out the treatment course, and toxicity data were recorded on medical records in detail. It should be confirmed by a prospective study.

Taxanes are also investigated widely in patient with unresectable stage III NSCLC. Weekly administration with carboplatin (CBDCA) plus paclitaxel (PTX) and concurrent RT was reported in multiinstitutional phase II study. Reported MST was promising, with 20.5 months.[25] Nevertheless, recently reported phase III trial compared induction chemotherapy plus CRT with CRT alone, which employed weekly CBDCA and PTX, showed disappointing results, with MST of 14 months and 12 months, respectively.[26] The authors concluded that the routine use of weekly CBDCA and PTX with simultaneous TRT should be re-examined. Chemotherapy with docetaxel (DOC) plus CDDP and concurrent TRT was also reported in a phase I/II study.[21] The result was promising, with MST of 23 months, and phase III trial comparing DOC and CDDP to CDDP, VDS, and mitomycin is currently underway.

Local recurrence was observed in 21 patients (29%), and the brain was also a major site of treatment failure (16 patients, 22%). These results are comparable to the literature.[21] On the basis of these observations, other radiation approaches such as hyperfractionated radiotherapy or high-dose thoracic radiation to improve local control should be considered.[27–31] Moreover, whether prophylactic cranial irradiation reduces the incidence of brain metastases should be confirmed.

Advanced age did not correlate with worse prognosis and it is compatible with literature.[32] Gender, tumor size, body weight loss, smoking status did not significantly correlate with shorter overall survival, and it may be due to the small sample size of our study.

We excluded 33 patients who participated in the trial evaluated consolidation docetaxel after concurrent CRT with CDDP and VNR.[14] Sekine and colleagues reported that majority of patients could not continue with consolidation docetaxel after concurrent CRT with CDDP and VNR because of pulmonary toxicity. Although consolidation therapy using docetaxel seems to be highly effective in SWOG phase II study,[33] randomized phase III trial failed to demonstrate that addition of consolidation docetaxel improves survival.[34]

Two patients did not receive full dose of radiotherapy. Nevertheless, these two patients were treated initially with curative intent. Therefore we included these two patients in this analysis. Moreover, exclusion of these two patients did not alter the results (data not shown).

In conclusion, chemoradiotherapy with CDDP and VNR was promising and well tolerated. This regimen could be used as a control arm in future trial for stage III NSCLC.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

Supported in part by the Grant-in-Aid for Cancer Research (18S-1) from the Ministry of Health, Labor and Welfare of Japan.

REFERENCES

1. Devesa SS, Bray F, Vizcaino AP, et al. International lung cancer trends by histologic type: male:female differences diminishing and adenocarcinoma rates rising. *Int J Cancer* 2005;117:294–299.
2. van Meerbeeck JP. Staging of non-small cell lung cancer: consensus, controversies and challenges. *Lung Cancer* 2001;34(Suppl 2):S95–S107.
3. Turrisi AT III, Bogart J, Sherman C, et al. The role of radiotherapy and chemotherapy for curative management of medically inoperable and stage III nonsmall cell lung cancer, and radiotherapy for palliation of symptomatic disease. *Respir Care Clin N Am* 2003;9:163–190.
4. Dillman RO, Seagren SL, Propert KJ, et al. A randomized trial of induction chemotherapy plus high-dose radiation versus radiation alone in stage III non-small-cell lung cancer. *N Engl J Med* 1990;323:940–945.
5. Sause W, Kolesar P, Taylor SI, et al. Final results of phase III trial in regionally advanced unresectable non-small cell lung cancer: Radiation Therapy Oncology Group, Eastern Cooperative Oncology Group, and Southwest Oncology Group. *Chest* 2000;117:358–364.
6. Furuse K, Fukuoka M, Kawahara M, et al. Phase III study of concurrent versus sequential thoracic radiotherapy in combination with mitomycin, vindesine, and cisplatin in unresectable stage III non-small-cell lung cancer. *J Clin Oncol* 1999;17:2692–2699.
7. Curran WJ, Scott CB, Langer CJ, et al. Long-term benefit is observed in a phase III comparison of sequential vs concurrent chemo-radiation for patients with unresectable stage III NSCLC: RTOG 9410. *Proc Am Soc Clin Oncol* 2003;22:Abstract 621.
8. Zatloukal P, Petruzelka L, Zemanova M, et al. Concurrent versus sequential chemoradiotherapy with cisplatin and vinorelbine in locally advanced non-small cell lung cancer: a randomized study. *Lung Cancer* 2004;46:87–98.
9. Fournel P, Robinet G, Thomas P, et al. Randomized phase III trial of sequential chemoradiotherapy compared with concurrent chemoradiotherapy in locally advanced non-small-cell lung cancer: Groupe Lyon-Saint-Etienne d'Oncologie Thoracique-Groupe Francais de Pneumo-Cancerologie NPC 95-01 Study. *J Clin Oncol* 2005;23:5910–5917.
10. Schiller JH, Harrington D, Belani CP, et al. Comparison of four chemotherapy regimens for advanced non-small-cell lung cancer. *N Engl J Med* 2002;346:92–98.
11. Kelly K, Crowley J, Bunn PA Jr, et al. Randomized phase III trial of paclitaxel plus carboplatin versus vinorelbine plus cisplatin in the treatment of patients with advanced non–small-cell lung cancer: a Southwest Oncology Group trial. *J Clin Oncol* 2001;19:3210–3218.
12. Scagliotti GV, De Marinis F, Rinaldi M, et al. Phase III randomized trial comparing three platinum-based doublets in advanced non-small-cell lung cancer. *J Clin Oncol* 2002;20:4285–4291.
13. Sekine I, Noda K, Oshita F, et al. Phase I study of cisplatin, vinorelbine, and concurrent thoracic radiotherapy for unresectable stage III non-small cell lung cancer. *Cancer Sci* 2004;95:691–695.
14. Sekine I, Nokihara H, Sumi M, et al. Docetaxel consolidation therapy following cisplatin, vinorelbine, and concurrent thoracic radiotherapy in patients with unresectable stage III non-small cell lung cancer. *J Thorac Oncol* 2006;1:810–815.
15. Albain KS, Crowley JJ, Turrisi AT III, et al. Concurrent cisplatin, etoposide, and chest radiotherapy in pathologic stage IIIB non-small-cell lung cancer: a Southwest Oncology Group phase II study, SWOG 9019. *J Clin Oncol* 2002;20:3454–3460.
16. Furuse K, Kubota K, Kawahara M, et al. Phase II study of concurrent radiotherapy and chemotherapy for unresectable stage III non-small-cell lung cancer. Southern Osaka Lung Cancer Study Group. *J Clin Oncol* 1995;13:869–875.
17. Atagi S, Kawahara M, Hosoe S, et al. A phase II study of continuous concurrent thoracic radiotherapy in combination with mitomycin, vindesine and cisplatin in unresectable stage III non-small cell lung cancer. *Lung Cancer* 2002;36:105–111.
18. Le Chevalier T, Brisgand D, Douillard JY, et al. Randomized study of vinorelbine and cisplatin versus vindesine and cisplatin versus vinorelbine alone in advanced non-small-cell lung cancer: results of a European multicenter trial including 612 patients. *J Clin Oncol* 1994;12:360–367.
19. Vokes EE, Herndon JE, 2nd, Crawford J, et al. Randomized phase II study of cisplatin with gemcitabine or paclitaxel or vinorelbine as induction chemotherapy followed by concomitant chemoradiotherapy

for stage IIIB non-small-cell lung cancer: cancer and leukemia group B study 9431. *J Clin Oncol* 2002;20:4191–4198.
20. Furuse K, Ohta M, Fukuoka M, et al. Early phase II clinical study of KW-2307 in patients with lung cancer. Lung Cancer Section in KW-2307 Study Group. *Gan To Kagaku Ryoho* 1994;21:785–793.
21. Kiura K, Ueoka H, Segawa Y, et al. Phase I/II study of docetaxel and cisplatin with concurrent thoracic radiation therapy for locally advanced non-small-cell lung cancer. *Br J Cancer* 2003;89:795–802.
22. Belani CP, Choy H, Bonomi P, et al. Combined chemoradiotherapy regimens of paclitaxel and carboplatin for locally advanced non-small-cell lung cancer: a randomized phase II locally advanced multi-modality protocol. *J Clin Oncol* 2005;23:5883–5891.
23. Kaplan B, Altynbas M, Eroglu C, et al. Preliminary results of a phase II study of weekly paclitaxel (PTX) and carboplatin (CBDCA) administered concurrently with thoracic radiation therapy (TRT) followed by consolidation chemotherapy with PTX/CBDCA for stage III unresectable non-small-cell lung cancer (NSCLC). *Am J Clin Oncol* 2004;27:603–610.
24. Kim DW, Shyr Y, Shaktour B, et al. Long term follow up and analysis of long term survivors in patients treated with paclitaxel-based concurrent chemo/radiation therapy for locally advanced non-small cell lung cancer. *Lung Cancer* 2005;50:235–245.
25. Choy H, Akerley W, Safran H, et al. Multiinstitutional phase II trial of paclitaxel, carboplatin, and concurrent radiation therapy for locally advanced non-small-cell lung cancer. *J Clin Oncol* 1998;16:3316–3322.
26. Vokes EE, Herndon Ii JE, Kelley MJ, et al. Induction chemotherapy followed by chemoradiotherapy compared with chemoradiotherapy alone for regionally advanced unresectable stage III non-small-cell lung cancer: cancer and leukemia group B. *J Clin Oncol* 2007.
27. Pisch J, Moskovitz T, Esik O, et al. Concurrent paclitaxel-cisplatin and twice-a-day irradiation in stage IIIA and IIIB NSCLC shows improvement in local control and survival with acceptable hematologic toxicity. *Pathol Oncol Res* 2002;8:163–169.
28. Belani CP, Wang W, Johnson DH, et al. Phase III study of the Eastern Cooperative Oncology Group (ECOG 2597): induction chemotherapy followed by either standard thoracic radiotherapy or hyperfractionated accelerated radiotherapy for patients with unresectable stage IIIA and B non-small-cell lung cancer. *J Clin Oncol* 2005;23:3760–3767.
29. Ishikura S, Ohe Y, Nihei K, et al. A phase II study of hyperfractionated accelerated radiotherapy (HART) after induction cisplatin (CDDP) and vinorelbine (VNR) for stage III non-small-cell lung cancer (NSCLC). *Int J Radiat Oncol Biol Phys* 2005;61:1117–1122.
30. Socinski MA, Morris DE, Halle JS, et al. Induction and concurrent chemotherapy with high-dose thoracic conformal radiation therapy in unresectable stage IIIA and IIIB non-small-cell lung cancer: a dose-escalation phase I trial. *J Clin Oncol* 2004;22:4341–4350.
31. Kong FM, Ten Haken RK, Schipper MJ, et al. High-dose radiation improved local tumor control and overall survival in patients with inoperable/unresectable non-small-cell lung cancer: long-term results of a radiation dose escalation study. *Int J Radiat Oncol Biol Phys* 2005;63:324–332.
32. Schild SE, Stella PJ, Geyer SM, et al. The outcome of combined-modality therapy for stage III non-small-cell lung cancer in the elderly. *J Clin Oncol* 2003;21:3201–3206.
33. Gandara DR, Chansky K, Albain KS, et al. Consolidation docetaxel after concurrent chemoradiotherapy in stage IIIB non-small-cell lung cancer: phase II Southwest Oncology Group Study S9504. *J Clin Oncol* 2003;21:2004–2010.
34. Hanna NH, Neubauer M, Ansari R, et al. Phase III trial of cisplatin (P) plus etoposide (E) plus concurrent chest radiation (XRT) with or without consolidation docetaxel (D) in patients (pts) with inoperable stage III non-small cell lung cancer (NSCLC): HOG LUN 01-24/USO-023. *Proc Am Soc Clin Oncol* 2007;25:Abstract 7512.

International Journal of Urology (2008) 15, 389–393 doi: 10.1111/j.1442-2042.2008.02037.x

Meeting Report

Report from the second Japanese Urological Association–Japanese Society of Medical Oncology joint conference, 2007: 'Diagnosis and treatment of urological malignant tumors: How can we promote subspecialists?'

Nagahiro Saijo,* Tsuneharu Miki,* Yoshinobu Kubota,* Seiji Naito,* Hideyuki Akaza,* Shunji Takahashi* and Hironobu Minami*

Preface: The second Japanese Urological Association–Japanese Society of Medical Oncology joint conference was held on 25 October 2007. The theme of this year's conference was 'Diagnosis and treatment of urological malignant tumors: How can we promote subspecialists?' This Meeting Report briefly discusses the themes of uro-oncology education; collaboration of urologists and medical oncologists for treatment of advanced renal cell carcinoma; the role of urologists in treatment of urological cancer; the role of the medical oncologist in therapy, and collaboration between the JUA and the JSMO.

Program

Moderators: **Nagahiro Saijo** Deputy Director, National Cancer Center Hospital East
Tsuneharu Miki Professor, Kyoto Prefectural University of Medicine

1. EDUCATION OF URO-ONCOLOGY IN THE JAPANESE UROLOGICAL ASSOCIATION
Presenter: **Yoshinobu Kubota** Professor, Yokohama City University

2. INVOLVEMENT OF UROLOGISTS AND MEDICAL ONCOLOGISTS IN THE TREATMENT OF ADVANCED RENAL CELL CARCINOMA
Presenter: **Seiji Naito** Professor, Kyushu University

3. THE POSITION OF THE UROLOGIST IN THE TREATMENT OF UROLOGICAL CANCER
Presenter: **Hideyuki Akaza** Professor, University of Tsukuba

4. THE ROLE OF THE MEDICAL ONCOLOGIST IN THERAPY FOR UROLOGICAL MALIGNANCY IN JAPAN
Presenter: **Shunji Takahashi** Chief, Cancer Institute Hospital

5. COLLABORATION BETWEEN THE JAPANESE SOCIETY OF MEDICAL ONCOLOGY AND THE JAPANESE UROLOGICAL ASSOCIATION FOR DEVELOPING TRAINING SYSTEMS FOR MEDICAL ONCOLOGISTS
Presenter: **Hironobu Minami** Professor, Kobe University

DISCUSSION

Summary of second Japanese Urological Association–Japanese Society of Medical Oncology joint conference

Moderators

Nagahiro Saijo MD
Deputy Director
National Cancer Center Hospital East
Tsuneharu Miki MD
Professor
Department of Urology
Kyoto Prefectural University of Medicine

The second Japanese Urological Association–Japanese Society of Medical Oncology (JUA–JSMO) joint conference was held on 25 October 2007, at the National Kyoto International Congress Center from 18:00 to 20:00 hours. The meeting was sponsored by the JUA and the JSMO and was cosponsored by Takada Pharmaceutical Company. The theme of this year's conference was 'Diagnosis and treatment of urological malignant tumors: How can we promote subspecialists?' The session was chaired by Tsuneharu Miki, a professor at Kyoto Prefectural University of Medicine, and Nagahiro Saijo, Deputy Director of the National Cancer Center Hospital East. Three and two speakers were invited from the JUA and the JSMO, respectively.

Yoshinobu Kubota, a professor at Yokohama City University School of Medicine, talked about current educational programs in urology at universities and through the Japanese Urology Association. He reported that the study of urology in Japan covers molecular biology, diagnosis, surgery and chemotherapy, including palliative care of the kidneys, urinary tract and male genital organs. He stressed the need for a Society of Uro-oncology as a subspecialty of urology and bidirectional communication between the JUA–JSMO and the Japanese Association of Radiation Oncology (JASTRO) through joint symposiums and educational seminars.

Seiji Naito, a professor at the Graduate School of Medical Sciences, Kyushu University, talked about the recent development of new molecular target drugs in the field of urology. The development of new drugs like Sorafenib and Sunitinib in Japan has depended solely on clinical trials

* Presenters in order of Program.

Received 29 January 2008; accepted 29 January 2008.

conducted by urologists. He stressed that the quality of these clinical trials for oncology drugs was high, even though the trials were conducted by urologists. He also mentioned that surgery will remain an important treatment modality in the field of uro-oncology and emphasized the importance of collaborations between the JUA and the JSMO, the JASTRO and the Japanese Society of Palliative Care.

Hideyuki Akaza, a professor at the University of Tsukuba, criticized the situation of Gan Shinryo Renkei Kyoten Byoin, nominated by the Ministry of Health, Labour and Welfare, because it lacks fundamental functions requested by the government. He also criticized the functions of two National Cancer Center Hospitals, Tsukiji and Kashiwa, because essential key elements do not exist for the integration of Gan Shinryo Renkei Kyoten Byoin. He stressed that neither of the National Cancer Center Hospitals function as medical centers, since Cancer Centers should be connected with all other branches of medicine. He concluded that bidirectional education and efforts will be essential to establish the field of uro-oncology in Japan.

Shunji Takahashi, Chief of Ariake Ganken Hospital, talked about the current situation of the Cancer Board for the treatment of urogenital tumors at his hospital. Ariake Ganken Hospital organizes a Cancer Board for each tumor type and cares for their cancer patients using a multidisciplinary specialist team consisting of surgeons, medical oncologists, radiation oncologists and nurses. At this moment, their model represents the ideal situation for taking care of cancer patients in Japan.

Hironobu Minami, a professor at Kobe University Graduate School of Medicine and the executive director of the Japanese Society of Medical Oncology, talked about the missions, strategic plans and visions of the JSMO. The JSMO began certifying medical oncologists in 2005 and presently has 205 certified medical oncologists. They have subspecialties for thoracic oncology, hematology/oncology, gastrointestinal oncology, breast cancer, and other areas. Unfortunately, there is only one specialist in uro-oncology. More specialists are essential for optimizing the care of patients with urogenital tumors. The JUA and the JSMO should collaborate with regard to the education of urologists and medical oncologists.

Although the meeting was scheduled to last from 18:00 to 20:00 hours, more than 100 participants attended and many productive discussions were held. The next joint meeting will be scheduled in conjunction with the JUA or the JSMO Annual Meeting.

Education of uro-oncology in Japanese Urological Association

Presenter

Yoshinobu Kubota MD
Professor
Department of Urology, Yokohama City University School of Medicine

Urology in Japan covers diagnoses and treatments including surgeries and molecular therapeutics of a broad range of diseases in urogenital organs. This wide field of urology is different from the urology in the USA which is mainly urological surgery. Thus, Japanese urologists have required wide knowledge, technical skills and experience in several therapeutic modalities including chemotherapy for urogenital cancers. Chemotherapy for urological cancers is therefore a familiar subject of urology in Japan.

Recently, cancer chemotherapy has progressed to be one of the key tools of the treatment for solid cancers such as urogenital cancer. And the JUA has been involved in developing several subspecialties in collaboration with other associated scientific and medical societies.

Considering these situations, there are two key issues for the JUA regarding education on chemotherapy for urogenital cancers. One is education on cancer chemotherapy for urologists and trainees. The other is to train uro-oncologists, especially specialists in chemotherapy for urogenital cancer. In each educational issue, collaboration with medical oncology and urology is essential.

The establishment of a society for the subspecialty of urological oncology, in collaboration with both the JSMO and the JUA is important (Fig. 1). Also, closer communication between the JSMO and the JUA is recommended for further developing and promoting new chemotherapies which are effective against urogenital cancer.



Fig. 1 How to educate the uro-oncologist.

Involvement of urologists and medical oncologists in the treatment of advanced renal cell carcinoma

Presenter

Seiji Naito MD
Professor
Department of Urology, Graduate School of Medical Sciences, Kyushu University

Cytokine therapy, mainly using IFN-α or IL2, has been conventionally adopted as a drug therapy for advanced renal cell carcinoma. Cytokine therapy has demonstrated a low response rate (approximately 15%) and a limited duration of response (6–10 months) so it is not considered to be a satisfactory treatment. Recently, several molecular-targeted drugs, which exert their therapeutic effects by inhibiting intracellular signal transduction involved in tumor cell proliferation or angiogenesis, have been developed. The beneficial effects of these drugs on renal cell

carcinoma have been reported and so the therapeutic strategy has dramatically changed recently. In Europe and the USA, sunitinib, which is an orally available, multitargeted receptor tyrosine kinase inhibitor of vascular endothelial growth factor receptor (VEGFR) and platelet-derived growth factor receptor (PDGFR), is now being positioned as a first line treatment for metastatic renal cell carcinoma. Furthermore, sorafenib, which is an orally available multikinase inhibitor active on Raf-1, and receptor tyrosine kinases including VEGFR-1, -2, -3, PDGFR-β, c-Kit, Flt-3 and RET, are being positioned as second line treatment for cytokine refractory metastatic renal cell carcinoma. Temsirolimus, which is an inhibitor of the kinase m-TOR (mammalian target of rapamycin), is being positioned as a first line treatment for poor-risk patients with metastatic renal cell carcinoma. In Japan, the phase II studies of sunitinib and sorafenib have been completed and applications for the approval of these drugs have been submitted to the Health, Labour and Welfare Ministry. They will soon be approved for use in the clinical setting. The dosage of sorafenib used in the Japanese phase II study was equivalent to the dosage used in the clinical studies in Europe and the USA. However, the response rate and the incidence of adverse drug reactions such as hand–foot skin reaction and hypertension obtained in the Japanese study were higher than those observed in other clinical studies in Europe and the USA. It is difficult to make an accurate comparison without careful consideration, but the possible effect of ethnicity on the response and adverse drug reactions can not be ruled out. Considering the possibility of the long-term administration of these drugs, adverse drug reactions may be encountered which have not yet been predicted. The postmarketing collection and broad distribution of data on adverse drug reactions and therapeutic effects from registered patients treated at specified medical facilities, at least for some time, are indispensable to preserve patient safety, validate the efficacy of these drugs and educate urologists in charge of treatment. In order to deal with such a situation, urologists should promote close cooperation with physicians who specialize in medical oncology, radiation oncology, psychotherapy, palliative therapy, dermatology, cardiovascular diseases, respiratory diseases, etc. (Fig. 2).



Fig. 2 Holistic medical care for patients with renal cell carcinoma by cooperation among urologists and other relevant physicians including medical oncologists.

Other promising new molecular-targeted drugs for renal cell carcinoma are also in the development phase. Various combination therapies, such as the concomitant use of molecular-targeted drugs, molecular-targeted drugs and cytokines, or the sequential use of molecular-targeted drugs are now being investigated, so the strategy of drug therapy for renal cell carcinoma may change in the near future. In principle, a nephrectomy has been recommended prior to cytokine therapy for patients with metastatic renal cell carcinoma. Whether or not a nephrectomy should also be recommended prior to molecular-targeted therapy still remains unknown. The timing of surgical treatment for metastatic sites during molecular-targeted therapy may also be an important issue in the future.

Urologists should be specialists that provide holistic medical care throughout the course of renal cell carcinoma. In the practical treatment of renal cell carcinoma, urologists are expected to organize a medical team, usually consisting of radiologists, physicians specializing in palliative therapy and those specializing in psychosomatic internal medicine, as well as medical oncologists depending on the patient's pathological condition.

In conclusion, since the advent of effective molecular-targeted drugs, the treatment strategy for metastatic renal cell carcinoma is dramatically changing. In order to practice effective holistic medical care, opportunities for exchanging expertise among physicians including urologists, medical oncologists and other relevant clinicians should be encouraged and increased to promote the development of urologists with comprehensive knowledge and experience regarding the treatment of renal cell carcinoma.

The position of the urologist in the treatment of urological cancer

Presenter

Hideyuki Akaza MD
Professor
Department of Urology, University of Tsukuba, Ibaraki, Japan

A significant number of patients with malignancies including urological cancer have systemic involvement such as metastasis at either a macroscopic or microscopic level. In addition, some patients have various complications at diagnosis. Thus, a treatment strategy should be developed not only for the cancer lesion itself but for other systemic conditions. In a total care system like this the role of the urologist is very important.

It is important in cancer care not to treat only cancer lesions but to care for the patient according to the comorbidity and complications that may occur during cancer treatment (Fig. 3).



Fig. 3 The problems in surgical oncology.

It is crucial for cancer care to be carried out at an institution where all medical departments are ready, or in an environment where hospital to hospital cooperation is possible. A cancer control program act (Gann taisaku kihon-hou) was enacted in 2007 and the cancer base hospital

design (Gann kyoten byouinn) is progressing as one of the policies for the realization of 'the standardization of cancer therapy'.

The following provision is in guidelines for the maintenance of the cancer base hospital delivered by the Ministry of Health, Labour and Welfare on 1 February 2007:

> The National Cancer Center Central Hospital and Hospital East, regarded as the cancer base hospital, set these guidelines and decide to bear roles, such as support to other cancer base hospitals, particularly the training of a specialty medical practitioner.[1]

Are these organizations fully endowed with a central mechanism that unifies a cancer base hospital? Have they got the mechanism fully established to respond to a subspecialty (such as cardio-vascular, respiratory, or renal function, which affect cancer therapy occasionally and are indispensable to it in these institutions) a complication, or a multiorgan operation?

What has caused the 'cancer refugee' who has become the center of attention these days? For example, the extirpation of renal cell carcinoma with a tumor thrombus in the vena cava inferior or further upstream can not be done without cardio-vascular surgery or vascular surgery. In what kind of institution is this possible? Can the complications accompanying urinary dysfunction or sexual dysfunction associated with prostate cancer, or various problems during endocrine therapy be dealt with appropriately?

At the first JUA-JSMO joint conference during the 44th Annual meeting of the Japanese Society of Clinical Cancer Oncology, the previous chairman of the European Organization of Research and Treatment of Cancer, Louis Denis made the following comments: 'In Europe most of the cancer centers are attached to hospitals as a separate section where they can be connected with all the other branches of medicine. Clinical trials of the last 30 years have forced cancer specialists into close collaboration'.[1] Is this what is lacking in cancer center design in Japan today? It is important in the treatment of urological cancer (at least for the time being until an ideal structure is established) to have efficient cooperation between the urological discipline and medical oncology.

Urologists should study medical oncology in general and medical oncologists should study urological oncology in order to become urological oncologists. These efforts should be bidirectional. Urological oncology in the USA is a specialty produced as a result of this bidirectional study.

The role of the medical oncologist in therapy for urological malignancy in Japan

Presenter

Shunji Takahashi MD
Chief
Department of Medical Oncology, Cancer Institute Hospital, Tokyo

In Japan, urological tumors have been treated by surgeons alone, including chemotherapy. However, recent demands for more specialized cancer treatment from patients and the development of molecular target therapy in the urological area have necessitated medical oncologists specializing in the urological tumor. There are very few medical oncologists participating in the treatment of urological tumors in Japan right now. How medical oncologists should participate in the treatment of urological tumors in Japan is discussed from the standpoint of our hospital.

The Cancer Institute Hospital moved to new buildings at Ariake, Koto-ku in Tokyo and the Department of Medical Oncology opened a new ward in June 2006. We started to participate in chemotherapy for urological tumors since the summer of 2006. First, at the 'Urological Cancer Board' once a week, surgeons, medical oncologists, pathologists, and nurses discussed cases of urological tumors treated with chemotherapy (Fig. 4). We are learning the diagnosis, standard treatment including surgery, and clinical courses of urological malignancies in the cancer board. In turn, we provided advice on oncological emergencies such as severe bone marrow suppression and electrolyte disturbances, or the new therapies for resistant cases.

During September 2006 we started to treat urological malignancy with second or third line chemotherapies, or phase I study in the new ward. We use irinotecan, taxanes, or other drugs for urothelial cancers or germ cell tumors, and started phase I study of new tyrosine kinase inhibitors for renal cell carcinoma (RCC) or urothelial cancer. Around five patients are always treated in the ward.

Most of the chemotherapy for urothelial cancer or germ cell tumor includes cisplatin, such as methotrexate, vinblastine, adriamycin, and cisplatin (MVAC) and bleomycin, etoposide and cisplatin (BEP). Most patients are hospitalized because of nausea and renal toxicity. Furthermore, MVAC is often associated with severe mucositis, and BEP is associated with severe bone marrow suppression, so many patients have been hospitalized for a long time. We first tried to decrease the length of hospitalization during cisplatin-containing therapy to 3 or 4 days by mucositis treatment and infection prevention. Then we started an outpatient treatment program of cisplatin-containing chemotherapy by clinical path including pre- and post chemotherapeutic hydration.

Molecular target therapy has recently been introduced into urological tumor treatment, especially for RCC. Molecular target drugs such as sunitinib, sorafenib, and bevacizumab are associated with a diverse range of adverse effects compared with conventional cytotoxic drugs. Bevacizumab (Avastin) was approved for colon cancer in Japan in April 2007. Grade 3–4 adverse effects with bevacizumab include hypertension (8–25%), bleeding (2–9%), arterial or venous thrombosis (1–20%), gastrointestinal perforation (1–2%), and proteinuria (1%). In the several months following the approval of bevacizumab, we experienced a few cases of deep vein thrombosis, GI perforation, and GI bleeding. To manage those adverse effects efficiently and safely, we needed a multidisciplinary approach (Fig. 5).

A few months before bevacizumab went on the market, we made 'Team Avastin', which consisted of doctors, pharmacists, nurses (of outpatient clinics, inpatient units, and an ambulatory treatment



Fig. 4 Members and purposes of the 'Cancer board'.

Fig. 5 Members of the multidisciplinary team for chemotherapy and their roles.

center), and medical collaboration officers in order to manage those adverse effects. The team made the clinical path for the initiation of bevacizumab therapy, the manual for managing the adverse effects of bevacizumab including consultation to gastrointestinal or respiratory surgeons, and made close liaison with cardiologists and neural surgeons in other hospitals. The team has revised the manual frequently, and solved the many problems associated with bevacizumab treatment.

In Japan, molecular target drugs such as sorafenib and sunitinib might be approved for RCC treatment in 2008. We are planning to make a new professional team consisting of medical oncologists, urological surgeons, nurses, pharmacists, and medical collaboration officers. The team will simulate the management of the severe adverse effects of these drugs, and make clinical paths and new manuals. We are also planning to start translational research such as a biomarker study.

In conclusion, in the area of urological malignancy, medical oncologists can participate in (i) some part of chemotherapy, (ii) care of complications with chemotherapy, (iii) experimental therapy such as phase I study, (iv) facilitating multidisciplinary care of patients, and (v) facilitating translational research.

Collaboration between the Japanese Society of Medical Oncology and the Japanese Urological Association for developing training systems for medical oncologists

Presenter

Hironobu Minami MD
Professor
Medical Oncology, Kobe University School of Medicine and Kobe University Hospital

It is well recognized that the quality of chemotherapy in oncology practice in Japan is lower than that in the United States or European countries. Patients with cancers are treated in an organ-specific medical system. Specifically, lung cancer is treated by chest physicians, gastrointestinal cancers by gastroenterologists or sometimes by surgeons, and genitourinary cancers by urologists. However, the organ-specific system often yields inadequate care. Patients with primary peritoneal adenocarcinoma presenting with ascites represent a subset of advanced cancers that are potentially curable by chemotherapy and surgical procedures for epithelial ovarian cancer. They often visit gastroenterologists with symptoms of abdominal fullness. Unfortunately, however, gastroenterologists often inadequately treat such patients with palliative chemotherapy for gastroenterological cancers without curative intent because they have undergone training for gastroenterological malignancies but not gynecological cancers. Similarly, patients with lung metastases from RCC sometimes visit thoracic oncologists who are not trained in immunotherapy, and patients are often inadequately treated.

Systemic chemotherapy for cancers should be performed by medical oncologists who have undergone a training program that includes all malignancies. However, training systems for medical oncologists including genitourinary cancers are currently under development in Japan. It is highly recommended that the JSMO and the JUA collaborate to establish such training systems for medical oncologists.

Reference

1 Akaza H. Report from the first Japanese Urological Association-Japanese Society of Medical Oncology joint conference, 2006: 'a step towards better collaboration between urologists and medical oncologists'. *Int. J. Urol.* 2007; **14**: 375–83.

Jpn J Clin Oncol 2008;38(5)339–346
doi:10.1093/jjco/hyn024

Efficacy and Safety of Pemetrexed in Combination with Cisplatin for Malignant Pleural Mesothelioma: A Phase I/II Study in Japanese Patients

Kazuhiko Nakagawa[1], Koichi Yamazaki[2], Hideo Kunitoh[3], Toyoaki Hida[4], Kenichi Gemba[5], Tetsu Shinkai[6], Yukito Ichinose[7], Susumu Adachi[8], Yoshihiro Nambu[9], Nagahiro Saijo[10] and Masahiro Fukuoka[1]

[1]Kinki University School of Medicine, Department of Medical Oncology, Osakasayama, Osaka, [2]Hokkaido University School of Medicine, First Department of Medicine, Sapporo, [3]National Cancer Center Hospital, Department of Internal Medicine and Thoracic Oncology, Tokyo, [4]Aichi Cancer Center Hospital, Department of Thoracic Oncology, Nagoya, [5]Okayama Rosai Hospital, Department of Respiratory Medicine, Okayama, [6]NHO Shikoku Cancer Center, Department of Medicine and Thoracic Oncology, Matsuyama, [7]National Kyushu Cancer Center, Department of Thoracic Oncology, Fukuoka, Japan, [8]Eli Lilly and company, Lilly Research Laboratories, Indianapolis, IN, USA, [9]Eli Lilly Japan K.K., Lilly Research Laboratories Japan, Kobe and [10]National Cancer Center Hospital East, Kashiwa, Chiba, Japan

Received October 3, 2007; accepted March 1, 2008; published online April 22, 2008

Background: Pemetrexed in combination with cisplatin (Pem/Cis) is used globally for the treatment of malignant pleural mesothelioma (MPM). This Phase I/II study was conducted to determine the recommended dose (RD) (Phase I) of Pem/Cis, and evaluate the efficacy and safety (Phase II) in Japanese MPM patients.
Methods: Key eligibility criteria were histologic diagnosis of MPM incurable by surgery, no prior chemotherapy, and a performance status 0–1. Under full vitamin supplementation, pemetrexed was intravenously administered on Day 1 of a 21-day cycle, followed by cisplatin. A cohort of six patients, starting from pemetrexed 500 mg/m^2 and cisplatin 75 mg/m^2 (Level 1), were studied in the dose-escalation Phase I (Step 1). The RD determined in Step 1 was carried forward into Phase II (Step 2). Planned number of patients treated with Pem/Cis was 18–38.
Results: In Step 1, 13 patients were enrolled: seven in Level 1 and six in Level −1 (pemetrexed 500 mg/m^2, cisplatin 60 mg/m^2). Two of six evaluable patients had dose-limiting toxicities (pneumonitis and neutropenia) in Level 1, establishing Level 1 as the RD. In Step 2, 12 patients were enrolled, for a total of 19 patients treated at the RD. Seven patients achieved a partial response among these patients, for a response rate of 36.8% (95% confidence interval: 16.3–61.6); overall survival was 7.3 months. One drug-related death occurred due to worsening of a pre-existing pneumonia. Common grade 3/4 toxicities were neutropenia and decreased-hemoglobin.
Conclusion: The Pem/Cis combination provides promising activity and an acceptable safety profile for chemonaive Japanese MPM patients with the same recommend dosage and schedule used in rest of the world.

Key words: cisplatin – mesothelioma – pemetrexed – phase I/II

INTRODUCTION

Malignant pleural mesothelioma (MPM) is a tumor derived from the mesothelium covering the surface of pleural membranes or from undifferentiated mesenchymal cells in connective tissue under the membranes. MPM is a locally invasive and aggressive tumor with a poor prognosis and a median survival time (MST) of ≈9–16 months (1).

MPM is known to be linked to asbestos exposure, and the incidence of this tumor is expected to increase in the next 10–20 years according to an estimation of asbestos consumption in

For reprints and all correspondence: Kazuhiko Nakagawa, Kinki University School of Medicine, Medical Oncology, 377-2 Ohnohigashi, Osakasayama 589-8511, Japan. E-mail: nakagawa@med.kindai.ac.jp

the world (9). Recently, the prevalence of MPM in Japan was widely recognized after uncovering the high incidence of MPM and MPM-related deaths in ex-workers of asbestos factories and in residents of the surrounding areas who may have been subject to non-occupational exposure to asbestos fibers.

Surgical resection offers local control of the tumor but its effect on survival remains unclear. In addition, application of radiation therapy is limited because of the diffuse extension of tumor spread. Regimens applied to lung cancer such as platinum-containing chemotherapy have been used for MPM in Japan; however, the efficacy outcomes of these therapies are not satisfactory. Therefore, effective systemic chemotherapy for MPM is clearly needed.

Pemetrexed is a novel antifolate (12) that inhibits three enzymes in folate metabolism: thymidylate synthase, dihydrofolate reductase and glycinamide ribonucleotide formyltransferase (11). Because of the multi-targeted profile of this compound, broad and preferable anti-tumor activity is expected. Pemetrexed has shown clinical activity in various tumors including mesotheliomas (6). A pivotal multicenter, randomized Phase III study of pemetrexed (500 mg/m^2) in combination with cisplatin (75 mg/m^2) versus cisplatin alone (cisplatin 75 mg/m^2) in patients with MPM who had no prior chemotherapy was conducted in 20 countries (not including Japan) (16). A total of 448 patients were randomized and treated in this study (226 treated by pemetrexed/cisplatin (Pem/Cis) and 222 treated by cisplatin). MST in the Pem/Cis arm was 12.1 months compared with 9.3 months in the cisplatin arm ($P = 0.020$, two-sided log rank test). This was the first confirmation of significant prolongation of survival for patients with MPM. On the basis of this evidence, the combination of pemetrexed and cisplatin was approved for the treatment of MPM in the USA in 2004. Since then, the combination therapy has been approved in more than 80 countries and regions for the treatment of MPM, and recognized as a standard care for MPM (8).

In 2005, we initiated a Phase I/II study of Pem/Cis therapy in Japanese patients with MPM who had no prior chemotherapy. The primary objectives of this study were to determine the clinically recommended dose (RD) of Pem/Cis therapy in the Phase I portion of the study (Step 1), and to examine tumor response of the combination therapy in the Phase II portion (Step 2). The secondary objectives included time-to-event efficacy outcomes [the duration of response, progression free survival (PFS), and overall survival time], 1-year survival rate, quality of life (QOL) assessments, pulmonary function tests and safety.

PATIENTS AND METHODS

Patient selection

Chemonaive patients with histological diagnosis of MPM, regardless of clinical stage and who were not candidates for curative surgery, were assessed for eligibility. Eligible patients needed to be 20–74 years old with a life expectancy $\geq$12 weeks and an Eastern Cooperative Oncology Group performance status (PS) 0 or 1. Patients were also required to have adequate organ functions: bone marrow reserve [platelets $\geq 100 \times 10^3/mm^3$, hemoglobin $\geq$9.0 g/dl, and absolute neutrophil count (ANC) $\geq 2.0 \times 10^3/mm^3$], hepatic function [bilirubin $\leq 1.5 \times$ upper limit of normal (ULN), aspartate/alanine transaminase (AST/ALT) $\leq 2.5 \times$ ULN, and serum albumin $\geq$2.5 g/dl], renal function (serum creatinine $\leq$ULN, and calculated creatinine clearance $\geq$45 ml/min using the Cockcroft and Gault formula), lung function (functional oxygen saturation [SpO_2] $\geq$92%) and normal electrocardiogram.

Patients were excluded from this study for active infection, symptomatic brain metastasis, a wide-spread diffuse shadow in the lung caused by interstitial pneumonitis diagnosed by chest X-ray, pregnancy, serious concomitant systemic disorders incompatible with the study, clinically significant effusions, Common Terminology Criteria for Adverse Events (CTCAEs) v3 grade $\geq$2 peripheral neuropathy, the inability to discontinue aspirin and other non-steroidal anti-inflammatory agents or the inability or unwillingness to take folate and vitamin B_{12} during the study.

This study was conducted in compliance with the guidelines of good clinical practice and the Declaration of Helsinki, and it was approved by the local institutional review boards. All patients gave written informed consent before study entry. The Efficacy and Safety Evaluation Committee (ESEC), an independent body, was consulted if any efficacy and safety issues arose in the study.

Study Design

This was a Phase I/II, multicenter, single-arm, open-label study, performed in two steps. The RD level established in Step 1 was carried forward in Step 2. Patients enrolled in Step 1 at the RD level could continue in Step 2 unless otherwise indicated. The planned number of patients in total of Steps 1 and 2 treated with Pem/Cis was 18–38 for examination of efficacy and safety profile. In Step 1, six patients were to be enrolled in each dose level. The lower number of the planned number of patients, 18, was set as the minimum number of patients needed to confirm that the response rate of the study drugs was significantly larger than the threshold rate of 10% at one-sided significant level 0.05 with $\geq$80% power.

Study Treatment

Pemetrexed was intravenously administered as a 10-min infusion on Day 1 of a 21-day cycle, followed by cisplatin administration intravenously as a 2-h infusion 30 min after pemetrexed administration. Patients were instructed to take a daily 1 g multivitamin containing 500 μg of folate beginning 1 week prior to Day 1 of Cycle 1 until study discontinuation. Vitamin B_{12} (1000 μg) was intramuscularly injected, starting 1 week prior to Day 1 of Cycle 1 and repeated every 9 weeks until study discontinuation. Patients remained on study unless they were discontinued, for instance, due to disease progression and unacceptable adverse events.

Determination of RD for Step 2

In Step 1 (Phase I), four escalating dose levels were planned: pemetrexed at 500 (Level 1), 700 (Level 2), 900 (Level 3) and 1000 mg/m^2 (Level 4) with cisplatin held at 75 mg/m^2. In addition, a lower dose level (Level −1) was planned at pemetrexed 500 mg/m^2 and a lower dose of cisplatin 60 mg/m^2 for a failure case of dose-escalation in Level 1. In the dose-escalation procedure, the starting dose of pemetrexed was set to be 500 mg/m^2 which is ca. 40% of the maximum tolerated dose (MTD) of pemetrexed monotherapy with folic acid and vitamin B_{12} supplementation determined in a Japanese Phase I study; the MTD and RD of pemetrexed were determined to be 1200 and 1000 mg/m^2, respectively (7). The percentage of the starting dose to the MTD was based on a guideline for Phase I/II study on anticancer drugs (10). For escalation of pemetrexed dose, a modified Fibonacci dose-escalation method was used (2). Dose level reduction or escalation depended on the incidence of dose-limiting toxicity (DLT) at a given dose level (Fig. 1). If two of six patients at Levels 1, 2 or 3 developed DLT, that dose level was considered the RD for Step 2 (Phase II) of the study, and then Step 2 was initiated. This was also the case for Level −1 or 4 if 0–2 patients developed DLT. If three or more patients developed DLT at a given dose level (except dose Level −1), the next lower dose level was considered the RD level for Step 2. If three or more patients had DLT at Level −1, a decision was made as to whether the study should be continued.

A DLT was defined as a toxicity occurring in Cycle 1 meeting one of the following criteria: any grade ≥3 non-hematologic toxicity (except nausea, vomiting, anorexia and fatigue), grade ≥2 peripheral neuropathy or hearing loss/impairment, grade ≥3 febrile neutropenia (<1000/mm^3 with ≥38.5°C), grade 4 leukopenia (<1000/mm^3) or neutropenia (<500/mm^3) lasting ≥3 days, thrombocytopenia (<25000/mm^3), or thrombocytopenia requiring platelet transfusion. A failure to start the second cycle by Day 29 due to toxicity was also considered a DLT. All toxicities were assessed according to CTCAE.



Figure 1. Scheme of dose-escalation Steps 1 and 2. DLT, dose-limiting toxicity.

Treatment Assessments

Anti-tumor Activity

Disease staging was assessed according to International Mesothelioma Interesting Group Tumor Node Metastasis (IMIG TNM) staging criteria (13). Within 28 days before the first treatment and approximately every 4 weeks after the first treatment, computer tomography or X-ray imaging of each lesion was performed. Tumor response was assessed using the modified Southwest Oncology Group (SWOG) criteria. Unidimensionally measurable lesions were defined as *Measurable disease*, and assessed objectively by the sum of the greatest diameters of them. Bidimensionally measurable lesions defined in the standard SWOG criteria (5) were assessed in the similar way. Best overall response selected from total overall response assessments was determined according to assessment of the Extramural Case Judgment Committee (E-CJC). Duration of response was measured as from the date of the first objective assessment of complete response (CR) or partial response (PR) until the date of the first assessment of progression of disease (PD). PFS was measured as from the registration date of Cycle 1 treatment until the first date of PD or death from any cause. Overall survival time was measured as from the registration date of Cycle 1 treatment until the date of death from any cause or until the last follow-up date in survival surveillance period.

QOL Assessments and Pulmonary Function Tests

QOL surveillance was employed using the following questionnaires: QOL questionnaire for cancer patients treated with anticancer drugs (QOL-ACD), and functional assessment of cancer therapy for lung cancer (FACT-L). These questionnaires were used on Day 1 of Cycles 1 and 2, and on 3 months after Day 1 of Cycle 1. QOL-ACD consists of four subscales (activity, physical condition, psychological condition and social relationships) and a total QOL scale (face scale) (4). The lung cancer subscale (LCS) score of FACT-L was used (3). As pulmonary function tests, forced vital capacity (FVC), forced expiratory volume in 1 s (FEV_1) and vital capacity (VC) were measured using a spirometer in the sitting position. All tests followed the Japanese Respiratory Function Test guidelines (14).

Safety

Adverse events were recorded throughout the study and after the last drug administration until signs of recovery were evident. Adverse events were evaluated according to treatment-emergent adverse events (TEAEs) definitions, and coded using the Medical Dictionary for Regulatory Activities (MedDRA v9.0). The severity (grade) of an adverse event was assessed according to CTCAE v3.

Statistical Analysis

The evaluation period of efficacy and safety in this study was defined as from the beginning of the study treatment to 5 months after the last patient began study treatment. For the

evaluations of overall survival time and 1-year survival rate, survival surveillance period was defined as from the beginning of the study treatment to 1 year after the last patient began study treatment. Patients who received the study drugs and complied with all inclusion/exclusion criteria were included in full analysis set (FAS). Patients who were treated with the RD level in Step 1 or 2 among FAS were included in efficacy analysis set for efficacy evaluation. Patients who received the study drugs at least once were included in safety analysis set for safety evaluation.

Assessment results of the best overall response by the E-CJC were used for efficacy analysis. Statistical tests based on binominal distribution were done to confirm that the response rate of the study drugs was significantly larger than the threshold rate of 10% at one-sided significant level 0.05. The threshold rate 10% was set on the basis of historical data on the response rate of cisplatin alone arm reported in other studies (15,16).

RESULTS

Patient Characteristics

From 2005 to 2006, a total of 25 Japanese patients with MPM were enrolled in Steps 1 and 2 at seven centers in Japan. All patients met the eligibility criteria and received study treatment; all were included in FAS. One patient was still receiving the study drug at the time of the efficacy and safety evaluations in this report.

Patient characteristics are summarized in Table 1. The majority of patients were male (22 patients, 88.0%). The median age was 61 years (range: 50–74 years). Most patients had a PS of 1 (18 patients, 72.0%) and clinical stage IV (21 patients, 84.0%). The predominant histologic subtype was epithelial in 64% of patients. Two demographic characteristics showed differences among dose levels. There were more patients with PS 0 in Level −1 (50.0%) than in Level 1 (21.1%). All six (100%) patients in Level −1 had the epithelial subtype versus 10 (52.6%) patients in Level 1.

Table 1. Patient characteristics

	Step 1 Level −1 ($n = 6$)	Level 1 ($n = 19$)	All treated ($n = 25$)
Gender			
Male	5	17	22
Female	1	2	3
Age			
Mean	61	61	61
SD	3.9	6.3	5.8
Med	61	59	61
Weight(kg)			
Mean	62.8	58.1	59.2
SD	8.51	11.19	10.65
Performance status prior to Cycle 1			
0	3	4	7
1	3	15	18
Histological subtype			
Epithelioid mesothelioma	6	10	16
Sarcomatoid mesothelioma	0	5	5
Biphasic mesothelioma	0	4	4
Other	0	0	0
Asbestos exposure			
Had no exposure	2	3	5
Had exposure	4	16	20
Stage of disease			
Ia	0	0	0
Ib	0	1	1
II	0	1	1
III	1	1	2
IV	5	16	21

Level 1: pemetrexed 500 mg/m^2 + cisplatin 75 mg/m^2
Level −1: pemetrexed 500 mg/m^2 + cisplatin 60 mg/m^2
SD, standard deviation.

Dose-Escalation, Dose-Limiting Toxicity and RD

One patient in Level 1 of Step 1 died on Day 14 of Cycle 1 due to exacerbation of pneumonia, respiratory failure (hypoxia) and disseminated intravascular coagulation (DIC). The ESEC evaluated the case of the early death. Since the patient had had the shadow of the lung detected by radiographic image prior to receiving study treatment, it was unlikely that the administration of pemetrexed was the primary cause of the pneumonia. The autopsy of this patient showed that interstitial changes in the lung were mild and the pathological diagnosis was an organizing pneumonia. The result of the autopsy was compatible with the clinical course and suggested that the direct cause of the death was not the drug-induced interstitial pneumonia but the exacerbation of infectious pneumonia, worsened by the study treatment. The case, therefore, was considered not appropriate for the DLT evaluation.

One patient was added in this dose level to assess the safety profile additionally. Among the six patients in Level 1 excluding the case inappropriate for the DLT evaluation, two patients showed DLTs: drug-induced pneumonitis in one patient and dose delay of Cycle 2 initiation due to decreased neutrophil count in the other. According to the protocol definition, Level 1 was determined to be an RD for the next phase (Fig. 1).

The ESEC, however, recommended examining the treatment at Level −1 (pemetrexed 500 mg/m^2 and cisplatin 60 mg/m^2) exploratively to accumulate more safety information. Accordingly, six patients were enrolled and treated at Level −1, and no DLTs were observed in this dose level.

Evaluating the data of these two levels together, the ESEC agreed to continue Step 2 carefully with the dose of Level 1. The sponsor decided to carry forward into Step 2 with

an RD of Level 1 (pemetrexed 500 mg/m^2 and cisplatin 75 mg/m^2). In Step 2, 12 patients were treated at Level 1.

Efficacy

Nineteen patients (7 in Step 1 and 12 in Step 2) in Level 1 were included in the efficacy analysis set and of 19 patients, seven patients had PR, five patients had stable disease (SD), six patients had PD and one patient was classified as not evaluated. An overall response rate (ORR) was 36.8% [95% confidence interval (CI): 16.3%–61.6%]. The 95% one-sided confidence lower limit was 18.8%, exceeding the threshold level of 10%. The six patients in Level −1 had PR; thus, the ORR for all 25 patients treated with the study drug reached 52.0% (13 total PR, 95% CI: 31.3%–72.2%).

The secondary efficacy variables were time-to-event outcomes (the duration of response, PFS and overall survival time), 1-year survival rate, QOL and pulmonary function test. The median duration of response was 5.2 months (95% CI: 4.3–7.3 months) for the seven responders in the efficacy analysis set (Table 2). The median duration of response for the six responders at Level −1 was again 5.2 months. For the efficacy analysis set, median PFS was 4.7 months (95% CI: 1.3–6.5 months) and MST was 7.3 months (95% CI: 4.6–14.2 months, Fig. 2) with 1-year survival rate of 36.8% (95% CI: 15.2%–58.5%). Median PFS for the six patients at Level −1 was 10.1 months. MST at Level −1 could not be calculated by Kaplan–Meier method. The 1-year survival rate of Level −1 (66.7%) was beyond 50%.

The QOL-ACD and FACT-L measures were used for QOL evaluation. There were no major changes from prior to Cycle 1 to 3 months after Cycle 1 treatment in the mean scores for the activity and physical condition subscales of QOL-ACD (Table 3); however, mean scores from prior to Cycle 1 to 3 months after Cycle 1 treatment for the psychological condition and social relationships subscales numerically increased. The mean LCS score of FACT-L did not change substantially from prior to Cycle 1 to 3 months after Cycle 1 treatment (data not shown). These score changes indicate that QOL of the patients was maintained without worsening from baseline. Pulmonary function was also maintained with no worsening from baseline observed in the pulmonary function tests (FEV_1, FVC and VC) in the efficacy analysis set (data not shown).

Safety

Of 25 patients of the safety analysis set, three died during the study period: one (Level 1, Step 1) from exacerbation of pneumonia as a pre-existing complication, respiratory failure, and DIC, as described earlier, and the other two (Step 2) due to study disease. Two patients experienced non-fatal serious adverse events (fever and aspiration pneumonia, respectively). A causal relationship between fever and the study drugs could not be ruled out, but the aspiration pneumonia was not considered related to study drugs. Adverse events leading to discontinuation from study treatment were observed in six patients: one patient at Level 1 and three patients at Level −1 in Step 1 and in two patients in Step 2. Adverse event leading to discontinuation in two or more patients was increased blood creatinine (two patients).

Table 2. Summary of time-to-event outcomes and 1-year survival rates

	Step 1 Level −1 ($n = 6$)	Level 1 ($n = 19$)	All treated ($n = 25$)
Duration of response (months)			
Responders	6	7	13
Med	5.2	5.2	5.2
(95% CI)	3.1 − *	4.3–7.3	4.3–7.3
Range	2.7–9.6	2.0–7.3	2.0–9.6
Censored (%)	50	14.3	30.8
Progression free survival (months)			
Med	10.1	4.7	4.8
(95% CI)	4.3 − *	1.3–6.5	2.5–7.1
Range	3.3–12.1	0.5–9.6	0.5–12.1
Censored (%)	50	10.5	20
Overall survival (months)			
Med	NA	7.3	9.2
(95% CI)	11.1 − *	4.6–14.2	5.8–14.4
Range	8.6–19.3	0.5–21.5	0.5–21.5
Censored (%)	66.7	21.1	32
1-year survival rate (%)			
	66.7	36.8	44.0
(95% CI)	28.9–100.0	15.2–58.5	24.5–63.5

*Not calculated. NA, not assessed.
Level 1: pemetrexed 500 mg/m^2 + cisplatin 75 mg/m^2.
Level −1: pemetrexed 500 mg/m^2 + cisplatin 60 mg/m^2.
CI, confidence interval.

Grade 3 or more laboratory TEAEs were observed in 16 patients: four patients at Level 1 and five patients at Level −1 in Step 1 and in seven patients in Step 2. Laboratory TEAEs observed in at least half of the 25 patients were decreased-hemoglobin, decreased red blood cell count, decreased neutrophil count, decreased white blood cell count, decreased lymphocyte count, increased blood urea and decreased body weight (Table 4). Grade 3 or more non-laboratory TEAEs were observed in eight patients: three patients at Level 1 and one patient at Level −1 in Step 1 and in four patients in Step 2. Non-laboratory TEAEs observed in at least half of the 25 patients were nausea, anorexia, vomiting and malaise. No major differences between Levels 1 and −1 (Step 1) in the incidence of TEAEs were noted.

For the 19 patients at Level 1, laboratory TEAEs of grade 3 or higher, possibly related to drug, and observed in at least two patients were decreased neutrophil count (seven patients, 36.8%), decreased hemoglobin (six patients, 31.6%), decreased white blood cell count (five patients, 26.3%), decreased lymphocyte count (five patients, 26.3%),



Figure 2. Kaplan–Meier plot of overall survival in the efficacy analysis set. Solid lines, overall survival; dotted lines, high and low limits of 95% confidence interval.

decreased platelet count (two patients, 10.5%) and decreased blood potassium (two patients, 10.5%). Non-laboratory adverse drug reactions of grade 3 or higher observed in at least two patients were vomiting (three patients, 15.8%), anorexia (three patients, 15.8%), nausea (two patients, 10.5%) and malaise (two patients, 10.5%). Adverse drug reactions of grade 3 or higher for the six patients in Level −1 were decreased neutrophil count (three patients), decreased-hemoglobin (two patients), decreased lymphocyte count (two patients) and decreased red blood cell count (one patient).

DISCUSSION

This Phase I/II study reports the first experience of the combination of pemetrexed and cisplatin therapy in Japanese patients. The RD of Pem/Cis combination therapy was established at pemetrexed 500 mg/m^2 and cisplatin 75 mg/m^2, with pemetrexed administration on Day 1 of each 21-day cycle followed by cisplatin, which is the same regimen used in worldwide for patients with MPM (16).

Of the 19 patients evaluable for efficacy at the RD level, there were PRs in seven patients, for an ORR of 36.8% (95% CI: 16.3%–61.6%). A pivotal Phase III study of the same regimen as that applied of the present study, yielded a response rate of 41.3% (95% CI: 34.8%–48.1%) in 225 patients (16). The response rates from both studies are comparable despite of the large difference in sample size.

The response rate of all the 25 treated patients was higher than the response rate for the 19 patients treated at the RD (52.0% versus 36.8%). This is due to the fact that all the six patients in Level −1 had PR. The excellent outcome observed in Level −1 may be attributed to differences between those patients who received the RD and those patients in Level −1 in the histological subtype of mesothelioma. All six patients in Level −1 had an epithelial subtype, which is known as a favorable prognostic factor, while only about half of the 19 patients at the RD had this subtype. In addition, the PS of the patients in Level −1 was better than the patients at RD.

A secondary efficacy endpoint MST showed 7.3 months in this study, shorter than that of the Pem/Cis arm in the Phase III study (12.1 months) (16). Although it would be difficult to compare MST of this study derived from a small sample size with the large Phase III study ($n = 226$), the discrepancy of survival between the two studies could be ascribed for the demographic characteristics of patients in both. There are less patients who had good prognostic factors in this study than in the Pem/Cis arm of the Phase III study: epithelial subtype: 52.6% versus 68.1%, a good PS: 21.1% (PS = 0) versus 51.8% (Karnofsky PS = 90/100) and clinical stage I/II: 8.0% versus 22.6% (16).

In this study, the most common adverse events (>50% of patients) were decreased-hemoglobin, erythropenia, neutropenia, leukopenia and lymphopenia for laboratory parameters, and nausea, anorexia, and vomiting for non-laboratory parameters. These hematologic and gastrointestinal events were similarly observed in the Pem/Cis arm of the pivotal Phase III study (16). No grade 3/4 febrile neutropenia toxicity which is a potentially life-threatening event was reported in our study. One death by pneumonitis was observed in this study; however, the patient was considered to have a pre-existing condition before initial treatment with study therapy. Adverse events observed in this study were predictable from safety profile observed in overseas trials and market experiences of pemetrexed and cisplatin combination therapy.

Table 3. Summary of QOL questionnaire for cancer patients treated with anticancer drugs (Level 1, $n = 19$)

Subscale	Measurement Point	n	Mean	SD	Min	Med	Max
Activity							
	Prior to Cycle1	19	62.9	25.35	20.0	60.0	100.0
	Prior to Cycle2	15	61.8	32.27	5.0	70.0	100.0
	Prior to Cycle3	14	69.6	21.79	20.0	75.0	95.0
	Cycle1 + 3M	11	60.5	32.13	5.0	70.0	100.0
Physical							
	Prior to Cycle1	19	64.7	22.33	15.0	70.0	100.0
	Prior to Cycle2	15	64.3	18.11	20.0	65.0	95.0
	Prior to Cycle3	14	66.2	18.33	30.0	70.0	85.0
	Cycle1 + 3M	11	61.4	21.46	35.0	60.0	95.0
Psychological							
	Prior to Cycle1	19	53.2	20.62	12.5	56.3	81.3
	Prior to Cycle2	15	59.6	24.87	12.5	62.5	100.0
	Prior to Cycle3	14	58.0	17.41	31.3	56.3	87.5
	Cycle1 + 3M	11	61.4	18.07	37.5	68.8	87.5
Social							
	Prior to Cycle1	19	32.9	21.56	5.0	25.0	75.0
	Prior to Cycle2	15	33.7	19.13	0.0	25.0	70.0
	Prior to Cycle3	14	43.6	19.94	10.0	42.5	85.0
	Cycle1 + 3M	11	36.4	22.59	10.0	30.0	85.0
Face scale							
	Prior to Cycle1	19	50.0	23.57	0.0	50.0	100.0
	Prior to Cycle2	14	55.4	24.37	0.0	50.0	100.0
	Prior to Cycle3	14	64.3	23.44	25.0	50.0	100.0
	Cycle1 + 3M	11	63.6	20.50	25.0	75.0	100.0

Level 1: pemetrexed 500 mg/m^2 + cisplatin 75 mg/m^2. M, months.
QOL, quality of life.

CONCLUSION

The RDs for the Pem/Cis combination are pemetrexed 500 mg/m^2 and cisplatin 75 mg/m^2, which is the same regimen used in worldwide for patients with MPM. The combination shows promising efficacy with an acceptable safety profile in Japanese patients with MPM.

On January 2007, Pem/Cis combination therapy was approved and launched for the treatment of patients with MPM in Japan. Intensive post-marketing surveillance in patients with MPM is ongoing.

Funding

This study has been supported and funded by Eli Lilly Japan K.K., Kobe, Japan.

Conflict of interest statement

S.A. and Y.N. are employed by the sponsor, Eli Lilly Japan K.K.; N.S. and M.F. are paid consultants to the sponsor.

Table 4. Summary of treatment-emergent adverse events (TEAEs) reported >25% patients

System organ class preferred term	Step 1 Level −1 ($n = 6$)	Level 1 ($n = 19$)	All treated ($n = 25$)
Patients with ≥1 TEAEs	6	19	25
Laboratory			
Hemoglobin decreased	6	18	24
Red blood cell count decreased	6	16	22
Neutrophil count decreased	5	16	21
White blood cell count decreased	5	15	20
Lymphocyte count decreased	5	12	17
Blood urea increased	5	11	16
Weight decreased	3	12	15
Blood albumin decreased	2	10	12
Platelet count decreased	4	8	12
Protein total decreased	3	9	12
Blood creatinine increased	4	7	11
Neutrophil count increased	2	8	10
White blood cell count increased	2	8	10
Blood sodium decreased	2	7	9
Alanine aminotransferase increased	1	7	8
Protein urine present	1	7	8
Aspartate aminotransferase increased	1	6	7
Blood magnesium decreased	2	5	7
Blood potassium decreased	0	7	7
Non-laboratory			
Nausea	6	18	24
Anorexia	6	16	22
Vomiting	3	15	18
Malaise	5	10	15
Constipation	3	9	12
Hiccups	3	5	8
Rash	2	6	8
Diarrhoea	1	6	7
Oedema	2	5	7
Pyrexia	2	5	7
Dysgeusia	3	4	7
Headache	1	6	7

Level 1: pemetrexed 500 mg/m^2 + cisplatin 75 mg/m^2
Level −1: pemetrexed 500 mg/m^2 + cisplatin 60 mg/m^2
MedDRA Ver 9.0.

References

1. British Thoracic Society Standards of Care Committee. Statement on malignant mesothelioma in the United Kingdom. *Thorax* 2001;56:250–65.
2. Carter SK. Study design principles in the clinical evaluation of new drugs as developed by the chemotherapy programme of the National Cancer Institute. In: Staquet MJ, editor. The Design of Clinical Trials in Cancer Therapy. Brussels, Belgium: Futara Pub Co 1973;242–89.

3. Cella DF, Bonomi AE, Lloyd SR, Tulsky DS, Kaplan E, Bonomi P. Reliability and validity of the Functional Assessment of Cancer Therapy-Lung (FACT-L) quality of life instrument. *Lung Cancer* 1995;12:199–220.
4. Eguchi K, Kurihara M, Shimozuma K, Hotta T, Murakami M, Suzuki N, et al. Quality of life questionnaire for cancer patients treated with anticancer drugs. *Nippon Ganchiryo Gakkaishi* 1993;28:1140–4 (in Japanese).
5. Green S, Weiss GR. Southwest oncology group standard response criteria, endpoint definitions and toxicity criteria. *Invest New Drugs* 1992;10:239–53.
6. Hanauske AR, Chen V, Paoletti P, Niyikiza C. Pemetrexed disodium: a novel antifolate clinically active against multiple solid tumors. *Oncologist* 2001;6:363–73.
7. Nakagawa K, Kudoh S, Matsui K, Negoro S, Yamamoto N, Latz JE, et al. A phase I study of pemetrexed (LY231514) supplemented with folate and vitamin B_{12} in Japanese patients with solid tumors. *Br J Cancer* 2006;95:677–782.
8. Pass HI, Hahn SM, Vogelzang NJ, Carbone M. Benign and malignant mesothelioma-Chapter 36. In: DeVita VT Jr., Hellman S, Rosenberg SA, editors Cancer Principles and Practice of Oncology. 7th edn. Philadelphia: Lippincott Williams & Wilkins 2004;1687–715.
9. Peto J, Decarli A, La Vecchia C, Levi F, Negri E. The European mesothelioma epidemic. *Br J Cancer* 1999;79:666–72.
10. Saijo N and Study Group. Guideline for phase I/II study on anticancer drugs (Draft version). *Med Front (Saishin Igaku)* 2001;56:1515–41 (in Japanese).
11. Shih C, Habeck LL, Mendelsohn LG, Chen VJ, Schultz RM. Multiple folate enzyme inhibition: mechanism of a novel pyrrolopyrimidine-based antifolate LY231514 (MTA). *Adv Enzyme Regul* 1998;38:135–52.
12. Taylor EC, Patel HH. Synthesis of pyrazolo[3,4-d]pyrimidine analogues of the potent antitumor agent N-{4-[2-(2-amino-4(3H)-oxo-7H-pyrrolo[2,3-d]pyrimidin-5-yl)ethyl]benzoyl}-L-glutamic acid (LY231514). *Tetrahedron* 1992;48:8089–100.
13. The International Mesothelioma Interest Group. A proposed new international TNM staging system for malignant pleural mesothelioma. *Chest* 1995;108:1122–8.
14. The Japanese Respiratory Society. In: Clinical Pulmonary Functions Committee, editor. Guideline of Pulmonary Function Test. Tokyo: Medical Review 2004 (in Japanese).
15. Van Meerbeeck JP, Gaafar R, Manegold C, Van Klaveren RJ, Van Marck EA, Vincent M, et al. Randomized phase III study of cisplatin with or without raltitrexed in patients with malignant pleural mesothelioma: an intergroup study of the European Organisation for Research and Treatment of Cancer Lung Cancer Group and the National Cancer Institute of Canada. *J Clin Oncol* 2005;23:6881–9.
16. Vogelzang NJ, Rusthoven JJ, Symanowski J, Denham C, Kaukel E, Ruffie P, et al. Phase III study of pemetrexed in combination with cisplatin versus cisplatin alone in patients with malignant pleural mesothelioma. *J Clin Oncol* 2003;21:2636–44.

A Randomized, Double-Blind, Phase IIa Dose-Finding Study of Vandetanib (ZD6474) in Japanese Patients With Non-Small Cell Lung Cancer

Katsuyuki Kiura, MD, PhD, Kazuhiko Nakagawa, MD, PhD,†*
Tetsu Shinkai, MD, PhD,‡ Kenji Eguchi, MD, PhD,§ Yuichiro Ohe, MD, PhD,‖
*Nobuyuki Yamamoto, MD, PhD,¶ Masahiro Tsuboi, MD, PhD,# Soichiro Yokota, MD, PhD,***
Takashi Seto, MD, PhD,†† Haiyi Jiang, MD,‡‡ Kazuto Nishio, MD, PhD,† Nagahiro Saijo, MD, PhD,§
and Masahiro Fukuoka, MD, PhD†

Introduction: Vandetanib (ZACTIMA™) is a once-daily, oral anticancer drug that selectively inhibits vascular endothelial growth factor receptor (VEGFR) and epidermal growth factor receptor (EGFR) signaling. Vandetanib was evaluated as a monotherapy in a randomized, double-blind, dose-finding study in Japan.

Patients and Methods: Eligible patients with locally advanced or metastatic (stage IIIB/IV) or recurrent non-small cell lung cancer, previously treated with chemotherapy, were randomized to receive once-daily oral vandetanib 100, 200, or 300 mg (1:1:1). The primary objective was to determine the objective response rate for each vandetanib dose.

Results: Fifty-three patients received vandetanib (100 mg, $n = 17$; 200 mg, $n = 18$; 300 mg, $n = 18$). The objective response rate in each dose arm was 17.6% (3 of 17; 100 mg), 5.6% (1 of 18; 200 mg), and 16.7% (3 of 18; 300 mg). Common adverse events included rash, diarrhea, hypertension, and asymptomatic QTc prolongation. The adverse event profile was generally consistent with that reported previously for agents that inhibit the VEGFR or EGFR signaling pathways. Among the three responders evaluated for *EGFR* mutation, two had no mutation, and in one case, the *EGFR* mutation status could not be determined by direct DNA sequencing and amplification refractory mutation system assay of *EGFR* exons 19–21. Baseline plasma VEGF levels appeared to be lower in patients who experienced clinical benefit after vandetanib treatment.

Conclusion: In Japanese patients with advanced non-small cell lung cancer, vandetanib monotherapy (100–300 mg/d) demonstrated antitumor activity with an acceptable safety and tolerability profile.

Key Words: Non-small cell lung cancer, Vandetanib, EGFR, VEGFR.

(*J Thorac Oncol.* 2008;3: 386–393)

Non-small cell lung cancer (NSCLC) accounts for approximately 75% of lung cancers and is the leading cause of cancer-related death worldwide.[1] Despite the introduction of more effective chemotherapeutic agents, new approaches are required to further improve patient outcome and survival. A major focus of new anticancer research is the targeting of cell-signaling pathways that contribute to tumor growth and progression.

Vascular endothelial growth factor receptor (VEGFR) and epidermal growth factor receptor (EGFR) are key drivers of tumor angiogenesis and cell proliferation, respectively, and both pathways have been validated as clinically relevant targets in NSCLC. The addition of bevacizumab, a humanized anti-VEGF-A monoclonal antibody, to paclitaxel and carboplatin has demonstrated clinical benefit in patients with NSCLC,[2] and the EGFR inhibitors gefitinib and erlotinib have demonstrated clinical activity as single agents in NSCLC.[3,4] Furthermore, EGFR is known to regulate the production of VEGF and other proangiogenic factors[5] and resistance to EGFR inhibition has been associated with increased expression of VEGF in a human tumor xenograft model of NSCLC.[6] Therefore, targeting the VEGFR and EGFR pathways may be more effective than inhibiting either pathway alone. This hypothesis is supported by the promising results from early clinical evaluation of erlotinib and bevacizumab in combination in patients with recurrent NSCLC.[7]

Vandetanib (ZACTIMA™) is a once-daily, orally available anticancer drug that inhibits VEGFR- and EGFR-dependent signaling,[8] as well as the RET (REarranged during

*Okayama Graduate School of Medicine, Dentistry, and Pharmaceutical Sciences and Okayama University Hospital, Okayama, Japan; †Kinki University School of Medicine, Osaka, Japan; ‡Shikoku Cancer Center, Ehime, Japan; §Tokai University Hospital, Kanagawa, Japan; ‖National Cancer Center Hospital, Tokyo, Japan; ¶Shizuoka Cancer Center, Shizuoka, Japan; #Tokyo Medical University Hospital, Tokyo, Japan; **Toneyama National Hospital, Osaka, Japan; ††Kyushu Cancer Center, Fukuoka, Japan; ‡‡AstraZeneca KK, Osaka, Japan; and the §§National Cancer Center Hospital East, Chiba, Japan.

Disclosure: Haiyi Jiang is an employee of AstraZeneca. All other authors declare no conflict of interest.

Address for correspondence: Katsuyuki Kiura, MD, PhD, Okayama University Graduate School of Medicine, Dentistry and Pharmaceutical Sciences and Okayama University Hospital, 2-5-1Shikata-cho, Okayama 700-8558, Japan; E-mail: kkiura@md.okayama-u.ac.jp

ISSN: 1556-0864/08/0304-0386

Transfection) receptor tyrosine kinase, which is an important growth driver in certain types of thyroid cancer.[9] Early clinical evaluation of vandetanib has demonstrated a promising efficacy and safety profile in a broad population of patients with advanced cancer. Phase I studies in advanced solid tumors conducted in the USA/Australia[10] and Japan[11] showed that once-daily doses of vandetanib (up to and including 300 mg) were generally well tolerated. In the Japanese study, objective tumor responses were observed in 4 of 9 patients with refractory NSCLC. Subsequent phase II studies in advanced NSCLC demonstrated antitumor activity both as a monotherapy and in combination with certain chemotherapy.[12–14] The positive outcome of these phase II trials led to the ongoing phase III evaluation of vandetanib in previously treated advanced NSCLC.

The primary objective of this randomized phase IIa study was to assess the objective response rate (ORR) to vandetanib (100, 200, or 300 mg/d) in Japanese patients with refractory NSCLC. The three doses investigated were selected based on the outcome of the Japanese phase I trial.[11]

PATIENTS AND METHODS

Patients

Patients with histologic or cytologic confirmation of locally advanced/metastatic (stage IIIB/IV) or recurrent NSCLC after failure of 1 or 2 platinum-based chemotherapy regimens were recruited from eight centers in Japan. The main eligibility criteria were age ≥20 years, a WHO performance status of 0 to 2, an estimated life expectancy ≥12 weeks, and completion of prior chemotherapy and/or radiotherapy at least 4 weeks before study entry (8 weeks for chest radiation and 6 weeks for mitomycin C). Patients with squamous cell histology were also eligible, and brain metastases were permitted if patients were asymptomatic and did not require corticosteroid treatment. Key exclusion criteria were a mixed small-cell and non-small cell histology, evidence of severe or uncontrolled systemic diseases, poorly controlled hypertension, a QTc interval ≥460 milliseconds by electrocardiogram during the screening period, and prior treatment with EGFR or VEGFR signaling inhibitors. All patients provided written informed consent. The study was conducted in accordance with the ethical principles stated in the Declaration of Helsinki, applicable guidelines on good clinical practice, local Institutional Review Board approval, and the AstraZeneca policy on Bioethics.

Study Design and Treatments

This was a randomized, double-blind, parallel-group, phase IIa dose-finding multicenter study to assess the efficacy and safety of vandetanib. A total of 53 patients were randomized (1:1:1) to receive once-daily oral vandetanib (100, 200, or 300 mg/d; Figure 1). Patients were stratified by histology (adenocarcinoma versus others), gender (male versus female), and smoking history (smoker versus nonsmoker). Treatment continued until a withdrawal or dose-interruption criterion was met. These criteria included progressive disease (PD), unacceptable toxicity, protocol noncompliance, or voluntary discontinuation by the patient.



FIGURE 1. Study design.

Efficacy

The primary objective of the study was to determine ORR with vandetanib monotherapy, using the Response Evaluation Criteria in Solid Tumors (RECIST); assessments were performed at baseline and every 4 weeks for the first 24 weeks of treatment, and then every 8 weeks until withdrawal. A confirmed complete response or partial response (PR) was considered to be an objective tumor response. Investigator assessment of best overall tumor response was used for the primary analysis and these assessments were subsequently submitted to AstraZeneca for review by the response evaluation committee. Secondary efficacy endpoints included time to progression (TTP), duration of response (the time interval between the date of first documented objective tumor response until the date of PD or death), and disease control rate (DCR) for each dose of vandetanib. Time to progression was calculated from the date of randomization until the date of PD or death (in the absence of progression) and estimated using the Kaplan–Meier method. DCR was defined as confirmed complete response, PR, or stable disease (SD) ≥8 weeks.

Safety and Tolerability

Safety was assessed by monitoring for adverse events (AEs) and collecting laboratory data. All AEs were collected for up to 30 days after the last dose of vandetanib and were graded according to Common Terminology Criteria for Adverse Events (CTCAE, version 3). Unless otherwise clinically indicated, 12-lead electrocardiograms were performed twice at screening, weekly for the first 8 weeks of treatment, and then once every 4 weeks thereafter. Vandetanib treatment was interrupted following: a single QTc measurement ≥550 milliseconds; 2 consecutive QTc measurements ≥500 milliseconds but <550 milliseconds; an increase of ≥100 milliseconds from baseline; or an increase of ≥60 milliseconds from baseline QTc to a QTc value ≥460 milliseconds. Upon resolution of QTc prolongation, vandetanib treatment was recommenced at a reduced dose.

Pharmacokinetics

To investigate the pharmacokinetic (PK) profile of vandetanib, blood samples were collected on the same days as scheduled electrocardiogram measurements. Plasma concentrations of vandetanib were determined using reversed-phase liquid chromatography–mass spectrometry. The col-

lected data were related to a nonlinear mixed effects model to estimate population PK using NONMEM V (v 1.1).

Tumor Biomarkers

An exploratory objective of this study was to investigate how variations in copy number or mutational status of the *EGFR* gene affect tumor response in advanced NSCLC patients receiving vandetanib treatment. Tumor biopsy samples were obtained from consenting patients, formalin-fixed, and embedded in paraffin. Gene copy number was investigated by fluorescence in situ hybridization using the LSI EGFR SpectrumOrange/CEP 7 SpectrumGreen probe (Vysis, Abbott Laboratories, IL) according to a previously published method.[15] Tumor samples had a high *EGFR* gene copy number if there was high gene polysomy (≥4 *EGFR* gene copies in ≥40% of tumor cells) or gene amplification (presence of tight *EGFR* gene clusters, an *EGFR* gene to chromosome 7 ratio of ≥2, or ≥15 copies of the *EGFR* gene per tumor cell in ≥10% of analyzed cells).

EGFR mutations were analyzed by DNA sequencing of exons 19–21, and additionally by using the amplification refractory mutation system (ARMS) assay to detect the exon 21 L858R point mutation and the most common exon 19 deletion (del G2235–A2249).[16]

Plasma Biomarkers

Plasma samples were collected from patients at baseline, day 29, and day 57, and stored at −70°C. The concentrations of the following angiogenic markers were determined by colorimetric Sandwich ELISA (R&D Systems, Minneapolis, USA): VEGF (Cat. #DVE00), the soluble angiopoietin receptor Tie-2 (Cat. #DTE200), and VEGFR-2 (Cat. #DVR200).

RESULTS

Patient Characteristics

Fifty-three patients were recruited from eight centers in Japan between December 27, 2004, and September 30, 2005. All were randomized on this study and received study drug. Patient characteristics and baseline demographics were generally similar in the three arms, and the patient populations were considered to be appropriate for the dose-finding objectives of this study (Table 1). At the time of data cut-off (23 January 2006), 11 patients were ongoing; PD was the most common reason for discontinuation (n = 35). Other reasons for discontinuation were AEs (n = 6) and withdrawal of consent (n = 1).

Efficacy

The overall ORR was 13.2% (95% CI: 5.5–25.3%) (7 of 53 patients), and all 7 responders were PRs (Table 2). According to vandetanib dose received, the ORRs were 17.6% (95% CI: 3.8–43.4%) (3 of 17 patients; 100 mg), 5.6% (95% CI: 0.1–27.3%) (1 of 18 patients; 200 mg), and 16.7% (95% CI:3.6–41.4%) (3 of 18 patients; 300 mg). In all cases, the response evaluation committee assessment of tumor responses was similar to the investigator assessments. The characteristics of those patients who achieved a PR are described in Table 3. Secondary efficacy assessments are presented in Table 2 and Figure 2.

Safety

Overall, the most common AEs were rash, diarrhea, hypertension, and QTc prolongation (Table 4). In general, no major differences were observed in the incidences of

TABLE 1. Patient Demographic and Baseline Characteristics (Full Analysis Set)

	Vandetanib 100 mg/d (n = 17)	Vandetanib 200 mg/d (n = 18)	Vandetanib 300 mg/d (n = 18)	Total (n = 53)
Median age, yr (range)	58 (30–78)	61 (43–77)	61 (44–77)	60 (30–78)
Male (%)	11 (64.7)	12 (66.7)	11 (61.1)	34 (64.2)
Female (%)	6 (35.3)	6 (33.3)	7 (38.9)	19 (35.8)
Smoking history[a]				
No (%)	5 (29.4)	8 (44.4)	7 (38.9)	20 (37.7)
Yes (%)	12 (70.6)	10 (55.6)	11 (61.1)	33 (62.3)
WHO performance status 0/1/2	5/12/0	7/11/0	6/12/0	18/35/0
Previous chemotherapy				
One regimen (%)	13 (76.5)	9 (50.0)	14 (77.8)	36 (67.9)
Two regimens (%)	4 (23.5)	9 (50.0)	4 (22.2)	17 (32.1)
Staging (%)				
IIIB	2 (11.8)	3 (16.7)	1 (5.6)	6 (11.3)
IV	14 (82.4)	12 (66.7)	15 (83.3)	41 (77.4)
Recurrent	1 (5.9)	3 (16.7)	2 (11.1)	6 (11.3)
Histology (%)				
Squamous	5 (29.4)	6 (33.3)	4 (22.2)	15 (28.3)
Adenocarcinoma	11 (64.7)	12 (66.7)	12 (66.7)	35 (66.0)
Other	1 (5.9)	0	2 (11.1)	3 (5.7)
Brain metastasis at study entry (%)	4 (23.5)	3 (16.7)	5 (27.8)	12 (23.6)

[a] No, patients who have smoked <100 cigarettes in their lifetime; Yes, patients who have smoked >100 cigarettes in their lifetime.

TABLE 2. Efficacy Summary

	Vandetanib 100 mg/d (n = 17)	Vandetanib 200 mg/d (n = 18)	Vandetanib 300 mg/d (n = 18)
Primary efficacy assessment			
Best response (RECIST)			
Partial response, n (%)	3 (17.6)	1 (5.6)	3 (16.7)
Stable disease ≥8 wk, n (%)	5 (29.4)	6 (33.3)	8 (44.4)
Disease progression, n (%)	9 (52.9)	10 (55.6)	7 (38.9)
Not evaluable, n (%)	0	1 (5.6)	0
Secondary efficacy assessments			
Disease control ≥8 wk, n (%)	8 (47.1)	7 (38.9)	11 (61.1)
Duration of response (wk)			
Median (range)[a,b]	na	na	15.9 (7.3–20.1)
Time to progression (wk)			
Median (range)[a]	8.3 (4.0–40.7)	12.3 (0–40.3)	12.3 (1.4–32.7)
No. of events	12	13	13

na, not applicable; RECIST, Response Evaluation Criteria in Solid Tumors.
[a] Median estimated using the Kaplan–Meier method.
[b] This parameter could not be estimated in the 100 and 200 mg/d arms owing to the lack of progressions by the date of data cut-off.

TABLE 3. Characteristics of Patients Who Were Partial Responders

Treatment (initial dose)	Gender	Age (yr)	Smoking History[a]	Histology	Previous Chemotherapy Regimens	Time to PR (d)	Duration of Response (d)
100 mg	Male	65	Yes	Adenocarcinoma	1	28	204[b]
100 mg	Female	72	No	Adenocarcinoma	1	78	141[b]
100 mg	Male	52	No	Adenocarcinoma	1	143	141[b]
200 mg	Female	69	No	Adenocarcinoma	1	26	140[b]
300 mg[c]	Male	69	Yes	Adenocarcinoma	2	31	51
300 mg	Female	68	No	Adenocarcinoma	1	28	81[b]
300 mg	Female	55	No	Adenocarcinoma	1	82	141

[a] No, patients who have smoked <100 cigarettes in their lifetime; Yes, patients who have smoked >100 cigarettes in their lifetime.
[b] Censored on the day of last tumor evaluation due to absence of disease progression (response ongoing at data cut-off).
[c] Patient started study treatment with 300 mg and the treatment was stopped 29 d after the start due to QTc prolongation. The patient re-started at a reduced dose level (200 mg) 35 d after the start.



FIGURE 2. Kaplan–Meier curve for time to progression.

the common AEs across the three vandetanib arms, although the incidences of diarrhea, constipation, and abnormal hepatic function were numerically higher in the vandetanib 300 mg arm compared with the 100 or 200 mg arms. A dose-dependent increase in the incidence of CTC grade 3 and 4 events was observed; the incidence of these events in the 100, 200, and 300 mg dose arms were 29.4% (5 of 17 patients), 38.9% (7 of 18 patients), and 66.7% (12 of 18 patients), respectively. Of the 24 CTC grade 3 or 4 AEs considered by the investigator to be vandetanib-related, hypertension (100 mg, n = 4; 200 mg, n = 3; 300 mg, n = 3), and asymptomatic QTc prolongation (200 mg, n = 1; 300 mg, n = 1) were reported in more than one patient. Across the three dose levels, the AEs in this study were generally manageable with symptomatic treatment, dose interruption, or reduction.

Six patients discontinued vandetanib because of an AE considered by the investigator to be vandetanib-related: cryptogenic organizing pneumonia (COP), hepatic steatosis, and photosensitivity reaction (each n = 1, 200 mg arm); QTc prolon-

TABLE 4. Number of Patients With Most Commonly Reported Adverse Events (Occurring in ≥10% Across all Treatment Groups), Regardless of Causality

MedDRA Preferred Term[a]	Vandetanib 100 mg/d (n = 17)	Vandetanib 200 mg/d (n = 18)	Vandetanib 300 mg/d (n = 18)	Total (n = 53)
Rash (%)	10 (59)	9 (50)	9 (50)	28 (53)
CTC grade 3/4	0/0	1/0	0/0	1/0
Diarrhea (%)	8 (47.1)	8 (44)	11 (61)	27 (51)
CTC grade 3/4	0/0	1/0	1/0	2/0
Hypertension (%)	8 (47)	10 (56)	7 (39)	25 (47)
CTC grade 3/4	4/0	3/0	3/0	10/0
ECG QTc prolonged (%)	4 (24)	9 (50)	8 (44)	21 (40)
CTC grade 3/4	0/0	1/0	1/0	2/0
Photosensitivity reaction (%)	2 (12)	5 (28)	5 (28)	12 (23)
CTC grade 3/4	0/0	0/0	0/0	0/0
Nasopharyngitis (%)	3 (18)	4 (22)	4 (22)	11 (21)
CTC grade 3/4	0/0	0/0	0/0	0/0
Dry skin (%)	2 (12)	4 (22)	5 (28)	11 (21)
CTC grade 3/4	0/0	0/0	0/0	0/0
Nausea (%)	3 (18)	3 (17)	4 (22)	10 (19)
CTC grade 3/4	0/0	0/0	0/0	0/0
Constipation (%)	2 (12)	1 (6)	6 (33)	9 (17)
CTC grade 3/4	0/0	0/0	0/0	0/0
Fatigue (%)	4 (24)	1 (6)	2 (11)	7 (13)
CTC grade 3/4	0/0	0/0	0/0	0/0
ECG QT prolonged (%)	1 (6)	2 (11)	4 (22)	7 (13)
CTC grade 3/4	0/0	0/0	0/0	0/0
Hepatic function abnormal (%)	1 (6)	1 (6)	4 (22)	6 (11)
CTC grade 3/4	0/0	0/0	1/0	1/0
Hematuria (%)	2 (12)	2 (12)	2 (12)	6 (11)
CTC grade 3/4	0/0	0/0	0/0	0/0

[a] MedDRA version 8.1.



FIGURE 3. Observed maximum vandetanib plasma concentration at day 28. Patients who received dose reduction within the first 28 days were excluded.

gation, alanine aminotransferase increased, and erythema multiforme (each n = 1, 300 mg arm). Only COP was classed as a serious AE. Six patients had vandetanib dose reductions due to AEs (100 mg, n = 1; 200 mg, n = 1; 300 mg, n = 4).

Seven patients experienced eight respiratory-related events (COP, dyspnoea, interstitial lung disease [ILD], hypoxia, pneumonitis [all n = 1], and pneumonia [n = 3]). The incidence of these events in the three dose levels was 5.9% (1 of 17 patients; 100 mg), 11.1% (2 of 18 patients; 200 mg) and 22.2% (4 of 18 patients; 300 mg), respectively. Four of these events were considered to be related to vandetanib (COP, ILD, pneumonia [n = 2]). The ILD event was reported in a 64-year-old male patient in the 300 mg arm and resulted in patient death. This event was reported 8 days after vandetanib 300 mg was discontinued because of disease progression. No postmortem examination was performed and the investigator and a third-party physician considered the cause of death to be ILD.

All QTc prolongation was asymptomatic and manageable with dose interruption and/or reduction. The incidence of QTc prolongation was lower in the vandetanib 100 mg (24%) arm compared with the 200 mg (50%) and 300 mg (44%) arms. The mean change in QTc interval from baseline to week 3 (when maximum prolongation was observed) in the 100, 200, and 300 mg arms was +14 milliseconds (range, −25 to 29 milliseconds), +16.5 milliseconds (range, −36 to 49 milliseconds), and +27.6 milliseconds (range, 4 to 51 milliseconds), respectively. Protocol-defined QTc prolongation determined at the treatment site resulted in dose reduc-