## Society for Immunotherapy of Cancer (SITC)

#### Immunotherapy for the Treatment of Non-Small Cell Lung Carcinoma Liza C. Villaruz University of Pittsburgh Cancer Institute

Cancer Immunology 101 July 31, 2015



# Outline

- NSCLC Background
- Mechanism of Immune Checkpoint Inhibition in NSCLC
- Clinical Experience
- Potential Biomarkers to Improve Patient Selection
- Take Home Points

# Background

- Significant therapeutic advances have been made in advanced NSCLC with the advent of genomic profiling and targeted therapies, e.g. EGFR mutant or ALK rearranged NSCLC.
- Patient with currently actionable oncogenic drivers comprise about 15-20% lung adenocarcinomas.
- In patients without actionable oncogenic drivers, chemotherapy has remained the mainstay of treatment.
- In particular, there are no validated genomic targets in Sq-NSCLC.

# Background

- Immunotherapy in lung cancer has *until recently* been met with disappointing results.
- Lung cancer immune dysfunction is characterized by evasion of immunosurveillance.
  - Production of immunosuppressive chemokines by the tumor cells
  - Loss of MHC antigen expression
  - Higher proportion of T-regulatory (T<sub>reg</sub>) cells in the tumor microenvironment

# **Immune Checkpoints**



- CTLA-4 is expressed on T cells and regulates the early stages of T-cell activation
  - counteracts T-cell
    costimulatory receptor CD28
    by competing for its ligands
- PD-1 mediates immune resistance in the tumor microenvironment by downregulating the activity of effector T cells in peripheral tissues

#### *Clin Cancer Res* 2015;21:976-984.

# Immune Checkpoints

- Crucial for self-tolerance
- Co-opted by tumors
  - PD-1 ligands are frequently upregulated in human cancers, including NSCLC
  - PD-1 expressed on TILs, B cells, NK cells, monocytes and dendritic cells.
- Immune checkpoint blockade "releases the breaks".



### Phase 1 multi-cohort CA209-003 study: NSCLC cohort

- N = 129; most patients  $\geq 3$  lines of therapy
  - ORR similar across histologies (16.7% squamous and 17.6% non-squamous)
  - Durable responses (45% ongoing responses), occurred early (50% at first assessment; 8 wks); could continue following treatment discontinuation
    - 6/16 (38%) responders who discontinued therapy for reasons other than disease progression responded for ≥30 weeks following end of therapy; 5/6 (83%) were ongoing at time of reporting

Efficacy of nivolumab monotherapy by dose in patients with NSCLC					
Dose mg/kg	ORR % <sup>a,b</sup> (n/N)	Estimated Median DOR <sup>c</sup> wks (range)	SD Rate <sup>a</sup> ≥24 wks % (n/N)	Median PFS <sup>d,e</sup> months (95% CI)	Median OS <sup>d,e</sup> months (95% CI)
All patients	17 (22/129)	74 (6.1+, 133.9+)	10.1 (13/129)	2.3 (1.8, 3.7)	9.9 (7.8, 12.4)
1	3.0 (1/33)	63.9 (63.9, 63.9)	15.2 (5/33)	1.8 (1.7, 3.3)	9.2 (5.3, 11.1)
3	24.3 (9/37)	74 (16.1+, 133.9+)	8.1 (3/37)	1.9 (1.7, 7.3)	14.9 (7.3, NE)
10	20.3 (12/59)	83.1 (6.1+, 132.7+)	8.5 (5/59)	3.7 (1.9, 3.8)	9.2 (5.2, 12.4)

<sup>a</sup>Modified Response Evaluation Criteria In Solid Tumors (RECIST) v1.0. CIs for ORRs and SD rates were calculated using the Clopper-Pearson method; <sup>b</sup>Six patients with unconventional "immune-related" responses were not included as responders; <sup>c</sup>Time from first response to documented progression, death, or last tumor assessment (+ = censored); estimated median DORs were determined from Kaplan-Meier curves; <sup>d</sup>Median values for time-to-event endpoints (PFS, OS, DOR) were estimated using the Kaplan-Meier method; <sup>e</sup>Survival data were collected retrospectively

Brahmer, ASCO 2014

## CA209-003 NSCLC Survival KM by Dose



OS = overall survival

Brahmer, ASCO 2014

#### CheckMate 017 (NCT01642004) - Study Design



Patients stratified by region and prior paclitaxel use

83% (225/272) of patients had quantifiable PD-L1 expression

### CheckMate 017 (NCT01642004): Overall Survival



#### CheckMate 017 (NCT01642004): Progression-Free Survival



PFS per investigator.

#### **Objective Response Rate**

	Nivolumab n = 135	Docetaxel n = 137
ORR, %	20	9
(95% CI)	(14, 28)	(5, 15)
P-value <sup>a</sup>	0.0	083
Best overall response, %		
Complete response	1 <sup>b</sup>	0
Partial response	19	9
Stable disease	29	34
Progressive disease	41	35
Unable to determine	10	22
Median DOR, <sup>c</sup> mo	NR	8.4
(range)	(2.9, 21+)	(1.4+, 15+)
Median time to response, <sup>c</sup> mo (range)	2.2 (1.6, 12)	2.1 (1.8, 9.5)

• 28 patients in the nivolumab arm were treated beyond RECIST v1.1-defined progression

• Non-conventional benefit was observed in 9 patients (not included in ORR)

<sup>a</sup>Based on two-sided stratified Cochran–Mantel–Haenszel test on estimated odds ratio of 2.6 (95% CI: 1.3, 5.5). <sup>b</sup>One pt experienced complete response. <sup>c</sup>Values are for all confirmed responders per RECIST v1.1 (nivolumab, n = 27; docetaxel, n = 12). Symbol + indicates a censored value. NR = not reached

### OS and PFS by PD-L1 Expression

• Survival benefit with nivolumab was independent of PD-L1 expression level

PD-L1	Patients, n		Unstratified	Interaction	PD-L1 negative expression	
expression	Nivolumab	Docetaxel	HR (95% CI)	<i>P</i> -value	Not quantifiable	
OS						
≥1%	63	56	0.69 (0.45, 1.05)	0.56	<b>--+</b>	
<1%	54	52	0.58 (0.37, 0.92)	0.00	<b>—</b> —	
≥5%	42	39	0.53 (0.31, 0.89)	0.47	<b>———</b> —	
<5%	75	69	0.70 (0.47, 1.02)	0.47	<b></b>	
≥10%	36	33	0.50 (0.28, 0.89)	0.44		
<10%	81	75	0.70 (0.48, 1.01)	0.41	_ <b></b> _	
Not quantifiable	18	29	0.39 (0.19, 0.82)			
PFS						
≥1%	63	56	0.67 (0.44, 1.01)	0 70		
<1%	54	52	0.66 (0.43, 1.00)	0.70		
≥5%	42	39	0.54 (0.32, 0.90)	0.16		
<5%	75	69	0.75 (0.52, 1.08)			
≥10%	36	33	0.58 (0.33, 1.02)	0.25		
<10%	81	75	0.70 (0.49, 0.99)	0.30		
Not quantifiable	18	29	0.45 (0.23, 0.89)			

PD-L1 expression was measured in pre-treatment tumor biopsies (DAKO automated IHC assay)<sup>15</sup>

Spigel, ASCO 2015

1.0

0.5

0.125

**Nivolumab** 

0.25

2.0

Docetaxel

PD-L1 positive expression

### Treatment-related AEs ( $\geq$ 10% of patients)

	Nivolumab n = 131		Docetaxel n = 129	
	Any Grade Grade 3–4		Any Grade	Grade 3–4
Total patients with an event, %	58	7	86	55
Fatigue	16	1	33	8
Decreased appetite	11	1	19	1
Asthenia	10	0	14	4
Nausea	9	0	23	2
Diarrhea	8	0	20	2
Vomiting	3	0	11	1
Myalgia	2	0	10	0
Anemia	2	0	22	3
Peripheral neuropathy	1	0	12	2
Neutropenia	1	0	33	30
Febrile neutropenia	0	0	11	10
Alopecia	0	0	22	1

### **Treatment-related Select AEs**

	Nivolumab n = 131		Docetaxel n = 129	
	Any Grade	Grade 3–4	Any Grade	Grade 3–4
Endocrine, % Hypothyroidism	4 4	0 0	0 0	0 0
<b>Gastrointestinal, %</b> Diarrhea Colitis	8 8 1	1 0 1	20 20 0	2 2 0
Hepatic, <sup>a</sup> % ALT increased AST increased	2 2 2	0 0 0	2 1 1	1 1 1
Pulmonary, %	5	1	1 <sup>b</sup>	0
Lung infiltration Interstitial lung disease	1 0	0 0	0 0 1 <sup>b</sup>	0 0 0
<b>Renal,<sup>c</sup> %</b> Blood creatinine increased Tubulointerstitial nephritis	3 3 1	1 0 1	2 2 0	0 0 0
Skin, <sup>d</sup> %	9	0	9	2
Hypersensitivity/Infusion reaction, % Hypersensitivity Infusion-related reaction	1 0 1	0 0 0	2 2 1	1 1 0

• Select AEs: AEs with potential immunologic etiology that require frequent monitoring/intervention

<sup>a</sup> No cases of increased bilirubin occurred in the nivolumab arm. <sup>b</sup> Grade 5 event. <sup>c</sup> No cases of renal failure were reported in the nivolumab arm. <sup>d</sup> Includes rash, pruritus, erythema, maculopapular rash, skin exfoliation, urticaria and palmar plantar erythrodysasthesia syndrome.



# CheckMate 057 (NCT01673867) - Study Design



Patients stratified by prior maintenance therapy and line of therapy (second- vs third-line)

- PD-L1 expression measured using the Dako/BMS automated IHC assay<sup>14,15</sup>
  - Fully validated with analytical performance having met all pre-determined acceptance criteria for sensitivity, specificity, precision, and robustness

<sup>a</sup> Maintenance therapy included pemetrexed, bevacizumab, or erlotinib (not considered a separate line of therapy); <sup>b</sup> Per RECIST v1.1 criteria as determined by the investigator.

#### Paz-Ares, ASCO 2015

# CheckMate 057 (NCT01673867): Overall Survival



Symbols represent censored observations.

#### Paz-Ares, ASCO 2015

## **Objective Response Rate**

	Nivolumab (n = 292)	Docetaxel (n = 290)
ORR (95% CI)	<b>19%</b> (15, 24)	<b>12%</b> (9, 17)
<i>Odds Ratio</i> (95% CI) <i>P-</i> value <sup>a</sup>	1.72 (1. 0.02	1, 2.6) 246
Best overall response, % Complete response Partial response Stable disease Progressive disease Unable to determine	1 18 25 44 11	<1 12 42 29 16
Median time to response, <sup>b</sup> mo (range)	2.1 (1.2, 8.6)	2.6 (1.4, 6.3)
Median DOR, <sup>b</sup> mo, (range)	<b>17.2</b> (1.8, 22.6+)	<b>5.6</b> (1.2+, 15.2+)
Ongoing response, <sup>c</sup> %	52	14

• 71 (24%) patients on nivolumab were treated beyond RECIST v1.1-defined progression

• Non-conventional benefit was observed in 16 patients (not included in best overall response)

<sup>a</sup> Based on two-sided stratified Cochran Mantel Haenszel test; <sup>b</sup> Values are for all responders (nivolumab, n = 56; docetaxel, n = 36); <sup>c</sup> Ongoing response at last tumor assessment before censoring. Symbol + indicates a censored value.

### Treatment Effect on OS in Predefined Subgroups

	Ν	Unstratified HR (95% C
Overall	582	0.75 (0.62, 0.91)
Age Categorization		
(years)		
<65	339	0.81 (0.62, 1.04)
≥65 and <75	200	0.63 (0.45, 0.89)
≥75	43	0.90 (0.43, 1.87)
Gender		
Male	319	0.73 (0.56, 0.96)
Female	263	0.78 (0.58, 1.04)
Baseline ECOG PS		
0	179	0.64 (0.44, 0.93)
≥1	402	0.80 (0.63, 1.00)
Smoking Status		
Current/Former Smoker	458	0.70 (0.56, 0.86)
Never Smoked	118	1.02 (0.64, 1.61)
EGFR Mutation Status		
Positive	82	1.18 (0.69, 2.00)
Not Detected	340	0.66 (0.51, 0.86)
Not Reported	160	0.74 (0.51, 1.06)



All randomized patients (nivolumab, n = 292; docetaxel, n = 290).

Paz-Ares, ASCO 2015

## OS by PD-L1 Expression



Symbols represent censored observations.

Paz-Ares, ASCO 2015

#### PD-L1 Expression in Non–Small-Cell Lung Cancers.





#### **OS by PD-L1 Expression**





### Mutational Burden and Response to PD1 blockade





Naiyer A. Rizvi et al. Science 2015;348:124-128

### Molecular smoking signature and PD1 blockade





Naiyer A. Rizvi et al. Science 2015;348:124-128

# Checkpoint inhibitors in NSCLC

Agent	Selected Trials		
CTLA			
lpilumumab	Ongoing Ph III with CP in Sq NSCLC		
Tremelimumab	Ongoing Ph Ib with MEDI4736		
PD-1			
Nivolumab	Ph III vs. docetaxel previously treated Sq & Non-Sq NSCLC		
	Ph III 1 <sup>st</sup> line vs. chemotherapy, PD-L1+		
Pembrolizumab	Ph II/III vs. docetaxel previously treated NSCLC		
	Ongoing Ph III 1 <sup>st</sup> line vs. chemotherapy, PD-L1 +		
	Ongoing Ph II in brain metastases		
PD-L1			
MPDL-3280A	Ongoing Ph III vs. docetaxel previously treated NSCLC		
MEDI4736	Ongoing Ph III following concurrent chemorads		
	Ongoing Ph II after > 2 lines of therapy		

## **Take Home Points**

•Lung cancer evades the immune system by co-opting the PD1/PD-L1 immune checkpoint.

•The immune checkpoint inhibitors are associated with a high level of activity in advanced NSCLC

–Nivolumab is the first PD-1 inhibitor to demonstrate a survival benefit versus standard-of-care docetaxel in previously-treated patients with advanced SQ and non-SQ NSCLC

–Nivolumab benefit was independent of PD-L1 expression in SQ; in non-SQ it was predictive of benefit.

-Responses are durable.

-The safety profile of nivolumab was favorable versus docetaxel.

•Biomarkers such as mutational burden may serve to identify patients likely to respond to checkpoint inhibition.

