Comprehensive Cancer Center



# Antibody Drug Conjugates : New Directions, New Agents!

Hope S. Rugo, MD

Professor of Medicine and Winterhof Famly Professor of Breast Oncology Director, Breast Oncology and Clinical Trials Education University of California San Francisco Comprehensive Cancer Center

## **ADCs have different antibodies, linkers and payloads**

		ADC Attributes	Trastuzumab emtansine (T-DM1)	Trastuzumab deruxtecan (T-DXd)	Sacituzumab govitecan (SG)	Datopotamab deruxtecan (Dato-DXd)	SKB264	Patritumab deruxtecan (HER3-DXd)	Disitamab vedotin (RC-48)	ARX788
	body	Target	HER2	HER2	TROP2	TROP2	TROP2	HER3	HER2	HER2
	Anti	Antibody	Trastuzumab	Trastuzumab	hRS7 lgG1k	Datopotamab	hRS7 lgG1	Patritumab	Hertuzumab	Trastuzumab
		DAR	~3.5:1	7–8:1	~7.6:1	~4:1	~7.4:1	~8:1	4:1	2:1
	nker	Linker	Thioether	Tetrapeptide- based	Hydrolysable	Tetrapeptide- based	2- methylsulfonyl pyrimidine	Tetrapeptide- based	Valine- citrulline	Hydroxyl- amine-PEG4
	Ē	Cleavable linker?	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
	-	Payload	Emtansine	DXd	SN-38	DXd	KL610023 (T030)	DXd	Monomethyl Auristatin E (MMAE)	Amberstatin (MMAF)
Antibody Drug Conjugate	ayload	Payload MoA	Anti- microtubule	Topo1 inhibitor	Topo1 inhibitor	Topo1 inhibitor	Topo1 inhibitor	Topo1 inhibitor	Anti- microtubule	Anti- microtubule
		Membrane permeable?	Low	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No

### ADC technology enables tumour-specific targeting



Membrane-impermeable drug

### Updated Primary Endpoint: PFS by BICR

## Trastuzumab deruxtecan in HER2+ MBC Destiny Breast-03

### **Demographics**

- 50% HR+
- 15% baseline brain mets
- 70% visceral disease
- 61% prior pertuzumab
- Median 2 lines of prior therapy

### Anti-cancer therapies in post-trial setting:

- T-DXd arm: 64/182 (35.2%) received T-DM1
- T-DM1 arm: 42/243 (17.3%) received T-DXd

#### Updated AEs

- ILD: 15.2%, no grade 4 or 5 All grade AE
- Nausea: 77%
- Vomiting: 52%
- Alopecia 40%
- Neutropenia <u>>grade 3: 16%</u>

Hurvitz S et al. SABCS 2022; Lancet Oncology 2023



### Key Secondary Endpoint: Overall Survival



T-DM1 263 257 252 248 243 242 237 233 232 227 224 217 211 203 199 197 191 186 183 179 172 169 167 164 164 158 140 129 117 106 90 70 59 45 41 38 27 20 15 8 7 4 3 3 1 1 0

## **DESTINY-Breast02**

### Randomized phase 3, open-label, multicenter study (NCT03523585)



## Pooled Analysis of T-DXd in HER2+ Brain Metastases: DB01, 02, 03 Exploratory CNS-PFS per BICR

### **Treated/Stable BMs**

**Untreated/Active BMs** 



Hurvitz et al, ESMO 2023

BICR, blinded independent central review; BM, brain metastasis; CNS, central-nervous system; PFS, progression-free survival; T-DXd, trastuzumab deruxtecan. CNS-PFS was defined by BICR as only radiological progression.

# T-DXd in HER2+ Brain Metastases or LMD

TUXEDO-1 Study: Newly diagnosed BMs or PD after prior Rx; prior HP for all, T-DM1 allowed



ROSET-BM: Retrospective Review of Pts with HER2+ MBC and BM or LMD; N=89, independent review of imaging



19 pts with LMD

• 12 mo PFS: 60.7%, 12 mo OS: 81.1%

Yamanaka et al, SABCS 2022 PD7-01; Nikura et al, NPJ Breast Cancer.

Bartsch R, et al. Nature Med, 2022

### **2023: Approach to Therapy for Metastatic HER2+ BC:**



\*AI+TP in select cases and for maintenance in ER+ disease; # endocrine Tx + HER2 therapy at clinically appropriate points for ER+ MBC

# Select Trials in Progress with T-DXd: HER2+

- Early stage
  - Destiny Breast05 (NSABP B-60)
    - T-DM1 vs T-DXd as post neoadjuvant therapy (n=1600)
      - Question: Safety of concurrent radiation therapy?
        - Katherine trial: radiation pneumonitis 1.5 vs 0.7%, no difference in radiation skin injury
  - Destiny Breast11
    - Neoadjuvant T-DXd x 8 v T-DXd x 4/THP vs AC/THP (n=624)
- Metastatic
  - Destiny Breast09
    - First-line: THP vs TDXd + placebo vs TDXd + pertuzumab (N=1134)
  - Destiny Breast12
    - 2 cohorts treated with T-DXd, with or without brain mets at baseline (n-500)

# Destiny-Breast04: Updated Survival Results of T-DXd in HER2-low Metastatic Breast Cancer



At the updated data cutoff (March 1, 2023), median follow-up was 32.0 months (95% Cl, 31.0-32.8 months)

- At the primary analysis (data cutoff, January 11, 2022), median follow-up was 18.4 months
- The primary analysis of PFS was by BICR; this is comparing investigator assessment
- Patient population: Median one line of chemotherapy for MBC, 65-70% prior CDKi, 70% liver mets

Modi et al, NEJM 2022; ESMO 2023

## **Updated Overall Survival**



		HF	<b>{+</b>	HF	२-	All Pa	tients
Drimony Analysia (PICD)	OS	T-DXd (n=331)	TPC (n=163)	T-DXd (n=40)	TPC (n=18)	T-DXd (n=373)	TPC (n=184)
Filliary Allalysis (DICR)	Median OS, months	23.9	17.5	18.2	8.3	23.4	16.8
	HR (95% CI); <i>P</i> value	HR 0.64 (0.48-	0.86); 0.0028	0.48 (0.2	24-0.95)	HR 0.64 (0.49-	-0.84); 0.0010

Modi et al, NEJM 2022; ESMO 2023

## Updated Progression Free Survival (Investigator Assessed)



		H	IR+	HI	२-	All Pat	ients
	PFS	T-DXd (n=331)	TPC (n=163)	T-DXd (n=40)	TPC (n=18)	T-DXd (n=373)	TPC (n=184)
Primary Analysis (BICR)	Median PFS, months	10.1	5.4	8.5	2.9	9.9	5.1
Modi et al. NEJM 2022: ESMO 2023	HR (95% CI); <i>P</i> value	0.51 (0.40-	0.64); <0.0001	0.46 (0.2	24-0.89)	HR 0.50 (0 <0.00	.40-0.63); 001

### Subgroup analyses: OS in the HR+ Cohort

### **OS in all Patients**

	No. of Events/	/No. of Patients	OS, median	(95% CI), mo	Hazard Ratio for Death	(95% CI)		No. of Events/N	lo. of Patients	OS, median	(95% CI), mo		
	T-DXd	TPC	T-DXd	TPC				T-DXd	TPC	T-DXd	TPC	Hazard Ratio for Death (9	5% CI)
Prior CDK4/6 inhibitors Yes No	156/233 53/96	78/115 31/47	22.3 (19.8-24.3) 30.3 (23.0-35.1)	16.8 (13.6-19.5) 22.4 (15.6-27.2)		0.71 (0.54-0.94) 0.63 (0.41-0.99)	Prior CDK4/6 inhibitors Yes No	158/235 55/98	81/118 32/48	22.3 (19.7-24.2) 29.6 (22.9-35.1)	16.7 (14.0-19.4) 22.4 (15.6-27.2)		0.71 (0.54-0.92)
IHC status IHC 1+ IHC 2+/ISH-	121/192 90/139	67/96 43/67	22.9 (20.8-25.2) 24.2 (20.8-26.5)	16.9 (13.5-22.4) 19.1 (15.1-22.3)		0.67 (0.50-0.91) 0.73 (0.51-1.05)	IHC status IHC 1+ IHC 2+/ISH-	137/214 105/159	77/107 51/77	22.7 (20.3-24.7) 23.6 (20.0-26.0)	15.7 (13.5-19.9) 17.1 (13.1-21.7)		0.65 (0.49-0.86) 0.72 (0.51-1.01)
Prior lines of chemotherapy 1 ≥2	118/203 93/127	63/93 47/69	25.5 (23.9-28.8) 19.0 (16.7-22.7)	19.4 (16.7-23.9) 14.0 (10.8-20.0)		0.66 (0.48-0.89) 0.76 (0.53-1.08)	Prior lines of chemotherapy 1 ≥2	129/221 113/151	69/100 59/83	25.5 (23.4-28.9) 18.1 (16.1-21.5)	18.2 (15.6-22.5) 14.0 (10.8-19.1)	⊢ <b>∳</b> 1 ⊨_ <b>∳</b> 1	0.62 (0.46-0.83) 0.78 (0.57-1.07)
Age <65 years ≥65 years	164/260 47/71	81/120 29/43	23.0 (20.8-24.8) 25.5 (21.0-28.8)	17.6 (14.8-20.0) 19.5 (9.2-30.6)		0.67 (0.52-0.88) 0.72 (0.45-1.15)	Age <65 years ≥65 years	185/290 57/83	95/136 33/48	22.7 (20.3-24.4) 24.4 (18.4-28.0)	16.7 (14.0-19.1) 19.5 (11.1-30.2)		0.64 (0.50-0.82) 0.77 (0.50-1.19)
Race White Asian Other	104/156 80/131 25/37	51/78 46/66 12/16	23.9 (19.8-24.8) 23.9 (21.7-28.7) 21.5 (15.0-30.4)	15.1 (12.3-19.9) 19.9 (16.7-27.2) 15.2 (6.2-23.9)		0.65 (0.47-0.91) 0.75 (0.52-1.07) 0.56 (0.28-1.12)	Race White Asian Other	123/176 90/151 26/38	62/91 51/72 13/17	22.0 (18.2-24.2) 25.2 (21.7-29.6) 21.2 (17.0-28.9)	14.5 (10.7-19.4) 19.1 (15.7-24.3) 15.2 (6.2-23.9)		0.68 (0.50-0.93) 0.68 (0.48-0.96) 0.55 (0.28-1.07)
Region Asia Europe and Israel North America	80/128 102/149 29/54	42/60 49/73 19/30	23.4 (21.0-27.4) 23.9 (20.8-25.7) 24.5 (15.8-28.9)	19.9 (16.7-27.2) 17.6 (12.3-20.2) 16.0 (8.8-22.3)		0.76 (0.53-1.11) 0.66 (0.47-0.93) 0.59 (0.33-1.06)	Region Asia Europe and Israel North America	90/147 118/166 34/60	47/66 59/85 22/33	24.0 (21.7-29.3) 22.3 (19.0-24.2) 20.6 (13.6-25.9)	19.1 (15.7-24.3) 14.8 (10.7-19.9) 14.9 (10.5-19.5)		0.69 (0.49-0.98) 0.67 (0.49-0.91) 0.66 (0.38-1.13)
ECOG performance status 0 1	109/187 102/44	59/95 51/68	26.0 (23.0-29.6) 21.4 (17.9-23.9)	20.2 (16.7-24.4) 14.9 (12.6-18.4)		0.68 (0.49-0.93) 0.70 (0.50-0.99)	ECOG performance status 0 1	117/200 125/173	68/105 60/79	25.9 (23.0-29.3) 20.6 (17.2-22.7)	19.4 (15.1-22.8) 14.5 (12.3-18.4)		0.62 (0.46-0.83) 0.74 (0.54-1.01)
Visceral disease at baseline Yes No	201/298 10/33	99/146 11/17	22.9 (21.4-24.5) NE (20.4-NE)	17.5 (14.8-20.2) 18.4 (13.5-NE)		0.73 (0.57-0.93) 0.34 (0.14-0.81)	Visceral disease at baseline Yes No	227/332 15/41	109/157 19/27	22.4 (20.0-24.0) NE (28.0-NE)	16.9 (14.0-20.0) 15.7 (12.9-20.6)		0.71 (0.57-0.90) 0.35 (0.18-0.70)
					000 025 050 075 100 125 150	175 200						0.00 0.25 0.50 0.75 1.00 1.25 1.50	1.75 2.00

0.00 0.25 0.50 0.75 1.00 1.25 1.50 1.75 2.00

### **Adverse Events**

Nausea Fatiguea Transaminases increased<sup>b</sup> Alopecia Neutropeniac Anemiad Vomiting Decreased appetite Thrombocytopenia<sup>e</sup> T-DXd T-DXd Leukopenia ■ TPC, Diarrhea = TPC, Constipation

					5	0		24				
52					8	5				44	Ē	
4	12				4		11			40		
	38				0				33			
	3	5		14						42	53	
	3	4			9	5		24				
	3	4			1	0 1	0					
		29			2	1	16					
d, any grad	е		25		6	1 5						
d, grade ≥3			24		7		1	9	31			
grade ≥3			22		1	2	18	3				
any grade			22			•	13					

	Grade 1	Grade 2	Grade 3	Grade 4	Grade 5	Any Grade					
ILD/pneumonitis (adjudicated	ILD/pneumonitis (adjudicated, drug-related), n (%)										
T-DXd (n = 371)	13 (3.5)	24 (6.5)	4 (1.1) <sup>a</sup>	0	4 (1.1)ª	45 (12.1)					
TPC (n = 172)	1 (0.6)	0	0	0	0	1 (0.6)					
Left ventricular dysfunction											
Ejection fraction decreased,	, n (%)										
T-DXd (n = 371)	2 (0.5)	15 (4.0)	1 (0.3)	0	0	18 (4.9)					
TPC (n = 172)	0	0	0	0	0	0					
Cardiac failure, n (%)											
T-DXd (n = 371)	0	1 (0.3)	1 (0.3)	0	0	2 (0.5)					
TPC (n = 172)	0	0	0	0	0	0					

Percent of Patients Experiencing Drug-Related TEAE

Modi et al, NEJM 2022; ESMO 2023

For T-DXd: 8.2% discontinued for ILD/pneumonitis; 4.6% dose reduced for N/V

## **DB04: Nausea and Vomiting**

- 189/371 patients (50.9%) in the T-DXd arm and 64/172 patients (37.2%) in the TPC arm received antiemetic prophylaxis<sup>a</sup>
- Prophylaxis was not mandatory per study protocol, but was recommended

	Nau	Isea	Vom	iting
	T-DXd	TPC	T-DXd	TPC
n (%)	n = 371	n = 172	n = 371	n = 172
Dose reduction associated with N/V	17 (4.6)	4 (2.3)	3 (0.8)	1 (0.6)
Drug interruption associated with N/V	5 (1.3)	4 (2.3)	0	0
Drug discontinuation associated with N/V	1 (0.3)	0	1 (0.3)	0

### **Three Classes of Anti-Emetic Premedication is Recommended**

This can be individualized to patient symptoms



N/V, nausea or vomiting; T-DXd, trastuzumab deruxtecan; TPC, treatment of physician's choice.

<sup>a</sup>Prophylaxis included antiemetics and antinauseants, corticosteroids for systemic use, drugs for functional gastrointestinal disorders, or other.

#### Rugo et al, ESMO Breast 2023; NCCN 2023

# Pooled Analysis of ILD/Pneumonitis in 9 Trastuzumab deruxtecan Monotherapy Studies



- 1150 pts (44.3% breast cancer) with a median treatment duration 5.8 mo (0.7-56.3)
- Overall incidence: 15.4% (grade 5: 2.2%); grade 1-2: 77.4%
- 87% had their first event within 12 months of their first dose

Powell et al, ESMO Open 2022

## **Re-Treatment in Patients After Occurrence of Grade 1 ILD**



- 6 patients with grade 1 ILD (as assessed by investigator) were re-treated after resolution; 1 of these
  patients had a second ILD event that was adjudicated as grade 2 by the adjudication committee at
  re-occurrence
  - At DCO, 1 patient discontinued due to an AE; 2 patients discontinued due to PD; 3 patients remained on T-DXd

AE, adverse event; DCO, data cutoff; ILD, interstitial lung disease; PD, progressive disease; PR, partial response; SD, stable disease; T-DXd, trastuzumab deruxtecan.

#### Rugo et al, ESMO Breast 2023

# **DAISY: BOR rate according to HER2 expression**



### THE BOR RATE IS DEFFERENT BETWEEN THE THREE COHORTS p < 0.0001

*Data cut-off: Oct 19, 2021* 

#### Mosele et al, Nature Medicine 2023

# **DAISY: PFS according to HER2 expression**



THE PFS IS DEFFERENT BETWEEN THE THREE COHORTS p < 0.0001

Median follow up: 15.6 months

# **Testing Trastuzumab Deruxtecan in HER2 'Ultralow' DESTINY-Breast06**

### **Key differences with DB-04:**

 Includes IHC0 (ultralow, n=150))

HR+

Prior CDK4/6 inhibitor

setting

• HER2 IHC 2+ v. 1+ v. 0+

Prior taxane in non-metastatic

- Larger (n=850)
- Restricted to HR+ disease
- Chemo-naïve patients

### **Status: Completed accrual**



- · Chemotherapy options: capecitabine, paclitaxel, nAb-paclitaxel
- Treatment continues until progressive disease or toxicity
- HER2 IHC 0+ defined by any IHC staining up to 10% of tumor cells
- Futility analysis in HER2 IHC 0+ cohort will be done

#### **ENDPOINTS**

#### Primary:

 PFS (BICR) in HER2 IHC 1+/2+ population

#### Key Secondary:

- OS in HER2 IHC 1+/2+ population
- PFS in ITT population
- OS in ITT population

#### Secondary:

- PFS (investigator assessed) in HER2 IHC 1+/2+
- ORR and DOR of HER2 IHC 1+/2+ and ITT populations
- Safety and tolerability
- Symptoms, functioning and HRQoL

#### Exploratory:

- PRO
- Pharmacodynamic biomarkers

## Sacituzumab Govitecan (SG): First-in-Class Trop-2–Directed ADC



0

No. of Patients Still at Risk Time Imonthal

SSIs defined as the line from data of contentiation to the data of death-from any or Con regression adjusted for smatthcarles flucture number of prior discontenapola and Milling, team metalatione registrice, CO, normal satured , SG, substantial position.

SG TPC

- Trop-2 is expressed in all subtypes of breast cancer and linked to poor prognosis
- Key grade ≥3 TRAEs (SG vs TPC): neutropenia (51% vs 33%), diarrhea (10% vs <1%), leukopenia (10% vs 5%), anemia (8% vs 5%), FN (6% vs 2%)</li>
- G-CSF: 49% in the SG arm vs 23% in the TPC arm
- Dose reductions due to TRAEs were similar (22% SG vs 26% TPC)
- No severe CV toxicity, no grade >2 neuropathy or grade >3 ILD with SG

Bardia et al. NEJM, 2021.

30

## TROPICS 02 for HR+/HER2- Disease: PFS & OS in the ITT Population

#### PFS<sup>1</sup>

**OS**<sup>2,3</sup>



SG demonstrated a statistically significant improvement in PFS and OS vs TPC

Median follow-up was 10.2 months.

BICR, blinded independent central review; ITT, intent-to-treat; OS, overall survival; PFS, progression-free survival; SG, sacituzumab govitecan; TPC, treatment of physician's choice.

1. Rugo HS, et al. J Clin Oncol. 2022;40:3365-3376. Adapted from Rugo HS, et al. Sacituzumab govitecan in hormone receptor-positive/human epidermal growth factor receptor 2-negative metastatic breast cancer. J Clin Oncol. 2022. doi: 10.1200/JCO.22.01002. Reprinted with permission from American Society of Clinical Oncology. 2. Rugo H, et al. ESMO 2022. Oral LBA76. 3. Tolaney et al, ASCO Abstract 1003; Rugo et al, Lancet 2023

### No new toxicity signals compared to ASCENT

### TROPiCS-02: PFS and OS by Trop-2 Expression Level and HER2 IHC Status

OS

	Status	Median PFS, m	Median PFS, months (95% CI)			Status	Median OS, m	onths (95% CI)	HR (95% CI)
		SG	ТРС				SG	ТРС	
Trop-2	H-score <100	5.0 (4.1, 6.0) n=96	4.0 (2.7, 5.6) n=96	<b>0.79</b> (0.56, 1.12)	Trop 2	H-score <100	14.9 (12.7, 18.1) n=96	11.3 (10.0, 13.3) n=96	<b>0.78</b> (0.57, 1.06)
	H-score ≥100	5.8 (4.0, 8.3) n=142	4.1 (2.3, 4.5) n=128	<b>0.61</b> (0.45, 0.83)	Trop-2	H-score ≥100	14.4 (12.7, 17.0) n=142	11.2 (9.9, 12.7) n=128	<b>0.82</b> (0.63, 1.08)
HER2	IHC1+, IHC2+/ISH–	5.8 (4.1, 8.4) n=149	4.2 (2.8, 5.5) n=134	<b>0.60</b> (0.44, 0.62)		IHC1+, IHC2+/ISH–	15.4 (13.5, 19.1) n=149	11.5 (10.1, 12.9) n=134	<b>0.75</b> (0.57, 0.97)
	IHC0	5.0 (3.9, 7.2) n=101	3.4 (1.8, 4.2) n=116	<b>0.70</b> (0.51, 0.98)	HEKZ	IHCO	13.6 (12.1, 16.0) n=101	10.8 (9.2, 14.2) n=116	<b>0.85</b>

PFS

#### Tolaney et al. ASCO 2023. Abstract 1003; updated from Rugo et al, ESMO 2022 and Rugo et al, SABCS 2022; Rugo et al, Lancet 2023

### **TROPiCS-02: Responses and Safety Summary**



Median DoR, months (95% Cl): 8.1 (6.7, 8.9) vs 5.6 (3.8, 7.9)

### Safety summary

n (%) AE Grade ≥3		So (n=2 199	G 268) (74)	TPC (n=249) 149 (60)		
AEs $\rightarrow$ dose del	ау	178	(66)	109	(44)	
AEs $\rightarrow$ dose red SAEs	uctions	91 ( 74 (	34) 28)	82 ( 48 (	33) 19)	
AEs $\rightarrow$ death <sup>a</sup>		6 (	2)	C		
Hematologic	Neutropenia Anemia Thrombocytopenia	Any grade 189 (71) 98 (37) 17 (6)	Grade 23 140 (52) 20 (7) 1 (<1)	Any grade 136 (55) 69 (28) 41 (16)	Grade ≥3 97 (39) 8 (3) 9 (4)	
GI	Diarrhea Nausea Constipation Vomiting Abdominal pain	166 (62) 157 (59) 93 (35) 64 (24) 53 (20)	27 (10) 3 (1) 1 (<1) 3 (1) 10 (4)	57 (23) 87 (35) 61 (24) 39 (16) 34 (14)	3 (1) 7 (3) 0 4 (2) 2 (1)	
Other	Alopecia Fatigue Asthenia Decreased appetite Dyspnea Headache Pyrexia AST increased	128 (48) 105 (39) 62 (23) 57 (21) 49 (18) 44 (16) 39 (15) 33 (12)	0 16 (6) 6 (2) 4 (1) 5 (2) 1 (<1) 2 (1) 4 (1)	46 (18) 82 (33) 50 (20) 52 (21) 39 (16) 36 (14) 45 (18) 44 (18)	0 9 (4) 5 (2) 2 (1) 11 (4) 2 (1) 0 8 (3)	

<sup>a</sup>Of 6 AEs leading to death, 1 (septic shock due to neutropenic colitis) was considered treatment related by investigator

Rugo et al, JCO 2022; Rugo et al, ESMO 2022; Rugo et al, SABCS 2022; Tolaney et al. ASCO 2023. Abstract 1003; Rugo et al, Lancet 2023

## ASCENT and TROPiCS-02: Safety Outcomes by UGT1A1 Status

### UTG1A1

- Variants affect enzymatic function, causing reduced metabolic capacity
- ✓ Over 50% of individuals may harbor an UTG1A1 polymorphism, dependent on genetic ancestry

Grade ≥3 TEAEs	SG
Overall (%)	(n=268)
Neutropenia	52
Diarrhea	10
Anemia	8
Febrile neutropenia	6

	ASCI	ENT	TROPiCS-02			
SG patients (n=250)	UTG1A1 Status n(%)	Dose Intensity (%)	UTG1A1 Status n(%)	Dose Intensity (%)		
*1/*1 (wt)	113 (44)	99.8	104 (38)	99		
*1/*28	96 (37)	99.5	119 (44)	98		
*28/*28	34 (13)	99.8	25 (9)	94		

		ASCENT		TROPiCS-02					
Grade ≥3 TEAEs By UTG1A1 Status (%)	*1/*1 (wt)	*1/*28	*28/*28	*1/*1 (wt)	*1/*28	*28/*28			
Neutropenia	53	47	59	45	57	64			
Diarrhea	10	9	15	6	13	24			
Anemia	4	6	15	6	8	8			
Febrile neutropenia	3	5	18	6	7	4			
Growth factor for neutro	penia (initiate	ed on/after	first dose)	overall 54%					
				33	49	11			

ASCENT: Treatment discontinuation due to TRAEs more common in \*28 homozygous genotype

Nelson, RS, et al. *Cancers.* 2021;13:1566. Rugo, HS, et al. *npj Breast Cancer.* 2022;8:98. Marmé, F, et al. *Annals of Oncol.* 2023;8(1suppl\_4):101223-101223. Rugo et al, Lancet 2023

#### **ASCENT-03** (NCT05382299): PD-L1 negative N=540

### Ascent-07: First-line Chemotherapy in HR+

Primary Endpoint

**Key Secondary Endpoints** 

PFS by BICR



#### SACI-IO TNBC and HR+: Sacituzumab govitecan +/- pembrolizumab in 1L PD-L1- mTNBC and HR+



#### Garrido-Castro/Tolaney

#### Days 1 and 8, every 21 days OS · Progressed after 1 or more ET for N = 654 ORR by BICR mBC, or relapsed within 12 months of · TTDD to Physical functioning 2:1 completing adjuvant ET or while Treatment of physician's choice ecitabine, paclitaxel, nab-paclitaxe randomizati receiving adjuvant ET Secondary Endpoints No prior treatment with a PFS by investigator Stratification: topoisomerase I inhibitor Duration of prior CDK 4/6i in metastatic setting (none/<12 mos vs · ORR by investigator Measurable disease per RECIST >12 mos) DOR HER2 IHC (HER2 IHC 0 vs HER2 IHC-low (IIHC 1+: 2+/ISH-I) Safety Geographic region (US/CAN/EU vs. ROW) Prior CDK 4/6i not required (no prior CDK 4/6i capped at 30%) **GBG: SASCIA Post-Neoadjuvant Trial** NCT04595565

Sacituzumab govitecan

10 mg/kg IV

Key eligibility criteria: •HR+/HER2\* negative, locally

metastatic breast cancer

advanced mBC

v1.1

advanced and unresectable, or

· Eligible for first chemotherapy for



### Phase III Trial: Optimice-RD/ASCENT-05 **Residual disease in TNBC**



PI: Sara Tolaney; Alliance Foundation Trial

# **Datopotamab Deruxtecan (Dato-DXd)**

### Dato-DXd is an ADC with 3 components<sup>1,2</sup>:

- A humanized anti-TROP2 IgG1 monoclonal antibody attached to:
- A topoisomerase I inhibitor payload, an exatecan derivative, via
- A tetrapeptide-based cleavable linker



Payload mechanism of action: topoisomerase I inhibitor <sup>b,1</sup>
High potency of payload b,2
Optimized drug to antibody ratio $\approx 4^{b,c,1}$
Payload with short systemic half-life b,c,2
Stable linker-payload b,2
Tumor-selective cleavable linker b,2
Bystander antitumor effect b,2,4

<sup>a</sup> Image is for illustrative purposes only; actual drug positions may vary. <sup>b</sup> The clinical relevance of these features is under investigation. <sup>c</sup> Based on animal data. 1. Okajima D, et al. AACR-NCI-EORTC 2019; [abstract C026]; 2. Nakada T, et al. *Chem Pharm Bull*. 2019;67(3):173-185; 3. Krop I, et al. SABCS 2019; [abstract GS1-03]; 4. Ogitani Y, et al. *Cancer Sci*. 2016;107(7):1039-1046.

## TROPION-Breast01 (Phase 3): Datopotamab deruxtecan vs chemo for unresectable/inoperable or metastatic HR+, HER2– breast cancer

#### Key eligibility

- HR+/HER2-<sup>a</sup> breast cancer
- Previously treated with 1–2 lines of chemo (inoperable/metastatic setting)
- Experienced progression on ET and for whom ET was unsuitable
- ECOG PS 0/1

#### **Stratification factors**

- Lines of chemo in unresectable/ metastatic setting (1 vs 2)
- Geographical location (US/Canada/ Europe vs ROW)
- Previous CDK4/6 inhibitor (yes vs no)



- At data cutoff (July 17, 2023), patients remaining on treatment:
  - Data-DXd, n=93
     TPC, n=39
- Median follow-up: 10.8 months
- Meidan one line of prior therapy

alHC 0/1+/2+; ISH-; blnvestigator's choice of chemotherapy; cBy BICR per RECIST v1.1. Dato-DXd, datopotamab deruxtecan; TPC, treatment of physician's choice. Bardia A, et al. SABCS 2023. Abstract GS02-01

### **TROPION-Breast01: PFS and time to subsequent therapy**

#### PFS by investigator assessment



### **TROPION-Breast01: PFS by BICR in subgroups**



### **TROPION-Breast01: Safety**

### **Overall safety summary**

TRAEs, n (%)¹	Dato-DXd (n=360)	ICC (n=351)
All grades	337 (94)	303 (86)
Grade ≥3	75 (21)	157 (45)
Associated with dose reduction	75 (21)	106 (30)
Associated with dose interruption	43 (12)	86 (25)
Associated with discontinuation	9 (3)	9 (3)
Associated with death	0	1 (0.3)
Serious TRAEs	21 (6)	32 (9)
Grade ≥3	17 (5)	31 (8)

### AE of clinical interest

Neutropenia*	Dato-DXd (n=360)	ICC (n=351)
Treatment-related neutropenia	*, n (%)	
Any grade	39 (11)	149 (42)
Grade ≥3	4 (1)	108 (31)
Leading to dose interruption	0	60 (17)
Leading to dose reduction	1 (0.3)	45 (13)
Leading to dose discontinuation	0	1 (0.3)
G-CSF usage, n (%)		
On treatment	10 (3)	81 (22)
Post-treatment <sup>+</sup>	1 (0.3)	30 (8)

### TTD global health status/quality of life, physical functioning and pain

	Median T month (1 <sup>st</sup> instan	TD, s ice)		Median mont (confirn	TTD, hs ned)	
TTD	Dato-DXd	ICC	HR (95% CI)	Data DXd	ICC	HR (95% CI)
GHS/QOL	3.4	2.1	0.85 (0.68, 1.06)	9.0	4.8	0.76 (0.58, 0.98)
Physical functioning	5.6	3.5	0.77 (0.61, 0.99)	12.5	6.2	0.77 (0.59, 1.01)
Pain	3.5	2.8	0.85 (0.68, 1.07)	9.0	5.5	0.72 (0.55, 0.94)

GHS/QOL, global health status/quality of life; TTD, time to deterioration. Bardia A, et al. SABCS 2023. Abstract GS02-01

Stomatitis <sup>‡</sup>	Dato-DXd (n=360)	ICC (n=351)
Treatment-related stomatitis‡, r	ו (%)	
Any grade	180 (50)	46 (13)
Grade 3	23 (6)	9 (3)
Leading to dose interruption	5 (1)	3 (1)
Leading to dose reduction	44 (12)	5 (1)
Leading to dose discontinuation	1 (0.3)	0

- Clear efficacy as second line chemotherapy for HR+ MBC
- Primary toxicity stomatitis can likely be managed in most with steroid MW, low heme toxicity
- Await OS data

## BEGONIA Trial: Dato-DXd + Durvalumab

- 1<sup>st</sup> line TNBC
  - N=62;
  - Median FU 11.7 mo
  - Durable responses
    - Median FU 13.8 mo, DOR 15.5 mo

PD-L1 xpressio

- Adverse events
  - 57% grade 3/4 AEs; 16% d/c due to AEs
  - Stomatitis (65%), rash (32%), dry eye (21%), hypothyroidism (14.5%), keratitis (14.5%)
    - 11% Gr3/4 stomatitis
  - ILD/pneumonitis in 5% (3)
    - All grade 1-2

#### **Confirmed ORR** was 79% (49/62; 95% CI, 66.8–88.3) with 6 CR and 43 PR

 Antitumour responses were observed regardless of PD-L1 expression level as assessed by 2 separate PD-L1 assays and scoring methods



#### Change from Baseline in Sum of Target Lesions Over Time 240 220 Partial respons 200 -180 8 160 1.40 120 -100 -80 -60 -40 -20 -20 -<u>\_</u> -40 --60 -80 -100 -120Time (weeks

### TROPION-Breast02 (n=625)

#### NCT05374512



#### NCT06103864



DFI 6 to 12 months capped at 20%.

Arms 1 and 2. In selected countries only.

1000 mg/m2 IV + carboplatin AUC 2 IV days 1 and 8 Q3W

- 1st line therapy for TNBC
- PD-L1 negative

ullet





# **TROPION Breast04** (n=1728) NCT06112379

### Neoadjuvant therapy for TNBC

Chemotherapy options include paclitaxel (90 mg/m<sup>2</sup>IV on days 1, 8, and 15, Q4W), nab-paclitaxel (100 mg/m<sup>2</sup>IV days 1, 8, and 15, Q4W) or gemcitabine

Once approximately 75 participants are randomised to Arm 3, this cohort will close, and all countries will continue with a 1:1 randomisation strategy for

 Durvalumab + Dato-DXd x 8 cycles followed by surgery; durva x 9 cycles postop vs KN522

## Patritumab Deruxtecan: Phase 2 Study of HER3-DXd in MBC

- 60 pts:
  - HR+: Prior CDKi, 0-2 chemo
  - TN: 1-3 chemo
  - 27 HR+/19 TN (n=48)
  - 64% HER3 <a>25%; 8% <25% (n=47)</a>
- ORR 35%, CBR 43%,
  - No relationship to HER3 expression
- DOR <u>></u> 6mo: 47.6% in responders (n=10)
- Most common AE:
  - Nausea/diarrhea/fatigue
  - TEAE: 2 ILD, 1 low plt

	Any grade (N=60) n (%)	Grade 3/4 (N=60) n (%)
Any Adverse Event (AE)	56 (93.3)	19 (31.7)
Nausea	30 (50.0)	2 (3.3)
Fatigue	27 (45.0)	4 (6.7)
Diarrhea	22 (36.7)	3 (5.0)
Vomiting	19 (31.7)	1 (1.7)
Anemia	18 (30.0)	0
Alopecia	17 (28.3)	N/A
Hypokalemia	9 (15.0)	1 (1.7)
Decreased Appetite	8 (13.3)	0
Neutrophil Count Decreased**	7 (11.7)	3 (5.0)
White Blood Cell Count Decreased**	7 (11.7)	1 (1.7)

	(N=60) n (%)
Number of Prior Systemic Regimens in Metastatic Setting	
1-2 prior regimens	24 (40.0)
3 or more prior regimens	36 (60.0)
Median (range)	3 (1, 9)
Type of Prior Regimens in the Metastatic Setting*	
Chemotherapy	54 (90.0)
PARP inhibitors	3 (5.0)
Immunotherapy	12 (20.0)
Sacituzumab govitecan	5 (8.3)

	HR+	TNBC
	(N=29)	(N=19)
ORR, n (%)	12 (41.4)	4 (21.1)
95% CI	(23.5, 61.1)	(6.1, 45.6)



# **Newer ADCs: SABCS 2023**

- SKB264 (MK-2870)
  - TROP2 ADC with novel TOPO1 inhibitor (belotecan derivative); DAR 7.4

ORR<sup>\*</sup>, % (95% CI)

DCR, % (95% CI)

0.7 mg/kg

(N=2)

50.0 (1.3,98.7)

50.0 (1.3,98.7)

1.4 mg/kg

(N=2)

0

100.0 (15.8,100.0)

4.8 mg/kg

(N=12)

33.3 (9.9,65.1)

66.7 (34.9,90.1)

- Efficacy in phase II TNBC (n=59): ORR 42.4%; PFS 5.7 mo
- Toxicity (Gr 
   <u>></u>3): stomatitis (6.8%) , neutropenia (25.4%), N/V
- BL-B01D1 dose escalation/expansion study
  - EGFR/HER2 bispecific ADC with TOPO1 payload
  - Responses 31-45%, seen in all subtypes
  - Toxicity: stomatitis, neutropenia, N/V, elevated liver e<sup>o</sup>
- B7-H4 TOPO1 ADC
  - Dose escalation
  - Toxicity:
    - bone marrow suppression

BOR, n	TNBC	HR+ HER2-	HER2+
	(n=35)	(n=38)	(n=23)
Prior treatment line median (range)	3 (1-9)	4 (1-13)	4 (0-8)
ORR, % (95% CI)	31.4%	44.7%	39.1%
	(16.9-49.3)	(28.6-61.7)	(19.7-61.5)

5.8 mg/kg

(N=11)

27.3#(6.0,61.0)

81.8 (48.2,97.7)

7.2 mg/kg

(N=1)

0

100.0 (2.5,100.0)

Total

(N=28)

28.6 (13.2,48.7)

75.0 (55.1,89.3)

Yin Y, et al. SABCS 2023. PS08-08; Wu et al SABCS 2023 PS08-07; Wu et al, ESMO 2023 3810

TNBC

## **Mechanisms of Resistance to TROP2 ADC**



Analysis of tumor tissue from 3 patients pre- and post Sacituzumab treatment

- Two acquired resistance mechanisms identified
  - Mutations in TOP1 leading to decreased binding of SN38 with topoisomerase I
  - Mutation in TROP2 leading to decreased binding of SG and decreased cell surface expression

## HR+/HER2-low efficacy data (n=56)

SG → T-DXd (n=24, 42.9%)	<ul> <li>Median lines of therapy for</li> <li>Median lines chem</li> <li>Median total lines of</li> <li>Intervening therapies betw</li> </ul>	or MBC prio otherapy: 2 of therapy: 3 ween ADCs	or to <mark>SG</mark> : 2.0 (range 0-5) 3.0 (range 0-9 5: 47.8%	rwPFS ADC1 (SG) ADC2 (T-DXd) 23 - Still on Therapy	
		ADC1 (SG)	ADC2 (T-DXd)	21 - × Censored (toxicity) y 19 - t 17 -	
	ORR (CR+PR) by investigator assessment, %	77.3%	34.8%	요 15 - :::: 13 - 	0 10 20 30 40 50 Time (months) from ADC1 start
	CBR (CR + PR + SD) by investigator assessment, %	86.4%	60.9%	<b>₩</b> 9 - 7 - 5 -	
	Median rwPFS, months	8.0	3.7		
	Median rwOS from time of each ADC start, months	22.8	7.8	20 10 0 10 20 Time on treatment (months)	E 0 10 20 30 40 50 Time (months) from ADC2 start
<b>T-DXd → SG</b> (n=32, 57.1%)	<ul> <li>Median lines of therapy for Median lines chen</li> <li>Median total lines</li> <li>Intervening therapies bet</li> </ul>	or MBC prid notherapy: 2 of therapy: ween ADCs	or to T-DXd: 2.0 (range 0-5 4.5 (range 2- s: 42.4%	)) ADC1 (T-DXd) ADC2 (SG) 31	rwOS
<b>T-DXd → SG</b> (n=32, 57.1%)	<ul> <li>Median lines of therapy for Median lines chen</li> <li>Median total lines</li> <li>Intervening therapies bet</li> </ul>	or MBC prio notherapy: 2 of therapy: ween ADCs ADC1 (T-DXd)	or to T-DXd: 2.0 (range 0-5 4.5 (range 2- s: 42.4% ADC2 (SG)	)) ADC1 (T-DXd) ADC2 (SG) 31 - 25 - 25 - 25 - 25 - 25 - 25 - 25 - 2	rwOS
<b>T-DXd → SG</b> (n=32, 57.1%)	<ul> <li>Median lines of therapy for Median lines chem</li> <li>Median total lines</li> <li>Intervening therapies bet</li> <li>ORR (CR+PR) by investigator assessment, %</li> </ul>	or MBC price notherapy: 2 of therapy: ween ADCs ADC1 (T-DXd) 46.9%	or to T-DXd: 2.0 (range 0-5 4.5 (range 2- s: 42.4% ADC2 (SG) 18.5%	)) ADC1 (T-DXd) ADC2 (SG) 31 - 29 - 27 - 25 - 23 - 25 - 23 - 25 - 23 - 21 - 19 - 17 - 15 - 25 - 17 - 15 - 25 - 25 - 25 - 25 - 25 - 25 - 25	rwOS
<b>T-DXd → SG</b> (n=32, 57.1%)	<ul> <li>Median lines of therapy for Median lines chem</li> <li>Median total lines</li> <li>Intervening therapies bet</li> <li>ORR (CR+PR) by investigator assessment, %</li> <li>CBR (CR + PR + SD) by investigator assessment, %</li> </ul>	or MBC price notherapy: 2 of therapy: ween ADCs ADC1 (T-DXd) 46.9% 78.1%	or to T-DXd: 2.0 (range 0-5 4.5 (range 2- s: 42.4% ADC2 (SG) 18.5% 37.0%	)) ADC1 (T-DXd) ADC2 (SG) 31 - 25 - 23 - 25 - 23 - 21 - 25 - 23 - 21 - 25 - 23 - 21 - 25 - 23 - 21 - 25 - 23 - 21 - 25 - 23 - 21 - 25 - 23 - 25 - 23 - 25 - 23 - 25 - 23 - 25 - 23 - 25 - 23 - 25 - 25	rwOS
<b>T-DXd → SG</b> (n=32, 57.1%)	<ul> <li>Median lines of therapy from the Median lines cheme.</li> <li>Median total lines</li> <li>Intervening therapies bet</li> <li>ORR (CR+PR) by investigator assessment, %</li> <li>CBR (CR + PR + SD) by investigator assessment, %</li> <li>Median rwPFS, months</li> </ul>	or MBC price notherapy: 2 of therapy: ween ADCs ADC1 (T-DXd) 46.9% 78.1% 5.5	or to T-DXd: 2.0 (range 0-5 4.5 (range 2- s: 42.4% ADC2 (SG) 18.5% 37.0% 2.6	)) ADC1 (T-DXd) ADC2 (SG) 31 - 27 - 25 - 23 - 21 - 15 - 15 - 15 - 15 - 15 - 15 - 15	rwOS

## HR-/HER2-low efficacy data (n=28)

SG → T-DXd	•	Median lines of therapy for I	MBC prior t	to <mark>SG:</mark> 2.0 (	range 0-5) rwPFS	rwOS
(11 20, 00.070)		ORR (CR+PR) by investigator assessment, % CBR (CR + PR + SD) by investigator assessment, % Median rwPFS, months Median rwOS from time of each ADC start, months	ADC1 (SG) 68.0% 80.0% 7.8 16.5	ADC2 (T-DXd) 35.0% 45.0% 2.8 6.5	ADC1 (SG) ADC2 (T-DXd) Still on Therapy Toxicity Toxicity ADC1 (SG) ADC2 (T-DXd) Still on Therapy Toxicity Toxicity Toxicity Toxicity Toxicity	Time (months) from ADC2 start
<b>T-DXd → SG</b> (n=3, 10.7%)	•	Median lines of therapy for M Intervening therapies betwee	/IBC prior to en ADCs: 6	o T-DXd: 3. 66.7%	0 (range 1-5) <b>rwPFS</b>	
<b>T-DXd → SG</b> (n=3, 10.7%)	•	Median lines of therapy for N Intervening therapies betwee	/IBC prior to en ADCs: 6 ADC1 (T-DXd)	o T-DXd: 3. 66.7%	0 (range 1-5) <b>rwPFS</b>	
<b>T-DXd → SG</b> (n=3, 10.7%)		Median lines of therapy for M Intervening therapies betwee ORR (CR+PR) by investigator assessment, %	ABC prior to en ADCs: 6 ADC1 (T-DXd) 33.3%	o T-DXd: 3. 6.7% ADC2 (SG) 0.0%	0 (range 1-5) <b>rwPFS</b>	
<b>T-DXd → SG</b> (n=3, 10.7%)	:	Median lines of therapy for M Intervening therapies betwee ORR (CR+PR) by investigator assessment, % CBR (CR + PR + SD) by investigator assessment, %	/IBC prior to en ADCs: 6 ADC1 (T-DXd) 33.3% 66.7%	o T-DXd: 3. 6.7% ADC2 (SG) 0.0% 50.0%	0 (range 1-5) <b>rwPFS</b>	rwOS
<b>T-DXd → SG</b> (n=3, 10.7%)	:	Median lines of therapy for M Intervening therapies betwee ORR (CR+PR) by investigator assessment, % CBR (CR + PR + SD) by investigator assessment, % Median rwPFS, months	ABC prior to en ADCs: 6 ADC1 (T-DXd) 33.3% 66.7% undete	o T-DXd: 3. 6.7% ADC2 (SG) 0.0% 50.0%	0 (range 1-5) <b>rwPFS</b>	rwOS
T-DXd → SG (n=3, 10.7%)	:	Median lines of therapy for M Intervening therapies betwee ORR (CR+PR) by investigator assessment, % CBR (CR + PR + SD) by investigator assessment, % Median rwPFS, months Median rwOS from time of each ADC start, months	ABC prior to en ADCs: 6 ADC1 (T-DXd) 33.3% 66.7% undete undete	o T-DXd: 3. 66.7% ADC2 (SG) 0.0% 50.0% ermined	0 (range 1-5) <b>rwPFS</b>	rwOS

## A3 study: Clinical course of patients with TOP variants



Occhiogrosso R, et al. SABCS 2023. Abstract PS08-03

#### TBCRC 064: TReatment of ADC-Refractory Breast CancEr with Dato-DXd or T-DXd (TRADE DXd). PI: Ana Garrido-Castro Primary endpoint (ADC1, ADC2): ORR **Eligibility:** Secondary endpoints: PFS, OS, CBR, TTOR, DOR Confirmed unresectable locally ADC<sub>1</sub> ADC<sub>2</sub> advanced or metastatic disease History of HER2-low BC: IHC 1+ Treat until HR+ (n=66) HR+ (n=66) Crossover T-DXd Dato-DXd or 2+/ISH- (any sample: primary progression or to ADC<sub>2</sub> at unacceptable or met) 0-1 prior lines 1-2 prior lines progression HR- (n=50) HR- (n=50) Measurable disease toxicity

Cohorts 1 & 2: Enrollment Prior to ADC #1



\*Randomization 1:1 to T-DXd or Dato-DXd as ADC<sub>1</sub> for allocation purposes.



### Registry Sequencing Study: Laura Huppert UCSF



#### Objectives/considerations:

# Conclusion

- Antibody Drug Conjugates!
  - An exciting and effective drug delivery system for the treatment of multiple subtypes of MBC
- Remarkable efficacy in HER2+ disease
  - Proven efficacy of sequential HER2 ADC with different payloads
- Established role in TNBC
  - SG is a new standard of care for mTNBC
- Established role in HER2 low and HR+ disease
  - T-DXd is a new standard of care of HER2 'low' disease
  - Sacituzumab a treatment option for pre-treated HR+ disease
- Ongoing trials in earlier lines, early-stage disease, and new ADCs in phase III trials
- Many questions remain!
  - Defining HER2 low
  - Sequencing of ADCs
  - Understanding resistance.

### Toxicity management is critical

• Combination data with radiation largely lacking



### Roadmap for HR+/HER2- Metastatic Breast Cancer



- TRADE-DXd (DFCI): DATO-Dxd and TDXd
- Sacituzumab sequenced registry trial (UCSF): SG and TDXd

