

POWERED BY COR2ED

EXPERTS KNOWLEDGE SHARE:

UNDERSTANDING THE CHANGING TREATMENT LANDSCAPE IN HCC AND OPTIMISING THERAPY FOR THE INDIVIDUAL PATIENT

Dr. Richard Finn, Dr. Catherine Frenette and Dr. Amit Singal Sunday November 11th 2018 San Francisco, USA





Please note:

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

This meeting is supported by an Independent Educational Grant from Bayer.

EXPERTS KNOWLEDGE SHARE



THE OBJECTIVE OF THIS MEETING IS TO DISCUSS THE TOPIC 'UNDERSTANDING THE CHANGING TREATMENT LANDSCAPE IN HCC AND OPTIMISING THERAPY FOR THE INDIVIDUAL PATIENT'

- Your opportunity to **discuss and share learnings on a challenging topic** within the area of liver oncology
- A chance to hear **the views of our Experts** and allow them to answer the questions that are important to you
- Review and discuss **Patient Case Studies**, using the questions that you have sent in advance of this evening

OVERVIEW AND SCENE-SETTING

Dr. Richard Finn UCLA Geffen School of Medicine, USA

CURRENT SYSTEMIC THERAPY SEQUENCES IN ADVANCED HCC



FDA approved in the US



Positive data from randomized phase III studies, under FDA review in the US, pending approval



HCC, hepatocellular carcinoma; FDA, Food and Drug Administration; ILCA, International Liver Cancer Association; US, United States

PRE-MEETING SURVEY AMONG DELEGATES



- At what point do you transition from loco-regional to systemic therapy?
 - Disease stage and treatment response were the most important indicators for transitioning from loco-regional to systemic therapy
- What role does treatment sequencing play in your therapeutic decision making?
 - For most delegates, treatment sequencing plays a (very) important role in daily practice
- Do you prescribe immunotherapy?
 - Not all delegates prescribe immunotherapy themselves
 - Some collaborate with their oncologist to treat patients with immunotherapy
 - In some countries immunotherapy is not yet available for the treatment of HCC

CASE STUDY 1

Dr. Amit Singal UT Southwestern Medical Center, USA

PATIENT CASE #1 INITIAL PRESENTATION



History

- 57-year old male
- History of obesity, diabetes, and hepatitis C, diagnosed by PCP during routine "baby-boomer" screening
- Asymptomatic and actively working
- Presents for consideration of hepatitis-C treatment



AFP, alpha-fetoprotein; HCC, hepatocellular carcinoma; INR, international normalized ratio; MRI, magnetic resonance imaging; PCP, primary-care provider

PATIENT CASE #1 INITIAL PRESENTATION

- History
 - 57-year old male
 - History of obesity, diabetes, and hepatitis C, diagnosed by PCP during routine "baby-boomer" screening
 - Asymptomatic and actively working
 - Presents for consideration of hepatitis-C treatment
- Examination
 - Compensated cirrhosis
 - No ascites or encephalopathy
 - HCC screening ultrasound was read as US-3 (≥ 1 observation ≥ 1 cm)
 - MRI shows multifocal, bilobar HCC (LR-5)
 - 4 lesions, largest 6 cm
 - No evidence of vascular invasion or distant metastases
- Status
 - Child-Pugh score A bilirubin 0.6, albumin 3.4, INR 1.1, platelets 87
 - AFP 427 ng/mL











WHAT WOULD YOU CONSIDER FOR INITIAL TREATMENT IN THIS PATIENT?



WHAT WOULD YOU CONSIDER FOR INITIAL TREATMENT IN THIS PATIENT?

The PREMIERE trial of transarterial radioembolization (TARE) versus conventional transarterial chemoembolization (TACE) showed:





IS THERE ANY ROLE FOR A COMBINATION OF LOCOREGIONAL AND SYSTEMIC THERAPY?



IS THERE ANY ROLE FOR A COMBINATION OF LOCOREGIONAL AND SYSTEMIC THERAPY?

SPACE ¹	TACE-2 ²	TACTICS ³	SORAMIC ⁴
TTP	PFS	PFS	OS
 169 days for TACE + sorafenib 166 for TACE HR 0.80, p = 0.07 	 238 days for TACE + sorafenib 235 days for TACE HR 0.99 95% CI 0.77-1.27 	 25.2 months for TACE + sorafenib 13.5 months for TACE HR 0.59 95% CI 0.41-0.87 Treated until unTACEable progression (other studies treated until radiologic progression) 	 12.1 months for SIRT + sorafenib 11.5 months for sorafenib HR 1.01 95% CI 0.82-1.25

CI, confidence interval; HR, hazard ratio; OS, overall survival; PFS, progression-free survival; SIRT, selective internal radiation therapy; TACE, transarterial chemoembolization; TTP, time to progression 1. Lencioni R, et al. *J Hepatol.* 2016;64:1090-1098. 2. Meyer T, et al. *Lancet Gastroenterol Hepatol.* 2017;2:565-575. 3. Kudo M, et al. *J Clin Oncol.* 2018;36:Suppl. Abstract 206. 4. Ricke J, et al. *Liver Int.* 2015;35:620-626.

PATIENT CASE #1 FOLLOW-UP PRESENTATION



- Diagnosis
 - Multifocal HCC
- Initial treatment
 - TARE to both right and left lobes
- Follow-up MRI after 3 months
 - Evidence of progression
 - Left portal-vein tumor thrombus
- Status
 - Child-Pugh score A bilirubin 0.7, albumin 3.2, INR 1.1
 - ECOG-PS score 0
 - AFP 1,274 ng/mL



PATIENT CASE #1 TREATMENT





WHAT TREATMENT WOULD YOU CONSIDER IN THIS PATIENT?

PATIENT CASE #1 TREATMENT





WHAT TREATMENT WOULD YOU CONSIDER IN THIS PATIENT?

SARAH ¹	SINveNIB ²	SHARP ³	Asia-Pacific ⁴	REFLECT ⁵	CHECKMATE 459
OS	OS	OS	OS	OS	
 8.0 months for SIRT 9.9 months for sorafenib HR 1.15 95% CI 0.94–1.41 	 8.8 months for SIRT 10.0 months for sorafenib HR 1.1 95% CI 0.9–1.4 	 10.7 months for sorafenib 7.9 months for placebo HR 0.69 95% CI 0.55-0.87 	 6.5 months for sorafenib 4.2 months for placebo HR 0.68 95% CI 0.50-0.93 	 13.6 months for lenvatinib 12.3 months for sorafenib HR 0.92 95% CI 0.79-1.06 Secondary endpoints: PFS 7.3 vs. 3.6 months for lenvatinib vs. sorafenib ORR 41% vs. 12% for lenvatinib vs. sorafenib 	• Results for nivolumab versus sorafenib are pending

CI, confidence interval; HR, hazard ratio; ORR, overall respsonse rate; OS, overall survival; PFS, progression-free survival; SIRT, selective internal radiation therapy; TACE, transarterial chemoembolization

1. Vilgrain V, et al. *Lancet Oncol.* 2017;18:1624-1636. 2. Chow PHW, et al. *J Clin Oncol.* 2018; 36:1913-1921. 3. Llovet JM, et al. *N Engl J Med.* 2008;359:378-390. 4. Cheng AL, et al. *Lancet Oncol.* 2009;10:25-34. 5. Kudo M, et al. *Lancet.* 2018;391:1163-1173.

PATIENT CASE #1 SYSTEMIC TREATMENT



WOULD YOU STILL PURSUE SYSTEMIC THERAPY IF THE PATIENT HAD PROGRESSION BUT HAD NOT YET DEVELOPED VASCULAR INVASION?

PATIENT CASE #1 SYSTEMIC TREATMENT



WOULD YOU STILL PURSUE SYSTEMIC THERAPY IF THE PATIENT HAD PROGRESSION BUT HAD NOT YET DEVELOPED VASCULAR INVASION?

What if:

- The patient was Child-Pugh B bilirubin 2.1, albumin 2.9, INR 1.2?
- Bilirubin was 1.5 but the patient had developed mild ascites?

CASE STUDY 2

Dr. Catherine Frenette Scripps Green Hospital, La Jolla, CA, USA

PATIENT CASE #2 INITIAL PRESENTATION



- History
 - 74-year old woman
 - Hepatitis C
 - Contracted from her husband
 - Never been treated
- Presents with a **new diagnosis of HCC** to pursue treatment



PATIENT CASE #2 EXAMINATION

- Ultrasound
 - 4.5-cm mass in her liver
- **CT-liver**
 - Solitary 6.3-cm lesion in segment 4 consistent with HCC, with tumor thrombus in the middle hepatic vein
- CT-chest
 - Multiple lung lesions concerning for metastatic disease, all < 1cm
 - Multiple small peripheral pulmonary emboli
 - 3-cm destructive lesion in left 7th rib, consistent with bony metastasis





PATIENT CASE #2 ANAMNESIS AND LAB RESULTS



Anamnesis

- She denies any history of decompensating events
- Feeling well, except for some mild discomfort in her ribs on the left side that she had attributed to a fall

Lab results

- Normal basic metabolic panel
- CBC notable for platelets 145, otherwise normal
- AST 90
- ALT 113
- Bilirubin 0.4
- Albumin 4.1
- AFP 2982

Status

- Child-Pugh score A
- Cirrhotic, CTP score 5
- ECOG-PS score 0
- BCLC stage C





IS THERE A ROLE FOR LOCOREGIONAL THERAPY IN A PATIENT WITH METASTATIC DISEASE?





IS THERE A ROLE FOR LOCOREGIONAL THERAPY IN A PATIENT WITH METASTATIC DISEASE?

SHOULD HER RIB LESION BE RADIATED?



- The patient was started on sorafenib 200 mg twice daily, and titrated based on side effects to total dose of 400 mg in morning and 200 mg in evening
 - Full dose had resulted in significant all-over body rash and diarrhea
- She also underwent radiation to the rib lesion and the tumor thrombus to attempt to decrease further risk of a pulmonary embolism



PATIENT CASE #2 FOLLOW UP – 3 MONTHS



- **Restaging** after radiation and three months of sorafenib therapy
 - AFP 15
 - Rib lesion without enhancement and with 30% shrinkage
 - Liver lesion without enhancement, tumor thrombus resolved
 - Pulmonary metastatic disease stable
- She remained on sorafenib therapy for the next 20 months



PATIENT CASE #2 FOLLOW UP – 20 MONTHS



- At her **20 month visit**
 - CT-liver stable without enhancement in primary lesion
 - CT-lungs stable
 - Rib lesion with **local recurrence** of 2.8 cm lesion
 - AFP increased from 20 to 862



WHAT SECOND-LINE THERAPY WOULD YOU CONSIDER FOR THIS PATIENT?



WHAT SECOND-LINE THERAPY WOULD YOU CONSIDER FOR THIS PATIENT?

Would your therapy be different:

- If her AFP had increased but **no progressive disease** was evident on **imaging**?
- If she had **not tolerated sorafenib**?



SHOULD TYROSINE KINASE INHIBITORS BE STARTED AT FULL DOSE INITIALLY AND TITRATED DOWN, OR LOW DOSE AND TITRATED UP?

PATIENT CASE #2 SECOND-LINE TREATMENT OPTIONS



Tyrosine kinase inhibitors

Regorafenib¹

- Phase-3 RESORCE study in patients who tolerated sorafenib ≥ 400 mg daily for 20 of prior 28 days
- OS: 10.6 months vs 7.8 months with placebo (HR 0.63)

Cabozantinib²

- Phase-3 CELESTIAL study
- OS: 10.2 months vs 8.0 months with placebo (HR 0.76)

Immunotherapy

Nivolumab³

- Phase-2 CHECKMATE-040
 study
- ORR (mRECIST): 19%
- OS: 15.6 months

Pembrolizumab⁴

- Phase-2 KEYNOTE-224 study
- ORR (mRECIST): 15%
- OS: 12.9 months

Anti-VEGF

Ramucirumab⁵

- Phase-3 REACH-2 study in patients with AFP > 400
- OS: 8.5 months vs 7.3 months with placebo (HR 0.71)

HR, hazard ratio; mRECIST, modified Response Evaluation Criteria in Solid Tumors; ORR, overall response rate; OS, overall survival
1. Bruix J, et al. *Lancet.* 2017;389:56-66.
2. Abou-Alfa GK, et al. *N Engl J Med.* 2018;379:54-63.
3. El-Khoueiry AB, et al. *Lancet.* 2017;389:2492-2502.
4. Zhu AX, et al. *Lancet Oncol* 2018;9:940-952.
5. Zhu AX, et al. *J Clin Oncol.* 2018;36:Suppl:4003



- The patient was started on **regorafenib** at 160 mg daily, three weeks on and one week off (prior to the approval and availability of immunotherapy)
 - The dose was titrated for side effects of diarrhea, and she was able to maintain 120 mg daily
- The rib lesion was again **radiated** for symptoms
- Three months after starting regorafenib she had stable disease on imaging and her AFP had decreased to 26
- She **continued regorafenib** for the next 18 months
- Most recent imaging shows stable disease, but AFP has started to creep upwards, latest value 79



PATIENT CASE #2 THIRD-LINE TREATMENT



WHAT ARE THE THIRD-LINE TREATMENT OPTIONS?

PATIENT CASE #2 THIRD-LINE TREATMENT



WHAT ARE THE THIRD-LINE TREATMENT OPTIONS?

Cabozantinib

- 27% of patients in the CELESTIAL trial had 2 prior systemic therapies
- Subgroup analysis of patients receiving 2 prior systemic therapies HR 0.90 (NS)

Immunotherapy

 No data on third-line immunotherapy







SHOULD HER HEPATITIS C BE TREATED? IF YES, WHEN?

36



Are you interested in finding out more about HCC CONNECT and our educational programmes?



Visit our website at <u>www.hccconnect.info</u>



Follow us on Twitter @hccconnectinfo



Join the HCC CONNECT group on LinkedIn



HCC CONNECT Bodenackerstrasse 17 4103 Bottmingen SWITZERLAND

Dr. Antoine Lacombe Pharm D, MBA Phone: +41 79 529 42 79 antoine.lacombe@cor2ed.co

Dr. Froukje Sosef MD Phone: +31 6 2324 3636 <u>froukje.sosef@cor2ed.com</u>

