SI-053 treats glioblastomas regardless of tumour genotype

This document has been prepared by Double Bond Pharmaceutical for the purpose of summarising current scientific literature and providing a short assessment of the challenges and therapeutic opportunities in glioblastoma treatment.

13 August 2025

Summary

Glioblastomas' significant heterogeneity complicates diagnosis in an era of increasing reliance on genotyping, as traditional biopsies may provide an incomplete genetic snapshot of the tumour. This same complexity also limits the effectiveness of targeted therapies. In contrast, broad-acting agents, such as the locally delivered SI-053, offer a more generalised approach. By targeting the fundamental process of DNA replication, SI-053 is designed to suppress growth across diverse tumour subvariants, overcoming limitations posed by genetic heterogeneity and the blood-brain barrier.

Key words: tumor heterogeneity, genotyping, SI-053

Background

Glioblastomas exhibit significant intra-patient heterogeneity, both spatially and temporally. Distinct regions within the same tumour can harbour divergent genetic and transcriptional profiles, which may further evolve over time. Single-biopsy sampling may fail to capture key subclonal driver mutations, resulting in false-negative findings when such alterations are confined to localised tumour regions[1–7].

Historically, diagnosis relied predominantly on histological and morphological features such as necrosis, mitotic activity, and microvascular proliferation, which is now increasingly informed by molecular markers including IDH mutation status, 1p/19q codeletion, TERT promoter mutations, EGFR amplification, and methylation profiling[8–14].

Most glioblastoma-associated mutations remain undruggable, and clinical trials targeting these alterations have thus far failed to yield significant improvements in survival[15]. SI-053's active compound, Temozolomide, is a potent alkylating cytostatic agent which targets the fundamental process of DNA replication. Its anti-proliferative effect is not limited to specific genetic contexts, offering a generalised, genotype-independent mechanism of action which broadly suppresses tumour proliferation. Furthermore, the intracranial administration of SI-053 circumvents the challenges posed by the blood–brain barrier, enabling more direct and effective delivery to tumour tissue compared to systemically administered therapies[16].

Challenges of Tumour Heterogeneity and Emerging Solutions

Even within this molecular era, transcriptional subtypes often correlate with histomorphological patterns. Morphology remains a powerful phenotypic readout that can help prioritise molecular testing and reveal critical "morpho-molecular" correlates. This phenotypic heterogeneity is so pronounced that glioblastoma was historically termed glioblastoma multiforme (GBM)[17]. Still, many histological transitions between tumour regions are subtle, difficult to standardise across observers, and do not reliably map to distinct biological programs[18].

To better capture the full spectrum of intra-tumoral variation, modern single-cell and spatial profiling technologies have been introduced. These include single-cell RNA sequencing, spatial transcriptomics, imaging mass cytometry, and others that allow high-resolution dissection of glioma biology. At a more accessible level, multiregional sampling has emerged as a practical strategy to improve diagnostic accuracy. Numerous studies have shown that key genetic and transcriptional events may be confined to specific tumour coordinates or microenvironments[19, 20]. For example, Liu et al. demonstrated that multisampling workflows significantly outperformed single-sample approaches in capturing intra-tumoral heterogeneity, detecting more than twice as many cancer cell subpopulations[21].

Despite these advances, limitations remain. Sampling approaches are still poorly standardised and often lack region-specific guidance. More refined strategies, such as radiologically guided sampling or microscopic feature-guided laser capture microdissection, can help, but they are difficult to scale or incorporate into routine clinical workflows due to time, cost, and inter-observer subjectivity[22].

One key concern is the representativeness of biopsies. Core biopsies often reflect only a narrow spatiotemporal snapshot of the tumour and may not capture its clonal diversity. Larger samples, while seemingly more comprehensive, may intermingle anatomically distinct subregions, obscuring meaningful patterns of functional heterogeneity[23, 24].

References

1. Dagogo-Jack I, Shaw AT. Tumour heterogeneity and resistance to cancer therapies.
Nat Rev Clin Oncol. 2018; 15(2): 81-94

2. Ramón y Cajal S, Sesé M, Capdevila C, et al. Clinical implications of intratumor heterogeneity: challenges and opportunities. J Mol Med. 2020; 98(2): 161-177

3. Fisher R, Pusztai L, Swanton C. Cancer heterogeneity: implications for targeted therapeutics.
Br J Cancer. 2013; 108(3): 479-485

4. Schäfer N, Gielen GH, Rauschenbach L, et al. Longitudinal heterogeneity in glioblastoma: moving targets in recurrent versus primary tumors. J Transl Med. 2019; 17(1): 96.

5. Richards LM, Whitley OKN, MacLeod G, et al. Gradient of developmental and injury response transcriptional states defines functional vulnerabilities underpinning glioblastoma heterogeneity. Nat Cancer. 2021; 2(2): 157-173

6. Wang L, Jung J, Babikir H, et al. A single-cell atlas of glioblastoma evolution under therapy reveals cell-intrinsic and cell-extrinsic therapeutic targets. Nat Cancer. 2022; 3(12): 1534-1552.

7. Ravi VM, Will P, Kueckelhaus J, et al. Spatially resolved multi-omics deciphers bidirectional tumor-host interdependence in glioblastoma. Cancer Cell. 2022; 40(6): 639-655.e13.

8. WHO Classification of Tumours Editorial Board. Central nervous system tumours [Internet]. Lyon (France): International Agency for Research on Cancer; 2021. (WHO classification of tumours series, 5th ed.; vol. 6).

9. Louis DN, Perry A, Wesseling P, Brat DJ, Cree IA, Figarella-Branger D, et al. The 2021 WHO Classification of Tumors of the Central Nervous System: a summary. Neuro Oncol. 2021;23(8):1231-51.

10. Capper D, Jones DTW, Sill M, Hovestadt V, Schrimpf D, Sturm D, et al. DNA methylation based classification of central nervous system tumours. Nature. 2018;555(7697):469-74.

11. Priesterbach-Ackley LP, Boldt HB, Petersen JK, Bervoets N, Scheie D, Ulhøi BP, et al. Brain tumour diagnostics using a DNA methylation-based classifier as a diagnostic support tool. Neuropathol Appl Neurobiol. 2020;46(5):478-92.

12. Pickles JC, Stone TJ, Jacques TS. Methylation-based algorithms for diagnosis: experience from neuro-oncology. J Pathol. 2020;250(5):510-7.

13. Eckel-Passow JE, Lachance DH, Molinaro AM, Walsh KM, Decker PA, Sicotte H, et al. Glioma Groups Based on 1p/19q, IDH, and TERT Promoter Mutations in Tumors. New England Journal of Medicine. 2015;372(26):2499-508.

14. Stichel D, Ebrahimi A, Reuss D, Schrimpf D, Ono T, Shirahata M, et al. Distribution of EGFR amplification, combined chromosome 7 gain and chromosome 10 loss, and TERT promoter mutation in brain tumors and their potential for the reclassification of IDHwt astrocytoma to glioblastoma. Acta Neuropathol. 2018;136(5):793-803.

15. Back to the future? Temozolomide for brain tumours (17th May 2024). https://www.oncopedia.wiki/contributions/back-to-the-future-emozolomide-for-brain-tumours.

16. Karlsson, I. et al. (2018) 'Local delivery of temozolomide via a biologically inert carrier (Temodex) prolongs survival in glioma patients, irrespectively of the methylation status of MGMT,' Neoplasma, 66(02), pp. 288–293. https://doi.org/10.4149/neo_2018_180613n393.

17. Burger PC, Kleihues P. Cytologic composition of the untreated glioblastoma with implications for evaluation of needle biopsies. Cancer. 1989; 63(10): 2014-2023

18. van den Bent MJ. Interobserver variation of the histopathological diagnosis in clinical trials on glioma: a clinician's perspective. Acta Neuropathol. 2010; 120(3): 297-304.

19. Lili LN, Matyunina LV, Walker LD, Daneker GW, McDonald JF. Evidence for the importance of personalized molecular profiling in pancreatic cancer. Pancreas. 2014; 43(2): 198-211.

20. Sicklick JK, Kato S, Okamura R, et al. Molecular profiling of cancer patients enables personalized combination therapy: the I-PREDICT study. Nat Med. 2019; 25(5): 744-750.

21. Liu LY, Bhandari V, Salcedo A, et al. Quantifying the influence of mutation detection on tumour subclonal reconstruction. Nat Commun. 2020; 11(1): 6247.

22. Faust K, Lee MK, Dent A, et al. Integrating morphologic and molecular histopathological features through whole slide image registration and deep learning. Neurooncol Adv. 2022; 4(1).

23. Diaz-Cano SJ (2000) Designing a molecular analysis of clonality in tumours.
J Pathol 191(4):343–344

24. Diaz-Cano SJ, Blanes A, Wolfe HJ (2001) PCR techniques for clonality assays