

## Memorial Sloan Kettering Cancer Center

# Abstract #E43: Nivolumab plus cabozantinib in patients with non-clear cell renal cell carcinoma: Results of a phase 2 trial

Chung-Han Lee, Martin H Voss, Maria Isabel Carlo, Ying-Bei Chen, Ed Reznik, Andrea Knezevic, Robert A Lefkowitz, Natalie Shapnik, Diana Tassone, Chloe Dadoun, Mark Zucker, Neil J. Shah, Colette Ngozi Owens, Deaglan Joseph McHugh, David Henry Aggen, Andrew Leonard Laccetti, Ritesh Kotecha, Darren R. Feldman, Robert J. Motzer

## INTRODUCTION

- Kidney cancer represents many different malignancies, varying in pathobiology and sensitivity to approved systemic agents with clear cell RCC comprising 60-80% of cases and are dependent on vascular endothelial growth factor (VEGF) signaling.<sup>1</sup>
- Other subtypes are collectively grouped as non-clear cell RCC (ncRCC) but constitute a diverse mixture of heterogeneous malignancies.
- Cabozantinib plus nivolumab (CaboNivo) improved objective response rate (ORR), progression-free survival (PFS), and overall survival (OS) over sunitinib in a phase 3 trial for metastatic clear cell renal cell carcinoma (ccRCC) (NCT03141177).<sup>2</sup>
- We report the results of a phase 2 trial of CaboNivo in patients with ncRCC

## **METHODS**

This is a single institution, phase II study (ClinicalTrials.gov identifier: NCT03635892) of cabozantinib in combination with nivolumab in patients with advanced or metastatic ncRCC, who did not receive prior PD-1/PD-L1-targeted treatment.



- Cohort 1 included patients with papillary, unclassified, or translocation-associated RCC; Cohort 2 included patients with chromophobe RCC.
- Cohort 1 was a single-stage design that met its primary endpoint(N=20) and was expanded to produce more precise estimates of ORR (total N=40). Cohort 2 was a Simon two-stage design that closed early.
- Histopathology was prospectively reviewed at MSKCC and retrospectively reviewed/confirmed by a dedicated GU Pathologist (YC). Papillary included unclassified with papillary features, high grade/type 1 papillary, and FH-deficient/type 2 papillary.
- Correlative analyses by next-generation sequencing were performed.

- **1; Table 2**).
- unclassified RCC and 1 of 2 patients with translocation-associated RCC (Figure 1).
- 16.3–NE) (**Figure 2)**.
- Table 4)
- objective response (Figure 3).

- therapy.

Memorial Sloan Kettering Cancer Center, New York, NY

## RESULTS

A total of 47 patients were treated; 40 in Cohort 1 and 7 in Cohort 2 with a median follow up time of 13.1 months (range 2.2 – 28.6) (**Table 1**).

• ORR for Cohort 1 was 48% (95% CI 31.5–63.9) and no objective responses were seen in the 7 patients in Cohort 2 with chromophobe histology (Figure

• Among patients with papillary histology, objective response was seen in 15 of 32 (47%, 95% CI: 29-65). Response was seen in 3 of 6 patients with

• Cohort 1: Median PFS was 12.5 months (95% CI 6.3–16.4) and median OS was 28 months (95% CI

Grade 3/4 treatment-related adverse events were observed in 32% of patients. Cabozantinib and nivolumab were discontinued due to toxicity in 13% and 17% of patients, respectively. (Table 3;

5/6 patients with NF2 mutations and 4/5 patients with FH mutations had an objective response, while 1/6 patients with SETD2 mutations had an

	_		
Table 1:	Patient	Chara	cteristics

	Cohort 1 (N=40)	Cohort 2 (N=7)
Age at diagnosis (years) – median (range)	57 (33, 78)	54 (46, 68)
Sex		
Male	28 (70%)	3 (43%)
Female	12 (30%)	4 (57%)
Histology		
Papillary*	32 (80%)	-
Unclassified without papillary features†	6 (15%)	
Translocation-Associated	2 (5%)	-
Chromophobe†	-	7 (100%)
Karnofsky performance status		
90	29 (73%)	5 (71%)
80	11 (27%)	2 (29%)
IMDC risk classification		
Favorable	8 (20%)	3 (43%)
Intermediate	27 (67%)	3 (43%)
Poor	5 (13%)	1 (14%)
MSKCC risk classification		
Good	8 (20%)	2 (29%)
Intermediate	24 (60%)	4 (57%)
Poor	8 (20%)	1 (14%)
Prior nephrectomy	27 (67%)	7 (100%)
Prior systemic therapy‡	14 (35%)	2 (29%)
VEGF inhibitor	10 (25%)	2 (29%)
mTOR inhibitor	8 (20%)	0 (0%)
Chemotherapy	2 (5%)	0 (0%)
Number of sites of disease at treatment –	2 (1, 7)	2 (1, 3)
median (range)		
Location of metastasis		
Lymph node	31 (78%)	2 (29%)
Lung	18 (45%)	2 (29%)
Bone	12 (30%)	2 (29%)
Retroperitoneum/peritoneum	10 (25%)	4 (57%)
Liver	8 (20%)	2 (29%)
*Includes 16 unclassified with papillary features, 11 deficient/type 2 papillary. †Sarcomatoid features were found in one unclassific chromophobe. ‡Ten patients in Cohort 1 received prior combination 1 patient received crizotinib	high grade/type 1 pap ed without papillary fe on therapy; 1 patient re	villary and 5 FH- eatures and one eceived erlotinib, and

# **KEYTAKEAWAYS/CONCLUSIONS**

• Cabozantinib + Nivolumab showed promising efficacy in metastatic non-clear cell RCC patients with papillary, unclassified, or translocation-associated histologies.

• Adverse events in non-clear cell RCC were consistent with the observed adverse-event profile of this combination in ccRCC.

• Genomic studies highlight the heterogeneity of non-clear cell RCC and warrant further study as predictors of response to systemic



# cohort 1 8

Median treatmen Treatment-relate Treatment-related Treatment-relate either study drug Treatment-relate both study drugs Cabozantinib Median treatme Dose reduction

Discontinuation Nivolumab Median treatme

Discontinuation

In the combined coho discontinued nivolun cutoff. \*On either cabozantin

## Table 3. Drug exposure in combined

<u>)</u>	
duration, months (95% CI)*	11.0 (7.8, 21.1)
AE of any grade	41 (87%)
AE of grade 3 or 4	15 (32%)
AE leading to discontinuation of	10 (21%)
AE leading to discontinuation of	4 (9%)
nt duration, months (95% CI)	9.1 (7.4, 21.1) 37 (79%) 8 (17%)
nt duration, months (95% CI) for AE	10.6 (6.0, 18.8) 6 (13%)
rt of 47 patients, 27 discontinued caboza ab, and 20 continue one or both therapi	ntinib, 28 es at the time of data
ib or nivolumab	

## Table 4. Treatment-related adverse events in combined cohort 1 & 2

Adverse Event	All grades	Grade 3/4
Fatigue	27 (57)	0 (0)
Palmar-plantar erythrodysesthesia syndrome	27 (57)	2 (4)
Diarrhea	25 (53)	3 (6)
Hypertension	18 (38)	6 (13)
Dry mouth	17 (36)	0 (0)
Nausea	14 (30)	1 (2)
Mucositis oral	13 (28)	0 (0)
Hoarseness	12 (26)	0 (0)
Constipation	10 (21)	0 (0)
Dry skin	10 (21)	0 (0)
Dyspnea	10 (21)	0 (0)
Headache	10 (21)	0 (0)
Cough	9 (19)	0 (0)
Gastroesophageal reflux disease	9 (19)	0 (0)
Arthralgia	8 (17)	0 (0)
Pruritus	8 (17)	0 (0)
Rash maculo-papular	8 (17)	0 (0)
Treatment-related adverse events occurring w	ith at least 1	5% all-grade

frequency are shown.

Fable 2: Sum	ımary	of Efficacy	Outcomes
		Cohort 1 (N=40)	Cohort 2 (N=7)
bjective response rate	(95% CI)	48% (31.5, 63.9)	0% (0, 41.0)
est response – n (%)			
Partial response		19 (48%)	0 (0%)
Stable disease		20 (50%)	5 (71%)
Progressive disease		1 (3%)	1 (14%)
Not Evaluable		0 (0%)	1 (14%)
bisease control rate (959	% CI)	98% (86.8, 99.9)	71% (29.0, 96.3)
Clinical benefit rate (95%	ώCI)	58% (40.9, 73.0)	29% (3.7, 71.0)
ledian progression-free nonths (95% CI)	survival,	12.5 (6.3, 15.9)	*
ledian duration of responention of responention (95% CI)	onse,	13.6 (9.7, 19.8)	†
	rith objectiv	re response or stable d	isease (SD) for at least
4 weeks. Disease control i	2; †No resp	conders in Cohort 2	
A weeks. Disease control in Not calculated for Cohort	2; <sup>†</sup> No resp	l Exome Sec	quencing
A weeks. Disease control in Not calculated for Cohort	2; <sup>†</sup> No resp	l Exome Sec Cohort 1	<b>Juencing</b> Cohort 2
Histology	rgeted	l Exome Sec Cohort 1	<b>Juencing</b> Cohort 2
Histology Best Objective Response	rgeted	l Exome Sec Cohort 1	uencing Cohort 2
Histology Best Objective Response	rgeted	L Exome Sec	uencing Cohort 2
Histology Best Objective Response NF2	19%	L Exome Sec Cohort 1	Definition of the online of th
Histology Best Objective Response NF2 FH SETD2	19%	L Exome Sec Cohort 1	Cohort 2
Histology Best Objective Response NF2 FH SETD2 BAP1	19%	L Exome Sec Cohort 1	Cohort 2
Histology Best Objective Response NF2 FH SETD2 BAP1 TP53	19% 16% 19%	Cohort 1	<b>Quencing</b> Cohort 2
Histology Best Objective Response NF2 FH SETD2 BAP1 TP53 PTFN	19% 16% 19% 16% 19% 16% 10% 10% 10% 10% 10% 10% 10% 10% 10% 10	Cohort 1	Quencing   Cohort 2   0%   0%   0%   0%   0%   0%   0%   0%   0%   0%   0%   0%   0%   0%   0%   0%   0%   0%   0%   0%   0%   0%   0%   0%   0%   0%   0%   0%   0%   0%   0%   0%   0%   0%   0%   0%
Histology Best Objective Response NF2 FH SETD2 BAP1 TP53 PTEN PBRM1	19% • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • •	Lexome Sec Cohort 1	Quencing   Cohort 2   0%   0%   0%   0%   0%   0%   0%   0%   0%   0%   0%   0%   0%   0%   0%   0%   0%   0%   0%   0%   0%   0%   0%   0%   0%   0%   0%   0%   0%   0%   0%   0%   0%   0%   0%   0%   0%   0%   0%   0%   0%   0%   0%   0%   0%   0%   0%   0%   0%   0%   0%   0%   0%
Histology Best Objective Response NF2 FH SETD2 BAP1 TP53 PTEN PBRM1 ARID2	19% ••••• 19% ••••• 16% •••• 16% •••• 16% •••• 16% •••• 16% •••• 16% •••• 16% •••• 16% •••• 16% •••••	Lexome Sec Cohort 1	Quencing   Cohort 2   0%   0%   0%   0%   0%   0%   0%   0%   0%   0%   0%   0%   0%   0%   0%   0%   0%   0%   0%   0%   0%   0%   0%   0%   0%   0%   0%
Histology Best Objective Response NF2 FH SETD2 BAP1 TP53 PTEN PBRM1 ARID2 CDKN2A	19% ••••• 19% ••••• 16% •••• 16% ••••• 16% ••••• 16% ••••• 16% ••••• 16% ••••• 16% •••••• 16% ••••••••••••••••••••••••••••••••••••	L Exome Sec Cohort 1	Quencing   Cohort 2   0%   0%   0%   0%   0%   0%   0%   0%   0%   0%   0%   0%   0%   0%   0%   0%   0%   0%   0%   0%   0%   0%   0%   0%
Histology Best Objective Response NF2 FH SETD2 BAP1 TP53 PTEN PBRM1 ARID2 CDKN2A CHEK2	19%	Exome Sec Cohort 1	Quencing   Cohort 2   0%   0%   0%   0%   0%   0%   0%   0%   0%   0%   0%   0%   0%   0%   0%   0%   0%   0%   0%   0%   0%   0%   0%
Histology Best Objective Response NF2 FH SETD2 BAP1 TP53 PTEN PBRM1 ARID2 CDKN2A CHEK2 DNMT3A	19%	Lents with any respon- ponders in Cohort 2	Cohort 2   0%   0%   0%   0%   0%   0%   0%   0%   0%   0%   0%   0%   0%   0%   0%   0%   0%   0%   0%   0%   0%   0%   0%   0%
Histology Best Objective Response NF2 FH SETD2 BAP1 TP53 PTEN PBRM1 ARID2 CDKN2A CHEK2 DNMT3A DOT1L	19%	Lents with any respon- ponders in Cohort 2	Cohort 2 0% 0% 0% 0% 0% 0% 0% 0% 0% 0%

CHEK2	6%
DNMT3A	6%
DOT1L	6%
IRF4	6%
KDM6A	6%
MST1R	6%
PIK3CA	6%
TSC1	6%
est Objective Response	Partial Response Stat
enetic Alteration	Inframe Mutation (unknown
	Missense Mutation (unknow
	Fusion Germline Muta
istology	Papillary RCC TFE3
Sarcomatoid <sup>2</sup> Multiple Sar	nples <sup>3</sup> TFE-amplified

### References

1. Linehan WM. Genetic basis of kidney cancer: Role of genomics for the development of disease-based therapeutics. Genome Res 2012;22:2089-2100. 2. Choueiri TK, Powles T, Burotto M, et al. Nivolumab plus cabozantinib versus sunitinib for advanced renal-cell carcinoma. N Engl J Med 2021;384:829-841

### **Conflicts of Interest**

Dr. Lee has consulting or advisory roles with Amgen, Bristol Myers Squibb, EMD Serono, Eisai, Exelixis, Merck, and Pfizer; travel, accommodations, expenses from Calithera Biosciences, Eisai; and research funding from Bristol Myers Squibb, Calithera, Eisai, Eli Lilly, Exelixis, Merck, and Pfizer.

Acknowledgements Study support provided by Bristol Myers Squibb and Exelixis. Medical writing support was provided by Joyce Tsoi.

### Corresponding Author Contact: Dr. Chung-Han Lee, ClinicalTrials.Gov Identifier: NCT03635892

Poster Presented at the International Kidney Cancer Symposium: North American 2021; November 5-6, 2021.

