# The emerging role of maintenance therapy?

Rob Jones,

Medical Oncologist

University of Glasgow

UK



# **Conflicts of interest**

Type of affiliation / financial interest	Name of commercial company
Research funding, speaker and advisory honoraria	Astellas
Research funding, speaker and advisory honoraria	AstraZeneca
Speaker and advisory honoraria, travel support	Bayer
Speaker and advisory honoraria, travel support	BMS
Research funding	Exelixis
Speaker and advisory honoraria, travel support	Ipsen
Speaker and advisory honoraria, travel support	Jansssen
Speaker and advisory honoraria, travel support	Merck Serono
Speaker and advisory honoraria, travel support	MSD
Research funding, speaker and advisory honoraria	Novartis / AAA
Research funding, speaker and advisory honoraria	Pfizer
Research funding, speaker and advisory honoraria	Roche
Advisory honoraria	Seagen

### Maintenance therapy: not a new idea

**PFS in patients with stage III NSCLC<sup>1</sup>** (receiving durvalumab or placebo following chemoradiotherapy)\*



#### PFS in patients with advanced ovarian cancer with a mutation in BRCA1 and/or BRCA2<sup>2</sup>

(receiving olaparib or placebo following platinum-based CT)<sup>+</sup>



Placebo 131 118 103 82 65 56 53 47 41 39 38 31 28 22 6 5 1 0 0 0 0

1. Antonia SJ et al. N Engl J Med 2018;379:2342–2350. Supplementary appendix; 2. Moore K et al. N Engl J Med 2018;379:2495–2505.

#### Maintenance immunotherapy in urothelial cancer





#### OS, ITT population: primary endpoint<sup>1</sup>



#### OS (PD-L1-positive tumour population): primary endpoint<sup>1</sup>



#### **PFS (overall population): secondary endpoint**



### Why maintenance immunotherapy?



# Why maintenance immunotherapy?



- Chemo causes immunogenic cell death
- Depletion of immunosuppressive stroma
- Chemo increases antigen load of tumour
- Function of patient selection and early treatment

#### Subsequent cancer therapy<sup>†2,3</sup>

Therapy	Overall population		Subgroup who discontinued study therapy due to PD	
	avelumab + BSC (n=350)	BSC alone (n=350)	avelumab + BSC (n=189)	BSC alone (n=263)
Discontinued and received subsequent drug therapy, %	42.3	61.7	70.4	75.3
PD-L1/PD-1 inhibitor	6.3	43.7	9.0	52.9
Fibroblast growth factor receptor inhibitor	2.6	2.3	4.8	3.0
Any other drug	40.0	34.0	67.2	41.8
Discontinued with no subsequent drug therapy, %	33.4	30.9	29.6	24.7
Study treatment ongoing, %	24.3	7.4	-	-

1. Powles T et al. *N Engl J Med* 2020;383:1218–1230;

#### Subsequent cancer therapy<sup>†2,3</sup>

Therapy	Overall population		Subgroup who discontinued study therapy due to PD	
	avelumab + BSC (n=350)	BSC alone (n=350)	avelumab + BSC (n=189)	BSC alone (n=263)
Discontinued and received subsequent drug therapy, %	42.3	61.7	70.4	75.3
PD-L1/PD-1 inhibitor	6.3	43.7	9.0	52.9
Fibroblast growth factor receptor inhibitor	2.6	2.3	4.8	3.0
Any other drug	40.0	34.0	67.2	41.8
Discontinued with no subsequent drug therapy, %	33.4	30.9	29.6	24.7
Study treatment ongoing, %	24.3	7.4	-	-

1. Powles T et al. *N Engl J Med* 2020;383:1218–1230;

### Maintenance pembrolizumab: randomized phase II



FIG 2. Kaplan-Meier curves for (A) progression-free survival (PFS), and (B) overall survival (OS) in patients treated with pembrolizumab versus placebo (N = 107). MERT, maximum efficiency robust test.

Galsky et al. JCO 2020

### Rucaparib maintenance in patient with DNA repair defects



\* DRD biomarker 'positive' defined as one, or more, of the following:

- ≥10% genome-wide loss of heterozygosity
- Somatic alteration in any of: ATM, BARD1, BRCA1, BRCA2, BRIP1, CDK12, CHEK2, FANCA, NBN, PALB2, RAD51, RAD51B, RAD51C, RAD51D, RAD54L
- Known germline BRCA1 or BRCA2 alteration

Somatic tumour testing utilised the FoundationOne next-generation sequencing assay, https://www.foundationmedicine.com/test/foundationone-cdx

#### Crabb et al. JCO 2022

#### Rucaparib maintenance in patient with DNA repair defects



MAINCAV- Phase III randomized trial of maintenance cabozantinib and avelumab vs maintenance avelumab after 1L platinum-based chemotherapy in patients with mUC (NCT05092958)

Patients with locally advanced/mUC, N3 only disease allowed

CR/PR/SD with standard 1st-line platinum-based chemotherapy (4-6 cycles)

Stratification:

- Best response to 1st-line chemo (CR vs PR vs SD)
- Sites of metastases: visceral vs non-visceral



#### EV-302/Keynote-A39 Study Design





- Maintenance therapy is now a part of standard first line treatment
- The underlying mechanism is unclear
- Patient needs during this phase are paramount
- But new treatments, given until progression, may displace maintenance