## Immunotherapy for Melanoma

Michael Postow, MD Melanoma and Immunotherapeutics Service Memorial Sloan Kettering Cancer Center

## **Conflicts of Interest**

Bristol-Myers Squibb: -Research support -Participated in an advisory council -Honorarium

Amgen: -Participated in an advisory council

Caladrius: -Participated in an advisory council

Merck: -Honorarium

I will not address any non-FDA approved treatments.

## **Case Presentation**

52 year old otherwise healthy man with dysphagia and weight loss.

An EGD reveals BRAF wildtype esophageal melanoma.

A CT scan of his chest, abdomen, and pelvis was performed.





What is the best initial treatment option for a patient with BRAF wildtype melanoma?

> Radiotherapy? Chemotherapy? Immunotherapy? BRAF + MEK targeted therapy?

## Response rates to immunotherapy

	NIVO + IPI (N=314)	NIVO (N=316)	IPI (N=315)
ORR, % (95% CI)*	<b>57.6</b> (52.0–63.2)	<b>43.7</b> (38.1–49.3)	<b>19.0</b> (14.9–23.8)
Two-sided <i>P</i> value vs IPI	<0.001	<0.001	
Best overall response — %			
Complete response	12.1	9.8	2.2
Partial response	45.5	33.9	16.8
Stable disease	13.1	10.4	21.9
Progressive disease	22.6	38.0	48.9
Unknown	6.7	7.9	10.2
Median duration of response, months (95% CI)	<b>NR</b> (20.5–NR)	<b>22.3</b> (20.7–NR)	<b>14.4</b> (8.3–NR)
Ongoing response among responders, %	72.5	72.4	51.7
*Py PECIET v1 1 NP - not reached			Database lock Nov 2015

## **ORR in Patient Subgroups**

			% Higher absolute ORR with
	ORR (Patients)		
Total	57.6% (314)	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	1/1%
population	43.7% (316)	·	1470
BRAF		—	
Wild_type	53.3% (212)	• • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • •	7%
wild-type	46.8% (218)	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	
Mutant	66.7% (102)	•	200/
withant	36.7% (98)	•	30%
M Stage			
M1c	51.4% (185)	• • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • •	13%
	38.6% (184)		
Baseline LDH			
<1    N	65.3% (199)	• • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • •	14%
	51.5% (196)	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	
SHI N	44.7% (114)	•	1/1%
ZOLIN	30.4% (112)		1478
>2x      N	37.8% (37)		16%
	21.6% (37)		10/0
Age (yr)			
>65 and <75	57.4% (94)		9%
	48.1% (79)		
>75	54.3% (35)		110/
	43.6% (39)		
		ı I I I 70 50 30 10	i i 0 -10
		NIVO or NIVO+IPI better	IPI better IVO+IPI IVO+IPI IVO

## **Progression-Free Survival**



Database lock Nov 2015

## **Progression Free Survival: Subgroups**

	Median PFS	Events/patients		Hazard Ratio (95% CI)	
Total	11.5 (8.9- 22 2)	161/314		0.42 (0.34-0.52)	
population	6.9 (4.3-9.5)	183/316		0.55 (0.45-0.67)	
BRAF			•		
Wild-type	11.3 (8.3- 22.2)	110/212	<b>•</b> -	0.41 (0.33-0.53)	
,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,	7.1 (4.9-14.3)	120/218	<b>●</b>	0.48 (0.38-0.60)	
Mutopt	15.5 (8.0-NR)	51/102	<b>—</b>	0.44 (0.31-0.63)	
wutant	5.6 (2.8-9.3)	63/98		0.76 (0.54-1.07)	
M Stage					
M1c	8.5 (5.5-13.2)	108/185	<b>—</b>	0.49 (0.38-0.63)	
IVITC	5.3 (2.8-7.1)	118/184	<b>—</b>	0.60 (0.47-0.76)	
Baseline					
LDH		07/400	<b>●</b> -		
≤UI N	NR (11.5-NR)	87/199		0.37 (0.28-0.48)	
-011	9.7 (6.9-22.0)	106/196	-	0.52 (0.41-0.67)	
. LILNI	4.2 (2.8-9.3)	74/114		0.47 (0.34-0.64)	
>ULIN	2.8 (2.6-4.0)	76/112	-	0.59 (0.43-0.80)	
	2.8 (2.2-4.4)	29/37		0.41 (0.23-0.73)	
>2x ULN	2.6 (1.7-2.8)	30/37		0.63 (0.36-1.09)	
Age (vr)					
	11.1 (8.3-NR)	51/94	<b>—</b>	0.39 (0.27-0.56)	
≥65 and <75	5 16.1 (6.7- 24.9)	41/79		0.37 (0.25-0.54)	
<b>N7</b> 5	22.2 (4.4-NR)	17/35		0.53 (0.29-0.95)	
≤10	5.3 (2.6-NR)	24/39		0.76 (0.45-1.29)	
		NIVO or	U 1 2 NIVO+IPI better		+ NIVO+IP

Wolchok et al. ASCO 2016

- NIVO

# What about overall survival of combination?

# Overall survival still immature from phase 3 study

## **Overall Survival at 2 Years of Follow-up** (All Randomized Patients)



• 30/47 (64%) of patients randomized to IPI crossed over to receive any systemic therapy at progression

Postow et al. AACR 2016

# Combination has more side effects than either drug alone

 Updated safety information with 9 additional months of follow-up were consistent with the initial report

	NIVC (N=:	O+IPI NIVO =313) (N=313)		IPI (N=311)		
Patients reporting event, %	Any Grade	Grade 3-4	Any Grade	Grade 3-4	Any Grade	Grade 3-4
Treatment-related adverse event (AE)	95.8	56.5	84.0	19.8	85.9	27.0
Treatment-related AE leading to discontinuation	38.7	30.7	10.5	7.3	15.4	13.5
Treatment-related death*	0		0.3		0.3	

 68.8% of patients who discontinued NIVO+IPI due to treatment-related AEs achieved a response

\*One reported in the NIVO group (neutropenia) and one in the IPI group (colon perforation)

Database lock Nov 2015

### **Most Common Treatment-related Select AEs**

	NIVO+IPI (N=313)		NIVO (N=313)		IPI (N=311)	
	Any Grade	Grade 3-4	Any Grade	Grade 3-4	Any Grade	Grade 3-4
Skin AEs, %	60.4	5.8	43.8	2.2	54.7	2.9
Rash	28.4	2.9	22.7	0.3	21.2	1.6
Pruritus	35.1	1.9	20.4	0.3	36.3	0.3
Gastrointestinal AEs, %	47.6	15.3	21.7	2.9	37.3	11.6
Diarrhea	45.4	9.6	20.8	2.2	33.8	6.1
Colitis	11.5	8.0	2.2	1.0	11.3	8.0
Endocrine AEs, %	32.3	5.8	15.7	1.6	11.6	2.6
Hypothyroidism	16.0	0.3	9.3	0	4.5	0
Hyperthyroidism	10.2	1.0	4.5	0	1.0	0
Hepatic AEs, %	31.6	19.8	7.3	2.6	7.4	1.6
Elevated ALT	17.9	8.6	3.8	1.0	3.9	1.6
Elevated AST	15.7	6.1	4.2	1.0	3.9	0.6
Pulmonary AEs, %	7.3	1.0	1.6	0.3	1.9	0.3
Pneumonitis	6.7	1.0	1.3	0.3	1.6	0.3
Renal AEs, %	6.4	1.9	1.0	0.3	2.6	0.3
Elevated creatinine	4.2	0.3	0.6	0.3	1.6	0

Immune-modulating medicines were used to manage adverse events and led to resolution rates of • immune mediated AEs in the vast majority (>85%) of patients Database lock Nov 2015

13

## **Diarrhea and Colitis**



Slangen et al., World J Gastrointest Pharmacol Ther, 2013

# He develops 6 watery, persistent stools per day. You recommend:

- 1. Holding off on steroids initially since it may affect the efficacy of immunotherapy
- 2. Starting oral steroids
- 3. Giving a dose of infliximab
- 4. Colonoscopy prior to starting steroids to ensure a proper diagnosis of immunotherapy colitis
- 5. Ciprofloxacin and flagyl

### Time to Onset of Grade 3/4 Treatment-related Select AEs Patients receiving nivolumab + ipilimumab or ipilimumab alone



• Most grade 3/4 treatment-related select AEs occurred during the combination phase

Circles represent median; bars signify ranges

Hodi et al. ASCO 2015

## **Diarrhea/Colitis Management**

- 1. Stools < 4X baseline: imodium, budesonide
- 2. Stools < 7X baseline: 1mg/kg of prednisone
- 3. Stools > 7X baseline or refractory to oral steroids:
  - 1. Hospitalize for IV solumedrol 1-2mg/kg
  - 2. Consider infliximab 5mg/kg even before hospitalization
  - 3. Consider CT scan and colonoscopy, but these rarely help

\*\*Taper steroids slowly over at least several weeks and consider opportunistic infectious prophylaxis\*\*

## Patients who receive steroids for side effects have similar outcomes (ipilimumab)



### Horvat et al. J Clin Oncol 2015

# Immunosuppression does not seem to affect nivolumab outcomes

	NIVO monotherapy with IM N = 139	NIVO monotherapy without IM N = 437
OBB, n (%), [95% Cl]	40 (28.8)	141 (32.3)
	[21.4-37.1]	[27.9–36.9]
BOR, n (%)		
CR	7 (5.0)	22 (5.0)
PR	33 (23.7)	119 (27.2)
SD	31 (22.3)	102 (23.3)
PD	63 (45.3)	173 (39.6)
Not evaluable	5 (3.6)	21 (4.8)
Median duration of response, mo (95%	NR	22.0
CI)	(9.3–NR)	(22.0–NR)
Median time to response, mo (range)	2.1 (1.2–8.8)	2.1 (1.4–9.2)

- ORR was 28.8% in pts who
   had received
   immunosuppression and was
   32.3% in pts who had not
   received immunosuppression
- Time to response was similar in both subgroups (median of 2.1 months), and median duration of response was 22 months in those who did not receive immunosuppression and had not been reached in pts who received systemic immunosuppression

# Patients who stop combination due to side effects have high ORR

### Table 2. Treatment exposure (NIVO+IPI patients)

	All randomized (N = 94) <sup>a</sup> NIVO IPI		Discontinued due to AEs (n = 35)		
			NIVO	IPI	
Doses received, median (range)	4 (1-45)	4 (1-4)	3 (1-45)	3 (1-4)	
Number of doses of NIVO received, n/N (%) of patients					
1	11/94 <b>(12)</b>		3/35 <b>(9)</b>		
2	16	/94 <b>(17)</b>	9/35 <b>(26)</b>		
3	12	12/94 <b>(13)</b> 6/3			
4	17/94 <b>(18)</b> 9/35 <b>(26)</b>			(26)	
>4 (includes maintenance phase)	38/94 <b>(40)</b>		8/35 <b>(23)</b>		
<sup>a</sup> 95 patients were randomized, but 1 patient was not treated					

- As reported previously,<sup>1</sup> the NIVO+IPI and IPI groups (all randomized group) had ORRs of 59% vs 11% and CRs of 22% vs 0%, respectively
- Similar response rates were observed in the subgroup of patients who discontinued NIVO+IPI due to AEs (**Table 3**), with a 69% median reduction in tumor burden (**Figure 2**)

### Table 3. Response to treatment (NIV0+IPI patients)

	All randomized (N = 95)	Discontinued due to AEs (n = 35)
ORR, % (95% CI)	59 (48-69)	66 (48-81)
Best overall response, %		
Complete response	22	20
Partial response	37	46
Stable disease	13	17
Progressive disease	16	9
Could not be determined	13	9

# Patients who stopped combination due to side effects have excellent PFS

### Figure 4B. Progression-free survival at 2 years of follow-up



Hodi et al. ASCO 2016



## February 2015



## February 2015



### May 2015

## Factors into deciding single agent PD-1 vs. combination immunotherapy

- 1. Assessment of comorbidities?
- 2. Any contraindication to steroids or immunosuppression?
- 3. Reliability and communication between patient and care team?
- 4. Pace and disease burden of cancer?
- 5. Cannot use PD-L1 for treatment selection

## **Future questions**

- Since ~68% of patients with melanoma who discontinued due to toxicity had a response, how much is needed?
- 2. What is the role of maintenance PD-1 after combination immunotherapy? When should PD-1 be stopped?
- 3. What other combinations can include PD-1?

## Thank you from our team!!

