





## Exposure-Response relationships with immunotherapies: Could TDM make PK an actionable issue?

Pr. Joseph Ciccolini

COMPO CRCM INRIA Inserm U1068 Biogénopôle CHU Timone APHM









# Declaration of Interest 2024

### Fees:

- Pierre Fabre
- Pfizer
- Promise Proteomics
- Daiichi Sankyo
- Astra Zeneca
- Esai
- Roche

## **Research:**

- Roche Institute Genentech
- Pierre Fabre
- BMS
- Astra Zeneca
- Merck Serono

- Dose-response relationships can be loose for most cancer drugs.
- There is a twofold relationship: between dose and exposure, and between exposure and PD endpoints.



• Contrary to what Big Pharma claims..... E-R are not so flat with immune checkpoint inhibitors!





- TDM & PK is:
- Nothing but a waste of time



- TDM & PK could be potentially:
- Helpful to predict efficacy or tox?
- Helpful to de-escalate treatments?



Where is the real action?



.... But how is target engagment at the tumor level?



Which metrics for exposure is actually relevant?

## Dose-Exposure relationships with anti-CTLA4

Cancer Therapy: Clinical

#### Exposure–Response Relationships of the Efficacy and Safety of Ipilimumab in Patients with Advanced Melanoma

Yan Feng<sup>1</sup>, Amit Roy<sup>1</sup>, Eric Masson<sup>1</sup>, Tai-Tsang Chen<sup>2</sup>, Rachel Humphrey<sup>1</sup>, and Jeffrey S. Weber<sup>3</sup>





Clinical Cancer Research

Dosage does not predict survival..... but trough levels do!

## Dose-Exposure relationships with anti-CTLA4



#### Cancer Therapy: Clinical

Exposure–Response Relationships of the Efficacy and Safety of Ipilimumab in Patients with Advanced Melanoma

Yan Feng<sup>1</sup>, Amit Roy<sup>1</sup>, Eric Masson<sup>1</sup>, Tai-Tsang Chen<sup>2</sup>, Rachel Humphrey<sup>1</sup>, and Jeffrey S. Weber<sup>3</sup>





Clinical Cancer Research

• E-R relationships with Nivolumab (NSCLC)



Responding patients have higher trough levels



• E-R relationships with Nivolumab (NSCLC)









Pascaline Boudou-Rouquette <sup>1</sup>, Jennifer Arrondeau <sup>1</sup>, Audrey Thomas-Schoemann <sup>5,6</sup>, Manuela Tiako <sup>4</sup>, Nihel Khoudour <sup>4</sup>, Jeanne Chapron <sup>7</sup>, Frédérique Giraud <sup>7</sup>, Marie Wislez <sup>7</sup>, Diane Damotte <sup>8,9</sup>, Audrey Lupo <sup>8,9</sup>, Michel Vidal <sup>4,6</sup>, Jérôme Alexandre <sup>1,10</sup>, François Goldwasser <sup>1,10</sup>, Michel Tod <sup>11,12,13</sup> and Benoit Blanchet <sup>4,5,\*</sup>



But multivariate analysis kills the E-R relationships!



• E-R relationships with Nivolumab (melanoma)

# <text><text><text>

Extended PFS + OS in patients with higher nivolumab levels Better response if higher nivolumab levels + favorable genetic profile



• E-R relationships with Pembrolizumab



#### ORIGINAL ARTICLE

#### Using Model-Based "Learn and Confirm" to Reveal the Pharmacokinetics-Pharmacodynamics Relationship of Pembrolizumab in the KEYNOTE-001 Trial

J Elassaiss-Schaap<sup>1,2\*</sup>, S Rossenu<sup>1,3</sup>, A Lindauer<sup>1,4</sup>, SP Kang<sup>1</sup>, R de Greef<sup>4,5</sup>, JR Sachs<sup>1</sup> and DP de Alwis<sup>1</sup>



Check for updates

• E-R relationships with Pembrolizumab



Early change in the clearance of pembrolizumab reflects the survival and therapeutic response: A population pharmacokinetic analysis in real-world non-small cell lung cancer patients



Baseline clerance predicts survival

• E-R relationships with Pembrolizumab



Increasing dosing in patients with Pembro levels < 16 µg/mL stretches the PFS

• E-R relationships with Pembrolizumab



## **Design** DEDICATION-1 trial (NVALT-30)

# <u>Stratification factors:</u> - Type of treatment: - Pembrolizumab - Pemetrexed / platinum / pembrolizumab - Smoking, PDL1 status, Gender, PS 0/1 vs 2



#### Primary objective:

To investigate the non-inferiority of reduced dose pembrolizumab vs. standard dose for treatment of advanced stage NSCLC in terms of overall survival

#### Secondary objectives:

- DCR, PFS, OS, 1yr-DCR, ORR
- To develop, assess, and validate immune checkpoint inhibitor response biomarkers

## Unilateral de-escalation with Pembro does not compromise OS or PFS

• E-R relationships with Pembrolizumab



## The DEDICATION-1 trial (NVALT-30)



Unilateral de-escalation with Pembro does not compromise global efficacy

• E-R relationships with Pembrolizumab



Pembrolizumab: 200 mg; 30 min i.v. infusion; Q3W | Individualestimate of CL = 0.12 L/day 75centration (µg/mL) ğ 50 m Pembrolizumab Sampled on 20th May 2021 Lower than 1µg/mL levels would be achieved by the 1st of November 2021 0 -336 357 315 168 189 210 252 273 294 Time (days)

Case Reports > Cancer Chemother Pharmacol. 2024 Jun;93(6):627-632. doi: 10.1007/s00280-023-04611-x. Epub 2023 Nov 13.

## Life-threatening toxicities upon Pembrolizumab intake: could pharmacokinetics be the bad guy?

Mourad Hamimed <sup>1</sup><sup>2</sup>, Raynier Devillier <sup>3</sup>, Pierre-Jean Weiller <sup>3</sup>, Clémence Marin <sup>1</sup><sup>4</sup>, Jean-Marc Schiano <sup>3</sup>, Nawel Belmecheri <sup>3</sup>, Marie-Christine Etienne-Grimaldi <sup>5</sup>, Joseph Ciccolini <sup>6</sup> <sup>7</sup> <sup>8</sup>, Samia Harbi <sup>3</sup>



Patient with reduced clearance of pembrolizumab at risk of IRAEs?

• Inter-patient variability



Hôpitaux Universitaires de Marseille





13,1 ± 7,9 μg/mL62,9 ± 17,9 μg/mL20,0 ± 9,3 μg/mLCV = 60,3%CV = 28,5%CV = 46%

Marked inter-patient variability on PK!



- Clearance values and Trough level at C1 are both strong predictors of the PFS in patients treated with pembrolizumab (log-rank test p< 0,0001).
- Independent predictor after multivariate analysis [Age, Sex, Associated chemo, PDL1 status, Albuminemia, Creat, tumor size, LDH, NLR, Ecog status]: Cmin Cycle1 p = 0,0034.





Pembrolizumab: Clearance values and trough levels at C1 predicts PFS and early-progression!



Hôpitaux Universitaires de Marseille





Nivolumab: Trough levels at C1 predicts early-progression + trend on PFS!

0

0

0



Atezolizumab: no E-R relationships !

## Is the truth out there?



## DOES EXPOSURE REALLY MATTER?

# Is the truth out there?

Target Mediated Drug Disposition (TMDD)... with immune checkpoint inhibitors?



TMDD with anti-PD1/PDL1 would then suggest that:

- The more infiltrated T lymphocytes in tumor.... the lower the efficacy?
- The higher PDL1 expression..... the lower the efficacy?

## Is the truth out there?

Target Mediated Drug Disposition (TMDD)... with immune checkpoint inhibitors?

- The targets of most immunotherapies are immune cells, not tumor cells!
- The antigenic mass is not correlated to tumor burden (i.e., anti-PD1, anti-CTLA4)!
- But big tumors and poor performance status could lead to cachexia



## Disease Progression could thus indirectly increase mAb clearance!



Flat-Dosing could lead to strong overexposure in some patients!

It is assumed that ALL cancer patients weight 80-100 kg





In silico modeling helps select alternative dosing/scheduling



In silico modeling helps select alternative and personalized dosing/scheduling





#### ARTICLE

Killing a fly with a sledgehammer: Atezolizumab exposure in real-world lung cancer patients

Sophie Marolleau<sup>1</sup><sup>©</sup> | Alice Mogenet<sup>2</sup> | Clara Boeri<sup>1</sup> | Mourad Hamimed<sup>1</sup><sup>©</sup> | Joseph Ciccolini<sup>1</sup><sup>©</sup> | Laurent Greillier<sup>1,2</sup><sup>©</sup>



Pr L. Greillier CHU Nord

Microsoft Tecentriq<sup>®</sup> Unexes 1000 mg/201 mmg/mJ



$$CL = CL_{ini} e^{-\frac{T_{max}t^{\gamma}}{T_{50}^{\gamma} + t^{\gamma}}}$$

C

| PK characteristics and exposure metrics | n = 27        |
|---|---------------|
| Baseline clearance (L/day)              | 0.26 (0.05)   |
| <i>t</i> ½ (day)                        | 15.96 (3.39)  |
| Distribution volume (L)                 | 5.87 (0.07)   |
| AUC C1 (µg.day/mL)                      | 4615 (932)    |
| $C_{\min 1} (\mu g/mL)$                 | 78.81 (15.31) |
| $C_{\rm max1}$ (µg/mL)                  | 359.54 (3.90) |
| T6 (day)                                | 82.65 (15.19) |

100% patients are strongly over-exposed !





#### ARTICLE

Killing a fly with a sledgehammer: Atezolizumab exposure in real-world lung cancer patients

Sophie Marolleau<sup>1</sup> | Alice Mogenet<sup>2</sup> | Clara Boeri<sup>1</sup> | Mourad Hamimed<sup>1</sup> | Joseph Ciccolini<sup>1</sup> | Laurent Greillier<sup>1,2</sup>





Pr L. Greillier CHU Nord

Possible to shift from 1200 mg Q3W to 1200 mg Q12W ! Alternative: 1200 mg Q3W to 96 mg Q3W !









#### May 31 – June 4, 2024 McCormick Place | Chicago, IL & Online am.asco.org #ASC024



Pr L. Greillier CHU Nord



## **Simulation for Cost-reduction**

 Yearly-cost could be reduced by -77% (Q12W 1200 mg) to -79% (Q3W 96 mg) per patient.

#### Cost for one-year treatment per patient

|                | Standard | Model-Guided |           |
|----------------|----------|--------------|-----------|
|                | dosing   | Q12W 1200 mg | Q3W 96 mg |
| Drug cost      | 58854    | 13848        | 4708      |
| Daily Care     | 9 299    | 2352         | 9299      |
| Total (€)      | 68153    | 16200        | 14007     |
| otal (U.S. \$) | 63105    | 15000        | 12969     |



TDM could be cost-effective!

Т









#### May 31 – June 4, 2024 McCormick Place | Chicago, IL & Online am.asco.org #ASC024



Pr L. Greillier CHU Nord



## TDM could be cost-effective!



## To sum up



TDM makes sense

## To sum up

Customizing Pembrolizumab



# To sum up

- ✓ Atezolizumab (Tecentriq®)
- ✓ Bevacizumab (Avastin®)
- ✓ Cetuximab (Erbitux®)
- ✓ Ipilimumab (Yervoy®)
- ✓ Nivolumab (Opdivo®)
- ✓ Pembrolizumab (Keytruda®) Agnostic (MSI-H)
- ✓ Rituximab (Endoxan®)
- ✓ Trastuzumab (Herceptin®)
- ✓ Trastu-emtansine, Trastu-deruxtecan









