Checkpoint inhibitors:
What's known (lessons learned) and
What's new (perspectives)

Ahmad Awada, MD, PhD

Head of Oncology Medicine Department
Institut Jules Bordet
Université Libre de Bruxelles (U.L.B.)
Brussels – Belgium

The partners of oncology progress

Biologists
- **Hallmarks of cancer**
- **Driver targets**
- **Critical pathways**

Sequencers
- **Individual tumor genomic landscapes**

Targeted therapy of cancer

Chemists
- **Selective drugs to molecular aberration**

Clinical researchers
- **Innovative drug development methodology**

Eight lessons learned from the development of dozens of molecular-targeted therapies (1)

► Treatment of unselected populations should be discouraged

► The identification of a driver genetic abnormality and the discovery of a selective agent are key

► 'Rare' tumors are 'good' niches for MTTs

► Discovery of the resistance mechanisms is a high priority

Eight lessons learned from the development of dozens of molecular-targeted therapies (2)

► One gene may predict resistance, but no single gene, protein, or pathway can predict full efficacy

► Chemotherapy (also radiotherapy) remains important for synergy with targeted agents in selective settings

► Better outcomes are seen in the metastatic setting than in the adjuvant one

► Expected and unexpected side effects can arise from MTTs

Activating and inhibitory receptors on T cells: basis of modern immunotherapy

Lesson 1: Checkpoint inhibitors are so far approved in several solid tumors or histologically agnostic tumors, but there are more to come…

A. Awada. Personal communication 2018.

Approved immune checkpoint inhibitors in solid tumors

► <u>Melanoma:</u> nivolumab ± ipilimumab, pembrolizumab (1st line)

► <u>NSCLC:</u> pembrolizumab ± chemotherapy (1st line PD-L1 ≥ 50%)

► <u>NSCLC (sq. and non-sq.):</u> nivolumab, pembrolizumab and atezolizumab (chemo pretreated)

► <u>RCC:</u>* nivolumab (prior TKIs); nivolumab + ipilimumab (1st line)

► <u>Bladder:</u> several checkpoint inhibitors

► <u>Head and neck:</u> pembrolizumab, nivolumab…

► <u>Merkel cell carcinoma:</u> avelumab

► <u>MSI tumors:</u>* pembrolizumab, nivolumab

Slide shows a mixture of EMA and FDA approvals

and more to come…

Any off-label data shown are used to support the educational message of the presentation and not intended to endorse use of any drug in any way

Lesson 2: Solid tumors do not respond equally to checkpoint inhibitors

Efficacy of checkpoint inhibitors in different solid tumors: <u>virus-</u>induced tumors as an example

Tumor (virus)	ORR (%)	Disease control rate (%)
Hepatocellular (HBV, HCV)	14–17	68
Cervix (HPV)	13	25
Merkel (polyomavirus)	30	41
Anal (HPV, HIV)	27	70
Head and neck/nasopharyngeal (EBV)	11–18/26	15–36
Gastric/GEJ (EBV)	9–26	29–38

<u>Question:</u> How can we improve efficacy? Combinations? …

Limited efficacy so far of single-agent checkpoint inhibitors in other solid tumors

| Tumor	ORR (%)	Disease control rate (%)
Prostate[1]	13	NA
Ovarian	11–15	NA
TNBC	9–19	31–46
ER+ BC	3–12	28
Neuroendocrine	6–12 (lung 20%)	60–88
Biliary tract cancers	6–18	NA

Question: How to transform cold tumors to hot tumors?

Lesson 3: Combinations based on immunotherapies: huge potential and setting/tumor dependency

# Combination therapy based on immunotherapies: a means to overcome resistance!

Examples of checkpoint inhibitors Combinations + other molecular-targeted agents or chemotherapy

▶ Checkpoint inhibitors + VEGF(R) inhibitors

▶ Checkpoint inhibitors + chemotherapy agents

Angiogenesis (VEGF) leads to an immunosuppressive tumor microenvironment

Ott et al. Front Oncol 2015;5:202.

Selected studies of CPIs + VEGF-targeted therapies in renal cell carcinoma

Agents	No. of patients (line)	ORR, %	DCR, %
Atezolizumab + bevacizumab	454 (1st)	43% (PDL1+)	–
Nivolumab + sunitinib	33 (1st)	51	81
Nivolumab + pazopanib	20 (1st)	45	80
Tremelimumab + sunitinib	21 (1st or 2nd)	43	76
Pembrolizumab + bevacizumab	14 (2nd)	71	NA
Pembrolizumab + lenvatinib	30	63	NA
Pembrolizumab + axitinib	52 (1st)	71	90

Checkpoint inhibitors + chemotherapy

▶ **ESMO LBA1_PR.** IMpassion130: atezolizumab + nab-paclitaxel first-line improved OS in PD-L1+ TNBC[1]

▶ **ESMO LBA8_PR.** Pembrolizumab ± PF improved OS vs PF + cetuximab in recurrent/metastatic head and neck cancer (PD-L1+)[2]

▶ **CheckMate 227,[3] IMpower 150[4] and 131[5], KEYNOTE-189[6] and 407[7]:** five studies showed benefit in 1st-line NSCLC

Checkpoint inhibitors + other immunotherapy approaches

▶ Ipilimumab (CTLA4) + nivolumab (PD-1)

▶ Durvalumab (PD-L1) + MEDI 0680 (PD-1)

▶ Pembrolizumab (PD1) + epacadostat (IDO)*

▶ Nivolumab (PD-1) + BMS-986016 (LAG3)

▶ Nivolumab (PD-1) + mogamulizumab (CCR4)

▶ Nivolumab (PD-1) + ISA101 (vaccine)

Ipilimumab (CTLA4) + nivolumab (PD-1) in solid cancers

Ref.	Tumor type, line of therapy (no. of pts)	ORR, %	DCR, %
Lenz et al. ESMO 2018[1]	CRC (MSI-H or dMMR), 1st line	60 (CR 7%)	NA
Janjigian et al. ASCO 2017[2]	Upper GI	23–40 (PD-L1 ≥ 1%) 0–22 (PD-L1 < 1%)	NA
Antonia et al. Lancet Oncol 2016[3]	SCLC, ≥ 1 line (115)	21	40
Zalcman et al. ESMO 2017[4]	Mesothelioma, > 1 line	28	50
Hellmann et al. Lancet Oncol 2017[5]	NSCLC, 1st line (77)	43	68
ESMO 2017, LBA5[6]	RCC, 1st line	42	–
Wolchok et al. N Eng J Med 2017[7]	Melanoma, 1st line (314)	58	70

Lesson 4: Emerging data in the (neo)adjuvant/ consolidation settings are very encouraging (compared with other targeted agents)

► Melanoma (adjuvant): ipilimumab, nivolumab, pembrolizumab

► NSCLC (maintenance): durvalumab (PD-L1+)

► Neoadjuvant: lung (nivolumab pCR: 45%), MCC, TNBC (+ chemo), bladder (pembrolizumab pCR 42%), colon (dMMR)

Lesson 5: CPIs are active in melanoma brain metastases

What about other solid tumors?

Prospective phase II clinical trials of ipilimumab + nivolumab in locally untreated melanoma brain metastases presented at ASCO 2017[1,2]

Study	Therapy, Cohorts	Tot. No.	ORR IC %	ORR EC %	Gr3/4 AE%	Discontinuation due to AE
CMate 204	Ipi/nivo	75	55	49	52	31
ABC	A: Ipi/nivo	26	42*	48	46	27
	B: Nivo	25	20*	30	24	4
	C: Nivo	16	6	25	19	6

Cohorts A & B: Concordant Intra-& Extra-cranial Response*

*Includes patients with evaluable radiological assessments ≥ 12 weeks
† Intracranial metastases only

Intracranial Progression Free Survival

	A: Ipi+Nivo N=26	B: Nivo N=25	C: Nivo† N=16
Total N° Events, n (%)	14 (53%)	18 (72%)	14 (88%)
Med. PFS, mo (95% CI)	4.8 (2.6, NR)	2.7 (2.2, NR)	2.5 (1.4, NR)
6-mo PFS rate, % (95% CI)	46% (30–70%)	28% (16–54%)	13% (3–46%)

AE, adverse event; CI, confidence interval; EC, extracranial; Gr, grade; IC, intracranial; ipi, ipilimumab; nivo, nivolumab; NR, not reached; PFS, progression-free survival.
1. Tawbi et al. Presented at ASCO 2017; Abstract 9507. 2. Long et al. Presented at ASCO 2017; Abstract 9508.

Any off-label data shown are used to support the educational message of the presentation and not intended to endorse use of any drug in any way

Lesson 6: Resistance will emerge sooner or later. Understanding the mechanisms is key

Resistance mechanisms are multifactorial

MHC, major histocompatibility complex; SNP, single nucleotide polymorphism; TCR, T-cell receptor.
Slide provided courtesy of S. Aspeslagh. Figure adapted from Chen & Mellman. Immunity 2013;39:1–10.

Lesson 7: **Predictive biomarkers are present but not perfect**

Predictive biomarkers of checkpoint inhibitors under investigation

► **PD-L1 expression** (in tumor cells and/or tumor-infiltrating immune cells)

> **Overall, there is a correlation, but it is not perfect, and it is variable between drugs, antibodies used for staining, tumor types, and settings**

► **Mutational load/neoantigens:** emerging biomarker (e.g. NSCLC, etc.)

► **Gene signature** (e.g. IFNγ signature)?

► **TILs/CD8+T cells** (T-cell clonality or fraction)?

► **CRP? LDH?**

► **Combination of biomarkers** (e.g. immunogram...)

The cancer immunogram: value as a predictive tool to predict sensitivity/resistance to therapy?

Blank et al. Science 2016;352:658–60.

Lesson 8: The pattern of tumor responses is different from that of other anticancer agents

▶ Timing of tumor response (early vs late)

▶ Duration of response (under or after stopping therapy)

▶ Pseudoprogression (rare outside melanoma)

▶ Hyperprogression (10–20%)

Lesson 9: Survival is probably the best outcome in clinical trials (and not PFS!)

► Median survival time

► Percentage of surviving patients at different time points!

Lesson 10: Side effects are mainly autoimmune diseases, which could, rarely, be fatal if not quickly and well managed

Healthy organs affected by immune checkpoint blockade

Encephalitis, aseptic meningitis
Hypophysitis
Uveitis
Thyroiditis, hypothyroidism, hyperthyroidism
Dry mouth, mucositis
Pneumonitis
Rash, vitiligo
Thrombocytopenia, anemia
Myocarditis
Hepatitis
Pancreatitis, autoimmune diabetes
Adrenal insufficiency
Nephritis
Vasculitis
Colitis
Arthralgia
Neuropathy
Enteritis

Figure 1. Organs Affected by Immune Checkpoint Blockade.
Immune checkpoint blockade can result in inflammation of any organ. Shown are the most common immune-related adverse events that clinicians encounter in patients treated with immune checkpoint blockade.

Lesson 11: Some clinical answers but still a lot of challenging questions

Immune checkpoint inhibitors: clinical research questions (1)

▶ Fully define spectrum of clinical activity; endpoints?

▶ Optimal doses/schedules/sequences and duration of therapy

▶ How to optimally manage the side effects and other events under treatment?

Immune checkpoint inhibitors: clinical research questions (2)

► Role of the microbiome/use of antibiotics before or during therapy

► Benefit/risk in elderly patients/patients with organ grafts/patients with HIV

► Benefit/risk in patients with autoimmune diseases

► Efficacy in brain metastases (treatment or prevention)

Lesson 12: Checkpoint inhibitors are not the only approach.

Other immuno-oncology approaches are emerging

A. Awada. Personal communication 2018.

CAR-Ts CYAD-01 program at JB Institute

► CYAD-01: NKG2D receptor-based CAR-T targets
  - Eight stress ligands expressed across the hematologic/solid tumors

► CYAD-01: multiple administrations (safe) in ≠ solid tumors

► CYAD-01: combination with FOLFOX in CRC

Mode of action of oncolytic CVA21, an oncolytic virus

Tumor cells

CVA21 preferentially infects tumor cells expressing high levels of ICAM-1

CVA21 replicates rapidly, rupturing the tumor cell. Progeny virus and tumor antigens are released

Replicated viruses repeat the oncolytic process in nearby tumor cells

Adaptive immune response identifies and destroys tumor cells via activated cytotoxic T-cells,

Modern immunotherapy with CPIs has broken many dogmas in oncology… (1)

It is not true that

1. Immunotherapy does not work in bulky tumors

2. Immunotherapy works only in what were considered 'immunologic tumors', such as melanoma and RCC

3. Significant survival rates (cure?) are difficult to obtain in metastatic disease

Modern immunotherapy with CPIs has broken many dogmas in oncology… (2)

It is not true that

4. Early progressive disease should trigger stopping the therapy (so what about pseudoprogression and late responses?)

5. Immunotherapy should not be combined with chemotherapy (and/or radiotherapy)

6. Our management of patients with cancer (mainly metastatic disease) is still minor

But it is true that we are at the beginning, and we should continue to do hard but smart work to achieve more progress

Thank you

Disclaimer

While Bristol-Myers Squibb uses reasonable efforts to include accurate and up-to-date information in this material, Bristol-Myers Squibb makes no warranties or representations as to its accuracy. Bristol-Myers Squibb assumes no liability or responsibility for any errors or omissions in the content of the material. Neither Bristol-Myers Squibb nor any other party involved in creating, producing or delivering the material is liable for any direct, incidental, consequential, indirect or punitive damages arising out of your access to, or use of, the material.

You should assume that everything you see or read on this presentation is copyrighted, unless otherwise noted, and may not be used without mentioning the source. Bristol-Myers Squibb neither warrants nor represents that your use of materials displayed on the Site will not infringe rights of third parties not owned by or affiliated with Bristol-Myers Squibb.

Nothing on these presentations should be construed as the giving of advice or the making of a recommendation and it should not be relied on as the basis for any decision or action. BMS, nor other parties involved, accepts no liability for the accuracy or completeness or use of, nor any liability to update, the information contained on this Presentation. These materials are provided "AS IS" WITHOUT WARRANTY OF ANY KIND, EITHER EXPRESSED OR IMPLIED, INCLUDING, BUT NOT LIMITED TO, THE IMPLIED WARRANTIES OF MERCHANTABILITY, FITNESS FOR A PARTICULAR PURPOSE, OR NON-INFRINGEMENT.