Castration-resistant prostate cancer

Castration-Resistant Prostate Cancer: Current Approach



Ravi A. Madan, M.D. Clinical Director Genitourinary Malignancies Branch Center for Cancer Research, NCI, NIH



FDA approved therapies

Prostate Cancer FDA-Approved Therapies for Newly Metastatic (Normal Testosterone) / Death



Castrate resistant prostate cancer

What is Castration Resistance Prostate Cancer?

- Progressive disease despite castration levels of testosterone (50 ng/dL)
- Progression could be PSA or Imaging
- The androgen receptor drives prostate cancer growth
 - Depriving the tumor of testosterone is the primary therapy for metastatic disease

Anti-androgen therapy

So why do we use Anti-Androgen therapy in CRPC?



Resistance Mechanisms:

- AR Amplification
- Secondary androgen production
- Ligand independent growth
- Intranuclear changes

Prostate cancer rules

Rules of the Game: Prostate Cancer Working Group

- PSA is **NOT** the primary measure of progression in mCRPC
- Radiographic imaging is the primary objective measure
- Patient symptoms and treatment tolerability also paramount

Optimal treatment sequence Optimal Treatment Sequence?

- No clear data for sequencing treatment in metastatic castration resistant prostate cancer (*mCRPC*)
- Ongoing trials will evaluate this question further
- In the absence of data I will provide *my opinion* on treatment selection
- Treatment decisions should be made with understanding of the following factors
 - Treatment side effects
 - Patient co-morbidities
 - Patient symptoms
 - Pace of disease

mCRPC treatment considerations

Considerations for the Treatment of mCRPC

Key disease questions:

- Previous therapies
- Pace of disease (e.g. time of progression on ADT, pace of mets)
- Symptoms (none, moderate or significant)

Key patient characteristics:

- Age
- Comorbidities
- Quality of life preferences
- Treatment logistics

One Possible Decision Algorithm for Treatment of mCRPC: Normal Pace of Disease*



*Initial response to ADT 1-2 years or longer *Metastasis on scans shows slow progression

Algorithm

One Possible Decision Algorithm for Treatment of mCRPC: Rapid Pace of Disease*



*Initial response to ADT short (e.g less than 1 year) or *Metastasis on scans shows rapid progression

Decision algorithm

One Possible Decision Algorythm for Treatment of mCRPC: Normal Pace of Disease*

Minimal Symptoms

Sipuleucel-T

*Initial response to ADT 1-2 years or longer *Metastasis on scans shows slow progression

Therapeutic Cancer Vaccine: Sipuleucel-T

Therapeutic Cancer Vaccine: Sipuleucel-T



Apheresis Center

Company (Dendreon)

Doctor's Office

IMPACT: Randomized Phase 3 Trial

IMPACT: Randomized Phase 3 Trial (IMmunotherapy Prostate AdenoCarcinoma Treatment)



Primary endpoint: Secondary endpoint:

Overall Survival Time to Objective Disease Progression

Kantoff PW et al. NEJM. 2010;363:411-22

Sipuleucel-T: IMPACT Overall Survival



Sipuleucel-T

Sipuleucel-T: IMPACT Overall Survival



PSA and Sipuleucel-T

Patients with Lower PSA Had Greater OS Benefit After Sipuleucl-T

	Baseline PSA (ng/ml)						
	<22 (n=188)	22-50 (n=128)	50-134 (n=128)	>134			
Median OS (mos)							
Sipuleucel-T	41.3	27.1	20.4	18.4			
Control	28.3	20.1	15.0	15.6			
Difference	13.0	7.0	5.4	2.8			
HR	0.51	0.74	0.81	0.84			

Schellhammer PF et al. Urol. 2013

Sipuleucel-T Toxicity

- Chills, fatigue, fever, nausea, and headache
- Cerebrovascular events were reported in 3.5 percent of patients treated with sipuleucel-T patients and 2.4 percent of patients who received placebo.

Sipuleucel-T

Society of Immunotherapy of Cancer (SITC) Recommendations for Sipuleucel-T



Sipuleucel-T

-Don't expect PSA decrease

-Use early, in less aggressive disease

My recommendation: Treat and move on to the next therapy

Algorithm

One Possible Decision Algorithm for Treatment of mCRPC: Normal Pace of Disease*



Enzalutamide

A small molecule AR antagonist Affinity 30 folds of bicalutamide Prevent nuclear translocation Prevents co-activator recruitment



AFFIRM

AFFIRM: Randomized Phase III Study of MDV3100 vs. Placebo in mCRPC after Progression on Docetaxel



AFFIRM: Phase III trial with 1199 patients with mCRPC Previously treated with docetaxel OS: 18/4 to 13.6 mos (HR: 0.63; P<0.001) TTP: 8.3 vs 2.9 mos (HR: 0.40; P<0.001) FDA approved on 8/31/2012



PREVAIL: Randomized Phase III Study of Enzalutamide vs Placebo in mCRPC before chemotherapy



Enzalutamide Toxicity

Cardiovascular: Peripheral edema (15%) Central nervous system: Fatigue (51%), headache (12%) Endocrine & metabolic: Hot flashes (20%) Gastrointestinal: Diarrhea (22%) Hematologic: Neutropenia (15%; grades 3/4: 1%) Neuromuscular & skeletal: Back pain (26%), arthralgia (21%), musculoskeletal pain (15%) Respiratory: Upper respiratory tract infection (11%)

Algorithm

One Possible Decision Algorithm for Treatment of mCRPC: Normal Pace of Disease*



*Initial response to ADT 1-2 years or longer *Metastasis on scans shows slow progression

Abiraterone rationale

Rationale for Abiraterone in CRPC

• There is up-regulation of androgen biosynthesis enzymes in CRPC



• Blocks androgen synthesis by the adrenal glands, testes and within the prostate tumor tissue

Abiraterone study

Abiraterone: COU-AA-301 Study Design



- This study was conducted in 147 sites in 13 countries
- Patients were enrolled from May 2008 through July 2009

Abiraterone: COU-AA-301 Trial



Abiraterone trial

Abiraterone: COU-AA-301 Trial

Variable	Abiraterone Acetate (N = 797)	Placebo (N = 398)	Hazard Ratio (95% CI)	P Value
Time to PSA progression (mo)	10.2	6.6	0.58 (0.46-0.73)	<0.001
Progression-free survival according to radiographic evidence (mo)	5.6	3.6	0.67 (0.59-0.78)	< 0.001
PSA response rate (%)				
Total	38.0	10.1		< 0.001
Confirmed response on the basis of the PSA concentration	29.1	5.5		<0.001
Objective response on the basis of imaging studies	14.0	2.8		<0.001

COU-AA-302

COU-AA-302 (chemo-naïve)



Ryan CJ, Lancet Oncol, 2015

Abiraterone Toxicity

Cardiovascular: Edema (25% to 27%), hypertension (9% to 22%; grades 3/4: 1% to 4%)

Central nervous system: Fatigue (39%), insomnia (14%)

Dermatologic: Bruise (13%)

Endocrine & metabolic: Increased serum triglycerides (63%), hyperglycemia (57%), hypernatremia (33%), hypokalemia (17% to 28%; grades 3/4: 3% to 5%), hypophosphatemia (24%; grades 3/4: 7%), hot flash (19% to 22%)

Gastrointestinal: Constipation (23%), diarrhea (18% to 22%), dyspepsia (6% to 11%)

Genitourinary: Urinary tract infection (12%)

Hematologic: Lymphocytopenia (38%; grades 3/4: 9%)

Hepatic: Increased serum ALT (11% to 42%; grades 3/4: 1% to 6%), increased serum AST (31% to 37%; grades 3/4: 2% to 3%)

Neuromuscular & skeletal: Joint swelling (30%, including joint discomfort), myalgia (26%)

Respiratory: Cough (11% to 17%), upper respiratory infection (5% to 13%), dyspnea (12%), nasopharyngitis (11%)

Normal pace of disease

One Possible Decision Algorithm for Treatment of mCRPC: Normal Pace of Disease*



*Initial response to ADT 1-2 years or longer *Metastasis on scans shows slow progression

Overlapping resistance

Overlapping Resistance: Androgen Receptor Splice Variants

- Variable splicing of AR mRNA can lead to resistance mechanisms to antiandrogen therapy
- ARV-7 has been investigated extensively, lacks a ligand binding domain and is constituently active
- Increases in ARV-7 seen after treatment with Abiraterone/Enzalutamide, likely contributing to cross-resistance.
- Thus sequential abiraterone and enzalutamide use may not have additive benefits



PROPHECY

PROPHECY: Regardless of Platform, Patients with Splice Variant AR-V7 had Worse Outcomes



Armstrong AJ etal. JCO, 2019

Algorithm

One Possible Decision Algorythm for Treatment of mCRPC: Rapid Pace of Disease*



*Initial response to ADT short (e.g less than 1 year) or *Metastasis on scans shows rapid progression

Algorithm

One Possible Decision Algorithm for Treatment of mCRPC: Rapid Pace of Disease*



*Initial response to ADT short (e.g less than 1 year) or *Metastasis on scans shows rapid progression

Docetaxel

Docetaxel

- In 1960s, crude extract of the bark of the Pacific yew tree, Taxus brevifolia, was shown to have suppressive activity in preclinical tumor models.
- By 1971, paclitaxel was identified as the active constituent of the bark extract.
- Taxanes exhibit antimicrotubule and antitumor activity
- Emerging data suggests that taxanes inhibit AR translocation via microtubules



Phase III study

TAX327: A Multicenter, Randomized Phase III Study of 3 weekly Docetaxel + Prednisone vs. Weekly Docetaxel + Prednisone vs. Mitoxantrone + Prednisone



TAX327: Overall Survival



Docetaxel Toxicity

Central nervous system: Central nervous system toxicity (20% to 58%; severe: 6%; including neuropathy)

- Dermatologic: Alopecia (56% to 76%), dermatological reaction (20% to 48%; severe: \leq 5%), nail disease (11% to 41%)
- Endocrine & metabolic: Fluid retention (13% to 60%; severe: 7% to 9%; dose dependent)
- Gastrointestinal: Stomatitis (19% to 53%; severe 1% to 8%), diarrhea (23% to 43%; severe: 5% to 6%), nausea (34% to 42%), vomiting (22% to 23%)
- Hematologic & oncologic: Neutropenia (84% to 99%; grade 4: 75% to 86%; nadir [median]: 7 days, duration [severe neutropenia]: 7 days; dose dependent), leukopenia (84% to 99%; grade 4: 32% to 44%), anemia (65% to 97%; dose dependent; grades 3/4: 8% to 9%), thrombocytopenia (8% to 14%; grade 4: 1%; dose dependent), febrile neutropenia (5% to 14%; dose dependent)
- Hepatic: Increased serum transaminases (4% to 19%)
- Hypersensitivity: Hypersensitivity (1% to 21%; with premedication 15%)
- Infection: Infection (1% to 34%; dose dependent)
- Neuromuscular & skeletal: Weakness (53% to 66%; severe 13% to 18%), myalgia (3% to 23%), neuromuscular reaction (16%)
- Respiratory: Pulmonary reaction (41%)

Algorithm

One Possible Decision Algorythm for Treatment of mCRPC: Normal Pace of Disease*



*Initial response to ADT 1-2 years or longer *Metastasis on scans shows slow progression

Radium-223 (Alpharadin)

Bone –targeting radiopharmaceutical High energy alpha-particles with short range ($<100\mu$ m) hence less bone marrow toxicity



Radium trial

ALSYMPCA: Randomized Phase III Study of Radium-223 vs. Placebo in mCRPC with bone metastases





Ra-223 50kBq/kg q4wks x 6

Placebo

ALSYMPCA trial

ALSYMPCA: Randomized Phase III Study of Radium-223 vs. Placebo in mCRPC with bone metastases



Parker C. et al. NEJM, 2013.

Survival curve

ALSYMPCA: Subgroup Analysis based on Previous Docetaxel



Radium 223 AEs

Radium 223 AEs

- Cardiovascular: Peripheral edema (13%)
- Gastrointestinal: Nausea (36%), diarrhea (25%), vomiting (19%)
- Hematologic: Anemia (93%; grades 3/4: 6%), lymphocytopenia (72%; grades 3/4: 20%), leukopenia (35%; grades 3/4: 3%), thrombocytopenia (31%; grades 3/4: 1% to 6%), neutropenia (18%; grades 3/4: 1% to 3%)

Algorithm

One Possible Decision Algorythm for Treatment of mCRPC: Normal Pace of Disease*



*Initial response to ADT 1-2 years or longer *Metastasis on scans shows slow progression

Cabazitaxel

Cabazitaxel

- Novel taxane active in docetaxel resistant cell lines
 - Less affinity for P-glycoprotein pump



Methoxyl side chain instead of hydroxyl groups found in docetaxel

Phase III study

TROPIC: Randomized Phase III Study of Cabazitaxel vs. Mitoxantrone in mCRPC after Progression on Docetaxel



ŧ

TROPIC

TROPIC: Overall Survival



de Bono JS. et al. Lancet 2010

Cabazitaxel vs. Docetaxel

Cabazitaxel vs. Docetaxel

- Cabazitaxel was <u>not</u> superior to docetaxel in front-line chemotherapy setting
- Cabazitaxel at 20 mg has same long term outcomes as Cabazitaxel at 25 mg

Sartor OA et al. ASCO 2016

Cabazitaxel toxicity

Cabazitaxel Toxicity

- Central nervous system: Fatigue (37%), fever (12%)
- Gastrointestinal: Diarrhea (47%; grades 3/4: 6%), nausea (34%), vomiting (22%), constipation (20%), abdominal pain (17%), anorexia (16%), taste alteration (11%)
- Hematologic: Anemia (98%; grades 3/4: 11%), leukopenia (96%; grades 3/4: 69%), neutropenia (94%; grades 3/4: 82%; nadir: 12 days [range: 4-17 days]), thrombocytopenia (48%; grades 3/4: 4%)
- Neuromuscular & skeletal: Weakness (20%), back pain (16%), peripheral neuropathy (13%; grades 3/4; <1%), arthralgia (11%)
- Renal: Hematuria (17%)
- Respiratory: Dyspnea (12%), cough (11%)

Should strongly consider the use of growth factor

Metastatic disease

Biopsy Metastatic Disease? Why? When?

PARP inhibitor

PARP Inhibitor – Breakthrough Status



Robinson D et al. Cell, 2015

- 50 patients treated with a olparib.
- 16 patients had "responses"
- 14 of the 16 had DNA damage repair defects



J. Matso, S. Carreira, S. Sanshu, S. Miranda, H. Mourag, R. Perez-Lopez, D. Nava Bedriguez, D. Beblinson, A. Ovelin, N. Tureriu, G. Beyen, N. Perez, A. Gilfman, F. Figueriedia, C. Paulding, G. Serd, S. Jais, C. Balph, A. Protherson, S. Farsnain, B. Jornes, T. Blott, U. McGowern, D. Bianchiri, J. Goodali, Z. Zefeirion, T. Williamson, R. Fernideschi, R. Riinnass, B. Ebbs, G. Forder, D. Bods, W. Yuan, Y.-M. Wu, X. Coo, R. Brough, H. Permberton, R. A'Hern, A. Sanin, L.P. Rueju, R. Feles, G. Attack, C.J. Lord, A. Ashworth, M.A. Rubis, K.E. Ennobert, P.Y. Feng, A.M. Chinradyan, E. Hall, and J.S. de Boro.

MSI high prostate cancer

MSI High Prostate Cancer

Approval of pembrolizumab Incidence

- Localized PC ~2%
- Autopsy series of mCRPC ~12%
 - Pritchard et al., Nature Com 201
- Ongoing testing suggests <u>5-6%</u> of mCRPC

Lemery et al., NEJM 2017

Inactivation of CDK12 Delineates a Distinct Immunogenic Class of Advanced Prostate Cancer

Yi-Mi Wu,^{1,230} Marcin Cleślik,^{1,239} Robert J. Lonigro,¹ Pankaj Vats,¹ Melissa A. Reimers,² Xuhong Cao,¹ Yu Ning,¹ Lisha Wang,¹ Lakahmi P. Kunju,^{12,4} Navonil de Sarkar,¹ Elisabeth I. Heath,¹² Jonathan Chou,³ Feis, Y. Feng,^{30,10,11} Peter S. Nelson,^{5,12,13} Johann S. de Bono,^{14,15} Weiping Zou,^{12,14} Bruce Montgomery,^{12,17} Ajai Aiva,¹³ PCF/SU2C International Prostate Cancer Dream Team, Dan R. Robinson,^{12,14} and Arul M. Chinnalyan,^{12,4,10,12,15}

Graphical Abstract **Biallelie** Internation CDK12 mutations checkpoint inhibitors distinct class of PrCa T cell CDK12 nation Ant-PD Ant-PD-1 -----CDK12 Genome Immune Cell Instability 🕈 Infitration Metastatio Prostate Extensive Cancer Increased lowers tandem duplications of necaritigens Normal ABCODEF Tumor ABBCCBDEF Gene A B C B D E E F F Fusions

Highlights

- CDM12 biallelic inactivating mutations define a distinct subtype of prostate cancer
- CDK72 loss is associated with genomic instability and local tandem duplications
- CDK12 less loads to increased gene fusions, neoantigen burden, and T cell infiltration
- Patients with CDKM2 mutant tumors may benefit from immune checkpoint inhibition

Wu YM et al. Cell, 2018

New therapies

MSI High **Prostate** Cancer

Approval of pembrolizumab Incidence

- Localized PC ~2%
- Autopsy series of mCRPC ~12%
 - Pritchard et al., Nature Com 201
- Ongoing testing suggests <u>5-6%</u> of mCRPC

Lemery et al., NEJM 2017

Inactivation of CDK12 Delineates a Distinct Immunogenic Class of Advanced Prostate Cancer

Yi-Mi Wu,^{1,2,20} Marcin Cleślik,^{1,2,20} Robert J. Lonigro,¹ Pankaj Vats,¹ Melissa A. Reimers,² Xuhong Cao,¹ Yu Ning,¹ Lisha Wang,¹ Lakshmi P, Kunju,^{1,2,4} Navonil de Sarkar,⁸ Eisabeth I, Heath,^{8,7} Jonathan Chou,⁶ Felix Y, Feng,^{60,10,11} Peter S. Nelson, 512,13 Johann S. de Bono, 14,15 Weiping Zou, 12,19 Bruce Montgomery, 12,17 Ajai Alva, 1.2 PCF/SU2C International Prostate Cancer Dream Team, Dan R, Robinson, 127 and Arul M, Chinnaivan 12

subtype of prostate cancer

burden, and T cell infiltration

immune checkpoint inhibition

CDK12 loss loads to increased gene fusions, neoantigen

tandem duplications



Wu YM et al. Cell, 2018

Olaparib

Olaparib for mCRPC (chemo-naïve)



de Daha Jileta I.N. Englis Med 2020

56

Olaparib

Olaparib for mCRPC (chemo-naïve)



58

Median

1000

5.8

3.5

0.49 [95% CI, 0.38-8-63]

or death.

Olaparib for mCRPC

Olaparib for mCRPC (chemo-naïve)

B Cohorts A and B							
Subgroup	Hazard Ratio for Progression or De	eath (95% CI)					
All patients	•	0.49 (0.38-0.63)					
Previous taxane use							
Yes		0.39 (0.29-0.53)					
No		0.77 [0.50-1.22]					
Measurable disease at baseline							
Yes		0.41 (0.30-8.56)					
No		0.64 (0.43-0.88)					
Metastases at baseline							
Bone only		0.57 (0.35-0.94)					
Viscenal		0.42 [0.28-8.64]					
Other		0.57 (0.37-0.90)					
ECOG score at baseline							
0		0.67 (0.46-1.00)					
1		0.45 [0.32-8.64]					
2 -		0.31 (0.10-1.13)					
Age at randomization							
<85 pr		0.53 (0.34-0.85)					
285 pr	•	0.52 (0.39-8.70)					
Regian							
Asia		0.67 (0.44-1.84)					
Europe		0.48 [0.33-0.71]					
North and South America		0.43 [0.26-0.73]					
PSA at baseline							
≥Median	-	0.46 (0.33-0.65)					
distant		DATE IN ALL DISC					
Gene alteration							
SWCA1	.	0.41 [0.13-1.39]					
89CA2		0.31 (0.13-0.32)					
A7M		1.04 (0.61-1.87)					
CD812		0.34 (0.44-1.31)					
CHEK2		0.87 [0.23-4.13]					
PR#2924		6.61 (1.41-46.43)					
840541		0.35 (0.03-2.54)					
8.06	825 100 4.00 16.00						
-							
Olsparib Better Control Better							



de Daha Jileta I, N. Englis Med 2020 -

Chemo-naive

Olaparib for mCRPC (chemo-naïve)





de Dana al eta I, N. Englia Med 2020.

Rucaparib

Rucaparib mCRPC (chemo-refractory)





AbdaWieta. CSMO:2020

Treatment strategy

Strategy for Treating mCRPC in 2021



Lu-177-PMSA

2021 Update: Lu-177-PSMA



Monis, MJ et al, ASCO 2021 via UroToday

Phase 3 Trial

Lu-177-PSMA Phase 3 Trial (post docetaxel)



Morris, MJ et al, ASCO 2021 via UroToday

Survival curve

Lu-177-PSMA



Sartor, O et al. NHJM, 2021

Prostate cancer

Non-Metastatic Castration Resistant Prostate Cancer

Approved therapies. My thoughts



Castration sensitive prostate cancer

Metastatic Castration Sensitive Prostate Cancer

Newly diagnosed with metastatic disease

or

• Recurrent disease that presents with metastasis

Therapies

Prostate Cancer Therapies for Newly Metastatic (Normal Testosterone)



Treatment intensification

Treatment Intensification for Metastatic Castration *Sensitive* Prostate Cancer (*High Volume*)





PEACE-1 Fizazi, K et al. Lancet, 2022

Therapies

Prostate Cancer Therapies for Newly Metastatic (Normal Testosterone)



Conclusions

Conclusions

- The treatment landscape for mCRPC is expanding, extending survival of patients
- Targeting DNA-damage repair mutations in mCRPC increase the need to biopsy late-stage patients and/or consider germline testing
- Future efforts will be made to advances Lu-PSMA to earlier stage patients
- With many treatments now available in mCRPC, treatment options must be tailored to individual patients