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Enrichment in drug development

• **Enrichment**: Prospective use of any patient characteristic to select a study population in which detection of a drug effect (if one is in fact present) is more likely than it would be in an unselected population

  – Strategies to decrease heterogeneity – reduce inter-patient and intra-patient heterogeneity
  
  – Prognostic enrichment strategies – choosing patients with a greater likelihood of having a disease-related endpoint event
  
  – Predictive enrichment strategies – choosing patients more likely to respond to the drug treatment (i.e., treatment selection using a biomarker)

• If successful, may lead to companion diagnostic

Predictive biomarker definition

- A biomarker associated with benefit or lack of benefit (potentially even harm) from a particular therapy relative to other available therapy.

- **FDA-NIH “BEST” glossary definition**: A biomarker used to identify individuals who are more likely than similar patients without the biomarker to experience a favorable or unfavorable effect from a specific intervention or exposure.¹

“Ideal” biomarker for trial enrichment and companion diagnostic (predictive biomarker) development

- **Patients who benefit from new therapy**
- **Patients who do not benefit from new therapy**

Biomarker-defined subgroup

“Precision medicine”
Biomarker **useful** for trial enrichment, and likely for companion diagnostic (predictive biomarker) development

- **Patients who benefit from new therapy**
- **Patients who do not benefit from new therapy**

Biomarker-defined subgroup
Biomarker **not cost-effective** to use for trial enrichment or companion diagnostic (predictive biomarker) development

Patients who benefit from new therapy

Patients who do not benefit from new therapy

Biomarker-defined subgroup
No drug effect for a biomarker to find

Patients who benefit from new therapy

Biomarker?

Patients who do not benefit from new therapy
A series of questions to answer

• Q1: Does the drug work in any patients?
• Q2: If the drug does not work in all patients, is there a subset in which it does work?
• Q3: If the drug works in only a subset, is there a biomarker that defines that subset?
• Q4: If a biomarker is needed, what is the best way to measure it?
Tension between assay development and therapeutic development

• **Assay analytical performance** – minimum requirements in early trials
  – Sufficient reproducibility so that study could be repeated
  – Fit for use on anticipated specimen types (specimen format, processing & handling)

• **First priority** is usually to establish that the new agent has promising **activity**
  – Biomarker has to be “good enough” to capture a sufficient portion of the patients who will benefit in order to see signal
  – Later biomarker refinement often needed
Predictive biomarker development & evaluation

• Must have **biomarker and assay to measure it**
  – *Predictive ability transfers* from pre-clinical models to human
  – Assay requirements: *acceptable reproducibility* and *fit for use on clinical specimens* (may have limited availability)
  – Flexibility for assay evolution, but eventually need *locked assay* with established *analytical performance*

• Typically proceed through **phase II and III trials**
  – Trial design choices depend on *biomarker credentials* and *question(s)* one wishes to answer at each stage
  – *First priority* usually to establish *promising activity* of new agent
  – Biomarker has to be “*good enough*” to capture a sufficient patients who will benefit in order *to see signal of activity*
  – *Sometimes retrospective studies* using banked trial specimens are possible

• **Failure may be due to drug and or biomarker/assay**
Non-randomized biomarker-guided phase II studies

Can we detect “signal” of activity at least in subgroup defined by “best guess” biomarker?

- **Biomarker enrichment**
  - Biomarker positivity required for patient eligibility
  - Biomarker-driven is appealing, aids accrual

- **Biomarker stratification**
  - Consider results combined and separately within biomarker positive and negative subgroups
  - May include biomarker-based adaptive features

McShane L et al., *Clin Cancer Res* 2009;15:1898-1905
Freidlin B et al., *J Clin Oncol* 2012;30:3304-3309
Reasons to conduct randomized trials (phase II and III designs)

- Desired endpoint is a time-to-event endpoint and prognostic effect of biomarker cannot be ruled out.
- If agent not expected to deliver robust tumor shrinkage (e.g., cytostatic), what are the appropriate benchmarks for endpoints such as PFS or SD within biomarker-defined subgroups if no randomization?
- Other effective therapies available.
- New (biomarker-directed) agent will be tested *in combination* with a standard therapy (standard therapy ± new agent)?
Prognostic vs. predictive: Importance of control groups

Prognostic but not predictive (M = biomarker)

Prognostic and predictive
CLINICALLY USEFUL predictive biomarker

Qualitative interaction: Patients “positive” for the biomarker benefit from the treatment but others receive no benefit or possibly even harm.

How *NOT* to parse evidence for a candidate predictive biomarker

NEW TREATMENT:
BIOMARKER POS > BIOMARKER NEG

STANDARD TREATMENT:
BIOMARKER POS = BIOMARKER NEG (NOT PROGNOSTIC)
How to CORRECTLY parse evidence for a candidate predictive biomarker

BIOMARKER POS: NEW TRT > STD TRT

Now we see that the biomarker is not useful for selection of new treatment (because both patient subgroups benefit).

Quantitative interaction: Treatment benefits all patients but by different amounts
Plasma IL-6 as predictive biomarker for pazopanib vs. placebo?


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Interleukin 6</th>
<th>PFS (weeks)</th>
<th>HR (95% CI)</th>
<th>p value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>42.3</td>
<td>24.0</td>
<td>0.55 (0.38-0.81)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>32.6</td>
<td>9.9</td>
<td>0.31 (0.21-0.44)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Prognostic: P<0.0001

Usefully predictive? Quantitative interaction: P=0.009

Does treatment benefit all? Is the biomarker cutpoint wrong?
# PD-L1 expression as a predictive biomarker in cancer immunotherapy

The story becomes even more complex when looking at PFS and OS endpoints

(Adapted from Table 3 in Patel & Kurzrock, *Mol Cancer Ther* 2015;14(4):847-856)
EGFR mutation predictive for PFS benefit with gefitinib in NSCLC (IPASS trial)


**EGFR mutation:**
- 60% mutated
- Positive prognostic factor
- Positive predictive factor for gefitinib benefit (qualitative interaction, p<0.001)

**IPASS:** Phase III 1st line advanced adeno NSCLC
gefitinib vs. carboplatin+paclitaxel

**Cessation of chemo?**

**ALL PATIENTS**
P<0.001, HR=0.74
95% CI=0.65-0.85

**EGFR MUT-POS**
P<0.001, HR=0.48,
95% CI=0.36-0.64

**EGFR MUT-NEG**
P<0.001, HR=2.85
95% CI=2.05-3.98

![Graphs showing survival outcomes for different groups based on EGFR mutation status.](image-url)
IPASS Trial: Evaluation of EGFR mutation as a predictive marker (OS)
Gefitinib vs. Chemo in NSCLC: Biomarker and Survival Analyses

Fukuoka et al 2011, J Clin Oncol 29:2866-2874

Marker Availability
IHC 30%
FISH 33%
MUT 36%

Marker values lacking for over half of the cases
IPASS Trial: Evaluation of EGFR mutation as a predictive marker (OS)
Gefitinib Versus Chemo in NSCLC: Biomarker and Survival Analyses

Fukuoka et al 2011, J Clin Oncol 29:2866-2874

Marker Positivity*
IHC 73%
FISH 61%
MUT 60%

*These rates are high because these were patients in East Asia who were nonsmokers or former light smokers.

The only statistically significant benefit was in the subgroup with EGFR mutation status unknown.

High rates of crossover; other EGFR-inhibitors showed benefit in unselected patients in second line setting.
Randomized phase III biomarker-driven trial designs with time-to-event endpoint

• **Basic designs**
  – Biomarker-Enrichment
  – Biomarker-Strategy
  – Biomarker-Stratified

• **Typical clinical endpoints (depends on context)**
  – Overall survival (OS)
  – Disease-free survival (DFS)
  – Relapse-free survival (RFS)

Biomarker-enrichment design

- Based in knowledge of biology (New agent → Molecular target)
- Control therapy arm controls for marker prognostic effect
- Variation: Standard therapy ± new agent
- Limitations:
  - Off-target effects of new agent not fully evaluated
  - Regulatory indication limited to marker+ group
  - Marker refinement within trial (form of marker or assay) limited to marker+ group

All patients \[ \xrightarrow{\text{Marker assay}} \] Marker + \[ \xrightarrow{\text{R}} \] OFF study

New agent

R = randomization
Biomarker-strategy design

- Marker-guided treatment sounds attractive
- Might be only realistic option for complex multi-marker guided strategies, but can’t separate biomarker and drug effects
- Must measure marker in non-guided control arm to distinguish prognostic effect
- Non-guided randomization allows assessment of new agent effect in marker–
- Statistical inefficiency
  - Marker– patients receive same therapy on both arms in standard strategy design
  - If randomize non-guided group, even more inefficient
Biomarker-stratified design

- Allows maximum information
  - Controls for prognostic effect of marker
  - Directly compares new agent to control therapy in all patients
- Allows retrospective evaluation of different markers or assays
- Variation: Standard therapy ± new agent
- Completely randomized design with retrospective marker evaluation is an option, but assay results might not be available for 100% of patients
- Different approaches to testing in biomarker subgroups (Freidlin & Korn, Nat Rev Clin Oncol 2014;11: 81–90 )
Randomized phase II/III trial design

Issues

- Choice of intermediate endpoint (IE)
- Define “promising” activity for Phase II (error rates, timing of analyses)
- Accrual suspension to allow Phase II data to mature

Initiate randomized phase II trial in biomarker POSITIVE* patients (N₁/2 patients per arm)

Follow N₁ patients for intermediate endpoint (e.g., IE = PFS, RR)

Activity on IE?

Promising

Initiate randomized phase III trial

Continue to follow the N₁ phase II patients for definitive phase III endpoint (e.g., OS)

Insufficient

STOP trial

Accrue N₂ additional biomarker POSITIVE patients into phase III trial (N₂/2 randomized to each arm) and follow for definitive endpoint*

Primary analysis

*Design can also be used without enrichment, or be stratified by biomarker

Hunsberger S et al., Clin Cancer Res 2009; 15:5950-5955
Korn E et al., J Clin Oncol 2012; 30:667-671
Onartuzumab example
Phase II trial followed by separate phase III trial

- MET – transmembrane receptor tyrosine kinase (RTK), which binds hepatocyte growth factor (HGF) is associated with poor prognosis and acquired resistance to EGFR-targeted drugs
- Onartuzumab (MetMab) – a recombinant, humanized monovalent monoclonal antibody targeting MET
- Extensive development to optimize MET IHC assay\(^1\) for use in a phase II trial with MET status integral to one of co-primary hypotheses\(^2\)

\(^1\)Koeppen et al. *Clin Cancer Res* 2014;20(17):4488-4498
Onartuzumab example (cont.)
Phase II trial followed by separate phase III trial

- Development process for MET IHC assay¹
  - 16 antibodies tested; SP44 selected
  - SP44 intensities associated with MET protein expression by Western, other anti-MET antibody, and flow cytometry; mRNA expression

Fig S3. MET mRNA levels vs. MET IHC staining intensity in NSCLC cell lines

Table S4. SP44 IHC scores for tissue sections cut from two separate blocks of 10 different NSCLCs

Onartuzumab phase II NSCLC trial results

• Successful randomized double blind phase II trial of erlotinib (E) +/- onartuzumab (O) in patients (n=137) with recurrent advanced NSCLC (OAM4558g)\(^1\)

  – Co-primary endpoints: PFS in ITT and MET-POS
  – ITT pop’n: PFS HR=1.09 (p=0.69), OS HR=0.80 (p=0.34)
  – MET-POS (54% MET-POS by IHC 2+/3+ on intensity and percent staining):
    • PFS HR=0.53 (p=0.04), Median 1.5 (E) vs. 2.9 (E+O) mos. (27 vs 20 events)
    • OS HR=0.37 (p=0.002), Median 3.8 (E) vs. 12.6 (E+O) mos. (26 vs 16 events)
  – MET-NEG: PFS HR=1.82 (p=0.05), OS HR=1.78 (p=0.16)

\(^1\)Spigel et al. *J Clin Oncol* 2013;31(32):4105-4114
Onartuzumab phase III NSCLC trial results

- **MetLung Trial**: Randomized double blind phase III trial of erlotinib (E) +/- onartuzumab (O) in patients with recurrent advanced NSCLC who were MET-POS by IHC
  - Primary endpoint Overall Survival (OS)
  - Planned sample size N=490 randomized
- **Stopped for futility** after 499 patients enrolled (244 events)
  - O+E did not improve survival:
    - HR=1.27, p=0.068, median OS 6.8 mos. vs. 9.1 mos.

Wrong drug, biomarker, or biology; or just bad luck?²

¹Spigel et al. *J Clin Oncol* 2014;32:5s (suppl; abstr 8000)
²Hirsch et al. *Clin Cancer Res* 2014;20:4422-4424
New generation of oncology clinical trial designs (phase II, III, and II/III)

- Basket/bucket trials – variety of cancer types; single drug targeting a single mutation
- Umbrella trials – multiple biomarker-based cohorts, each matched to a drug; single or multiple histology/cancer types (NCI-MATCH, BATTLE trials, Lung-MAP, ALCHEMIST)
- Platform trials - standing trial structure, multiple agents enter and exit, single cancer type, possibly biomarker-driven or adaptive (I-SPY2 trial, FOCUS trials)
- Combinations of the above (e.g., basket umbrella trial)

  - Abrams et al., ASCO Educ Book 2014, pp. 71-76 (NCI-MATCH, Lung-MAP, ALCHEMIST)
  - Barker et al., Clin Pharm & Ther 2009;86:97-100 (I-SPY2)
  - Kaplan et al., J Clin Oncol 2013;31:4562-4568 (FOCUS)
  - Kim et al., Cancer Discovery 2011;1:44-53 (BATTLE)
  - Kummar et al., J Natl Cancer Inst 2015;107(4):djv003 (review of molecular profiling trials)
Lung-MAP: Version 1
Randomized phase II/III umbrella basket trial
Squamous NSCLC; incurable IIIB or IV; failed ≥ 1 chemo; measurable Disease; PS ≤ 2

FMI NGS/MET IHC

Non-match (Anti-PD-L1)

PI3K PIK3CA mut

CDK4/6 CCND1, CCND2, CCND3, cdk4 ampl

FGFR FGFR ampl, mut, fusion

HGF c-Met Expr

Arm^1 | Arm^2
--- | ---
^1 Medi4736 ^2 Docetaxel
^1 GDC-0032 ^2 Docetaxel
^1 Palbociclib ^2 Docetaxel
^1 AZD4547 ^2 Docetaxel
^1 Rilotumumab + erlotinib ^2 Erlotinib

1:1
Lung-MAP: Version 1
Phase II/III design for each sub-study

- Phase II Analysis: 55 PFS events
- Phase III Interim Analyses: OS for efficacy, PFS/OS for futility
- Complete Accrual: 256 OS events, 290 PFS events
- Final Analysis
- Stop after 12 months follow-up
Lung-MAP TRIAL: Version 2

Lung-MAP (SWOG S1400) is a multi-drug, multi-sub-study, biomarker-driven squamous cell lung cancer clinical trial that uses state-of-the-art genomic profiling to match patients to sub-studies testing investigational treatments that may target the genomic alterations, or mutations, found to be driving the growth of their cancer.

Design change required after approval of nivolumab changed standard of care for advanced squamous NSCLC.

http://www.lung-map.org/about-lung-map
**Primary objective:** To evaluate the proportion of patients with objective response (OR) to targeted study agent(s) in patients with advanced refractory cancers and lymphomas

**Secondary objectives:** To evaluate the proportion of patients with PFS >= 6 months of treatment with targeted study agent(s) in patients with advanced refractory cancers and lymphomas

**Signal finding trial:** Patients who have advanced disease that progressed on at least one standard therapy or for which there is no known effective therapy. Master screening protocol directing to multiple biomarker-based mixed histology single arm phase II trial sub-protocols.

NCI MATCH trial design*

- One-stage design (each arm)
  - 31 evaluable patients per arm
  - N = 35 total
- 4066 mutations of interest on targeted NGS panel (plus PTEN IHC) used for treatment assignment
- Primary endpoint: Overall Response Rate
  - H0: ≤ 5% vs Ha: 25%
  - Reject H0 if ≥ 5/31 responses
  - Type I error 1.8% / arm (one-sided)
  - Power 92%
- Secondary endpoints: Progression Free Survival (PFS)
  - 6 months 15% (med PFS 2.2 m) vs 35% (med PFS 4 m)

*Currently screening > 100 patients per week to find matches for 24 arms

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Arm</th>
<th>Target</th>
<th>Drug(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>EGFR mut</td>
<td>Afatinib</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>HER2 mut</td>
<td>Afatinib</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C1</td>
<td>MET amp</td>
<td>Crizotinib</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C2</td>
<td>MET ex 14 sk</td>
<td>Crizotinib</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>EGFR T790M</td>
<td>AZD9291</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>ALK transloc</td>
<td>Crizotinib</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G</td>
<td>ROS1 transloc</td>
<td>Crizotinib</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H</td>
<td>BRAF V600</td>
<td>Dabrafenib+ trametinib</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>PIK3CA mut</td>
<td>Taselisib</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>PTEN mut</td>
<td>GSK2636771</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P</td>
<td>PTEN loss</td>
<td>GSK2636771</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q</td>
<td>HER 2 amp</td>
<td>Ado-trastuzumab emtansine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R</td>
<td>BRAF nonV600</td>
<td>Trametinib</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S1</td>
<td>NF1 mut</td>
<td>Trametinib</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S2</td>
<td>GNAQ/GNA11</td>
<td>Trametinib</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T</td>
<td>SMO/PTCH1</td>
<td>Vismodegib</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U</td>
<td>NF2 loss</td>
<td>Defactinib</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V</td>
<td>cKIT mut</td>
<td>Sunitinib</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W</td>
<td>FGFR1/2/3</td>
<td>AZD 4547</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X</td>
<td>DDR2 mut</td>
<td>Dasatinib</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y</td>
<td>AKT1 mut</td>
<td>AZD 5363</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Z1A</td>
<td>NRAS mut</td>
<td>Binimetinib</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Z1B</td>
<td>CCND1,2,3 amp</td>
<td>Palbociclib</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Z1D</td>
<td>dMMR</td>
<td>Nivolumab</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Challenges: Current and future

- Interdependency between validation of a predictive biomarker and establishing efficacy of matched drug
  - Biomarker enrichment in trials only needs to be “good enough” to find sufficient drug activity; tension with goals for patient care

- Biomarker and its assay may evolve over a series of trials; refinements may occur after trials completed
  - Danger of repeatedly “refined” biomarker assays wandering too far from actual clinical outcome data

- Randomized and “all-comers” trials increasingly challenging due to rapid acceptance of targeted drugs based on robust response rates alone and sometimes premature faith in a biomarker

- As biomarker-defined subgroups continue to shrink, umbrella-type trials for screening on national or international scale will become essential
  - NCI MATCH experience suggests enthusiasm is high