

INTERVIEW

Johanna C Bendell, MD

Dr Bendell is Director of GI Oncology Research and Associate Director of the Drug Development Unit at Sarah Cannon Research Institute in Nashville, Tennessee.

Tracks 1-19

- Track 1 Case discussion: A 65-year-old patient with HER2-positive, metastatic gastroesophageal carcinoma
- Track 2 Chemotherapy and trastuzumab in metastatic gastric cancer (GC)
- Track 3 Investigation of T-DM1 and pertuzumab in HER2-positive advanced GC
- Track 4 REGARD: Results from a Phase III trial of ramucirumab as second-line therapy for metastatic gastric or gastroesophageal junction cancer
- Track 5 Ongoing trials of ramucirumab in GC and other solid tumors
- Track 6 Case discussion: A 40-year-old patient with resected Stage III colon cancer discontinues adjuvant FOLFOX due to toxicity
- Track 7 Considerations for use of adjuvant capecitabine
- Track 8 Use of adjuvant oxaliplatin for Stage III colon cancer
- Track 9 Perspective on the use of oxaliplatin in elderly patients and those with Stage II colon cancer
- Track 10 Validation of the Oncotype DX® Colon Cancer assay Recurrence Score® (RS) as a predictor of recurrence risk in patients with Stage II and III colon cancer treated with 5-FU/leucovorin with or without oxaliplatin on the NSABP-C-07 trial

- Track 11 Utility of the Onco*type* DX and ColoPrint[®] assays in colon cancer
- Track 12 Case discussion: A 52-year-old patient with a KRAS/BRAF wild-type moderately differentiated adenocarcinoma of the colon treated with neoadjuvant FOLFOX/ bevacizumab
- Track 13 Treatment holidays in the management of metastatic colorectal cancer (mCRC)
- Track 14 Role of maintenance bevacizumab in mCRC
- Track 15 New options for continued anti-angiogenic treatment after disease progression on first-line therapy for mCRC
- Track 16 Clinical experience with aflibercept and regorafenib
- Track 17 Case discussion: A 56-year-old patient with locally advanced, poorly differentiated adenocarcinoma of the head of the pancreas
- Track18 MPACT: Results from a Phase III study of weekly nanoparticle albumin-bound (*nab*) paclitaxel with gemcitabine versus gemcitabine alone for metastatic adenocarcinoma of the pancreas
- Track 19 Use of *nab* paclitaxel/gemcitabine for older patients with metastatic pancreatic cancer

Select Excerpts from the Interview

Track 3

DR LOVE: The ToGA trial previously demonstrated a survival advantage with the addition of trastuzumab to chemotherapy for patients with HER2-positive advanced gastric cancer (GC). What other HER2-targeted therapies are currently under investigation in HER2-positive GC?

DR BENDELL: T-DM1 is currently under investigation as second-line therapy for advanced disease (2.1). We're excited about T-DM1 in GC as well as the data coming from studies of pertuzumab combined with trastuzumab. Additional ongoing studies are investigating anti-HER2 therapies in the first-line and locally advanced settings.

2.1 Select Ongoing Clinical Trials of HER2-Directed Therapies in Gastric Cancer (GC), Including Adenocarcinoma of the Gastroesophageal Junction (GEJ)

rial ID	Phase	Treatment arms	Patient population
NCT01641939	111	• T-DM1 (3.6 mg/kg, q3wk) • T-DM1 (2.4 mg/kg, q1wk) • Taxane	Previously treated locally advanced or metastatic GC
NCT01774786	111	Pertuzumab/trastuzumab/CTPlacebo/trastuzumab/CT	Chemotherapy and HER2-directed therapy-naïve metastatic GC or GEJ
NCT01702558	II	• T-DM1/capecitabine	Previously treated locally advanced or metastatic GC
NCT01191697	II	Trastuzumab/CAPOX/bev	Metastatic GEJ

CT = chemotherapy; bev = bevacizumab

www.clinicaltrials.gov, June 2013.

Tracks 4-5

DR LOVE: Would you discuss the results of the Phase III REGARD trial evaluating second-line ramucirumab for metastatic GC or gastroesophageal junction cancer (Fuchs 2013; [2.2])?

DR BENDELL: Ramucirumab is a fully human monoclonal antibody directed against VEGFR-2. Whereas bevacizumab binds to the ligand, ramucirumab binds to the receptor. In the REGARD study, patients were randomly assigned to receive ramuci-

2 REGARD: A Phase III Best Supportive Care for Metastatic Gas	(BSC) versus Pl	acebo and BSC	as Second-Line	e Therapy
Efficacy	Ramucirumab $(n = 238)$	Placebo (n = 117)	Hazard ratio	Log-rank <i>p</i> -value
Median overall survival	5.2 mo	3.8 mo	0.776	0.0473
Median progression-free survival	2.1 mo	1.3 mo	0.483	< 0.0001
Response rate (CR + PR)	3.4%	2.6%	_	0.756
Select adverse events, Grade ≥3	Ramucirumab (n = 236)		Placebo (n = 115)	
Fatigue	6.4%		9.6	5%
Hypertension	7.6%		2.6	5%
Anemia	6.4	1%	7.8	%

CR = complete response; PR = partial response

Fuchs S et al. Gastrointestinal Cancers Symposium 2013; Abstract LBA5.

rumab or placebo. Improvements were observed in overall and progression-free survival with ramucirumab. A few years ago, data from the AVAGAST study of capecitabine/ cisplatin with or without bevacizumab as first-line therapy for patients with GC reported no improvements in overall survival (Ohtsu 2011). However, on subgroup analysis, particularly of patients in the United States, a significant trend toward improvement in overall and progression-free survival was observed with bevacizumab.

Differences in the epidemiology of GC worldwide have been discussed. In the United States, GC with much poorer prognosis tends to be present, which, for unknown reasons, appears to be more susceptible to anti-angiogenic agents. In the REGARD study, most patients received ramucirumab in North America. This may explain why the REGARD study was positive, whereas AVAGAST wasn't.

We're awaiting results from 2 other studies: The RAINBOW trial, which is evaluating second-line paclitaxel with or without ramucirumab, and a first-line Phase II study of FOLFOX with or without ramucirumab. Patients with metastatic gastroesophageal cancer definitely need more treatment options. Most patients don't make it to second-line therapy, and those who do have a poor survival of approximately 4 months. The availability of more agents should result in a better survival.

📊 Tracks 15-16

DR LOVE: Given the new options for continued angiogenic inhibition after progression on first-line therapy, how do you approach the treatment of metastatic colorectal cancer (mCRC)?

DR BENDELL: The ARIES (Bendell 2012) and BRiTE (Grothey 2008) registrational trials initially investigated bevacizumab beyond progression, and benefits in the TML study (2.3) weren't as robust as those observed in ARIES or BRiTE. This suggests that doctors can select patients who are benefiting from anti-angiogenic therapy better than the trials. The patients who benefit from bevacizumab beyond first progression are those for whom up-front bevacizumab-based chemotherapy was beneficial and well tolerated. The decision for bevacizumab continuation as second-line therapy boils down to individual patient outcomes in the first line.

If a patient fared well with bevacizumab-based chemotherapy, such as FOLFOX, in the first-line setting, then I'm more inclined to continue bevacizumab with FOLFIRI into the second line. If a patient experienced rapid progression on first-line bevacizumab-based therapy, I may consider switching up the anti-angiogenic agent to something like afliber-

Addition of Bevac Chemotherapy (C		o Crossover Flu with Metastati	oropyrimidine-B	
Efficacy	CT + bev (n = 409)	CT (n = 410)	Hazard ratio	<i>p</i> -value
Median overall survival	11.2 mo	9.8 mo	0.81	0.0062
Median progression-free survival	5.7 mo	4.1 mo	0.68	< 0.0001

cept. And, although it's good to now have regorafenib as an available option for mCRC, we are far from being able to identify those patients who might best benefit from it.

Aflibercept in combination with FOLFIRI improved overall and progression-free survival in the Phase III VELOUR trial (2.4). In my practice, the major side effect associated with aflibercept is asthenia. I also observe an increased incidence of diarrhea and neutropenia.

In terms of regorafenib, I have been seeing a patient for 5 years who had received all systemic chemotherapies. He also participated in 3 Phase I trials for patients with refractory disease. I was running out of options when regorafenib received FDA approval. I initiated treatment and was thrilled because after 2 cycles of regorafenib, his CEA level dropped, he experienced a minor response and he is currently tolerating it well. Like sorafenib, the major side effects of regorafenib are fatigue and hand-foot syndrome (2.5). For the latter, I recommend a urea-based cream thrice daily.

VELOUR: A Phase I with FOLFIRI as Se				
Survival	FOLFIRI + aflibercept (n = 612)	FOLFIRI + placebo (n = 614)	Hazard ratio	<i>p</i> -value
Median progression-free survival	6.9 mo	4.7 mo	0.758	< 0.0001
Median overall survival	13.5 mo	12.1 mo	0.817	0.0032
elect adverse events (Grades 3-4)	FOLFIRI + aflibercept (n = 611)		FOLFIRI + placebo (n = 605)	
Neutropenia	36.7%		29.5	5%
Asthenic conditions	16.8%		10.6%	
Diarrhea	19.3%		7.8%	

Van Cutsem E et al. J Clin Oncol 2012;30(28):3499-506.

2.5

CORRECT: A Phase III Trial of Regorafenib with Best Supportive Care (BSC) versus Placebo with BSC for Patients with Metastatic Colorectal Cancer Who Experience Disease Progression After Standard Therapies

Efficacy	Regorafenib + BSC (n = 505)	Placebo + BSC (n = 255)	Hazard ratio	<i>p</i> -value
Median overall survival	6.4 mo	5.0 mo	0.77	0.0052
Median progression-free survival	1.9 mo	1.7 mo	0.49	< 0.0001
Disease control rate	41.0%	15%	—	< 0.0001
	Regorafenib +	BSC (n = 500)	Placebo + BSC (n = 253)	
Select adverse events	All grades	Grade 3 or 4	All grades	Grade 3 or 4
Hand-foot skin reaction	47%	16.6%	8%	0.4%
Fatigue	47%	9.6%	28%	5.1%

Grothey A et al. Lancet 2013;381(9863):303-12.

Track 18

DR LOVE: What are your thoughts on the results of the Phase III MPACT study of gemcitabine with or without weekly *nab* paclitaxel for metastatic pancreatic cancer?

DR BENDELL: This study showed that the *nab* paclitaxel/gemcitabine regimen is effective with overall and progression-free survival benefits (Von Hoff 2013; [2.6]). The MPACT study was conducted in a different patient population from the ACCORD-11 trial of FOLFIRINOX, which was conducted exclusively in France by investigators who understood and knew how to administer FOLFIRINOX. The ACCORD-11 study provided patients with growth factors and strong antiemetics and included adequate supportive care and dose reductions to manage toxicities.

DR LOVE: Typically, younger patients with metastatic pancreatic cancer are treated with FOLFIRINOX. Based on the results of the MPACT study, would you consider *nab* paclitaxel/gemcitabine as an option in this setting?

DR BENDELL: We were involved in the MPACT trial, but I would like to have more experience with *nab* paclitaxel/gemcitabine in terms of toxicities. The primary toxicities I observed were blood count issues, so I administered growth factors on occasion, not automatically as I do with FOLFIRINOX. I have also observed numbness, tingling and neuropathy but primarily hematologic toxicities. I would also like to get a personal feel for its efficacy compared to that of modified FOLFIRINOX.

Efficacy outcome	<i>nab-P/Gem</i> (n = 431)	Gem (n = 430)	Hazard ratio	<i>p</i> -value
Median OS	8.5 months	6.7 months	0.72	0.000015
Median PFS	5.5 months	3.7 months	0.69	0.000024
ORR (independent review)	23%	7%	_	1.1 x 10 ⁻¹⁰
Grade ≥3 adverse events	<i>nab</i> -P/Gem (n = 421)		Gem (n = 402)	
Neutropenia	38%		27%	
Leukopenia	31%		16%	
Fatigue	17%		7%	
Peripheral neuropathy	17%		<1%	

Von Hoff DD et al. Gastrointestinal Cancers Symposium 2013; Abstract LBA148.

SELECT PUBLICATIONS

Bendell JC et al. Treatment patterns and clinical outcomes in patients with metastatic colorectal cancer initially treated with FOLFOX-bevacizumab or FOLFIRI-bevacizumab: Results from ARIES, a bevacizumab observational cohort study. *Oncologist* 2012;17(12):1486-95.

Grothey A et al. Bevacizumab beyond first progression is associated with prolonged overall survival in metastatic colorectal cancer: Results from a large observational cohort study (BRITE). J Clin Oncol 2008;26(33):5326-34.

Ohtsu A et al. Bevacizumab in combination with chemotherapy as first-line therapy in advanced gastric cancer: A randomized, double-blind, placebo-controlled Phase III study. J Clin Oncol 2011;29(30):3968-76.