Results 63 pts were randomized to TLPO (n=43) vs TLPLDC (n=20). The TLPO cohort contained more females and received less chemotherapy (0% vs 10%), but otherwise were comparable. There were no differences in DFS (p=0.948) or OS (p=0.779) between the two vaccines (figures 1&2). Comparing the TLPO pts to all other pts in the phase IIb trial [TLPLDC+G-CSF (n=57), TLPLDC-G-CSF (n=46), and placebo (n=41)] the TLPO arm had improved DFS compared to placebo (p=0.019) and TLPLDC-G-CSF (p=0.001), but roughly equivalent to the TLPLDC-G-CSF arm (p=0.276) (figure 3). A similar trend was seen in OS analysis, though differences were not statistically significant (figure 4).

Conclusions TLPO and TLPLDC vaccines (without the use of G-CSF) improve DFS in patients with resected stage III/IV melanoma compared to placebo. The TLPO vaccine may offer advantages via reduced cost and vaccine production time. TLPO should be closely considered for further clinical trials.
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3-YEAR RESULTS OF THE PHASE 2 RANDOMIZED TRIAL FOR TALIMOGENE LAHERPAREPVEC (T-VEC) NEOADJUVANT TREATMENT PLUS SURGERY VS SURGERY IN PATIENTS WITH RESECTABLE STAGE IIIB-IVM1A MELANOMA


Background Neoadjuvant immunotherapies and targeted therapies for advanced melanoma are an active area of investigation. This is the first clinical trial of an approved oncolytic viral immunotherapy as a neoadjuvant treatment in advanced melanoma and the largest randomized controlled neoadjuvant trial including all types of resectable regional metastases to date. Previously published 2-year primary analysis results reported improved recurrence-free survival (RFS, HR 0.66, P=0.038) and overall survival (OS, HR 0.49, P=0.050) for neoadjuvant T-VEC plus surgery vs immediate surgery in resectable stage IIIB-IVM1a melanoma patients. Here, we report the 3-year interim analysis results.

Methods Patients with resectable stage IIIB-IVM1a melanoma and ≥ 1 injectable cutaneous, subcutaneous, or nodal lesions were randomized 1:1 to receive 6 doses/12 weeks of neoadjuvant T-VEC then surgery (Arm 1) vs immediate surgical resection (Arm 2). T-VEC was administered until surgery, no remaining injectable tumors, or intolerance. RFS was defined as time from randomization to the first of local, regional, or distant recurrence, or death, where patients who did not receive surgery were imputed as events at baseline. Key secondary and exploratory endpoints include safety, an RFS sensitivity analysis that censored events at the start of subsequent anticancer therapy, OS, and event-free survival (EFS), defined as time from randomization to disease progression that precludes surgery, or local, regional or distant recurrence post-surgery, or death from any cause, whichever occurs first. All P values are descriptive.

Results As of April 30, 2020, median follow-up for all patients was 41.3 months. For Arm 1 vs. Arm 2, the 3-year KM estimates of RFS were 46.5% vs. 31.0% (HR 0.66, P=0.043). In the RFS sensitivity analysis that removed the potential effect of subsequent anticancer therapy on RFS, the 3-year Kaplan-Meier (KM) estimates of RFS were 49.1% for Arm 1 and 22.9% for Arm 2 (HR 0.60, P=0.022). The 3-year KM estimates of EFS were 50.3% for Arm 1 and 32.7% for Arm 2 (HR 0.58, P=0.015). For OS, the 3-year KM estimates were 83.2% for Arm 1 and 71.6% for Arm 2 (HR 0.54, P=0.061). No new safety signals were detected.

Conclusions At 3-year follow up, we continued to observe improved RFS and OS and observed improved EFS with neoadjuvant T-VEC plus surgery compared with surgery alone. These results build upon the prior 2-year results to support the treatment effect of neoadjuvant T-VEC on advanced resectable melanoma. The final analysis will occur at 5 years.
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TALIMOGENE LAHERPAREPVEC (T-VEC) IN COMBINATION WITH IPILOMUB (IPI) VERSUS IPI ALONE FOR ADVANCED MELANOMA: 4-YEAR INTERIM ANALYSIS OF A RANDOMIZED, OPEN-LABEL, PHASE 2 TRIAL


Background This is the first randomized trial evaluating an oncolytic virus with an immune checkpoint inhibitor in...
advanced melanoma. Improved objective response rate (ORR) was observed for T-VEC plus IPI compared to IPI alone (39% vs. 18%; OR 2.9; 95% CI, 1.5–5.5; P=0.002).\(^1\) At 3-year follow-up, median OS was not reached in either arm (HR, 0.85; 95% CI, 0.55–1.32; \(P=0.480\)).\(^2\) Here we present 4-year interim analysis results including BRAF V600 mutation subgroup analysis.

Methods Patients with unresectable or metastatic (IIIB-IV) melanoma were randomized 1:1 to receive T-VEC plus IPI or IPI alone. T-VEC was injected day 1, week 1, at 106 PFU/mL, followed by 108 PFU/mL on day 1, week 4, and Q2W there after. IPI (3 mg/kg) was given Q3W starting day 1, week 6, up to 4 doses, for T-VEC arm; day 1, week 1 for IPI alone. Response was assessed per immune-related response criteria (irRC) Q12W until disease progression. The primary endpoint was ORR; key secondary endpoints were overall survival (OS), progression-free survival (PFS), durable response rate (DRR), and safety (NCT01740297).

Results A total of 198 patients (98 combination, 100 IPI alone) were randomized. As of February 25, 2020, median follow-up was 48.3 months for combination and 35.7 months for IPI alone. DRR improved for combination vs. IPI (33.7% vs. 13.0%; OR 3.4; 95% CI, 1.7–7.0; \(P=0.001\)). Median PFS was 13.5 months with combination and 6.4 months with IPI (HR 0.81; 95% CI, 0.57–1.15; \(P=0.23\)). Median OS was not reached for combination and was 50.1 months for IPI (HR 0.82; 95% CI, 0.54–1.25; \(P=0.36\)). For combination, 47 (48.0%) patients received subsequent anti-cancer therapy vs. 64 (64.0%) for IPI; median time from randomization to first subsequent therapy was 27.7 months and 8.3 months, respectively. In subgroup analysis, patients without BRAF V600 mutation (63% combination, 60% IPI) improved DRR and PFS for combination vs. IPI alone (DRR: 33.9% vs. 5.0%; median PFS: 18.0 months vs. 4.5 months); BRAF V600 mutation positive patients (36% combination, 34% IPI) were similar between arms (DRR: 34.3% vs. 26.5%; median PFS: 4.2 months vs. 6.4 months). No additional safety signals observed in follow-up.

Conclusions The improved PFS and DRR for the combination arm at 4-year follow-up indicates continued benefit of combination therapy. Patients receiving IPI alone were more likely to receive subsequent anti-cancer therapy in a shorter time. Subsequent anticancer therapies may confound OS analysis. The BRAF mutant post-hoc analysis requires further mechanistic investigation.
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