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“attempting to consolidate clinical phases of drug development into a single, repeatedly amended FiH protocol”

Seamlessness can reduce enrollment pauses and increase patient access, but require intentional design considerations

Hobbs et al, JNCI, 2019
Platform phase I/II design

- TATTON trial: Osimertinib combinations in EGFR-mutant NSCLC
  - Seamless enrollment across multiple dose finding cohorts

Oxnard et al, Ann Oncol, 2020
Registirical phase I/II studies

- AURA trial: FiH study of osimertinib in EGFR-mutant NSCLC

Oxnard & Thress et al, JCO, 2016
AURA trial: FiH study of osimertinib in EGFR-mutant NSCLC

**Registrational phase I/II studies**

- **AURA trial**
  - Biomarker analysis set (n = 308)
  - Escalation
    - Not preselected by T790M status
  - Expansion
    - Enrollment by local tumor testing followed by central tumor confirmation (cobas EGFR Mutation Test) of T790M status or by central tissue testing alone

- Similar approach for:
  - Pembrolizumab in PDL1-high NSCLC (KN-001 part F)
  - Selpercatinib in RET+ NSCLC (LIBRETTO-001)
  - Etc.

Oxnard & Thress et al, JCO, 2016
Re-considering trial phases

Phase I (safety, dose)

Phase II (efficacy, optimize dose)

Phase III (outcome improvement)

Go / no-go decision
Re-considering trial phases

- Seamless protocols have the potential to allow efficient enrollment before and after go/no-go decision.

Phase I
(safety, dose)

Phase II
(efficacy, optimize dose)

Phase III
(outcome improvement)

Phase I/II
(safety, dose, efficacy)

Phase II/III
(optimize dose, outcome improvement)

Go / no-go decision
Systematic review of literature identified 28 lung cancer studies using a seamless phase II/III design, falling primarily in 3 categories:

- Phase II/III trials with inefficacy/futility analyses (inferentially seamless)
- Dose escalation phase II/III trials (operationally seamless)
- Multi-arm multi stage phase II/III trials

Palermos et al, J Clin Med, 2022
Platform phase II/III design

A Study to Evaluate the Efficacy and Safety of Multiple Targeted Therapies as Treatments for Participants With Non-Small Cell Lung Cancer (NSCLC) (B-FAST)

ClinicalTrials.gov ID: NCT03178552
Sponsor: Hoffmann-La Roche
Information provided by: Hoffmann-La Roche (Responsible Party)
Last Update Posted: 2024-01-19

Blood First Assay Screening Trial (BFAST) in Treatment-Naive Advanced or Metastatic NSCLC: Initial Results of the Phase 2 ALK-Positive Cohort
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Dziadziuszko et al, JTO, 2021
Peters et al, Nat Med, 2022
Registralional phase II/III design

A Study of LY3537982 Plus Immunotherapy With or Without Chemotherapy in Participants With Non-Small Cell Lung Cancer (NSCLC) With a Change in a Gene Called KRAS G12C (SUNRAY-01)

ClinicalTrials.gov ID  NCT06119581
Sponsor  Eli Lilly and Company
Information provided by  Eli Lilly and Company (Responsible Party)
Last Update Posted  2024-01-24

- Initial dose optimization & safety lead-in
- Subsequent placebo-controlled phase 3

*This clinical trial is conducted globally. †Olomorasib is administered PO. ‡Pembrolizumab is administered IV. §Placebo is administered PO. ¶Pemetrexed is administered IV. ‖Platinum (cisplatin or carboplatin) is administered IV. [Accessed January 31, 2024].

https://clinicaltrials.gov/ct2/show/NCT06119581

Primary endpoint: To determine the dose of olomorasib to be administered in combination with pembrolizumab with or without chemotherapy

Tumor PD-L1 expression ≥50%:
- Olomorasib† + pembrolizumab‡ or
- Placebo§ + pembrolizumab‡

Tumor PD-L1 expression 0-100%:
- Olomorasib† + pembrolizumab‡ + pemetrexed¶ + platinum‖
- Placebo§ + pembrolizumab‡ + pemetrexed¶ + platinum‖

Primary endpoint: Progression-free survival per RECIST v1.1 by Blinded Independent Central Review (BICR)
Conclusions

- Operational seamlessness offers an opportunity to reduce enrollment gaps and development timelines
- Seamless studies can be complex and require intentional design
- For different programs, dose optimization may potentially fit as a seamless component either of a FIH trial or of a registrational phase III trial
Adaptive Phase 2/3 Designs with Early Dose Selection: A Statistical Perspective
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Overview of seamless and adaptive Phase 2/3 trial designs

• Inferentially seamlessly adaptive Phase 2/3 designs, or adaptive Phase 2/3 designs for short, are highly appealing in theory but present significant challenges in practice.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Minimum pause after Phase 2</th>
<th>Inclusion of Phase 2 patients in Phase 3 primary analysis</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Inferentially seamless adaptive Phase 2/3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>Inclusion can be questionable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>Conventional sequential Phase 2/3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Operationally seamless adaptive Phase 2/3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Inclusion of Phase 2 patients in Phase 3 primary analysis

Yes

No
Typical options post preliminary dose finding

- Dose Escalation
  - MTD finding
- Randomized Dose Selection
- Adaptive Phase 2/3 with Dose Selection
- Phase 3 Confirmatory

Ideally, dose selection occurs early but may require more patients with longer follow-up in challenging situations.

- More informative but slow
- Fast but less informative

Just Right?
A hypothetical adaptive Phase 2/3 design

- Dose-selection is primarily based on the safety/PK data
  - The criteria are accepted FDA and the decision is made by an external DMC
- Overall survival (OS) after complete f/u from Stage 1 (Phase 2) and Stage 2 for the selected dose vs control are combined for the Phase 3 primary analysis
  - 10% of patients (selected dose and control) are from Stage 1
  - Stage 1 patients contributes disproportionally more OS information due to longer f/u
Phase 3 primary analysis

- An inverse normal combination test is often used for the primary analysis, which is a robust method for Type I error control but inefficient for analysis
  - A complicated combination of the two stage-wise p-values, where the one based on Stage 1 patients is multiplied by number of doses
  - It essentially assumes that a dose is cherry-picked based on better OS after complete f/u
- 40-50% of alpha is lost, even when selecting a dose based on better tolerability, despite a lower ORR
  - Penalty increases (effective alpha decreases) as OS information from Stage 1 patients increases

Large loss of alpha after taking the penalty

![Graph showing loss of alpha](image)
Sample size comparison based on the hypothetical design

To compensate for the excessive penalty, the sample size must be increased by ~10-20% (~$20m cost) to attain the same power as a straight two-arm study.
A more nuanced approach to the statistical analysis

- Combination test is better suited for scenarios when dose-selection is primarily based on an efficacy endpoint, sample size is larger, and f/u is longer.
- When dose-selection is primarily based on safety/PK data in patients with short f/u, the selected dose should be simply tested at 2.5% level.
  - A small alpha will be spent for the administrative look as determined by the pre-specified alpha-spending function at the actual information fraction (e.g., 5%) observed at dose-selection.
  - Penalty should be paid when the decision is based on an efficacy endpoint that is highly correlated with the primary endpoint of the study.

Example of dose-selection rule
(GATSBY: trastuzumab emtansine vs taxane in patients with previously treated HER2-positive gastric cancer)

Lancet Oncol 2017; 18: 640–53
An example: a pivotal study of Gardasil 9

- Dose selection was based on immunogenicity and safety. No penalty was paid due to small correlation between biomarker and efficacy endpoint.

Enrollment pause for 9 months

Clin Trials 2015;12(1):84-90
Sample size comparison under the improved approach

The reduced sample size makes the adaptive Phase 2/3 design more competitive.
Discussion

• In general, seamless designs assisted with adaptive dose selection can make dose optimization more cost-effective and Project Optimus more appealing to sponsors.
  – The Pembrolizumab program not only randomized multiple doses in the FIH study but also took two doses to the end in the initial Phase 3 trials. However, it is unrealistic to expect a typical program to do the same, given the large sample size and substantial costs.

• As a viable approach to meet the Project Optimus requirement, adaptive Phase 2/3 designs may generate high-quality multi-dose randomized-controlled data for decision-making and hold great promise to expedite a development program.
  – Including additional doses in a confirmatory trial provides more data for the FDA to act upon than otherwise, and it undermines the purpose of the Project to have to pay a hefty penalty based on an unrealistically conservative assumption.
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