# **Effect of Amivantamab Dose Interruptions on Efficacy and Safety of First-line Amivantamab Plus Lazertinib in EGFRmutant Advanced NSCLC: Exploratory Analyses From** the MARIPOSA Study

Maria del Rosario Garcia Campelo¹, Byoung Chul Cho², Nicolas Girard³, Shun Lu⁴, Hiroshige Yoshioka⁵, Jong-Seok Lee⁶, Se-Hoon Lee<sup>7</sup>, Baogang Liu<sup>8</sup>, Mehmet Ali Nahit Sendur<sup>9</sup>, Benjamin Besse<sup>10</sup>, Alexander I Spira<sup>11</sup>, Enriqueta Felip<sup>12</sup>, Andres Aguilar<sup>13</sup>, Joshua K Sabari<sup>14</sup>, Sanjay Popat<sup>15</sup>, Parthiv Mahadevia<sup>16</sup>, Seema Sethi<sup>17</sup>, Joshua M Bauml<sup>17</sup>, Yuriy Ostapenko<sup>18</sup>

Republic of Korea; "Samsung Medical Center, Sungkyunkwan University S rra Yildirim Bevazit University. Ankara Bilkent City Hospital. Ankara, Turkev f Medicine, Seoul, Republic of Korea;

# Key Takeaway

Amivantamab + lazertinib represents a new standard of care in patients with first-line epidermal growth factor receptor (EGFR)mutant advanced non-small cell lung cancer (NSCLC)

# Conclusions

Γ.		<ul> <li>``</li> </ul>	
1		٦	
х	ι		
	-	/	

(i)

Approximately half of the patients treated with amivantamab + lazertinib required dose interruptions within the first 4 months

Key skin and gastrointestinal adverse events (AEs) occurred early and diminished over time

• No grade 4 or 5 AEs were reported



Median progression-free survival (PFS) after 4 months was similar between patients with and without dose interruptions

Dose interruptions are a meaningful way to manage AEs without (i) compromising PFS

# Background

- Amivantamab is an EGFR-MET bispecific antibody with immune cell-directing activity<sup>2-4</sup>
- Lazertinib is a central nervous system-penetrant, third-generation EGFR tyrosine kinase inhibitor5
- In MARIPOSA, amivantamab + lazertinib significantly improved PFS versus osimertinib in treatment-naïve, EGFR-mutated advanced NSCLC (Figure 1)1
- Key AEs were highest within the first 4 months7
- The protocol recommended amivantamab dose interruptions for grade ≥2 toxicities
- We evaluated the association of amivantamab dose interruptions within the first 4 months with the efficacy and safety outcomes of amivantamab + lazertinib

# Methods

- Patients with treatment-naïve, EGFR-mutant advanced NSCLC were randomized 2:2:1 to amivantamab + lazertinib (n=429), osimertinib (n=429), or lazertinib (n=216; Figure 2)
- The primary endpoint was PFS by blinded independent central review per RECIST v1.1 for amivantamab + lazertinib versus osimertinib

# Results

### Descriptive analysis of amivantamab dose interruptions

- Among the 421 patients who received  $\geq 1$  dose of amivantamab, 206 (49%) patients had a dose interruption within the first 4 months
- Dose interruption is defined as a skipped dose that is not made up; this population may also include patients who had a dose reduction or drug discontinuation
- Outcomes were similar among patients with and without dose interruptions (Table 1)

## Table 1: Outcomes in patients with and without dose interruptions<sup>a</sup>

Endpoint, median (95% CI)	Dose interruptions within the first 4 months (n=206)	No interruptions within the first 4 months (n=215)	All randomized patients (n=429)
PFS	23.9 mo	23.7 mo	23.7 mo
	(18.5–NE)	(18.4–NE)	(19.1–27.7)
ORR	87%	89%	86%
	(81–91)	(84–93)	(83–89)
DoR among confirmed	25.8 mo	26.1 mo	25.8 mo
responders	(16.7–NE)	(20.1–NE)	(20.1–NE)

scontinued the study, had disease progression, or died within the first 4 months were not evaluated, as they were i point (and the outcome event may occur prior to the dose interruption). terval; DQR, duration of response; NE, not estimable; ORR, objective response rate; PFS, progression-free survival

- However, this analysis measured exposure (interruptions) and outcomes over the same time period, which could lead to bias
- Outcomes, such as progression or death, could occur before dose interruptions, which leads to outcome-based selection bias

## Patients

- 43/421 (10%) patients either discontinued the study, had disease progression, or died prior to 4 months and were not included in this analysis
- Removing patients who died, progressed, or discontinued within the first 4 months avoids outcome-based selection bias between dose-interruption groups
- 188 patients had a dose interruption within the first 4 months and 190 patients did not
- Baseline characteristics were similar between patients with and without dose interruptions (Table 2)
- Among the 188 patients with dose interruptions:
  - Median time to first interruption: 43 days (interquartile range [IQR], 16–72)
  - Among the 94% of patients who resumed amivantamab, the median dose-interruption duration was 22 days (IQR, 14–41)

### Table 2: Demographic and baseline characteristics

Characteristic, n (%)	Dose interruptions within the first 4 months (n=188)	No interruptions within the first 4 months (n=190)	
Median age (range), years	63 (35–86)	62 (24-88)	
Female	120 (64)	120 (63)	
Race		~	
Asian	108 (57)	114 (60)	
Non-Asian	78 (41)	76 (40)	
Unknown	2 (1)	0	
ECOG PS score of 1	122 (65)	127 (67)	
History of smoking	61 (32)	54 (28)	
History of brain metastases	80 (43)	71 (37)	
EGFR mutation type			
Ex19del	101 (54)	124 (65)	
L858R	87 (46)	66 (35)	





# Key AEs

- Key AEs occurred most frequently during the first 4 months and declined over the next 4 months (Figure 3)
- 36–39%; dermatitis acneiform, ~65%; stomatitis, ~80%; decreased appetite, ~89%; peripheral edema, 17–60%; diarrhea, 72–77%
- No grade 4 or 5 AEs were reported

# Figure 3: Prevalence and severity of key AEs over time



Note: The event with the highest toxicity grade experies nced by the patient was reported. AEs were coded using MedDRA v25.

# Association of dose interruptions with PFS

- Median PFS after 4 months was similar between patients with and without dose interruptions (Figure 4)

# Figure 4: PFS with and without dose interruptions



Cho BC, et al. Presented at: European Society for Medical Oncology (ESMO) Congress; October 20–24, 2023; Madrid, Spain. LBA14. 2. Moores S, et al. Cancer Res. 2016;76(13):3942–3953.
 Vijayarajhavan S, et al. Mol Cancer Ther. 2020;19(10):2044–2056. 4. Yun J, et al. Cancer Discov. 2020;10(8):1194–1209. 5. Ahn M–J, et al. Lancet Oncol. 2019;20(12):1681–1690.
 Cho BC, et al. J Thorac Oncol. 2022;17(4):558–567. 7. Spira A, et al. Presented at: North America Conference on Lung Cancer (NACLC); December 1–3, 2023; Chicago, IL, USA.

nding author: Maria del Rosario Garcia Campelo (MA.Rosario.Garcia.Campelo@sergas.es)

The percent decrease observed in key AEs during Months 5 to 8 relative to the first 4 months was as follows: rash, 46–63%; paronychia, 29–39%; hypoalbuminemia

• The PFS hazard ratio by multivariable analysis adjusting for age, Eastern Cooperative Oncology Group performance status score, EGFR mutation type, Asian race, and history of brain metastases was 1.06 (95% Cl, 0.73–1.44), indicating no significant association of dose interruption with PFS after the 4-month exposure period - The multivariate analysis was performed via multivariate Cox proportional hazards model, only including patients who were still at risk of PFS at 4 months