

# Genomic analysis of circulating tumor DNA from patients with hormone receptor-positive, HER2-mutant metastatic breast cancer enrolled in SUMMIT: Mechanisms of acquired resistance to neratinib + fulvestrant + trastuzumab

Cynthia Ma,<sup>1</sup> James Waisman,<sup>2</sup> Adam Brufsky,<sup>3</sup> Eddy Yang,<sup>4</sup> Hans Wildiers,<sup>5</sup> John Crown,<sup>6</sup> Sarina Piha-Paul,<sup>7</sup> Jennifer Suga,<sup>8</sup> Jose Garcia-Saenz,<sup>9</sup> Valentina Gambardella,<sup>10</sup> Angel Guerrero,<sup>11</sup> Salomon M Stemmer,<sup>12</sup> Ron Bose,<sup>1</sup> Tonya Novara-Demgen,<sup>13</sup> Daniel DiPrimeo,<sup>13</sup> Lisa D. Eli,<sup>13</sup> Komal Jhaveri<sup>14</sup> <sup>1</sup>Washington University School of Medicine, St. Louis, MO, USA; <sup>2</sup>City of Hope Comprehensive Cancer Center, Duarte, CA, USA; <sup>4</sup>University Hospital of UPMC, Pittsburgh, PA, USA; <sup>4</sup>University Hospital Schure, St. Vincent's Private Hospital, Dublin, Ireland; <sup>7</sup>The University of Texas MD Anderson Cancer Center, Houston, TX, USA; <sup>4</sup>University Hospital Schure, St. Vincent's Private Hospital, Dublin, Ireland; <sup>7</sup>The University of Texas MD Anderson Cancer Center, Houston, TX, USA; <sup>4</sup>University Hospital Schure, St. Vincent's Private Hospital, Dublin, Ireland; <sup>7</sup>The University of Texas MD Anderson Cancer Center, Houston, TX, USA; \*Kaiser Permanente Vallejo Medical Center, Vallejo, CA, USA; \*Hospital Clínico San Carlos, Madrid, Spain; <sup>12</sup>Institute of Hospital Clínico de Valencia, Spain; <sup>12</sup>Institute of Oncology, Davidoff Center, Rabin Medical Center, Petah Tiqwa, and the Sackler Faculty of Medicine, Tel Aviv University, Tel Aviv, Israel

## Introduction

- HER2 mutations are oncogenic drivers in a subset of metastatic breast cancers (MBCs) and may be acquired as a mechanism of resistance to endocrine therapy.12
- Neratinib (N) is an oral, irreversible, pan-HER tyrosine kinase inhibitor with demonstrated preclinical and clinical activity against HER2-mutant cancers.1-8
- In the hypothesis-generating SUMMIT basket trial (NCT01953926), original cohorts of patients with locally assessed hormone receptor-positive (HR+), HER2-negative (HER-), HER2-mutant MBC received N alone or in combination with fulvestrant (N+F; Figure 1). Clinical responses were promising but of short duration. Clinical progression coincided with emergence of additional HER2 mutations and/or amplification of the mutant allele.<sup>6</sup>
- Addition of trastuzumab (T) to the doublet was postulated to prolong response. The combination of N+F+T in heavily pretreated patients with HR+, HER2-mutant MBC who had received cyclin-dependent kinase 4/6 inhibitors (CDK4/6is; n=51) yielded a confirmed overall response rate (ORR) of 35.3%, median duration of response (DOR) of 14.3 months, clinical benefit rate (CBR) of 47.1%, and median progression-free survival (PFS) of 8.2 months.8
- Seven of these 51 patients were part of a cohort that was randomized (1:1:1) to N+F+T, F+T, or F alone. Patients randomized to F+T or F could crossover to N+F+T upon progression. No patients responded to F or F+T; however, one of four patients who crossed over to N+F+T after progressing on F+T responded to the triplet, as did two of six who crossed over after progressing on F.8
- We undertook longitudinal circulating tumor DNA (ctDNA) sequencing in patients who responded to N+F+T upfront and after crossover

#### Figure 1. SUMMIT study design: HR+, HER2-, HER2-mutant MBC cohorts



# Objectives

- To report baseline HER2 alterations, as assessed by central next-generation sequencing (NGS) of ctDNA and compare with reported enrollment mutations.
- To longitudinally evaluate HER2 mutation variant allele frequencies (VAFs) in patients with clinical responses to N+F+T at three timepoints: before treatment, on treatment, and either at end of treatment, progression, or at last blood drav
- To assess longitudinal genomic profiles of patients randomized to F or F+T who then crossed over to N+F+T.
- To determine whether potential mechanisms of acquired resistance to N+F+T (dual HER2 therapy) are consistent with or different from those previously reported for N+F

# Methods

- NGS was conducted using the Tempus xF+ assay (Tempus Labs, Chicago, IL)
- Tempus xF+ is a targeted liquid biopsy panel that detects cell-free DNA (cfDNA) in blood specimens obtained from patients with advanced solid tumors and detects:
- Single-nucleotide variants and insertions and/or deletions in 523 genes.
- Gene rearrangements in 10 genes
- Copy number variants (CNVs), including gains in seven genes and losses in two genes.

### Analysis cohort

- Patients were enrolled on SUMMIT on the basis of an activating HER2 mutation as reported by any commercial or Clinical Laboratory Improvement Amendments/College of American Pathologists (or regionally equivalently) certified laboratory, sequenced from either tissue (formalin-fixed paraffin embedded; FFPE) or liquid biopsy.
- A total of 68 patients had HR+, HER2-, HER2-mutant MBC and prior CDK4/6i therapy; ctDNA was centrally assessed for 24 patients (Figure 2).
- ctDNA from pre-treatment liquid biopsies was sequenced by Tempus xF+ (Table 2). The genomic spectrum was consistent with prior SUMMIT cohorts and with publicly available datasets (Figure 3).

# Results

Patients with HR+, HER2-, HER2-mutant MBC treated with N+F+T had increased response and prolonged PFS (Table 1).

Small randomized cohorts supported the contribution of N to the triplet.

<sup>3</sup>Puma Biotechnology, Inc., San Francisco, CA, USA; <sup>14</sup>Memorial Sloan-Kettering Cancer Center, New York, NY, USA

#### Table 1. Efficacy summary overall and according to treatment received<sup>8</sup>

Parameter	Non-randomized + Randomized HR+ Prior CDK4/6i (N+F+T, n=51)	Randomized HR+ Prior CDK4/6i (F+T, n=7)	After crossover from F+T to N+F+T (n=4)	Randomized HR+ Prior CDK4/6i (F, n=7)	After crossover from F to N+F+T (n=6)
Objective response (confirmed CR or PR) <sup>a</sup> , n (%) CR PR	18 (35.3) 1 (2.0) 17 (33.3)	0 0 0	1 (25.0) 0 1 (25.0)	0 0 0	2 (33.3) 0 2 (33.3)
Best overall response <sup>b</sup> (confirmed or unconfirmed PR or CR), n (%)	25 (49.0)	0	1 (25.0)	0	2 (33.3)
Median DOR <sup>c</sup> , months (95% CI)	14.3 (6.4–NE)	No response	6.2 (NE-NE)	No response	6.3 (6.2–6.4)
Clinical benefit <sup>d</sup> , n (%)	24 (47.1)	0	1 (25.0)	0	5 (83.3)
Median PFS <sup>c</sup> , months (95% CI)	8.2 (4.7-12.7)	3.9 (1.9-4.1)	8.25 (NE-NE)	4.1 (1.6-4.1)	NE

rval; CR, confirmed response; NE, not estimable; PR, partial response; SD, stable disease

ier analysis. For crossover patients, calculated from time of crossover to N+F+T. hefit defined as confirmed CR or PR or SD for ≥24 weeks (within ± 7-day visit window)

#### Figure 2. ctDNA samples for central NGS



#### Table 2. Concordance between enrollment assay and central pretreatment ctDNA NGS

Central NGS	Enrollment assay sample type		
Pretreatment ctDNA (centrally assessed), n (%)	FFPE tissue (n=14)	ctDNA (n=10)	
HER2 mutation detected	13 (92.8)	8 (80.0)°	
HER2 mutation not detected	1 (7.1)	2 (20.0)	

### Figure 3. Genomic spectrum of centrally assessed ctDNA at baseline (n=24)

88%	
38%	Inframe mutation (putative driver)
33%	Missense mutation (putative driver)
29%	Missense mutation (unknown significance)
17%	Splice mutation (unknown significance)
17%	Truncating mutation (putative driver)
13%	Amplification
13%	No alterations
8%	
	88%

Figure 4. HER2 mutations: VAF in patients<sup>a</sup> treated with N+F+T. Blood draw and ctDNA sequencing A) at pretreatment, on-treatment, and at time of progression in patients who progressed after treatment and B) at pretreatment, on-treatment, and at last blood draw in patients who remained on treatment



#### HER2 mutations in patients treated with N+F+T

- HER2 VAFs decreased upon treatment with N+F+T in patients with clinical response, and re-emerged upon progression, along with additional HER2 mutations, including gatekeepers, sensitive mutations, and variants of unknown significance (Figure 4A).
- HER2 VAFs decreased upon treatment initiation in patients with clinical response to N+F+T, and remained undetectable while patients remained on treatment (Figure 4B).
- Individual patient mutation profiles are shown in Figure 5 and detail emergence of mutations upon disease progression.

#### Figure 5. Emergent mutations at progression on N+F+T





Copyright 2022 Puma Biotechnology

**#PD17-01** 

#### Crossover case study 1: F to N+F+T



#### Crossover case study 2: F+T to N+F+T



# Conclusions

- HER2 mutation VAFs in ctDNA from patients with HR+, HER2-mutant MBC decrease upon treatment with N+F+T and increase upon progression, consistent with tumor response over time
- Enrollment HER2 mutations detected by local clinical assays on either archival primary or metastatic tissue, or liquid biopsy, were 88% overall concordant with centrally assessed ctDNA analysis of pretreatment blood samples
- The spectrum of genomic alterations was consistent with prior SUMMIT breast cancer cohorts and publicly available datasets. In 12 of the 14 patients who had clinical response to N+F+T and longitudinal ctDNA sequencing, the HER2 mutation was undetectable in the on-treatment sample; only those two with L755S remained detectable on treatment. This observation is consistent with the reported lesser sensitivity of L755S relative to other HER2 mutations.1,7,9
- Mutations that emerged upon progression on N+F+T in patients with initial clinical response included additional HER2 alterations (gatekeeper mutations, sensitive mutations, and variants of unknown significance) and mutations in PIK3CA, PTEN, and TP53.
- Dual HER2 targeting plus HR targeting (N+F+T), despite deepening and prolonging clinical response compared with N+F alone, did not preclude eventual emergence of additional HER2 genomic events.
- Highlighted case studies of patients initially randomized to F or F+T who then crossed over to receive the triplet. with corresponding ctDNA analysis and imaging results, support the role of N in the efficacy of the triplet regimen.

### References

- Bose et al. Cancer Discov 2013:3:224-37
- Razavi et al. Cancer Cell 2018;34:427–38
- . Nayar et al. Nat Genet 2019;51:207-16. , ann et al. Clin Cancer Res 2019:25:277–89
- 5. Hyman et al. Nature 2018;554:189-94.
- 6. Smyth et al. Cancer Discov 2020:10:198-213
- Ma et al. Clin Cancer Res 2017;23:5687-95 8. Jhaveri et al. J Clin Oncol 2022;40(16 suppl.)1028.
- 9. Li et al. Cell Cycle 2019;18:1513-22.

### Acknowledgments and disclosures

- The authors would like to thank all patients and their families for participating in the SUMMIT study
- SUMMIT was sponsored by Puma Biotechnology, Inc.
- Puma Biotechnology, Inc. funded the editorial/creative assistance for this poster, which was provided by Miller Medical Communications Ltd The presenting author, Cynthia Ma, has the following financial relationships to disclose
- Research grant (institution): Puma Biotechnology, Inc. Grant funding: DOD BC170330P1.