1 *Article*

2 **Bacterial lipopolysaccharide as negative predictor of gemcitabine efficacy in**
3 **advanced pancreatic cancer – translational results from the AIO-PK0104 phase 3**
4 **study**

5 Michael Guenther ^{1,†}, Michael Haas, MD ^{2,†}, Volker Heinemann, MD ^{2,3}, Stephan Kruger, MD
6 ², Christoph Benedikt Westphalen, MD ², Michael von Bergwelt-Baildon, MD, PhD ^{2,3}, Julia
7 Mayerle, MD ⁴, Jens Werner, MD ⁵, Thomas Kirchner, MD ^{1,3}, Stefan Boeck, MD ^{2,3,†} and
8 Steffen Ormanns, MD ^{1,†*}

9
10 1: Institute of Pathology, Faculty of Medicine, Ludwig-Maximilians-University, Munich,
11 Germany

12 2: Department of Internal Medicine III, Grosshadern University Hospital, Ludwig-Maximilians-
13 University, Munich, Germany

14 3: German Cancer Consortium (DKTK), partner site Munich, Germany

15 4: Department of Internal Medicine II, Grosshadern University Hospital, Ludwig-Maximilians-
16 University, Munich, Germany

17 5: Department of General, Visceral and Transplant Surgery, Ludwig-Maximilians-University,
18 Munich, Germany

19 *: corresponding author

20 †: authors contributed equally to this work

21
22 Abstract: 212 words

23 Word count: 2.157 words

24 Figures: 2

25 Tables: 3

26 References: 14

27 Running title: Lipopolysaccharide detection in pancreatic cancer

28 *Supplements: Tables S2, S3, S4, S6, S7, S8; Figure S1, S5*

29 Conflict of interest disclosure: The authors declare no potential conflicts of interest.

30
31 Corresponding author:

32 Steffen Ormanns, MD

33 Institute of Pathology, Ludwig-Maximilians-University

34 Thalkirchner Strasse 36

35 80337 Munich, Germany

36 +49-89-2180-73632

37 steffen.ormanns@med.uni-muenchen.de

1 ABSTRACT

2 **Background:**

3 Gram-negative bacteria mediated gemcitabine resistance in pre-clinical models. We
4 determined if intratumoral lipopolysaccharide (LPS) detection by immunohistochemistry is
5 associated with outcome in advanced pancreatic ductal adenocarcinoma (PDAC) treated
6 with gemcitabine and non-gemcitabine containing 1st-line chemotherapy.

7
8 **Methods:**

9 We examined LPS on tumor tissue from 130 patients treated within the randomized phase 3
10 trial AIO-PK0104 and a validation cohort ($n=113$) from a prospective biomarker study and
11 analyzed the association of LPS detection to patient outcome according to treatment
12 subgroups.

13
14 **Results:**

15 In 24% of samples from the AIO-PK0104 study LPS was detected; in LPS-positive patients
16 median OS was 4.4 months, compared to 7.3 months with LPS negative tumors (HR 1.732,
17 $p=0.010$). A difference in OS was detected in the subgroup of patients treated with 1st-line
18 gemcitabine-based treatment ($n=71$; HR 2.377, $p=0.002$), whereas no difference in OS was
19 observed in the non-gemcitabine subgroup ($n=59$; HR 1.275, $p=0.478$). Within the validation
20 cohort, the LPS positivity rate was 23%, and LPS detection was correlated with impaired OS
21 in the gemcitabine subgroup ($n=94$; HR 1.993, $p=0.008$) whereas no difference in OS was
22 observed in the non-gemcitabine subgroup ($n=19$; HR 2.596, $p=0.219$).

23
24 **Conclusions:**

25 The detection of intratumoral LPS as a surrogate marker for gram-negative bacterial
26 colonization may serve as a negative predictor for gemcitabine efficacy in advanced PDAC.

27
28
29 **Clinical trial registry:**

30 NCT00440167

31

32

33

34

35

36

37

1 Background

2 The majority of patients with pancreatic ductal adenocarcinoma (PDAC) is diagnosed in an
3 advanced stage, resulting in mortality rates almost equal to incidence rates ¹. Palliative
4 chemotherapy is considered as an international standard of care for these patients; however,
5 relevant predictive biomarkers for rational treatment decisions are still lacking ². Increasing
6 evidence indicates a crucial role for the human microbiome in solid malignancies, especially
7 in gastrointestinal tumors which are in close contact to dense microbial colonization ^{3, 4}.
8 Importantly, intratumoral bacteria have been shown to promote tumorigenesis ⁵ and to confer
9 resistance to gemcitabine in human adenocarcinoma ^{6, 7}. As reported recently, intratumoral
10 bacteria can metabolize gemcitabine (2',2'-difluorodeoxycytidine) into its inactive form 2',2'-
11 difluorodeoxyuridine; in a pre-clinical model, gemcitabine depletion was dependent on the
12 expression of a long isoform of the bacterial enzyme cytidine deaminase (CDD_L) commonly
13 found in gram-negative bacteria ⁷. Bacterial lipopolysaccharide is a major component of the
14 cell wall of gram-negative bacteria and can easily be detected by immunohistochemistry ⁷.
15 In the present study, we report the results of immunohistochemical detection of intratumoral
16 LPS as a surrogate marker of gram-negative bacterial colonization in the tumor tissue of 243
17 patients with advanced PDAC from two independent study cohorts and the correlation of
18 intratumoral LPS detection to patient outcome according to the applied 1st-line chemotherapy
19 regimen (gemcitabine vs non-gemcitabine containing).

22 Materials and Methods

23 *Patients and tumor samples*

24 Archival tumor material was derived from 130 advanced PDAC patients treated within the
25 randomized phase 3 study AIO-PK0104 (NCT00440167), that compared a 1st-line treatment
26 with gemcitabine + erlotinib versus capecitabine + erlotinib (with the option of a cross-over to
27 the comparator cytotoxic drug in the 2nd-line setting) ⁸. A validation of the LPS results from
28 AIO-PK0104 was performed on 113 patient samples derived from a previously reported
29 prospective biomarker trial ⁹, in which the 1st-line chemotherapy regimens were as follows: 40
30 patients received gemcitabine monotherapy, 29 patients gemcitabine and cisplatin, 10
31 patients gemcitabine and oxaliplatin, 14 gemcitabine and capecitabine, 11 patients single-
32 agent capecitabine, 7 patients capecitabine and oxaliplatin, one patient received FOLFOX-6
33 and one patient received gemcitabine and 5-FU. Both studies had approval of the local ethics
34 committee and were conducted according to GCP/ICH.

LPS immunohistochemistry

Intratumoral bacterial LPS was detected immunohistochemically on formalin fixed paraffin embedded (FFPE) tumor material as described previously¹⁰ using a monoclonal mouse anti-LPS antibody detecting the core bacterial LPS antigen (clone WN1 222-5, Hycult Biotech, Uden, The Netherlands) at a 1:800 dilution. Tumors from 133 patients were included in a tissue microarray (TMA) as three cores of one mm diameter each (71 samples from the AIO-PK0104 cohort, 62 samples from the validation cohort), whereas biopsies from 110 patients were stained as whole mount tissue sections (59 samples from the AIO-PK0104 cohort, 51 samples from the validation cohort). Normal human colonic mucosa, which physiologically carries high amounts of gram-negative bacteria and normal human liver tissue, which physiologically may show high amounts of LPS, were used as positive controls in each staining run (suppl. figure S1A and S1B). Of note, normal adjacent pancreatic tissue did not show LPS signals nor unspecific staining in acinar cells (figure S1C). On TMA embedded tumor tissue, cases showing strong signals in at least one TMA core or weak and single signals in at least two cores were evaluated as positive, whereas all others were evaluated as negative. On whole mount tissue sections, the presence of definitive LPS signals throughout the tumor tissue was evaluated as positive, whereas complete absence of signal was evaluated as negative. All slides were read and scored by two researchers (MG, SO), blinded to the patient outcome and discrepant cases were discussed until agreement was reached. Microphotographs were acquired as described previously¹⁰.

Statistical analyses

Progression free survival (PFS) and overall survival (OS) were calculated from the initiation of 1st-line chemotherapy to the occurrence of an event (progress, death). The correlation of tumor or patient characteristics to PFS and OS was calculated using the Kaplan-Meier method. Hazard ratios were estimated by Cox proportional hazards regression. Correlation of patient or sample characteristics was assessed using cross tabulations and two sided χ^2 -tests. Statistical analyses were run on SPSS software (IBM, Ehningen, Germany).

Results

Patient characteristics

In the overall population (n=243) median patient age was 62 years; 145 patients were male. On therapy initiation, 23 patients from the AIO-PK0104 trial and 10 patients from the validation cohort had locally advanced disease, whereas all others had distant metastases. Both cohorts were comparable in terms of patient age, sex, KPS groups as well as tissue sample origin and tissue modality (TMA vs whole slide). In the AIO-PK0104 cohort, we

detected more locally advanced cases, higher grade tumors and less lung metastases. Related to the trial design, more patients received non-gemcitabine based 1st-line chemotherapy in the AIO-PK0104 cohort (table S2). All clinicopathologic patient characteristics and associated survival times of each subgroup are summarized in table S3.

LPS detection and clinico-pathological patient characteristics

Using immunohistochemistry, bacterial LPS could reliably be detected in 24.5 % of all PDAC samples (figure 1). To preclude potential sampling errors due to the use of TMA embedded tissue, we compared the staining result in whole mount tissue sections and the TMA cores of 10 exemplary positive and 15 exemplary negative cases from both cohorts and found complete consistency (table S4, figures S5A, S5B). Interestingly, we detected a significantly higher rate of LPS positivity in tumor samples which were derived from metastatic sites compared to primary tumor tissue samples (36.5% vs. 9.4%, $p<0.001$, table 1). As expected in a cohort of advanced PDAC patients, tissue samples from liver metastases constituted the largest group (96 of 243 samples) and showed a significantly higher LPS positivity rate than tissue from other metastatic sites or primary tumors (55.2% vs. 9.3%, $p<0.001$, table 1). In the subgroup in which only primary tumor samples were examined, no statistically significant association of primary tumor location and LPS detection was found ($p=0.484$, table S6). Moreover, we found no statistically significant association between LPS detection and patient characteristics such as gender, age group, KPS group or tumor differentiation (table 1).

Intratumoral LPS detection is associated with inferior survival in gemcitabine treated PDAC patients

We detected bacterial LPS in the tumor material of 24 % of the 130 patients from the AIO-PK0104 study, which was significantly associated to inferior OS (4.4 vs 7.3 months, HR 1.732, $p=0.010$, figure 2A). Intratumoral LPS was significantly associated with a shorter OS in the 1st-line gemcitabine randomization arm (3.3 vs 7.7 months, HR 2.377, $p=0.002$, figure 2B), whereas no such difference in the 1st-line capecitabine arm was detected (5.7 vs 6.7 months, HR 1.275, $p=0.478$, figure 2C). All 113 patients selected for the validation cohort received erlotinib-free, either gemcitabine-based or non-gemcitabine based 1st-line chemotherapy regimens⁹; 23% of these tumor samples were LPS positive, which again was significantly associated to shorter patient PFS (4.1 vs 7.8 months, HR 1.760, $p=0.028$) and OS (6.2 vs 10.8 months, HR 1.880, $p=0.009$, figure 2D). In subgroup analyses, the negative impact of LPS detection on either PFS (HR 2.051, $p=0.010$) or OS (HR 1.993, $p=0.008$, figure 2E) was restricted to the gemcitabine subgroup, whereas no difference in PFS (HR 1.292, $p=0.742$) or OS (HR 2.596, $p=0.219$, figure 2F) was detected for the non-gemcitabine subgroup with regard to LPS status, respectively (table 2).

In Cox multivariate regression analyses adjusting for the parameters which were statistically significant prognosticators in univariate analyses (tumor grade, KPS and disease stage at chemotherapy initiation), we confirmed LPS detection as independent negative predictor for both PFS and OS in the gemcitabine 1st-line chemotherapy subgroup (table 3).

To preclude a potential impact of the imbalance of LPS positivity in metastatic and primary tumor tissue, we compared OS and PFS according to LPS detection in each subgroup and obtained similar results as in the overall cohorts (table S7). From 110 patients treated within the AIO-PK0104 study, objective tumor response data (a secondary trial endpoint) was available. In the capecitabine 1st-line randomization arm, the disease control rate (DCR) of patients with LPS positive tumors was 40.0% (4 of 10 patients) compared to 42.5% (17 of 40 patients) in the patients with LPS negative tumors ($p=0.589$, table S8). In the gemcitabine 1st-line randomization arm, DCR of patients with LPS positive tumors was 66.7% (8 of 12 patients) compared to 62.5% (30 of 48 patients) for patients with LPS negative tumors ($p=0.534$, table S8). Thus, we detected no statistically significant differences in tumor response according to LPS detection and treatment arm.

Discussion

In far contrast to other malignancies like colorectal or lung cancer, biomarkers that predict treatment efficacy of specific drugs are still lacking in PDAC. In 2017, Geller *et al* reported pre-clinical data suggesting that intratumoral bacteria mediate tumor resistance to gemcitabine ⁷. However, as to our best knowledge, these data have never been clinically validated yet. As gemcitabine is mainly applied in PDAC, we thought to validate the hypotheses from Geller and co-workers on patient samples from our previously conducted clinical trials in advanced PDAC ^{8,9}. As both the AIO-PK0104 cohort as well as the validation cohort contained patients treated with 1st-line gemcitabine and also non-gemcitabine containing chemotherapy, we thought to evaluate a potential predictive role for the occurrence of intratumoral bacteria on gemcitabine efficacy.

Unfortunately, no positivity rates of LPS immunohistochemistry were reported in the study by Geller *et al.*, but the rate of 25% LPS positivity in our overall study population was significantly lower than the rate of 76% 'bacterial DNA'-positive PDAC samples reported in their study ⁷. However, as their molecular assay detects all kinds of bacteria with superior sensitivity compared to immunohistochemistry and LPS is a cell wall component of gram-negative bacteria only, both figures are not directly comparable. One also might expect higher positivity rates examining whole mount primary tumor resection specimens - as performed by Geller and colleagues - compared to biopsy tissue or TMA embedded tumor material. Nevertheless, we precluded a potential bias resulting from tissue modality and

1 confirmed the reliability of TMA embedded tissue to detect intratumoral LPS compared to
2 whole mount tissue. Moreover, although our study population consisted of patients with
3 advanced PDAC, where histological confirmation is often performed by a percutaneous
4 biopsy of metastases ⁹, we even detected higher positivity rates in metastases than in
5 primary tumors, which was mostly due to more LPS positive liver metastases. However,
6 intratumoral LPS detection remained a potential negative predictor of gemcitabine efficacy
7 irrespective of the tissue origin subgroup.

8 Our main results (summarized within table 2) provide evidence that LPS detection in FFPE
9 tumor samples may serve as a negative predictor for gemcitabine efficacy in advanced
10 PDAC, thereby confirming for the first time the previously published pre-clinical data ⁷. This
11 potential predictive biomarker for gemcitabine efficacy may be of special interest, as additive
12 antibiotic treatment in LPS positive cases could at least theoretically be used to eliminate
13 bacterial colonization and thus overcome bacterially mediated chemotherapy resistance as
14 already shown *in-vivo* ⁷. Although gemcitabine monotherapy has been largely replaced by
15 more efficient chemotherapy regimens in the clinically fit patient ¹¹, it is still widely used in the
16 clinical practice, especially in patients with significant co-morbidities ¹², where adjuvant
17 antibiotic treatment in LPS-positive tumors could increase the unfortunately still suboptimal
18 treatment efficacy.

19 Our study has several limitations that have to be taken into account when interpreting the
20 results: the design was retrospective and a relevant heterogeneity on the applied treatment
21 regimens (specifically in the validation cohort) may lead to a potential bias. Additionally, in
22 both cohorts the use of 2nd-line therapy (usually with the alternative cytotoxic backbone, e.g.
23 5-fluorouracil-based after gemcitabine and vice versa) may have an impact on the results,
24 specifically for OS. However, as the rate of 2nd-line therapy was below 50% in AIO-PK0104, a
25 significant impact of 2nd- and further-line treatments on our results should not be expected. It
26 must also be noted that all patients included in this LPS analysis were treated before the
27 introduction of FOLFIRINOX ¹³ or gemcitabine/nab-paclitaxel ¹⁴. Additionally, the LPS
28 immunohistochemistry used only detects a cell wall component of gram-negative bacteria
29 and does not allow assessment of bacterial viability or further characterization of the bacterial
30 infiltrate. As both AIO-PK0104 as well as the prospective biomarker study (used for the
31 validation cohort) unfortunately had not collected information about the frequency of
32 endoscopic retrograde cholangiopancreatography (ERCP) including placement of bile duct
33 stents, we are not able to provide data on a potential correlation of the ERCP procedure
34 (and/or the occurrence of cholangitis and subsequent use of antibiotic) in our patient
35 population – aspects that of course would be of additional scientific interest in interpreting the
36 reported data.

1 Nevertheless, based on the results from AIO-PK0104 and the validation cohort, intratumoral
2 bacterial LPS detection in PDAC samples may serve as a novel negative predictive
3 biomarker for gemcitabine efficacy, confirming previous pre-clinical observations. These
4 findings must be validated prospectively and should be addressed in the light that this
5 biomarker also may be modifiable by the use of antibiotics.

1 **Additional Information**

2 *Ethics approval and consent to participate*

3 In both study cohorts, the local ethics committee approved the use of patient material for
4 translational research purposes (project numbers 554-11 and 401-15). All patients gave
5 written informed consent to participate in their respective study upon study enrollment. This
6 study was performed in accordance with the Declaration of Helsinki.

8 *Data availability*

9 All supplemental data of this manuscript can be found on the journals website.

11 *Conflict of interest*

12 The authors declare no conflict of interest in relation to the work described within the present
13 manuscript.

15 *Funding*

16 This study was financed by internal funds of the Institute of Pathology, LMU.

18 *Authors' contributions*

19 MG and SO read and scored immunohistochemical stainings, performed statistical analyses
20 and drafted the figures. SO and SB drafted the manuscript. TK read slides and provided
21 material. MH, SK, CBW, VH, MvBB, JM, JW and SB provided clinical patient data and patient
22 material. All authors read and reviewed the manuscript.

24 *Acknowledgments*

25 The authors would like to thank all patients and their families, nurses, study coordinators and
26 AIO investigators for their active participation in the clinical trials that contributed data to this
27 translational biomarker study.

28 We also thank A. Sendelhofert and A. Heier for excellent technical assistance.

1 **References**

- 2 1. Siegel RL, Miller KD, Jemal A. Cancer statistics, 2019. *CA: a cancer journal for*
3 *clinicians*. 2019;69(1):7-34.
- 4 2. Neoptolemos JP, Kleeff J, Michl P, Costello E, Greenhalf W, Palmer DH. Therapeutic
5 developments in pancreatic cancer: current and future perspectives. *Nature reviews*
6 *Gastroenterology & hepatology*. 2018;15(6):333.
- 7 3. Riquelme E, Zhang Y, Zhang L, Montiel M, Zoltan M, Dong W, et al. Tumor
8 microbiome diversity and composition influence pancreatic cancer outcomes. *Cell*.
9 2019;178(4):795-806. e12.
- 10 4. Helmink BA, Khan MW, Hermann A, Gopalakrishnan V, Wargo JA. The microbiome,
11 cancer, and cancer therapy. *Nature medicine*. 2019:1.
- 12 5. Sethi V, Kurtom S, Tarique M, Lavania S, Malchiodi Z, Hellmund L, et al. Gut
13 microbiota promotes tumor growth in mice by modulating immune response.
14 *Gastroenterology*. 2018;155(1):33-7. e6.
- 15 6. Lehouritis P, Cummins J, Stanton M, Murphy CT, McCarthy FO, Reid G, et al. Local
16 bacteria affect the efficacy of chemotherapeutic drugs. *Scientific reports*. 2015;5:14554.
- 17 7. Geller LT, Barzily-Rokni M, Danino T, Jonas OH, Shental N, Nejman D, et al.
18 Potential role of intratumor bacteria in mediating tumor resistance to the chemotherapeutic
19 drug gemcitabine. *Science*. 2017;357(6356):1156-60.
- 20 8. Heinemann V, Vehling-Kaiser U, Waldschmidt D, Kettner E, Märten A, Winkelmann
21 C, et al. Gemcitabine plus erlotinib followed by capecitabine versus capecitabine plus
22 erlotinib followed by gemcitabine in advanced pancreatic cancer: final results of a
23 randomised phase 3 trial of the 'Arbeitsgemeinschaft Internistische Onkologie'(AIO-PK0104).
24 *Gut*. 2013;62(5):751-9.
- 25 9. Haas M, Ormanns S, Baechmann S, Remold A, Kruger S, Westphalen CB, et al.
26 Extended RAS analysis and correlation with overall survival in advanced pancreatic cancer.
27 *British journal of cancer*. 2017;116(11):1462.
- 28 10. Ormanns S, Altendorf-Hofmann A, Jackstadt R, Horst D, Assmann G, Zhao Y, et al.
29 Desmogleins as prognostic biomarkers in resected pancreatic ductal adenocarcinoma.
30 *British journal of cancer*. 2015;113(10):1460.
- 31 11. Springfield C, Jäger D, Büchler MW, Strobel O, Hackert T, Palmer DH, et al.
32 Chemotherapy for pancreatic cancer. *La Presse Médicale*. 2019;48(3):e159-e74.
- 33 12. Macarulla T, Carrato A, Díaz R, García A, Laquente B, Sastre J, et al. Management
34 and supportive treatment of frail patients with metastatic pancreatic cancer. *Journal of*
35 *geriatric oncology*. 2019;10(3):398-404.
- 36 13. Conroy T, Desseigne F, Ychou M, Bouché O, Guimbaud R, Bécouarn Y, et al.
37 FOLFIRINOX versus gemcitabine for metastatic pancreatic cancer. *New England Journal of*
38 *Medicine*. 2011;364(19):1817-25.
- 39 14. Von Hoff DD, Ervin T, Arena FP, Chiorean EG, Infante J, Moore M, et al. Increased
40 survival in pancreatic cancer with nab-paclitaxel plus gemcitabine. *New England Journal of*
41 *Medicine*. 2013;369(18):1691-703.

1 **Figure titles and legends**

2

3 **Figure 1**

4 *Intratumoral LPS can be detected in advanced PDAC tumor samples*

5 Immunohistochemical detection of bacterial lipopolysaccharide (LPS) in pancreatic cancer.
6 Exemplary cases of LPS positive (A) and LPS negative (B) pancreatic cancer samples. 200-
7 fold magnification. Scale bars indicate 50 μ m.

8

9 **Figure 2**

10 *Intratumoral LPS is associated with inferior OS in gemcitabine treated PDAC patients*

11 Overall survival (OS) of each patient subgroup according to intratumoral LPS detection.

12 Kaplan-Meier plots of OS in the

13 (A) AIO-PK0104 overall cohort

14 (B) 1st-line gemcitabine subgroup of the AIO-PK0104 trial population

15 (C) 1st-line capecitabine subgroup of the AIO-PK0104 trial population

16 (D) Validation overall cohort

17 (E) 1st-line gemcitabine subgroup of the validation cohort

18 (F) 1st-line non-gemcitabine subgroup of the validation cohort

19 Crossed lines indicate censored cases.

20

21

22 **Table titles and legends**

23

24 **Table 1**

25 *Association of clinicopathologic variables and LPS detection in the entire study cohort*

26

27 **Table 2**

28 *Patient prognosis according to LPS detection in each patient subgroup*

29 Median times of overall survival (OS) and progression free survival (PFS) according to
30 intratumoral LPS detection in each study subgroup as well as corresponding hazard ratios
31 (HR) and 95% confidential intervals (95% CI).

32

33 **Table 3**

34 *Intratumoral LPS is an independent negative prognostic biomarker in gemcitabine-treated*
35 *PDAC patients*

Cox regression analyses in the indicated patient subgroups for overall survival (OS) and (PFS), adjusting for tumor grade, KPS group, type of 1st-line palliative chemotherapy and disease stage at 1st-line therapy initiation.

KPS: Karnofsky performance status; tumor grade: high grade (G3-G4) vs low grade (G1-G2) differentiation; CTX-type: type of 1st-line chemotherapy (gemcitabine-based vs non-gemcitabine based); disease stage: disease stage at 1st-line therapy initiation (metastatic vs locally advanced).

Supplementary figures and tables

Figure S1

Bacterial lipopolysaccharide (LPS) detection in (A) normal colonic mucosa, (B) normal liver and (C) normal acinar pancreatic tissue

Immunohistochemical detection of bacterial lipopolysaccharide (LPS) in normal colonic mucosa shows distinct and strong a cloud like luminal staining, whereas it appears dot-like and speckled in normal liver. Normal pancreatic tissue shows no staining. 200-fold magnification. Scale bars indicate 50 µm.

Table S2

Comparison of the clinicopathologic parameters in the AIO-PK0104 and the validation cohort

Table S3

Patient prognosis according to clinicopathologic variables in each patient subgroup

Median times of overall survival (OS) and progression free survival (PFS) according to clinicopathologic variables in each study subgroup as well as corresponding hazard ratios (HR) and 95% confidential intervals (95% CI).

Table S4 / Figure S5

Complete concordance of LPS detection in TMA cores and corresponding whole mount tissue sections

Comparison of the staining results in TMA tissue and whole mount tissue sections of ten exemplary positive and 15 exemplary negative PDAC cases, of which five negative cases are depicted in figure S5A and five positive cases in figure S5B.

1 **Table S6**

2 *LPS detection is not associated to primary tumor location*

3 Cross tabulation of LPS positivity in PDAC primary tumor samples according to the primary
4 tumor location.

5

6 **Table S7**

7 *Similar effect of LPS detection on PFS and OS in metastatic and primary tumor tissue origin*
8 *subgroups*

9 Median times of overall survival (OS) and progression free survival (PFS) according to
10 intratumoral LPS detection in each subgroup according to tumor tissue origin (primary tumor
11 vs metastatic tissue) as well as corresponding hazard ratios (HR) and 95% confidential
12 intervals (95% CI).

13

14 **Table S8**

15 *LPS detection is not associated with tumor response in the AIO-PK0104 cohort*

16 Disease control rates (DCR) according to LPS positivity in each randomization arm of 110
17 patients from the AIO-PK0104 trial. PD = progressive disease, SD = stable disease, PR =
18 partial response, CR = complete remission.

19

20

cumulative survival

cumulative survival

table 1		LPS			p-value (χ ² -test)
		-	+	total	
primary tumor location	unknown	17	6	23	0.617
	pancreatic head	103	36	139	
	pancreatic body	39	8	47	
	pancreatic tail	27	7	34	
total		186	57	243	
metastasis at therapy initiation	lung	5	1	6	0.023
	liver	65	31	96	
	peritonuem	12	0	12	
	other	16	7	23	
	none	32	1	33	
	liver and peritoneum	17	1	18	
	lung and liver	6	5	11	
	liver and bone	1	0	1	
	lung and abdominal lymph nodes	3	0	3	
	liver and lymph nodes	16	6	22	
	liver, lung and lymph nodes	3	1	4	
	lymph nodes	8	3	11	
	liver and adrenal gland	1	1	2	
	lung, liver and bone	1	0	1	
total		186	57	243	
tissue origin	hepatic metastasis	59	44	103	0.000
	primary tumor	106	11	117	
	peritoneal metastasis	8	0	8	
	lung metastasis	5	1	6	
	lymph node	4	0	4	
	other / unknown	4	1	5	
total		186	57	243	
age group	<=60	75	27	102	0.346
	>60	111	30	141	
total		186	57	243	
gender	male	112	33	145	0.755
	female	74	24	98	
total		186	57	243	
KPS group	<= 80	75	28	103	0.210
	> 80	110	28	138	
total		185	56	241	
CTX type	gemcitabine 1 st line subgroup	64	14	78	0.164
	non-gemcitabine 1 st line subgroup	122	43	165	
total		186	57	243	
disease stage at therapy initiati	locally advanced	32	1	33	0.003
	metastatic	154	56	210	
total		186	57	243	
grade group	G1-G2	75	14	89	0.031
	G3-G4	111	43	154	
total		186	57	243	
tissue origin	metastasis	80	46	126	0.000
	primary tumor	106	11	117	
total		186	57	243	

table 2		LPS	<i>n</i>	%	OS (months)	<i>p</i> (log-rank)	HR	95% CI	PFS (months)	<i>p</i> (log-rank)	HR	95% CI
all patients	total	+	57	24.5	5.6	0.000	1.805	1.312 - 2.482	3.5	0.034	1.413	1.024 - 1.951
		-	186	76.5	8.5				4.0			
	AIO-PK0104	+	31	23.9	4.4	0.010	1.732	1.133 - 2.649	1.8	0.249	1.278	0.840 - 1.944
		-	99	76.2	7.3				2.8			
	validation cohort	+	26	23.0	6.2	0.009	1.880	1.161 - 3.045	4.1	0.028	1.760	1.055 - 2.936
		-	87	77.0	10.8				7.8			
1 st line gemcitabine subgroup	total	+	43	35.2	5.5	0.000	2.081	1.425 - 3.038	3.7	0.005	1.728	1.175 - 2.542
		-	122	64.8	8.8				6.1			
	AIO-PK0104	+	19	26.8	3.3	0.002	2.377	1.353 - 4.178	3.2	0.062	1.681	0.968 - 2.919
		-	52	73.2	7.7				3.6			
	validation cohort	+	24	25.5	6.2	0.008	1.993	1.190 - 3.338	4.7	0.010	2.051	1.177 - 3.573
		-	70	74.5	12.0				9.2			
1 st line non-gemcitabine subgroup	total	+	14	18.0	5.7	0.306	1.373	0.747 - 2.526	2.2	0.955	1.018	0.554 - 1.868
		-	64	82.0	7.3				2.2			
	AIO-PK0104	+	12	20.3	5.7	0.478	1.275	0.651 - 2.497	1.7	0.829	0.929	0.475 - 1.817
		-	47	79.7	6.7				2.2			
	validation cohort	+	2	10.5	3.0	0.219	2.596	0.536 - 12.580	2.2	0.742	1.292	0.278 - 6.014
		-	17	89.5	9.2				2.7			

table 3

	OS			
	parameter	p (Cox)	HR	95% CI
all cases	grade group	0.002	1.592	1.194 - 2.122
	KPS group	0.000	0.601	0.455 - 0.793
	LPS	0.002	1.664	1.203 - 2.302
gemcitabine 1st line subgroup	grade group	0.000	1.977	1.401 - 2.790
	disease stage	0.029	1.877	1.065 - 3-306
	LPS	0.002	1.872	1.267 - 2.765
non-gemcitabine 1st line subgroup	KPS group	0.000	0.401	0.246 - 0.654

	PFS			
	parameter	p (Cox)	HR	95% CI
all cases	grade group	0.002	1.610	1.187 - 2.186
	KPS group	0.002	0.637	0.476 - 0.853
	CTX type	0.000	0.456	0.335 - 0.620
gemcitabine 1st line subgroup	LPS	0.009	1.674	1.136 - 2.467
	grade group	0.001	1.838	1.275 - 2.648
non-gemcitabine 1st line subgroup	KPS group	0.002	0.435	0.258 - 0.733