. Balleine RL, Wilcken NR (2012) High-risk estrogen-receptor-positive breast cancer. *Mol Diagn Ther* 16(4):235–240
5. Anderson WF, Chatterjee N, Ershler WB et al (2002) Estrogen receptor breast cancer phenotypes in the Surveillance, Epidemiology, and End Results database. *Breast Cancer Res Treat* 76(1):27–36
6. Althuis MD, Fergenbaum JH, Garcia-Closas M et al (2004) Etiology of hormone receptor-defined breast cancer: a systematic review of the literature. *Cancer Epidemiol Biomarkers Prev* 13(10):1558–1568
7. Early Breast Cancer Trialists' Collaborative Group (EBCTCG) (2005) Effects of chemotherapy and hormonal therapy for early breast cancer on recurrence and 15-year survival: an overview of the randomised trials. *Lancet* 365:1687–1717
8. Davies E, Hiscox S (2011) New therapeutic approaches in breast cancer. *Maturitas* 68(2):121–128
9. Allison KH, Hammond MEH, Dowsett M et al (2020) Estrogen and progesterone receptor testing in breast cancer: ASCO/CAP guideline update. *J Clin Oncol* 38:1346–1366
10. Honma N, Horii R, Iwase T et al (2014) Proportion of estrogen or progesterone receptor expressing cells in breast cancers and response to endocrine therapy. *Breast* 23(6):754–762
11. Balduzzi A, Bagnardi V, Rotmensz N et al (2014) Survival outcomes in breast cancer patients with low estrogen/progesterone receptor expression. *Clin Breast Cancer* 14(4):258–264
12. Gloyeske NK, Dabbs DJ, Rohit B (2014) Low ER + Breast Cancer: Is This a Distinct Group? *Am J Clin Pathol* 141(5):697–701
13. Heldring N, Pike A, Andersson S et al (2007) Estrogen receptors: how do they signal and what are their targets. *Physiol Rev* 87:905–931
14. Van den Eynden GG, Colpaert CG, Vermeulen PB et al (2002) Comparative analysis of the biochemical and immunohistochemical determination of hormone receptors in invasive breast carcinoma influence of the tumor-stroma ratio. *Pathol Res Pract* 198:517–524

15. Sparano JA, Paik S (2008) Development of the 21-gene assay and its application in clinical practice and clinical trials. *J Clin Oncol* 26(5):721–728
16. Andre F, Broglio K, Roche H et al (2008) Estrogen receptor expression and efficacy of docetaxel-containing adjuvant chemotherapy in patients with node-positive breast cancer: results from a pooled analysis. *J Clin Oncol* 26:2636–2643
17. Chen T, Zhang N, Moran MS et al (2018) Borderline ER positive primary breast cancer gains no significant survival benefit from endocrine therapy: a systematic review and meta-analysis. *Clin Breast Cancer* 18:1–8
18. Hammond ME, Hayes DF, Dowsett M et al (2010) American Society of Clinical Oncology/College of American Pathologists guideline recommendations for immunohistochemical testing of estrogen and progesterone receptors in breast cancer. *J Clin Oncol* 28:2784–2795
19. Yi M, Huo L, Koenig KB et al (2014) Which threshold for ER positivity? a retrospective study based on 9639 patients. *Ann Oncol* 25:1004–1011
20. Poon IK, Tsang JY, Li J et al (2020) The significance of highlighting the oestrogen receptor low category in breast cancer. *BJC* 123:1223–1227
21. Viale G, Regan MM, Maiorano E et al (2007) Prognostic and predictive value of centrally reviewed expression of estrogen and progesterone receptors in a randomized trial comparing letrozole and tamoxifen adjuvant therapy for postmenopausal early breast cancer: BIG 1–98. *J Clin Oncol* 25(25):3846–3852
22. Ogawa Y, Moriya T, Kato Y et al (2004) Immunohistochemical assessment for estrogen receptor and progesterone receptor status in breast cancer: analysis for a cut-off point as the predictor for endocrine therapy. *Breast Cancer* 11(3):267–275
23. Collins LC, Botero ML, Schnitt SJ (2005) Bimodal frequency distribution of estrogen receptor immunohistochemical staining results in breast cancer: an analysis of 825 cases. *Am J Clin Pathol* 123:16–20
24. Fujii T, Kogawa T, Dong W et al (2017) Revisiting the definition of estrogen receptor positivity in HER2-negative primary breast cancer. *Ann Oncol* 28(10):2420–2428

Figures

Figure 1

Survival analysis between different estrogen receptor (ER) subgroups in early breast cancer patients. Difference in 5-year recurrence-free survival between (a) ER^{high}/ER^{low}/ER⁻, (b) ER^{high}/ER^{low}, (c) ER^{low}/ER⁻, and (d) ER^{high}/ER⁻ patients.

Figure 2

Survival analysis between different estrogen receptor (ER) subgroups in early stage invasive ductal carcinoma patients. Difference in 5-year recurrence-free survival between (a) ER^{high}/ER^{low}/ER⁻, (b) ER^{high}/ER^{low}, (c) ER^{low}/ER⁻, and (d) ER^{high}/ER⁻ patients.

Figure 3

Effect of estrogen receptor (ER) expression level on hormonal therapy (HT) response. (a) Difference in 5-year recurrence-free survival in ER+ patients. (b) Difference in 5-year recurrence-free survival in ERlow patients.