

Safety of cabazitaxel in senior adults with metastatic castration-resistant prostate cancer: Results of the European compassionate-use programme

Axel Heidenreich^{a,*}, Sergio Bracarda^b, Malcolm Mason^c, Haluk Ozen^d, Lisa Sengelov^e, Inge Van Oort^f, Christos Papandreou^g, Sophie Fossa^h, Simon Hitierⁱ, Miguel Angel Climent^j, on behalf of European investigators

- ^a RWTH Aachen University, Department of Urology, Aachen, Germany
- ^b Ospedaliero San Donato, Department of Oncology, Arezzo, Italy
- ^c Cardiff University, Department of Oncology, Wales, UK
- ^d Hacettepe University, Department of Urology, Ankara, Turkey
- ^e Herlev University Hospital, Department of Oncology, Herlev, Denmark

f Radboud University Nijmegen Medical Centre, Department of Urology, Nijmegen, Netherlands

- ^g Larissa University Hospital, Department of Oncology, Larissa, Greece
- ^hOslo University Hospital, Department of Oncology, Oslo, Norway
- ⁱ Sanofi, Statistics, Paris, France
- ^j Fundación Instituto Valenciano De Oncología, Department of Oncology, Valencia, Spain

KEYWORDS

Metastatic castrationresistant prostate cancer Cabazitaxel Safety Senior men Elderly Neutropenia Granulocyte colony-stimulating factor Supportive care Abstract *Background:* Cabazitaxel/prednisone has been shown to prolong survival versus mitoxantrone/prednisone in patients with metastatic castration-resistant prostate cancer (mCRPC) that has progressed during or after docetaxel. Subsequently, compassionate-use programmes (CUPs) and expanded-access programmes (EAPs) were established worldwide, allowing access to cabazitaxel before its commercial availability. Preliminary results of the European CUP/EAP, focusing on the elderly population (aged \geq 70 years), are reported. *Patients and methods:* Enrolled patients with progressive mCRPC received cabazitaxel

 (25 mg/m^2) plus 10 mg oral prednisone/prednisolone every 3 weeks until disease progression, death, unacceptable toxicity or physician/patient decision. Safety was analysed by age group (<70, [70–75] and \geq 75 years). The influence of selected variables on grade \geq 3 neutropenia and/or neutropenic complications was analysed in multivariate analysis.

Results: 746 men were enrolled (<70 years, n = 421; [70–75], n = 180, ≥ 75 years, n = 145). Number of cabazitaxel cycles, dose reductions for any cause, dose delays possibly related to

E-mail address: aheidenreich@ukaachen.de (A. Heidenreich).

0959-8049/\$ - see front matter © 2014 Elsevier Ltd. All rights reserved. http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.ejca.2014.01.006

Please cite this article in press as: Heidenreich A. et al., Safety of cabazitaxel in senior adults with metastatic castration-resistant prostate cancer: Results of the European compassionate-use programme, *Eur J Cancer* (2014), http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.ejca.2014.01.006

^{*} Corresponding author: Address: RWTH Aachen University, Pauwelsstrasse 30, 52074 Aachen, Germany. Tel.: +49 241 808 9374; fax: +49 241 808 2441.

ARTICLE IN PRESS

A. Heidenreich et al. / European Journal of Cancer xxx (2014) xxx-xxx

cabazitaxel adverse events, and tolerability were similar in the three age groups. Prophylactic granulocyte colony-stimulating factor (G-CSF) use was more common in men aged \geq 70 years. In multivariate analysis, age \geq 75 years, treatment cycle 1, and neutrophil count <4000/mm³ before cabazitaxel injection were associated with increased risk of developing grade \geq 3 neutropenia and/or neutropenic complications. Prophylactic use of G-CSF at a given cycle significantly reduced this risk by 30% (odds ratio 0.70, *p* = 0.04).

Conclusion: The results suggest that cabazitaxel has a manageable safety profile in everyday clinical practice. Prophylactic use of G-CSF, especially at cycle 1 and in men aged ≥ 75 years, is important and improves tolerability in senior adults treated with cabazitaxel.

© 2014 Elsevier Ltd. All rights reserved.

1. Introduction

The past 4 years have seen significant advances in the management of metastatic castration-resistant prostate cancer (mCRPC), with five novel therapies (abiraterone, cabazitaxel, enzalutamide, radium-223, and sipuleucel-T) demonstrating a survival benefit in phase III clinical trials [1–5].

Taxanes have an important role in this broad armamentarium. Their anti-tumour activity has been shown to promote assembly and stabilisation of microtubules, blocking tumour cell division [6], and inhibiting tumour cell trafficking, including nuclear translocation of the androgen receptor, a key driver of prostate cancer growth [7,8]. In 2004, the results of two pivotal phase III studies (TAX 327 and SWOG 99-16) demonstrated, for the first time, a significant improvement in overall survival (OS) with docetaxel/prednisone and docetaxel/ estramustine compared with mitoxantrone/prednisone [9-11]. Moreover, 19% of patients treated in TAX 327 and receiving docetaxel every 3 weeks (q3w) survived for at least 3 years, versus only 14% with mitoxantrone [11]. Based on these results, docetaxel plus prednisone became the standard of care for mCRPC, recommended by many international guidelines [12–17].

Cabazitaxel is a next generation taxane, selected for clinical development based on its ability to overcome docetaxel resistance and its ability to cross the blood-brain barrier in preclinical animal models [18–20]. In the phase III TROPIC trial, median survival was 15.1 months (95% confidence interval [CI] 14.1–16.3) with cabazitaxel/prednisone, and 12.7 months (95% CI 11.6–13.7) with mitoxantrone/prednisone [1]. Updated results showed a long-term survival benefit, with almost twice as many patients alive at 2 years with cabazitaxel compared with the active control arm mitoxantrone (15.9% versus 8.2%; odds ratio [OR] 2.11; 95% CI 1.33–3.33) [21].

Cabazitaxel is now considered an effective treatment option for mCRPC for patients progressing during or after docetaxel [12,13,15,16]. In TROPIC, however, cabazitaxel was associated with some clinically important adverse events (AEs)—mainly an increased risk of \geq grade 3 febrile neutropenia (cabazitaxel 8% versus mitoxantrone 1%) and grade \geq 3 diarrhoea (cabazitaxel

6% versus mitoxantrone <1% [1]. Overall, 5% of patients in the cabazitaxel group and 2% of those in the mitoxantrone group died within 30 days of the last infusion—the most frequent cause of death in the cabazitaxel group was neutropenia and its clinical consequences. This toxicity might have, at least in part, been because patients were heavily pretreated and had very advanced disease, prophylactic G-CSF at the first cabazitaxel cycle was not allowed (it was only allowed at first occurrence of either neutropenia lasting ≥ 7 or neutropenia complicated by fever or infection) and because in this worldwide study, some centres lacked expertise in pro-active management of AEs [22]. The crucial role of adequate patient care was highlighted by a post hoc analysis limited to French TROPIC centres (90 patients in total) where proactive management of side-effects was required [23]. In this sub-study, the discontinuation rate due to AEs with cabazitaxel was lower than in the global TROPIC population (11% versus 18%) and there was no death due to toxicity, resulting in a greater OS benefit versus mitoxantrone (18.0 months versus 14.3 months).

The TROPIC results led to the establishment of compassionate-use programmes (CUPs) and early-access programmes (EAPs) in 30 countries worldwide, allowing access to the drug before its commercial availability. An awareness programme for physicians and nurses on the pro-active management of AEs related to cabazitaxel was implemented in each centre. Results from the German CUP and the Italian EAP have already been published [24,25]. Compared to TROPIC, there was a consistently lower rate of febrile neutropenia (Germany 1.8%; Italy 5% versus 8% in TROPIC) and grade ≥ 3 diarrhoea (Germany 0.9%; Italy 2.8% versus 6% in TROPIC) [1,24,25], demonstrating the benefits of proactive measures to reduce the incidence and severity of cabazitaxel-related AEs. In this paper, we report the preliminary safety results of the European CUPs/EAPs. In the interest of patients, the safety analysis focuses particularly on the senior adult patients (aged [70-75] and \geq 75 years) as this population is at increased risk of chemotherapy-induced AEs due to associated comorbidities [26].

Download English Version:

https://daneshyari.com/en/article/8443554

Download Persian Version:

https://daneshyari.com/article/8443554

Daneshyari.com