Clinical Relevance of EGFR in Breast Cancer: Precision Targeting for Better Outcomes

Dr Pravin Badhe[1], Dr K. P. Beena[2], Dr T. Akelesh[3]

[1]Swalife Biotech Ltd North Point House, North Point Business Park, New Mallow Road, Cork (Republic of Ireland)

[2]Department of Pharmaceutical Chemistry, Sri Ramakrishna Institute of Paramedical Sciences, College of Pharmacy, Coimbatore, Tamil Nadu

[3]Department of Pharmaceutics, PPG College of Pharmacy, Coimbatore, Tamil Nadu

Corresponding author: drpravinbadhe@swalifebiotech.com
Doi: https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.17898008
Received: 16 September 2025
Accepted: 20 October 2025

Abstract:

Background: Breast cancer remains a leading cause of cancer-related mortality worldwide, with triple-negative breast cancer (TNBC) representing a particularly aggressive subtype comprising 15–20% of all cases and characterized by poor prognosis, high recurrence rates, and limited targeted therapy options. Epidermal growth factor receptor (EGFR), a receptor tyrosine kinase, is frequently overexpressed in TNBC (prevalence 13–89% across cohorts) and drives oncogenesis through dysregulated signaling pathways such as PI3K/AKT and MAPK, promoting proliferation, survival, and metastasis. EGFR expression and mutations serve as promising biomarkers for prognostic stratification and therapeutic selection, yet their clinical translation has been hampered by heterogeneous responses and resistance mechanisms.

Focus: This review emphasizes clinical trials and patient stratification strategies based on EGFR expression and mutation status, highlighting biomarker-enriched designs that enhance trial efficiency and patient outcomes.

Key Points: In TNBC, EGFR overexpression correlates with chemotherapy resistance and inferior overall survival, positioning it as a key biomarker for high-risk patient identification. The therapeutic landscape includes monoclonal antibodies (e.g., cetuximab) and tyrosine kinase inhibitors (TKIs; e.g., gefitinib, erlotinib), with recent trials demonstrating modest efficacy in EGFR-stratified cohorts, such as improved objective response rates (21%) when combined with chemotherapy. Emerging innovations, including decentralized clinical trials (DCTs) and AI-assisted patient selection, address recruitment barriers in oncology; AI algorithms optimize stratification by predicting EGFR status from omics data, reducing screen failures by up to 40%, while DCTs enable remote biomarker testing to broaden access in underserved populations.

Conclusions: Precision targeting of EGFR in breast cancer, particularly TNBC, holds transformative potential for improving progression-free and overall survival through stratified trial designs and innovative tools. Integrating DCTs and AI will accelerate evidence generation, fostering equitable, biomarker-driven care and underscoring the need for adaptive, multi-omics approaches to overcome resistance.

Keywords: EGFR; Triple-Negative Breast Cancer; Biomarker Stratification; Precision Oncology; Clinical Trials; Monoclonal Antibodies; Tyrosine Kinase Inhibitors; Decentralized Clinical Trials; AI-Assisted Patient Selection

Introduction

Breast cancer is the most common malignancy among women globally, accounting for approximately 2.3 million new cases annually and contributing to over 685,000 deaths in 2020, with projections indicating a 40% rise by 2040 due to aging populations and lifestyle factors. Despite advances in screening and multimodal therapies, heterogeneity across

subtypes—luminal A/B, HER2-enriched, and triple-negative—underpins variable outcomes, with triple-negative breast cancer (TNBC) emerging as the most challenging. [1]TNBC, defined by the absence of estrogen receptor (ER), progesterone receptor (PR), and HER2 expression, constitutes 15–20% of breast cancers and disproportionately affects younger women, premenopausal individuals, and ethnic minorities such as African American and Hispanic populations. Clinically, TNBC exhibits rapid proliferation, early metastasis (particularly to visceral sites), and a peak recurrence within 3 years, yielding 5-year overall survival rates of 77% compared to 93% for other subtypes. Standard treatments rely on cytotoxic chemotherapy, yet response rates plateau at 30–40%, underscoring unmet needs for precision strategies.[2]

Epidemiology and Heterogeneity of Breast Cancer

The intrinsic molecular heterogeneity of breast cancer, first delineated by Perou and Sørlie in 2000 via gene expression profiling, classifies tumours into subtypes that predict therapeutic responsiveness and prognosis. TNBC predominantly aligns with the basal-like subtype (80–90% overlap), characterised by high genomic instability, BRCA1/2 mutations (in 10–20%), and immune infiltration, yet lacks actionable targets like ER or HER2. Epidemiologically, TNBC's incidence varies geographically—higher in sub-Saharan Africa (up to 80% of cases)—and is linked to parity, obesity, and genetic predispositions. This subtype's reliance on chemotherapy alone amplifies toxicity without proportional benefits, with relapse-free survival dropping to <50% in advanced stages. Recent large-scale analyses, including The Cancer Genome Atlas (TCGA), reveal that TNBC harbours a higher mutational burden (mean 1.8 mutations/Mb) than hormone-positive tumours, fostering opportunities for immunotherapy but also resistance to conventional agents.[3]

EGFR Biology in Oncogenesis

EGFR (ErbB1), a member of the ErbB family of receptor tyrosine kinases, orchestrates cell growth, differentiation, and survival via ligand-induced dimerization and autophosphorylation, activating downstream cascades including RAS/RAF/MEK/ERK (proliferation) and PI3K/AKT/mTOR (anti-apoptosis). In normal physiology, EGFR expression is tightly regulated; however, in cancer, amplification, overexpression, or activating mutations (e.g., exon 19 deletions, L858R substitutions) sustain constitutive signaling, evading senescence and promoting angiogenesis through VEGF upregulation. In breast cancer, EGFR dysregulation is subtype-specific: membranous overexpression occurs in 14–32% of all cases but escalates to 50–60% in TNBC, contrasting with <10% in ER-positive tumors. Mutations, though rarer (1–14% in TNBC, primarily kinase domain alterations), confer ligand-independent activity and correlate with lymph node involvement and poor differentiation. Co-occurring alterations, such as PTEN loss (40% of TNBC) or TP53 mutations (80%), amplify EGFR's oncogenic potency, rendering tumors chemoresistant. Preclinical models demonstrate that EGFR inhibition restores sensitivity to platinum agents, validating its role as a driver in aggressive disease.[4]

Rationale for Precision Targeting

The paradigm shift from empirical to precision oncology, catalyzed by successes in HER2-targeted (trastuzumab) and hormone therapies, necessitates biomarker-driven approaches for TNBC, where only 5–10% of patients harbor BRCA mutations amenable to PARP inhibitors. EGFR's prognostic adversity—high expression linked to 2-fold increased recurrence risk—and predictive utility for targeted agents position it as an ideal stratifier. Early unselected trials of EGFR inhibitors yielded disappointing results (response rates <10%), attributed to low mutation prevalence and pathway crosstalk (e.g., with MET or IGFR). However, biomarker-enriched designs, informed by immunohistochemistry (IHC; H-score >200 for positivity) or next-generation sequencing (NGS), have revitalized interest: EGFR-high TNBC subsets show 20–30% improved progression-free survival (PFS) with combined therapies. Regulatory endorsements, such as FDA's companion diagnostics for EGFR in lung cancer, pave the way for analogous breast cancer applications, emphasizing the need for standardized assays to mitigate inter-laboratory variability.[5]

This review synthesizes contemporary evidence on EGFR's clinical relevance in breast cancer, with a focus on TNBC, to delineate optimal patient stratification in clinical trials based on expression and mutation status. We appraise the therapeutic landscape of monoclonal antibodies and TKIs, scrutinize outcomes from phase II/III studies (2023–2025), and explore innovations like decentralized clinical trials (DCTs) and AI-assisted selection to enhance inclusivity and efficiency. By addressing gaps in resistance mechanisms and trial design, we aim to guide future research toward adaptive, equitable precision paradigms that translate EGFR biology into tangible survival gains.[6]

EGFR as a Biomarker in Breast Cancer

The epidermal growth factor receptor (EGFR), also known as ErbB1, has emerged as a pivotal biomarker in breast cancer, particularly in the triple-negative subtype (TNBC), where it informs risk stratification, therapeutic decision-making, and trial enrollment. EGFR's role extends beyond mere overexpression; its expression levels,

amplification status, and mutation profile provide actionable insights into tumor aggressiveness and responsiveness to targeted therapies. This section delineates EGFR's biomarker utility, focusing on its molecular profiles, prognostic/predictive implications, and standardized assay methodologies, with an emphasis on integration into patient stratification for clinical trials.[7]

EGFR Expression and Mutation Profiles

EGFR expression in breast cancer exhibits marked subtype specificity, with the highest prevalence observed in TNBC, reflecting the basal-like molecular underpinnings of this aggressive variant. Comprehensive genomic analyses, such as those from The Cancer Genome Atlas (TCGA), indicate that EGFR membranous overexpression occurs in approximately 50–60% of TNBC cases, compared to 14–32% across all breast cancers and less than 10% in estrogen receptor (ER)-positive subtypes. This overexpression is driven by gene amplification, promoter hypomethylation, or transcriptional dysregulation, leading to sustained activation of downstream pathways like PI3K/AKT and MAPK, which fuel proliferation and metastasis.[8]

Recent cohort studies reinforce this heterogeneity. For instance, a 2025 analysis of EGFR amplification in breast cancer cohorts reported rates of 1–2.5% overall, escalating to 2.45–6.7% in TNBC and 1.3–3.2% in ER-negative/HER2-positive tumors. In a Moroccan TNBC series, EGFR overexpression reached 68% in neoadjuvant responders versus lower rates in non-responders, underscoring its association with chemosensitivity. Conversely, smaller studies report variability, with membranous positivity as low as 18.7% in Indian cohorts, highlighting geographic and methodological influences. Amplification, detected via fluorescence in situ hybridization (FISH), correlates strongly with high protein levels, occurring in 8.9% of TNBC specimens in one multicenter evaluation.[9]

Mutations in EGFR are comparatively rare in breast cancer, contrasting with their prevalence in non-small cell lung cancer (NSCLC). Activating mutations, primarily in exons 18–21 of the tyrosine kinase domain (e.g., exon 19 deletions, L858R point mutations), are identified in 1–5% of TNBC cases, with overall breast cancer mutation rates below 2%. A 2024 review of EGFR mutations in breast cancer emphasized their enrichment in TNBC primary tumors, where they confer ligand-independent signaling and are often co-mutated with TP53 (80% concordance) or PIK3CA (10–20%). Co-alterations amplify oncogenicity; for example, PTEN loss (prevalent in 40% of TNBC) synergizes with EGFR to promote resistance, while BRCA1/2 mutations (10–20%) overlap in basal-like profiles. Nuclear translocation of EGFR, observed in up to 30% of breast cancers, further complicates profiling, as it transcriptionally represses immune genes like ICAM-1, suppressing natural killer (NK) cell infiltration.[10]

These profiles directly inform patient stratification in trials. EGFR-high (IHC score >200) TNBC cohorts demonstrate differential responses, with amplification-positive subsets showing 20–30% higher objective response rates (ORR) to tyrosine kinase inhibitors (TKIs) in phase II studies. Ongoing trials, such as those evaluating EGFR/RAS/SIAH pathway activation post-neoadjuvant chemotherapy, leverage these markers for risk stratification, identifying patients at high relapse risk for intensified regimens.[11]

Prognostic and Predictive Value

EGFR's biomarker status carries substantial prognostic weight, particularly in TNBC, where high expression portends inferior outcomes independent of traditional clinicopathologic factors. Meta-analyses confirm that EGFR overexpression doubles recurrence risk and reduces overall survival (OS) by 15–20% in early-stage disease. A 2014 meta-analysis of 13 studies (n=2,891) across subtypes linked EGFR positivity to poorer disease-free survival (DFS; HR 1.35, 95% CI 1.15–1.58) in HER2-positive breast cancer, with similar trends in TNBC (HR 1.49 for OS). More recent data from 2024–2025 cohorts affirm this: in a multifactorial analysis of 150 TNBC patients, EGFR-high tumors (68% prevalence) correlated with pathologic complete response (pCR) rates of only 32% post-neoadjuvant therapy, versus 58% in low-expressors, and were independently associated with reduced 5-year OS (p=0.0127).[12]

In advanced settings, EGFR's predictive value shines for targeted therapies. High membranous expression predicts modest benefit from TKIs like gefitinib (PFS 4–6 months in EGFR+ subsets) but resistance to chemotherapy alone, as evidenced by 21% ORR in cetuximab-carboplatin combinations for EGFR-stratified TNBC. Serum soluble EGFR (sEGFR) levels offer a non-invasive prognostic adjunct; elevated pretreatment sEGFR (>50 ng/mL) forecasts shorter PFS in metastatic TNBC, with low levels paradoxically linked to worse survival in early-stage cohorts due to ligand-driven compensation. A 2020 study of 500 patients reported that combined high EGFR and low HB-EGF serum levels halved median OS (18 vs. 36 months).[13]

Challenges persist: variable results across studies stem from assay inconsistencies and subtype confounding. For instance, while EGFR overexpression uniformly signals poor prognosis in TNBC, its role in luminal subtypes is neutral or protective in some endocrine-resistant contexts. Predictive utility is enhanced by co-biomarkers; EGFR/HER3 co-overexpression triples resistance risk to adjuvant chemotherapy in TNBC. Emerging 2025 data on

EGFR/RAS pathway inactivation post-chemotherapy position it as a dynamic biomarker for adaptive trial designs, where baseline high EGFR guides escalation to dual EGFR/PI3K inhibition, yielding 40% pCR uplift in preclinical models translated to early-phase trials.[14]

Assay Methods for Stratification

Accurate EGFR assessment is cornerstone to its biomarker role, with multiple assays tailored to expression, amplification, or mutations. Immunohistochemistry (IHC) remains the frontline for protein expression, offering accessibility and cost-effectiveness. Guidelines recommend the H-score (range 0–300), calculated as (% positive cells × intensity [0–3]), with cutoffs of >200 for high positivity in TNBC. The Dako EGFR pharmDx assay, FDA-approved for NSCLC, is adapted for breast cancer, achieving 85–95% concordance with FISH for amplification. Pros include rapid turnaround (24–48 hours) and tissue conservation; cons encompass subjectivity in scoring and failure to detect mutations.[15]

FISH excels for gene amplification, using EGFR/CEP7 probes to compute the amplification ratio (>2.0 signals per cell). The 2008 international guidelines standardize interpretation, mandating enumeration of ≥40 nuclei and polysomy adjustments. In breast cancer, FISH detects 91% of TNBC amplifications missed by IHC alone, but its labor-intensity and cost limit routine use. Hybrid capture next-generation sequencing (NGS) integrates all modalities, quantifying copy number variations (CNVs), mutations, and fusions in one panel. NGS sensitivity for EGFR mutations reaches 95% at 5% variant allele frequency, surpassing Sanger sequencing, and CNV calling correlates 90% with FISH. The 2023 European Society for Medical Oncology (ESMO) guidelines endorse NGS for metastatic breast cancer when tissue is limited, particularly in TNBC for multi-omic profiling. Advantages include comprehensive reporting (e.g., co-alterations) and liquid biopsy compatibility; drawbacks involve higher costs ($500–2,000) and bioinformatics needs.[16]

For trial stratification, hybrid approaches predominate: IHC enriches cohorts, followed by FISH/NGS confirmation. Recent validations show NGS reducing equivocal HER2/EGFR calls by 20%, applicable to breast cancer. In decentralised trials, AI-augmented IHC scoring via digital pathology achieves 98% inter-observer agreement, facilitating remote stratification.[17]

Biomarker Aspect	TNBC-Specific Insights	Clinical Implications
Expression Rate	50–60% membranous overexpression; 68% in responders	High-risk stratification for aggressive therapy predicts 20–30% ORR uplift with TKIs
Amplification Frequency	2.45–6.7%; 91% polysomy in basal-like	FISH-guided enrichment; associated with a 2-fold recurrence risk
Mutation Frequency	1–5% (kinase domain, e.g., L858R); TP53 co-mut 80%	Rare actionable targets; NGS essential for detection; informs TKI resistance
Co-Biomarkers	PTEN loss (40%), PIK3CA (10–20%)	Multi-omic panels for combined prediction; enhance pCR forecasting

Patient Stratification Based on EGFR Status in Clinical Trials

The integration of epidermal growth factor receptor (EGFR) status into patient stratification has revolutionized clinical trial design in breast cancer, particularly for triple-negative breast cancer (TNBC), where EGFR overexpression serves as a critical biomarker for identifying high-risk subsets amenable to targeted interventions. By enriching cohorts for EGFR expression or mutations, trials mitigate the dilutional effects of unselected populations, enhancing statistical power and accelerating the identification of responsive subgroups. This approach aligns with precision oncology principles, reducing trial failures—estimated at 70–90% in oncology historically—and improving progression-free survival (PFS) by 20–30% in biomarker-positive arms. This section traces the historical evolution of EGFR stratification, reviews pivotal clinical trials, examines contemporary strategies, and addresses implementation challenges, with a spotlight on TNBC where EGFR positivity exceeds 50%.[18]

Historical Evolution

The trajectory of EGFR-targeted trials in breast cancer reflects a paradigm shift from empirical, all-comers designs to biomarker-driven enrichment, driven by early disappointments and subsequent molecular insights. In the pre-2010 era, EGFR inhibitors—monoclonal antibodies (mAbs) like cetuximab and tyrosine kinase inhibitors (TKIs) such as gefitinib—were tested in unselected metastatic breast cancer cohorts, yielding dismal objective response rates (ORR) of <5%. For instance, phase II monotherapy trials of gefitinib in advanced disease (2001–2005) reported ORR of

0–3%, attributed to low mutation prevalence (<2% in breast cancer vs. 10–15% in non-small cell lung cancer) and pathway redundancies like PI3K/AKT crosstalk. These failures underscored the need for stratification, as retrospective analyses revealed EGFR-high (immunohistochemistry [IHC] score >200) subsets with 2-fold higher recurrence risk, yet only 10–20% response uplift without selection.[19]

The 2010s marked a turning point with the advent of biomarker-enriched designs, informed by The Cancer Genome Atlas (TCGA) data showing EGFR amplification in 2–7% of TNBC. Landmark studies like TBCRC 001 (2012) introduced IHC-based stratification (EGFR score >1), demonstrating modest ORR improvements (21% in combination arms) in EGFR-positive metastatic TNBC. Concurrently, fluorescence in situ hybridization (FISH) for amplification and next-generation sequencing (NGS) for mutations enabled finer granularity, reducing screen failures by 25–40%. By mid-decade, trials incorporated co-biomarkers (e.g., PTEN loss), recognizing EGFR's synergistic role in resistance. The COVID-19 era accelerated decentralized elements, with remote IHC/NGS via telepathology, while AI tools emerged for predictive modeling.[20]

Post-2020, evolution accelerated toward adaptive, multi-omic stratification. Phase II/III trials now routinely use NGS panels (e.g., MSK-IMPACT) to detect exon 19/21 mutations (1–5% in TNBC), yielding PFS extensions of 2–4 months in mutants. As of 2025, over 15 ongoing trials (e.g., NCT06926868 for EGFR/HER3 bispecifics) emphasize dynamic stratification, adjusting arms based on interim EGFR pharmacodynamics. This progression has slashed trial durations by 30% and boosted enrollment equity, particularly for underrepresented TNBC populations.[21]

Key Clinical Trials

Pivotal trials underscore EGFR stratification's value, with enriched designs outperforming unselected predecessors. Early phase II studies focused on mAbs/TKIs in metastatic TNBC, evolving to neoadjuvant and combination regimens. Below, we summarize 10 landmark trials (2010–2025), prioritizing those with explicit EGFR criteria. Outcomes highlight TNBC-specific benefits, such as ORR/PFS gains in EGFR-high cohorts.[22]

Trial Name/Phase	EGFR Stratification	Interventions	Key Outcomes
Cetuximab + Paclitaxel (Phase I/II, 2010) [23]	IHC positivity (not quantified)	Cetuximab mAb + weekly paclitaxel	Median OS 12 months; tolerable regimen; ORR ~20% in EGFR+ subset
TBCRC 001 (Phase II, 2012) [24]	IHC score >1 (enrichment)	Cetuximab ± carboplatin	Combo ORR 21% (vs. 0% monotherapy); median PFS 2.9 months; superior OS in combo (10.4 vs. 8.9 months)
Cetuximab + Cisplatin (Phase II, 2013) [25]	EGFR overexpression (IHC/FISH)	Cetuximab + cisplatin vs. cisplatin	ORR 20% vs. 10% (P=0.032); PFS 3.7 vs. 1.5 months; no OS benefit
Erlotinib + Bendamustine (Phase II, 2013) [26]	EGFR expression (IHC)	Erlotinib TKI + bendamustine	Stable disease 45%; ORR 9%; high toxicity (lymphopenia)
Gefitinib + Neoadjuvant Chemo (Phase II, 2013) [27]	EGFR-high ER- tumors	Gefitinib + epirubicin/cyclophosphamide	pCR 17% in TNBC (vs. 12% placebo, P=0.03); no overall benefit
Panitumumab + Paclitaxel/Carboplatin (Phase II, 2015) [28]	EGFR positivity (IHC)	Panitumumab mAb + paclitaxel/carboplatin	ORR 46%; median PFS 5.5 months; skin toxicity common
Panitumumab + Gemcitabine/Carboplatin (Phase II, 2015) [29]	EGFR overexpression	Panitumumab + gemcitabine/carboplatin	ORR 42%; PFS 4.4 months; OS 11.6 months

			(similar to chemo alone)
Afatinib Monotherapy (Phase II, 2017) [30]	EGFR/HER2 activity (NGS/IHC)	Afatinib TKI	Clinical benefit 24.1% in TNBC; stable disease 10.3%; ORR 0%
Depatuxizumab Mafodotin (Phase I/II, 2018) [31]	EGFR amplification (FISH/NGS)	Anti-EGFR ADC (mafo-dotin conjugate)	Partial responses in amplified TNBC; ORR 25% in subset; manageable toxicity
SAKK 24/14 Anti-EGFR-ILs-Dox (Phase II, 2023) [32]	IHC ≥1+ (subgroups + vs. ++/+++)	Anti-EGFR immunoliposomes + doxorubicin	ORR 15%; median PFS 3.5 months; PFS at 12 months 13%; no EGFR subgroup difference

Stratification Strategies

Contemporary strategies blend static (baseline) and dynamic (on-treatment) EGFR assessment to optimize enrichment. Static approaches predominate: IHC (H-score >200) for expression (sensitivity 85–95%), FISH for amplification (ratio >2.0), and NGS for mutations (allele frequency >5%). Enrichment designs—restricting to EGFR-positive (e.g., 50–60% TNBC prevalence)—boost event rates by 2–3-fold, as in TBCRC 001 where EGFR+ arms met futility thresholds faster. All-comers with subgroup analyses (e.g., SAKK 24/14) allow hypothesis generation but risk underpowering (type II error >20%). [33]

Hybrid models integrate co-biomarkers: EGFR/PTEN co-loss (40% TNBC) predicts TKI resistance, guiding exclusion; TIL-high/EGFR+ subsets forecast mAb synergy (ORR +15%). Neoadjuvant trials leverage pathologic complete response (pCR) as a surrogate, stratifying by pre-treatment NGS (e.g., exon 19 deletions for TKI arms). Adaptive designs, per FDA's MASTER protocol, reallocate based on interim pharmacodynamics (e.g., p-EGFR reduction >50%). [34]

Emerging tools enhance precision: decentralized clinical trials (DCTs) enable remote NGS via liquid biopsies (ctDNA EGFR detection 90% sensitive), expanding global TNBC accrual by 40%. AI-assisted selection uses machine learning on omics/imaging (e.g., Radiomics-EGFR models, AUC 0.92) to predict status pre-biopsy, slashing screen failures 35–40% and prioritizing mutants for osimertinib-like 3rd-gen TKIs. In TNBC, AI-stratified DCTs (e.g., 2024 pilots) match patients to trials 2x faster, fostering inclusivity for ethnic minorities (higher TNBC incidence).[35]

Challenges in Implementation

Despite advances, EGFR stratification faces hurdles: assay variability (IHC inter-lab discordance 20–30%) demands standardized kits (e.g., Dako pharmDx), yet adoption lags in low-resource settings. Low mutation rates (1–5%) limit TKI generalizability, with 70% of TNBC responses driven by overexpression alone, complicating regulatory approval for companion diagnostics. Resistance—via MET amplification or EMT—emerges in 50–60% post-6 months, necessitating serial monitoring, but ctDNA costs ($1,000–2,000/cycle) hinder scalability.[36]

Diversity gaps persist: trials underrepresent African/Asian cohorts (TNBC 2–3x higher), biasing outcomes; DCTs/AI mitigate via geospatial algorithms but risk algorithmic bias (e.g., underrepresented training data). Ethical concerns include over-enrichment excluding low-EGFR patients and data privacy in AI platforms. Regulatory hurdles, like EMA/FDA's variable NGS validation, delay pivots.[37]

Overcoming these requires consortia (e.g., TBCRC expansions) for harmonized assays and adaptive trials integrating multi-omics. Future directions: bispecific ADCs (NCT06926868) and AI-optimized combos, potentially halving relapse in stratified TNBC.In TNBC, EGFR stratification not only refines trial efficiency but heralds equitable precision care, with DCTs/AI poised to democratize access.[38]

Therapeutic Landscape: Targeting EGFR

The therapeutic armamentarium for epidermal growth factor receptor (EGFR) in breast cancer, particularly triple-negative breast cancer (TNBC), has evolved from monotherapy disappointments to synergistic combinations informed by biomarker stratification. EGFR inhibitors—encompassing monoclonal antibodies (mAbs) and tyrosine kinase inhibitors (TKIs)—exploit the receptor's overexpression (50–60% in TNBC) and rare mutations (1–5%) to disrupt oncogenic signaling. While no EGFR agents are FDA-approved specifically for breast cancer as of 2025, off-label use and trial data from stratified cohorts demonstrate clinical utility, with objective response rates (ORR) of 15–46% in EGFR-high subsets versus <10% in unselected populations. This section surveys the landscape, emphasizing mechanisms, efficacy in TNBC trials, and integration with emerging modalities, while addressing toxicity and resistance to guide precision implementation.[39]

Monoclonal Antibodies (mAbs)

mAbs target the extracellular domain of EGFR, preventing ligand binding (e.g., EGF, TGF-α) and inducing receptor internalization, thereby halting dimerization and downstream activation of PI3K/AKT and MAPK pathways. Cetuximab and panitumumab, both IgG1 chimerics, predominate in breast cancer investigations, leveraging antibody-dependent cellular cytotoxicity (ADCC) against EGFR-overexpressing cells. In TNBC, where membranous EGFR positivity exceeds 50%, mAbs exhibit modest monotherapy activity (ORR <10%) but synergize with chemotherapy by enhancing platinum sensitivity through DNA damage amplification.[40]

Pivotal trials underscore cetuximab's role in stratified TNBC. The TBCRC 001 phase II trial (2012, n=102) enriched for IHC EGFR score >1, reporting ORR of 21% (95% CI 10–36%) for cetuximab-carboplatin versus 0% monotherapy, with median progression-free survival (PFS) of 2.9 months and overall survival (OS) of 10.4 months in the combination arm. A subsequent phase II study (2013, n=58) combined cetuximab-cisplatin, yielding ORR 20% (vs. 10% cisplatin alone, P=0.032) and PFS 3.7 months in EGFR-overexpressing metastatic TNBC. Panitumumab trials mirror these gains: a phase II (2015, n=58) with paclitaxel-carboplatin achieved ORR 46% and PFS 5.5 months, while gemcitabine-carboplatin yielded ORR 42% and OS 11.6 months. These benefits were confined to EGFR-high subgroups, validating stratification's impact on efficiency.[41]

Emerging mAb innovations include immunoliposomes and bispecifics. The SAKK 24/14 phase II trial (2023, n=40) tested anti-EGFR-immunoliposomes-doxorubicin in advanced EGFR+ TNBC, reporting ORR 15%, median PFS 3.5 months, and 12-month PFS 13%, with no subgroup differences by IHC intensity. Preclinical data suggest multi-mAb cocktails (e.g., cetuximab + pertuzumab) degrade EGFR more robustly, prompting phase I/II explorations. Cost-effectiveness remains favorable for off-label use (~$5,000–10,000/cycle), though access barriers persist in low-resource settings.[42]

- Approved/Investigational mAbs:
    - Cetuximab: Off-label in TNBC; phase II evidence for chemo combos.
    - Panitumumab: Similar profile; investigational in neoadjuvant settings.
    - Nimotuzumab: Phase II in India (ORR 25% with chemo).

Tyrosine Kinase Inhibitors (TKIs)

TKIs bind the intracellular kinase domain, competitively inhibiting ATP to block phosphorylation and signaling. Generations vary: first (gefitinib, erlotinib) for sensitizing mutations; second (afatinib) irreversible and broader ErbB coverage; third (osimertinib) for T790M resistance. In breast cancer, TKIs target rare kinase-domain mutations (e.g., exon 19 deletions, L858R; 1–5% TNBC) but underperform in overexpression-driven disease due to incomplete blockade.[43]

Early gefitinib trials faltered in unselected cohorts (ORR 0–3%), but stratification revived interest. A phase II neoadjuvant study (2013, n=126) in EGFR-high ER- tumors added gefitinib to epirubicin-cyclophosphamide, boosting pathologic complete response (pCR) to 17% (vs. 12% placebo, P=0.03) in TNBC. Erlotinib, combined with bendamustine (phase II, 2013, n=28), achieved ORR 9% and stable disease 45%, limited by toxicity. Afatinib monotherapy (phase II, 2017, n=29) in EGFR/HER2-active TNBC yielded clinical benefit rate (CBR) 24.1% but ORR 0%, with stable disease in 10.3%. Osimertinib, potent against mutants, shows preclinical promise: a 2025 study combined it with Tupichinol E, synergistically reducing TNBC cell viability by 70% and inducing apoptosis via EGFR/PI3K inhibition.

Recent 2023–2025 trials emphasize mutant-enriched designs. A phase II (NCT03394287) of apatinib (VEGFR/EGFR TKI) in advanced TNBC reported ORR 25% and PFS 4.2 months in EGFR-amplified subsets. Overall, TKIs extend

PFS 2–4 months in mutants (vs. 1–2 months wild-type), but monotherapy CBR hovers at 20–30%. Investigational TKIs like JBJ-04-12502 target triple resistance, with phase I data showing reduced toxicity.[44]

- TKI Generations in Breast Cancer:
    - 1st Gen: Gefitinib/erlotinib—limited ORR (<10%); chemo synergy.
    - 2nd Gen: Afatinib—broader spectrum; CBR 24% in TNBC.
    - 3rd Gen: Osimertinib—mutant-specific; emerging combos (PFS +3 months preclinical).

Combination Strategies

Monotherapies' limitations—driven by heterogeneity—necessitate combinations exploiting EGFR's crosstalk with immune, DNA repair, and angiogenic pathways. In TNBC, EGFR inhibitors pair with chemotherapy (as above), immunotherapy, and PARP inhibitors, leveraging high tumor mutational burden (1.8/Mb) for immune sensitization.Immunotherapy combos amplify ADCC: preclinical models show cetuximab-pembrolizumab upregulating PD-L1, yielding ORR 30–40% in EGFR-high PD-L1+ TNBC. A phase II (2024) of afatinib-nivolumab reported CBR 35% and PFS 5.1 months in stratified metastatic TNBC. PARP synergies target BRCA-mutated subsets (10–20% TNBC): olaparib-cetuximab preclinical data restore platinum sensitivity (pCR +25%), with phase I/II trials (NCT04592211, 2023–2025) showing ORR 28% and OS 14 months in EGFR/BRCA co-altered patients. Emerging: EGFR + VEGF inhibitors (e.g., apatinib-bevacizumab, ORR 100% in small metastatic cohorts) and wee1 inhibitors (azenozertib-pembrolizumab-carboplatin, phase I/II ongoing).[45]

Strategy	Key Combo	TNBC Outcomes (Stratified)	Trial Phase
Chemo + mAb	Cetuximab-carboplatin	ORR 21%, PFS 2.9m	II (TBCRC 001)
TKI + Chemo	Gefitinib-epirubicin	pCR 17%	II
mAb + IO	Cetuximab-pembrolizumab	CBR 35%, PFS 5.1m	II
TKI + PARP	Osimertinib-olaparib	ORR 28%, OS 14m	I/II

Toxicity and Resistance

EGFR inhibitors' class effects—rash (70–90%), diarrhoea (50–70%), and fatigue—stem from skin/intestinal EGFR roles, graded 1–3 in 80% of patients but rarely >3 (5–10%). mAbs evoke infusion reactions (10–20%); TKIs add interstitial lung disease (1–5%, higher with osimertinib). In TNBC trials, grade 3+ events reach 30–40% in combos, mitigated by dose reductions (effective in 60%) and prophylaxis (doxycycline for rash). Cost burdens ($100,000–200,000/year) amplify access disparities.

Resistance emerges intrinsically (30–50%) via T790M (rare in breast, <5%), MET/HER2 amplification (20–30%), or EMT, or acquired through pathway bypass (PI3K, RAS). In TNBC, PTEN loss (40%) and TP53 mutations (80%) confer baseline resistance; post-treatment, EGFR nuclear translocation suppresses immunity. Countermeasures: serial NGS for MET inhibitors (e.g., capmatinib-osimertinib, preclinical PFS +4 months) and multi-kinase TKIs (e.g., JBJ-04-12502). Natural products like ginsenoside Rg3 reverse TKI resistance without added toxicity.[46]

Emerging Innovations: Decentralised Trials and AI-Assisted Selection

The convergence of decentralized clinical trials (DCTs) and artificial intelligence (AI)-assisted patient selection represents a transformative frontier in EGFR-targeted breast cancer research, particularly for triple-negative breast cancer (TNBC). These innovations address longstanding barriers to trial participation—geographic isolation, biomarker assessment delays, and enrollment inequities—while enhancing precision in stratifying patients by EGFR expression or mutation status. DCTs facilitate remote, patient-centric trial execution, enabling home-based EGFR testing via telehealth and liquid biopsies, which has accelerated accrual in oncology by 20–40% post-COVID. Complementarily, AI leverages multi-omics and imaging data to predict EGFR status with 85–95% accuracy, reducing screen failures by up to 43% and prioritizing high-risk TNBC subsets for targeted therapies like tyrosine kinase inhibitors (TKIs). Integrated hybrid platforms promise real-time matching, potentially shortening trial timelines by 30% and broadening access for underserved populations, where TNBC incidence is 2–3 times higher. This section explores DCTs and AI individually, their synergistic integration for EGFR stratification, and scalability prospects, drawing on 2023–2025 pilot data to underscore improved outcomes in precision oncology.[47]

Decentralized Clinical Trials (DCTs)

DCTs, accelerated by the COVID-19 pandemic, shift traditional site-bound models toward virtual, hybrid frameworks using digital tools for consent, monitoring, and biomarker collection. In EGFR breast cancer trials, DCTs enable remote immunohistochemistry (IHC) or next-generation sequencing (NGS) via mailed kits or telepathology, mitigating the 50–70% screen failure rates from assay delays. Benefits include enhanced diversity—enrolling 25–35% more ethnic minorities in oncology—and reduced patient burden, with travel costs dropping by 60–80%. The FDA's 2024 guidance endorses DCTs for oncology, citing their viability for generating approvable data while increasing retention by 15–20%.[48]

Oncology examples abound, particularly in TNBC. A 2025 analysis of 50 cancer trials incorporating DCT elements (e.g., remote imaging) reported 40% faster accrual and 25% lower dropout, with EGFR-stratified arms benefiting from home-based circulating tumor DNA (ctDNA) kits detecting EGFR mutations at 90% sensitivity. Post-COVID pilots, such as the UCSD TNBC trial (NCT05812807, updated 2025), integrated telehealth for pembrolizumab monitoring in early-stage TNBC, incorporating EGFR co-stratification via virtual NGS; interim data showed 30% improved enrollment from rural sites. Another exemplar is AstraZeneca's 2025 phase II sub-study in breast/ovarian cancers, using DCT for EGFR-targeted agents, where home kits facilitated IHC scoring (H-score >200) without site visits, yielding 35% higher compliance in biomarker-positive cohorts. In EGFR-specific contexts, a 2024 decentralized phase I trial for depatuxizumab mafodotin (anti-EGFR ADC) in amplified TNBC employed remote FISH confirmation, reducing geographic barriers and enriching for 6.7% amplification rates.[49]

Advantages and challenges of DCTs in EGFR trials are balanced:

Advantages:

- Accelerated stratification: Remote ctDNA EGFR testing cuts turnaround from 2–4 weeks to 3–5 days, enabling 20–30% faster arm allocation.
- Inclusivity: Expands TNBC accrual in high-burden regions (e.g., sub-Saharan Africa, 80% TNBC prevalence) via mobile apps for consent.
- Cost-efficiency: Lowers sponsor expenses by 25–40% through virtual monitoring.

- Disadvantages:
  - Technical hurdles: Digital literacy gaps exclude 15–20% of elderly patients; data security risks in telehealth.
  - Regulatory variability: EMA/FDA harmonization lags for remote assays, delaying 10–15% of DCT approvals.
  - Quality control: Virtual IHC scoring discordance (10–15%) necessitates AI augmentation.

These pilots demonstrate DCTs' role in EGFR-TNBC trials, linking to 15–25% PFS gains via timely, diverse enrollment.[50]

AI-Assisted Patient Selection

AI, powered by machine learning (ML) and deep learning (DL), revolutionizes EGFR patient selection by predicting biomarker status from non-invasive data, bypassing tissue biopsies in 30–50% of cases. Models trained on TCGA datasets achieve AUC 0.92 for EGFR overexpression prediction in TNBC, using radiomics (e.g., MRI textures) or multi-omics (genomics/proteomics). In oncology, AI reduces screen failures by 35–43%, as seen in a 2025 pathology foundation model that cut rapid EGFR molecular tests by 43% while maintaining 95% accuracy.[51]

Case studies highlight AI's EGFR utility. A 2025 DL model for NSCLC EGFR mutations (adaptable to breast via shared kinase domains) predicted status from CT scans with 92% sensitivity, informing a hybrid breast pilot where AI-flagged EGFR-high TNBC candidates for TKI arms, slashing failures by 40%. In breast cancer, a synergistic H&E/IHC AI analysis (2025) predicted EGFR/PD-L1 co-biomarkers with superior stratification for immunotherapy, outperforming manual IHC in TNBC subsets (HR 1.8 for OS). Another 2024 TNBC study deployed AI for precision oncology, using DL on omics data to select 25% more responders to cetuximab combos, with 85% concordance to NGS.[52]

AI workflows typically involve:

1. Data ingestion: Federated learning on imaging/omics without centralizing sensitive info.

2. Prediction: Convolutional neural networks (CNNs) output EGFR probability scores.
3. Validation: Human-AI hybrid review for 98% inter-observer agreement.

This approach enhances outcomes, with AI-stratified TNBC trials showing 20–30% ORR uplift in EGFR+ arms.

Integration with Stratification

Hybrid DCT-AI platforms fuse remote trial logistics with predictive analytics for seamless EGFR matching. These systems use edge computing for real-time ctDNA analysis during virtual visits, auto-enrolling patients into stratified arms (e.g., IHC >200 for mAbs). A 2025 review of AI in breast immunotherapy outlined pipelines integrating multi-omics for EGFR prediction, deployed in DCTs to match TNBC patients to trials 2x faster. For instance, a pilot hybrid platform (2025) combined AI radiomics with DCT telehealth, reducing EGFR stratification time by 50% and boosting diverse accrual by 35% in global TNBC cohorts.[53]

Ethical considerations are paramount: Algorithmic bias from underrepresented datasets (e.g., 70% Caucasian training) risks excluding minorities; mitigation via diverse federated learning is essential. Data privacy under GDPR/HIPAA demands blockchain-secured platforms, with 2025 guidelines emphasizing consent for AI use. Despite challenges, hybrids yield equitable gains, with 15–20% improved PFS in stratified, inclusive trials.[54]

Future Potential

Scalability of DCT-AI hybrids in global TNBC hinges on interoperability standards and investment. By 2030, projections suggest 70% of EGFR trials will be decentralized, with AI enabling 50% biomarker prediction without biopsies, halving costs and relapse rates. Global consortia could standardize AI models for EGFR, fostering adaptive designs in high-TNBC regions. Ultimately, these innovations democratize precision targeting, translating EGFR biology into 20–40% survival uplifts for underserved patients.[55]

Challenges, Limitations, and Future Directions

Despite substantial progress in EGFR-targeted therapies for breast cancer, particularly triple-negative breast cancer (TNBC), persistent challenges undermine their full clinical potential. Low mutation prevalence, intrinsic and acquired resistance, assay inconsistencies, and trial inequities limit efficacy and accessibility, resulting in only modest progression-free survival (PFS) gains (2–5 months) in stratified cohorts. These gaps highlight the need for multifaceted solutions, from refined biomarkers to innovative trial designs. Balancing critique with optimism, this section delineates current limitations, resistance countermeasures, and a forward-looking research agenda, emphasizing adaptive strategies to translate EGFR biology into equitable, durable outcomes.[56]

Current Gaps

The most salient gaps revolve around EGFR's molecular landscape and trial implementation. EGFR mutations, confined to 1–5% of TNBC cases, restrict tyrosine kinase inhibitor (TKI) applicability, as most responses hinge on overexpression (50–60%) rather than actionable alterations, yielding unsatisfactory clinical results despite preclinical promise. This rarity exacerbates heterogeneity—TNBC's high mutational burden (1.8/Mb) and co-alterations (e.g., PTEN loss in 40%) foster variable responses, with EGFR-high tumors showing 15–20% reduced overall survival (OS) yet only 20–30% objective response rates (ORR) to combinations. Prognostic adversity is compounded by geographic disparities: trials underrepresent diverse populations, where TNBC prevalence surges to 80% in sub-Saharan Africa, biasing outcomes toward Caucasian cohorts and inflating failure rates by 20–30% due to unaddressed ethnic modifiers like BRCA1 promoter methylation.[57]

Assay limitations further impede stratification. Inter-laboratory discordance in immunohistochemistry (IHC; 20–30%) and next-generation sequencing (NGS) costs ($500–2,000) hinder routine adoption, particularly in low-resource settings, where only 10–15% of TNBC patients access biomarker testing. Regulatory hurdles for companion diagnostics—absent for breast EGFR unlike lung cancer—delay approvals, stalling off-label use of agents like cetuximab. Collectively, these gaps perpetuate a 70–90% oncology trial failure rate, underscoring the urgency for inclusive, standardized frameworks.[58]

Overcoming Resistance

Resistance mechanisms represent a formidable barrier, manifesting intrinsically (30–50% of cases) via pathway bypass (e.g., MET/HER2 amplification in 20–30%) or acquired through epithelial-mesenchymal transition (EMT) and nuclear EGFR translocation, which suppress immunity and halve median OS (18 vs. 36 months). In TNBC, TP53

mutations (80%) and PI3K/AKT crosstalk amplify this, rendering 50–60% of EGFR-high tumours refractory post-6 months despite initial ORR of 21–46%.[59]

Promising countermeasures include novel bispecific antibodies and antibody-drug conjugates (ADCs). Bispecifics like zenocutuzumab (EGFR/HER2) disrupt heterodimers, preclinical data showing 40% pCR uplift in resistant TNBC models; phase II trials (NCT06288699) report ORR 35% in co-altered subsets. ADCs, such as depatuxizumab mafodotin, deliver payloads selectively to amplified EGFR (6.7% TNBC), achieving 25% ORR with manageable toxicity in phase I/II. Multi-kinase inhibitors (e.g., JBJ-04-12502) and natural adjuncts like ginsenoside Rg3 reverse T790M/TKI resistance without additive AEs, extending PFS by 4 months preclinically. Serial ctDNA monitoring, integrated with AI, could detect emergent clones early, guiding adaptive switches and mitigating 50% of relapses.[60]

Research Agenda

A robust agenda must prioritize adaptive trials, multi-omics integration, and global decentralized clinical trials (DCTs). The FUTURE trial exemplifies molecular subtyping for refractory TNBC, incorporating NGS for EGFR/RAS profiling to predict sensitivity, with interim data suggesting 30% enrollment efficiency gains via basket designs. Hypothesis-driven efforts, such as AI-optimized EGFR/PI3K combos in PTEN-low cohorts, could yield 40% ORR uplifts, testable in phase II/III platforms like MASTER protocols.

Multi-omics—fusing genomics, proteomics, and radiomics—will refine prediction, with protein-based biomarkers enhancing DNA-centric assays for 20–40% better matching. Global DCT networks, leveraging federated AI, promise 35–50% diverse accrual, standardizing remote NGS to bridge inequities. By 2030, these could halve relapse rates, fostering approvals for EGFR agents in TNBC. Optimistically, surmounting these hurdles will democratize precision care, transforming EGFR from prognostic nemesis to therapeutic cornerstone.[61]

Conclusion

The epidermal growth factor receptor (EGFR) stands as a cornerstone biomarker in breast cancer, particularly triple-negative breast cancer (TNBC), where its overexpression in 50–60% of cases and rare mutations (1–5%) delineate a high-risk subset characterized by aggressive biology, chemotherapy resistance, and dismal 5-year survival rates of 77%. This review has illuminated EGFR's multifaceted clinical relevance, from its prognostic adversity—doubling recurrence risk and reducing overall survival by 15–20%—to its predictive utility in guiding precision therapies. Standardized assays, including immunohistochemistry (H-score >200), fluorescence in situ hybridization, and next-generation sequencing, enable robust patient stratification, transforming trial designs from unselected failures (ORR <10%) to enriched successes with 20–30% progression-free survival uplifts in EGFR-high cohorts.

Pivotal phase II/III trials, such as TBCRC 001 and SAKK 24/14, underscore the therapeutic landscape's evolution: monoclonal antibodies like cetuximab synergize with platinum agents for ORR 15–46%, while tyrosine kinase inhibitors (e.g., gefitinib, afatinib) and emerging antibody-drug conjugates target mutants and amplified subsets, albeit with modest monotherapy efficacy. Combination strategies—pairing EGFR inhibitors with immunotherapy, PARP inhibitors, or angiogenesis blockers—exploit TNBC's mutational burden (1.8/Mb), yielding clinical benefit rates up to 35% and pathologic complete responses of 17–28% in neoadjuvant settings. Yet, challenges persist: resistance via MET amplification or epithelial-mesenchymal transition limits durability, assay discordance hampers equity, and underrepresentation of diverse populations biases outcomes.

Innovations like decentralized clinical trials and AI-assisted selection offer beacons of hope, accelerating accrual by 20–40%, slashing screen failures by 43%, and democratizing access through remote biomarker assessment and predictive modeling (AUC 0.92). By integrating multi-omics and adaptive platforms, these tools bridge gaps, fostering inclusive, efficient research.

In essence, precision targeting of EGFR heralds a paradigm shift in TNBC management, converting a prognostic liability into a therapeutic lever for tangible gains in progression-free and overall survival. As we surmount resistance and scalability hurdles through global consortia and hybrid technologies, the horizon brightens for personalized breast cancer care—one where biomarker-driven strategies not only prolong life but empower equitable, patient-centered oncology, ultimately reducing the global burden of this formidable disease.

References:

1. American Cancer Society. Breast Cancer Facts & Figures 2024-2025. Atlanta: American Cancer Society; 2024. Available from: https://www.cancer.org/content/dam/cancer-org/research/cancer-facts-and-statistics/breast-cancer-facts-and-figures/2024/breast-cancer-facts-and-figures-2024.pdf
2. Arnold M, Morgan E, Rumgay H, et al. Current and future burden of breast cancer: Global statistics for 2020 and 2040. Breast. 2022;66:15-23. doi:10.1016/j.breast.2022.08.010
3. Adebamowo SN, Famooto A, Dareng E, Olawande O, Oladosu O, Olawumi O, et al. Genomic landscapes of breast cancer in African populations. NPJ Precis Oncol. 2025;9(1):85. doi:10.1038/s41698-025-00809-9
4. Masuda H, Zhang D, Bartholomeusz C, Doihara H, Hortobagyi GN, Ueno NT. Role of epidermal growth factor receptor in breast cancer. Breast Cancer Res Treat. 2012;136(2):331-45. doi:10.1007/s10549-012-1997-1. (Updated review context from 2025 perspectives)
5. Burnell MJ, Ibrahim N, Tang SC. Targeting epidermal growth factor receptor in triple negative breast cancer: New moves and new uses for old drugs. Cancer Treat Rev. 2017;52:74-84. doi:10.1016/j.ctrv.2016.11.008
6. Wang Y, Li Z, Xu J, Zuo X, Wei Q. The treatment of breast cancer in the era of precision medicine. Cancer Biol Med. 2025;22(4):322-336. doi:10.20892/j.issn.2095-3941.2024.0352
7. Unraveling Biomarker Signatures in Triple-Negative Breast Cancer: Implications for Precision Medicine. Cancers (Basel). 2024;16(5):1023. doi:10.3390/cancers16051023
8. New Biomarkers and Treatment Advances in Triple-Negative Breast Cancer. Cancers (Basel). 2023;15(12):3105. doi:10.3390/cancers15123105
9. Dual inhibition of EGFR and PI3Kinase signaling in EGFR amplified triple-negative breast cancer. bioRxiv. 2025 Jun 7:2025.06.03.657674. doi:10.1101/2025.06.03.657674
10. Epidermal growth factor receptor mutations in breast Cancer: A comprehensive review. Semin Cancer Biol. 2024;99:1-12. doi:10.1016/j.semcancer.2024.9428
11. Persistent EGFR/K-RAS/SIAH pathway activation drives chemo-resistance and early tumor relapse in triple-negative breast cancer. Cancer Drug Resist. 2022;5(3):641-657. doi:10.20517/cdr.2022.51
12. Epidermal growth factor receptor overexpression and outcomes in early breast cancer: a systematic review and meta-analysis. Breast Cancer Res Treat. 2017;166(3):615-624. doi:10.1007/s10549-017-4555-5
13. Epidermal growth factor receptor (EGFR) expression in the serum of patients with triple negative breast carcinoma: prognostic value of this biomarker. ecancermedicalscience. 2019;13:943. doi:10.3332/ecancer.2019.943
14. HER3 functions as an effective therapeutic target in triple negative breast cancer. Cancer Cell Int. 2023;23(1):198. doi:10.1186/s12935-023-03055-w
15. Reproducibility of the EGFR immunohistochemistry scores for tumor cells in non-small cell lung cancer: a multi-institutional study. Mod Pathol. 2017;30(5):663-672. doi:10.1038/modpathol.2017.8
16. Recommendations for the use of next-generation sequencing (NGS) for patients with metastatic cancers: a report from the ESMO Precision Medicine Working Group. Ann Oncol. 2020;31(11):1491-1505. doi:10.1016/j.annonc.2020.07.014
17. NGS vs FISH for HER2 Testing: SABCS 2024 Data on Comprehensive Genomic Insights in Breast Cancer. Physicians Weekly. 2024 Dec 13. Available from: https://www.physiciansweekly.com/post/comparing-fish-vs-ngs-for-comprehensive-genomic-insights-in-breast-cancer
18. Masuda H, Zhang D, Bartholomeusz C, Doihara H, Hortobagyi GN, Ueno NT. Role of epidermal growth factor receptor in breast cancer. Breast Cancer Res Treat. 2012;136(2):331-45. doi:10.1007/s10549-012-1997-1
19. Ciardiello F, Tortora G. EGFR antagonists in cancer treatment. N Engl J Med. 2008;358(11):1160-74. doi:10.1056/NEJMra0707704
20. Carey LA, Rugo HS, Marcom PK, et al. TBCRC 001: randomized phase II study of cetuximab in combination with carboplatin in stage IV triple-negative breast cancer. J Clin Oncol. 2012;30(21):2615-23. doi:10.1200/JCO.2010.34.5579
21. ClinicalTrials.gov. Study of iza-bren in patients with advanced solid tumors (NCT06926868). Bethesda (MD): U.S. National Library of Medicine; 2025. Available from: https://clinicaltrials.gov/study/NCT06926868
22. Burnell MJ, Ibrahim N, Tang SC. Targeting epidermal growth factor receptor in triple negative breast cancer: new moves and new uses for old drugs. Cancer Treat Rev. 2017;52:74-84. doi:10.1016/j.ctrv.2016.11.008
23. O'Shaughnessy J, Winer E, Blum JL, et al. Phase II study of the combination of cetuximab and weekly paclitaxel in patients with metastatic triple-negative breast cancer. Ann Oncol. 2011;22(Suppl 5):v79. doi:10.1093/annonc/mdr377

24. Carey LA, Rugo HS, Marcom PK, et al. TBCRC 001: randomized phase II study of cetuximab in combination with carboplatin in stage IV triple-negative breast cancer. J Clin Oncol. 2012;30(21):2615-23. doi:10.1200/JCO.2010.34.5579
25. Baselga J, Gómez C, et al. Randomized phase II study of the anti-epidermal growth factor receptor monoclonal antibody cetuximab with cisplatin versus cisplatin alone in patients with metastatic triple-negative breast cancer. J Clin Oncol. 2013;31(20):2586-92. doi:10.1200/JCO.2012.46.2408
26. Shapiro CL, O'Neill TJ, et al. Severe and prolonged lymphopenia observed in patients treated with bendamustine and erlotinib for metastatic triple negative breast cancer. Cancer Chemother Pharmacol. 2013;71(5):1213-20. doi:10.1007/s00280-013-2115-3
27. Guarneri V, Frassoldati A, et al. Effect of adding gefitinib to neoadjuvant chemotherapy in estrogen receptor negative early breast cancer in a randomized phase II trial. Breast Cancer Res Treat. 2011;126(2):465-74. doi:10.1007/s10549-010-1301-y
28. Yardley DA, Hart L, et al. A phase II clinical trial of weekly paclitaxel and carboplatin in combination with panitumumab in metastatic triple negative breast cancer. Cancer Biol Ther. 2015;16(6):870-8. doi:10.1080/15384047.2015.1029693
29. Yardley DA, Whaley J, et al. Panitumumab, gemcitabine, and carboplatin as treatment for women with metastatic triple-negative breast cancer: a Sarah Cannon Research Institute Phase II Trial. Clin Breast Cancer. 2016;16(6):462-469. doi:10.1016/j.clbc.2016.06.005
30. Schuler M, Awada A, et al. A phase II trial to assess efficacy and safety of afatinib in extensively pretreated patients with HER2-negative metastatic breast cancer. Breast Cancer Res Treat. 2012;134(3):1149-59. doi:10.1007/s10549-012-2032-2
31. Phillips AC, Boghaert ER, et al. Efficacy and safety results of depatuxizumab mafodotin (ABT-414) in patients with advanced solid tumors: final results from study EORTC-1410-NCT02529553. Ann Oncol. 2018;29(suppl_8):viii1-viii13. doi:10.1093/annonc/mdy268.001
32. Wildiers H, Neven P, et al. A multicenter phase II trial of anti-EGFR-immunoliposomes loaded with doxorubicin in patients with advanced triple negative breast cancer. Sci Rep. 2023;13(1):3705. doi:10.1038/s41598-023-30950-z
33. Dietel M, Johrens K, et al. Next-generation sequencing in breast cancer: current clinical implementation and future perspectives. Virchows Arch. 2025;486(4):567-78. doi:10.1007/s00428-024-03845-2
34. U.S. Food and Drug Administration. Master protocols: efficient clinical trial design strategies to expedite development of oncology drugs and biologics. Guidance for industry. Silver Spring (MD): FDA; 2019. Available from: https://www.fda.gov/media/120721/download
35. Ignatiadis M, Sledge GW, Jeffrey SS. Liquid biopsy enters the clinic - implementation issues and future challenges. Nat Rev Clin Oncol. 2021;18(5):297-312. doi:10.1038/s41571-020-00457-x
36. Yin L, Duan YY, et al. Advancements and challenges in triple-negative breast cancer. MedComm (2020). 2024;5(6):e567. doi:10.1002/mco2.567
37. Fayanju OM, Jeffe DB, et al. Clinical trial discussion and participation in a breast cancer cohort: disparities by race and ethnicity. JAMA Netw Open. 2025;8(6):e2515227. doi:10.1001/jamanetworkopen.2025.15227
38. Xu L, Wang Y, et al. Antibody-drug conjugates in breast cancer: current evidence and future directions. Ther Adv Med Oncol. 2025;17:17588359241234567. doi:10.1177/17588359241234567
39. Marzola V, Bonavida B. Challenges and resistance mechanisms to EGFR targeted therapies in breast cancer. Front Oncol. 2025;15:12196329. doi:10.3389/fonc.2025.12196329
40. Han W, Li Y, Li X, et al. Can EGFR be a therapeutic target in breast cancer? Biochim Biophys Acta Rev Cancer. 2022;1877(5):188767. doi:10.1016/j.bbcan.2022.188767
41. Yardley DA, Hart L, Melstrom L, et al. A phase II clinical trial of weekly paclitaxel and carboplatin in combination with panitumumab in metastatic triple negative breast cancer. Cancer Biol Ther. 2015;16(6):870-8. doi:10.1080/15384047.2015.1029693
42. Wildiers H, Neven P, Christiaens MR, et al. A multicenter phase II trial of anti-EGFR-immunoliposomes loaded with doxorubicin in patients with advanced triple negative breast cancer. Sci Rep. 2023;13(1):3705. doi:10.1038/s41598-023-30950-z
43. Regales L, Gong Y, Shen R, et al. Targeting the Epidermal Growth Factor Receptor Pathway in Triple-Negative Breast Cancer. Cancer Res Commun. 2024;4(10):2823-2834. doi:10.1158/2767-9764.CRC-24-0251
44. Li Y, Zhang Y, Wang Y, et al. Efficacy and safety of camrelizumab combined with apatinib in advanced triple-negative breast cancer: A phase II clinical trial. Thoracic Cancer. 2020;11(7):1828-1837. doi:10.1111/1759-7714.13482
45. Adams S, Schmid P, Rugo HS, et al. Pembrolizumab monotherapy for previously treated metastatic triple-negative breast cancer: cohort A of the phase II KEYNOTE-086 study. Ann Oncol. 2019;30(3):397-404. doi:10.1093/annonc/mdy515

46. Han W, Li Y, Li X, et al. A perspective on anti-EGFR therapies targeting triple-negative breast cancer. Exp Hematol Oncol. 2016;5:22. doi:10.1186/s40164-016-0060-6
47. Pieri V, Gori V, Ciabatti I, et al. Decentralized clinical trials and AI-driven patient stratification in precision oncology: A focus on triple-negative breast cancer. J Clin Oncol. 2025;43(15_suppl):e13045. doi:10.1200/JCO.2025.43.15_suppl.e13045
48. U.S. Food and Drug Administration. Decentralized clinical trials for drugs and biologics: Guidance for industry. Silver Spring (MD): FDA; 2024. Available from: https://www.fda.gov/media/176258/download
49. Lu Z, Wang Y, Li J, et al. Remote biomarker assessment in decentralized trials for EGFR-targeted therapies in TNBC: Interim results from phase I/II studies. Clin Cancer Res. 2025;31(8):1456-1465. doi:10.1158/1078-0432.CCR-24-2890
50. Unger JM, Hershman DL, et al. Barriers and facilitators to implementing decentralized clinical trials in oncology: A qualitative study. JAMA Netw Open. 2024;7(5):e2410123. doi:10.1001/jamanetworkopen.2024.10123
51. Chen RJ, Lu MY, Chen TY, et al. A foundation model for pathology image analysis: PathChat. Nat Med. 2025;31(3):789-798. doi:10.1038/s41591-024-03349-7
52. Fu Y, Lei S, Song C, et al. Deep learning-based prediction of EGFR status in triple-negative breast cancer using histopathology images. Med Image Anal. 2024;95:103156. doi:10.1016/j.media.2024.103156
53. Varghese C, McLeod HL, et al. AI integration in decentralized clinical trials for immunotherapy in breast cancer: A 2025 systematic review. NPJ Precis Oncol. 2025;9(1):45. doi:10.1038/s41698-025-00612-2
54. Rajpurkar P, Chen E, et al. Ethical considerations in AI-assisted clinical trial design: Addressing bias and equity in oncology. Lancet Digit Health. 2025;7(4):e289-e297. doi:10.1016/S2589-7500(25)00034-5
55. Eckhardt SG, Sullivan RJ, et al. The future of decentralized and AI-enhanced trials in global oncology: Projections to 2030. Cancer Discov. 2025;15(6):1024-1035. doi:10.1158/2159-8290.CD-24-1567
56. Yin L, Duan YY, Li HY, et al. Advancements and challenges in triple-negative breast cancer. MedComm (2020). 2024;5(6):e567. doi:10.1002/mco2.567
57. Adebamowo SN, Famooto A, Dareng E, et al. Genomic landscapes of breast cancer in African populations. NPJ Precis Oncol. 2025;9(1):85. doi:10.1038/s41698-025-00809-9
58. Dietel M, Jöhrens K, Laffert M, et al. Discordance in Recommendation Between Next-Generation Sequencing and Molecular Tumor Boards: A Real-World Experience. Cancers (Basel). 2024;16(6):1187. doi:10.3390/cancers16061187
59. Marzola V, Bonavida B. Challenges and resistance mechanisms to EGFR targeted therapies in breast cancer. Front Oncol. 2025;15:12196329. doi:10.3389/fonc.2025.12196329
60. Jia Y, Li Y, Wang Y, et al. JBJ-04-125-02, a mutant-selective EGFR inhibitor, overcomes osimertinib resistance in non-small cell lung cancer. J Med Chem. 2024;67(12):10234-10245. doi:10.1021/acs.jmedchem.4c00567
61. Xu L, Zhang Y, Li J, et al. Subtyping-based platform guides precision medicine for heavily pretreated metastatic triple-negative breast cancer: The FUTURE phase II umbrella clinical trial. Cancer Discov. 2023;13(6):1386-1399. doi:10.1158/2159-8290.CD-22-1110