Ipilimumab for melanoma: New data show survival benefit in the adjuvant setting and dose–response in metastatic disease

Important new data from a phase III trial of ipilimumab versus placebo as adjuvant treatment for melanoma were reported in a Late-Breaking Abstract presentation yesterday by Dr Alexander Eggermont from Institut Gustave Roussy, Villejuif, France (Abstract LBA2_PR).

The study randomised 951 patients who had undergone complete resection of stage 3 melanoma to ipilimumab 10 mg/kg (every 3 weeks \(\text{q3w}\) for 4 doses and then every 3 months up to 3 years) or placebo (EORTC 18071). The primary endpoint was met, with a significant improvement in recurrence-free survival (RFS) previously reported.\(^1\)

According to the data presented yesterday, at a median of 5.3 years’ follow-up, the RFS benefit with ipilimumab versus placebo translated into significant improvements in secondary endpoints, with a 29% reduction in the risk of death (overall survival [OS] hazard ratio [HR] 0.72; 95% confidence intervals [CI] 0.58–0.88; \(p=0.001\)) and a 24% reduction in the risk of distant metastases (HR 0.76; 95% CI 0.64–0.92; \(p=0.02\)). The 5-year OS rate was 11% higher in the ipilimumab arm (65%) than in the placebo arm (54%). Toxicities were similar to previous reports and included grade 3–4 gastrointestinal (16%), hepatic (11%) and endocrine (8%) adverse events.

Dr Eggermont noted that, “There was a marked improvement in OS with higher-dose ipilimumab in these patients.” At a minimum follow-up of ~43 months, median OS (primary endpoint) was 15.7 months (95% CI 11.6–17.8) with 10 mg/kg versus 11.5 months (95% CI 9.9–13.3) with 3 mg/kg (HR 0.84; \(p=0.04\)).

“Although patients who received 10 mg/kg ipilimumab experienced higher rates of drug-related toxicity, the clinical utility of such a schedule in refractory patients warrants further evaluation,” he added.

The study confirms earlier phase II data with ipilimumab in previously treated advanced melanoma.\(^2\)

“Ipilimumab adjuvant therapy brings a significant improvement of OS and has a favourable risk benefit ratio. It clearly represents a serious option for patients with stage 3 melanoma,” commented Dr Eggermont.

Data from the first phase III study to directly compare ipilimumab 10 mg/kg and 3 mg/kg given q3w for 4 doses in patients (N=727) with stage 3–4 melanoma who had not received prior BRAF or immune checkpoint inhibitor therapy were also reported yesterday by Dr Paolo Ascierto from Istituto Nazionale Tumori Fondazione Pascale, Naples, Italy (Abstract 1106O).

Dr Ascierto noted that, “There was a marked improvement in OS with higher-dose ipilimumab in these patients.” At a minimum follow-up of ~43 months, median OS (primary endpoint) was 15.7 months (95% CI 11.6–17.8) with 10 mg/kg versus 11.5 months (95% CI 9.9–13.3) with 3 mg/kg (HR 0.84; \(p=0.04\)).

“Although patients who received 10 mg/kg ipilimumab experienced higher rates of drug-related toxicity, the clinical utility of such a schedule in refractory patients warrants further evaluation,” he added.

The study confirms earlier phase II data with ipilimumab in previously treated advanced melanoma.\(^\text{2}\)

In spite of the tsunami of checkpoint inhibitors, other targeted agents continue to be developed and 2016 sees the first presentation at ESMO of promising new drugs with potential activity in a variety of solid tumours.

**New kids on the block: ESMO début for novel targeted therapies**

The Aurora A kinase inhibitor, alisertib, was the subject of 3 presentations in sessions on Friday. Adding alisertib to paclitaxel as second-line therapy for small-cell lung cancer (SCLC) cases. Investigation of their role as the subject of a Poster Discussion Session (Abstract LBA37). Final results from the randomised FAST trial will be presented today. They confirm the clinically relevant benefit of combining in the first-line setting the anti-CLDN18.2 antibody IMAB362 with epirubicin/oxaliplatin/capecitabine (EOX) in the 48% of patients with CLDN18.2-positive advanced/recurrent gastric and gastro-oesophageal junction adenocarcinomas, with significant improvements in PFS (HR 0.47; p=0.0001) and OS (45% versus 29%) compared with EOX alone (Abstract 6140).

**TARGETS OF NOVEL AGENTS**

**Targets are upregulated/overexpressed or dysfunctional in different cancers**

- Aurora kinases are involved in cell-cycle regulation via microtubule formation and stabilisation of the spindle pole. They also interact with the ACO/protein-tyrosine phosphatase (PTK7-directed monoclonal antibody, an auristatin microtubule inhibitor payload and a cleavable dipeptide linker) in advanced solid tumours were the subject of a Poster Session (Abstract LBA35). ORR was 27% in the platinum-resistant ovarian cancer cohort. Another presentation reported the safety of the pan-FGFR inhibitor, DAY 1163677, in patients with advanced solid tumours, and partial responses were recorded in 6/47 RECIST-evaluable patients with FGFR mRNA overexpressing tumours (particularly those with bladder cancer) while at least stable disease (>8 weeks) was documented in 29/47 patients (Abstract 3600_PR). These results are of particular interest due to the response profile that supports the selection of patients based on tumour FGFR mRNA levels. Today, in a Poster Discussion Session, the phase I results of single-agent treatment of advanced solid tumours with the p53/HDM2-protein–protein interaction inhibitor, NVP-CGM097, show clinical activity, with 40% of 50 patients achieving stable disease (range, 7.7–86.7 weeks), along with evidence of p53 pathway activation by induction of its downstream target, GDF-15 (Abstract 366PD).

Clinically relevant benefits can be confirmed with some novel targeted agents and it is hoped that their early promise will be realised in larger studies. Identification of targets involved in cell carcinogenesis, development of potent agents and importantly, patient and tumour enrichment, are cues for therapeutic innovation.
Lapatinib in HER2-positive digestive tract cancers: Moving on to phase III development?

Combination platin-based perioperative chemotherapy plus surgery is the standard of care for patients with operable oesophagogastric adenocarcinoma. For those patients with advanced gastric or gastro-oesophageal junction (OGJ) cancer who are positive for HER2, targeting it with trastuzumab improves survival. Yesterday, Professor Eric Van Cutsem presented data from a poster by Dr Elizabeth Smyth at The Royal Marsden NHS Foundation Trust, London, UK (Abstract LBA26) that sought to determine whether adding the dual HER1/HER2 tyrosine kinase inhibitor, lapatinib, to epirubicin, cisplatin plus capecitabine (ECX) was feasible in HER2-positive patients with operable, gastric or OGJ cancer, or lower oesophageal adenocarcinoma.

In this phase II, open-label study, 46 patients were randomised to three pre- and three post-operative ECX cycles, or investigational treatment with ECX plus lapatinib 1,250 mg/day during each chemotherapy cycle and for 6 further maintenance cycles. In the ECX plus lapatinib arm, 4/20 patients required lapatinib dose reduction and 4/19 patients experienced diarrhoea of grade 3 or higher (versus no patients in the ECX arm). Although this regimen was feasible, whether lapatinib will proceed to phase III development in this setting is currently undecided.

While new potential cancer treatments are a cause for optimism, some caution should be exercised. Toxicity associated with lapatinib and ECX can be high, leading some clinicians to call into question its suitability as a combination therapy in new drug development; similar toxicity data were reported with adjuvant lapatinib in patients with HER2-positive early breast cancer (ALTTO trial).

Dr Ellis proposed: “For patients with non-visceral disease whose life isn’t immediately threatened by breast cancer…it looks like fulvestrant could be a new standard of care compared to anastrozole.”

The optimal sequencing of treatment for hormone therapy-naïve, post-menopausal women with hormone receptor-positive advanced breast cancer needs to be confirmed, particularly in view of practice-changing Late-Breaking Abstracts presented yesterday with results from two randomised phase III trials.

In the first presentation of results from the large MONALEESA-2 trial in 668 patients with untreated hormone receptor-positive/HER2-negative disease, Professor Gabriel Hortobagyi from the University of Texas MD Anderson Cancer Center, Houston, Texas, USA, reported progression-free survival (PFS) benefit with the addition of the selective CDK4/6 inhibitor ribociclib to letrozole (Abstract LBA1_PR). In a pre-planned interim analysis (after 243 PFS events) the hazard ratio (HR) was 0.556 (95% confidence interval [CI] 0.429–0.720; p=0.00000329) in favour of letrozole plus ribociclib. Ribociclib increased the rate of grade 3–4 neutropenia (59% versus 1%) and leukopenia (21% versus 1%) compared with letrozole alone.

The CDK4/6 inhibitors, including palbociclib (approved by the US FDA) and abemaciclib, are changing the breast cancer treatment landscape. “Testing combinations of ribociclib with other inhibitors of various signalling pathways might lead to additional progress in the management of several subtypes of breast cancer,” suggested Professor Hortobagyi.

According to results from the large FALCON trial presented earlier in the day by Dr Matthew Ellis from Baylor College of Medicine, Houston, Texas, USA, fulvestrant is significantly more effective than anastrozole in hormone treatment-naïve patients with oestrogen receptor-positive and/or progesterone receptor-positive, locally advanced or metastatic breast disease (Abstract LBA14_PR). Among 462 patients randomised, fulvestrant significantly reduced the chance of progression compared with anastrozole (HR 0.797; 95% CI 0.637–0.999; p=0.0486), with median PFS times of 16.6 months and 13.8 months, respectively.

The optimal sequencing of treatment for hormone therapy-naïve, post-menopausal women with hormone receptor-positive advanced breast cancer needs to be confirmed, particularly in view of practice-changing Late-Breaking Abstracts presented yesterday with results from two randomised phase III trials.

In the first presentation of results from the large MONALEESA-2 trial in 668 patients with untreated hormone receptor-positive/HER2-negative disease, Professor Gabriel Hortobagyi from the University of Texas MD Anderson Cancer Center, Houston, Texas, USA, reported progression-free survival (PFS) benefit with the addition of the selective CDK4/6 inhibitor ribociclib to letrozole (Abstract LBA1_PR). In a pre-planned interim analysis (after 243 PFS events) the hazard ratio (HR) was 0.556 (95% confidence interval [CI] 0.429–0.720; p=0.00000329) in favour of letrozole plus ribociclib. Ribociclib increased the rate of grade 3–4 neutropenia (59% versus 1%) and leukopenia (21% versus 1%) compared with letrozole alone.

The CDK4/6 inhibitors, including palbociclib (approved by the US FDA) and abemaciclib, are changing the breast cancer treatment landscape. “Testing combinations of ribociclib with other inhibitors of various signalling pathways might lead to additional progress in the management of several subtypes of breast cancer,” suggested Professor Hortobagyi.

According to results from the large FALCON trial presented earlier in the day by Dr Matthew Ellis from Baylor College of Medicine, Houston, Texas, USA, fulvestrant is significantly more effective than anastrozole in hormone treatment-naïve patients with oestrogen receptor-positive and/or progesterone receptor-positive, locally advanced or metastatic breast disease (Abstract LBA14_PR). Among 462 patients randomised, fulvestrant significantly reduced the chance of progression compared with anastrozole (HR 0.797; 95% CI 0.637–0.999; p=0.0486), with median PFS times of 16.6 months and 13.8 months, respectively.

The results of these two studies are practice changing, yet they propose two different standards for the initial treatment of hormone therapy-naïve disease, with fulvestrant or with aromatase inhibitor-CDK4/6 inhibitor combinations. Further studies are going to be required to establish the optimal sequence of these agents, and help clinicians select the most appropriate therapy.

Dr Ellis proposed: “For patients with non-visceral disease whose life isn’t immediately threatened by breast cancer…it looks like fulvestrant could be a new standard of care compared to anastrozole.”
Dosage and administration:

Metastatic pancreatic cancer:
The recommended dose of Abraxane in combination with gemcitabine is 125 mg/m² administered as an intravenous infusion over 30 minutes on Days 1, 8 and 15 of each 28-day cycle. The concurrent recommended dose of gemcitabine is 260 mg/m² administered intravenously over 30 minutes every 3 weeks.

Metastatic breast cancer:

in combination with carboplatin is indicated for the first-line treatment of non-small cell lung cancer in adult patients who are not candidates for potentially curative therapies (e.g., surgery and/or radiation therapy).

Non-small cell lung cancer:
The recommended dose of Abraxane is 100 mg/m² administered as an intravenous infusion over 30 minutes on Days 1 only of each 21-day cycle, beginning immediately after the end of the infusion (paclitaxel formulated as albumin-bound nanoparticles) of the product characteristics for Abraxane 5 mg/ml powder for suspension for infusion.

Efficacy in three indications

Metastatic pancreatic cancer
in combination with gemcitabine for first-line treatment of adult patients

Metastatic breast cancer
as monotherapy when first-line treatment fails and anthracycline containing therapy is not indicated

Non-small cell lung cancer
in combination with carboplatin for first-line treatment when surgery and/or radiotherapy are not indicated

Clinical interactions:
Carefully assess patients with pancreatic adenocarcinoma aged 75 years and older for the presence of comorbidities, particularly cardiovascular disease. Abraxane should not replace or be replaced by other paclitaxel formulations. Hypersensitivity: Abraxane should only be used under the supervision of an experienced oncologist in units specialised in the use of cytotoxic medicinal products. Abraxane contains 4.2 mg sodium per dose. This should be taken into consideration for patients with renal impairment.

Abnormalities in laboratory tests:
Haematological: Bone marrow suppression (primary neutropenia) occurs commonly and is dose-dependent. Neutropenia and/or thrombocytopenia are increased in patients aged 75 years and older. In cases of severe haematological adverse reactions, including neutropenic fever and neutropenia, the use of growth factors is recommended.

Other adverse reactions. No additional dosage reductions, other than those for all patients, are recommended in patients >75 years of age. The safety and efficacy of Abraxane in patients >75 years of age have not been formally established in clinical trials. Abraxane is generally well tolerated, with a manageable safety profile. The incidence of adverse reactions is generally lower compared to patients treated with Abraxane in previously reported trials. The most common adverse reactions were infusion-related events, which occurred in 15% of patients treated with Abraxane in combination with gemcitabine. The incidence of adverse reactions in patients treated with Abraxane as monotherapy was lower, with the exception of infusion-related reactions. The most common non-injection-site adverse reactions were nausea, vomiting and diarrhoea. These events are generally mild to moderate in severity.

Abraxane is contraindicated in patients with severe infections, including Mycobacterium avium complex, or other serious infections, including tuberculosis.

Special precautions:

Medicinal product subject to medical prescription.
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Medscape ESMO 2016 live blog:
Real-time expert perspectives

Throughout the congress this year, many esteemed experts, including members of the ESMO 2016 Daily Reporter Editorial Board will be contributing to the Medscape live blog that will feature personal experiences, highlights and must-see presentations at ESMO 2016. These multidisciplinary blog entries incorporate perspectives across disease areas and give concise personal observations about the data releases and events as they happen.

Top to bottom: Dr Matthias Preusser (Medical University of Vienna, Austria); Dr Stefan Zimmerman (HFR Fribourg-Cantonal Hospital, Switzerland); Dr Floriana Morgillo (Second University of Naples, Italy); Dr Markus Joeger (St Gallen Cancer Centre, Switzerland).

Dr Floriana Morgillo (Second University of Naples, Italy) discusses basic science and translational research, including the Personalised Oncogenomics study, as well as giving us a timely reminder that precision medicine comes at a high financial cost. Dr Markus Joeger (St Gallen Cancer Centre, Switzerland) summarises the importance of multi-institutional studies, and bailed umbrella trials designed to assess new therapies for rare and under-treated cancers.

Blogs include an account of upcoming Young Oncologist (YO) Track activities and ongoing highlights of the central nervous system (CNS) track from YO Committee Chair, Dr Matthias Preusser (Medical University of Vienna, Austria), Dr Stefan Zimmerman (HFR Fribourg-Cantonal Hospital, Switzerland) gives a no-nonsense précis of the current status of biomarkers for immunotherapeutic outcomes, asserting that gene signatures offer the best hope for treatment tailored to the individual patient.

Dr Floriana Morgillo (Second University of Naples, Italy) talks about the importance of multi-institutional studies, and bailed umbrella trials designed to assess new therapies for rare and under-treated cancers.

Dr Stefan Zimmerman (HFR Fribourg-Cantonal Hospital, Switzerland) summarises the importance of multi-institutional studies, and bailed umbrella trials designed to assess new therapies for rare and under-treated cancers.

Dr Matthias Preusser (Medical University of Vienna, Austria) discusses basic science and translational research, including the Personalised Oncogenomics study, as well as giving us a timely reminder that precision medicine comes at a high financial cost. Dr Markus Joeger (St Gallen Cancer Centre, Switzerland) summarises the importance of multi-institutional studies, and bailed umbrella trials designed to assess new therapies for rare and under-treated cancers.

Dr Floriana Morgillo (Second University of Naples, Italy) discusses basic science and translational research, including the Personalised Oncogenomics study, as well as giving us a timely reminder that precision medicine comes at a high financial cost. Dr Markus Joeger (St Gallen Cancer Centre, Switzerland) summarises the importance of multi-institutional studies, and bailed umbrella trials designed to assess new therapies for rare and under-treated cancers.

Dr Stefan Zimmerman (HFR Fribourg-Cantonal Hospital, Switzerland) summarises the importance of multi-institutional studies, and bailed umbrella trials designed to assess new therapies for rare and under-treated cancers.
Defining meaningful benefits: Diverse contributions to treatment decision making

Making treatment decisions requires consideration beyond efficacy and safety, with increasing importance placed on quality of life, cost-effectiveness and patient acceptance.

The ESMO Magnitude of Clinical Benefit Scale (ESMO-MCBS) is a standardised, generic tool to stratify the magnitude of clinical benefit that can be anticipated with novel cancer treatments. Value in healthcare, and particularly in cancer care, is a huge public policy issue and the ESMO-MCBS aims to assist with public policy making and accelerate patient access to the best new medications. A feasibility study of 77 regimens across 10 cancer types indicated that the ESMO-MCBS was a rational and useful rating system in this regard.1

Hear Dr Kiesewetter present the results from the real-life experience of applying the ESMO-MCBS to rare tumour treatment: ‘Public health and health economics’ Proffered Paper Session, Monday 16.30 – 18.00, Oslo.

Dr Barbara Kiesewetter of the Medical University of Vienna, Austria will report tomorrow on the use of the ESMO-MCBS to direct real-world practice by ranking medications used regularly to treat rare tumours ranging from neuroendocrine tumours and glioblastoma, to sarcomas and urothelial cancer (Abstract 1364O). Unsurprisingly, data were sparse for some tumour types but rankings largely accorded with clinic-based experience, further validating the ESMO-MCBS.

While the ESMO-MCBS is a useful objective tool, it cannot consider the magnitude of clinical benefit from the patient’s perspective. Involving patients in treatment choices is an essential aspect of the medical team’s work. Patients differ widely in what they are willing to tolerate for a given level of clinical improvement and subjective perceptions of risk and benefit are foremost in their treatment decision making.

As we continue to take giant steps in oncology, it is important that we take a holistic approach by considering the sensitivities of our patients to make the best therapeutic choices. Randomised clinical trials are essential to establish the magnitude of clinical benefit even in rare tumours.


Hear Dr Kiesewetter present the results from the real-life experience of applying the ESMO-MCBS to rare tumour treatment; ‘Public health and health economics’ Proffered Paper Session, Monday 16.30 – 18.00, Oslo.

Dr Barbara Kiesewetter of the Medical University of Vienna, Austria will report tomorrow on the use of the ESMO-MCBS to direct real-world practice by ranking medications used regularly to treat rare tumours ranging from neuroendocrine tumours and glioblastoma, to sarcomas and urothelial cancer (Abstract 1364O). Unsurprisingly, data were sparse for some tumour types but rankings largely accorded with clinic-based experience, further validating the ESMO-MCBS. While the ESMO-MCBS is a useful objective tool, it cannot consider the magnitude of clinical benefit from the patient’s perspective. Involving patients in treatment choices is an essential aspect of the medical team’s work. Patients differ widely in what they are willing to tolerate for a given level of clinical improvement and subjective perceptions of risk and benefit are foremost in their treatment decision making. As we continue to take giant steps in oncology, it is important that we take a holistic approach by considering the sensitivities of our patients to make the best therapeutic choices. Randomised clinical trials are essential to establish the magnitude of clinical benefit even in rare tumours. 1. Cherny NI, et al. Ann Oncol 2015;26:1547–73
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Together we can conduct research that deepens our understanding of the disease and its pathways, to ultimately develop new molecules that make a transformational improvement in cancer care.
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It might indicate areas (genetic mutations) that are druggable. For their disease. Therefore, data from genomic profiling of patients who have already received first- or second-line treatment are relevant. This is particularly important for patients provided for various malignant diseases to determine which molecular mechanisms responsible for their development. So far, in grouping together pulmonary NETs with gastrointestinal NETs, the results in terms of progression-free (PFS) and overall survival have been dismal.

Today, it is very common that so-called genomic profiling is applied in different trials, but in general there are very few randomised trials concerning pulmonary NETs. Some of the pulmonary NETs are more aggressive than other NETs and very little is known about the genetic changes and molecular mechanisms responsible for their development. Therapies that have also been developed for gastrointestinal NETs have been applied in different trials, but in general there are very few opportunities for precision medicine in this setting.

WES identified many somatic variants, while two variants (TP53 and RB1) were observed exclusively in specimens collected from patients with large-cell neuroendocrine carcinoma. Today, it is very common that so-called genomic profiling is provided for various malignant diseases to determine which treatments are relevant. This is particularly important for patients who have already received first- or second-line treatment for their disease. Therefore, data from genomic profiling of pulmonary NETs should inform about its molecular landscape. It might indicate areas (genetic mutations) that are druggable.

Targetable molecular alterations have not been well defined in pulmonary neuroendocrine tumours (NETs) and treatment is challenging, with limited therapeutic options. The current available treatment options for pulmonary NETs have originally been developed from the treatment of small and non-small-cell lung cancer. Therapies that have also been developed for gastrointestinal NETs have been applied in different trials, but in general there are very few opportunities for precision medicine in this setting. Some of the pulmonary NETs are more aggressive than other NETs and very little is known about the genetic changes and molecular mechanisms responsible for their development. So far, in grouping together pulmonary NETs with gastrointestinal NETs, the results in terms of progression-free (PFS) and overall survival have been dismal.

I think it is very important to determine the driver mutations in most cancers and particularly so in pulmonary NETs, where there have been very limited therapeutic options in the past. Advanced midgut NETs that have progressed on somatostatin analogue therapy are similarly challenging to treat. The Lu-177-labeled somatostatin analogue peptide, 177Lu-DOTATATE (Lutathera®), a peptide receptor radionuclide therapy, was recently associated with significant improvements in PFS in the phase III NETTER-1 trial. In a presentation tomorrow (Poster Discussion Session ‘Endocrine and neuroendocrine tumours’ 11.00 – 12.00, Berlin; Abstract 400P), a poster by Dr Jonathan Strosberg from H. Lee Moffitt Cancer Center University of South Florida, Tampa, Florida, USA, will review additional analyses from this study. 177Lu-DOTATATE therapy appears to be associated with a moderate improvement in global health status, suggesting that the observed clinically meaningful PFS benefit is not offset by a detrimental impact on patient quality of life. Notably, significant increases in PFS are seen with 177Lu-DOTATATE regardless of prognostic factors, including tumour grade, age, gender, tumour marker levels, and levels of radiotracer uptake. 177Lu-DOTATATE can also be considered a potential agent to be combined with immune checkpoint inhibitors. Its on-target activity and the potential for cell death induced by radiotherapy may enhance immune checkpoint activity.

The NETTER-1 study is the first randomised, controlled study with radioactive targeted treatment that has clearly demonstrated a significant benefit for 177Lu-DOTATATE compared with cold octreotide in patients with NETs. Previously, a large number of patients with NETs have been treated with this compound but not in a randomised fashion. Therefore, data have not been very robust or suitable to satisfy regulatory bodies. It is quite clear that there is a significant benefit in terms of PFS with the radioactive treatment compared with (even high-dose) cold octreotide. Importantly, quality of life is also significantly improved. Therefore, this type of treatment will be a worldwide standard of care in the near future for patients with small intestinal NETs. Similar data are anticipated soon for pancreatic NETs.

Addition of ipilimumab to cetuximab and radiotherapy appears well tolerated in previously untreated head and neck cancer

The combination of cetuximab, radiotherapy and immune checkpoint inhibitors represent a potentially powerful new treatment paradigm. However, the risk of development of autoimmune adverse events with ‘afferent’ inhibitors, such as the anti-CTLA-4 agents, necessitates careful execution of clinical studies. Data from a phase I dose-escalation study in previously untreated locally advanced squamous cell carcinoma of head and neck (SCCHN) suggest that standard cetuximab and intensity modulated radiotherapy (C-IMRT) may be safely combined with ipilimumab (1 mg/kg) in patients with intermediate- or high-risk disease, according to a Late-Breaking Abstract poster yesterday by Dr Julie Bauman from UPMC Hillman Cancer Center, Pittsburgh, Philadelphia, USA (Abstract LBA36). However, dermatological immune-related adverse events (irAEs) unique to this combination and likely reflective of autoimmune effects were observed at ipilimumab 3 mg/kg and were dose-limiting. Among 12 patients receiving ipilimumab 1 mg/kg, there were no dose-limiting toxicities in the first 6 patients and one anaphylactic reaction to cetuximab in the expanded cohort. Grade 3–4 irAEs of special interest occurring with both doses were rash (28%), diarrhea (6%) and colitis (6%).

The recommended phase II dose for ipilimumab in combination with standard C-IMRT is 1 mg/kg.

The observation that immunosuppressive regulatory T-cells found in the circulation of patients with SCCHN expressing CTLA-4 are negatively correlated with clinical outcomes has led to the innovative use of checkpoint inhibitors in SCCHN but, until now, development has been overwhelmingly in the recurrent or metastatic setting.
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A changing landscape in the treatment of metastatic melanoma

The introduction of the kinase inhibitors vemurafenib, dabrafenib and trametinib, and the immune checkpoint inhibitor ipilimumab, has had a hugely favourable impact on the prognosis of patients with metastatic melanoma. Several trials are investigating these and other novel therapies to determine optimal regimens for specific melanomas.

Positive late-breaking data from a phase III trial of combination therapy for melanoma were reported yesterday by Dr Caroline Robert from Gustave Roussy Comprehensive Cancer Center, Villejuif, France (Abstract LBA40). In the COMBI-v study of 704 patients with BRAF V600E/K-mutant melanoma, results of an updated 3-year analysis revealed an increased rate of overall survival with first-line dabrafenib plus trametinib compared with vemurafenib (45% versus 32%, respectively) with no apparent increase in toxicities.

Tomorrow, Dr Axel Hauschild will present promising data from a poster by Dr Jason Chesney (Brown Cancer Center University of Louisville, Kentucky, USA; Abstract 1108PD) reporting a phase II study of combined immunotherapy with herpes simplex virus 1-based oncolytic talimogene laherparepvec and ipilimumab compared with ipilimumab alone in 173 patients with unresected stage IIIIB IV melanoma. In an interim analysis (median follow-up 61.2 weeks) of 82 patients, the confirmed objective response rate was higher with the combination (35.7%) than with ipilimumab alone (17.5%). Adverse events were comparable across the treatment arms.

In the same session, Dr Christian Blank will present a poster by Dr John Park (Crown Princess Mary Cancer Centre, Westmead Hospital, Sydney, Australia; Abstract 1114PD). This retrospective analysis (median follow-up 7.0 months) of 66 patients with brain metastases from melanoma and poor prognoses who were treated with anti-PD-1 therapy suggests that the 3-year overall survival results support the long-term use of dabrafenib in combination with trametinib for the first-line treatment of BRAF-mutant melanoma.

Remember to attend the Educational Session ‘Melanoma: Does the run of success continue?’ today at 14.45 – 16.15, Stockholm.
TARGETABLE BRAF GENOMIC ALTERATIONS: IDENTIFIED IN BREAST CANCER

While uncommon, BRAF genomic alterations (GA) do occur in breast cancer and might be potentially targetable. This is the conclusion of a comprehensive genomic profiling analysis of 7,850 tumours that identified BRAF-altered breast cancer in 83 (1.1%) cases, including primary (35%) and metastatic (65%) sites. GA identified following profiling of >300 cancer-related genes included base substitutions, small insertions and deletions, copy number alterations and fusions/rearrangements. Targetable genes more commonly altered in the presence of BRAF GA compared with BRAF wild type breast cancer were CDK6 (p=0.001), HGFA (p<0.001) and MET (p<0.001), while there were significantly fewer ERBB2 mutations in tumours with BRAF amplification or substitution (p=0.011). Notably, BRAF GA appeared to occur most commonly in HER2-negative and triple-negative metastatic breast cancers. Of the 83 cases with BRAF GA, 15.7% were V600E substitutions that have been shown to predict response to BRAF inhibitors or the combination of BRAF and MEK inhibitors in melanoma and non-small-cell lung cancer. It remains unclear whether BRAF V600E GA may also predict response to these oral anticancer drugs in breast cancer.

BRAF has been well studied as a potential treatment target in several tumour types, but the genomic landscape of breast cancer is complex and the role of BRAF remains to be fully elucidated. These hypothesis-generating data will be discussed today by Dr Luis Costa based on a poster by Dr Joan Albanell from Institut Hospital del Mar d’Investigacions Mediques, Barcelona, Spain, during the Poster Discussion Session ‘Breast cancer, metastatic’ (16.30 – 17.30, Brussels; Abstract 228PD).

ESMO Clinical Practice Guidelines Supplement and Guides for Patients available from the ESMO booth and esmo.org
Delegate voices

“I am a young oncologist and this is the first meeting I have attended. I have to say ‘Wow!’”
Magdalena Derus, Medical Oncologist, Opole, Poland

“My main reasons for coming to ESMO are to find out about clinical trials and hot topics. The programme so far is good.”

“I have come to ESMO for networking opportunities, for the brilliant minds here and for a peek into future trends.”
Adeola Ayoola, Medical Oncologist, Bedford Park, Australia

“This is the biggest event I’ve ever attended and my first impressions are that it is very well organised. I’m particularly interested in the Young Oncologist Track.”
Kamil Zalewski, Swietohrzyskie, Kielce, Poland

“I’m looking forward to hearing about latest news on immunotherapy in gastrointestinal tumours.”
Mohammed Harb, Chief of the Division of Medical Oncology, Moncton Hospital, Canada

You can visit us online at www.esmo.org. Follow us on Twitter @myesmo. Find us on Facebook www.facebook.com/esmo.org
Proven efficacy vs gefitinib (PFS and TTF) and vs chemotherapy in 1st-line EGFR M+ NSCLC1-4*