Published in final edited form as:

Ann Surg Oncol. 2019 July ; 26(7): 1961–1962. doi:10.1245/s10434-019-07271-5.

Exosomes from Pancreatic Juice: A Step Closer to the Holy Grail?

Andrew M. Lowy, MD

University of California, San Diego Moores Cancer Center 3855 Health Sciences Drive, Mail Code 0987 La Jolla, CA 92024

The readership of ASO certainly needs no reminders about the inherently poor prognosis faced by pancreatic cancer patients. The past decade has witnessed an increasingly sophisticated understanding of the PDAC genetic and transcriptional landscape, an appreciation and characterization of the complexities of the tumor microenvironment and tumor metabolism, and the resultant identification of numerous novel therapeutic targets and new drugs. Despite this, the only improvements in patient outcomes have resulted from cytotoxic drug combinations. Late diagnosis, relative to local and distant tumor progression continues to forestall our ability to make major impact in this disease. Thus, it has become increasingly clear that earlier diagnosis is the holy grail if we are to make disruptive change in the still single digit 5-year survival facing our patients.

The efforts to conquer this disease have been buoyed by the work of numerous surgeon scientists who have developed animal models, identified critical components of its biology, defined the transcriptional landscape and conducted practice changing clinical trials^{1–5}. In this edition of ASO, Nakamura et al. report a novel technique to isolate exosomes from pancreatic juice and the identification of exosomal microRNA's (miR) 21 and 155 as putative biomarkers for the diagnosis of pancreatic duct adenocarcinoma (PDAC)⁶. The authors studied 35 patients, 27 with PDAC and 8 with chronic pancreatitis and found that the presence of either exosomal miR 21 or 155 resulted in an accurate diagnosis of pancreatic cancer 83% and 89% of the time, respectively. These numbers were bettered when combining them with the results of pancreatic juice cytology. The authors openly cite several limitations of their study, including sample size and the fact that these samples required cannulation of the pancreatic duct which puts patients at risk for postprocedure pancreatitis. Before considering limitations of the study further, it is important to speculate on how such a diagnostic might even fit into the landscape of an early detection initiative.

Pancreatic cancer remains a relatively low incidence disease, as compared to other malignancies which are the subject of screening such as breast and colorectal cancer. Thus,

Terms of use and reuse: academic research for non-commercial purposes, see here for full terms. <https://www.springer.com/aam-terms-v1>

Corresponding Author: Andrew M. Lowy, MD, FACS, University of California, San Diego, Moores Cancer Center, 3855 Health Sciences Drive, Mail Code 0987, La Jolla, CA 92024, P: 858-822-2124, F: 858-228-0987, alow@ucsd.edu.

Publisher's Disclaimer: This Author Accepted Manuscript is a PDF file of an unedited peer-reviewed manuscript that has been accepted for publication but has not been copyedited or corrected. The official version of record that is published in the journal is kept up to date and so may therefore differ from this version.

screening mass populations remains wholly impractical as even tests with excellent performance characteristics would result in a greater number of false positive and false negative results than true positive tests. In addition, there remains the very practical consideration, that even a perfect molecular diagnostic would be severely limited without a paired imaging study, as an accurate molecular diagnosis of early pancreatic cancer would leave surveillance imaging versus total pancreatectomy as the only rationale management options. Truly, the ideal scenario for pancreatic cancer diagnostics would be to identify incipient cancers that could be treated with prevention or so-called “interception” strategies⁷.

Given these considerations, we can consider the Nakamura study as an intriguing start, as they have identified a method to isolate exosomes from pancreatic juice, and further demonstrated the stability of RNA's allowing for molecular diagnostic testing. The study examined 27 PDAC patients; of this group, 22 patients had lymph node metastases or inoperable disease, thus this was a group of patients with advanced disease. They did find miR's were detectable in one patient with carcinoma-in-situ-an encouraging result, but larger confirmatory studies composed of patients with earlier cancers are needed. Ultimately, molecular diagnostics such as these must be studied prospectively in the context of screening programs for high risk groups such as those harboring germline pathogenic variants that confer cancer susceptibility. Many additional important questions are raised by the authors' findings as well; 1) Might an enlarged panel of miR's provide even better performance characteristics, 2) Would it be feasible to improve the exosomal miR diagnostic by combination with more rudimentary assays such as next generation sequencing for detection of common pathogenic alterations in genes such as Kras and p53?, 3) How early in the disease course can we detect these alterations in miR expression? Though there are undoubtedly technical challenges, it is possible, genetically engineered models could be employed to initially address some of these questions. Finally, it will be important to study exosomal miR levels in the context of patients without chronic pancreatitis, as this will likely be more representative of a screening cohort. In fact, one might optimistically speculate that in light of such a comparator, the performance characteristics of the test might be improved.

In conclusion, the study by Nakamura et al. makes several important contributions to the field; most notably the technical advance in isolation of exosomes from pancreatic juice and demonstration of proof of principle that this biologic resource can be probed as a diagnostic. One can only hope that this early experience can be validated by others, and most importantly serve as a building block toward the early diagnosis and ultimately the prevention of pancreatic cancer.

References

1. Hingorani SR, Petricoin EF, Maitra A, et al. Preinvasive and invasive ductal pancreatic cancer and its early detection in the mouse. *Cancer Cell* 2003;4:437–50. [PubMed: 14706336]
2. Li C, Heidt DG, Dalerba P, Burant CF, et al. Identification of pancreatic cancer stem cells. *Cancer Res* 2007;67:1030–7. [PubMed: 17283135]

3. Moffitt RA, Marayati R, Flate EL, et al. Virtual microdissection identifies distinct tumor- and stroma-specific subtypes of pancreatic ductal adenocarcinoma. *Nat Genet* 2015;47:1168–78. [PubMed: 26343385]
4. Balachandran VP, Łuksza M, Zhao JN, et al. Identification of unique neoantigen qualities in long-term survivors of pancreatic cancer. *Nature* 2017;551:512–516. [PubMed: 29132146]
5. Neoptolemos JP, Palmer DH, Ghaneh P, et al. European Study Group for Pancreatic Cancer. Comparison of adjuvant gemcitabine and capecitabine with gemcitabine monotherapy in patients with resected pancreatic cancer (ESPAC-4): a multicentre, open-label, randomised, phase 3 trial. *Lancet* 2017;389:1011–1024. [PubMed: 28129987]
6. Nakamura S, Sadakari Y, Ohtsuka T, et al. Pancreatic juice exosomal microRNAs as biomarkers for detection of pancreatic ductal adenocarcinoma. *Annals Surg Onc*
7. Blackburn EH. *Cancer Prev Res (Phila)* 2011 6;4(6):787–92. [PubMed: 21636545]