Document ID: GBM-2025-010

Title: MGMT Promoter Methylation as Predictive Biomarker in Elderly Glioblastoma: Impact on Treatment Decision-Making and Outcomes

Publication Type

Review (Comprehensive Biomarker Review and Clinical Practice Guidelines)

Year of Publication

2025

Patient Demographics

- **Age Group**: Focus on 60+ years population
- **Data Sources**: Meta-analysis of 34 studies encompassing 4,286 elderly patients
- **Study Types**: Randomized controlled trials (12), prospective cohorts (15), retrospective analyses (7)
- **Geographic Distribution**: Global (North America, Europe, Asia, Australia)
- **Time Period**: Studies published 2005-2024

Disease Focus

Glioblastoma multiforme with specific focus on O6-methylguanine-DNA methyltransferase (MGMT) promoter methylation as predictive and prognostic biomarker in geriatric neuro-oncology

Treatment Discussed

Treatment approaches analyzed across MGMT methylation subgroups:

MGMT-Methylated Tumors: - Standard chemoradiotherapy (temozolomide + radiotherapy) - Dose-intensified temozolomide regimens - Chemoradiotherapy alone in frail elderly - Novel combinations (TMZ + immunotherapy, TMZ + targeted therapy)

MGMT-Unmethylated Tumors: - Radiotherapy alone (historical approach) - Standard chemoradiotherapy (current standard) - Experimental approaches (immunotherapy, novel alkylators) - Clinical trial enrollment emphasis

Study Outcome Summary

MGMT Methylation Prevalence in Elderly: - Overall methylation rate: 42.7% (95% CI: 39.8-45.6%) - Age 60-69: 44.3% - Age 70-79: 41.8% - Age 80+: 38.9% - Similar prevalence to younger populations

Survival Outcomes by MGMT Status:

MGMT-Methylated Tumors: - Pooled median OS with standard chemoradiotherapy: 18.2 months (95% CI: 17.1-19.5) - Pooled median PFS: 9.7 months (95% CI: 8.9-10.6) - 24-month survival: 38.4% - 36-month survival: 18.7% - 60-month survival (long-term survivors): 8.3%

MGMT-Unmethylated Tumors: - Pooled median OS with standard chemoradiotherapy: 11.8 months (95% CI: 10.9-12.8) - Pooled median PFS: 5.4 months (95% CI: 4.8-6.1) - 24-

month survival: 18.2% - 36-month survival: 7.1% - 60-month survival: 2.4%

Hazard Ratio Comparing Methylated vs Unmethylated: - Overall survival: HR 0.48 (95% CI: 0.43-0.54, p<0.001) - Progression-free survival: HR 0.52 (95% CI: 0.46-0.58, p<0.001) - MGMT status strongest prognostic factor in multivariate analysis

Treatment Benefit by MGMT Status:

Temozolomide Benefit Analysis: - MGMT-methylated: Adding TMZ to RT improved OS by 7.4 months (HR 0.51, p<0.001) - MGMT-unmethylated: Adding TMZ to RT improved OS by 2.1 months (HR 0.75, p=0.008) - Treatment interaction: MGMT status significantly modifies TMZ benefit (interaction p<0.001)

Response Rates: - MGMT-methylated + TMZ: Objective response 41.3% - MGMT-unmethylated + TMZ: Objective response 18.7% - MGMT-methylated + RT alone: Objective response 15.2%

Age-Specific MGMT Impact:

Age 60-69 years: - MGMT-methylated median OS: 19.6 months - MGMT-unmethylated median OS: 12.4 months - HR: 0.45 (p<0.001)

Age 70+ years: - MGMT-methylated median OS: 16.8 months - MGMT-unmethylated median OS: 10.7 months - HR: 0.52 (p<0.001)

MGMT predictive value maintained across all elderly age strata.

Testing Methodology Comparison:

Methylation-Specific PCR (MSP): - Most widely used (67% of studies) - Binary result (methylated/unmethylated) - High sensitivity, variable specificity - Threshold issues

Pyrosequencing: - Quantitative assessment (26% of studies) - Methylation percentage (0-100%) - Optimal cutoff: 9-10% methylation - Better reproducibility

Immunohistochemistry (MGMT protein): - Inverse correlation with methylation - Lower concordance with clinical outcomes - Not recommended as standalone test

Recommendation: Pyrosequencing preferred when available; MSP acceptable with proper quality control.

Clinical Utility in Treatment Decision-Making:

Strong Evidence Supporting MGMT-Guided Decisions: 1. MGMT-methylated elderly patients derive substantial benefit from aggressive chemoradiotherapy 2. MGMT-unmethylated elderly patients have modest benefit from chemotherapy addition 3. Very frail MGMT-unmethylated patients may consider RT alone or supportive care 4. Clinical trial enrollment particularly valuable for MGMT-unmethylated patients

Expert Panel Recommendations for Elderly Patients:

MGMT-Methylated, Good Performance Status (KPS ≥70): - Standard chemoradiotherapy (Stupp protocol) - **STRONG RECOMMENDATION** - Consider extended maintenance TMZ (>6 cycles) - **MODERATE RECOMMENDATION** - Hypofractionated RT option for age 70+ with comorbidities - **STRONG RECOMMENDATION**

MGMT-Methylated, Poor Performance Status (KPS 50-60): - Hypofractionated RT + concurrent TMZ - **STRONG RECOMMENDATION** - Temozolomide alone option for frail patients - **WEAK RECOMMENDATION**

MGMT-Unmethylated, Good Performance Status: - Standard chemoradiotherapy (current standard) - **MODERATE RECOMMENDATION** - Clinical trial enrollment preferred - **STRONG RECOMMENDATION** - Hypofractionated RT + TMZ acceptable - **MODERATE RECOMMENDATION**

MGMT-Unmethylated, Poor Performance Status: - Hypofractionated RT alone - **MODERATE RECOMMENDATION** - Best supportive care option - **ACCEPTABLE**

ALTERNATIVE - Clinical trial if available - **ENCOURAGED**

Future Biomarker Combinations: - MGMT + IDH status (IDH-mutant better prognosis) - MGMT + TERT promoter mutation - MGMT + multi-gene panels - Liquid biopsy approaches under investigation

Clinical Implementation Barriers: - Testing turnaround time (median 14 days reported) - Cost and reimbursement variability - Technical expertise requirements - Inter-laboratory standardization challenges - Patient education and counseling needs

FDA Approval Status

MGMT Testing: Not FDA-Required but Guideline-Recommended - MGMT testing is not an FDA-mandated companion diagnostic - Recommended by NCCN Guidelines (Category 2A) - Endorsed by EANO, AANS/CNS guidelines as standard practice - Most insurance providers cover testing - Testing typically performed in CLIA-certified laboratories

Temozolomide: Approved Without Biomarker Restriction - FDA approval does not require MGMT testing - Label does not restrict use to methylated tumors - Clinical practice increasingly uses MGMT for decision support

Key Findings

MGMT promoter methylation status represents the strongest predictive biomarker for temozolomide benefit in elderly glioblastoma patients. Testing should be performed routinely in all elderly patients to guide treatment intensity decisions and facilitate informed shared decision-making.

Elderly patients with MGMT-methylated tumors and reasonable performance status should receive aggressive multimodal therapy as outcomes approach those of younger patients. The substantial survival benefit (median 18+ months) and potential for long-term survival justify treatment intensification.

MGMT-unmethylated elderly patients present a therapeutic challenge with modest chemotherapy benefit. These patients are ideal candidates for clinical trials investigating novel therapeutic approaches. De-escalation to radiotherapy alone may be appropriate for very frail patients after careful shared decision-making.

Standardization of MGMT testing methodology and turnaround time optimization remain important quality improvement targets. Pyrosequencing with established cutoffs provides most reliable quantitative assessment.

Integration of MGMT status with comprehensive geriatric assessment and patient preferences enables personalized treatment planning that balances survival benefit, quality of life, and treatment burden in elderly glioblastoma patients.

Citations

1. Hegi ME, Diserens AC, Gorlia T, et al. MGMT gene silencing and benefit from temozolomide in glioblastoma. N Engl J Med. 2005;352(10):997-1003.

2. Wick W, Platten M, Meisner C, et al. Temozolomide chemotherapy alone versus radiotherapy alone for malignant astrocytoma in the elderly: the NOA-08 randomised, phase 3 trial. Lancet Oncol. 2012;13(7):707-715.

3. Malmström A, Grønberg BH, Marosi C, et al. Temozolomide versus standard 6-week radiotherapy versus hypofractionated radiotherapy in patients older than 60 years with glioblastoma: the Nordic randomised, phase 3 trial. Lancet Oncol. 2012;13(9):916-926.

4. Perry JR, Laperriere N, O'Callaghan CJ, et al. Short-course radiation plus temozolomide in elderly patients with glioblastoma. N Engl J Med. 2017;376(11):1027-1037.

5. Binabaj MM, Bahrami A, ShahidSales S, et al. The prognostic value of MGMT

promoter methylation in glioblastoma: a meta-analysis of clinical trials. J Cell Physiol. 2018;233(1):378-386.

6. Weller M, Stupp R, Reifenberger G, et al. MGMT promoter methylation in malignant gliomas: ready for personalized medicine? Nat Rev Neurol. 2010;6(1):39-51.

7. Christians A, Hartmann C, Benner A, et al. Prognostic value of three different methods of MGMT promoter methylation analysis in a prospective trial on newly diagnosed glioblastoma. PLoS One. 2012;7(3):e33449.

8. Mansouri A, Hachem LD, Mansouri S, et al. MGMT promoter methylation status testing to guide therapy for glioblastoma: refining the approach based on emerging evidence and current challenges. Neuro Oncol. 2019;21(2):167-178.

9. Herrlinger U, Tzaridis T, Mack F, et al. Lomustine-temozolomide combination therapy versus standard temozolomide therapy in patients with newly diagnosed glioblastoma with methylated MGMT promoter (CeTeG/NOA-09): a randomised, open-label, phase 3 trial. Lancet. 2019;393(10172):678-688.

10. Reifenberger G, Hentschel B, Felsberg J, et al. Predictive impact of MGMT promoter methylation in glioblastoma of the elderly. Int J Cancer. 2012;131(6):1342-1350.

Correspondence: International Neuro-Oncology Biomarker Consortium
Expert Panel: 22 neuro-oncologists, molecular pathologists, and geriatric oncologists from 15 countries
Methodology: Systematic review following PRISMA guidelines; guideline development using GRADE methodology
Consensus Process: Modified Delphi approach for recommendations
Funding: Nonprofit medical research foundations; no industry support
Conflict of Interest: All panel members disclosed relationships; no conflicts affecting recommendations; independent methodologists conducted evidence synthesis.