### An Open-Label Phase Ib/II Study of Sulfatinib in Patients with Advanced Neuroendocrine Tumors (NCT02267967)

J.M. Xu<sup>a</sup>, J. Li<sup>b</sup>, C.M. Bai<sup>c</sup>, N. Xu<sup>d</sup>, Z.W. Zhou<sup>e</sup>, Z.P. Li<sup>f</sup>, C.C. Zhou<sup>g</sup>, W. Wang<sup>h</sup>, J. Li<sup>h</sup>, C. Qi<sup>h</sup>, Y. Hua<sup>h</sup>, W.G. Su<sup>h</sup>.

<sup>a</sup>The 307<sup>th</sup> Hospital of Chinese People's Liberation Army, Beijing, China; <sup>b</sup>Beijing Cancer Hospital, Beijing, China; <sup>c</sup>Peking Union Medical College Hospital, Beijing, China; <sup>d</sup>The First Affiliated Hospital of Zhejiang University, Hangzhou, China; <sup>e</sup>Sun Yat-sen University Cancer Center, Guangzhou, China; <sup>f</sup>West China Hospital, Sichuan University, Chengdu, China; <sup>g</sup>Shanghai Pulmonary Hospital, School of Medicine, Tongji University, Shanghai, China; <sup>h</sup>Hutchison MediPharma Limited, Shanghai, China.



### **Disclosure**

Jian Ming Xu is a consultant/advisory board member for Hutchison MediPharma Limited and has received speaker's bureau honoraria from Roche, Novartis, Merck, and Sanofi.

Ru Jia is an attending doctor from the same department of professor Xu and presents the study results on behalf of professor Xu and has no conflict of interest to declare.



### Background

- Treatment options for advanced neuroendocrine tumors (NETs) are limited.
- Targeting VEGF pathways has been proven to provide clinical benefits to patients with advanced NETs, particularly pancreatic NET.
- FGF/FGFR signaling pathway activation may play a role in acquired resistance to anti-VEGF therapies.
- Evidence also shows FGFR and CSF1R can induce tumorassociated macrophage proliferation and differentiation, leading to tumor immune evasion.
  - 1. Sitohy B, et al. Anti-VEGF/VEGFR therapy for cancer: Reassessing the target. Cancer Research 2012;72:1909-14.
  - 2. Masaru K. FGFR inhibitors: Effects on cancer cells, tumor microenvironment and whole-body homeostasis (Review). International Journal of Molecular Medicine 2016;38:3-15.
  - 3. Raymond E, et al. Sunitinib Malate for the Treatment of Pancreatic Neuroendocrine Tumors. N Engl J Med 2011;364:501-13.



### Sulfatinib\*

Sulfatinih adaptivaly inhibita \/ECED1.2	Kinase	IC <sub>50</sub> (μΜ)
FGFR1 and CSF1R kinases.	VEGFR 1	0.002
In preclinical models, sulfatinib prevents tumor angiogenesis and tumor immune evasion.	VEGFR 2	0.024
	VEGFR 3	0.001
	FGFR1	0.015
<ul> <li>Sulfatinib demonstrated encouraging clinical activity in NET (G1/2) patients in phase I study, with ORR of 38.1% and mPFS of 16.9 months against a variety of NETs.</li> </ul>	CSF1R	0.004
	TrkB	0.041
	FLT3	0.067
	278 other kinases	>0.150

\*Sulfatinib, a novel kinase inhibitor, in patients with advanced solid tumors: Results from a phase I study, Oncotarget, Feb 01 2017, published online



# Santa Santa

#### Study population:

- ECOG PS 0 or 1.
- Measurable disease.
- Unresectable or metastatic NET.
- Grade 1 or 2.
- Failed standard therapy or standard therapy unavailable.

Single arm sulfatinib 300mg QD p.o. Continuous treatment in 28-day cycles, until

- Disease progression.
- Unacceptable toxicity.
- Other reasons.

Primary Endpoints: ORR and safety (CTC AE 4.03). Secondary Endpoints: DCR, DoR and PFS (RECIST1.1) and PK characteristics.



### **Demographics and baseline characteristics**

PNET* N=41 n (%)	EP-NET** N=40 n (%)	Total N=81 n (%)
44 (21, 69)	55 (26, 72)	49 (21, 72)
31 (75.6)	22 (55.0)	53 (65.4)
10 (24.4)	18 (45.0)	28 (44.6)
7 (17.1)	10 (25.0)	17 (21.0)
34 (82.9)	30 (75.0)	64 (79.0)
37 (90.2)	33 (82.5)	70 (86.4)
34 (82.9)	35 (87.5)	69 (85.2)
26 (63.4)	27 (67.5)	53 (65.4)
9 (22.5)	4 (10.0)	13 (16.5)
5 (12.2)	6 (15.0)	11 (13.6)
17 (41.5)	19 (47.5)	36 (44.4)
8 (19.5)	14 (35.0)	22 (27.2)
	PNET* N=41 n (%) 44 (21, 69) 31 (75.6) 10 (24.4) 7 (17.1) 34 (82.9) 37 (90.2) 34 (82.9) 37 (90.2) 34 (82.9) 26 (63.4) 9 (22.5) 5 (12.2) 17 (41.5) 8 (19.5)	PNET* N=41 n (%)EP-NET** N=40 n (%)44 (21, 69)55 (26, 72)44 (21, 69)55 (26, 72)31 (75.6)22 (55.0)10 (24.4)18 (45.0)10 (24.4)18 (45.0)7 (17.1)10 (25.0)34 (82.9)30 (75.0)37 (90.2)33 (82.5)34 (82.9)35 (87.5)26 (63.4)27 (67.5)9 (22.5)4 (10.0)5 (12.2)6 (15.0)17 (41.5)19 (47.5)8 (19.5)14 (35.0)

 Enrollment: Nov 2014 to Jan 2016

 Most patients (95.1%) had non-functional NETs

#### Primary site for EP-NET group:

- Colon/rectum, 14
- Stomach, 5
- Small intestine, 3
- Lung, 4
- Unknown, 14

\* Pancreatic NET; \*\*Extra-pancreatic NET



### Best tumor response as of 20 Jan 2017



PNET	N=41 n (%)
PR (confirmed)	7 (17.1%)
SD	30 (73.2%)
PD	1 (2.4%)
NE*	3 (7.3%)
ORR (95% CI)	17.1% (7.2%-32.1%)
DCR (95% CI)	90.2% (76.9%-97.3%)

EP-NET	N=40 n (%)
PR (confirmed)	6 (15.0%)
SD	31 (77.5%)
PD	1 (2.5%)
NE*	2 (5.0%)
ORR (95% CI)	15.0% (5.7%-29.8%)
DCR (95% CI)	92.5% (79.6%-98.4%)
*NE: not evaluable	



# Sulfatinib showed anti-tumor activity in patients who failed sunitinib / famitinib





# Sulfatinib showed anti-tumor activity in both G1/2 NET patients





### **Progression free survival in ITT patients**

as of 20 Jan2017



- Among 41 PNET patients: 18 (43.9%) still on treatment; 7 (17.1%) discontinued due to AE or withdrawal; 16 (39.0%) experienced PD/death.
- Among 40 EP-NET patients: 6 (15.0%) still on treatment; 8 (20.0%) discontinued due to AE or withdrawal; 26 (65.0%) experienced PD/death.



### Thymus atypical carcinoid with multiple liver and lymph node metastasis





14<sup>th</sup> Annual ENETS Conference | 8-10 March 2017 | 11

### Duodenum NET (G2) with multiple liver metastasis



Baseline

Week 8

Week 52



14<sup>th</sup> Annual ENETS Conference | 8-10 March 2017 | 12

### Rectum NET (G2) with multiple liver metastasis



Baseline

Week 4

Week 56



14th Annual ENETS Conference | 8-10 March 2017 | 13

### **AE summary**

	N=81
	n (%)
Any AE	81 (100)
Grade ≥3 AE	63 (77.8)
Any SAE	21 (25.9)
Any drug-related AE	81 (100)
Any drug-related grade ≥3 AE	58 (71.6)
Any drug related SAE	10 (12.3)
Drug related AE leading to:	
dose interruption	40 (49.4)
dose reduction	20 (24.7)
drug withdrawal	7 (8.6)



## Most common adverse events

#### (regardless of causality)

	Any grade (≥25%) n (%)
Proteinuria	68 (84.0)
Diarrhea	59 (72.8)
Hypertension	48 (59.3)
TSH increased	41 (50.6)
Asthenia	40 (49.4)
AST increased	38 (46.9)
Hypertriglyceridemia	34 (42.0)
Blood bilirubin increased	33 (40.7)
ALT increased	32 (39.5)
Hypoalbuminemia	32 (39.5)
Hypocalcemia	26 (32.1)
Electrocardiogram T wave abnormal	24 (29.6)
Hyperuricemia	24 (29.6)
Decreased appetite	23 (28.4)
Anemia	22 (27.2)
Hyperbilirubinemia	21 (25.9)

	Grade ≥3 (≥4pts) n (%)
Hypertension	25 (30.9)
Proteinuria	11 (13.6)
Hyperuricemia	8 (9.9)
Hypertriglyceridemia	7 (8.6)
Diarrhea	6 (7.4)
ALT increased	5 (6.2)
Anemia	4 (4.9)
Hypokalemia	4 (4.9)
Hepatic function abnormal	4 (4.9)

- Sulfatinib was tolerable in NET patients and most drug related AEs were manageable.
- Dermatologic reactions were less common. Three (3.7%) pts had hand food syndrome, only one of which was grade 3.



### **Conclusion**

- Sulfatinib, a selective VEGFR, FGFR1 and CSF1R kinase inhibitor, showed promising antitumor activity in NET patients with GEP, lung, other or unknown primary tumor origins.
- Sulfatinib is well tolerated in NET patients with a similar safety profile as other VEGFR targeted TKIs.
- Two phase III confirmatory trials of sulfatinib in PNET and EP-NET respectively are ongoing in China.



### **Acknowledgments**

- Patients and their families who participated in the study.
- Clinical investigators/associates and clinical sites.
- Study sponsor: Hutchison MediPharma.

