Exploratory biomarker analysis of trastuzumab deruxtecan (T-DXd) versus trastuzumab emtansine (T-DM1) efficacy in human epidermal growth factor receptor 2–positive (HER2+) metastatic breast cancer (mBC) in DESTINY-Breast03

William Jacot,[1] Seock-Ah Im,[2] Sherene Loi,[3] Thomas Bachelot,[4] Sara Hurvitz,[5] Srinivasan Madhusudan,[6] Hiroji Iwata,[7] Giuseppe Curigliano,[8,9] Javier Cortés,[10,11,12] Anton Egorov,[13] Vinit Kumar,[14] Aislyn Boran,[14] Yusuke Kuwahara,[14] Erika Hamilton[15]

[1]Institut du Cancer de Montpellier, Université de Montpellier, INSERM U1194, Montpellier, France; [2]Seoul National University Hospital, Cancer Research Institute, Seoul National University College of Medicine, Seoul, Republic of Korea; [3]Peter MacCallum Cancer Centre, The University of Melbourne, Melbourne, VIC, Australia; [4]Centre Léon Bérard, Lyon, France; [5]University of Washington School of Medicine, Fred Hutchinson Cancer Center, Seattle, WA, USA; [6]School of Medicine, University of Nottingham, Nottingham University Hospital, Nottingham, United Kingdom; [7]Aichi Cancer Center Hospital, Nagoya, Japan; [8]European Institute of Oncology, IRCCS, Milan, Italy; [9]Department of Oncology and Hemato-Oncology, University of Milan, Italy; [10]Quironsalud Group, Pangaea Oncology, International Breast Cancer Center, Madrid, Spain; [11]IOB Madrid, Hospital Beata María Ana, Madrid, Spain; [12]Faculty of Biomedical and Health Sciences, Universidad Europea de Madrid, Madrid, Spain; [13]Daiichi Sankyo, Inc., Rueil-Malmaison, France; [14]Daiichi Sankyo, Inc., Basking Ridge, NJ, USA; [15]Sarah Cannon Research Institute, Nashville, TN, USA

Introduction

- In the randomized DESTINY-Breast03 study (NCT03529110), T-DXd, a HER2-directed antibody-drug conjugate, demonstrated superior efficacy compared with T-DM1 in patients with HER2+ mBC that progressed on or after trastuzumab plus taxane[3]
- During the second interim analysis (data cutoff [DCO] July 25, 2022), T-DXd demonstrated clinically meaningful improvement versus T-DM1, with a median progression-free survival (mPFS) by blinded independent central review (BICR) of 28.8 months versus 6.8 months (hazard ratio, 0.33 [95% CI, 0.26-0.43])[3]
  – Confirmed objective response rate (ORR) by BICR was 79% (21% experiencing a complete response [CR]) with T-DXd versus 35% (10% experiencing a CR) with T-DM1[3]
- Based on DESTINY-Breast03 results, T-DXd was approved for the treatment of patients with HER2+ mBC who have received a prior anti-HER2–based regimen in either the metastatic setting or in the neoadjuvant/adjuvant setting and had developed disease recurrence during or within 6 months of completing therapy[4]
- The cytotoxic payload of T-DXd is a topoisomerase I inhibitor,[5] and molecular biomarkers of DNA damage response and cell proliferation pathways may be useful as prognostic and predictive biomarkers[6,7]

Methods

- Methods of sample collection are shown in **Figure 1**
- In this comprehensive analysis, a Cox proportional hazards model was used to assess any association between baseline biomarker status and differences in T-DXd versus T-DM1 clinical efficacy (mPFS) at a median follow-up of 28.4 months and 26.5 months in the T-DXd and T-DM1 arms, respectively
  – Large genomic rearrangements were excluded
  – Circulating tumor DNA (ctDNA) tumor fraction (maximum variant allele frequency [VAF]) is a known prognostic factor[8] and was associated with PFS in this biomarker analysis. Because of this, ctDNA tumor fraction was tested as a covariate for each Cox proportional hazards model; this did not change the conclusions for each biomarker
  – Copy number variations (CNVs) were generally excluded (except where noted, i.e. HER2, phosphatase and tensin homolog [PTEN], BRCA, and homologous recombination repair) from correlative analysis because these are only detectable above a certain ctDNA tumor fraction threshold. CNVs are reported only in the baseline genomic landscape
  – Alterations observed in <10% of patients were excluded from correlative analysis

- Genetic alterations of interest were reported regardless of statistical significance, including:
  – Median plasma HER2 adjusted copy number (aCN), adjusted for ctDNA tumor fraction according to published methods,[9] from patients with HER2 amplified status
  – PI3K pathway alterations defined per the CAPItello-291 trial: activating mutations in PIK3CA and AKT and inactivating alterations (including deletions) in PTEN genes[10,11]
  – TP53 alterations included single nucleotide variants (SNVs) and insertions/deletions (indels) and were classified as loss of function according to oncoKB™
  – HRD status (cutoff value 0.4) according to the Guardant Infinity pipeline, which incorporates a probabilistic model of genomic and methylation predictors[12]
  – BRCA1/2 SNVs, CNVs, or indels, including both somatic and germline, classified as loss of function according to Guardant Health functional annotation (Note: germline mutations were not included if not allowed by enrolling country or site)
    » HRD status is based on an algorithm employed by Guardant Health which is not fully defined by mutational status. This may partially explain why BRCA-mutant cases are not fully encapsulated in the HRD-positive subgroup. In addition, samples with monoallelic loss have been reported to have HRD-loss-of-heterozygosity scores which are similar to BRCA wild-type cases.[13,14] The majority of BRCA1/2 alterations in this ctDNA dataset were deletions, with unknown allelic or monoallelic status and may not have a functional impact (ie, are HRD negative)

- For emerging mutations from paired baseline/EOT ctDNA analysis (Figure 1):
  – Analysis included only genes with a prevalence ≥5% in either arm at baseline or EOT
  – A McNemar test was applied to determine if the numbers of mutant cases detected at baseline versus EOT were different on a patient level, within each treatment arm
  – Emerging mutations with a significant P value of ≤0.05 by McNemar test were tested to identify treatment arm-specific emerging gene alterations by interaction P value based on a generalized linear model, including tumor fraction as a covariate[15]
  – Multiple testing correction was conducted using Benjamini-Hochberg procedure in each treatment arm
  – For TOP1 mutations, all detected TOP1 SNVs/indels at baseline or EOT were analyzed and reported regardless of prevalence and VAF

Figure 1. Sample collection

Figure 1. Sample collection

Results

Baseline Genomic Landscape

- The DESTINY-Breast03 baseline genomic landscape was representative of HER2+ breast cancer, with most frequent alterations (SNVs, CNVs, and indels) observed in TP53 (73%), HER2 (ERBB2; 61%), CDK12 (52%), and PIK3CA (48%)
- In this comprehensive analysis, there were no baseline genomic alterations identified that were predictive of efficacy of T-DXd compared with T-DM1
- Several baseline genomic alterations of interest are reported
- The efficacy and baseline characteristics were comparable for the intent-to-treat versus baseline ctDNA evaluable populations (data not shown)

Baseline HER2 Genomic Status

- Detection rate of HER2 amplification in ctDNA was 56% (236 of 421 samples), including aneuploidy and focal HER2 amplification
- HER2 plasma aCN was higher in the subgroup of patients with HER2 immunohistochemistry 3+ versus immunohistochemistry 2+ tumors (data not shown)
- Efficacy was comparable in both arms regardless of high/low median HER2 plasma aCN at baseline; a trend towards lower efficacy was more apparent in the T-DM1 arm, which had numerically shorter mPFS and lower ORRs in the low HER2 plasma aCN subgroup (Figure 2; Table 1)
  – Patients without any HER2 amplification detected in ctDNA (not detected [ND]) tend to have lower ctDNA tumor fraction, which is positively prognostic,[9] as reflected by the efficacy in this subgroup
- Clinical response to T-DXd was similar and remained greater than that of T-DM1 in patients with (T-DXd, n = 20; T-DM1, n = 20) and without (T-DXd, n = 184; T-DM1, n = 197) baseline activating HER2 alterations

Baseline PI3K Pathway Alteration Status

- T-DXd maintained superior clinical activity compared with T-DM1 regardless of the presence of PI3K pathway alterations (Figure 3; Table 1)
- PIK3CA mutations have previously been shown to have a prognostic effect, with longer PFS for patients whose tumors expressed wild-type versus mutated PIK3CA[16,17]
- Although there is a potential relationship with PIK3CA mutation status and T-DM1 efficacy in early BC, T-DM1 appears to be effective regardless of PIK3CA mutation status in mBC[18]

Baseline TP53 Alteration Status

- T-DXd maintained superior clinical activity to T-DM1 regardless of the presence of TP53 alterations
- Efficacy was comparable in both arms irrespective of TP53 alteration status (Figure 3; Table 1)

Baseline HRD Status

- T-DXd maintained superior clinical activity to T-DM1 regardless of HRD status
- ORR was similar regardless of HRD status in the T-DXd arm and numerically lower in the HRD positive subgroup of the T-DM1 arm; mPFS tended to be shorter in both arms in patients with HRD positive status (Figure 3; Table 1)

Baseline BRCA1/2 Alteration Status

- T-DXd maintained superior clinical activity to T-DM1 regardless of BRCA1/2 alteration status
- ORRs were similar in the T-DXd arm regardless of BRCA1/2 alteration status, whereas ORR tended to be lower in patients with BRCA1/2 alterations in the T-DM1 arm (Figure 3; Table 1)
- mPFS tended to be slightly shorter in patients with BRCA1/2 alterations compared with patients without BRCA1/2 alterations in both arms

Emerging Mutations at EOT

- The number of patients with APC and ATM mutations at EOT was higher compared to baseline in the T-DM1 arm based on the McNemar test. In the T-DXd arm at EOT compared with baseline, the number of patients with CHEK2 mutations was higher and the number of patients with HER2, GATA3, MED12, PIK3CA, and TP53 mutations was lower, per the McNemar test (Figure 4)
- PIK3CA mutations were retained after treatment in the T-DM1 arm compared with the T-DXd arm, where mutations were less frequent at EOT, based on a generalized linear model accounting for ctDNA tumor fraction (interaction P value, 0.014; Figure 4)
- Although present at low frequencies in both arms at baseline and EOT (<5.0%), TOP1 mutations appeared to emerge in 4 patients in the T-DXd arm; no emerging TOP1 mutations were detected in the T-DM1 arm (Figure 5)
  – In the T-DXd arm, multiple emerging TOP1 mutations were detected in 2 patients with a best overall response of partial response who discontinued due to disease progression
  – All emerging TOP1 mutations, except one, have unknown significance relating to TOP1 function or inhibitor binding and span the N-terminal, core, and linker domains of TOP1

Figure 2. Efficacy according to baseline HER2 plasma aCN

Figure 2. Efficacy according to baseline HER2 plasma aCN

Figure 3. Association of baseline biomarkers and hazard ratio for PFS

Figure 3. Association of baseline biomarkers and hazard ratio for PFS

[a]Not detected in samples with analyzable ctDNA.

Table 1. Efficacy according to baseline biomarker status

Biomarker	Status	Treatment Arm, n (%)[a]	ORR (95% CI), %	mPFS (95% CI), months	mPFS Hazard Ratio (95% CI)	mPFS Interaction P Value
HER2 Plasma aCN	High aCN	T-DXd 62 (30.4)	87.1 (76.1-94.3)	23.9 (18.0-NE)	0.46 (0.27-0.77)	0.53
		T-DM1 56 (25.8)	50.0 (36.3-63.7)	9.7 (5.8-25.7)		
	Low aCN	T-DXd 59 (28.9)	81.4 (69.1-90.3)	21.1 (12.3-NE)	0.39 (0.24-0.61)	
		T-DM1 59 (27.2)	35.6 (23.6-49.1)	5.4 (3.0-6.8)		
	HER2 amp ND[b]	T-DXd 83 (40.7)	77.1 (66.6-85.6)	37.3 (26.2-NE)	0.31 (0.21-0.48)	-
		T-DM1 102 (47.0)	22.5 (14.5-32.4)	8.1 (4.4-10.9)		
PI3K Alteration	PI3K alteration positive	T-DXd 87 (42.6)	80.5 (70.6-88.2)	27.6 (15.0-NE)	0.32 (0.22-0.48)	0.35
		T-DM1 87 (40.1)	33.3 (23.6-44.3)	4.4 (3.2-6.8)		
	PI3K alteration ND[b]	T-DXd 117 (57.4)	82.1 (73.9-88.5)	NE (22.1-NE)	0.40 (0.28-0.58)	
		T-DM1 130 (59.9)	40.0 (31.5-49.0)	9.7 (6.8-12.1)		
TP53 Alteration	TP53 alteration positive	T-DXd 123 (60.3)	86.2 (78.8-91.7)	29.0 (21.0-NE)	0.34 (0.24-0.48)	0.38
		T-DM1 137 (63.1)	35.0 (27.1-143.7)	5.6 (4.2-8.2)		
	TP53 alteration ND[b]	T-DXd 81 (39.7)	74.1 (63.1-83.2)	27.5 (20.9-NE)	0.42 (0.27-0.66)	
		T-DM1 80 (36.9)	41.3 (30.4-52.8)	8.4 (5.8-14.0)		
HRD Status	HRD positive	T-DXd 23 (11.3)	82.6 (61.2-95.1)	12.4 (6.8-NE)	0.36 (0.18-0.71)	0.67
		T-DM1 27 (12.4)	14.8 (4.2-33.7)	2.8 (1.4-4.3)		
	HRD negative	T-DXd 181 (88.7)	81.4 (74.8-86.6)	37.3 (23.7-NE)	0.37 (0.28-0.49)	
		T-DM1 190 (87.6)	40.5 (33.5-47.9)	7.1 (5.7-9.7)		
BRCA1/2 Alteration	BRCA1/2 alteration positive	T-DXd 40 (19.6)	80.0 (64.4-91.0)	21.1 (11.9-NE)	0.37 (0.21-0.66)	0.72
		T-DM1 38 (17.5)	26.3 (13.4-43.1)	2.7 (1.5-7.0)		
	BRCA1/2 alteration ND[b]	T-DXd 164 (80.4)	81.7 (74.9-87.3)	37.3 (23.7-NE)	0.36 (0.27-0.48)	
		T-DM1 179 (81.1)	39.7 (32.4-47.2)	8.1 (5.6-9.8)		

[a]Percentages calculated using 204 and 217 as the denominators for T-DXd and T-DM1, respectively.
[b]Not detected in samples with analyzable ctDNA.

Figure 4. Emerging mutations at EOT

Figure 4. Emerging mutations at EOT

P values were calculated based on the McNemar test.
[a]Multiple testing correction was conducted using Benjamini-Hochberg procedure in each treatment arm.

Figure 5. Emerging TOP1 mutations at baseline and EOT

Figure 5. Emerging TOP1 mutations at baseline and EOT

Asterisk denotes translation termination. Grey line represents max VAF as tumor fraction.
[*]Confirmed BOR, reason for discontinuation.

Objective

- This was the first exploratory biomarker analysis of DESTINY-Breast03 aimed to investigate the potential prognostic and/or predictive value of baseline genomic alterations with T-DXd versus T-DM1 treatment in patients with HER2+ mBC. Genomic alterations at end of treatment (EOT) were also examined to assess their emergence after treatment with T-DXd versus T-DM1

Conclusions

- Based on this comprehensive analysis, genomic alterations at baseline were not identified to be predictive of efficacy of T-DXd compared with T-DM1
- T-DXd maintained superior activity compared with T-DM1 regardless of the presence of predefined detectable baseline genomic alterations relevant to mBC, including phosphoinositide 3-kinase (PI3K), homologous recombination deficiency (HRD), breast cancer gene 1 (BRCA1/2), and tumor protein 53 (TP53)
- Emergence of topoisomerase 1 (TOP1) mutations after T-DXd treatment represents a potential mechanism of resistance in a limited number of patients from DESTINY-Breast03. Due to the small number of cases and currently unknown impact of observed mutations on TOP1 function or DXd binding, additional datasets may be beneficial to further characterize the significance of this finding[1,2]

Plain Language Summary

Why did we perform this research?
Trastuzumab deruxtecan (T-DXd) is an anticancer therapy that targets a protein called human epidermal growth factor receptor 2 (HER2) which is highly expressed in approximately 20% of breast cancer cases.[1-3] The treatment benefits and safety of T-DXd were compared with those of trastuzumab emtansine (T-DM1) in the DESTINY-Breast03 trial.[4,5] Patients included in the trial must have had HER2-positive breast cancer that could not be removed by surgery and had spread to other areas of the body (metastatic).[4,5] Previous results from DESTINY-Breast03 showed T-DXd to be more beneficial in patients compared with T-DM1.[4,5] The objective of this biomarker analysis was to investigate the effect of T-DXd versus T-DM1 according to genomic alterations present at the start of the trial (before receiving T-DXd or T-DM1 treatment). The emergence of genomic alterations after treatment with T-DXd or T-DM1 was also investigated.

How did we perform this research?
Blood samples were collected from patients in the DESTINY-Breast03 trial at the start and end of trial treatment with either T-DXd or T-DM1. Biomarkers within the samples were measured to determine the presence or absence of a specific gene alteration. Efficacy outcomes were assessed to investigate whether the presence of gene alterations was associated with the clinical effects of T-DXd versus T-DM1 treatment.

What were the findings of this research?
T-DXd consistently demonstrated better treatment benefits compared with T-DM1 across all the biomarker groups analyzed at the start of treatment. At the end of treatment, PIK3CA mutations were found to persist after T-DM1 treatment compared with T-DXd. In addition, TOP1 mutations were found after T-DXd treatment in a small number of patients and may represent a rare mechanism by which T-DXd stops having an effect.

What are the implications of this research?
These results demonstrated that the treatment benefits of T-DXd do not appear to be influenced by the biomarkers assessed in this analysis. Further studies are needed to assess the implications of emerging mutations with treatment.

Where can I access more information?
To learn more about the DESTINY-Breast03 study, you can visit https://clinicaltrials.gov/ct2/show/NCT03529110

References

1. Slamon DJ et al. Science. 1989;244(4905):707-712.
2. Iqbal N et al. Mol Biol Int. 2014;2014:852748.
3. Ogliari Y et al. Clin Cancer Res. 2016;22(20):5094-5108.
4. Cortés J et al. N Engl J Med. 2022;386(12):1143-1154.
5. Hurvitz SA et al. Lancet. 2023;401(10371):105-117.

References

1. Costes JT et al. Cancer Discl. 2021;11(10):2436-2445.
2. Ocdnogesai Abelman R et al. Cancer Res. 2022;65:116-123.
3. Snavegna G et al. Clin Cancer Res. 2019;25(10):3046-3053.
4. ErkHERlU. Sem-trastuzumab deruxtecan-nxki for injection, for intravenous use. Prescribing information. Daiichi Sankyo Inc; 2024.
5. Oglari Y et al. Clin Cancer Res. 2016;22(20):5094-5108.
6. Neves Rebello Alves L et al. Genes (Basel). 2023;14(7):1364.
7. Thomas A et al. Clin Cancer Res. 2019;25(22):6581-6589.
8. Imura D et al. J Clin Oncol. 2016;25:116-123.
9. Hundix S et al. Lancet. 2023;401:105-117.
10. ENHERTU® (fam-trastuzumab deruxtecan-nxki) for injection, for intravenous use. Prescribing information. Daiichi Sankyo Inc; 2024.
11. Turner NC et al. N Engl J Med. 2023;388:2058-2070.
12. Barbacioru C et al. Presented at American Society of Clinical Oncology Annual Meeting; June 2-6, 2023; Chicago, Illinois. Abstract 558.
13. Foundation One CDx technical information (K4x), FoundationOne_CDx_Label_Technical_Info.pdf (www.foundationmedicine.com).
14. Sokol ES et al. JCO Precis Oncol. 2020;4:442-465.
15. Andrei P et al. Am J Clin Oncol. 2004; Vol. 10.1016.
16. Perez EA et al. BMC Cancer. 2019;19:517.
17. Baselga J et al. J Clin Oncol. 2016;34(20):3753-3761.
18. Hunter FW et al. Br J Cancer. 2020;122(5):603-612.

André 2004.09.010. Online ahead of print.