Characterizing IMDC prognostic groups in contemporary first-line combination therapies for metastatic renal cell carcinoma (mRCC)



Matthew Ernst¹, Vishal Navani¹, J Connor Wells¹, Frede Donskov², Naveen Basappa³, Chris Labaki⁴, Sumanta K Pal⁵, Luis Meza⁵, Lori A Wood⁶, D Scott Ernst⁷, Bernadette Szabados⁸, Rana R. Mckay⁹, Francis Parnis¹⁰, Cristina Suarez¹¹, Takeshi Yuasa¹², Anil Kapoor¹³, Ajjai Alva¹⁴, Georg A Bjarnason¹⁵, Toni K Choueiri⁴, and Daniel YC Heng¹

Department of Medical Oncology, Tom Baker Cancer Centre, University of Calgary¹; Department of Oncology, Aarhus University of Alberta³; Dana Farber Cancer Centre, San Diego, Moores Cancer Center, San Diego, CA⁹; Peter MacCallum Cancer Center, William Cancer Center, University of Calgary¹; University of Calgary¹; Cross Cancer Center, University of Calgary¹; Cancer Institute of Oncology, University of Cancer Center, University of Cancer Center, University of Cancer Center, University of Michigan Comprehensive Cancer Center, University of Toronto¹⁵

Background

- The combination of immuno-oncology agents (IO) ipilimumab and nivolumab (IPI-NIVO) and combinations of IO with vascular endothelial growth factor targeted therapies (IOVE) have demonstrated efficacy in clinical trials for the first-line treatment of mRCC¹⁻⁵
- This study seeks to establish real-world clinical benchmarks based on the International mRCC Database Consortium (IMDC) risk criteria using vascular endothelial growth factor targeted therapy (VEGF-TT) treated patients for context

Methods

- The IMDC database (IMDConline.com) was used to identify patients with mRCC who received first-line IPI-NIVO, IOVE and VEGF-TT from 2002-2021
- IOVE included axitinib/pembrolizumab, lenvatinib/pembrolizumab, cabozantinib/nivolumab, or axitinib/avelumab
- VEGF-TT included sunitinib or pazopanib
- The primary endpoint was overall survival (OS) and was calculated from time of initiation of first-line therapy to death from any cause
- Log-rank tests were conducted to differentiate between favorable, intermediate, and poor risk OS outcomes within treatment groups
- Overall response rates (ORR) and complete response (CR) rates were calculated based on physician assessment of best clinical response.

Results

- 692 patients received IPI-NIVO, 224 received IOVE, and 7152 received VEGF-TT
- Baseline characteristics for IPI-NIVO, IOVE, and VEGF-TT, respectively, were as follows: median age (interquartile range) 63 (56-69), 64 (57-70), and 63 (56-70); male 72%, 74%, and 72% (P=0.74); non-clear cell histology 15%, 10%, and 13% (p=0.15); sarcomatoid features 24%, 15%, and 13% (P < 0.0001); brain metastasis 8%, 4%, and 8% (P=0.04); liver metastasis 18%, 14%, and 18% (p=0.17); underwent nephrectomy 61%, 79% and 80% (P < 0.0001).

Conclusions

- •IMDC criteria continue to risk stratify patients in contemporary combination therapies
- •These findings provide real-world survival and response benchmarks for contemporary first-line mRCC treatments
- These findings may be useful for patient counseling and future trial development

Table 1: Benchmark OS and response rate by IMDC risk group

| | IPI-NIVO n=692 | | | IOVE n=244 | | | VEGF-TT n=7152 | | |
|-------------|----------------|--------------|-------------|------------|--------------|------------|----------------|----------------|---------------|
| IMDC Risk | Favorable* | Intermediate | Poor | Favorable | Intermediate | Poor | Favorable | Intermediate | Poor |
| n (%) | 66 (10) | 399 (58) | 227 (33) | 81 (33) | 117 (48) | 46 (19) | 1290 (18) | 3977 (56) | 1185 (17) |
| 12-month OS | 94% | 84% | 60% | 98% | 91% | 82% | 92% | 75% | 38% |
| 18-month OS | 90% | 77% | 49% | 94% | 85% | 75% | 84% | 64% | 28% |
| CR (%) | 4/55 (7) | 16/342 (5) | 4/186 (2) | 5/72 (7) | 4/100 (4) | 0/39 (0) | 39/1160 (3) | 121/3446 (4) | 23/1529 (2) |
| ORR (%) | 24/55 (44) | 139/342 (41) | 61/186 (33) | 44/72 (61) | 59/100 (59) | 17/39 (44) | 456/1160 (39) | 1156/3446 (34) | 320/1529 (21) |

P-values (log rank) for OS between risk groups were significant for IPI-NIVO, IOVE, and VEGF-TT with p<0.001 *IPI-NIVO is not indicated in favorable risk patients and must be interpreted with caution

References

- . Powles T et al. Pembrolizumab plus axitinib versus sunitinib monotherapy as first-line treatment of advanced renal cell carcinoma (KEYNOTE-426): extended follow-up from a randomised, open-label, phase 3 trial. Lancet Oncol. 2020 Dec;21(12):1563-1573
- 2. Motzer RJ *et al.* Nivolumab plus Ipilimumab versus Sunitinib in Advanced Renal-Cell Carcinoma. N Engl J Med. 2018 Apr 5;378(14):1277-1290
- 3. Motzer R *et al.* Lenvatinib plus Pembrolizumab or Everolimus for Advanced Renal Cell Carcinoma. N Engl J Med. 2021 Apr 8;384(14):1289-1300 4. Choueiri TK *et al.* Nivolumab plus Cabozantinib versus Sunitinib for Advanced Renal-Cell Carcinoma. N Engl J Med. 2021 Mar 4;384(9):829-841
- 5. Motzer RJ *et al*. Avelumab plus Axitinib versus Sunitinib for Advanced Renal-Cell Carcinoma. N Engl J Med. 2019 Mar 21;380(12):1103-1115

Table 2: OS Kaplan Meier curves





