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MODULE 1: Checkpoint Inhibitor Therapy for Microsatellite Instability (MSI)-High and Microsatellite-Stable (MSS) Endometrial Cancer
Endometrial Cancer (EC) – Four molecular subtypes
(Integrated genomic, transcriptomic and proteomic characterization)

- POLE ultra-mutated (15x > vs MSI)
- MSI hyper-mutated (8x > vs MSS)
- Copy number low - endometrioid - (MSS group)
- Copy number high - serous-like -

GOG 210 Endometrioid (Cosgrove 2018)

Incidence: 49% CNS, 4% POLE mutant, 39% MMR deficient, 8% copy number altered (CNA).
Cancer-specific mortality: 5%=CNS ; 2.6% =POLE tumors; 7.6% =MMR deficient tumors; 19% with CNA tumors.
POLE mutant and MSI-high resemble melanoma in mutation prevalence

Alexandrov et al, Nature 2013
All Patients with Endometrial Cancer Should be Tested for dMMR!

- PCR Assay for selected PolyA microsatellites
- MLH1/PMS2 and MSH2/MSH6 IHC
- 5% false positive and negative rate
### Checkpoint Inhibitors Have Shown Activity in Endometrial Cancer, Particularly in MSI-H Tumors

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fader et al&lt;sup&gt;1&lt;/sup&gt;</th>
<th>KEYNOTE-028&lt;sup&gt;2&lt;/sup&gt;</th>
<th>NCT01375842&lt;sup&gt;3&lt;/sup&gt;</th>
<th>NCT02501096&lt;sup&gt;4&lt;/sup&gt;</th>
<th>GARNET&lt;sup&gt;5&lt;/sup&gt;</th>
<th>Pooled MSI-H&lt;sup&gt;6&lt;/sup&gt;</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Phase(s)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1b</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Population</td>
<td>Previously treated dMMR, recurrent/ persistent EC</td>
<td>Previously treated LA/metastatic PD-L1 positive EC</td>
<td>Recurrent EC</td>
<td>Advanced EC</td>
<td>Previously treated recurrent/advanced MSI-H EC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patients, n</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Treatment</td>
<td>Pembrolizumab</td>
<td>Pembrolizumab</td>
<td>Atezolizumab + lenvatinib</td>
<td>Pembrolizumab</td>
<td>Pembrolizumab</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ORR, %</td>
<td>56&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt; (criteria not specified)</td>
<td>13.0&lt;sup&gt;a,b&lt;/sup&gt; (RECIST v1.1)</td>
<td>13 (RECIST v1.1)</td>
<td>39.6&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt; (irRECIST)</td>
<td>39.6&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt; (irRECIST)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DCR, %</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>26.0</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>86.8</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DOR</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>NE</td>
<td>NE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mPFS</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>1.8 mo</td>
<td>1.4 mo</td>
<td>7.4 mo</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mOS</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>9.6 mo</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>NR&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Safety summary</td>
<td>No AEs Gr &gt;3</td>
<td>Gr ≥3 TRAEs: 16.7%</td>
<td>Gr ≥3 TRAEs: 47%</td>
<td>Gr ≥3 TRAEs: 70%</td>
<td>Gr ≥3 TRAEs: 70%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Median follow-up</td>
<td>9.1 mo</td>
<td>76.2 wk</td>
<td>Min: 11.2 mo</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<sup>a</sup> Indicates ongoing response. <sup>b</sup> Primary endpoint. <sup>c</sup> Efficacy analysis included 23 patients. <sup>d</sup> Data pooled across 5 trials; these data led to approval of pembrolizumab for advanced or unresectable MSI-H/dMMR tumors. <sup>e</sup> Major efficacy outcome.

AE, adverse event; DCR, disease control rate; dMMR, deficient mismatch repair; DOR, duration of response; EC, endometrial cancer; Gr, grade; irRECIST, immune-related RECIST; LA, locally advanced; Min, minimum; mOS, median overall survival; mPFS, median progression-free survival; MSI-H, high microsatellite instability; NR, not reached; ORR, overall response rate; RECIST, Response Evaluation Criteria In Solid Tumors; TRAE, treatment-related adverse event.
Lenvatinib and Pembrolizumab in Patients With Advanced Endometrial Cancer

Key Eligibility Criteria
- Aged ≥18 years
- Pathologically confirmed and metastatic endometrial carcinoma
- ≤2 Prior systemic therapies
- Measurable disease by irRECIST
- ECOG performance status ≤1
- Life expectancy ≥12 weeks

Lenvatinib
20 mg/day (oral) + Pembrolizumab
200 mg Q3W (IV)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response Category</th>
<th>Total (n = 108)</th>
<th>Not MSI-H or dMMR (n = 94)</th>
<th>MSI-H/dMMR (n = 11)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Best overall response, n (%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Complete response</td>
<td>11 (10.2)</td>
<td>10 (10.6)</td>
<td>1 (9.1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Partial response</td>
<td>33 (30.6)</td>
<td>26 (27.7)</td>
<td>6 (54.5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stable disease</td>
<td>42 (38.9)</td>
<td>38 (40.4)</td>
<td>3 (27.3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Progressive disease</td>
<td>14 (13.0)</td>
<td>12 (12.8)</td>
<td>1 (9.1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not evaluable</td>
<td>8 (7.4)</td>
<td>8 (8.5)</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Objective response rate (complete response + partial response), n (%)</td>
<td>44 (40.7)</td>
<td>36 (38.3)</td>
<td>7 (63.6)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Makker V, et al. Presented at ESMO Annual Meeting
Lenvatinib/Pembro: Challenges

- > 50% HTN, fatigue, diarrhea
- Grade 3 toxicities HTN (34%) and diarrhea (8%)
- HTN develops quickly
- 60% of patients had dose reduction of lenvatinib
- Average dose 14 mg
Dostarlimab TSR-042

• A humanized monoclonal antibody directed against the negative immunoregulatory human cell surface receptor programmed cell death 1 (PD-1; programmed death-1),
• IgG4
• Dosing 1000 mg every 6 weeks
• Toxicities similar to other immune checkpoint inhibitors
GARNET Study: Best Overall Tumor Response

Dostarlimab demonstrated clinically meaningful response rates regardless of MSI status, with an ORR of 30%, 49% in the MSI-H cohort, and 20% in the MSS cohort.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Best Overall Response</th>
<th>MSI-H EC (n=41)</th>
<th>MSS EC (n=79)</th>
<th>MSI status unknown (n=5)</th>
<th>Total (N=125)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Overall response rate</td>
<td>n (%) (95% CI)</td>
<td>20 (49%) (32.9, 64.9)</td>
<td>16 (20%) (12.0, 30.8)</td>
<td>1 (20%) (0.5, 71.6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Complete response</td>
<td>n (%)</td>
<td>2 (49%)</td>
<td>4 (5.1%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Partial response</td>
<td>n (%)</td>
<td>181 (43.9%)</td>
<td>12 (15.2%)</td>
<td>1 (20.0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disease control rated</td>
<td>% (95% CI)</td>
<td>63.4% (46.9, 77.9)</td>
<td>46.8% (35.5, 58.4)</td>
<td>60.0% (147, 94.7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Response ongoing</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>85.0%</td>
<td>81.3%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Based on central testing, MSI status could not be determined; 17 confirmed and 1 still on treatment and yet to be confirmed; 11 confirmed and 1 still on treatment and yet to be confirmed; irCR: immune-related complete response; irPR: immune-related partial response; irSD: immune-related stable disease; uirPR: unconfirmed immunerelated partial response. CI: confidence interval.

Data extract date: January 21, 2019.

Oaknin A et al. SGO 2019;Abstract 33.
In general, what treatment would you recommend for a patient with **microsatellite-stable (MSS)** metastatic endometrial cancer who experienced disease progression on carboplatin/paclitaxel?

- **Lenvatinib/pembrolizumab**: 22
- **Test for PD-L1 combined positive score (CPS) and administer pembrolizumab if 1% or higher**: 1
- **Cisplatin/doxorubicin**: 1
- **Doxorubicin**: 1
In general, what treatment would you recommend for a patient with microsatellite-stable (MSS) metastatic endometrial cancer who experienced disease progression on carboplatin/paclitaxel?

- Test for PD-L1 combined positive score (CPS) and administer pembrolizumab if 1% or higher: 26%
- Lenvatinib/pembrolizumab: 24%
- Carboplatin/docetaxel: 22%
- Pembrolizumab: 15%
- Cisplatin/doxorubicin: 9%
- Other: 4%

Survey of general medical and gynecologic oncologists, May 2020
In general, what treatment would you recommend for a patient with high microsatellite instability (MSI-H) metastatic endometrial cancer who experienced disease progression on carboplatin/paclitaxel?

Pembrolizumab

24 Gynecologic oncologists

Medical oncologists
In general, what treatment would you recommend for a patient with high microsatellite instability (MSI-H) metastatic endometrial cancer who experienced disease progression on carboplatin/paclitaxel?

- Pembrolizumab: 57%
- Lenvatinib/pembrolizumab: 30%
- Carboplatin/docetaxel: 11%
- Cisplatin/doxorubicin: 2%

Survey of general medical and gynecologic oncologists, May 2020
For a patient with **MSI-H** metastatic endometrial cancer, outside of a clinical trial setting and regulatory and reimbursement issues aside, what is the earliest point at which you would introduce an anti-PD-1/PD-L1 antibody?

First line: 10

Second line: 14
What dose and schedule of pembrolizumab are you currently administering to your patients with metastatic endometrial cancer?

- 200 mg every 3 weeks: 12 respondents
- 400 mg every 6 weeks: 13 respondents
Dr Birrer: Case – MSI-high Endometrial Cancer

• 51 year old with G2 EMCA → CT scan negative for metastatic disease
• RTLH/BSO/LND → Stage IIIC2 (positive pelvic/paraaortic lymph nodes)
• Adjuvant treatment: carbo/paclitaxel x 6 cycles followed by whole pelvic xRT
• Post treatment scan: NED
• 12 month f/u visit – CT scan shows intra-abdominal recurrence
• She was treated with anti-PD-1 single agent
Dr Birrer: Case – MSS Endometrial Cancer

- 41 year old biopsy proven G3 EMCA \(\rightarrow\) CT scan negative for metastatic disease \(\rightarrow\) proceed with surgery
- Surgery: RTLH/BSO/blSLND \(\rightarrow\) Stage IIIC1 (positive pelvic lymph node)
- Adjuvant treatment: carbo/paclitaxel x 6 cycles
- Post treatment scan: NED
- 3 f/u month visit – she is in pain, frequent nausea \(\rightarrow\) CT scan
Dr Birrer: Case – MSS (cont’d)

• Biopsy done → metastatic high-grade carcinoma consistent with known uterine primary
• IHC: ER neg
• NGS: amplification of AKT2, FGFR1, CCNE, MSI-S, TMB low
• Started her on Lenvatinib/pembro
• Developed HTN controlled by two anti-HTNs; grade 2 diarrhea—dose reduced to 14 mg lenvatinib
• Re-scan after 4 months
MODULE 2: Current Indications for and Future Role of Immune Checkpoint Inhibitors in Cervical Cancer
## Efficacy and Safety of Pembrolizumab in Previously Treated Advanced Cervical Cancer: Results From the Phase II KEYNOTE-158 Study


### PD-L1+ Cohort (CPS ≥ 1)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ENDPOINT</th>
<th>N=77</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ORR (95% CI)</td>
<td>14.3% (7.4 - 24.1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Complete response</td>
<td>2.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Partial response</td>
<td>11.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Median duration (mos)</td>
<td>Not reached (4.1 - 18.6+)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% with duration ≥ 6 mos</td>
<td>91%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Median follow-up (mos)</td>
<td>11.7 (0.6 – 22.7)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**COMBINED POSITIVE SCORE:**

PD-L1+ cells (tumor cells, lymphocytes, macrophages)

Total number of tumor cells x 100
US FDA Accelerated Approval of Pembrolizumab
First Immunotherapy Approved for Cervical Cancer (June 12, 2018)

FDA approves pembrolizumab for advanced cervical cancer with disease progression during or after chemotherapy

On June 12, 2018, the Food and Drug Administration approved pembrolizumab for patients with recurrent or metastatic cervical cancer with disease progression on or after chemotherapy whose tumors express PD-L1 (CPS ≥1) as determined by an FDA-approved test.

Pembrolizumab was investigated in 98 patients with recurrent or metastatic cervical cancer enrolled in a single cohort of KEYNOTE 158 (NCT02628067), a multicenter, non-randomized, open-label, multi-cohort trial. Patients were treated with pembrolizumab intravenously at a dose of 200 mg every 3 weeks until unacceptable toxicity or documented disease progression. Among the 98 patients, approval was based on 77 (79%) patients who had tumors that expressed PD-L1 with a CPS ≥1 and who had received at least one line of chemotherapy for metastatic disease. PD-L1 status was determined using the PD-L1 IHC 22C3 pharmDx Kit.

BEATcc
Phase III Randomized Frontline Trial of Atezolizumab (anti-PD-L1)

• Primary Stage IVB, persistent or recurrent carcinoma of the cervix
• Measurable disease by RECIST v1.1
• ECOG-PS: 0-1
• No previous systemic chemotherapy for advanced or recurrent disease
• N=404 pts

R 1:1

Cisplatin + paclitaxel + bevacizumab (GOG#240) until disease progression, unacceptable toxicity, death or withdrawal of consent

Cisplatin + paclitaxel + bevacizumab + atezolizumab until disease progression, unacceptable toxicity, death or withdrawal of consent

Primary Endpoints:
Overall survival (OS)

Secondary Endpoints:
• PFS
• ORR
• DOR
• Safety
• HR-QOL

Stratification Factors:
- Prior concurrent Cisplatin-RDT
- Histology: SCC vs ADK (including AdenoSquamous)
- Chemotherapy Backbone: Cisplatin vs Carboplatin

Safety run-in cohort: 12 pts after 2 cycles of treatment

ClinicalTrials.gov Identifier: NCT03556839
Checkpoint Inhibition

Key Concepts

Endocrinopathies

Abscopal effect of hypofractionated radiotherapy

Minion LE, Tewari KS. Gynecol Oncol 2018;148:609-21.
In general, what would be your preferred first-line therapy for a patient with MSS metastatic cervical cancer who has received no prior systemic treatment?

- Cisplatin/paclitaxel/bevacizumab: 18
- Carboplatin/paclitaxel/bevacizumab: 5
- Carboplatin/paclitaxel: 2

Gynecologic oncologists: [Filled 18 times]
Medical oncologists: [Filled 2 times]
In general, what would be your preferred first-line therapy for a patient with MSS metastatic cervical cancer who has received no prior systemic treatment?

- Cisplatin/paclitaxel/bevacizumab: 28%
- Carboplatin/paclitaxel: 22%
- Carboplatin/paclitaxel/bevacizumab: 19%
- Cisplatin/paclitaxel: 15%
- Test for PD-L1 CPS and administer pembrolizumab if 1% or higher: 6%
- Other: 10%

Survey of general medical and gynecologic oncologists, May 2020
In general, what would be your preferred first-line therapy for a patient with MSS metastatic cervical cancer who experienced relapse 12 months after receiving cisplatin-based chemoradiation therapy for Stage IIIb disease?

Carboplatin/paclitaxel/bevacizumab

Cisplatin/paclitaxel/bevacizumab

Gynecologic oncologists: 23
Medical oncologists: 2
In general, what would be your preferred first-line therapy for a patient with MSS metastatic cervical cancer who experienced relapse 12 months after receiving cisplatin-based chemoradiation therapy for Stage IIIB disease?

- Test for PD-L1 CPS and administer pembrolizumab if 1% or higher: 30%
- Carboplatin/paclitaxel/bevacizumab: 30%
- Carboplatin/paclitaxel: 28%
- Pembrolizumab: 7%
- Other chemotherapy: 5%

Survey of general medical and gynecologic oncologists, May 2020
In general, what would be your preferred second-line therapy for a patient with MSS metastatic cervical cancer who experienced disease progression on carboplatin/paclitaxel/bevacizumab?

- **Test for PD-L1 CPS and administer pembrolizumab if 1% or higher**: 20 votes
- **Pembrolizumab**: 1 vote
- **Other**: 4 votes

Gynecologic oncologists: 20 votes
Medical oncologists: 4 votes
Dr Tewari: Case 1 – Recurrent Cervical Cancer

• 36 year old Caucasian married mother of two small children, living in rural Georgia
• PMH unremarkable
• Screening – sporadic cervical cancer screening 2014-2019
• 2018
  • Post-coital vaginal bleeding (hemoglobin 9.5 mg/dL), dyspareunia, pelvic pain
  • 5 cm friable cervical lesion biopsied: poorly differentiated squamous cell carcinoma (SCCA)
  • PET/CT: FIGO stage IB3 SCCA cervix
• Management:
  • Cisplatin-based chemoradiation (40 mg/m² BSA weekly with 50.4 Gy IMRT) plus high-dose-rate intracavitary brachytherapy for total dose 85 Gy to Point A
  • Missed 8 radiotherapy sessions due to transportation issues
  • Complete clinical response
Dr Tewari: Case 1 (cont’d) – Recurrent Cervical Cancer

• 2019
  • Presents 14 months following chemoradiation with severe pelvic and right flank pain
  • Cachetic, unable to work as a medical assistant, confined to her apartment [ECOG PS 2]
  • Pelvic examination – large, fixed mass with right pelvic side wall extension
  • PET/CT: large necrotic pelvic mass, right hydronephrosis; CT-guided bx confirms pulmonary metastasis of SCCA cervix
  • Serum creatinine = 1.7 mg/dL
  • Travel limited by geography
  • Management:
    • Moore score = 3
    • Percutaneous right nephrostomy and anterograde right ureteral placement
    • Ensure® (3 cans/day)
    • Carboplatin (AUC 6) + Paclitaxel (175 mg/m² BSA) + Bevacizumab (15 mg/kg) x 7 cycles
    • Complete clinical response
Dr Tewari: Case 1 (cont’d) – Recurrent Cervical Cancer

• 2020
  • Presents with left supraclavicular lymphadenopathy and mild hemoptysis
  • PET/CT
    • Supraclavicular node (SUV 12)
    • Bilateral pulmonary metastasis measuring 2 cm and 4 cm (SUV 6-9)
  • CT-guided bx confirms recurrent disease
  • PD-L1+
    • Combined Positive Score = 16
  • Management:
    • Pembrolizumab 200 mg IV q3 wks (January – February 2020)
    • Surveillance PET/CT (March 2020) demonstrates pulmonary metastases enlarged
    • Pembrolizumab 200 mg IV q3 wks (March – April 2020)
    • Surveillance PET/CT (May 2020) demonstrates partial response (pseudo-progression)
    • Pembrolizumab 400 mg IV q6 wks (begins May 2020 per COVID-19 US FDA guidance)
      • Hypothyroidism managed with thyroid hormone supplementation
Dr Tewari: Case 2 – Metastatic Cervical Cancer

- 45 y/o Hispanic married mother of four, housekeeper
- Lives in Orange County, CA
- Lack of access to healthcare (no prior cervical cancer screening)
- Presents with vaginal bleeding and pelvic pain [ECOG PS = 1]
- Physical exam notable for cervical expansion with tumor eroding into the proximal third of the vagina
  - Biopsy confirms adenocarcinoma
- PET/CT demonstrates para-aortic metastases (SUV 8)
- Referred to the University of California, Irvine NCI-Designated Comprehensive Cancer Center
- Management:
  - Screened and enrolled on KEYNOTE-826; still remains on trial and appears to be doing well
  - Randomized to cisplatin (50 mg/m² BSA) + paclitaxel (175 mg/m² BSA) + bevacizumab (15 mg/kg) plus/minus pembrolizumab 200 mg/placebo q21 days
MODULE 3: Current and Potential Role of Immune Checkpoint Inhibitor Therapy in Ovarian Cancer Management
FDA-approved indications for immunotherapy in ovarian cancer

- Pembrolizumab: 2017 FDA approval for **MSI-high/MMR deficient cancers**
- The incidence of germline MMR gene mutations in high grade serous cancers is 1-8%
- MMR deficiency is more common in non-serous ovarian cancer

**2020 ASCO ovarian cancer genetics guidelines re MMR testing:**

- Women diagnosed with clear cell, endometrioid, or mucinous ovarian cancer should be offered somatic tumor testing for mismatch repair deficiency
- Testing for MMR deficiency may be offered to women diagnosed with other histologic types of epithelial ovarian cancer


Murphy MA Cancer 2011
Possible ways to improve the effectiveness of immune checkpoint inhibition in ovarian cancer

• Combination with other agents
  ❖ Cytotoxic agents
  ❖ Targeted agents
  ❖ Other immune checkpoint inhibitors
  ❖ Antiangiogenic therapies
FIRST Trial of Dostarlimab (TSR-042)

ClinicalTrials.gov Identifier: NCT03602859

N= 720-960
Newly diagnosed advanced ovarian cancer

Cycle 1 Carboplatin-Paclitaxel

RANDOMIZATION 1:1:2

Arm-1
Carboplatin-Paclitaxel
+ I.V. placebo
± bevacizumab

Placebo
(oral and I.V.)
± bevacizumab

Arm-2
Carboplatin-Paclitaxel
+ I.V. placebo
± bevacizumab

Niraparib
+ I.V. placebo
± bevacizumab

Arm-3
Carboplatin-Paclitaxel
+ TS0-042
± bevacizumab

Niraparib
+ TS0-042
± bevacizumab

*I.V. placebo up to 15 months in total

Primary endpoint: PFS
Secondary endpoints: ORR, DOR, DCR, PROs, TFST, TSST, PFS2, OS
Niraparib and Pembrolizumab Resulted in Clinical Activity Across a Broad Study Population

Table 3. ORR Subgroup Analysis in the Efficacy-Evaluable Population

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Patient Subgroup</th>
<th>No./Total No. of Patients</th>
<th>ORR, % (90% CI)a</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All</td>
<td>11/60</td>
<td>18 (11-29)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Platinum status</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resistant</td>
<td>6/29</td>
<td>21 (9-37)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Refractory</td>
<td>2/16</td>
<td>13 (2-34)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not applicableb</td>
<td>3/15</td>
<td>20 (6-44)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prior lines of therapy²</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-2</td>
<td>7/25</td>
<td>28 (14-46)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>≥3</td>
<td>4/35</td>
<td>11 (4-24)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prior bevacizumab use</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>7/37</td>
<td>19 (9-33)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>4/23</td>
<td>17 (6-36)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tBRCA statusc</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tBRCAAmut</td>
<td>2/11</td>
<td>18 (3-47)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tBRCAnwt</td>
<td>9/47</td>
<td>19 (10-31)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PD-L1 status</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Positive</td>
<td>7/33</td>
<td>21 (10-36)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negative</td>
<td>2/21</td>
<td>10 (2-27)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HRD status²</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HRD positive</td>
<td>3/12</td>
<td>14 (4-33)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HRD negative</td>
<td>6/32</td>
<td>19 (9-34)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Abbreviations: HRD, homologous recombination deficiency; ORR, objective response rate; PD-L1, programmed death-ligand 1; tBRCA, tumor BRCA; tBRCAAmut, tumor BRCA mutation; tBRCAnwt, tumor BRCA wild type.

a Includes only confirmed responses using Response Evaluation Criteria in Solid Tumors, version 1.1.

b Includes patients with an interval free of platinum-based chemotherapy of at least 180 days but unable to receive further platinum-based chemotherapy (owing to toxic effects or allergic reaction).

c For pooled analysis, neoadjuvant therapy, adjuvant therapy, and the combination of both were considered to be 1 line of therapy. Small molecules, hormonal agents, and bevacizumab were not counted in the lines of therapy.

d Only patients with known biomarker status were included.

Now open....

A Phase 2 Open-Label, Single-Arm Study to Evaluate the Efficacy and Safety of the Combination of Niraparib and Dostarlimab (TSR-042) in Patients With Platinum Resistant Ovarian Cancer (MOONSTONE)

ClinicalTrials.gov Identifier: NCT03955471
Do you generally evaluate microsatellite instability status in your patients with advanced ovarian cancer?

Yes: 12 Gynecologic oncologists

No: 13 Medical oncologists
Do you generally evaluate microsatellite instability status in your patients with advanced ovarian cancer?

- Yes: 69%
- No: 31%

Survey of general medical and gynecologic oncologists, May 2020
How would you respond to a patient with MSI-H metastatic endometrial cancer who is about to begin treatment with pembrolizumab and asks you to estimate the chance that during the first year of treatment she will…

- **"Sail through" treatment**: 65% (Gyn Oncs) vs 65% (Med Oncs)
- **Experience side effects that require drug to be held**: 21% (Gyn Oncs) vs 25% (Med Oncs)
- **Experience side effects that require discontinuation**: 14% (Gyn Oncs) vs 10% (Med Oncs)
How would you respond to a patient with MSI-H metastatic endometrial cancer who is about to begin treatment with pembrolizumab and asks you to estimate the chance that during the first year of treatment she will...

- Develop immune-related colitis that requires clinical management
  - Gyn Oncs: 8%
  - Med Oncs: 10%
- Develop immune-related pneumonitis that requires clinical management
  - Gyn Oncs: 7%
  - Med Oncs: 3%
- Develop immune-related neurologic side effects that require clinical management
  - Gyn Oncs: 3%
  - Med Oncs: 2%
How would you respond to a patient with MSS metastatic endometrial cancer who is about to begin treatment with \textit{lenvatinib/pembrolizumab} and asks you to estimate the chance that during the first year of treatment she will ...

- "Sail through" treatment: 18% (Gyn Oncs), 10% (Med Oncs)
- Experience side effects that lead to dose reduction: 73% (Gyn Oncs), 77% (Med Oncs)
- Experience side effects that require discontinuation: 21% (Gyn Oncs), 30% (Med Oncs)
How would you respond to a patient with MSS metastatic endometrial cancer who is about to begin treatment with lenvatinib/pembrolizumab and asks you to estimate the chance that during the first year of treatment she will...

- Develop hypertension that requires clinical management: Gyn Oncs 52%, Med Oncs 65%
- Develop gastrointestinal toxicity that requires clinical management: Gyn Oncs 36%, Med Oncs 50%
For a patient with MSI-H metastatic endometrial cancer and Crohn’s disease well controlled with infliximab, regulatory and reimbursement issues aside, what is the earliest point at which you would introduce an anti-PD-1/PD-L1 antibody?

- **First line**: 1
- **Second line**: 5
- **Third line or beyond**: 4
- **I would not use an anti-PD-1/PD-L1 antibody for this patient**: 14

- **Gynecologic oncologists**: Yellow
- **Medical oncologists**: White
For a patient with MSI-H metastatic endometrial cancer and Crohn’s disease well controlled with infliximab, regulatory and reimbursement issues aside, what is the earliest point at which you would introduce an anti-PD-1/PD-L1 antibody?

- First line: 17%
- Second line: 22%
- Third line or beyond: 17%
- I would not use an anti-PD-1/PD-L1 antibody for this patient: 44%

Survey of general medical and gynecologic oncologists, May 2020
For a patient with **MSI-H metastatic endometrial cancer** and **mild psoriasis not requiring active treatment**, regulatory and reimbursement issues aside, what is the earliest point at which you would introduce an anti-PD-1/PD-L1 antibody?

- **First line**: 1
- **Second line**: 20
- **Third line or beyond**: 2
- **I would not use an anti-PD-1/PD-L1 antibody for this patient**: 2
For a patient with MSI-H metastatic endometrial cancer and mild psoriasis not requiring active treatment, regulatory and reimbursement issues aside, what is the earliest point at which you would introduce an anti-PD-1/PD-L1 antibody?

- First line: 17%
- Second line: 50%
- Third line or beyond: 26%
- I would not use an anti-PD-1/PD-L1 antibody for this patient: 7%

Survey of general medical and gynecologic oncologists, May 2020
Dr Mautlonis Case: 74 yo WF

2011: diagnosed with advanced ovarian cancer, high grade serous, received 6 cycles of carbo/paclitaxel IV

2014: recurrence, surgery, and received 3 cycles of IP cisplatin and IV/IP paclitaxel followed by 3 cycles of carboplatin and paclitaxel IV

2016: recurrence and received single agent carboplatin IV

CT after 3 cycles showed PD

2017: went on trial 16-257 (NCT02865811), PLD and pembrolizumab; off study in 2019 because of 2 year mark for pembro (per study, pembro max is 2 years) and continued doxorubicin alone
Dr Matulonis Case: 65 yo WF

2017: Presented with chronic lower back pain and found to RTP adenopathy and bilateral adnexal masses

Underwent optimal cytoreductive surgery; stage IIIC HGSC (BRCA wild type)

Receives 6 cycles of carbo/paclitaxel

9 months later – recurrence with adenopathy and peritoneal disease on CT, elevated CA125, carbo/PLD

CA125 starts to rise during cycle 5, and CT shows PD

18-303 March 2019: OPAL, TSR-042, niraparib, and bev (NCT03574779)

Required DR to 200 of niraparib, PR after 4 cycles

Developed covid19 in April 2020 (exposed to +family member in same house), hospitalized and now recovering
MODULE 4: Novel Targeted Agents and Strategies Under Investigation for Gynecologic Cancers
Rationale for targeting Tissue Factor

- TF is normally ubiquitously present in the sub-endothelium.
- In tumors TF is co-opted to promote tumor initiated thrombosis and cancer metastasis.
Mechanism of action of tisotumab vedotin

• Tissue factor (TF) is aberrantly expressed in a broad range of solid tumours, including cervical cancer,¹ ² and TF expression has been associated with higher tumour stage and grade, higher metastatic burden and poor prognosis²

• TF expression in cervical cancer makes TF a novel target for patients with cervical cancer

• ADC targets TF
  • Monoclonal Antibody targets TF
  • Payload: Microtubule disrupting MMAE

• Allowing for direct cytotoxicity and bystander killing, as well as antibody-dependent cellular cytotoxicity³,⁴

Background - innovaTV 201 Study Design

Tisotumab Vedotin first studied in multiple solid tumors, with specific expansion cohort in Cervical Cancer

- innovaTV 201 is a first-in-human, open-label, single-arm, phase I/IIa dose-escalating (3+3 design) and expansion study of TV in patients with locally advanced or metastatic solid tumors known to express TF

- Patients with clinical benefit (stable disease [SD] or better) at the end of 4 cycles had the option to continue TV for up to 8 additional cycles (12 cycles total) or until disease progression or unacceptable toxicity. After 12 cycles, patients with clinical benefit could continue in an extension study (NCT03245736)

**Dose-Escalation Phase**
TV 0.3-2.2 mg/kg IV Q3W  
N=27
- Cervical
- Bladder
- Endometrial
- Oesophageal
- NSCLC
- SCCHN
- Ovarian
- Prostate

**Dose-Expansion Phase**
TV 2.0 mg/kg IV Q3W  
N=168
- Cervical (n=55)
  - Bladder (n=15)
  - Endometrial (n=14)
  - Oesophageal (n=15)
  - NSCLC (n=15)
  - Ovarian (n=36)
  - Prostate (n=18)

**Cervical Cohort (N=55)**

- **Primary Endpoint:** Safety and Tolerability
- **Selected Secondary Endpoint:** Investigator-assessed ORR by RECIST v1.1

---

**IV, intravenous; NSCLC, non–small-cell lung cancer; Q3W, every 3 weeks; RECIST, Response Evaluation Criteria In Solid Tumours; SCCHN, squamous cell carcinoma of the head and neck.**

*aSubjects were enrolled into cohorts at increasing dose levels of TV in 21-day treatment cycles. bThe SCCHN cohort was closed by a protocol amendment due to an event of pharyngeal tumour haemorrhage with fatal outcome. The event was deemed to be most likely related to the disease itself. cIn phase II, ovarian and cervical cohorts were expanded to include more patients based on preliminary efficacy observed in the first 14 patients enrolled. dAE severity graded per Common Terminology Criteria for Adverse Events [CTCAE] v4.0. eComputed tomography or magnetic resonance imaging was performed at baseline and every 6 weeks during the study for tumour assessments.**

50% (17 of 34 patients; 95% CI, 35%-65%) achieved clinical benefit after 12 weeks (DCR)

32% (11 of 34 patients; 95% CI, 17%-50%) achieved response (ORR)

- 8 PR, confirmed
- 3 PR, unconfirmed

CI=confidence interval; CR=complete response; CT=computed tomography; DCR=disease control rate; ORR=overall response rate; PD=progressive disease; PR=partial response; RECIST=Response Evaluation Criteria in Solid Tumors; SD=stable disease.

Two patients were withdrawn prior to CT scan, and so are not represented in the graph. PD due to new lesion at same scan. Clinical benefit was defined as the DCR rate, the proportion of patients who achieved a CR, PR, or SD after 12 weeks. Response was as assessed by investigators using standard RECIST 1.1 criteria. One of which is still ongoing. Data cutoff date July 24, 2017.

innovaTV 201 – Adverse events of special interest

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AEOSI Term</th>
<th>N=34</th>
<th></th>
<th>Any Grade, n (%)</th>
<th>Grade ≥3, n (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>N=34</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N=34</td>
<td></td>
<td>Any Grade, n (%)</td>
<td>Grade ≥3, n (%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ocular (any)(^a)</td>
<td>18 (53%)</td>
<td></td>
<td>1 (3%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conjunctivitis</td>
<td>17 (50%)</td>
<td></td>
<td>1 (3%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conjunctivitis scar</td>
<td>1 (3%)</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conjunctivitis viral</td>
<td>1 (3%)</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conjunctival ulceration</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Keratitis</td>
<td>1 (3%)</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ulcerative keratitis</td>
<td>2 (6%)</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Symblepharon</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neuropathy (any)</td>
<td>12 (35%)</td>
<td></td>
<td>2 (6%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

AEOSI = adverse events of special interest.

\(^a\)Most patients who experienced other events than conjunctivitis also experienced conjunctivitis.

innovaTV 205 (GOG 3024): Recurrent or Metastatic Cervical Cancer

**Treatment Setting**
- Disease progression on or after standard-of-care therapy (2L+)
- No prior systemic treatment (1L)
- Disease progression on or after 1–2 prior systemic therapies (2L–3L)

**Dose-Escalation Phase**
- **Arm A**: Tisotumab vedotin escalating doses IV Q3W + bevacizumab escalating doses IV Q3W
- **Arm B**: Tisotumab vedotin escalating doses IV Q3W + pembrolizumab fixed dose IV Q3W
- **Arm C**: Tisotumab vedotin escalating doses IV Q3W + carboplatin fixed dose IV Q3W

**Dose-Expansion Phase**
- **Arm D**: Tisotumab vedotin RP2D IV Q3W + carboplatin fixed dose IV Q3W
- **Arm E**: Tisotumab vedotin RP2D IV Q3W + pembrolizumab fixed dose IV Q3W
- **Arm F**: Tisotumab vedotin RP2D IV Q3W + pembrolizumab fixed dose IV Q3W
- **Arm G**: Tisotumab vedotin IV on days 1, 8, and 15 of a 28-day cycle

**New dosing schedule**
CheckMate 358 Summary

- The results suggest clinical benefit with both regimens of nivolumab + ipilimumab in patients with R/M cervical cancer
  - While patient subgroups were small, responses were noted regardless of tumor cell PD-L1 expression
  - Across both regimens, efficacy was better in patients **without** prior systemic therapy versus with prior systemic therapy for R/M disease
- Responses were durable; at median follow-up >10 mo, median duration of response was not reached for either regimen in patients **without** prior systemic therapy
- The treatment regimens had a manageable safety profile; no new safety signals were detected
- Given the limited treatment options for patients with R/M cervical cancer, these data with nivolumab + ipilimumab are of strong clinical interest and warrant further investigation in this patient population
Randomized phase II trial of carboplatin-paclitaxel versus carboplatin-paclitaxel-trastuzumab in uterine serous carcinoma that overexpresses HER2/neu: Updated Survival Analysis

- **Primary objective**: To estimate whether the addition of trastuzumab to paclitaxel and carboplatin chemotherapy improves PFS compared to paclitaxel and carboplatin alone

- **Eligibility**:
  - FIGO stage III-IV USC or recurrent USC
  - HER2/neu+ USC as defined by IHC score of 3+ (ASCO/CAP 2007 criteria) or 2+ with gene amplification confirmed by FISH
  - Patients diagnosed with recurrence were required to have measurable disease, defined as at least one target lesion per RECIST 1.1
  - Patients with recurrent disease may not have received >3 prior chemotherapies for treatment of their EC and a treatment-free interval of >6 months from last C/T was required for patients with recurrent disease

- **Design**
  - Originally designed to accrue 100 subjects
  - Power calculations for the trial assumed median PFS would be 6 months on the carboplatin/paclitaxel arm and 10.5 months on the carboplatin/paclitaxel/trastuzumab arm, equivalent to a hazard ratio (HR) of 0.57 with trastuzumab addition
  - First subject enrolled in August of 2011, after which (1) the accrual rate was slower than planned, and (2) observed PFS exceeded original expectations
  - Because of this, interim futility analysis was performed. Study closed to further accrual in March of 2017 with 61 enrolled subjects.

Paclitaxel 175 mg/m² and carboplatin AUC 5
IV q 21 days x 6 cycles

Paclitaxel 175 mg/m² and carboplatin AUC 5
+ Trastuzumab (at 8 mg/kg 1st dose & then 6 mg/kg in subsequent cycles) x 6 cycles f/b trastuzumab maintenance at 6 mg/kg until disease progression or prohibitive toxicity

**Eligible USC HER2+ Patients**

- Optimal or suboptimal CRS status allowed
- EBRT allowed prior to enrollment

Randomization 1:1
OVERALL SURVIVAL

• Benefit was particularly striking in the stage III-IV pts, with a median OS of 25.4 mos (control) compared with an unreached median OS (experimental; p=0.0406, HR: 0.492, 90%CI 0.249-0.974)

• There was no significant OS benefit observed in the recurrence cohort
Carboplatin-paclitaxel-trastuzumab - Summary

- First trial of targeted therapy in USC ONLY pts
- Demonstration that HER2 is an important prognostic and actionable target in USC
- NCCN designation of C/T/Trastuzumab as a preferred regimen in HER2+ USC (Level IIA)

Amanda N. Fader, Dana M. Roque, Eric Siegel, Natalia Buza, Pei Hui, Osama Abdelghany, Setsuko K. Chambers, Angeles Alvarez Secord, Laura Havrilesky, David M. O’Malley, Floor Backes, Nicole Nevadunsky, Babak Edraki, Dirk Pikaart, William Lowery, Karim S. ElSahwi, Paul Celano, Stefania Bellone, Masoud Azodi, Babak Litkouhi, Elena Ratner, Dan-Arin Silasi, Peter E. Schwartz, and Alessandro D. Santin SGO 2020
Randomized double-blind placebo controlled trial of primary maintenance vigil immunotherapy (VITAL study) in stage III/IV ovarian cancer: Efficacy assessment in BRCA1/2-wt patients

• Vigil is an autologous tumor cell vaccine constructed from autologous harvested tumor tissue
  • transfected with a DNA plasmid encoding GMCSF
  • transfected with bi-shRNA-furin

Rocconi et al. SGO 2020
“The Chinese use two brush strokes to write the word 'crisis.' One brush stroke stands for danger; the other for opportunity. In a crisis, be aware of the danger—but recognize the opportunity.”

— John F. Kennedy

https://www.goodreads.com/author/show/3047.John_F_Kennedy
Dr O’Malley Case 1: A woman in her 20s

- 2016 - Diagnosed with stage IIIB cervical cancer
- Received chemoradiation with HDR
- 2018 - multiple pulmonary masses - biopsy confirmed lung recurrence;
- 2018 - cisplatin + paclitaxel + Bev x 6 cycles with progression
- New bone lesion treated with RT
- Screen Fail for Iovance C-145-04 TILs trial (due to PFTs)
- 2019: started on innovaTV 204 – GOG 3023 ((Genmab).

PD-L1 testing negative; Foundation One with TERT promotor abnormality
• Continues on therapy with persistent lesion
• >16 months
• Approx. 60% regression
Dr O’Malley Case 2: A woman in her 40s

- 2018: Diagnostic laparoscopy – biopsy omental
  - Poorly differentiated squamous cell carcinoma consistent with metastatic cervical cancer.
- Cisplatin and paclitaxel x 4 cycles. CT scan with partial response and resolution of bowel obstruction.
- 2018: Cisplatin, paclitaxel, and bevacizumab started (avastin added after cycle 5, received 8 cycles total) – Mixed response
- 2019: 12 cycles of Pembro
- Palliative RT to the pelvis
- Tumor testing: Anti-PD-1 Result: High positive for PD-1; Positive for PD-L1 expression (TPS 1-49%); Tumor proportion score (TPS)*: 5%.
innovaTV 205 (GOG 3024) Arm F (TV & pembro)

- 11% decrease RECIST
- Removed off trial due to recurrent SBO
MODULE 5: SGO/ASCO 2020 Review
MODULE 6: COVID-19 and Gynecologic Cancers
Do you believe that receiving an anti-PD-1/PD-L1 antibody makes a patient more susceptible to contracting COVID-19?

- Yes: 2
- No: 13
- I don’t know: 10

Gynecologic oncologists: 
Medical oncologists:
Do you believe that receiving an anti-PD-1/PD-L1 antibody increases a patient’s risk of developing complications associated with COVID-19?

- **Yes**: 7
- **No**: 6
- **I don’t know**: 12

Gynecologic oncologists: [6 votes]  
Medical oncologists: [6 votes]
Clinical Practice Statement

Anti-cancer therapy and clinical trial considerations for gynecologic oncology patients during the COVID-19 pandemic crisis

Bhavana Pothuri, Angeles Alvarez Secord, Deborah K. Armstrong, John Chan, Amanda N. Fader, Warner Huh, Joshua Kesterson, Joyce F. Liu, Kathleen Moore, Shannon N. Westin, R. Wendel Naumann

a NYU Langone Health, Perlmutter Cancer Center, New York University School of Medicine, New York, NY, United States
b Duke Cancer Institute, Duke University Health System, Durham, NC, United States
c Kelly Gynecologic Oncology Service, Department of Gynecology and Obstetrics, Johns Hopkins School of Medicine, Baltimore, MD, United States
d California Pacific-Palo Alto Medical Foundation, Sutter Research Institute, San Francisco, CA, United States
e University of Alabama at Birmingham, Birmingham, AL, United States
f Penn State Hershey Medical Center, Hershey, PA, United States
g Dana-Farber Cancer Institute, Boston, MA, United States
h University of Oklahoma, Stephenson Cancer Center, Oklahoma City, OK, United States
i University of Texas, MD Anderson Cancer Center, Houston, TX, United States
j Levine Cancer Center, Atrium Health, Charlotte, NC, United States

HIGHLIGHTS

* The worldwide COVID-19 pandemic has limited cancer care and clinical trials.
* Strategies should be employed to limit contact points with health care facilities.
* All care should consider the risks of cancer care balanced against the risk of COVID-19 infection.
SGO Clinical Practice Statement

Regardless of geographic location, COVID-19 will impact all practitioners; however, the degree will vary based on COVID-19 burden and available local resources.

Pothuri B et al. Gynecol Oncol 2020;[Online ahead of print].
SGO Clinical Practice Statement: Considerations for Immunotherapy

• COVID-19 infection and early immunotherapy-related pneumonitis have similar presentations. In the case of suspected pneumonitis, test for COVID-19 before starting steroids and collaborate with pulmonary consultants.

• Access to PFTs and bronchoscopy may be limited and decisions may need to be made based on clinical findings and severity of symptoms.

Pothuri B et al. Gynecol Oncol 2020;[Online ahead of print].
SGO Clinical Practice Statement: Considerations for Immunotherapy

• Consider less-frequent dosing intervals with immune checkpoint inhibitors:
  – Pembrolizumab 400 mg IV q6wk
  – Nivolumab 480 mg IV q4wk
  – Atezolizumab 1,680 mg IV q4wk

Pothuri B et al. Gynecol Oncol 2020;[Online ahead of print].
SGO Clinical Practice Statement: Considerations for Immunotherapy

- Currently no evidence demonstrates that immunotherapy, in cancer patients, increases COVID-19 susceptibility. Strong overlap exists between immune-related pneumonitis and COVID-19 infection, including cough, dyspnea, fever and CT findings of ground-glass opacities and interstitial changes.

- Pre-existing lymphopenia is associated with lower immunotherapy response and predicts more severe COVID-19 infections.

Pothuri B et al. Gynecol Oncol 2020;[Online ahead of print].
SGO Clinical Practice Statement: Considerations for Immunotherapy

• Currently, the WHO and CDC recommend that corticosteroids not be used in treatment of COVID-19 viral pneumonia or ARDS unless indicated for another reason (asthma, COPD, septic shock).

• Pre-existing lymphopenia is associated with lower immunotherapy response and predicts more severe COVID-19 infections.

Pothuri B et al. Gynecol Oncol 2020;[Online ahead of print].
SGO Clinical Practice Statement: Clinical Trial Considerations

Prioritize Tier 1 studies where there is high potential benefit (i.e., trial that offers a drug when alternative treatments are limited) in resource-stratified environments.

Pothuri B et al. Gynecol Oncol 2020;[Online ahead of print].
Thank you for joining us!

CME credit information will be emailed to each participant tomorrow morning.