

# Il carcinoma mammario metastatico HER2 low: quali novità?

### **Alessandra Fabi**

Medicina di Precisione in Senologia Fondazione Policlinico Universitario A. Gemelli IRCCS, Roma, Italia



Fondazione Policlinico Universitario Agostino Gemelli IRCCS Università Cattolica del Sacro Cuore

Fondazione Policinico Universitario Agostino Gemelli IRCCS Università Cattolica del Sacro Cuore



Roma, 13 Ottobre 2023



- HER2-low BC Definition and Features
- Anti-HER2 Agents in HER2-low BC
  - Monoclonal Antibodies & 'Old' Antibody Drug Conjugates (ADCs)
  - 'New' ADCs: Trastuzumab-Deruxtecan (T-Dxd)
- Conclusions & Future Perspectives

## **HER2-low BC Definition**



٠

## **HER2-low BC Features**

- Retrospective clinicopathological and PAM50 analysis from 3,689 patients with HER2negative disease.
- The proportion of HER2-low was higher in HRpositive disease (65.4%) than TNBC (36.6%).
- Within HR-positive disease, ERBB2 and luminal-related genes (90%) were more expressed in HER2-low than HER2 0.
- TNBC HER2-low are mostly (85%) basal-like.
  No gene was found differentially expressed in TNBC according to HER2 expression.

Similar biology between HER2 low and HER2 0

### Intrinsic subtype distribution in HER2 low



Schettini F et al., NPJ Breast Cancer 2021

## **HER2-low BC Prognosis**



Similar prognosis between HER2 low and HER2 0

No prognostic role for HER2 low expression

Schettini F et al., NPJ Breast Cancer 2021



- HER2-low BC Definition and Features
- Anti-HER2 Agents in HER2-low BC
  - Monoclonal Antibodies & 'Old' Antibody Drug Conjugates (ADCs)
  - 'New' ADCs: Trastuzumab-Deruxtecan (T-Dxd)
- Conclusions & Future Perspectives

## Negative Results of Monoclonal Abs & 'Old' ADC in HER2-low BC

### NSABP B-47 Trial: Adjuvant Trastuzumab in HER2 low BC

STRATIFICATION



- In 2008, the centralized re-analysis of the NSABP B-31 trial identified 10% of HER2 non-amplified samples. These patients seemed to benefit from adjuvant trastuzumab.
- However, the NSABP B-47 showed absence of efficacy of adjuvant Trastuzumab in HER2 low BC.
- Similar negative results with Pertuzumab and T-DM1 in the advanced setting.

Paik S et al., NEJM 2008; Fehrenbacher L et al., JCO 2020; Gianni L et al., JCO 2010; Burris H etal., JCO 2011

## The 'New' ADCs

Antibody-Drug Conjugates (ADCs): Mechanism of Action



## 'New' ADCs in HER2-low BC



Nakada. Chem Pharm Bull (Tokyo). 2019;67:173. Trail. Pharmacol Ther. 2018;181:126. Ogitani. Cancer Sci. 2016;107:1039.

### Trastuzumab Duocarmazine (SYD985)

Trastuzumab-vc-seco-duocarmycin-hydroxybenzamide-azaindole



Dokter. Mol Cancer Ther. 2014;13:2618. Elgersma. Mol Pharm. 2015;12:1813.

- Higher Drug-to-Antibody ratio (DAR).
- Cleavable linker.

## **T-DXd in Heavily Pretreated HER2-low MBC**

- Dose escalation and expansion phase I study.
- Population: advanced HER2 expressing/mutated solid tumors.
- HER2-low BC in cohorts 2c and 2e and treated with ≥ 1 dose of T-DXd at 5.4 (n = 21) or 6.4 mg/kg (n = 33).
- Median PFS: 11.1 mo [95% CI, 7.6-NE]
- Median DOR, 10.4 mo [95% CI, 8.8-NE]

Characteristic	HER2-Low Breast Cancer N = 54
Median age (range), years	56.6 (33-75)
Country	
Japan	27 (50.0)
United States	27 (50.0)
ECOG performance status	
0	36 (66.7)
1	18 (33.3)
Median time from initial diagnosis (range), months <sup>a</sup>	105.0 (13.0-290.3)
Median No. of prior cancer regimens (range)	7.5 (2-16)
$\geq$ 5 prior cancer regimens	45 (83.3)
CDK4/6 inhibitor	16 (29.6)
HER2-targeted therapy	10 (18.5)
Trastuzumab	10 (18.5)
Pertuzumab	7 (13.0)
T-DM1	5 (9.3)
Other	1 (1.9)
Previous cancer surgery	48 (88.9)



Modi S et al., J Clin Oncol 2020

## **DESTINY-Breast04: Phase III Study of T-Dxd in HER2-low MDC**

#### An open-label, multicenter study (NCT03734029)



Modi S et al., ASCO 2022 & NEJM 2022

## **DESTINY-Breast04: Baseline Characteristics**

	Hormone receptor–positive		All pa	All patients		
	T-DXd	TPC	T-DXd	TPC		
	(n = 331)	(n = 163)	(n = 373)	(n = 184)		
Lines of systemic therapy (metastatic setting)						
Number of lines, median (range)	3 (1-9)	3 (1-8)	3 (1-9)	3 (1-8)		
Number of lines, n (%)						
1	23 (7)	14 (9)	39 (10)	19 (10)		
2	85 (26)	41 (25)	100 (27)	53 (29)		
≥3	223 (67)	108 (66)	234 (63)	112 (61)		
Lines of chemotherapy (metastatic setting)						
Number of lines, median (range)	1 (0-3)	1 (0-2)	1 (0-3)	1 (0-2)		
Number of lines, n (%)						
0	1 (0.3)	1 (0.6)	1 (0.3)	1 (0.5)		
1	203 (61.3)	93 (57.1)	221 (59.2)	100 (54.3)		
2	124 (37.5)	69 (42.3)	145 (38.9)	83 (45.1)		
≥3	3 (0.9)	0	6 (1.6)	0		
Lines of endocrine therapy (metastatic setting)						
Number of lines, median (range)	2 (0-7)	2 (0-6)	2 (0-7)	2 (0-6)		
Number of lines, n (%)						
0	28 (8)	17 (10)	60 (16)	34 (18)		
1	105 (32)	49 (30)	108 (29)	51 (28)		
2	110 (33)	53 (33)	115 (31)	54 (29)		
≥3	88 (27)	44 (27)	90 (24)	45 (24)		
Prior targeted cancer therapy, n (%)						
Targeted therapy	259 (78)	132 (81)	279 (75)	140 (76)		
CDK4/6 inhibitor	233 (70)	115 (71)	239 (64)	119 (65)		
Brain metastases at baseline, n (%)	18 (5)	7 (4)	24 (6)	8 (4)		
Liver metastases at baseline, n (%)	247 (75)	116 (71)	266 (71)	123 (67)		

## **DESTINY-Breast04: PFS**

median follow-up was 18.4 months

### Hormone receptor-positive

### **All patients**



Benefit was observed across all stratification subgroups, including according to HER2-low (IHC 1+ or IHC 2+/ISH-) and prior CDK4/6i

#### PFS by blinded independent central review.

HR, hormone receptor; mPFS, median progression-free survival; PFS, progression-free survival; T-DXd, trastuzumab deruxtecan; TPC, treatment of physician's choice.

## **DESTINY-Breast04: OS**





**All patients** 

HR, hormone receptor; mOS, median overall survival; OS, overall survival; T-DXd, trastuzumab deruxtecan; TPC, treatment of physician's choice.

#### Modi S et al., ASCO 2022 & NEJM 2022

## **DESTINY-Breast04:** similar results in HR- (Exploratory analysis)

PFS OS Hazard ratio: 0.46 Hazard ratio: 0.48 100 100 95% CI, 0.24-0.89 95% CI, 0.24-0.95 Progression-Free Survival Probability (%) 80 80 Overall Survival Probability (%) T-DXd T-DXd 60 60 mPFS: 8.5 mo mOS: 18.2 mo Δ 5.6 mo Δ 9.9 mo TPC 40 40 mOS: 8.3 mo 20 20 TPC mPFS: 2.9 mo 0 0 0 1 2 3 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25 26 27 28 5 6 7 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25 26 27 28 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 Months Months No. at Risk No. at Risk 6 5 4 4 T-DXd (n = 40): 40 39 33 29 28 25 21 20 19 18 13 13 11 11 10 8 7 5 5 4 4 3 1 0 T-DXd (n = 40): 40 39 38 37 36 34 34 32 31 30 28 27 26 26 23 23 19 TPC (n = 18): 18 17 11 7 6 4 3 3 2 2 2 2 2 2 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 0 TPC (n = 18): 18 17 16 14 14 14 3 11 10 8 8 8 7 6 6 5 5 5 5 3 3

HR, hormone receptor; mOS, median overall survival; mPFS, median progression-free survival; OS, overall survival; PFS, progression-free survival; T-DXd, trastuzumab deruxtecan; TPC, treatment of physician's choice. For efficacy in the hormone receptor–negative cohort, hormone receptor status is based on data from the electronic data capture corrected for misstratification.

#### Modi S et al., ASCO 2022 & NEJM 2022

## **DESTINY-Breast04: ORR**

#### **Confirmed Objective Response Rate**



Hormone receptor status is based on data from the electronic data capture corrected for misstratification.

ORR, objective response rate; T-DXd, trastuzumab deruxtecan; TPC, treatment of physician's choice.

<sup>a</sup>The response of 1 patient was not confirmed. <sup>b</sup>Clinical benefit rate is defined as the sum of complete response rate, partial response rate, and more than 6 months' stable disease rate, based on blinded independent central review.

## **DESTINY-Breast04: Safety**



#### Adjudicated as drug-related ILD/pneumonitis<sup>a</sup>

n (%)	Grade 1	Grade 2	Grade 3	Grade 4	Grade 5	Any Grade
T-DXd (n = 371)	13 (3.5)	24 (6.5)	5 (1.3)	0	3 (0.8)	45 (12.1)
TPC (n = 172)	1 (0.6)	0	0	0	0	1 (0.6)
					Modi S et al., AS	CO 2022 & NEJM 202

## **DESTINY-Breast04:PROs**



- GHS/QoL was maintainted with T-Dxd and TPC (QLQ-C30).
- Fatigue scores remained stable over time in both treatment arms.
- With T-DXd, an increase in nausea and vomiting scores was only clinically relevant in early cycles, after which scores decreased and remained stable over time.



## **DESTINY-Breast04:PROs**

### GHS/QoL

**Pain Symptoms** 



 Time to definitive deterioration of GHS/QoL and pain was longer among patients who received T-DXd vs TPC (QLQ-C30)

 T-DXd treatment delays the deterioration of GHS/QoL and shows a QoL benefit of T-DXd vs TPC in patients with HR+/HER2-low mBC

## TROPiCS-02: A Phase 3 Study of SG in HR+/HER2- Locally **Recurrent Inoperable or Metastatic Breast Cancer**

#### NCT03901339

Metastatic or locally recurrent inoperable HR+/HER2- breast cancer that progressed aftera:

- At least 1 endocrine therapy, taxane, and CDK4/6i in any setting
- At least 2, but no more than 4, lines of chemotherapy for metastatic disease
  - (Neo)adjuvant therapy for early-stage disease qualified as a prior line of chemotherapy if disease recurred within 12 months
- Measurable disease by RECIST 1.1

N=543



- Endocrine therapy in metastatic setting ≥6 months (yes/no)
- Prior lines of chemotherapies (2 vs 3/4)

\*Usease histology based on the ASCO/CAP chiena \*Single agent standard of care treatment of physician's choice was specified prior to randomization by the investigator. ASCOX:AP, American Society of Cirical Oncology/College of American Pathologists, BICR, blinded independent review; CBR, clinical benefit rate, CDK4/9, cyclin-dependent knase 4/6 trihibitor, DOR, duration of response; HER2, human ecidemist growth factor encyptor 2 negative, HR+, hormonal receptor-positive, (V, maximously, LIR, loal investigator melew, (Nengacjuvent, neepotyewint or adjuvent, ORR, objective response rate, OS, owend survival, PTS, progression-free survival PRO, actient-reported eukomes; R. randemized RECIST, Response Evaluation Criteria in Solid Tumors





miscancom Hope S. Rugo, MD

Content of this preservation is the property of the author licensed by ASOO. Permission required for rouse.



# **Demographics and Baseline Characteristics**

	SG (n=272)	TPC (n=271)
Female, n (%)	270 (99)	268 (99)
Median age, y (range)	57 (29-86)	55 (27-78)
<65 y, n (%)	199 (73)	204 (75)
≥65 y, n (%)	73 (27)	67 (25)
Race or ethnic group, n (%)		
White	184 (68)	178 (66)
Black	8 (3)	13 (5)
Aslan	11 (4)	5 (2)
Other* / Not reported <sup>b</sup>	69 (25)	75 (28)
ECOG PS, n (%)		
0	116 (43)	126 (46)
1	156 (57)	145 (54)
Visceral metastases at baseline, n (%)	259 (95)	258 (95)
Liver metastases,° n (%)	229 (84)	237 (87)
De novo metastatic breast cancer, n (%)	78 (29)	60 (22)

	8G (n=272)	TPC (n=271)		
Median time from initial metastatic diagnosis to randomization, mo (range)	48.5 (1.2- 243.8)	46.6 (3.0- 248.8)		
Prior chemotherapy in (neo)adjuvant setting, n (%)	173 (64)	184 (68)		
Prior endocrine therapy use in the metastatic setting ≥6 mo, n (%)	235 (86)	234 (86)		
Prior CDK4/6 inhibitor use, n (%)				
≤12 months	161 (59)	166 (61)		
>12 months	106 (39)	102 (38)		
Unknown	5 (2)	3 (1)		
Median prior chemotherapy regimens in the metastatic setting, n (range) <sup>d</sup>	3 (0-8)	3 (1-5)		

Encludes American Indian or Alaska Native, Native Hawaran or other Pacific Islander. "Not reported indicates local regulators did not allow collection of race or eltimoty information. Steering target interfactases per RECIST1.1 by local investigator review. The reported number of proc therapies were miscounted at screening for some patients, 9 patients received proc chemoliterapy regimens in the metastable setting outside the per protocol range. For inclusion criteria and were included in the interf. to-treat population

CDX496, cyclin-dependent knese 446; ECOG PS Eastern Cooperative Cosmogy Group performance status, ER estrogen receptor, (eno)edjavant or adjavant; ER socgestercee receptor, SG, sectuarities gravenan, TPC, treatment of physician's choice.



#ASC022



Consect of this presentation is the property of the author licensed by ASDO. Permission required for rouse.



# Primary Endpoint: BICR-Assessed PFS per RECIST v1.1 in the ITT Population

SG demonstrated a statistically significant improvement in PFS vs TPC with a 34% reduction in the risk of disease progression/death; a higher proportion of patients were alive and progression-free at all landmark timepoints



Median follow/up was 10.2 months

#ASC022

BICR, blinded independent certral review, ITT, intent to real; PFS, progression-free sunnivel; REC/ST, Response Evaluation Criteria in Solid Tumors; SG, sachus:mab gowlecan; TPC, treatment of physician's choice.





# Primary Endpoint: BICR-Assessed PFS per RECIST v1.1 in the ITT Population

SG demonstrated a statistically significant improvement in PFS vs TPC with a 34% reduction in the risk of disease progression/death; a higher proportion of patients were alive and progression-free at all landmark timepoints



BICR analysis	SG (n=272)	TPC (n=271)		
Median PFS, mo (95% CI)	5.5 (4.2-7.0)	4.0 (3.1-4.4)		
Stratified HR (95% CI)	0.66 (0.53-0.83)			
Stratified Log Rank P value	0.0003			
6-month PFS rate, % (95% CI)	46.1 (39.4-52.6)	30.3 (23.6-37.3)		
9-month PFS rate, % (95% CI)	32.5 (25.9-39.2)	17.3 (11.5-24.2)		
12-month PFS rate, % (95% CI)	21.3 (15.2-28.1)	7.1 (2.8–13.9)		

Median follow/up was 10.2 months.

#ASC022

BICR, blinded independent central review. ITT, intentito treat; PES, progression/me sunnult; REC/ST, Response Evaluation Criteria in Solid Tumors; SG, sacituz/mab govitecan; TPC, treatment of physician's choice.



Consent of this presentation is the property of the author licensed by ASDD. Permission resulted for rouse.



# **PFS Subgroup Analyses**

	Median PFS, n	ionths (95% CI)		
Subgroup	SG	TPC	Hazard Ratio	Hazard Ratio (95% CI)
Overall (N=543)	5.5 (4.2-7.0)	4.0 (3.1-4.4)	Hel	0.66 (0.53-0.82)
Visceral Metastasis Yes (n=517) No (n=26)	5.5 (4.2-7.0) 9.1 (1.3-NE)	4.0 (3.1-4.4) 5.6 (1.6-NE)	H0-1	0.66 (0.53-0.83) 0.78 (0.25-2.40)
ET for mBC 26 Months Yes (n=469) No (n=74)	5.6 (4.4-7.4) 3.9 (2.5-5.8)	4.1 (3.1-4.4) 3.5 (1.6-7.7)		0.61 (0.48-0.78) 1.13 (0.61-2.07)
# of Prior Chemos for mBC S2 (n=233) ≥3 (n=310)	5.7 (4.2-8.3) 5.3 (4.0-6.9)	4.2 (2.8–5.5) 3.7 (2.7–4.4)	HOH HOH	0.62 (0.45-0.85) 0.70 (0.52-0.95)
Age Group <65 years (n=403) ≥65 years (n=140)	5.5 (4.1-6.9) 6.7 (4.2-9.0)	4.1 (3.0-4.4) 3.5 (1.7-5.6)		0.69 (0.530.89) 0.59 (0.380.93)
ECOG Performance Score 0 (n=242) 1 (n=301)	5.7 (4.2-8.5) 5.0 (4.0-7.1)	4.1 (2.7-5.7) 4.0 (2.8-4.4)		0.61 (0.44-0.86) 0.70 (0.53-0.94)
Prior CDK4/6i Duration \$12 months (n=327) \$12 months (=208)	6.0 (4.6–8.3) 4.4 (3.3–7.0)	4.0 (2.8–4.4) 4.2 (2.7–5.6)	He-I	0.59 (0.44-0.78) 0.77 (0.54-1.10)
		0.062 SG Bett	15 0.25 1 4	16 TPC Better

the state of the state of the state

- PFS benefit for SG vs TPC was consistent across predefined subgroups, including patients with
  - ≥3 prior chemotherapy regimens in the metastatic setting
  - Visceral metastases
  - Age ≥65 years

PFS subgroup analyses by race, geographic region, TPC arm agents, and early relepse were assessed but not included in this figure

CDXARL cyclin dependent knase 4/6 inhtb for: ECOG, Eastern Cooperative Oncology Group, ET, endocrine therapy, mDG, metastatic breast cancer, NE, not evaluable; PFS, progression-free survival; SG, sacitizalimab govisioan; TPG, treatment of physician's choice.

2022 ASCO

#ASC022



Content of this preservation is the property of the author, licensed by ASDD, Permission repulsed for rouse.



# **OS** in the ITT Population (First Planned Interim Analysis)



ITT, intent to treat; OS, overal survival; SG, satitizemeth govitecan; TFC, treatment of physician's choice

#ASC022



Consist of this presentation is the property of the outhor licensed by ASDO. Permission resulted for rouse.



11

# **Response Rates**

BICR analysis	SG (n=272)	TPC (n=271)
ORR, n (%)	57 (21)	38 (14)
Odds ratio, nominal P value <sup>a</sup>	1.63, /	P=0.03
Best overall response, n (%)		
CR	2 (1)	0
PR	55 (20)	38 (14)
SD	142 (52)	106 (39)
SD ≥6 mo	35 (13)	21 (8)
PD	58 (21)	76 (28)
NE	15 (6)	51 (19)
CBR, <sup>b</sup> n (%)	92 (34)	59 (22)
Odds ratio, nominal P value*	1.84, P=0.002	
Median DOR, mo (95% CI)	7.4 (6.5-8.6)	5.6 (3.8-7.9)

#### ORR (21% vs 14%) and CBR (34% vs 22%) were higher with SG vs TPC

Wot formably tested because CS at IA1 was not statistically significant.

PCBR is defined as the precentage of patients with a continued best overall response of CR, PR, and SD 26 months

BICR, blinded independent central review, GBR, christal benefit rate; CR, complete response; DCR, curation of response; IAT, interm analysis 1; NE, not evaluable, ORR, objective response rate; PD, progressive disease; FR, partial response; SO, stable disease; SO, st





misexteen: Hope S. Rugo, MD

Consett of this presentation in the property of the author Scenard by ASDD. Permission required for rouse.



# Key All Grade and Grade ≥3 Treatment-Related Adverse Events<sup>a</sup>

		SG (n=2	(68)	TPC (n	=249)
TRAEs, n (%)		All grade	Grade ≥3	All grade	Grade ≥3
and the state	Neutropenia <sup>b</sup>	188 (70)	136 (51)	134 (54)	94 (38)
	Anemiac	91 (34)	17 (6)	62 (25)	8 (3)
Hematologic	Leukopenia	37 (14)	23 (9)	23 (9)	13 (5)
	Lymphopenia®	31 (12)	10 (4)	25 (10)	8 (3)
	Febrile neutropenia	14 (5)	14 (5)	11 (4)	11 (4)
	Diarrhea	152 (57)	25 (9)	41 (16)	3 (1)
	Nausea	148 (55)	3 (1)	77 (31)	7 (3)
Gastrointestinal	Vomiting	50 (19)	1 (<1)	30 (12)	4 (2)
	Constipation	49 (18)	0	36 (14)	0
	Abdominal pain	34 (13)	2 (1)	17 (7)	0
	Alopecia	123 (46)	0	41 (16)	0
Other	Fatigue	100 (37)	15 (6)	73 (29)	6 (2)
	Asthenia	53 (20)	5 (2)	37 (15)	2 (1)
	Decreased appetite	41 (15)	1 (<1)	34 (14)	1 (<1)
	Neuropathy	23 (9)	3 (1)	38 (15)	6 (2)

 There were no events of interstitial lung disease in the SG arm (vs 1% in the TPC arm) and no TRAEs of cardiac failure or left ventricular dysfunction in either arm

Assessed in the safety population of patients who received at dose of study treatment. Patients may report more than one event per preferred term. Key All Grade and Grade XD TRAEs defined as those occurring in X10% and X5% of patients in one arm, respectively. \*Combined preferred terms of 'neutropenia' and 'neutrophil count decreased.' \*Combined preferred terms of 'neutropenia' and 'neutrophil count decreased.' \*Combined preferred terms of 'neutropenia' and 'neutrophil count decreased.' \*Combined preferred terms of 'neutropenia' and 'lymphocyte count decreased' \*Combined terms of 'self-based'. \*Combined preferred terms of 'gait disoublence', 'nyponsities', 'neuropatity perpheral', 'paraisthetia', and 'perpheral' sensory neuropatity', SG, sacilitzamab govietion, TPC, teatment of physician's choice; 'TRAE, tractment-mated adverse event.





misenteen: Hope S. Rugo, MD

Contest of It's presentation is the property of Ite author licensed by ASCO. Permission securited for rouse.



14

# **EORTC QLQ-C30 Time to Deterioration Endpoints**





TTD	Patlents SG/TPC, n/n	SG median TTD, mo (95% Cl)	TPC median TTD, mo (95% Cl)	Stratified HR (95% CI)	Nominal P value <sup>a</sup>
Global Health Status/QoL	234/207	4.0 (3.0-5.4)	2.9 (2.2-3.6)	0.74 (0.59-0.91)	0.005
Fatigue	234/205	2.1 (1.6-2.8)	1.4 (1.1-1.9)	0.76 (0.62-0.93)	0.007
Pain	229/202	3.7 (2.8-4.9)	3.4 (2.7-4.6)	0.92 (0.74-1.14)	0.45

Assessed in patients all patients in the intent-to-treat population who had an evaluable assessment of the health-related QoL at baselino and at least one evaluable assessment at post-baseline visits.

Wot formally tested because CIS at IA1 was not statistically significant.

EORTC QLQ-C30, European Organization for Research and Treatment of Cancer Quarky of Life Questionnaire, IA1, Interim analysis 1; CS, overall survival; QSL, quarky of He, SG, septuzumab gov/lecan;

TPC, treatment of physician's choice; TTD, time-to-detenoration.

#ASC022





Consent of this preservation in the property of the author licensed by ASDD. Permission regulared for rouse.





- HER2-low BC Definition and Features
- Anti-HER2 Agents in HER2 low BC
  - Monoclonal Antibodies & 'Old' Antibody Drug Conjugates (ADCs)
  - 'New' ADCs: Trastuzumab-Deruxtecan (T-Dxd)
- Conclusions & Future Perspectives

# **Conclusions (1)**

- HER2-low BC is defined by IHC score 1+ or 2+/ISH-
  - Nearly 50% of all BC are HER2-low
  - HER2-low are more common among Luminal-Like tumors than TNBC
  - HER2-low seems to have no distinct biology/prognosis than HER2 score 0
- Negative results in HER2-low with '*Old*' anti-HER2 Abs and ADCs
- HER2-low BC emerges as a new druggable entity, through the delivery of payloads
- Destiny-Breast04 established T-Dxd as a new standard of care in HER2-low BC

# **Conclusions (2)**

- T-Dxd is the first HER2-targeted therapy to demonstrate efficacy in HER2-low BC
  - Similar magnitude of benefit across all subgroups
  - More data are needed in HER2-low/HR-
  - Peculiar toxicity of T-Dxd, management is crucial!

On August 5, 2022, the FDA approved T-Dxd for HER2-low BC

- Limited benefit of CT for pts who progress after multiple lines of CT and/or CDK4/6i (mPFS ~ 4 months)
- CT could be replaced by novel ADCs (against newer targets, novel payloads), such as Sacituzumabgovitecan (TROPiCS-02 study)



**DESTINY-Breast04** 

### Figure 1.

### **Study Schema**

#### Key eligibility criteria:

- HR+/HER2 negative, locally advanced and unresectable, or metastatic breast cancer
- Eligible for first chemotherapy for advanced or metastatic breast cancer
- No prior treatment with a topoisomerase I inhibitor
- Measurable disease per RECIST v1.1

Patients must have one of the following:

 Disease progression on ≥2 previous lines of ET with or without a targeted therapy in the metastatic setting

- Disease recurrence while on the first 24 months of starting adjuvant ET will be considered a line of therapy; these patients will only require 1 line of ET in the metastatic setting

 Disease progression within 6 months of starting first line ET with or without a CDK4/6i in the metastatic setting

 Disease recurrence while on the first 24 months of starting adjuvant ET with CDK4/6i and if the patient is no longer a candidate for additional ET in the metastatic setting as determined by the investigator

### Sacituzumab govitecan 10 mg/kg IV Days 1 and 8, every 21 days N = 6542:1 randomization Treatment of physician's choice (capecitabine, paclitaxel, nab-paclitaxel)

ASCENT-07

#### Stratification:

- Duration of prior CDK 4/6i in metastatic setting (none vs ≤12 mos vs • >12 mos)
- HER2 IHC (HER2 IHC 0 vs HER2 IHC-low ([IHC 1+; 2+/ISH-])

Geographic region (US/CAN/UK/EU vs ROW)

#### **Primary Endpoint**

PFS by BICR

#### **Key Secondary Endpoints**

- OS
- ORR by BICR
- Change from baseline in Physical Functioning and TTD of Global Health Status

#### Secondary Endpoints

- PFS by investigator
- ORR by investigator
- DOR
- Safety

## **Future Perspective**

- We need to precisely refine HER2 negative disease (distinguishing 'truly' HER2 negative from HER2-low)
- HER2 status can change between early and relapsed setting → IHC 0 on the primary often converts to HER2-low upon relapse
- Ongoing Phase 3 trial: T-DXd vs TPC in HER2-Low\*, HR+ whose disease has progressed on ET (DESTINY-Breast06) [\*HER2-low or HER2-ultra low: IHC >0 <1+ expression]
  - Role of ADCs in chemo naïve and HER2 Ultra-Low patients? Will ADCs replace CT as first-treatment of choice post-ET?
- Novel anti-HER2 agents are currently investigated in HER2-low BC ('New' ADC, Vaccines and Bispecific Antibodies)
  - T-Duocarmazine showed activity in heavily pretreated HER2-low MBC (ORR 28%-40%)







### Thank you for your attention