*Journal of Neuro-Oncology* 22: 239-243, 1994. 9 1994 *Kluwer Academic Publishers. Printed in the Netherlands.* 

# **Multidrug resistance in human cancer**

M. Lehnert

*Cancer Research Laboratory, Department C of lnternal Medicine, Kantonsspital, CH-9007 St. GalIen, Switzerland* 

*Key words:* multidrug resistance

# **Abstract**

Resistance to cytotoxic chemotherapy continues to be a major obstacle to more effective treatment of human cancers. A particular problem in clinical cancer chemotherapy is the phenomenon of simultaneous resistance of cancers to a variety of unrelated cytotoxic agents. Such resistance to multiple drugs is observed much more often than resistance to individual compounds. A similar experimental phenomenon has been termed multidrug resistance or MDR. Much has been learned in recent years about molecular mechanisms which can lead to MDR in cancer cells and a number of studies has been performed to evaluate the clinical relevance of such mechanisms. In particular, P-glycoprotein-associated MDR (MDR1) has received a lot of attention. This review will discuss (i) some principal aspects of drug resistance in cancer with particular emphasis on MDR1; (ii) available data on drug resistance mechanisms in brain tumors; and (iii) our current knowledge on the putative role of P-glycoprotein in the blood-brain barrier.

### **Principal aspects of chemotherapy resistance**

Chemotherapy resistance in cancer can be intrinsic or acquired. Tumors with intrinsic or *de novo* resistance fail to respond to the first chemotherapy given. This continues to be a major problem in various solid tumors, such as non-small cell lung cancers or gastrointestinal carcinomas. In acquired resistance, tumors initially respond to chemotherapy but eventually progress in spite of treatment. In both scenarios, simultaneous resistance to a variety of unrelated cytotoxic agents is much more common than resistance to an individual agent or a particular class of cytotoxic drugs.

When thinking about chemotherapy resistance in cancer, particularly when doing research in this field, it is useful to distinguish between questions related to resistance on the molecular, cellular and clinical level (Table 1). Lack of doing so has often resulted in poor study design and/or misinterpretation of data.

#### **Multidrug resistance**

Simultaneous resistance of cancers to multiple agents is a common clinical experience. Thus the experimental phenomenon of MDR has received much attention in recent years. Various molecular mechanisms have been identified which can result in MDR (reviewed in [1-3]). These include overexpression of the MDR1 gene and its protein product P-glycoprotein (Pgp); overexpression of the MRP gene and its protein product, like Pgp a membrane protein belonging to the superfamily of ATP-binding cassette transporter proteins; changes in the glutathione system; and reduced expression and/or activity of topoisomerase II.

A large amount of data has accumulated on the potential role of particular MDR mechanisms in clinical drug resistance. Unfortunately, most of this data must be considered inconclusive. This is partly due to shortcomings in study design and to various problems of the detection methods employed in *Table* /.Chemotherapy resistance in cancer. Some important questions related to the molecular, cellular and clinical levels of drug resistance

*Molecular resistance* 

- Overexpression of drug transport proteins (e.g., Pglycoprotein; MRP p190)?
- Lack of drug transport proteins (e.g., folate transporter)?
- Altered drug target(s) (e.g., topoisomerase II; dihydrofolate reductase)?
- Enhanced drug detoxification (e.g., increased activity of glutathione redox cycle, metallothione or aldehyde dehydrogenase)?
- Enhanced DNA repair (e.g., increased activity of  $O^6$ alkylguanine-DNA alkyltransferase)?

#### *Cellular resistance*

- Phenotype (e.g., resistance to single agent or multiple drugs; if multiple drugs, structurally and/or functionally related or unrelated agents)?
- Level of resistance?
- Altered cellular pharmacology of affected drug(s) (e.g., reduced uptake; enhanced efflux)?
- Molecular resistance or resistance due to tumor growth kinetics?

#### *Clinical resistance*

- Cellular or pharmacokinetic resistance?
- Impact of cellular/molecular resistance mechanism(s) on treatment outcome?
- Circumvention of resistance feasible?

these studies. However, this is also due to the complexity of clinical MDR. Various cytotoxic agents can be affected by more than one molecular mechanism. For instance, resistance to drugs such as doxorubicin or etoposide can be due to overexpression of Pgp or to reduced activity of topoisomerase II. Furthermore, MDR in human cancers can be multifactorial. Tumors may be composed of subpopulations of cancer cells which use differing resistance mechanisms ('resistance heterogeneity'). Alternatively, various resistance mechanisms may be operating simultaneously in particular cancer cells. Finally, overexpression of 'resistance proteins' such as Pgp might only be an indicator of a particular phenotype of tumor cells which is associated with poor prognosis, e.g., due to overexpression of particular oncogenes and/or loss of function of socalled tumor suppressor genes. Thus unambiguous assessment of the clinical relevance of particular MDR mechanisms with respect to chemotherapy sensitivity will continue to be a difficult task.

# **P-glycoprotein-associated muitidrug resistance**

The MDR mechanism most extensively studied in recent years is Pgp-associated MDR, also termed MDR1 or 'classical' MDR [3]. MDR1 is characterized by simultaneous resistance of cancer cells to a variety of structurally and functionally differing cytotoxic drugs, which usually are of natural origin or semisynthetic derivatives of natural product drugs. The clinically most relevant classes of agents affected by MDR1 are listed in Table 2, which also shows various cytotoxic drugs not involved in MDR1. These include platinum compounds, alkylating agents such as cyclophosphamide or melphalan, antimetabolites such as methotrexate or 5-fluorouracil, and also the agents most effective in the chemotherapy of brain tumors, i.e., chloroethylnitrosoureas and procarbazine. The pharmacological hallmark of MDR1 is reduced cellular drug accumulation due to enhanced efflux mediated by Pgp, which is believed to function as energy-dependent multidrug efflux pump.

Various methods have been developed to detect overexpression of MDR1 in clinical cancer specimens at the molecular or protein level, e.g., immunostaining and flow cytometry for detection of Pgp, reverse transcriptase polymerase chain reaction (RT-PCR), ribonuclease protection assay and RNA dot or slot blot for detection of MDR1 RNA transcripts. Two issues have to be kept in mind when selecting particular methods for MDR1 detection in clinical tumor samples: (a) MDR1/Pgp is present in

*Table 2.Clinically* important cytotoxic agents which are affected and not affected by P-glycoprotein-associated multidrug resistance

Affected	Not affected
Antracyclines	Classical alkylating agents
Vinca alkaloids	Chloroethylnitrosoureas
Podophyllotoxins	Procarbazine
Anthracenediones	Platinum compounds
Taxus compounds	Antimetabolites

many normal cells, including liver cells lining the biliary canaliculi, epithelial cells in colon and proximal renal tubuli, adrenal cells, endothelial cells in CNS and testicular capillaries, CD34+ hemopoietic stem cells and various lymphocyte subtypes [4-7]. (b) Low level overexpression of MDR1 has been frequently detected in a variety of tumor types and such low levels might be sufficient to confer clinical drug resistance. Accordingly, an ideal MDR1 detection method would be a so-called *in situ* technique, i.e., a method which allows to discern between normal and malignant cells expressing MDR1/Pgp, which has sufficient sensitivity to detect low level overexpression. Unfortunately, no method is currently available which meets both criteria. In addition to MDR1/Pgp detection methods, assays are available which are capable of analyzing Pgp function in clinical tumor specimens by measuring accumulation and/or efflux of Pgp substrates.

The variety of techniques used to detect MDR1/ Pgp expression is one reason for the often discrepant results in studies of MDR1/Pgp expression in clinical tumor samples. In general, MDR1/Pgp overexpression has been more frequently found in cancers which have failed prior chemotherapy than *de novo.* The exception from this rule are cancers arising from tissues which physiologically express Pgp, such as colon, kidneys or pancreas, where MDR1/Pgp can often be detected prior to any cytotoxic treatment. Studies in acute leukemias and various childhood cancers have shown a significant correlation between MDR1/Pgp-positivity of tumors and poor treatment outcome, i.e., response to chemotherapy, disease-free as well as overall survival [8-10]. However, the question remains whether the poor treatment results in Pgp-positive patients were indeed the result of Pgp-mediated chemotherapy resistance or Pgp was only an indicator of a more malignant phenotype (see above).

A number of agents from various pharmacological classes of drugs has been shown to be capable of reversing MDR1 *in vitro* and in animal models [11]. Various examples of these so-called chemosensitizers (CS) are shown in Table 3. The major mechanism through which CS appear to function appears to be competitive inhibition of the hydrophobic binding of MDR1 drugs to Pgp. As a result, Pgp241

mediated efflux of the cytotoxic agents is inhibited which leads to increased intracellular accumulation and thus cytotoxicity.

Many CS have been used in clinical MDR reversal studies (reviewed in [12-15]). Thus far, clinical effectiveness of CS has been low in patients with solid tumors. However, in various hematologic neoplasms including multiple myeloma and acute myeloid leukemia the addition of CS to chemotherapy in previously drug-refractory patients has been able to re-induce remissions in a significant portion of patients. Thus the concept of MDR1 reversal not only appears to function in experimental systems but also in patients. A number of problems have been observed in clinical reversal studies. These include the toxicities of the CS, often preventing dose escalation to achieve plasma levels high enough for effective MDR1 reversal, and pharmacokinetic interaction between CS and MDR1 drugs. For instance, addition of cyclosporin A to etoposide has been shown to result in an increase in etoposide AUC (area under the plasma disappearance curve) by more than 50% due to reduced renal and nonrenal elimination of the drug [16]. This increase was associated with significantly enhanced bone marrow toxicity. It has long been a concern that effective inhibition of physiologic Pgp function might increase chemotherapy toxicity, as Pgp might be in-

*Table* 3.Agents capable of reversing P-glycoprotein-associated multidrug resistance

Classes of drugs	Examples
Calcium channel blockers	Verapamil, bepridil, nifedipine, diltiazem, dexverapamil. dexniguldipine, Ro 11-2933
Calmodulin inhibitors	Trifluoperazine, thioridazine, chlorpromazine, clomipramine
Lysosomotropic agents	Quinine, quinidine, chlorogine, quinacrine
Steroids	Progesterone
Antiestrogens	Tamoxifen, toremifene
Cyclic peptide antibiotics	Cyclosporin A, <i>PSC 833</i> , <i>SDZ</i> 280–446
Miscellaneous	Dipyridamole, amiodarone, cefoperazone, ceftriaxone, erythromycin, S 9788

*Investigational agents.* 

volved in the elimination of drugs, the protection of tissues such as the CNS, and the protection of particular normal cells such as early bone marrow progenitor cells.

### **Chemotherapy resistance in brain tumors**

Efficacy of chemotherapy in adult brain tumors such as glioblastoma multiforme or high-grade astrocytomas has remained poor [17]. Although the majority of cancers initially respond to chemotherapy, responses tend to be short and impact of chemotherapy on survival seems minimal at most. Table 4 highlights some critical questions to be asked with respect to the clinical, cellular and molecular levels of chemotherapy resistance in brain tumors. In controlled trials, only chloroethylnitrosoureas and procarbazine have demonstrated unequivocal activity in brain tumors in adults. Accordingly, brain tumors are *de novo* resistant to the vast majority of cytotoxic agents. Such resistance might be of cellular/molecular and/or pharmacokinetic origin.

*Table* 4.Chemotherapy resistance in brain tumors. Some important questions related to the clinical, cellular and molecular levels of drug resistance

*Clinical resistance* 

- *Cellular orpharmacokinetic resistance?*
- *Which drugs have proven activity in brain tumors?*
- *Which are the molecular mechanisms which can confer resistance to these particular agents?*
- *Which are the mechanisms that can confer resistance to cytotoxic agents with no activity in brain tumors (e.g., lack of access due to blood-brain~tumor barrier; molecular mechanisms) ?*
- *Clinical relevance of molecular resistance mechanisms present in brain tumors?*
- *Circumvention of resistance feasible?*

#### *Cellular resistance*

- See Table 2

*Molecular resistance* 

- Increased DNA repair (e.g., increased activity of 06 alkylguanine-DNA alkyltransferase)?
- Enhanced drug detoxification (e.g., increased activity of the glutathione redox cycle)?
- Overexpression of drug transporter proteins (e.g., MDR1/ Pgp, MRP/p190)?

Permeability of the blood-brain barrier is limited for most cytotoxic agents. Accordingly, even for such highly chemotherapy-sensitive cancers as acute leukemias or non-Hodgkin's lymphomas the CNS can function as 'sanctuary' from the effects of systemic chemotherapy. There is some data to suggest permeability in brain tumor capillaries to be increased as compared to normal vessels. Nonetheless, most cytotoxic agents seem to be unable to cross the blood-tumor barrier. Furthermore, distances between capillaries and cancer cells are often substantial in brain tumors and passive diffusion capacity of many cytotoxic agents is limited.

Little data is available to date on molecular resistance mechanisms operative in brain tumors and the clinical relevance of such mechanisms is currently unknown [18]. Various studies have found Pgp expression in brain tumor cells at differing frequencies [19, 20]. No data has been reported on MDR mechanisms other than MDR1/Pgp in clinical brain tumor specimens or on the role of DNA repair enzymes such as  $O_6$ -alkylguanine-DNA-alkyltransferase (ATase) in brain tumor resistance. Enhanced ATase activity can confer resistance to drugs such as chloroethylnitrosoureas and procarbazine, and in nitrosourea-resistant glioma-derived tumor cell lines increased ATase activity has been documented [21].

MDR1/Pgp is known to be strongly expressed in endothelial cells of CNS capillaries [7]. In cultured human brain capillary endothelial cells, Pgp has been shown to transport various known Pgp substrates such as *Vinca* alkaloids or rhodamine 123 [22]. CS such as verapamil or cyclosporin A were able to block this transport. Accordingly, MDR1/ Pgp is believed to play a role in the blood-brain barrier [23]. Systemic administration of cytotoxic agents pumped by Pgp does not result in significant CNS concentrations, and it seems reasonable to suggest Pgp to be one mechanism preventing these drugs from entering the CNS. Thus, the inactivity of such agents in brain tumors might be due to limited access to the target. Thus one might speculate that effective blockage of Pgp function by CS could render drugs such as anthracyclines active in the treatment of brain tumors. On the other hand, in clinical MDR reversal studies Pgp inhibition might lead to

CNS toxicities by such agents. Both possibilities are of major clinical interest and studies are clearly needed which evaluate CS effects on uptake of MDR1 drugs in normal brain as well as in brain tumors. Various positron emitting radionuclides have been used with success for anthracycline labeling [24]. Thus PET might prove to be a useful technique for studying those issues.

Obviously, much remains to be learned about the mechanisms underlying chemotherapy resistance in brain tumors. Such data appears important for designing therapeutic strategies which can lead to better treatment of patients suffering from such cancers.

# **Acknowledgements**

This author's work in the field of multidrug resistance is supported by grants from the Swiss National Science Foundation; the Swiss Cancer League, sections St. Gallen-Appenzell and Thurgau; the Eastern Switzerland Foundation for Clinical Cancer Research; the Eugen and Elisabeth Schellenberg Foundation; and the Helmut Horten Foundation.

### **References**

- 1. Moscow JA, Cowan KH: Multidrug resistance. J Natl Cancer Inst 80: 14-20, 1988
- 2. Beck WT: The cell biology of multiple drug resistance. Biochem Pharmacol 36: 2870-2887, 1987
- 3. Gottesman MM, Pastan I: Biochemistry of multidrug resistance mediated by the multidrug transporter. Ann Rev Biochem 62: 385-427, 1993
- 4. Cordon-Cardo C, O'Brien JR Bocchia J, Casals D, Bertino JR, Melamed MR: Expression of the mulfidrug resistance gene product (P-glycoprotein) in human normal and tumor tissues. J Histochem Cytochem 38: 1277-1287, 1990
- 5. Chaudhary PM, Roninson IB: Expression and activity of Pglycoprotein, a multidrug efflux pump, in human hematopoietic stem cells. Cell 66: 85-94, 1991
- 6. Chaudhary PM, Mechetner EB, Roninson IB: Expression and activity of the multidrug resistance P-glycoprotein in human peripheral blood lymphocytes. Blood 11: 2735-2739, 1992
- 7. Cordon-Cardo C, O'Brien JR Casals D, Rittman-Grauer L, Biedler JL, Melamed MR, Bertino JR: Multidrug-resistance gene (P-glycoprotein) is expressed by endothelial cells at blood-brain barrier sites. Proc Natt Acad 8ci USA 86: 695- 698, 1989
- 8. Arceci RJ: Clinical significance of P-glycoprotein in multidrug resistance malignancies. Blood 81: 2215-2222, 1993
- 9. Chan HSL, Thorner PS, Haddad G, Ling V: Immunohistochemical detection of P-glycoprotein: Prognostic correlation in soft tissue sarcoma of childhood. J Clin Oncol 8: 689- 704,1990
- 10. Chan HSL, Haddad G, Thorner PS, DeBoer G, Lin YR Ondrusek N, Yeger H, Ling V: P-glycoprotein expression as a predictor of the outcome of therapy for neuroblastoma. N Engl J Med 325: 1608-1614, 1991
- 11. Ford JM, Hait WN: Pharmacology of drugs that alter mulfidrug resistance in cancer. Pharmacol Rev 42:155-199,1990
- 12. Sikic BI: Modulation of multidrug resistance: At the threshold. J Clin Onco111: 1629-1635, 1993
- 13. Lehnert M: Reversal of P-glycoprotein-associated multidrug resistance: The challenge continues. Eur J Cancer 29A: 636-638, 1993
- 14. Lehnert M: Reversal of multidrug resistance in breast cancer: Many more open questions than answers. Ann Oncol 4: 11-13, 1993
- 15. Lehnert M: Reversal of P-glycoprotein-associated multidrug resistance: From bench to bedside. Onkologie 17: 8-15, 1994
- 16. Lum BL, Kraubisch S, Yahanda AM, Adler KM, Jew L, Ehsan MN, Brophy NA, Halsey J, Gosland MR Sikic BI: Alteration of etoposide pharmacokinetics and pharmacodynamics by cyclosporine in a phase I trial to modulate multidrug resistance. J Clin Onco110: 1635-1642, 1992
- 17. Levin VA, Gutin PH, Leibel S: Neoplasms of the central nervous system. In: DeVita VT Jr, Hellman S, Rosenberg SA (eds) Cancer, Principles and Practice of Oncology. JB Lippincot Company, Philadelphia 1679-1737, 1993
- 18. Philips PC: Antineoplastic drug resistance in brain tumors. Neurol Clin 9: 383-404, 1991
- 19. Becket I, Becker KF, Meyermann R, H611t V: The multidrug resistance gene MDR1 is expressed in human glial tumors. Acta Neuropatho182: 516-519,1991
- 20. Nabors MW, Griffin CA, Zehnbauer BA, Hruban RH, Philips PC, Grossmann SA, Brem H, Colvin M: Multidrug resistance gene (MDR1) expression in human brain tumors. J Neurosurg 75: 941-946, 1991
- 21. Bodell WJ, Aida T, Berger MS, Rosenblum ML: Increased repair of O6-alkylguanine DNA adducts in glioma-derived human cells resistant to the cytotoxic and cytogenetic effects of 1,3-bis(2-chloroethyl)-l-nitrosourea. Carcinogenesis 7: 879-883, 1986
- 22. Hegmann EJ, Bauer HC, Kerbel RS: Expression and functional activity of P-gtycoprotein in cultured cerebral capillary endothelial cells. Cancer Res 52: 6969-6975, 1992
- 23. Schlosshauer B: The blood-brain barrier: Morphology, molecules, and neurothelin. BioAssays 15: 341-346, 1993
- 24. Zweit J, Carnochan P, Goodall R, Ott RJ: Excitation functions of proton induced reactions on cobalt: Production of no-carrier added Nickel-57, a positron emitting label for doxorubicin. Appl Radiat Isot 44: 1411-1416,1993

*Address for offprints."* M. Lehnert, Cancer Research Laboratory, Department C of Internal Medicine, Kantonsspital, CH-9007 St. Gallen, Switzerland