

POWERED BY COR2ED

MAINTENANCE THERAPY FOR METASTATIC UROTHELIAL CANCER

Prof. Sandy Srinivas, MD Stanford University Medical Center, Palo Alto, CA, USA

APRIL 2021

DISCLAIMER AND DISCLOSURES



Please note: The views expressed within this presentation are the personal opinions of the author. They do not necessarily represent the views of the author's academic institution or the rest of the GU CONNECT group.

This content is supported by an independent educational grant from Bayer.

Prof. Sandy Srinivas has received financial support/sponsorship for research support, consultation, or speaker fees from the following companies:

• Bayer, Eisai, Genentech, Janssen, Merck

BACKGROUND



- Platinum-based chemotherapy (CT) is the standard of care for patients with metastatic urothelial carcinoma in the first-line (1L) setting^{1,2}
 - However, progression-free survival (PFS) and overall survival (OS) benefits are limited due to emergence of CT resistance²
- Most patients have disease progression within approximately 9 months of CT treatment, and median OS is 14-15 months with cisplatin-based regimens and 9-10 months with carboplatin-based regimens among patients who are not suitable candidates for cisplatin-based therapy²
- Attempts at improving OS through the addition of other chemotherapeutics and/or immunotherapies have been disappointing

FIRST-LINE PHASE 3 TRIALS IN METASTATIC UROTHELIAL CANCER



Trial	Arms	No. enrolled	ORR (%)	PFS	OS	HR OS ^f	HR OS PD-L1 ^{+,f}	Comment
IMvigor130 ^{1,2}	Atezo/CT Atezo CT	451 362 400	47 23 44	8.2 NA 6.3	16.0 15.7 13.4ª/13.1 ^b	0.83 1.02	0.74 0.68	IMvigor130 trial was the first immune checkpoint inhibitor study to show a PFS benefit for 1L treatment of locally advanced and metastatic urothelial cancer. Atezo monotherapy may have benefit relative to CT, but this may be limited to PD-L1 high-expressing tumours.
KEYNOTE-361 ³	Pembro/CT Pembro CT	351 307 352	55 30 45	8.3 3.9 7.1	17.9 16.1 14.3	0.86 0.92	0.9 1.0	The addition of pembro to platinum-based CT for 1L treatment of advanced urothelial carcinoma did not provide a statistically significant benefit for PFS or OS. Patients who did respond to 1L immunotherapy had more durable responses, suggesting a subset of patients who may not require aggressive therapy to induce disease regression may benefit longer from immunotherapy.
DANUBE ^{4,5}	Durva/Treme Durva CT	342 346 344	36° 26° 49°	3.7° 2.3° 6.7°	15.1 ^c 14.4 ^d 12.1 ^{c,d}	0.85 ^e 0.99	0.74 0.89 ^e	The DANUBE trial was negative for its co-primary endpoints of OS in 1.) durva monotherapy vs CT in the PD-L1-high patient population and 2.) combination durva and treme vs CT in the ITT population. Results from the secondary endpoint analysis of combination immunotherapy in the PD-L1-high population warrants further investigation.

^a Comparison of atezo/CT vs CT; ^b Comparison of atezo vs CT; ^c ITT population results; ^d High PD-L1-expression results; ^e DANUBE trial co-primary endpoints: OS comparison between durva and CT for high PD-L1 expression tumours and OS comparison between durva/treme and CT for ITT population; ^fhazard ratios represent comparison between respective treatment and CT

1L, first line; Atezo, atezolizumab; CT, chemotherapy; Durva, durvalumab; HR, hazard ratio; ITT, intent-to-treat; NA, not available; ORR, objective response rate; OS, overall survival; PD-L1, programmed death ligand-1; PFS, progression-free survival; Treme, tremelimumab

1. Grande E, et al. ESMO 2019. Abstract #LBA14_PR (oral presentation); 2. Galsky M, et al. Lancet. 2020;395:1547-57; 3. Alva A, et al. ESMO 2020. Abstract #LBA23 (oral presentation); 5. Powles T, et al. ESMO 2020; Abstract #6970 (oral presentation); 5. Powles T, et al. Lancet. 2020;21:1574-88

JAVELIN BLADDER 100 STUDY DESIGN (NCT02603432)



 JAVELIN Bladder 100 assessed patients with locally advanced or metastatic urothelial cancer that did not progress following 1st-line CT and who were randomised to either standard of care or avelumab (anti-PD-L1)



^a BSC was administered per local practice based on patient needs and clinical judgement; other systemic antitumour therapy was not permitted, but palliative local radiotherapy for isolated lesions was acceptable

PD-L1⁺ status was defined as PD-L1 expression in \geq 25% of tumour cells or in \geq 25% or 100% of tumour-associated immune cells if the percentage of immune cells was > 1 % or \leq 1%, respectively, using the Ventana SP263 assay; 358 patients (51%) had a PD-L1⁺ tumour

BSC, best supportive care; CR, complete response; CT, chemotherapy; IV, intravenous; OS, overall survival; PD-L1, programmed death ligand-1; PFS, progression-free survival; PR, partial response; PRO, patient reported outcome; Q2W, every 2 weeks; R, randomisation; RECIST 1.1; Response Evaluation Criteria in Solid Tumours version 1.1; SD, stable disease; UC, urothelial carcinoma

Powles T, et al. N Engl J Med. 2020;383:1218-30



SELECT BASELINE CHARACTERISTICS

	Overall population (N=700)		PD-L1 ⁺ population (N=358)	
	Avelumab + BSC (N=350)	BSC alone (N=350)	Avelumab + BSC (N=189)	BSC alone (N=169)
Median age, years	68	69	70	70
Site of primary tumour, % Upper tract (renal pelvis, ureter) Lower tract (bladder, urethra, prostate gland)	30 70	23 77	23 77	21 79
Site of baseline metastasis, % Visceral Non-visceral ^a	55 45	55 45	47 53	47 53
PD-L1 status, % ^b Positive Negative Unknown	54 40 6	48 38 14	100 0 0	100 0 0
1st-line CT regimen, % Gemcitabine + cisplatin Gemcitabine + carboplatin Gemcitabine + cisplatin/carboplatin ^c Not reported	52 42 6 0	59 35 6 1	53 39 7 0	58 32 9 1
Baseline response to 1st-line CT, % CR or PR SD	72 28	72 28	74 26	76 24

^a Non-visceral includes patients with locally advanced disease or only non-visceral disease, including bone metastasis

^b PD-L1⁺ status was defined as PD-L1 expression in ≥25% or 100% of tumour-associated immune cells if the percentage of immune cells was >1% or ≤1%, respectively (SP263 assay); among patients evaluable for PD-L1 status in the avelumab and control arms, 58% and 56% had a PD-L1⁺ tumour, respectively

^c Patients who switched platinum-based regimens while receiving 1st-line CT



OS IN THE OVERALL POPULATION



OS was measured post randomisation (after CT); the OS analysis crossed the prespecified efficacy boundary based on the alpha-spending function (p<0.0053)

BSC, best supportive care; CI, confidence interval; HR, hazard ratio; OS, overall survival Powles T, et al. N Engl J Med. 2020;383:1218-30; Powles T, et al. Oral presentation ASCO 2020: LBA1



OS IN THE PD-L1⁺ POPULATION



OS was measured post randomisation (after CT); the OS analysis crossed the prespecified efficacy boundary based on the alpha-spending function (p<0.0014)

BSC, best supportive care; CI, confidence interval; HR, hazard ratio; NE, not estimable; OS, overall survival; PD-L1, programmed death ligand-1 Powles T, et al. N Engl J Med. 2020;383:1218-30; Powles T, et al. Oral presentation ASCO 2020: LBA1

JAVELIN BLADDER 100 STUDY



PFS RESULTS

PFS by independent radiology review in the overall population



PFS by independent radiology review in the PD-L1⁺ population



PFS was measured post randomisation (from end of CT)

PFS was measured post randomisation (from end of CT)

BSC, best supportive care; CI, confidence interval; HR, hazard ratio; PD-L1, programmed death ligand-1; PFS, progression-free survival Powles T, et al. N Engl J Med. 2020;383:1218-30; Powles T, et al. Oral presentation ASCO 2020: LBA1

JAVELIN BLADDER 100 STUDY



SUBGROUP ANALYSIS OF OS IN THE OVERALL POPULATION

	Events/patients, N				
Subgroup		Avelumab + BSC	BSC alone		Hazard ratio (95% CI)
All patients		145/350	179/350		0.69 (0.56-0.86) ^a
Age	<65 years ≥65 years	61/129 84/221	53/107 126/243		0.79 (0.55-1.15) 0.63 (0.47-0.83)
ECOG PS score	0 ≥1	77/123 68/137	101/211 78/139	 	0.64 (0.48-0.86) 0.74 (0.54-1.03)
1st-line CT regimen	Gemcitabine + cisplatin Gemcitabine + carboplatin Gemcitabine + cisplatin/carboplatin	71/183 68/147 6/20	98/206 73/122 7/20 —		0.69 (0.51-0.94) 0.66 (0.47-0.91) 0.75 (0.25-2.25)
Best response to 1st-line CT	CR or PR SD	104/253 41/97	127/252 52/98	 	0.69 (0.53-0.89) 0.70 (0.46-1.05)
Site of baseline metastasis	Visceral Non-visceral	93/191 52/159	101/191 78/159		0.82 (0.62-1.09) 0.54 (0.38-0.76)
Creatinine clearance	≥60 mL/min <60 mL/min	74/181 71/168	97/196 81/148	_	0.68 (0.50-0.92) 0.68 (0.50-0.94)
PD-L1 status	Positive Negative Unknown	61/189 76/139 8/22	82/169 72/132 25/49		0.56 (0.40-0.78) 0.86 (0.62-1.18) 0.69 (0.31-1.53)
Error bars show 95% Cl ^a Stratified (all other analyses a	are unstratified)		0.25 Favours a	6 0.5 1 2 Hazard ratio for OS with 95 avelumab + BSC Favours	4 5% CI BSC alone

BSC, best supportive care; CI, confidence interval; CR, complete response; CT, chemotherapy; ECOG PS, Eastern Cooperative Oncology Group performance status; OS, overall survival; PD-L1, programmed death ligand-1; PR, partial response; SD, stable disease

Powles T, et al. N Engl J Med. 2020;383:1218-30

JAVELIN BLADDER 100 STUDY



TREATMENT EMERGENT ADVERSE EVENTS (ANY CAUSALITY)

	Avelumab +	BSC (N=344)	BSC alone (N=345)		
	Any grade	Grade ≥3	Any grade	Grade ≥3	
Any TEAE, %	98.0	47.4	77.7	25.2	
Fatigue	17.7	1.7	7.0	0.6	
Pruritus	17.2	0.3	1.7	0	
Urinary tract infection	17.2	4.4	10.4	2.6	
Diarrhoea	16.6	0.6	4.9	0.3	
Arthralgia	16.3	0.6	5.5	0	
Asthenia	16.3	0	5.5	1.2	
Constipation	16.3	0.6	9.0	0	
Back pain	16.0	1.2	9.9	2.3	
Nausea	15.7	0.3	6.4	0.6	
Pyrexia	14.8	0.3	3.5	0	
Decreased appetite	13.7	0.3	6.7	0.6	
Cough	12.8	0.3	4.6	0	
Vomiting	12.5	1.2	3.5	0.6	
Hypothyroidism	11.6	0.3	0.6	0	
Rash	11.6	0.3	1.2	0	
Anaemia	11.3	3.8	6.7	2.9	
Haematuria	10.5	1.7	10.7	1.4	
Infusion-related reaction	10.2	0.9	0	0	

Safety was assessed in all patients who received ≥1 dose of avelumab in the avelumab arm, or who completed the cycle 1 day 1 visit in the BSC arm (N=689)

- TEAEs led to discontinuation of avelumab in 11.9% of patients
- Death was attributed by the investigator to study treatment toxicity in 2 patients (0.6%) in the avelumab + BSC arm
 - 1 due to sepsis (in cycle 10)
 - 1 due to ischaemic stroke (100 days after a single dose of avelumab)

Table shows TEAEs of any grade occurring in \geq 10% or grade \geq 3 TEAEs occurring in \geq 5% in either arm

SUMMARY



- Checkpoint inhibitors have altered the treatment landscape in metastatic urothelial cancer
- Immunotherapy as monotherapy does not appear to prolong OS in platinum-based CT-eligible patients, regardless of PD-L1 expression
- Combination treatment (either immuno-oncology [IO]–CT or IO–IO) does not appear to offer a survival benefit across all platinum-based CT-eligible patients
 - Further investigation is warranted to understand if combining PD-(L)1 and cytotoxic T-lymphocyte-associated protein 4 (CTLA-4) inhibitors in the PD-L1⁺ patient population improves survival
- In the JAVELIN Bladder 100 trial, maintenance avelumab after CT in patients whose disease has not progressed results in improvement in OS
 - Higher magnitude of benefit in PD-L1-high tumours
 - Benefit seen irrespective of type of CT, no. of cycles of CT, and prior response to CT
 - Maintenance immunotherapy with avelumab is the new standard of care in patients with advanced urothelial cancer whose disease has not progressed with platinum-based CT

REACH GU CONNECT VIA TWITTER, LINKEDIN, VIMEO & EMAIL OR VISIT THE GROUP'S WEBSITE http://www.guconnect.info



Follow us on Twitter <u>@guconnectinfo</u> Follow the GU CONNECT group on LinkedIn

Watch us on the Vimeo Channel <u>GU CONNECT</u>



Email sam.brightwell@cor2ed.com



POWERED BY COR2ED

GU CONNECT Bodenackerstrasse 17 4103 Bottmingen SWITZERLAND

Dr. Froukje Sosef MD



 \bowtie

+31 6 2324 3636

froukje.sosef@cor2ed.com

Dr. Antoine Lacombe Pharm D, MBA



- +41 79 529 42 79
- antoine.lacombe @cor2ed.com









Follow us on Twitter @guconnectinfo



Heading to the heart of Independent Medical Education Since 2012