



Il paziente con mHSPC: intensificazione del trattamento per migliorare la sopravvivenza, preservando la qualità di vita

Prolungare la sopravvivenza e mantenere la qualità di vita in tutto il percorso del paziente con mHSPC: linee guida ed evidenze scientifiche nel trattamento di prima linea e il possibile ruolo della radioterapia

Ciro Franzese

Humanitas University Humanitas Research Hospital Milano

The burden of prostate cancer

1.4 million men worldwide each year

It's estimated that cases of PC will rise to around 4 million in 2040

Sung H et al. CA Cancer J Clin 2021;71:209–49.



Metastatic prostate cancer



Clin Oncol 2017;35:3097-104

De novo metastatic prostate cancer



Clin Oncol 2017;35:3097-104

Morb Mortal Wkly Rep 2020;69:1473-80

What we know?



Spectrum of treatments of mHSPC



Role of chemotherapy

Burden of Metastatic Castrate Naive Prostate Cancer Patients, to Identify Men More Likely to Benefit from Early Docetaxel: Further Analyses of CHAARTED and GETUG-AFU15 Studies

Gwenaelle Gravis^{a,*}, Jean-Marie Boher^b, Yu-Hui Chen^c, Glenn Liu^d, Karim Fizazi^e, Michael A. Carducci^f, Stephane Oudard^g, Florence Joly^h, David M. Jarrard^d, Michel Soulieⁱ, Mario J. Eisenberger^f, Muriel Habibian^j, Robert Dreicer^k, Jorge A. Garcia^l, Maha H.M. Hussain^m, Manish Kohliⁿ, Nicholas J. Vogelzang^o, Joel Picus^p, Robert DiPaola^q, and Christopher Sweeney^r

Meta-analysis results of the aggregate data showed **significant heterogeneity in ADT + D versus ADT** effect sizes between **HV and LV subgroups** (p=0.017).

Adding Docetaxel in patients with HV disease has a consistent effect in improving median OS (HR 0.68, 95%CI 0.56 - 0.82)

Patients with LV disease showed much longer OS, without evidence that Docetatxel improved OS (HR 1.03, 95%CI 0.77 - 1.38)

Eur Urol. 2018 June ; 73(6): 847–855.

Quality of life and systemic treatments

Treatments for Metastatic Hormone-sensitive Prostate Cancer: Systematic Review, Network Meta-analysis, and Benefit-harm assessment

Dominik Menges^{*a*,*}, Henock G. Yebyo^{*a*}, Sergio Sivec-Muniz^{*a*}, Sarah R. Haile^{*a*}, Michaela C. Barbier^{*b*}, Yuki Tomonaga^{*a*}, Matthias Schwenkglenks^{*a,b*}, Milo A. Puhan^{*a*}

Treatment		IRR (95% CI)
Systemic combin	ation treatments	
Grade 1-2 AEs ADT + Doc ADT + Abi ADT + Enz ADT + Apa ADT + Doc + Dar		0.72 (0.52–1.00) 0.72 (0.57–0.91) 0.89 (0.70–1.13) 0.85 (0.60–1.20) 0.67 (0.41–1.09)
Grade 3-5 AEs ADT + Doc ADT + Abi ADT + Enz ADT + Apa ADT + Doc + Dar		3.68 (1.35–10.06) 1.38 (0.53–3.63) 1.12 (0.42–2.96) 1.18 (0.30–4.66) 3.83 (0.70–20.87)
Any-grade AEs ADT + Doc ADT + Abi ADT + Enz ADT + Apa ADT + Doc + Dar		1.01 (0.92–1.12) 1.01 (0.94–1.09) 1.01 (0.92–1.10) 1.01 (0.89–1.14) 1.02 (0.88–1.18)
	Incidence rate ratio	

Adverse effects—primary analysis

European Urology 2022, Article in press

The ARCHES trial

ARCHES: A Randomized, Phase III Study of Androgen Deprivation Therapy With Enzalutamide or Placebo in Men With Metastatic Hormone-Sensitive Prostate Cancer

Andrew J. Armstrong, MD, ScM¹; Russell Z. Szmulewitz, MD²; Daniel P. Petrylak, MD³; Jeffrey Holzbeierlein, MD⁴; Arnauld Villers, MD⁵; Arun Azad, MBBS, PhD⁶; Antonio Alcaraz, MD, PhD⁷; Boris Alekseev, MD⁸; Taro Iguchi, MD, PhD⁹; Neal D. Shore, MD¹⁰; Brad Rosbrook, MS¹¹; Jennifer Sugg, MS¹²; Benoit Baron, MS¹³; Lucy Chen, MD¹²; and Arnulf Stenzl, MD¹⁴



J Clin Oncol. 2019 Nov 10;37(32):2974-2986

The ARCHES trial

From March, 2016, to January, 2018, a total of 1,150 patients were randomly assigned 1:1 from 202 centers

The risk of **radiographic progression or death was significantly reduced by 61%** with enzalutamide plus ADT versus placebo plus ADT (HR, 0.39; 95%CI, 0.30 to 0.50; P <.001)

Enza + ADT significantly reduced also:

- the fiirst symptomatic skeletal event
- the castration resistance
- the pain progression



The ARCHES trial - outcome

	nzalutamide + ADT No. of patients (E)	Placebo + ADT No. of patients (E)		HR (95% CI) [†]
All patients	574 (91)	576 (201)	н н	0.39 (0.30 to 0.50)
Age < 65 years	148 (21)	152 (58)	⊢•	0.29 (0.17 to 0.47)
Age ≥ 65 years	426 (70)	424 (143)	HH i	0.44 (0.33 to 0.58)
Geographic region – Europe	341 (55)	344 (122)	⊢ •	0.42 (0.31 to 0.58)
Geographic region – North America	86 (14)	77 (29)		0.30 (0.16 to 0.57)
Geographic region – rest of the world	147 (22)	155 (50)		0.40 (0.24 to 0.66)
ECOG status 0 at baseline	448 (67)	443 (146)	⊢ - ⊣ ^I	0.38 (0.29 to 0.51)
ECOG status 1 at baseline	125 (24)	133 (55)		0.43 (0.27 to 0.70)
Gleason score at initial diagnosis < 8	171 (21)	187 (47)		0.42 (0.25 to 0.70)
Gleason score at initial diagnosis ≥ 8	386 (65)	373 (151)	⊢ •-1 ¹	0.36 (0.27 to 0.48)
Disease localization at baseline – bone only	268 (35)	245 (82)	▶●→	0.33 (0.22 to 0.49)
Disease localization at baseline – soft tissue only	51 (5)	45 (12)		0.42 (0.15 to 1.20)
Disease localization at baseline - bone and soft tiss	ue 217 (50)	241 (104)	⊢ •−4 ¹	0.42 (0.30 to 0.60)
Baseline PSA value at or below overall median	293 (41)	305 (96)	⊢∙⊣ ∣	0.38 (0.26 to 0.54)
Baseline PSA value above overall median	279 (50)	269 (104)	⊢ •-	0.41 (0.30 to 0.58)
Low volume of disease	220 (14)	203 (47)	┝●─┥	0.25 (0.14 to 0.46)
High volume of disease	354 (77)	373 (154)	⊢∙⊣ ∣	0.43 (0.33 to 0.57)
No prior docetaxel therapy	471 (70)	474 (166)	⊢ •-4 I	0.37 (0.28 to 0.49)
Prior docetaxel therapy	103 (21)	102 (35)	⊢ •──┤ ′	0.52 (0.30 to 0.89)
Previous use of ADT or orchiectomy	535 (88)	515 (179)	H++ İ	0.41 (0.32 to 0.53)
No previous use of ADT or orchiectomy	39 (3)	61 (22)	⊢∙ —	0.19 (0.06 to 0.62)
			0.0 0.5 1.0 1	.5 2.0

Favors Favors Enzalutamide + ADT Placebo + ADT

J Clin Oncol. 2019 Nov 10;37(32):2974-2986

The ARCHES trial – update 2022

Improved Survival With Enzalutamide in Patients With Metastatic Hormone-Sensitive Prostate Cancer

Andrew J. Armstrong, MD, ScM¹; Arun A. Azad, MBBS, PhD^{2,3}; Taro Iguchi, MD, PhD⁴; Russell Z. Szmulewitz, MD⁵; Daniel P. Petrylak, MD⁶; Jeffrey Holzbeierlein, MD⁷; Arnauld Villers, MD⁸; Antonio Alcaraz, MD, PhD⁹; Boris Alekseev, MD¹⁰; Neal D. Shore, MD¹¹; Francisco Gomez-Veiga, MD, PhD^{12,13}; Brad Rosbrook, MS¹⁴; Fabian Zohren, MD, PhD¹⁴; Shunsuke Yamada, MEng¹⁵; Gabriel P. Haas, MD¹⁵; and Arnulf Stenzl, MD¹⁶

Final prespecified OS analysis and an update on rPFS

Patients assigned to **enzalutamide plus ADT** had a **34% reduction** in the risk of death versus placebo plus ADT (HR 0.66; 95% CI, 0.53 to 0.81; P < .001)



The ARCHES trial – overall survival

Median duration of tx:

- Enzalutamide + ADT: 40,2 months
- Placebo + ADT: 13,8 months
- Crossover + ADT: 23,9 months

The clinical benefit of enzalutamide plus ADT was generally **consistent across prespecified subgroups**, except in patients with only soft tissue disease at baseline

No. (E)	No. (E)	Median (ENZA/PBO; months	s)	HR (95% CI)
574 (154)	576 (202)	NR/NR	HEH	0.66 (0.53 to 0.81)
148 (39)	152 (52)	54.2/NR	⊢∎	0.58 (0.38 to 0.88)
426 (115)	424 (150)	NR/NR	HEH.	0.68 (0.54 to 0.87)
341 (100)	344 (129)	54.2/NR	┝╼═╼┥│	0.70 (0.54 to 0.90)
86 (20)	77 (28)	NR/50.3	┝╍═╾╾┥│	0.48 (0.27 to 0.85)
147 (34)	155 (45)	NR/NR	⊢∎→	0.69 (0.44 to 1.08)
448 (112)	443 (143)	NR/NR		0.67 (0.52 to 0.86)
125 (42)	133 (59)	NR/45.9		0.65 (0.44 to 0.97)
171 (38)	187 (51)	NR/NR	⊢∎→	0.68 (0.44 to 1.04)
386 (108)	373 (145)	NR/49.7	HEH I	0.61 (0.48 to 0.79)
268 (64)	245 (84)	NR/NR		0.59 (0.43 to 0.82)
51 (12)	45 (9)	NR/NR	·	→ 1.13 (0.48 to 2.69)
217 (72)	241 (106)	NR/44.3		0.62 (0.46 to 0.84)
291 (72)	303 (97)	NR/NR		0.68 (0.50 to 0.93)
279 (82)	269 (105)	NR/48.3		0.63 (0.47 to 0.84)
220 (35)	203 (46)	NR/NR	⊢∎→	0.66 (0.43 to 1.03)
354 (119)	373 (156)	NR/45.9	⊢∎→	0.66 (0.52 to 0.83)
471 (124)	474 (165)	NR/NR		0.64 (0.51 to 0.81)
103 (30)	102 (37)	NR/NR		0.74 (0.46 to 1.20)
535 (144)	515 (179)	NR/NR		0.67 (0.54 to 0.83)
39 (10)	61 (23)	NR/NR	┝╾╋╾╌┼┙	0.57 (0.27 to 1.20)
	148 (39) 426 (115) 341 (100) 86 (20) 147 (34) 448 (112) 125 (42) 171 (38) 386 (108) 268 (64) 51 (12) 217 (72) 291 (72) 279 (82) 220 (35) 354 (119) 471 (124) 103 (30) 535 (144)	574 (154) 576 (202) 148 (39) 152 (52) 426 (115) 424 (150) 341 (100) 344 (129) 86 (20) 77 (28) 147 (34) 155 (45) 448 (112) 443 (143) 125 (42) 133 (59) 171 (38) 187 (51) 386 (108) 373 (145) 268 (64) 245 (84) 51 (12) 45 (9) 217 (72) 241 (106) 291 (72) 303 (97) 279 (82) 269 (105) 220 (35) 203 (46) 354 (119) 373 (156) 471 (124) 474 (165) 103 (30) 102 (37) 535 (144) 515 (179)	574 (154) 576 (202) NR/NR 148 (39) 152 (52) 54.2/NR 426 (115) 424 (150) NR/NR 341 (100) 344 (129) 54.2/NR 86 (20) 77 (28) NR/50.3 147 (34) 155 (45) NR/NR 448 (112) 443 (143) NR/NR 125 (42) 133 (59) NR/45.9 171 (38) 187 (51) NR/NR 386 (108) 373 (145) NR/NR 386 (108) 373 (145) NR/NR 51 (12) 45 (9) NR/NR 217 (72) 241 (106) NR/NR 217 (72) 241 (106) NR/NR 217 (72) 269 (105) NR/NR 217 (72) 269 (105) NR/NR 279 (82) 269 (105) NR/NR 320 (35) 203 (46) NR/NR 354 (119) 373 (156) NR/NR 303 (30) 102 (37) NR/NR 103 (30) 102 (37) NR/NR 355 (144)	574 (154) 576 (202) NR/NR Hert 148 (39) 152 (52) 54.2/NR Hert 426 (115) 424 (150) NR/NR Hert 341 (100) 344 (129) 54.2/NR Hert 86 (20) 77 (28) NR/50.3 Hert 86 (20) 77 (28) NR/NR Hert 147 (34) 155 (45) NR/NR Hert 125 (42) 133 (59) NR/45.9 Hert 171 (38) 187 (51) NR/NR Hert 386 (108) 373 (145) NR/NR Hert 268 (64) 245 (84) NR/NR Hert 217 (72) 241 (106) NR/A8.3 Hert 217 (72) 241 (106) NR/NR Hert 279 (82) 269 (105) NR/A8.3 Hert 354 (119) 373 (156) NR/NR Hert 471 (124) 474 (165) NR/NR Hert 103 (30) 102 (37) NR/NR Hert 535 (144) 515 (179) NR/NR Hert

J Clin Oncol. 2022 May 20;40(15):1616-1622

1.5 2.0

Favors PBO + ADT

0.0

Favors ENZA + ADT

0.5 1.0





The ARCHES trial – safety

TABLE 2. Summary of TEAEs and	Exposure-Adjusted TEA	Es of Special Interest	(safety analysis set)

TEAEs	ENZA + ADT (n = 572)	$PBO + ADT^{a} (n = 574)$
Median treatment duration, months (range)	40.2 (0.2-58.1)	13.8 (0.2-27.6)
Total exposure, PY	1,521.5	733.2
Any TEAE, No. (%)	520 (90.9)	504 (87.8)
Any grade 3-4 TEAE, No. (%)	224 (39.2)	160 (27.9)
Any TEAE leading to death, No. (%)	30 (5.2)	12 (2.1)
Any study drug-related TEAE, No. (%)	339 (59.3)	273 (47.6)
Any study drug-related TEAE leading to death, No. (%)	0	1 (0.2)
Any TEAE of special interest, No. (%)	416 (72.7)	327 (57.0)

SAFETY

The ARCHES trial – safety

	Enza + ADT			Placebo + ADT				
	All Grades Grade 3-4		All Grades		Grade 3-4			
TEAE of Special Interest by Group $\mathrm{Term}^{\mathrm{b}}$	No. (%)	Events (rate) ^c	No. (%)	Events (rate)°	No. (%)	Events (rate)°	No. (%)	Events (rate)°
Convulsions	3 (0.5)	3 (0.2)	3 (0.5)	3 (0.2)	3 (0.5)	3 (0.4)	2 (0.3)	2 (0.3)
Hypertension	82 (14.3)	88 (5.8)	29 (5.1)	30 (2.0)	39 (6.8)	40 (5.5)	13 (2.3)	13 (1.8)
Decreased neutrophil count	8 (1.4)	10 (0.7)	4 (0.7)	5 (0.3)	4 (0.7)	6 (0.8)	2 (0.3)	4 (0.5)
Cognitive/memory impairment	38 (6.6)	46 (3.0)	4 (0.7)	5 (0.3)	15 (2.6)	15 (2.0)	0	0
Ischemic heart disease	26 (4.5)	31 (2.0)	7 (1.2)	8 (0.5)	11 (1.9)	14 (1.9)	8 (1.4)	9 (1.2)
Other selected cardiovascular events	25 (4.4)	33 (2.2)	10 (1.7)	11 (0.7)	10 (1.7)	11 (1.5)	4 (0.7)	5 (0.7)
Posterior reversible encephalopathy syndrome	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Fatigue	184 (32.2)	216 (14.2)	16 (2.8)	26 (1.7)	118 (20.6)	126 (17.2)	11 (1.9)	12 (1.6)
Renal disorders	11 (1.9)	13 (0.9)	2 (0.3)	2 (0.1)	4 (0.7)	5 (0.7)	0	0
Second primary malignancies	22 (3.8)	23 (1.5)	15 (2.6)	16 (1.1)	11 (1.9)	14 (1.9)	7 (1.2)	7 (1.0)
Falls	58 (10.1)	86 (5.7)	7 (1.2)	10 (0.7)	19 (3.3)	20 (2.7)	3 (0.5)	4 (0.5)
Fractures	77 (13.5)	106 (7.0)	20 (3.5)	23 (1.5)	31 (5.4)	36 (4.9)	9 (1.6)	12 (1.6)
Loss of consciousness	15 (2.6)	16 (1.1)	9 (1.6)	10 (0.7)	2 (0.3)	2 (0.3)	1 (0.2)	1 (0.1)
Thrombocytopenia	3 (0.5)	7 (0.5)	0	16 (1.1)	3 (0.5)	3 (0.4)	0	0
Musculoskeletal events	223 (39.0)	395 (26.0)	14 (2.4)	1 (0.1)	170 (29.6)	257 (35.1)	17 (3.0)	20 (2.7)
Severe cutaneous adverse reactions	1 (0.2)	1 (0.1)	0	0	1 (0.2)	1 (0.1)	0	0
Angioedema	10 (1.7)	11 (0.7)	1 (0.2)	1 (0.1)	1 (0.2)	1 (0.1)	0	0
Rash	22 (3.8)	26 (1.7)	0	0	10 (1.7)	12 (1.6)	0	0
Hepatic disorder	34 (5.9)	43 (2.8)	8 (1.4)	11 (0.7)	34 (5.9)	55 (7.5)	4 (0.7)	9 (1.2)

The ENZAMET trial



The ENZAMET trial

A total of 1125 men underwent randomization and the median follow-up was 34 months

Volume of disease — no. (%)			
High	291 (52)	297 (53)	
Low	272 (48)	265 (47)	
Visceral metastases — no. (%)	62 (11)	67 (12)	
No. of months since diagnosis of metastasis			
Mean	2.9±6.9	3.1±7.2	
Median (IQR)	1.9 (0.9–2.8)	1.9 (1.0-2.8)	
Gleason score — no. <mark>(</mark> %)†			
≤7	152 (27)	163 (29)	
8–10	335 (60)	321 (57)	
Missing data	76 (13)	78 (14)	
Previous therapy — no. (%)			
Adjuvant androgen-deprivation therapy	58 (10)	40 (7)	
Antiandrogen therapy‡	285 (51)	316 (56)	
LHRHA‡	411 (73)	418 (74)	
Bilateral orchiectomy	5 (1)	8 (1)	
Docetaxel <u></u>	95 (17)	83 (15)	

The ENZAMET trial - outcome





The ENZAMET trial – subgroup analysis

Subgroup	Enzalutamida	Standard Care	Hazard Ratio (95%	C 1)	P Value for Interaction	Adjusted P Value
Subgroup		ts/total no.		cij	Interaction	P Value
All anti-sta	,	·	+	0.67 (0.52-0.86)		
All patients Volume of disease	102/563	143/562		0.67 (0.32-0.86)	0.04	0.14
	00/070	101005		0.42.40.06.0.70	0.04	0.14
Low	22/272	46/265		0.43 (0.26-0.72)		
High	80/291	97/297		0.80 (0.59-1.07)		
Early docetaxel planned					0.04	0.14
Yes	52/254	55/249		0.90 (0.62-1.31)		
No	50/309	88/313		0.53 (0.37-0.75)		
ACE-27 score					0.73	0.81
2 or 3	31/141	42/143		0.73 (0.46-1.16)		
0 or 1	71/422	101/419		0.65 (0.48-0.88)		
Antiresorptive therapy					0.006	0.06
Yes	17/55	11/58		1.77 (0.83-3.77)		
No	85/508	132/504		0.59 (0.45-0.77)		
Region					0.25	0.42
Ireland and United Kingdom	22/102	22/93		1.04 (0.57-1.88)		
North America	21/117	31/129		0.72 (0.41-1.25)		
Australia and New Zealand	59/344	90/340		0.58 (0.42-0.81)		
Gleason score					0.66	0.81
≤7	13/152	23/163		0.59 (0.30-1.16)		
8 to 10	66/335	84/321		0.70 (0.50-0.96)		
ECOG performance status			1		0.96	0.96
1 or 2	44/158	59/157		0.66 (0.45-0.98)		
0	58/405	84/405		0.66 (0.47-0.92)		
Age	50/105	01/100		0.00 (0.17 0.02)	0.16	0.33
≥70 yr	47/257	79/257		0.56 (0.39-0.81)	0.10	0.55
<70 yr	55/306	64/305	1	0.81 (0.56-1.15)		
Visceral metastases	33/ 300	04/505	-	0.01 (0.00 1.10)	0.16	0.33
Yes	18/62	18/67		1.05 (0.54-2.02)	0.16	0.33
No			-	0.62 (0.47-0.82)		
Previous local treatment	84/501	125/495		0.02 (0.47-0.62)	0.72	0.81
	20/020	10/025	<u>.</u>	0.72 (0.47, 1.00)	0.72	0.81
Yes	39/238	49/235		0.72 (0.47-1.09)		
No	63/325	94/327	0.2 0.6 1.0 2.0	0.65 (0.47–0.89)		

Enzalutamide Better Standard Care Better

The ENZAMET trial - safety

Adverse Event	Enzalutamide (N = 563)	Standard Care (N=558)
Any adverse event — no. of patients (%)*		
Grade 1	40 (7)	77 (14)
Grade 2	202 (36)	230 (41)
Grade 3	277 (49)	194 (35)
Grade 4	38 (7)	40 (7)
Grade 5	6 (1)	7 (1)
Serious adverse event		
No. of patients (%)	235 (42)	189 (34)
No. of events	385	297
Rate during treatment exposure (95% CI) — no./yr†	0.34 (0.29–0.40)	0.33 (0.28-0.39)
Adverse event leading to treatment discontinuation at any time — no. of patients	33	14

Update from ASCO 2022

Meeting Abstract | 2022 ASCO Annual Meeting II

GENITOURINARY CANCER—PROSTATE, TESTICULAR, AND PENILE

Updated overall survival outcomes in ENZAMET (ANZUP 1304), an international, cooperative group trial of enzalutamide in metastatic hormonesensitive prostate cancer (mHSPC).

<u>Ian D. Davis, Andrew James Martin, Robert Richard Zielinski, Alastair Thomson,</u> <u>Thean Hsiang Tan, Shahneen Sandhu,</u> ...

Enzalutamide added to TS provided clinically meaningful **improvements in OS** for the combined overall cohort, which persisted **with an additional 3 years of follow-up**.

The benefits were more pronounced in pts with **low volume disease**, and were also seen in the subgroup with M1 **high volume** mHSPC

	Enzalutam	ide	NSAA	NSAA		
	Deaths/Total	5y OS %	Deaths/Total	5y OS %	HR (95% CI)	
All participants	208/563	67	268/562	57	0.70 (0.58 to 0.84)	
Concurrent docetaxel						
No	100/310	72	145/312	58	0.60 (0.47 to 0.78)	
Yes	108/253	61	123/250	56	0.82 (0.63 to 1.06)	
Volume of Disease (Vol)						
Low	59/262	80	97/261	66	0.54 (0.39 to 0.74)	
High	149/301	55	171/301	49	0.79 (0 .63 to 0.98)	

TITAN trial

Apalutamide for Metastatic, Castration-Sensitive Prostate Cancer

Kim N. Chi, M.D., Neeraj Agarwal, M.D., Anders Bjartell, M.D., Byung Ha Chung, M.D., Andrea J. Pereira de Santana Gomes, M.D., Robert Given, M.D., Álvaro Juárez Soto, M.D., Axel S. Merseburger, M.D., Mustafa Özgüroğlu, M.D., Hirotsugu Uemura, M.D., Dingwei Ye, M.D., Kris Deprince, M.D., Vahid Naini, Pharm.D., Jinhui Li, Ph.D., Shinta Cheng, M.D., Margaret K. Yu, M.D., Ke Zhang, Ph.D., Julie S. Larsen, Pharm.D., Sharon McCarthy, B.Pharm., and Simon Chowdhury, M.D., for the TITAN Investigators*

Phase 3 trial, 525 patients with metastatic, castration-sensitive prostate cancer, randomly assigned patients to receive apalutamide (240 mg per day) or placebo, added to ADT



Treatments' comparison for mHSPC

Indirect Comparisons of Efficacy between Combination Approaches in Metastatic Hormone-sensitive Prostate Cancer: A Systematic Review and Network Meta-analysis

Niranjan J. Sathianathen^{*a,b*}, Samantha Koschel^{*a*}, Isaac A. Thangasamy^{*a*}, Jiasian Teh^{*a*}, Omar Alghazo^{*a*}, Georgiana Butcher^{*a,c*}, Harriet Howard^{*a,c*}, Jada Kapoor^{*a*}, Nathan Lawrentschuk^{*a,b*}, Shankar Siva^{*d,e*}, Arun Azad^{*e,f*}, Ben Tran^{*f*}, Damien Bolton^{*b*}, Declan G. Murphy^{*a,e,**}

All 4 interventions demonstrated **significantly improved OS compared with ADT alone**.

These four interventions were statistically comparable to each other with none being clearly superior.

However, enzalutamide + ADT had the absolute lowest HR compared with ADT alone (HR 0.53, 95%CI 0.37–0.75).



Overall survival for each intervention compared with (A) ADT and (B) enzalutamide.

European Urology 78 (2020) 347 - 357

Treatments' comparison for mHSPC



For **low-volume disease**, only **Enza demonstrated improved survival** compared with ADT, with the lowest absolute HR (HR 0.38, 95%CI 0.20–0.68).

Enzalutamide appeared to be superior to docetaxel in men with low-volume disease (HR 0.38, 95%CI 0.19–0.72).

European Urology 78 (2020) 347 - 357

Guidelines



Guidelines

EAU - EANM - ESTRO -ESUR - ISUP - SIOG Guidelines on Prostate Cancer

Recommendations	Strength rating
Offer immediate systemic treatment with androgen deprivation therapy (ADT) to palliate	Strong
symptoms and reduce the risk for potentially serious sequelae of advanced disease (spinal	
cord compression, pathological fractures, ureteral obstruction) to M1 symptomatic patients.	
Offer luteinising hormone-releasing hormone (LHRH) antagonists or orchiectomy before	Strong
starting ADT, especially to patients with impending clinical complications like spinal cord	
compression or bladder outlet obstruction.	
Offer early systemic treatment to M1 patients asymptomatic from their tumour.	Strong
Offer short-term administration of an older generation androgen receptor (AR) antagonist to	Weak
M1 patients starting LHRH agonist to reduce the risk of the 'flare-up' phenomenon.	
Do not offer AR antagonist monotherapy to patients with M1 disease.	Strong
Discuss combination therapy including ADT plus systemic therapy with all M1 patients.	Strong
Do not offer ADT monotherapy to patients whose first presentation is M1 disease if they	Strong
have no contraindications for combination therapy and have a sufficient life expectancy to	
benefit from combination therapy (\geq 1 year) and are willing to accept the increased risk of	
side effects.	
Offer ADT combined with chemotherapy (docetaxel) to patients whose first presentation is	Strong
M1 disease and who are fit for docetaxel.	
Offer ADT combined with abiraterone acetate plus prednisone or apalutamide or	Strong
enzalutamide to patients whose first presentation is M1 disease and who are fit enough for	
the regimen.	
Offer ADT combined with prostate radiotherapy (RT) (using the doses and template from	Strong
the STAMPEDE study) to patients whose first presentation is M1 disease and who have low	
volume of disease by CHAARTED criteria.	
Do not offer ADT combined with any local treatment (RT/surgery) to patients with high-	Strong
volume (CHAARTED criteria) M1 disease outside of clinical trials (except for symptom control).	
Do not offer ADT combined with surgery to M1 patients outside of clinical trials.	Strong
Only offer metastasis-directed therapy to M1 patients within a clinical trial setting or well-	Strong
designed prospective cohort study.	

Radiotherapy in mHSPC



Which role for radiotherapy in mHSPC?



RT in mHSPC - STAMPEDE TRIAL



Radiotherapy to the primary tumour for newly diagnosed, metastatic prostate cancer (STAMPEDE): a randomised controlled phase 3 trial

Christopher C Parker, Nicholas D James, Christopher D Brawley, Noel W Clarke, Alex P Hoyle, Adnan Ali, Alastair W S Ritchie, Gerhardt Attard, Simon Chowdhury, William Cross, David P Dearnaley, Silke Gillessen, Clare Gilson, Robert J Jones, Ruth E Langley, Zafar I Malik, Malcolm D Mason, David Matheson, Robin Millman, J Martin Russell, George N Thalmann, Claire L Amos, Roberto Alonzi, Amit Bahl, Alison Birtle, Omar Din, Hassan Douis, Chinnamani Eswar, Joanna Gale, Melissa R Gannon, Sai Jonnada, Sara Khaksar, Jason F Lester, Joe M O'Sullivan, Omi A Parikh, Ian D Pedley, Delia M Pudney, Denise J Sheehan, Narayanan Nair Srihari, Anna T H Tran, Mahesh K B Parmar*, Matthew R Sydes*, on behalf of the Systemic Therapy for Advanced or Metastatic Prostate cancer: Evaluation of Drug Efficacy (STAMPEDE) investigators†

 \mathbf{F}



2061 newly diagnosed metastatic prostate cancer randomized to

- a) Standard of care: lifelong androgen deprivation therapy (with up-front docetaxel permitted from December, 2015)
- b) Standard of care plus radiotherapy to the primary tumore

Men allocated to radiotherapy received either:

- 55 Gy in 20 daily fractions
- 36 Gy in 6 weekly fractions

RT in mHSPC - STAMPEDE TRIAL



RT in mHSPC - STAMPEDE TRIAL

В	Control	Radiotherapy	Interaction p value	HR (95% CI)
	Deaths/N	Deaths/N		
Age at random	isation (yea	rs)		
<70	223/595	228/597	0.066	1.03 (0.86–1.24)
≥70	168/434	142/435	•	0.78 (0.63-0.98)
WHO performa	ance score			
0	271/732	252/734	0.87	0.92 (0.77-1.09)
1-2	120/297	118/298		0.94 (0.73-1.21)
Tumour status	1			
<t2< td=""><td>5/12</td><td>5/14</td><td>0.66 ┥ 🔸</td><td>→ 0.61 (0.13–2.82)</td></t2<>	5/12	5/14	0.66 ┥ 🔸	→ 0.61 (0.13–2.82)
T2	33/84	33/89	٠	0.75 (0.44-1.27)
Т3	200/585	201/603	•	0.97 (0.80-1.18)
T4	126/260	104/246	•	0.78 (0.60-1.02)
Nodal status				
NO	118/345	116/344	0.47	0.97 (0.75-1.25)
N+	251/620	228/620		0.87 (0.72-1.04)
Gleason sum se	core			
≤7	41/173	54/172	0.084	➡ 1.34 (0.89–2.02)
8-10	332/820	303/810		0.91 (0.78–1.06)
Docetaxel plan	ned			
No docetaxel	357/844	342/847	0.63	0.93 (0.80-1.08)
Docetaxel	34/184	28/183	< ■	0.81(0.49-1.34)
Overall			\langle	0.92 (0.80–1.06
			0.5 0.6 0.7 0.8 0.9 1.0	1.2 1.4
			Favours radiotherapy Favo	ours control



	Within treatment window		After treatment window	
	Control (n=1029)	Radiotherapy (n=1032)	Control (n=1029)	Radiotherapy (n=1032)
Transurethral resection of the prostate	9 (1%)	13 (1%)	23 (2%)	24 (2%)
Ureteric stent	5 (<1%)	3 (<1%)	16 (2%)	7 (1%)
Surgery for bowel obstruction	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	1(<1%)
Urinary catheter	14 (1%)	18 (2%)	35 (3%)	36 (3%)
Nephrostomy	2 (<1%)	2 (<1%)	8 (1%)	3 (<1%)
Colostomy	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	2 (<1%)	1 (<1%)
Acute kidney injury	2 (<1%)	6 (1%)	31 (3%)	35 (3%)
Urinary tract infection	14 (1%)	31 (3%)	49 (5%)	75 (7%)
Urinary tract obstruction	4 (<1%)	7 (1%)	24 (2%)	17 (2%)
Prostate cancer death	2 (<1%)	1(<1%)	327 (32%)	313 (30%)

Treatment window defined as 12 weeks from randomisation for patients in either treatment group who did not receive docetaxel, and 28 weeks from randomisation for those who did.

Table 3: Incidence of symptomatic local events reported before and after treatment period

Role of RT for metastases?

Stereotactic Body Radiotherapy for Oligometastasis Opportunities for Biology to Guide Clinical Management



Potential Effect of Ablative Therapy:



Parallel Progression Model of Metastasis Evolution (with Metastatic Cascades):

M2b

M1b M1c

M2c



Potential Effect of Ablative Therapy:



Matter of definition



Oligometastatic state is not the same as low-volume according to CHAARTED

Low-volume CHARTEED may have large number of mets to lymph nodes and axial bone

Oligometastatic setting is defined as <= 5 mets

Recommendations for radiation therapy in oligometastatic prostate cancer: An ESTRO-ACROP Delphi consensus



2

Radiotherapy & Oncology

2022

Thomas Zilli^{a,b,c,*}, Vérane Achard^{b,c}, Alan Dal Pra^d, Nina Schmidt-Hegemann^e, Barbara Alicja Jereczek-Fossa^{f,g}, Andrea Lancia^h, Gianluca Ingrossoⁱ, Filippo Alongi^{j,k}, Shafak Aluwini¹, Stefano Arcangeli^m, Pierre Blanchard^{n,o}, Antonio Conde Moreno^p, Felipe Couñago^{q,r,s}, Gilles Créhange^t, Piet Dirix^u, Alfonso Gomez Iturriaga^v, Matthias Guckenberger^w, David Pasquier^{x,y}, Paul Sargos^z, Marta Scorsetti^{aa}, Stéphane Supiot^{ab}, Alison C. Tree^{ac}, Almudena Zapatero^{ad}, Jennifer Le Guevelou^{b,c}, Piet Ost^{ae,af}, Claus Belka^e

For de novo, oligorecurrent and oligoprogressive	Consensus Round 1: 68%; round 2: 88%
PSMA PET imaging	Consensus Round 1: 64%; round 2: 80%; round 3: 88%
Only for selected cases	Consensus Round 1: 84%
PSMA PET imaging	Consensus Round 1: 60%; round 2: 84%
Systemic therapy and treatment of the prostate (±pelvic nodes) and all metastatic lesions	Agreement Round 1: 68%; round 2: 76%;
Long-course, 18–36 months Pelvic and extra-pelvic nodal disease + bone lesions	round 3: 76% Agreement Round 1: 72%; round 2: 72%; round 3: 76% Agreement Round 1: 52%; round 2: 60%; round 3: 76%
	PSMA PET imaging Only for selected cases PSMA PET imaging Systemic therapy and treatment of the prostate (±pelvic nodes) and all metastatic lesions Long-course, 18–36 months

Local and metastatic curative radiotherapy in patients with de novo oligometastatic prostate

cancer

C. Reverberi, M. Massaro[⊠], M. F. Osti, D. Anzellini, L. Marinelli, A. Montalto, V. De Sanctis & M. Valeriani

Scientific Reports (2020) 10:17471

37 de novo Oligo-PCa patients treated with RT on primary tumor and metastases

- Radiotherapy was delivered in 5 weeks, the median dose to the pelvis was 45 Gy (1.8 Gy/fraction), and 68.75 Gy (2.75 Gy/fraction) for the prostate.
- For bone metastases the dose used was 45–55 Gy/25 fractions, while loco-regional nodal metastases were usually treated with 55–60 Gy/25 fractions.
- Extra-pelvic metastases were more commonly treated with SBRT in 1–5 fractions.

The median OS was 68.8 months, the 2- and 5-year OS rates were 96.9% and 65.4%.

The median b-RFS was 58 months and the 2- and 5-year b-RFS rates were 73.3% and 39.3%.





Scientific Reports (2020) 10:17471

The median OS was 68.8 months, the 2- and 5-year OS rates were 96.9% and 65.4%.

The median b-RFS was 58 months and the 2- and 5-year b-RFS rates were 73.3% and 39.3%.



Scientific Reports (2020) 10:17471

Metastasis-directed Therapy (SBRT) Guided by PET-CT ¹⁸F-CHOLINE Versus PET-CT ⁶⁸Ga-PSMA in Castration-sensitive Oligorecurrent Prostate Cancer: A Comparative Analysis of Effectiveness

Rosario Mazzola,¹ Giulio Francolini,² Luca Triggiani,³ Giuseppe Napoli,¹ Francesco Cuccia,¹ Luca Nicosia,¹ Lorenzo Livi,² Stefano Maria Magrini,³ Matteo Salgarello,⁴ Filippo Alongi^{1,2}

Clinical Genitourinary Cancer Month 2020

118 oligometastases in 88 patients treated with **upfront SBRT for oligorecurrence without ADT**

44 patients with Choline-PET

44 patients with PSMA-PET



News from ASTRO



News from ASTRO



NEWS FROM ASTRO

Conclusions

- MDT combined with HT as part of an intermittent regime improves PFS and thus time off HT.
 - Although subgroup analyses are limited, this effect persists across important subgroups (e.g. intact primary, use of 2nd generation HT, etc..)
- MDT combined with HT as part of an intermittent regime improves time with eugonad testosterone.
- Intermittent HT in combination with MDT may facilitate prolonged eugonad testosterone intervals while maintaining excellent disease control in men with oligometastatic prostate cancer.



ASTRO 64TH ANNUAL MEETING | October 23-26, 2022

EAU GUIDELINES

EAU - EANM - ESTRO -ESUR - ISUP - SIOG Guidelines on Prostate Cancer

Offer ADT combined with prostate radiotherapy (RT) (using the doses and template from	Strong
the STAMPEDE study) to patients whose first presentation is M1 disease and who have low volume of disease by CHAARTED criteria.	
Do not offer ADT combined with any local treatment (RT/surgery) to patients with high-	Strong
volume (CHAARTED criteria) M1 disease outside of clinical trials (except for symptom control).	
Do not offer ADT combined with surgery to M1 patients outside of clinical trials.	Strong
Only offer metastasis-directed therapy to M1 patients within a clinical trial setting or well-	Strong
designed prospective cohort study.	

ON-GOING STUDIES

Metastasis Directed Stereotactic Body Radiotherapy for Oligo Metastatic Hormone Sensitive Prostate Cancer (METRO)

Sponsor:

Umeå University

Collaborators:

University Hospital, Umeå Karolinska University Hospital Region Örebro County

Region Örebro County Region Jönköping County Stockholm South General Hospital Region Skane Vastra Gotaland Region ClinicalTrials.gov Identifier: NCT04983095

Recruitment Status ① : Recruiting First Posted ① : July 30, 2021 Last Update Posted ① : May 26, 2022

See Contacts and Locations

Prostate-cancer Treatment Using Stereotactic Radiotherapy for Oligometastases Ablation in Hormone-sensitive Patients (PRESTO)

Sponsor:

UNICANCER

Information provided by (Responsible Party):

UNICANCER

ClinicalTrials.gov Identifier: NCT04115007

Recruitment Status (): Recruiting First Posted (): October 3, 2019 Last Update Posted (): May 12, 2022

See Contacts and Locations

Conclusions

The management of patients with metastatic prostate cancer has been evolving rapidly in recent years.

The early start of new generation systemic treatments already in the hormone sensitive phase allows to improve the survival of these patients.

The choice of the drug to use should be mainly based on its impact on patient's quality of life as well as on the efficacy of the treatment.

While the role of RT on de novo metastatic primary tumor is clear, the treatment of metastases in these new scenarios still needs to be prospectively investigated.





THANK YOU !