Sensitization of Pancreatic Cancer to Chemoradiation by the Chk1 Inhibitor MK8776
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Abstract

Purpose: The combination of radiation with chemotherapy is the most effective therapy for unresectable pancreatic cancer. To improve upon this regimen, we combined the selective Checkpoint kinase 1 (Chk1) inhibitor MK8776 with gemcitabine-based chemoradiation in preclinical pancreatic cancer models.

Experimental Design: We tested the ability of MK8776 to sensitize to gemcitabine-radiation in homologous recombination repair (HRR)–proficient and –deficient pancreatic cancer cells and assessed Rad51 focus formation. In vivo, we investigated the efficacy, tumor cell selectivity, and pharmacodynamic biomarkers of sensitization by MK8776.

Results: We found that MK8776 significantly sensitized HRR-proficient (AsPC-1, MiaPaCa-2, BxPC-3) but not -deficient (Capan-1) pancreatic cancer cells to gemcitabine-radiation and inhibited Rad51 focus formation in HRR-proficient cells. In vivo, MiaPaCa-2 xenografts were significantly sensitized to gemcitabine-radiation by MK8776 without significant weight loss or observable toxicity in the small intestine, the dose-limiting organ for chemoradiation therapy in pancreatic cancer. We also assessed pChk1 (S345), a pharmacodynamic biomarker of DNA damage in response to Chk1 inhibition in both tumor and small intestine and found that MK8776 combined with gemcitabine or gemcitabine-radiation produced a significantly greater increase in pChk1 (S345) in tumor relative to small intestine, suggesting greater DNA damage in tumor than in normal tissue. Furthermore, we demonstrated the utility of an ex vivo platform for assessment of pharmacodynamic biomarkers of Chk1 inhibition in pancreatic cancer.


Introduction

Despite progress in the management of advanced pancreatic cancer, the prognosis for patients remains dismal. Although the use of FOLFIRINOX in the metastatic setting and concurrent gemcitabine-based chemoradiation in the locally advanced setting has produced incremental improvements in survival, more effective therapies are desperately needed (1, 2). Local disease management is an important issue in pancreatic cancer, as evidenced by the findings that 30% of patients die from local progression (3) and local control with radiation improves survival (2, 4). However, the median survival for patients with locally advanced disease remains approximately 1 year (although our recent results and those of others are more encouraging; refs. 5, 6). Thus, we sought to build upon these promising clinical results by the addition of a molecularly targeted agent to chemoradiation in pancreatic cancer.

Checkpoint kinase 1 (Chk1) is an important molecular target for sensitizing cancer cells to DNA-damaging agents. In response to DNA damage, Chk1 inhibits Cdc25 phosphatases resulting in cyclin–Cdk inhibition and cell-cycle arrest (notably, G2 arrest). In addition, Chk1 plays a role in activation of homologous recombination repair (HRR; refs. 7, 8). Thus, impairment of the DNA damage response by Chk1 inhibition renders cells more sensitive to DNA damage. Selectivity of this sensitization for tumor cells is a critical issue, and the consensus of many independent
Translational Relevance

Chemoradiation (vs. chemotherapy alone) improves survival in locally advanced pancreatic cancer and, thus, represents the best standard platform on which to improve outcome. Chk1 inhibitors in combination with chemotheraphy are now entering phase II clinical trials, and it is likely that Chk1 inhibitors in combination with chemoradiation will produce an even greater therapeutic benefit in the locally advanced disease setting. One outstanding issue in the development of Chk1 inhibitors is whether sensitization can be achieved selectively in tumors. In this study, we show the efficacy and tumor cell selectivity of sensitization to chemoradiation by Chk1 inhibition and assess pharmacodynamic biomarkers of this sensitization. The findings of this study should aid in the design of clinical trials using Chk1 inhibitors with chemoradiation in pancreatic cancer.

studies supports a model in which sensitization occurs preferentially in p53-mutant tumor cells (9–11). After DNA damage, normal cells are protected by their p53-mediated G1 checkpoint in the presence of Chk1 inhibition, whereas p53-mutant tumor cells lack this G1 checkpoint and are sensitized by G2 checkpoint abrogation in response to Chk1 inhibition. Small-molecule inhibitors of Chk1 have been an intense area of investigation in the last decade and, as a result, a number of potential clinical candidates are now under active clinical investigation, including: LY2603618, LY2606368, and MK8776 (formerly, SCH900776; refs. 12, 13).

Work from our laboratory has shown that Chk1 inhibition by AZD7762 sensitizes pancreatic cancer cells and tumors to gemcitabine-radiation and that inhibition of HRR is an important underlying mechanism of this sensitization (8). Furthermore, our previous work identified pChk1 (S345) as a pharmacodynamic biomarker of Chk1 inhibition through increased ATR/ATM-mediated phosphorylation of Chk1 that occurs in response to the height-enanced DNA damage associated with Chk1 inhibition (14, 15). Given our underlying clinical goal of combining Chk1 inhibition with gemcitabine-radiation in pancreatic cancer, in the present study we evaluated a selective Chk1 inhibitor, MK8776, which is advancing to phase II trials, in combination with gemcitabine-radiation in preclinical models of pancreatic cancer. Although this is the first study to evaluate MK8776 in combination with radiation and chemoradiation, it has been shown to sensitize to various chemotherapies including gemcitabine and cytarabine (12, 16). Importantly, we also investigated the tumor cell selectivity of this regimen by examining the DNA damage response not only in tumors but also in normal tissues. We found that MK8776 sensitized pancreatic cancer cells to gemcitabine and gemcitabine-radiation, but only in an HRR competent setting and in association with inhibition of Rad51 focus formation. Thus, we went on to determine the effects of MK8776 in combination with gemcitabine and radiation on pancreatic tumor xenograft growth as well as on biomarkers of Chk1 inhibition in both tumor and normal tissues. Furthermore, we introduce a new platform for the ex vivo assessment of pharmacodynamic biomarkers in pancreatic cancer.

Materials and Methods

Cell culture and drug solutions
AsPC-1, MiaPaCa-2, and BxPC-3 cells were obtained from the American Type Culture Collection (ATCC). Capan-1 Neo cells were obtained from S. Powell (Memorial Sloan Kettering Cancer Center, New York, NY; ref. 17). Cells were cultured in Dulbecco’s modified Eagle medium (DMEM; MiaPaCa-2), RPMI (AsPC-1, BxPC-3), or IMDM (Capan-1) supplemented with 10% FBS, 2 mmol/L glutamine, and antibiotics. MK8776 was obtained from Merck and prepared as 10 mmol/L stock solutions in DMSO for in vitro studies. For in vivo use, 5 mg/mL MK8776 was dissolved in 5% dextrose monohydrate (pH 6.5; Sigma) and administered by intraperitoneal injection. Gemcitabine (Eli Lilly) was dissolved in PBS or saline for in vitro and in vivo use, respectively.

Clonogenic survival
Exponentially growing cells were treated with drugs/radiation and then replated at cloning densities. Cells were grown for 9 to 14 days and then fixed and stained with methanol-acetic acid and crystal violet, respectively, and scored for colonies of 50 cells or more. Drug cytotoxicity was calculated as the ratio of surviving drug-treated cells relative to untreated control cells. Radiation survival data from drug-treated cells were corrected for drug cytotoxicity. Cell survival curves were fitted using the linear-quadratic equation, and the mean inactivation dose calculated according to the method of Fertil and colleagues (18). The radiation enhancement ratio was calculated as the ratio of the mean inactivation dose under control conditions divided by the mean inactivation dose under drug-treated conditions.

Immunofluorescence
Cells cultured and treated on coverslips were fixed and processed as previously described except with a mouse monoclonal Rad51 antibody (GeneFex; ref. 19). Samples were imaged with an Olympus IX71 FluoView confocal microscope (Olympus America) with an ×60 oil objective. For quantitation of Rad51 foci, at least 100 cells from each of three independent experiments were visually scored for each condition.

Immunohistochemistry
Tissues were fixed in 10% neutral buffered formalin for 24 hours, then embedded in paraffin, and sectioned at 5 μm. Sections were dehydrated to buffer and pretreated with citrate buffer, pH 6.0, for 10 minutes. After peroxidase and nonspecific blocking, sections were stained with pChk1 (S345) antibody (Cell Signaling Technology) at a dilution...
of 1:200 overnight at 4°C, followed the next day with the Envision+ Rabbit detection kit (room temperature) on a DAKO Autostainer (DAKO North America). Chromogen was applied for 5 minutes and sections were counterstained with hematoxylin. Immunohistochemistry was conducted by the University of Michigan Cancer Center Research Histology and Immunoperoxidase Lab. Specimens were evaluated microscopically with an ×20 objective on an Olympus IX71 microscope (Olympus America) with a Nikon DS-Fi1 camera and NIS-Elements software (Nikon). Samples were scored blindly by counting the number of positive and negative nuclei in a representative field. Between 300 and 800 cells were scored for each sample.

Immunoblotting
Pulverized tissues were lysed and immunoblotted as previously described (20). Proteins were detected with antibodies recognizing pChk1 (S345), pChk1 (S296), GAPDH (Cell Signaling Technology), and total Chk1 (Santa Cruz Biotechnology).

Irradiation
Irradiations were carried out using a Philips RT250 (Kimtron Medical) at a dose rate of approximately 2 Gy/min in the University of Michigan Comprehensive Cancer Center Experimental Irradiation Core. Dosimetry was carried out using an ionization chamber connected to an electrometer system that is directly traceable to a National Institute of Standards and Technology calibration. For tumor irradiation, animals were anesthetized with isoflurane and positioned such that the apex of each flank tumor was at the center of a 2.4 cm aperture in the secondary collimator, with the rest of the mouse shielded from radiation. For simultaneous irradiation of flank tumors and small intestines, aperture in the secondary collimator was used.

Tumor growth studies
Animals were handled according to a protocol approved by the University of Michigan Committee for Use and Care of animals. MiaPaCa-2 cells (5 × 10⁵) were suspended in a 1:1 mixture of 10% FBS/DMEM:Matrigel (BD Biosciences) and injected subcutaneously, bilaterally into the flanks of 3- to 5-week-old, female, athymic nude mice. Treatment was initiated when the average tumor volume reached 100 mm³. Tumor size was measured 2 times per week; tumor volume (TV) was calculated according to the equation: $TV = \pi / 6 (ab^2)$, where $a$ and $b$ are the longer and shorter dimensions of the tumor, respectively. Measurements were made until the tumor volume increased by approximately a factor of 4.

Tumor slicing
Tumors of approximately 300 mm³ were collected aseptically and embedded in 3% low-melting-point agarose. Two hundred micrometer slices were prepared with a Leica VT 1200S microtome with vibrating blade (Leica Microsystems) while submerged in oxygenated, ice-cold Krebs buffer, according to the previously described methodology (21). Slices were incubated in 12-well dishes containing DMEM (ATCC) supplemented with 2 mmol/L glutamine, penicillin, streptomycin, antibiotic-antimycotic (Gibco), and 20 mmol/L HEPES (pH 7.4) in a carbogen (95% O₂, 5% CO₂) purged chamber inside a 37°C, humidified, 5% CO₂ incubator for up to 30 hours, after which they were processed for biochemical or immunohistochemical analysis using the same methods as for intact tumors.

Statistical analysis
For tumor growth experiments, the time required for tumor volume doubling was determined for each xenograft by identifying the earliest day on which it was at least twice as large as on the first day of treatment. The Kaplan–Meier method was used to analyze the doubling times. Log-rank test (PROC LIFETEST in SAS) was used to compare the doubling times between any two treatment groups. In addition, the Bayesian hierarchical changepoint (BHC) model was used to compare tumor regression rates, regression periods, and regrowth rates between any two treatment groups. Biomarker data were analyzed using a mixed effect model (PROC MIXED in SAS), with a random effect modeling correlation between normal and tumor cells in the same animal. A Student t test or one-way ANOVA with a Tukey post hoc test was used for other analyses.

Results
To begin to determine the ability of MK8776 to sensitize to chemoradiation in pancreatic cancer cells, we first assessed sensitization to gemcitabine by MK8776 in a panel of p53-mutant pancreatic cancer cell lines. Cells were treated with IC₅₀ concentrations of gemcitabine followed by MK8776 at increasing concentrations. We found, in the order of magnitude of sensitization, that MiaPaCa-2, BxPC-3, and AsPC-1 cells were sensitized to gemcitabine by MK8776 (Fig. 1), whereas Capan-1 cells were only minimally sensitized. Sensitization occurred at concentrations of MK8776 which produced minimal single-agent toxicity (Supplementary Fig. S1).

We next assessed whether MK8776 would sensitize pancreatic cancer cells to gemcitabine-based chemoradiation. Cells were treated with a previously optimized schedule of gemcitabine followed by MK8776 and radiation (8, 14). We used nontoxic concentrations of gemcitabine that produced little radiosensitization alone and minimally toxic concentrations of MK8776, which were sufficient to abrogate the G₂ checkpoint (Supplementary Fig. S2) and inhibit Chk1 autophosphorylation (16). Treatment of AsPC-1, MiaPaCa-2, and BxPC-3 cells with MK8776 did not produce significant radiosensitization, although there was a trend toward marginal radiosensitization under these minimally toxic MK8776 conditions (Fig. 2; Supplementary Table S1). Importantly, MK8776 did significantly sensitize AsPC-1, MiaPaCa-2, and BxPC-3 cells, but not Capan-1 cells, to gemcitabine-radiation. Consistent with this observation, MK8776 treatment caused persistent DNA damage, reflected by γH2AX expression in response to gemcitabine-radiation.
in MiaPaCa-2 but not Capan-1 cells (Supplementary Fig. S3). Given that Capan-1 cells harbor a BRCA2 mutation rendering them HRR incompetent (17) while no BRCA2 mutation is present in the other pancreatic cancer cell lines, these findings suggest that HRR may play a role in sensitization by MK8776.

To specifically assess HRR we measured Rad51 focus formation in response to gemcitabine, MK8776, and radiation. Rad51, a DNA recombinase that promotes template strand invasion, is a key intermediary in HRR and forms foci at sites of HRR-mediated DNA double-strand break repair (22). In MiaPaCa-2 cells, Rad51 focus formation was induced in response to gemcitabine and/or radiation treatment and, as anticipated, MK8776 inhibited Rad51 focus formation in response to gemcitabine/radiation, although the magnitude of this effect appeared greatest in the presence of gemcitabine (Fig. 3A and B). In BxPC-3 cells, the inhibitory effect of MK8776 on Rad51 foci was only evident in response to gemcitabine plus radiation (Fig. 3C and D). This result is consistent with the chemoradiosensitization by MK8776 observed in these cells (Fig. 2). Together, these results show that the ability of MK8776 to inhibit Rad51

Figure 1. Chemosensitization by MK8776 in pancreatic cancer cells. Exponentially growing pancreatic cancer cells were treated with an IC_{50} concentration of gemcitabine (AsPC-1, 500 nmol/L; MiaPaCa-2 and BxPC-3, 250 nmol/L; Capan-1, 50 nmol/L) for 2 hours (t, 0–2 hours) followed by increasing concentrations of MK8776 (t, 24–48 hours). At the end of drug exposure, cells were processed for clonogenic survival. The surviving fraction was normalized to the MK8776 alone plating efficiency for each respective concentration. B, the sensitization factor was calculated as (surviving fraction, Gem only)/ (surviving fraction, Gem + MK8776). The MK8776 concentration used to calculate the sensitization factor was 500 nmol/L except in AsPC-1, which was 250 nmol/L. Data are the mean ± SE of n, 3–4 independent experiments.

Figure 2. Sensitization to chemoradiation by MK8776 in pancreatic cancer cells. Pancreatic cancer cell lines were treated with minimally cytotoxic concentrations of gemcitabine (AsPC-1, 100 nmol/L; MiaPaCa-2 and BxPC-3, 50 nmol/L; Capan-1, 25 nmol/L) for 2 hours (t, 0–2 hours) followed by MK8776 (500 nmol/L except in AsPC-1, 250 nmol/L, t, 23–48 hours), and radiation (0–8 Gy, t, 24 hours). At the end of treatment, cells were processed for clonogenic survival. Data are from a single representative experiment (plots) or are the mean radiation enhancement ratio ± SE for n, 3–4 independent experiments (in parenthesis). Statistical significance (P < 0.05) versus control (†) or Gem (+) is indicated. Cytotoxicity is summarized in Supplementary Table S1.
focus formation after gemcitabine-radiation is associated with sensitization.

We then aimed to determine the efficacy of MK8776 on pancreatic tumor growth in response to gemcitabine and radiation. Mice bearing MiaPaCa-2 xenografts were treated with MK8776 in combination with gemcitabine and radiation for 2 weeks, and tumor growth was monitored during and after therapy. We found that treatment with modest doses of gemcitabine or MK8776 alone produced minimal effect on tumor growth (Fig. 4). Although the combination of gemcitabine and MK8776 appeared to inhibit tumor growth more than either single agent, this effect did not reach significance. As expected, radiation treatment prolonged the time required for tumor volume doubling.
Likewise, the combination of modest doses of gemcitabine or MK8776 with radiation prolonged the time required for tumor volume doubling relative to untreated tumors ($P = 0.0001$ or $P = 0.0195$, respectively), but this effect was not significant relative to radiation treatment. Importantly, the combination of these same modest doses of MK8776 with gemcitabine-radiation significantly delayed the tumor volume doubling time relative to gemcitabine-radiation treatment ($P = 0.0087$) without a significant effect on weight loss (Supplementary Fig. S4). In addition, using the BHC statistical model (23), we noted that, during treatment with the combination of gemcitabine, MK8776, and radiation, tumors did not grow for an average of 10 days (90% confidence interval: 5–14 days), whereas tumor growth occurred throughout treatment with gemcitabine-radiation. These results support the conclusion that MK8776 sensitizes pancreatic tumors to chemoradiation.

To assess the Chk1-mediated DNA damage response in tumors, mice bearing MiaPaCa-2 xenografts were acutely treated with MK8776, gemcitabine, and radiation. The levels of both ATR/ATM-mediated phosphorylation (S345) as well as autophosphorylation (S296) of Chk1 in tumors were then measured. We found that pChk1 (S345) levels increased in response to either gemcitabine or MK8776, while the combination of the two produced an even greater level of pChk1 (S345; Fig. 5A). In tumors treated with radiation, there was a slight increase in pChk1 (S345) that was maximal in response to the combination of MK8776 + gemcitabine + radiation. This increase in pChk1 (S345) in response to Chk1 inhibition has been previously established and is thought to occur as a result of increased DNA damage in response to Chk1 inhibition as well as a feedback loop with protein phosphatase 2A (14, 24). Indeed, we found that induction of pChk1 (S345) was in general agreement with
γ-H2AX expression in response to MK8776, gemcitabine, and radiation. Consistent with Chk1 inhibition by MK8776, Chk1 autophosphorylation (S296) was inhibited under all conditions in which MK8776 was present. The effects of treatment on pChk1 (S345) were largely reproduced by immunohistochemistry, where strong nuclear pChk1 (S345) staining was observed in response to MK8776 + gemcitabine + radiation (Fig. 5B and D; Supplementary Fig. S5).

Clinically, the combination of gemcitabine with radiation for pancreatic cancer is limited by toxicity to the small intestine. We hypothesized that DNA damage measured by phosphorylation of Chk1 (S345) would be increased by MK8776 in combination with gemcitabine-radiation in tumor cells, but not in normal cells, as normal cells should be protected by an intact p53-mediated G1 checkpoint, whereas p53-mutant tumor cells should not. Small intestines were harvested from treated, tumor-bearing mice and assessed by immunohistochemistry for pChk1 (S345) protein levels. MK8776 treatment alone increased pChk1 (S345) levels in the intestinal crypt cells but not in the intestinal villar cells, a result likely related to the role Chk1 plays during DNA synthesis in rapidly dividing cells (Fig. 5C and D; refs. 12, 25). However, this early increase in pChk1 (S345) in the intestinal crypt cells in response to MK8776 was not associated with any observable long-term toxicity (Supplementary Fig. S4). More importantly, the addition of MK8776 to gemcitabine or gemcitabine-radiation produced a significantly greater effect on pChk1 (S345) in tumor relative to small intestine. To specifically test whether MK8776 sensitized small intestine to gemcitabine-radiation, we conducted a jejunal crypt assay, as we have done previously (26). We found, with the exception of positive control-treated mice, that none of the treatments, including MK8776 combined with gemcitabine-radiation, produced any observable loss of crypt viability (Supplementary Fig. S6). This result is consistent with a minimal effect of MK8776 in combination with gemcitabine-radiation on weight loss (Supplementary Fig. S4). Collectively, these results show that Chk1 inhibition produces more DNA damage and, thus, greater sensitization in response to gemcitabine/radiation in tumors than in normal tissues.

Given the need for pharmacodynamic biomarkers of response in pancreatic cancer and the complexity associated with pre- and posttreatment biopsies in patients, we initiated an ex vivo biomarker system with the long-term goal of being able to assess pharmacodynamic biomarkers in patient tumors from a single biopsy. To this end, 200 μm thick slices of MiaPaCa-2 xenografts were treated ex vivo with MK8776, gemcitabine, and radiation. Similar to the results obtained following in vivo treatment (Fig. 5A and B), pChk1 (S345) was induced in response to MK8776 and, to a greater extent, in combination with gemcitabine/radiation (Fig. 6). Consistent with phosphorylation of Chk1 at S345 triggering ubiquitin-mediated degradation of Chk1 (19, 27), we observed a decrease in total Chk1 protein in response to treatment with gemcitabine and MK8776 (with or without radiation). Induction of pChk1 (S296) was inhibited by MK8776. Immunohistochemistry revealed that the induction of pChk1 (S345) mirrored that seen in the in vivo treated xenografts and also showed that the structural integrity of the tumors was maintained using this tissue.
Taken together, these results show that this ex vivo slicing approach (Fig. 6B and C; Supplementary Fig. S7). The age in replicating cells (31–33) has led to the hypothesis of the effects of Chk1 inhibitors as monotherapy, the tumor cells are not. There is substantial literature to support their p53-mediated G1 checkpoint whereas Chk1 inhibition is thought to occur in a dependent manner, whereby normal cells are protected by Chk1 inhibition is a major mechanism of sensitization. Consistent with the role of Chk1 in replicating cells, we found pS345 Chk1 was induced in both tumor and small intestines following treatment with MK8776 alone. Notably, the pChk1 (S345) induction in the small intestines was restricted only to the replicating crypt cells. Although we have noted that pS345 Chk1 is a surrogate marker for DNA damage in tumors (14), the meaning of this marker in crypt cells is less clear, because there was no evidence of intestinal toxicity (weight loss or loss of crypt viability). More importantly, in the small intestines, the addition of gemcitabine/radiation to MK8776 did not produce any additional pChk1 (S345) or intestinal crypt toxicity, suggesting that no sensitization occurred in the small intestines. In tumors, however, the addition of gemcitabine/radiation to MK8776 produced a significant increase in pChk1 (S345) relative to MK8776 alone and was associated with the greatest tumor growth delay. Taken together, these results suggest that Chk1 inhibition by MK8776 selectively sensitizes tumor, but not small intestine, to gemcitabine/radiation.

An interesting finding of this study is that MK8776 did not sensitize to chemoradiation in HRR-deficient pancreatic cancer cells. Our previous work suggested that HRR inhibition was a mechanism of radiosensitization by Chk1 inhibitors, but left unclear the relative contributions of HRR inhibition versus G2 checkpoint abrogation to sensitization. The finding that Capan-1 cells, which are rendered HRR-incompetent by a BRCA2 mutation, are not sensitized to gemcitabine/radiation by MK8776 (despite G2 checkpoint abrogation by MK8776; data not shown) suggests that HRR inhibition is a major mechanism of sensitization. Consistent with previous reports, the effects of MK8776 on Rad51 focus formation (Fig. 3) support the hypothesis that HRR is a major target of Chk1 inhibition. Given that BRCA1/2 mutations are quite rare in pancreatic cancer (34), these results are favorable in the context of the broader applicability of Chk1 inhibitors as sensitizers in pancreatic cancers.

The development of a molecularly targeted agent in pancreatic cancer should involve the confirmation that both the target and the subsequent downstream signaling are inhibited. In the absence of a primary resection, patient pancreatic tumor specimens are generally limited to a one-time fine-needle aspirate or a small core needle biopsy. Although this may be adequate for assessing "static" biomarkers (such p53 or K-Ras mutation status), it is insufficient for the assessment of pharmacodynamic responses, which require pre- and posttreatment comparison. Furthermore, while p53 mutation status is a useful biomarker to some extent, it does not capture the degree of sensitization as, even in p53-mutant
cells, Chk1 inhibition produces a wide range of sensitization (Fig. 1). Thus, the development of pharmacodynamic biomarkers of Chk1 inhibition is important and has the potential to be predictive of the degree of tumor sensitization. To begin to develop a system which would permit pharmacodynamic assessment of a biomarker from a one-time biopsy in pancreatic cancer, we have integrated methodology which uses thinly sliced fresh tissue (21) into an ex vivo treatment platform. It will be important in future studies to determine if ex vivo biomarker analyses are feasible on patient pancreatic tumor biopsies and whether they are predictive of therapeutic efficacy (35).

Our preclinical finding that MK8776 improves the efficacy of gemcitabine-radiation in pancreatic cancer xenografts provides further support for the clinical development of Chk1 inhibitors in combination with chemoradiation. In order to best use Chk1 inhibitors such as MK8776 with chemoradiation, however, a few outstanding issues need to be addressed. Although p53 is one of several candidate biomarkers for tumor sensitization following Chk1 inhibition, the relationship of p53 mutation status or that of other candidate biomarkers, such as K-Ras, BRCA1/2, or DPC4, with clinical outcome remains to be established. Similarly, while pChk1 (S345) appears to be a reliable biomarker for Chk1 inhibition and DNA damage, it is still unclear whether changes in pChk1 (S345), or other dynamic biomarkers such as γH2AX or Rad51, correlate with clinical response. Furthermore, with the clinical development of agents that target different molecules in the Chk1 response network, such as Wee1, it is plausible that different subsets of tumors may respond more to Chk1 inhibitors compared with another targeted agent, and vice versa. Thus, it will be important to compare these agents to Chk1 inhibitors in terms of their efficacy and tumor cell selectivity, as well as to identify biomarkers which predict the superiority of one agent over the others. Finally, it is of interest to begin to understand the mechanisms of resistance that may be incurred in response to Chk1 inhibition in tumor cells.
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