

Neratinib + fulvestrant + trastuzumab for hormone-receptor positive, HER2-negative, HER2-mutant metastatic breast cancer: outcomes and biomarker analysis from the SUMMIT trial

Komal Jhaveri,¹ Jonathan W. Goldman,² Sara A. Hurvitz,³ Angel Guerrero-Zotano,⁴ Nisha Unni,⁵ Adam Brufsky,⁶ Haeseong Park,⁷ James Waisman,⁸ Eddie S. Yang,⁹ Iben Spanggaard,¹⁰ Sonya Reid,¹¹ Mark Burkard,¹² Aleix Prat,¹³ Sherene Loi,¹⁴ John Crown,¹⁵ Ariella Hanker,¹⁶ Ron Bose,¹² Bo Xhang,¹⁸ Lisa D. Eli,¹⁸ Hans Wildiers¹⁹ ¹Memorial Sloan Kettering Cancer Center, New York, NY, USA; ²UCLA, Santa Monica, CA, USA; ³David Geffen School of Medicine, UCLA, Santa Monica, CA, USA; ⁴Cluy of Hope Comprehensive Cancer Center, Duarte, CA, USA; ⁴University of Alabama at Birmingham, Birmingham, Birmingham, AL, USA; ⁴David Geffen School of Medicine, UCLA, Santa Monica, CA, USA; ⁴Cluy of Hope Comprehensive Cancer Center, Duarte, CA, USA; ⁴University of Alabama at Birmingham, Birmingham, AL, USA; ⁴Paringshospitalet – Copenhagen University Hospital, Copenhagen, Denmark; ¹¹The Vanderbilt Breast Center, Nashville, TN, USA; ⁴¹University of Medicine and Public Health, Madison, WI, USA; ¹²Hospital Clinic de Barcelona, Spain; ¹⁴Peter MacCallum Cancer Centre, Melbourne, Australia; ¹³St. Vincent's Private Hospital, Dublin, Ireland; ¹⁴University of Texas Southwestern Medical Center; Dallas, TX, USA; ¹³Washington University, St. Louis, MO, USA; ¹⁴University Hospitals Leuven, Leuven, Belgium

Introduction

- *HER2* mutations are oncogenic drivers in a subset of metastatic breast cancers (MBC), and may be acquired as a mechanism of resistance to endocrine therapy.¹⁻⁴
- Neratinib (N) is an oral, irreversible, pan-HER tyrosine kinase inhibitor that has demonstrated preclinical and clinical activity against HER2 mutations.¹⁻⁸
- In the hypothesis-generating SUMMIT basket trial (NCT01953926). HR+. HER2-mutant breast cancer treated with N had an ORR of 17%, median PFS of 3.6 months (n=18); patients treated with N + fulvestrant (F) had an ORR of 30% with a median PFS of 5.4 months (n=26).5,6
- ctDNA analysis of patients with *HER2* mutations in SUMMIT or MutHER (NCT01670877) who benefited from N as a single agent or in combination with F revealed acquisition of additional HER2 mutations and/or amplification of the HER2 mutant allele upon progression.⁶ Based on these observations. addition of trastuzumab (T) in five MutHER patients at progression on N+F resulted in three responses and one long-term stable disease.9
- These two independent data sets prompted the hypothesis that addition of T to N+F at the onset of treatment may increase clinical benefit and/or duration of response.
- Addition of T to N+F showed encouraging clinical activity with durable responses in the SUMMIT trial in hormone-receptor positive (HR+), HER2negative. HER2-mutant MBC, including patients who had previously received cyclin-dependent kinase 4/6 inhibitors (CKD4/6i).8,10
- A small, randomized Simon's 2-stage comparison (IDMC adjudicated) of N+F+T vs F+T vs F in patients with HR+, HER2-mutant MBC who had received prior CDK4/6i demonstrated a dependence upon N for response to the combination of N+F+T.9

Objectives

- To evaluate efficacy of N+F+T in patients with HR+. HER2-negative. HER2-mutant MBC who were previously treated with CKD4/6i therapy.
- To evaluate response in patients who crossed over to N+E+T after originally receiving F or F+T as part of the small, randomized design.
- To retrospectively centrally assess *HER2* mutation and HER2 expression statuses
- To explore biomarkers of response to N+F+T, including co-mutations, HER2 receptor levels, and mRNA expression patterns.
- To explore preclinical mechanisms for the increased benefit of addition of T to N in HER2-mutant breast cancer models.

Figure 1. SUMMIT study design: HR+, HER2-negative, HER2-mutant mBC cohorts



Characteristics	Non-randomized + Randomized HR+ Prior CDK4/6i (N+F+T, n=51)	Randomized HR+ Prior CDK4/6i (F+T, n=7)	Randomized HR+ Prior CDK4/6i (F, n=7)
Median age, years (range)	57.0 (25-83)	65.0 (37-72)	55.0 (46-80)
Sex, n (%) Female Male	50 (98.0) 1 (2.0)	7 (100) 0	7 (100) 0
Menopausal status, n (%) Post-menopausal Pre-menopausal N/A	43 (84.3) 7 (13.7) 1 (2.0)	7 (100) 0 0	7 (100) 0 0
ECOG performance status, n (%) 0 1 2	23 (45.1) 27 (52.9) 1 (2.0)	4 (57.1) 3 (42.9) 0	5 (71.4) 2 (28.6) 0
Histological type, n (%) Ductal Lobular Mixed ductal and lobular Other	20 (39.2) 25 (49.0) 1 (2.0) 5 (9.8)	5 (71.4) 2 (28.6) 0 0	5 (71.4) 1 (14.3) 0 1 (14.3)
Location of disease at time of enrollment, n (%) Visceral Non-visceral only Missing	46 (90.2) 4 (7.8) 1 (2.0)	6 (85.7) 1 (14.3) 0	7 (100) 0 0
Median time from first metastasis to enrollment, years (range)	2.2 (0-15)	1.0 (0-4)	1.6 (0-4)

Table 2. Prior therapies in the metastatic setting

Table 1. Baseline demographics

Prior therapies	Non-randomized + Randomized HR+ Prior CDK4/6i (N+F+T, n=51)	Randomized HR+ Prior CDK4/6i (F+T, n=7)	Randomized HR+ Prior CDK4/6i (F, n=7)
Patients with prior treatment for locally advanced/metastatic disease, n $(\%)$	51 (100)	7 (100)	7 (100)
Median number of prior anti-cancer regimens (range)	4 (1-10)	2 (1-10)	2 (1-6)
Prior endocrine therapy, n (%) Prior aromatase inhibitor Prior fulvestrant Prior tamoxifen	49 (96.1) 32 (62.7) 40 (78.4) 7 (13.7)	6 (85.7) 5 (71.4) 3 (42.9) 1 (14.3)	7 (100) 5 (71.4) 4 (57.1) 0 (0.0)
Prior chemotherapy, n (%)	32 (62.7)	2 (28.6)	4 (57.1)
Prior HER2 antibody-directed therapy, n (%)	4 (7.8)	1 (14.3)	1 (14.3)
Prior CDK4/6i, n (%)	51 (100)	7 (100)	7 (100)
Prior PIK3CAi, n (%)	6 (11.8)	1 (14.3)	1 (14.3)
Prior mTORi, n (%)	14 (27.5)	0 (0.0)	1 (14.3)

Table 3. Subject disposition

Parameter	Non-randomized + Randomized HR+ Prior CDK4/6i (N+F+T, n=51)	Randomized HR+ Prior CDK4/6i (F+T, n=7)	Randomized HR+ Prior CDK4/6i (F, n=7)	
Median duration of treatment, months (range)	6.2 (0.4-29.0)	3.5 (0.8 4.1)	2.1 (0.7-4.1)	
Patients crossed over to N+F+T, n (%)	NA	4 (57.1)	6 (85.7)	
Patients continuing treatment, n (%)	16 (31.4)	Before After crossover crossover 0 0	Before After crossover crossover 0 3 (42.9)	
Reasons for treatment discontinuation, n (%) Disease progression Death Adverse event Other	29* (56.9) 0 4 (7.8) 2(3.9)	Before After crossover crossover 3 (42.9) 3 (42.9) 0 0 0 0 0 1 (14.3)	Before After crossover crossover 1** (14.3) 3 (42.9) 0 0 0 0 0 0	

2 patients with clinical progression; **Clinical progression none recentor positive: NA not applicable: N peratipity T tract

Table 4. Efficacy summary

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) ^a , n (%)	18 (35.3)	0	1 (25.0)	0	2 (33.3)			
CR PR	1 (2.0) 17 (33.3)	0	0 1 (25.0)	0	0 2 (33.3)			
Best overall response (confirmed or unconfirmed PR or CR), n (%)	25 (49.0)	0	1 (25.0)	0	2 (33.3)			
Median DOR ^b , months (95% CI)	14.3 (6.4-NE)	No response 6.2 (NENE)		No response	6.3 (6.2-6.4)			
Clinical benefit ^c , n (%)	24 (47.1)	0	1 (25.0)	0	5 (83.3)			
Median PFS ^b , months (95% CI)	Aedian PFS ^a , months (95% Cl) 8.2 (4.7–12.7) 3.9 (1.9–4.1) 8.25 (NE–NE) 4.1 (1.6–4.1) NE							
Data cut-off: 15 April 2022. Tumor response based on: investigator tumor assessments (RECST v1.1) CR, confirmed response; PR, partial response; CR, confidence intervai; DOR, duration of response; NA, not applicable; NE, not estimable; PS; progression-free anvival "Objective response defined as either a conjuter of partial response that is confirment on loss than 4-weeks after the arteria for response are initially met "Vipital herefits defined as confirmed config PM or stable disease (DSI for 2a4 weeks levith) nd-7-davisit window)								

Figure 2. Change in tumor size (target lesion) and characteristics



Figure 3. Duration of treatment and best response for patients randomized to F+T or F, before and after crossover to N+F+T



Table 5. Efficacy by histology and HER2 mutation in N+F+T patients

	Histology			HER2 mutation							
Parameter	Lobular (n=25)	Ductal (n=20)	Other/mixed /unknown (n=6)	L7555 (n=16)	Exon 20 insertion (n=11)	Other KD ^d missense (n=9)	V777L (n=7)	S310F (n=3)	TMD ^e missense (n=2)	Dual HER2 mutations ¹ (n=2)	Exon 19 deletion (n=1)
Objective response (confirmed CR or PR) ^a ,n (%) CR	10 (40.0) 1 (4.0)	7 (35.0) 0	1 (16.7)	4 (25.0) 0	4 (36.4) 0	3 (33.3) 0	4 (57.1) 0	1 (33.3) 0	0	2 (100)	0
PR	9 (36.0)	7 (35.0)	1 (16.7)	4 (25.0)	4 (36.4)	3 (33.3)	4 (57.1)	1 (33.3)	0	1 (50.0)	0
Best overall response (confirmed or unconfirmed PR or CR), n (%)	13 (52.0)	11 (55.0)	1 (16.7)	5 (31.3)	6 (54.5)	5 (55.6)	5 (71.4)	1 (33.3)	0	2 (100)	1 (100)
Median DOR ⁶ , months (95% CI)	14.4 (5.0-NE)	14.3 (4.1–NE)	NE	14.3 (11.1–NE)	NE	6.4 (5.0–18.6)	NE	8.2 (NE-NE)	NE	NE	NE
Clinical benefit ^c , n (%)	12 (48.0)	11 (55.0)	1 (16.7)	7 (43.8)	5 (45.5)	4 (44.4)	4 (57.1)	1 (33.3)	0	2 (100)	1 (100)
Median PFS ^s , months (95% Cl)	8.3 (4.2–18.6)	6.2 (3.9–18.6)	4.0 (1.9–NE)	15.1 (2.6–NE)	10.2 (1.9-NE)	7.0 (2.0–20.5)	6.1 (1.9–NE)	3.4 (1.9–10.2)	1.8 (NE-NE)	NE	12.7 (NE–NE)

Table 6. Most common treatment-emergent adverse events*

	Non-randomized + Randomized HR+ Prior CDK4/6i (N+F+T, n=51)		Random Prior C (F+T,	ized HR+ DK4/6i n=7)	Randomized HR+ Prior CDK4/6i (F, n=7)		
Adverse event, n (%)	Any grade Grade 3**		Any grade	Grade 3/4	Any grade	Grade 3/4	
Diarrhea***	46 (90.2)	26 (51.0)	2 (28.6)	0	0	0	
Nausea	37 (72.5)	2 (3.9)	1 (14.3)	0	2 (28.6)	0	
Vomiting	27 (52.9)	4 (7.8)	0	0	0	0	
Fatigue	22 (43.1)	3 (5.9)	0	0	1 (14.3)	0	
Constipation	21 (41.2)	0	2 (28.6)	0	0	0	
Decreased appetite	20 (39.2)	4 (7.8)	0	0	0	0	
Abdominal pain	13 (25.5)	1 (2.0)	1 (14.3)	0	0	0	
Headache	12 (23.5)	0	1 (14.3)	0	1 (14.3)	0	
Asthenia	9 (17.6)	0	0	0	1 (14.3)	0	
Muscle spasms	9 (17.6)	0	0	0	0	0	
Urinary tract infection	9 (17.6)	0	0	0	0	0	

wo grade 4 AEs were reported (coma, n=1; muscle weakness, n=1) Loperamide prophylaxis: oral 12 mg days 1–14, 8 mg days 15–18; as nee

Table 7. Efficacy by exploratory biomarker: N+F+T patients

Central NGS mutation	No. of patients	ORR n (%)	CBR n (%)	Median PFS months (95% CI)		
HER2 Yes No Insufficient tissue	30 2 nt tissue 19		15 (50.0) 0 9 (47.4)	7.0 (2.6–18.6) 3.0 (1.8–4.1) 8.2 (4.7–18.6)		
HER2 and ERBB3	6	4 (66.7)	4 (66.7)	NE		
HER2 and ESR1	4	2 (50.0)	2 (50.0)	8.7 (1.9–18.6)		
HER2 and CDH1	16	7 (43.8)	7 (43.8)	7.0 (1.9–20.5)		
HER2 and TP53	7	2 (28.6)	2 (28.6)	2.0 (1.0-15.1)		
HER2 and PIK3CA	11	3 (27.3)	4 (36.4)	2.5 (1.0-18.6)		
HER2 and none of above	7	4 (57.1)	4 (57.1)	10.2 (3.9-NE)		
IHC category 0/1+ 2+ 3+ Insufficient tissue	9 18 1 23	2 (22.2) 6 (33.3) 0 10 (43.5)	3 (33.3) 8 (44.4) 0 13 (56.5)	7.0 (1.8–NE) 6.2 (2.4–NE) 3.9 (NE) 8.3 (4.2–18.6)		
Molecular subtype Luminal A Luminal B HER2-enriched Insufficient tissue	4 4 9 34	0 2 (50.0) 4 (44.4) 12 (35.3)	0 2 (50.0) 5 (55.6) 17 (50.0)	3.1 (1.0-NE) NE 10.2 (1.8-20.5) 8.2 (6.0-15.1)		

Figure 4. Addition of T to N in HER2-mutant cell line model



Conclusions

- The combination of N+F+T demonstrated encouraging clinical activity in patients with heavily pretreated HR+, HER2-negative, HER2-mutant MBC who had previously received CDK4/6i
- Confirmed ORR 35.3%, median DOR 14.3 months, CBR 41.7%, median PES 8.2 months.
- Preclinically, the addition of T to N prolonged suppression of HER3 phosphorylation in HR+, HER2-mutant breast cancer models, consistent with the reported increase in PFS for patients treated upfront with N+F+T compared with N or N+F.
- N appears to be a critical component of the combination therapy, as demonstrated by lack of response in the small cohort of patients treated with F or F+T, and by response in a subset of those upon crossover to N+F+T.
- Responses to N+F+T were observed in patients with both ductal and lobular histology; as opposed to apparent association of lobular histology with response to N+F reported in the MutHER trial.¹⁰
- Responses to N+F+T were observed across patients whose tumors harbored HER2 extracellular domain missense mutations (S310F/Y), exon 20 insertions, and several kinase domain missense mutations, even L755S, which had been reported to be associated with lower response to N+F.10
- Co-occurrence of HER2 and HER3 mutations did not preclude response to N+F+T, in contrast with the lack of clinical benefit reported for patients whose tumors harbored dual HER2/HER3 mutations who were treated with N or N+F.6,10,11
- Negative HER2 status (local FISH/IHC) was a criterion for enrolment; central retrospective testing revealed that 64.2% (n=18/28) of samples tested from patients treated with N+F+T were IHC 2+.
- All retrospective biomarker analyses were limited by the lack of adequate tissue for central NGS assessment of fresh, pretreatment biopsies.

Future directions

- Centrally assess HER2 FISH copy number and FISH ratio in patient tumors with adequate tissue remaining.
- Broaden understanding of HER2 receptor expression patterns in HER2-mutant MBC by mining large datasets, such as Project GENIE¹⁴, and comparing with the SUMMIT population:
- Are the majority of all HER2-mutant MBC patients also 'HER2-low' and, if so, what are the implications?
- Evaluate baseline ctDNA and mechanisms of acquired resistance to N+F+T by performing NGS on serial liquid biopsies.

8 Ihaveri et al. SABCS 2020 Abstract PD1-09

Ma et al. Clin Cancer Res 2022;28:1758-67.
 Jhaveri et al. SABCS 2021 Abstract GS4-10.
 Hanker et al. Cancer Cell 2021;1099–114.e
 Davidina tal. Cancer cell 2021;2029–214.e

Further explore preclinically the mechanistic rationale for addition of T to N.

References

- Bose et al. Cancer Disco very 2013-3-224-3
- Bose et al. Cancer Discovery 2015;3:224-37.
 Razavi et al. Cancer Cell 2018;34:427-38.
 Nayar et al. Nat Genet 2019;51:207-16.
 Croessmann et al. Clin Cancer Res 2019;25:277-89.
 Hyman et al. Nature 2018;554:189-94.
- 6. Smyth et al. Cancer Discov 2020;10:198–213.
 7. Ma et al. Clin Cancer Res 2017;23:5687–95.
- Beaubier et al. Oncotarget 2019;2384–96.
 Cheng et al. J Mol Diagn 2015;251–64.
 Andre et al. Cancer Discov 2017;818–31. Acknowledgements 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 Medica ommunications Ltd
- The presenting author, Komal Jhaveri, has the following financial relationships to disclose Research grant (institution): Puma Biotechnology Ind
- This presentation is the intellectual property of the author/presenter. Contact them at Email: jhaverik@mskcc.org for permission to reprint and/or distribute