

A Randomized, Open-label, Presurgical, Window-of-Opportunity Study Comparing the Pharmacodynamic Effects of the Novel Oral SERD AZD9496 with Fulvestrant in Patients with Newly Diagnosed ER⁺ HER2⁻ Primary Breast Cancer



John F.R. Robertson¹, Abigail Evans², Stephan Henschen³, Cliona C. Kirwan⁴, Ali Jahan⁵, Laura M. Kenny⁶, J. Michael Dixon⁷, Peter Schmid⁸, Ashutosh Kothari⁹, Omar Mohamed¹⁰, Peter A. Fasching¹¹, Kwok-Leung Cheung¹, Rachel Wuerstlein¹², Danielle Carroll¹³, Teresa Klinowska¹³, Justin P.O. Lindemann¹³, Alexander MacDonald¹⁴, Richard Mather¹³, Rhiannon Maudsley¹³, Michele Moschetta¹³, Myria Nikolaou¹³, Martine P. Roudier¹³, Tinnu Sarvotham¹³, Gaia Schiavon¹², Diansong Zhou¹⁴, Li Zhou¹⁴, and Nadia Harbeck¹²

ABSTRACT

Purpose: Fulvestrant, the first-in-class selective estrogen receptor (ER) degrader (SERD), is clinically effective in patients with ER⁺ breast cancer, but it has administration and pharmacokinetic limitations. Pharmacodynamic data suggest complete ER degradation is not achieved at fulvestrant's clinically feasible dose. This presurgical study (NCT03236974) compared the pharmacodynamic effects of fulvestrant with AZD9496, a novel, orally bioavailable, nonsteroidal, potent SERD, in treatment-naïve patients with ER⁺ HER2⁻ primary breast cancer awaiting curative intent surgery.

Patients and Methods: Patients were randomized 1:1 to receive AZD9496 250 mg twice daily from day 1 for 5–14 days, or fulvestrant 500 mg on day 1. On-treatment imaging-guided core tumor biopsies were taken between day 5 and 14 and compared with pretreatment diagnostic biopsies. The primary objective was

to compare the effects of AZD9496 and fulvestrant on ER expression. Secondary objectives included changes in progesterone receptor (PR) and Ki-67 pharmacokinetic/pharmacodynamic relationships and safety.

Results: Forty-six women received treatment (AZD9496 *n* = 22; fulvestrant *n* = 24); 35 paired biopsies were evaluable (AZD9496 *n* = 15; fulvestrant *n* = 20). The least square mean estimate for ER H-score reduction was 24% after AZD9496 versus 36% after fulvestrant treatment (*P* = 0.86). AZD9496 also reduced PR H-scores (−33.3%) and Ki-67 levels (−39.9%) from baseline, but was also not superior to fulvestrant (PR: −68.7%, *P* = 0.97; Ki-67: −75.4%, *P* = 0.98). No new safety findings were identified.

Conclusions: This was the first presurgical study to demonstrate that an oral SERD affects its key biological targets. However, AZD9496 was not superior to fulvestrant at the dose tested.

Introduction

Approximately 75% of breast cancers are estrogen receptor–positive (ER⁺), 60% of which are also progesterone receptor–positive (PR⁺) (1, 2). Endocrine therapy is highly effective and represents the mainstay treatment of ER⁺ breast cancers (3). Primary and secondary resistance occur in a high proportion of patients, which ultimately limits the use of these agents (4). Despite resistance to one or more

endocrine therapies, tumors continue to depend on ER activity for growth (5, 6). Therefore, ER remains an important target in the endocrine-resistant setting, emphasizing the need for more effective endocrine treatments.

Fulvestrant is the first-in-class SERD and was the first ER-targeting agent to be described as a pure antiestrogen, referring to its lack of agonism in all ER⁺ tissues (7). Fulvestrant is clinically effective in

¹University of Nottingham, Nottingham, United Kingdom. ²Poole Hospital, Poole, United Kingdom. ³Helios Clinics Schwerin, Schwerin, Germany. ⁴University of Manchester, Manchester, United Kingdom. ⁵King's Mill Hospital, Mansfield, United Kingdom. ⁶Imperial College London and Imperial College Healthcare NHS Trust, London, United Kingdom. ⁷Western General Hospital, Edinburgh, United Kingdom. ⁸Barts Cancer Institute, Queen Mary University of London, London, United Kingdom. ⁹Guy's and St Thomas' NHS Foundation Trust, London, United Kingdom. ¹⁰Johannes Wesling General Hospital, Minden, Germany. ¹¹Department of Gynecology and Obstetrics, Comprehensive Cancer Center Erlangen-EMN, Erlangen University Hospital, Friedrich Alexander University of Erlangen-Nuremberg, Nuremberg, Germany. ¹²Breast Center, Department of Obstetrics and Gynecology and Comprehensive Cancer Center, University of Munich (LMU), Munich, Germany. ¹³Research and Early Development, Oncology R&D, AstraZeneca, Cambridge, United Kingdom. ¹⁴Clinical Pharmacology and Safety Sciences, BioPharmaceuticals R&D, AstraZeneca, Cambridge, United Kingdom.

Note: Supplementary data for this article are available at Clinical Cancer Research Online (<http://clincancerres.aacrjournals.org/>).

Prior presentation: Data from this work were partially reported at San Antonio Breast Cancer Symposium 2019, December 10–14, San Antonio, TX (abstract number P6-04-01).

Corresponding Author: John F.R. Robertson, Division of Medical Sciences and Graduate Entry Medicine, School of Medicine, University of Nottingham, Royal Derby Hospital Centre, Derby, DE22 3DT, UK. Phone: 4401-3327-2488; Fax: 4401-3327-24880; E-mail: john.robertson@nottingham.ac.uk

Clin Cancer Res 2020;26:4242–9

doi: 10.1158/1078-0432.CCR-19-3387

©2020 American Association for Cancer Research.

Translational Relevance

Endocrine therapy is highly effective and the mainstay treatment for estrogen receptor-positive (ER⁺) breast cancer; unfortunately, resistance inevitably occurs. Fulvestrant is the first-in-class selective estrogen receptor degrader (SERD), and is clinically effective in both endocrine-naïve and resistant ER⁺ breast cancers. At present, fulvestrant is injected intramuscularly with an approved dose of 500 mg. Orally bioavailable SERDs may achieve greater exposure and anti-ER degrading activity than fulvestrant, which may translate into improved clinical outcomes. In this presurgical, window-of-opportunity study, the novel oral SERD AZD9496 reduced ER, progesterone receptor, and Ki-67 expression, and is the first to show that an oral SERD is able to impact its key biological targets in this setting. While AZD9496 250 mg twice daily was not superior to fulvestrant 500 mg, presurgical studies represent an important assessment of the proof of mechanism of novel SERDs in early clinical development.

patients with ER⁺ breast cancer, both naïve and resistant to endocrine therapy (8–13); it has been shown to be effective in patients who have disease progression after receiving tamoxifen [a selective estrogen receptor modulator (SERM)] therapy in phase III trials (8, 9); other SERMs were cross-resistant to tamoxifen despite promising phase II results (14, 15). Fulvestrant is also effective after third-generation aromatase inhibitors (AI) (10, 12, 16), and is more efficacious than these agents in the first-line setting in patients naïve to endocrine treatment, both in terms of progression-free survival [PFS; FIRST (17) and FALCON (18) studies] and overall survival [OS; FIRST (19)]. SERDs may also represent a more efficacious therapeutic option in the adjuvant setting as compared with tamoxifen and third-generation AIs; however, this remains to be proven in prospective randomized trials.

Fulvestrant has low oral bioavailability and is administered via intramuscular (i.m.) injection. The clinically approved dose of fulvestrant is 500 mg administered monthly as two 250 mg 5 mL intramuscular injections, with a loading dose on day 15 of the first cycle. Observations from fulvestrant studies suggest that its maximum clinical efficacy and biomarker impact may not have been achieved even at this dose. In a presurgical, window-of-opportunity study comparing three doses of fulvestrant (50 mg, 125 mg, and 250 mg), tamoxifen 20 mg, and placebo, all doses of fulvestrant were associated with dose-dependent reductions in ER and Ki-67 expression compared with placebo. ER reduction was significantly greater than tamoxifen at the fulvestrant 250 mg dose, and numerically but not statistically greater with fulvestrant dosed at 250 mg compared with 125 mg (59% vs. 50%) (13). Higher doses of fulvestrant have been explored; fulvestrant 750 mg i.m. monthly was effective at reducing proliferation in premenopausal women with ER⁺ breast cancer (20), and fulvestrant 1,000 mg monthly (500 mg i.m. dosed on day 1, 8, and 15 of a 28-day cycle, and on day 1 and 15 thereafter) is currently being investigated in the plasmaMATCH trial (NCT03182634).

In the neoadjuvant NEWEST trial, the degree of ER degradation in tumors was greater in patients with early breast cancer receiving 4 weeks of fulvestrant 500 mg treatment (dosed on day 0, 14, and 28, and every 28 days thereafter) compared with 250 mg (dosed on day 0 and 28, and every 28 days thereafter; –50.3% vs. –13.7%; $P < 0.0001$; ref. 21). The dose-dependent pharmacodynamic effects of fulvestrant shown in this study were echoed in the larger clinical efficacy phase III

study (CONFIRM) in the advanced disease setting, where fulvestrant 500 mg (dosed on day 0, 14, and 28, and every 28 days thereafter) was superior to fulvestrant 250 mg (dosed every 28 days) with respect to progression-free survival and overall survival (16, 22). In addition to ER, reductions in Ki-67 levels in the neoadjuvant setting have also shown to be predictive of long-term clinical efficacy of endocrine therapies in early breast cancer [IMPACT (23) and ATAC (24) trials, among others].

AZD9496 is an orally bioavailable, nonsteroidal, selective and potent ER α degrader and ER antagonist (25) that has shown antitumor activity in both endocrine-sensitive and -resistant models (26). In an HCC1428 long-term estrogen-deprived breast model, which is independent of estrogen for growth and as such represents a model of AI resistance, AZD9496 caused tumor regression and significant ER α degradation (27).

In a phase I dose-escalation, dose-expansion study of 45 patients (NCT02248090), AZD9496, dosed up to 600 mg twice daily in heavily pretreated patients with ER⁺/HER2[–] advanced breast cancer, was well tolerated. Six patients (three of whom had an *ESR1* mutation) experienced prolonged disease stabilization (defined as progression-free survival of more than 52 weeks), and one patient, who received AZD9496 250 mg twice daily, had a confirmed partial response.

This study was designed to assess and compare the effects of AZD9496 and fulvestrant after short-term administration on pharmacodynamic biomarkers ER α , PR, and Ki-67 in treatment-naïve patients with ER⁺ HER2[–] primary breast cancer awaiting surgery of curative intent. The study also assessed the pharmacokinetics of AZD9496 and fulvestrant on the day of biopsy, associated pharmacokinetic/pharmacodynamic relationships, and the safety and tolerability of AZD9496 compared with fulvestrant.

Patients and Methods

Study design and patients

In this open-label, randomized, multicenter presurgical trial (NCT03236974), patients were randomized 1:1 to receive either AZD9496 250 mg (twice daily orally for 5–14 days commencing on day 1 and continuing up to and including the day of the on-treatment biopsy) or fulvestrant 500 mg (administered as two 5 mL i.m. injections on day 1). The residual core-cut biopsy sample taken as a standard hospital diagnostic procedure was used as the pretreatment tumor tissue comparator for each patient if taken up to 6 weeks prior to starting study treatment (day 1). A new pretreatment biopsy was taken if diagnostic biopsies were of insufficient quality or taken more than 6 weeks prior to starting study treatment. After 5–14 days of study treatment (and approximately 2 hours after the last AZD9496 dose), up to three core-cut, on-treatment, imaging-guided biopsy samples were taken, either at the time of definitive surgery or at a separate visit prior to surgery. The 5- to 14-day window for surgery was considered adequate to allow fulvestrant plasma concentrations after the single 500 mg dose to be within the C_{max} and C_{min} observed when fulvestrant 500 mg is at steady state when administered using the standard therapeutic regimen in patients with advanced breast cancer (28, 29). Steady-state exposure of AZD9496 is reached after 5 days of treatment (30).

The study included postmenopausal women with newly diagnosed, resectable primary invasive breast cancer, histologically confirmed as ER⁺ (in this context defined by ER staining of $\geq 10\%$ of tumor cell nuclei), HER2[–] [defined as negative by *in situ* hybridization or an immunohistochemistry (IHC) status of 0 or 1+], and with a palpable tumor of any size, or a tumor with an ultrasound-assessed diameter of

Robertson et al.

at least 1 cm. Patients were excluded from the trial if they had evidence of metastatic disease; had received prior systemic or local treatment for the new primary breast cancer currently under investigation; were receiving medication or herbal supplements known to be strong inhibitors/inducers of CYP3A4/5, strong inhibitors of CYP2C8, or sensitive substrates of CYP2C8 inhibition; had received hormone replacement therapy anytime between 4 weeks before the pretreatment biopsy and the start of study treatment; had inflammatory breast cancer; or had any evidence of severe or uncontrolled systemic diseases, including uncontrolled hypertension, uncontrolled diabetes, or active infection, including hepatitis B, hepatitis C, and human immunodeficiency virus, as judged by the investigator.

Assessments

Tumor samples were sectioned and scored manually for ER, PR, and Ki-67 protein biomarkers by central pathology review. The percentage of ER⁺ or PR⁺ tumor epithelial cell nuclei in each staining category (negative; weak +; moderate ++; strong +++) were recorded for each sample. Results were expressed as an H-score, where H-score = (1 × % of +) + (2 × % of ++) + (3 × % of +++), with a range of 0–300. Ki-67 index was assessed and expressed as the percentage of positively stained tumor nuclei, following the International Ki-67 in the Breast Cancer Working Group recommendations (31).

Blood samples for determining AZD9496 plasma concentrations were taken at the time of on-treatment biopsy (approximately 2 hours after last AZD9496 dose) and 1–2 hours afterwards. An additional sample was taken 8–12 hours after the last dose, or at discharge from patients undergoing surgery on the day of biopsy. Patients who were undergoing surgery on a separate day to the biopsy had an optional sample taken 3–4 hours after on-treatment biopsy. Only one blood sample for fulvestrant pharmacokinetic analysis was taken on the day of biopsy, any time before on-treatment biopsy.

Safety was assessed in terms of adverse events [AEs; graded according to Common Terminology Criteria for Adverse Events (CTCAE) 4.0], laboratory data, vital signs, and electrocardiogram changes. AEs were monitored from screening through to the follow-up visit 28 ± 3 days after the last AZD9496 study dose or after fulvestrant administration.

This study was carried out in accordance with the principles of the International Conference on Harmonisation Guideline for Good Clinical Practice, the Declaration of Helsinki, and all applicable national and local laws. All patients gave their written consent to participate before enrolling in the study. The protocol was approved by the respective regulatory authorities and the research ethics committee of each participating site, and was subject to Ethics Committee and Institutional Review Board approvals.

Statistical analysis

The primary endpoint was the treatment effect on ER expression in tumor biopsy samples obtained before and during treatment. Secondary endpoints were the treatment effects on PR and Ki-67 expression in tumor biopsy samples obtained before and during treatment, plasma concentrations of AZD9496 or fulvestrant during treatment, and safety and tolerability. An analysis of covariance (ANCOVA) model, adjusted for baseline expression and day of on-treatment biopsy, was used to estimate the treatment effects on ER, PR, and Ki-67 expression. As this study was designed to assess the superiority of AZD9496 over fulvestrant, one-sided testing was performed; a *P* value <0.1 was needed to declare AZD9496 superior to fulvestrant. The least square (LS) mean, along with 80% confidence intervals (CI) for each treatment group was expressed as estimated percentage change from

baseline. One-sided *P* values were presented. PR and Ki-67 were log transformed before being analyzed, and then back-transformed to the original scale. Analysis for all pharmacokinetic/pharmacodynamic and pharmacodynamic/pharmacodynamic relationships in individual patients was limited to exploratory correlation plots using linear regression. In addition, for pharmacodynamic/pharmacodynamic relationships, *R* and *P* values were calculated by Spearman rank correlation. The treatment effect [difference in LS means, or geometric mean ratios (GMR) for log-transformed data] was calculated, together with CIs. The sample size was determined based on the fulvestrant data reported previously (32); sample size calculations indicated that 20 evaluable patients per treatment group would detect an absolute mean percent change difference in ER expression of 20% with a power of 80%, and a one-sided significance level of 10%. Assuming a drop-out rate of approximately 15%, the recruitment target was set at 24 patients per treatment group. Plasma concentrations of AZD9496 and fulvestrant were compared with pharmacokinetic models that were developed using historical data obtained from patients with metastatic ER⁺ breast cancer.

The safety analysis set was defined as all patients who received at least one dose of treatment. The pharmacodynamic analysis set included all evaluable patients, defined as those who received at least 80% of the AZD9496 predicted dose; received the last dose of AZD9496 on the day of on-treatment biopsy; had on-treatment biopsy within 5–14 days of AZD9496 therapy or fulvestrant administration; had evaluable paired tumor samples by central pathology assessment, and had no major protocol deviations that could have impacted biomarker analysis. The pharmacokinetic analysis set was defined as all patients who received at least one dose of study treatment and had at least one measured AZD9496 or fulvestrant concentration at a scheduled pharmacokinetic time-point postdose.

Data sharing statement

Data underlying the findings described in this manuscript may be obtained in accordance with AstraZeneca's data sharing policy described at <https://astrazenecagrouptrials.pharmacm.com/ST/Submission/Disclosure>.

Role of the study sponsor


AstraZeneca funded this study, and participated in the study design, data collection, data analysis, data interpretation, and the writing of the study report. AstraZeneca reviewed the publication, without influencing the opinions of the authors, to ensure medical and scientific accuracy, and the protection of intellectual property. The corresponding author had access to all data in the study, and had the final responsibility for the decision to submit the manuscript for publication.

Results

The study commenced on October 5, 2017; the last patient's last visit was on February 12, 2019, and final data cutoff was April 1, 2019. Patients were recruited from 12 sites in Germany and the United Kingdom; 49 were enrolled and randomized. Three patients were excluded from the study before receiving study treatment: one withdrew consent, and two were ruled ineligible. Of the 46 patients who completed the trial, 22 received AZD9496 and 24 received fulvestrant (Fig. 1). Paired biopsy samples from 35 patients were evaluable for biomarker analysis (AZD9496 *n* = 15; fulvestrant *n* = 20) and were

Presurgical Study of the Novel Oral SERD AZD9496 in ER⁺ BC**Figure 1.**

Trial profile. *AZD9496 follow-up visit: 28 ± 3 days after last dose; fulvestrant follow-up visit: 28 ± 3 days after treatment; BID, twice daily; IM, intramuscular; PD, pharmacodynamic.



included in the pharmacodynamic analysis set. Eleven paired biopsy samples were not evaluable: nine on-treatment tumor biopsies were surgical resections, one patient did not receive the last dose of AZD9496 on the day of on-treatment biopsy, and one patient did not have the on-treatment biopsy. Patients' characteristics were well balanced between the two groups and as expected per the inclusion/exclusion criteria (Table 1).

Pharmacodynamic analysis

The median biopsy day was similar between the two treatment groups (day 8 in the AZD9496 group and day 8.5 in the fulvestrant group), and in the AZD9496 group most biopsies (67%) took place 2–4 hours (range: 1–6) after the patient's last dose of AZD9496. The LS mean reduction in ER H-scores after adjusting for baseline and day of biopsy was 24.3% (80% CI: 14.3–34.4) in the AZD9496 group, and 36.3% (80% CI: 27.7–44.9) in the fulvestrant group. One-sided testing for AZD9496 superiority over fulvestrant was not significant (12%, $P = 0.86$; Fig. 2A).

PR H-scores were reduced from baseline in both the AZD9496 group [LS mean reduction: 33.3% (80% CI: 2.2–54.5)] and the fulvestrant group [LS mean reduction: 68.7% (80% CI: 56.4–77.5)]. The treatment effect between fulvestrant and AZD9496 was not significant, with a GMR of fulvestrant to AZD9496 of 2.13 [$P = 0.97$ (one-sided testing AZD9496 superior to fulvestrant); Fig. 2B]. Ki-67 levels were reduced from baseline by a mean of 39.9% (80% CI: 10.8–59.5) in the AZD9496 group, and 75.4% (80% CI: 65.1–82.7) in the fulvestrant group. Using one-sided testing, AZD9496 was determined to be not superior to fulvestrant, with a GMR of fulvestrant to AZD9496 of 2.4 ($P = 0.98$; Fig. 2C).

In the AZD9496 group, all correlations between individual percent changes in ER, PR, and Ki-67 were not statistically significant [ER and Ki-67 ($R = 0.31$, $P = 0.26$); PR and Ki-67 ($R = 0.059$, $P = 0.83$)], with the exception of the correlation between individual ER and PR percent changes ($R = 0.59$, $P = 0.022$). However, because of the number of tests conducted, this correlation may likely be due to chance (Supplementary Figs. S1A and S2). For patients in the fulvestrant group, the correlation was not statistically significant between ER and PR ($R = 0.37$, $P = 0.11$), ER and Ki-67 ($R = 0.21$, $P = 0.38$), and PR and Ki-67 ($R = 0.16$, $P = 0.51$; Supplementary Fig. S1B). However, ER reduction was accompanied by concurrent reductions in PR and Ki-67 in most of the patients in both the AZD9496 and fulvestrant groups (Supplementary Fig. S2).

Pharmacokinetic analysis

In the 44 patients included in the pharmacokinetic analysis set, plasma exposure of AZD9496 was lower than predicted on the basis of modeled pharmacokinetic data from the phase I trial in patients with advanced breast cancer (30). Compared with the steady-state plasma concentration observed in the phase I AZD9496 250 mg twice daily treatment group, the area under the concentration–time curve (AUC) for this study was 31% lower, and the C_{max} was 25% lower (Supplementary Fig. S3). Fulvestrant plasma exposure was consistent with historical data (AstraZeneca data on file; ref. 32). No clear pharmacokinetic/pharmacodynamic relationship between plasma concentration at biopsy and change in pharmacodynamic markers relative to baseline was observed for AZD9496 (Supplementary Fig. S4A–S4C) or fulvestrant (Supplementary Fig. S4D).

Robertson et al.

Table 1. Baseline characteristics of study population.

	AZD9496 (n = 22)	Fulvestrant (n = 24)	Total (n = 46)
Median age, years (range)	61.5 (52–83)	66.5 (52–87)	63.5 (52–87)
ECOG PS, n (%)			
0	21 (95)	18 (75)	39 (85)
1	1 (5)	6 (25)	7 (15)
Primary tumor, n (%)			
T1	10 (45)	9 (38)	19 (41)
T2	11 (50)	11 (46)	22 (48)
T3	1 (5)	4 (17)	5 (11)
Regional lymph nodes, n (%)			
N0	20 (91)	21 (88)	41 (89)
N1	0	3 (13)	3 (7)
Missing	2 (9)	0	2 (4)
Tumor grade, n (%)			
G1	3 (14)	5 (21)	8 (17)
G2	13 (59)	17 (71)	30 (65)
G3	5 (23)	2 (8)	7 (15)
GX	1 (5)	0	1 (2)
PR, n (%)			
Positive	16 (73)	19 (79)	35 (76)
Negative	6 (27)	4 (17)	10 (22)
Missing	0	1 (4)	1 (2)
HER2, n (%)			
IHC-borderline and FISH-negative	2 (9)	2 (8)	4 (9)
IHC-borderline and CISH-negative	0	1 (4)	1 (2)
Negative ^a	20	21	41
ER positive, n (%)	22 (100)	24 (100)	46 (100)

Abbreviations: CISH: chromogenic *in situ* hybridization; ECOG PS: Eastern Cooperative Oncology Group performance status; FISH, fluorescence *in situ* hybridisation; IHC, immunohistochemistry; PR, progesterone receptor.

^aBoth IHC and FISH/CISH negative.

Safety and tolerability


The safety analysis set included 46 patients. The median treatment duration of AZD9496 was 9.5 days (range: 6–15). Despite one patient missing their last dose of AZD9496 on the day of on-treatment biopsy,

compliance to study treatment was high, with a relative dose intensity of 100% (range: 90–125; upper end of range due to one patient not returning leftover study treatment). One dose interruption was reported, where a patient forgot to take a second dose of AZD9496 on day 6. She resumed normal dosing on day 7 and was deemed eligible to continue the study. AZD9496 and fulvestrant were both well tolerated, and no new safety findings were identified. Twenty-five (54.3%) patients experienced at least one AE, irrespective of causality: 11 (50.0%) in the AZD9496 group and 14 (58.3%) in the fulvestrant group. Most AEs were CTCAE grade 1 (21/25, 90.9%); no grade 3 or higher toxicities were reported. Nausea was the most common AE observed in the AZD9496 group ($n = 4$, 18.2%), while hot flush was the most common AE observed in the fulvestrant group ($n = 3$, 12.5%; **Table 2**). Thirteen (28.3%) patients experienced AEs that were considered by the investigator to be related to the study drug: 6 (27.3%) in the AZD9496 group and 7 (29.2%) in the fulvestrant group. No drug discontinuations occurred and no serious AEs were reported during the treatment and follow-up periods.

Discussion

This was the first presurgical, window-of-opportunity study to demonstrate that an oral SERD can impact its key biological targets, and the first randomized study to compare two SERDs (AZD9496 and fulvestrant). The treatment groups were well balanced in age, disease stage, and other tumor characteristics.

AZD9496 250 mg twice daily reduced ER expression in primary untreated breast tumors. However, the magnitude of ER reduction was not statistically superior from the effect of the clinically approved dose of fulvestrant. AZD9496 reduced PR and Ki-67 expression compared with baseline, but was not superior to fulvestrant. Preclinically, AZD9496 produced statistically significant ER degradation in the HCC1428 long-term estrogen-deprived breast model and the patient-derived xenograft CTC174 (27). In the MCF-7 xenograft model, AZD9496 demonstrated greater tumor growth inhibition than fulvestrant (27). In other endocrine-sensitive and -resistant breast cancer models, the effects of AZD9496 and fulvestrant were comparable (26).

**Figure 2.**

LS mean percentage change in pharmacodynamic markers from baseline to on-treatment biopsy. LS mean percentage change from baseline in ER H-score (A), PR H-score (B), and Ki-67 index levels (C). One-sided ANCOVA was used to assess treatment effects. PR H-score and Ki-67 index data were log transformed prior to analysis, with results back-transformed to represent percentage change. Error bars represent 80% CIs. ANCOVA, analysis of covariance; CI, confidence interval; LS, least square; PD, pharmacodynamic; PR, progesterone receptor.

Table 2. Most common AEs (>5% of patients), irrespective of causality, occurring during the study.

AE, by preferred term	Number of patients (%) ^a		
	AZD9496 250 mg BID (n = 22)	Fulvestrant 500 mg single dose (n = 24)	Total (n = 46)
Any AE	11 (50.0)	14 (58.3)	25 (54.3)
Nausea	4 (18.2)	2 (8.3)	6 (13.0)
Fatigue	2 (9.1)	2 (8.3)	4 (8.7)
Hot flush	1 (4.5)	3 (12.5)	4 (8.7)
Back pain	1 (4.5)	2 (8.3)	3 (6.5)
Pain in extremity	2 (9.1)	1 (4.2)	3 (6.5)

Abbreviation: BID: twice daily.

^aSafety analysis set.

AZD9496 plasma exposure was lower than expected on the basis of data from the previous phase I study. This could have contributed to the lower than anticipated ER degradation (30). Reasons for the lower exposure are unclear; however, interstudy variability, the sparse pharmacokinetic sampling schedule and the use of population pharmacokinetic analysis required to make comparisons in this study may have contributed to the variability of results. Similarly, differences in concomitant medications used by the newly diagnosed, treatment-naïve patients with breast cancer in this study and the advanced, heavily treated patients in the phase I study may also have impacted the results. In addition, it has been reported that patients with advanced cancer may have altered drug pharmacokinetics. This is due to the inflammatory state induced by their disease and changes in cytochrome P450 expression in the liver, most notably CYP3A, leading to reduced metabolic clearance of certain drugs (33–35). As AZD9496 is a substrate and inducer of CYP3A clinically (30), in contrast to fulvestrant, this may have contributed to the interstudy variability in exposure seen with AZD9496 but not with fulvestrant.

AZD9496 250 mg twice daily was the selected dose for this study, based on evidence of tolerability and biological activity at this dose in the previous phase I study. In that study, dose-limiting toxicities (DLT) were observed in three patients: one patient (150 mg twice daily) experienced abnormal hepatic functions, another (400 mg twice daily) developed grade 3 diarrhea and elevated liver function tests, and another (600 mg twice daily) developed grade 3 diarrhea; the MTD was not reached and therefore, 600 mg twice daily was the maximum dose explored and declared the maximum feasible dose (MFD; 30). The use of a higher dose of AZD9496 in this study may have resulted in greater pharmacodynamic activity, but this remains to be demonstrated.

Fulvestrant performed as expected, based on historical data, in terms of pharmacodynamic biomarker modulation (ER, PR, and Ki-67; refs. 21, 32), achieving a mean 36% reduction in ER H-score. In previous studies, fulvestrant reduced ER H-score from baseline by 41% (32).

Fulvestrant reduced PR levels by 69% and Ki-67 levels by 75% from baseline. These reductions are in line with two previous studies, where fulvestrant 500 mg reduced PR H-score by 34% and 81%, and Ki-67 levels by 75% and 79% (21, 32).

AZD9496 and fulvestrant were well tolerated and no new safety signals were identified. No grade 3 or higher toxicities, or serious AEs developed, and no patient discontinued study treatment. Hot flush was the most commonly reported AE in patients in the fulvestrant group,

consistent with the safety profiles of fulvestrant 500 mg in previous studies (16, 32). Nausea was the most common AE in the AZD9496 group, and judged as causally related in all four patients. Dose-limiting toxicities in the phase I study included grade 3 liver toxicities and diarrhea. However, in the current trial, no liver toxicities were reported and only one patient experienced an AZD9496 causally related grade I diarrhea (30).

The median day of biopsy was similar for both groups. On the basis of phase I data, the pharmacokinetic steady state of AZD9496 was expected to be 5 days (30). Within 5–14 days of exposure, fulvestrant concentration is anticipated to be within the C_{max} and C_{min} observed at steady state in patients with advanced breast cancer receiving fulvestrant 500 mg as a standard therapeutic regimen (28, 29). In the context of this study, a 5- to 14-day window was considered sufficient to observe the biomarker changes associated with fulvestrant, and appropriate to provide a comparison to assess the pharmacodynamic activity of AZD9496.

The rate of nonevaluable patient samples was higher than predicted because biopsy samples were taken from surgical resections instead of core-needle biopsies in some patients. Surgical samples were not included in the analysis of this study, as the POETIC trial (NCT02338310) showed evidence that surgery *per se* can affect Ki-67 expression in tumor tissue (36).

One limitation of this study is the lack of a placebo group to compare the consistency in ER, PR, and Ki-67 expression. In addition, examining a range of AZD9496 doses would have been useful to determine any dose–response relationship more robustly.

In conclusion, this is the first window-of-opportunity study where an oral SERD has shown relevant biomarker modulations in patients with ER⁺ breast cancer. However, AZD9496 was not superior to fulvestrant at the dose tested. Window-of-opportunity studies represent an important means to test the proof of mechanism and degree of pharmacodynamic activity of novel SERDs early in clinical development. They can also inform dosing decisions for future phase II and III trials, thus reducing the reliance on preclinical pharmacokinetic modeling.

Disclosure of Potential Conflicts of Interest

J.F.R. Robertson is an employee/paid consultant for Carrick Therapeutics, reports receiving speakers bureau honoraria from AstraZeneca and Bayer, and reports receiving other remuneration from AstraZeneca, Carrick Therapeutics and Cullinan Oncology. L.M. Kenny is an employee/paid consultant for Myriad Genetics, and reports receiving speakers bureau honoraria from Pfizer. P.A. Schmid is an employee/paid consultant for Pfizer, AstraZeneca, Novartis, Roche, Merck, Boehringer Ingelheim, Bayer, Eisai, Celgene and Puma. A. Kothari reports receiving speakers bureau honoraria from Integra. O. Mohamed reports receiving speakers bureau honoraria from AstraZeneca. P.A. Fasching is an employee/paid consultant for Novartis, Pfizer, Celgene, Roche, Daiichi-Sankyo, Merck Sharp & Dohme, AstraZeneca, Eisai, Lilly, and reports receiving commercial research grants from Cepheid and BionTech. K. Cheung reports receiving commercial research grants from AstraZeneca. R. Wuerstein is an employee/paid consultant for and reports receiving speakers bureau honoraria from AstraZeneca, Lilly, Pfizer, Novartis. D. Carroll is an employee/paid consultant for and holds ownership interest (including patents) in AstraZeneca and Azeria Therapeutics. T. Klinowska is an employee/paid consultant for and holds ownership interest (including patents) in AstraZeneca. J.P.O. Lindemann is an employee/paid consultant for AstraZeneca. A. MacDonald and R. Mather are employees/paid consultants for AstraZeneca. R. Maudsley is an employee/paid consultant for and holds ownership interest (including patents) in AstraZeneca. M. Moschetta is an employee/paid consultant for AstraZeneca. G. Schiavon is an employee/paid consultant for and holds ownership interest (including patents) in AstraZeneca. D. Zhou is an employee/paid consultant for AstraZeneca. N. Harbeck is an employee/paid consultant for AstraZeneca, Lilly, Novartis, Pfizer, Roche, reports receiving speakers bureau honoraria from Lilly, Novartis, Pfizer, Roche, and

Robertson et al.

AstraZeneca, and holds ownership interest (including patents) in West German Study Group. No potential conflicts of interest were disclosed by the other authors.

Authors' Contributions

Conception and design: J.F.R. Robertson, C.C. Kirwan, J.M. Dixon, D. Carroll, T. Klinowska, J.P.O. Lindemann, M. Moschetta, T. Sarvotham, G. Schiavon, N. Harbeck

Development of methodology: J.F.R. Robertson, C.C. Kirwan, J.M. Dixon, D. Carroll, T. Klinowska, J.P.O. Lindemann, A. MacDonald, R. Maudsley, M. Moschetta, T. Sarvotham, N. Harbeck

Acquisition of data (provided animals, acquired and managed patients, provided facilities, etc.): J.F.R. Robertson, A. Evans, S. Henschen, C.C. Kirwan, A. Jahan, L.M. Kenny, J.M. Dixon, A. Kothari, P.A. Fasching, K.-L. Cheung, R. Wuerstein, D. Carroll, A. MacDonald, M.P. Roudier, T. Sarvotham, N. Harbeck

Analysis and interpretation of data (e.g., statistical analysis, biostatistics, computational analysis): J.F.R. Robertson, A. Evans, J.M. Dixon, P. Schmid, K.-L. Cheung, D. Carroll, T. Klinowska, J.P.O. Lindemann, A. MacDonald, R. Maudsley, M. Moschetta, M. Nikolaou, M.P. Roudier, T. Sarvotham, G. Schiavon, D. Zhou, N. Harbeck

Writing, review, and/or revision of the manuscript: J.F.R. Robertson, A. Evans, C.C. Kirwan, A. Jahan, L.M. Kenny, J.M. Dixon, P. Schmid, A. Kothari, P.A. Fasching, K.-L. Cheung, R. Wuerstein, D. Carroll, T. Klinowska, J.P.O. Lindemann, A. MacDonald, R. Mather, R. Maudsley, M. Moschetta, M. Nikolaou, M.P. Roudier, T. Sarvotham, G. Schiavon, D. Zhou, N. Harbeck

Administrative, technical, or material support (i.e., reporting or organizing data, constructing databases): J.F.R. Robertson, J.M. Dixon, J.P.O. Lindemann, A. MacDonald, R. Mather, R. Maudsley, M.P. Roudier, T. Sarvotham

Study supervision: J.F.R. Robertson, S. Henschen, C.C. Kirwan, A. Jahan, J.M. Dixon, T. Klinowska, J.P.O. Lindemann, A. MacDonald, R. Mather, R. Maudsley, M. Moschetta, T. Sarvotham, N. Harbeck

Other (PI Guys site for conducting trial): A. Kothari

Other (coauthor): O. Mohamed

Acknowledgments

We thank the patients and their caregivers, as well as the investigators and the site staff who participated in this study. We thank Zoe Kelly, PhD, from InterComm International Ltd, Cambridge, UK for medical writing support, which was funded by AstraZeneca in accordance with Good Publication Practice (GPP3) guidelines (<http://www.ismpp.org/gpp3>). This study was funded by AstraZeneca. AstraZeneca develops and markets treatments for breast cancer. AZD9496 is an investigational medical product with no approved indication.

The costs of publication of this article were defrayed in part by the payment of page charges. This article must therefore be hereby marked *advertisement* in accordance with 18 U.S.C. Section 1734 solely to indicate this fact.

Received December 9, 2019; revised February 4, 2020; accepted March 26, 2020; published first March 31, 2020.

References

- Anderson WF, Chatterjee N, Ershler WB, Brawley OW. Estrogen receptor breast cancer phenotypes in the Surveillance, Epidemiology, and End Results database. *Breast Cancer Res Treat* 2002;76:27–36.
- Rakha EA, El-Sayed ME, Green AR, Paish EC, Powe DG, Gee J, et al. Biologic and clinical characteristics of breast cancer with single hormone receptor positive phenotype. *J Clin Oncol* 2007;25:4772–8.
- Johnston SJ, Cheung K-L. Endocrine therapy for breast cancer: a model of hormonal manipulation. *Oncol Ther* 2018;6:141–56.
- Jeselsohn R, Buchwalter G, De Angelis C, Brown M, Schiff R. ESR1 mutations—a mechanism for acquired endocrine resistance in breast cancer. *Nat Rev Clin Oncol* 2015;12:573–83.
- Austreid E, Lonning PE, Eikesdal HP. The emergence of targeted drugs in breast cancer to prevent resistance to endocrine treatment and chemotherapy. *Expert Opin Pharmacother* 2014;15:681–700.
- Bardone A, De Angelis C, Trivedi MV, Osborne CK, Schiff R. The changing role of ER in endocrine resistance. *Breast* 2015;24:S60–6.
- DeFriend DJ, Howell A, Nicholson RI, Anderson E, Dowsett M, Mansel RE, et al. Investigation of a new pure antiestrogen (ICI 182780) in women with primary breast cancer. *Cancer Res* 1994;54:408–14.
- Osborne CK, Pippen J, Jones SE, Parker LM, Ellis M, Come S, et al. Double-blind, randomized trial comparing the efficacy and tolerability of fulvestrant versus anastrozole in postmenopausal women with advanced breast cancer progressing on prior endocrine therapy: results of a North American trial. *J Clin Oncol* 2002;20:3386–95.
- Howell A, Robertson JF, Quaresma Albano J, Aschermannova A, Mauriac L, Kleeborg UR, et al. Fulvestrant, formerly ICI 182,780, is as effective as anastrozole in postmenopausal women with advanced breast cancer progressing after prior endocrine treatment. *J Clin Oncol* 2002;20:3396–403.
- Chia S, Gradishar W, Mauriac L, Bines J, Amant F, Federico M, et al. Double-blind, randomized placebo controlled trial of fulvestrant compared with exemestane after prior nonsteroidal aromatase inhibitor therapy in postmenopausal women with hormone receptor-positive, advanced breast cancer: results from EFACT. *J Clin Oncol* 2008;26:1664–70.
- Howell A, Robertson JFR, Abram P, Lichinitser MR, Elledge R, Bajetta E, et al. Comparison of fulvestrant versus tamoxifen for the treatment of advanced breast cancer in postmenopausal women previously untreated with endocrine therapy: a multinational, double-blind, randomized trial. *J Clin Oncol* 2004;22:1605–13.
- Johnston SR, Kilburn LS, Ellis P, Dodwell D, Cameron D, Hayward L, et al. Fulvestrant plus anastrozole or placebo versus exemestane alone after progression on non-steroidal aromatase inhibitors in postmenopausal patients with hormone-receptor-positive locally advanced or metastatic breast cancer (SoFEA): a composite, multicentre, phase 3 randomised trial. *Lancet Oncol* 2013;14:989–98.
- Robertson JF, Nicholson RI, Bundred NJ, Anderson E, Rayter Z, Dowsett M, et al. Comparison of the short-term biological effects of 7 α -[9-(4,4,5,5,5-pentafluoropentylsulfanyl)-nonyl]estra-1,3,5, (10)-triene-3,17 β -diol (Faslodex) versus tamoxifen in postmenopausal women with primary breast cancer. *Cancer Res* 2001;61:6739–46.
- Gao ZO, Gao ZP, Fields JZ, Boman BM. Development of cross-resistance to tamoxifen in raloxifene-treated breast carcinoma cells. *Anticancer Res* 2002;22:1379–83.
- Stenbygaard LE, Herrstedt J, Thomsen JF, Svendsen KR, Engelholm SA, Dombrowsky P. Toremifene and tamoxifen in advanced breast cancer—a double-blind cross-over trial. *Breast Cancer Res Treat* 1993;25:57–63.
- Di Leo A, Jerusalem G, Petruzelka L, Torres R, Bondarenko IN, Khasanov R, et al. Results of the CONFIRM phase III trial comparing fulvestrant 250 mg with fulvestrant 500 mg in postmenopausal women with estrogen receptor-positive advanced breast cancer. *J Clin Oncol* 2010;28:4594–600.
- Robertson JF, Llombart-Cussac A, Rolski J, Feldt D, Dewar J, Macpherson E, et al. Activity of fulvestrant 500 mg versus anastrozole 1 mg as first-line treatment for advanced breast cancer: results from the FIRST study. *J Clin Oncol* 2009;27:4530–5.
- Robertson JFR, Bondarenko IM, Trishkina E, Dvorkin M, Panasi L, Manikhas A, et al. Fulvestrant 500 mg versus anastrozole 1 mg for hormone receptor-positive advanced breast cancer (FALCON): an international, randomised, double-blind, phase 3 trial. *Lancet* 2016;388:2997–3005.
- Ellis MJ, Llombart-Cussac A, Feldt D, Dewar JA, Jasiówka M, Hewson N, et al. Fulvestrant 500 mg versus anastrozole 1 mg for the first-line treatment of advanced breast cancer: overall survival analysis from the phase II FIRST study. *J Clin Oncol* 2015;33:3781–7.
- Young OE, Renshaw L, Macaskill EJ, White S, Faratian D, Thomas JS, et al. Effects of fulvestrant 750 mg in premenopausal women with oestrogen-receptor-positive primary breast cancer. *Eur J Cancer* 2008;44:391–9.
- Kuter I, Gee JM, Hegg R, Singer CF, Badwe RA, Lowe ES, et al. Dose-dependent change in biomarkers during neoadjuvant endocrine therapy with fulvestrant: results from NEWEST, a randomized Phase II study. *Breast Cancer Res Treat* 2012;133:237–46.
- Di Leo A, Jerusalem G, Petruzelka L, Torres R, Bondarenko IN, Khasanov R, et al. Final overall survival: fulvestrant 500 mg vs. 250 mg in the randomized CONFIRM trial. *J Natl Cancer Inst* 2014;106:djt337.
- Smith IE, Dowsett M, Ebbs SR, Dixon JM, Skene A, Blohmer JU, et al. Neoadjuvant treatment of postmenopausal breast cancer with anastrozole, tamoxifen, or both in combination: the immediate preoperative anastrozole,

Presurgical Study of the Novel Oral SERD AZD9496 in ER⁺ BC

- tamoxifen, or combined with tamoxifen (IMPACT) multicenter double-blind randomized trial. *J Clin Oncol* 2005;23:5108–16.
24. Howell A, Cuzick J, Baum M, Buzdar A, Dowsett M, Forbes JF, et al. Results of the ATAC (Arimidex, Tamoxifen, Alone or in Combination) trial after completion of 5 years' adjuvant treatment for breast cancer. *Lancet* 2005;365:60–2.
 25. De Savi C, Bradbury RH, Rabow AA, Norman RA, de Almeida C, Andrews DM, et al. Optimization of a novel binding motif to (E)-3-(3,5-Difluoro-4-((1R,3R)-2-(2-fluoro-2-methylpropyl)-3-methyl-2,3,4,9-tetrahydro-1H-pyrido[3,4-b]indol-1-yl)phenyl)acrylic acid (AZD9496), a potent and orally bioavailable selective estrogen receptor downregulator and antagonist. *J Med Chem* 2015;50:8128–40.
 26. Nardone A, Weir H, Delpuech O, Brown H, De Angelis C, Cataldo ML, et al. The oral selective oestrogen receptor degrader (SERD) AZD9496 is comparable to fulvestrant in antagonising ER and circumventing endocrine resistance. *Br J Cancer* 2019;120:331–9.
 27. Weir HM, Bradbury RH, Lawson M, Rabow AA, Buttar D, Callis RJ, et al. AZD9496: an oral estrogen receptor inhibitor that blocks the growth of ER-positive and ESR1-mutant breast tumors in preclinical models. *Cancer Res* 2016;76:3307–18.
 28. Ohno S, Rai Y, Iwata H, Yamamoto N, Yoshida M, Iwase H, et al. Three dose regimens of fulvestrant in postmenopausal Japanese women with advanced breast cancer: results from a double-blind, phase II comparative study (FINDER1). *Ann Oncol* 2010;21:2342–7.
 29. Pritchard KI, Rolski J, Papai Z, Mauriac L, Cardoso F, Chang J, et al. Results of a phase II study comparing three dosing regimens of fulvestrant in postmenopausal women with advanced breast cancer (FINDER2). *Breast Cancer Res Treat* 2010;123:453–61.
 30. Hamilton EP, Patel MR, Armstrong AC, Baird RD, Jhaveri K, Hoch M, et al. A first-in-human study of the new oral selective estrogen receptor degrader AZD9496 for ER⁺/HER2⁻ advanced breast cancer. *Clin Cancer Res* 2018;24:3510–8.
 31. Dowsett M, Nielsen TO, A'Hern R, Bartlett J, Coombes RC, Cuzick J, et al. Assessment of Ki67 in breast cancer: recommendations from the International Ki67 in Breast Cancer working group. *J Natl Cancer Inst* 2011;103:1656–64.
 32. Robertson JF, Dixon JM, Sibbering DM, Jahan A, Ellis IO, Channon E, et al. A randomized trial to assess the biological activity of short-term (pre-surgical) fulvestrant 500 mg plus anastrozole versus fulvestrant 500 mg alone or anastrozole alone on primary breast cancer. *Breast Cancer Res* 2013;15:R18.
 33. Rivory LP, Slaviero KA, Clarke SJ. Hepatic cytochrome P450 3A drug metabolism is reduced in cancer patients who have an acute-phase response. *Br J Cancer* 2002;87:277–80.
 34. Slaviero KA, Clarke SJ, Rivory LP. Inflammatory response: an unrecognised source of variability in the pharmacokinetics and pharmacodynamics of cancer chemotherapy. *Lancet Oncol* 2003;4:224–32.
 35. Schwenger E, Reddy VP, Moorthy G, Sharma P, Tomkinson H, Masson E, et al. Harnessing metaanalysis to refine an oncology patient population for physiologybased pharmacokinetic modeling of drugs. *Clin Pharmacol Ther* 2017;103:271–80.
 36. Bliss J, Morden J, Evans A, Holcombe C, Horgan K, Mallon E, et al. Abstract P2-05-01: clinico-pathological relationships with Ki67 in POETIC (CRUK/07/015) – critical lessons for assessing Ki67 for prognosis and as a pharmacodynamic marker. *Cancer Res* 2017;77:P2-05-1–P2-1.

Clinical Cancer Research

A Randomized, Open-label, Presurgical, Window-of-Opportunity Study Comparing the Pharmacodynamic Effects of the Novel Oral SERD AZD9496 with Fulvestrant in Patients with Newly Diagnosed ER⁺ HER2⁻ Primary Breast Cancer

John F.R. Robertson, Abigail Evans, Stephan Henschen, et al.

Clin Cancer Res 2020;26:4242-4249. Published OnlineFirst March 31, 2020.

Updated version Access the most recent version of this article at:
doi:[10.1158/1078-0432.CCR-19-3387](https://doi.org/10.1158/1078-0432.CCR-19-3387)

Supplementary Material Access the most recent supplemental material at:
<http://clincancerres.aacrjournals.org/content/suppl/2020/03/31/1078-0432.CCR-19-3387.DC1>

Cited articles This article cites 36 articles, 13 of which you can access for free at:
<http://clincancerres.aacrjournals.org/content/26/16/4242.full#ref-list-1>

E-mail alerts [Sign up to receive free email-alerts](#) related to this article or journal.

Reprints and Subscriptions To order reprints of this article or to subscribe to the journal, contact the AACR Publications Department at pubs@aacr.org.

Permissions To request permission to re-use all or part of this article, use this link
<http://clincancerres.aacrjournals.org/content/26/16/4242>.
Click on "Request Permissions" which will take you to the Copyright Clearance Center's (CCC) Rightslink site.