RELAY+: Exploratory Study of Ramucirumab Plus Gefitinib in Untreated Patients With EGFR-Mutated Metastatic NSCLC

Makoto Nishio, MD, PhD,a,b Kazuto Nishio, MD, PhD,c Martin Reck, MD, PhD,d Edward B. Garon, MD,e Fumio Imamura, MD, PhD,f Tomoyuki Kawaguchi, PhD,g Hironori Yamaguchi, MD, PhD,h Satoshi Ikeda, MD, PhD,i Katsuya Hirano, MD,j Carla Visseren-Grul, MD,k Matteo Cecarelli, PharmD, MS,l Sameera R. Wijayawardana, PhD,m Annamaria Zimmermann, MD,n Tomoko Matsui,o Sotaro Enatsu, MD, PhD,p Kazuhiko Nakagawa, MD, PhDq

aDepartment of Thoracic Medical Oncology, The Cancer Institute Hospital of Japan, Tokyo, Japan
bDepartment of Genome Biology, Kindai University, Faculty of Medicine, Osaka, Japan
cLungClinic, Airway Research Center North, German Center of Lung Research, Grosshansdorf, Germany
dDepartment of Medicine, David Geffen School of Medicine at UCLA/TRIO-US Network, Los Angeles, California

*Corresponding author.

Disclosure: Dr. M. Nishio reports receiving grants and/or payment or honoraria from AstraZeneca, Boehringer Ingelheim, Bristol-Myers Squibb, Chugai Pharmaceutical Co., Ltd., Daiichi Sankyo Company, Limited, Eli Lilly Company, Merck Biopharma Co., Ltd., Merck Sharp & Dohme, Novartis, Ono Pharmaceutical Co., Ltd., Pfizer, Taiho Pharmaceutical Co., Ltd., Takeda Pharmaceutical Company Limited, and Teijin Pharma Limited. Prof. K. Nishio reports receiving support for this manuscript, grants or contracts, consulting fees, and/or honoraria from Amgen Inc., AstraZeneca, Bristol-Myers Squibb, Chugai Pharmaceutical Co., Ltd., Eisai Co., Ltd., Eli Lilly and Company, Eli Lilly Japan K.K., Guardant Health, Ignyta, Inc., Kansai Bio, Kyowa, Merck, Ono Pharmaceutical Co., Ltd., Oska Minami Hospital, Otsuka Pharmaceutical Co., Ltd., Life Technologies Japan, Merck Biopharma Co., Ltd., Merck Sharp & Dohme, Nichirei Biosciences Inc., Nippon Boehringer Ingelheim Co., Ltd., North East Asia Study Group, Novartis Pharma K.K., Ono Pharmaceutical Co., Ltd., Osaka Nihon Hospital, Otsuka Pharmaceutical Co., Ltd., Pfizer, Roche Diagnostics K.K., Sanofi, Solasia Pharma, SymBio Pharmaceuticals Limited, Thracic Oncology Research Group, and Yakult Honsha Co., Ltd. Prof. Dr. Reck reports receiving consultancy fees and/or payment or honoraria from AbbVie, Amgen, AstraZeneca, Bristol-Myers Squibb, Boehringer Ingelheim, Celgene K.K., Eli Lilly and Company, Merck, Merck Sharp & Dohme, Novartis, Pfizer, and Roche Diagnostics K.K. Prof. Garon reports receiving grants or contracts and/or consulting fees from ABL Bio, Boehringer Ingelheim, Bristol-Myers Squibb, Dracen Pharmaceuticals, Eisai Co., Ltd., EMD Serono, Inc., GlaxoSmithKline, Merck, Natera Inc., Novartis, Regeneron Pharmaceuticals Inc., Sanofi, Shionogi & Co., Ltd., and Xilido Therapeutics and grants/research support from AstraZeneca, Bristol-Myers Squibb, Dynavax Technologies, Eli Lilly and Company, EMD Serono, Inc., Genentech, Iovance Biotherapeutics, Merck, Mirati Therapeutics, Inc., Neon, and Novartis. Dr. Imamura reports receiving support for this manuscript from Eli Lilly and Company and honoraria from AstraZeneca, Boehringer Ingelheim, Bristol-Myers Squibb, Chugai Pharmaceutical Co., Ltd., Eli Lilly Company, Merck Biopharma, Merck Sharp & Dohme, Novartis Pharma K.K., Ono Pharmaceutical Co., Ltd., and Pfizer. Ass. Prof. Kawaguchi reports receiving payment or honoraria from Chugai Pharmaceutical Co., Ltd., and Merck Sharp & Dohme. Dr. Yamaguchi reports receiving support for this manuscript, grants or contracts, consulting fees, and/or honoraria from AstraZeneca, Bristol-Myers Squibb, Chugai Pharmaceutical Co., Ltd., Daiichi Sankyo Company, Limited, Eli Lilly and Company, Merck Sharp & Dohme, Novartis Pharma K.K., Ono Pharmaceutical Co., Ltd., Pfizer, Taiho Pharmaceutical Co., Ltd., Takeda Pharmaceutical Company Limited, and TOWA Pharmaceutical Co., Ltd. Dr. Ikeda reports receiving grants or contracts and/or honoraria from AstraZeneca K.K., Boehringer Ingelheim, Bristol-Myers Squibb, Chugai Pharmaceutical Co., Ltd., Eli Lilly Japan K.K., Ono Pharmaceutical Co., Ltd., Pfizer, and Taiho Pharmaceutical Co., Ltd. Dr. Hirano reports receiving payment or honoraria from AstraZeneca, Boehringer Ingelheim, Chugai Pharmaceutical Co., Ltd., and Ono Pharmaceutical Co., Ltd. Drs. Visseren-Grul, Cecarelli, and Wijayawardana and Mrs. Zimmerman are employees and shareholders of Eli Lilly and Company. Ms. Matsui and Dr. Enatsu are employees of Eli Lilly Japan K.K. and shareholders of Eli Lilly and Company. Prof. Nakagawa reports receiving support for the manuscript, grants or contracts, payment or honoraria, and/or payment for expert testimony from A2 Healthcare Corporation, 3H Clinical Trial Inc., AbbVie Inc., Amgen Inc., Astellas Pharma Inc., AstraZeneca K.K., Bayer, Yakuhin, Ltd., Bristol-Myers Squibb Company, CareNet, Inc., Chugai Pharmaceutical Co., Ltd., CMIC Shift Zero K.K., Covance Japan Co., Ltd., Daiichi Sankyo Company, Limited, Eisai Co., Ltd., Eli Lilly Japan K.K., EPS Corporation, EPS International Co., Ltd., GlaxoSmithKline K.K., Hisamitsu Pharmaceutical Co., Inc., ICON Japan K.K., IQVIA Services Japan K.K., Japan Clinical Research Operations, Kissei Pharmaceutical Co., Ltd., Kyorin Pharmaceutical Co., Ltd., Medical Mobile Communications Co., Ltd., Medical Research Support, Medical Review Co., Ltd., MEDICUS SHUP-PAN, Publishers Co., Ltd., Merck Biopharma Co., Ltd., Mochida Pharmaceutical Co., Ltd., Merck Sharp & Dohme K.K., Nanzando Co., Ltd., Nichi-iko Pharmaceutical Co., Ltd., Nikki Business Publications Inc., Nippon Boehringer Ingelheim Co., Ltd., Nippon Kayaku Co., Ltd., Novartis Pharma K.K., Ono Pharmaceutical Co., Ltd., Otsuka Pharmaceutical Co., Ltd., Parexel International Corp., Pfizer Japan Inc., Pfister R&D Japan G.K., PPD-SNBL K.K., PRA Health Sciences, Roche Diagnostics K.K., Sanofi K.K., SymBio Pharmaceuticals Limited, Synexa Health, Sysmex Corporation, Taiho Pharmaceutical Co., Ltd., Takeda Pharmaceutical Company Limited, Thermo Fisher Scientific K.K., Yodosha Company, Ltd., and Yomiuri Telecasting Corporation.

Address for correspondence: Makoto Nishio, MD, PhD, Department of Thoracic Medical Oncology, The Cancer Institute Hospital of Japan, Foundation for Cancer Research, 3-8-31 Arika, Koto-ku, Tokyo 135-8550, Japan. E-mail: mnishio@jicr.or.jp

Cite this article as: Nishio M, Nishio K, Reck M, et al. RELAY+: Exploratory study of ramucirumab plus gefitinib in untreated patients with EGFR-mutated metastatic NSCLC. JTO Clin Res Rep. XXXX;X:XXXXXX. Japan. E-mail: mnishio@jicr.or.jp

© 2022 The Authors. Published by Elsevier Inc. on behalf of the International Association for the Study of Lung Cancer. This is an open access article under the CC BY-NC-ND license (http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/4.0/). ISSN: 2666-3643

https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jtocr.2022.100303
Introduction: Ramucirumab (RAM) plus erlotinib was found to have superior progression-free survival (PFS) versus placebo plus erlotinib in untreated EGFR-mutated metastatic NSCLC in the global phase 3 RELAY study. RELAY+ was an open-label, two-period, single-arm, exploratory study of RAM plus gefitinib (GEF; period 1) and RAM plus osimertinib (period 2) in East Asia (NCT02411448).

Methods: Period 1 evaluated RAM (10 mg/kg) plus GEF (250 mg/d) in patients with untreated EGFR-mutated metastatic NSCLC. Period 2 evaluated RAM plus osimertinib (80 mg/d) in patients with disease progression who acquired T790M mutation in period 1. Exploratory end points included 1-year PFS rate (primary), other efficacy parameters, safety, and biomarker analyses of plasma (baseline, on-treatment, follow-up) using next-generation sequencing.

Results: From December 2017 to August 2018, a total of 82 patients were enrolled and started treatment (period 1, RAM + GEF). The 1-year PFS rate was 62.9% (95% confidence interval: 50.3–73.1). Treatment-emergent adverse events of grade three or higher were reported with RAM plus GEF in 60 of 82 patients (73.2%; five patients [6.1%] grade four). There were two deaths owing to adverse events that occurred (acute cardiac failure, congestive cardiac failure). T790M rate at disease progression in plasma was 81.0% (13 of 16 patients).

Conclusions: RELAY+ was found to have a favorable benefit-risk profile for RAM plus GEF in first-line treatment of East Asian patients with EGFR-mutated NSCLC.

© 2022 The Authors. Published by Elsevier Inc. on behalf of the International Association for the Study of Lung Cancer. This is an open access article under the CC BY-NC-ND license (http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/4.0/).
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Introduction

In East Asia, lung cancer has the highest incidence and mortality rate of all cancers. Approximately 50% of tumors from Asian patients with adenocarcinoma NSCLC have an EGFR gene mutation. The prevalence of EGFR mutations is higher in Asian populations than in white populations (approximately 40% versus 20%). In-frame deletions of exon 19 (ex19del) and an L858R point mutation in exon 21 (ex21.L858R) are the most common types of activating EGFR mutations, accounting for up to 46% and 39%, respectively, of mutations in the tyrosine kinase domain of the EGFR gene in EGFR-mutated NSCLC.

EGFR tyrosine kinase inhibitors (TKIs) are standard-of-care first-line treatment for EGFR-mutated NSCLC. Nevertheless, many patients eventually develop treatment resistance and experience disease progression on EGFR TKI therapy. Approximately 30% to 60% of patients with NSCLC treated with first- and second-generation EGFR TKIs acquire the EGFR T790M resistance mutation, whereas resistance mechanisms to the third-generation EGFR TKI osimertinib (OSI) are heterogeneous and mostly not targetable. After targeted treatments are exhausted, chemotherapy is the recommended treatment option. Additional treatment options to enhance the long-term efficacy of EGFR TKIs are therefore required.

Dual inhibition of the EGFR and vascular endothelial growth factor (VEGF) pathways has been found to be a viable treatment strategy to improve outcomes for patients with EGFR-mutated NSCLC. Using this strategy, promising efficacy has been shown in several clinical studies (JO25567, NEJ026, CTONG 1509, and RELAY), all of which have combined erlotinib (ERL), an EGFR TKI, with a VEGF inhibitor. RELAY was a global, phase 3, double-blind, randomized, placebocontrolled study investigating the efficacy and safety of the addition of ramucirumab (RAM), a human IgG1 VEGF receptor 2 antagonist, to ERL (RAM + ERL) in treatment-naive EGFR-mutated metastatic NSCLC.
free survival (PFS) was superior with RAM plus ERL treatment compared with placebo (PL) plus ERL (PL + ERL) (median PFS = 19.4 mo versus 12.4 mo; hazard ratio [HR] = 0.59 [95% confidence interval (CI): 0.46–0.76], p < 0.0001; 1-y PFS rate: 71.9% [95% CI: 65.1–77.6] versus 50.7% [95% CI: 43.7–57.3] for RAM + ERL and PL + ERL, respectively). The PFS benefit was consistent for ex19del and ex21.L858R subgroups. The safety profile in RELAY was consistent with established safety profiles of RAM and ERL in metastatic EGFR-mutated NSCLC. Similar efficacy and safety results were observed in the Japanese and East Asian RELAY subset populations. ERL and gefitinib (GEF) are first-generation EGFR TKIs used for first-line treatment of EGFR-mutated NSCLC. EGFR variants have been found in preclinical studies to have different sensitivity to ERL and GEF, and in the clinical setting ERL is used at its maximum tolerated dose, whereas GEF is used at submaximum tolerated dose levels. RELAY+, an additional cohort of RELAY, was an open-label, two-period, single-arm, exploratory study designed to evaluate the efficacy and safety of RAM plus GEF (RAM + GEF; period 1) for the first-line treatment of East Asian (Japanese, South Korean, Taiwanese) patients with metastatic EGFR-mutated NSCLC. In addition, the safety of RAM plus OSI (RAM + OSI; period 2) was evaluated in patients who had progressed on RAM plus GEF and acquired the T790M mutation during period 1. We report efficacy and safety results for period 1 and safety results for period 2.

---

**Figure 1.** RELAY+ exploratory open-label cohort: (A) study design and (B) patient disposition. aThe exploratory cohort included patients enrolled in Japan, South Korea, and Taiwan. bDeath due to adverse event. One patient died due to acute cardiac failure and one patient died due to congestive cardiac failure. Both events were considered related to the study treatment. Data cutoff date: November 25, 2020. GEF, gefitinib; ITT, intent-to-treat; OSI, osimertinib; q2w, once every 2 weeks; RAM, ramucirumab.
Materials and Methods

Study Design

RELAY+ (part C addendum of the RELAY study \[supplementary methods\]; www.clinicaltrials.gov; NCT02411448) was an open-label, two-period, single-arm, exploratory study conducted in Japan, South Korea, and Taiwan (Fig. 1A). Period 1 evaluated the efficacy and safety of RAM plus GEF in patients with untreated EGFR-mutated metastatic NSCLC. Period 2 evaluated the safety of RAM plus OSI in patients who had progressed on RAM plus GEF in period 1 and had developed the T790M mutation. Two exploratory biomarker studies were conducted; the first in the intent-to-treat populations and the second an optional exploratory liquid biopsy addendum specific to patients enrolled in Japan. Ethics review boards of each site approved the study protocol and addendum. The study was conducted in accordance with the Declaration of Helsinki, The Council for International Organizations of Medical Sciences International Ethical Guidelines, Good Clinical Practice guidelines, and local guidelines. All patients provided written informed consent.

Study Population

Patient inclusion and exclusion criteria were the same as those for RELAY.17 Briefly, patients were 18 years of age and older (≥20 y in Japan and Taiwan), previously had untreated stage IV NSCLC (defined by the American Joint Committee on Cancer Staging criteria for lung cancer), an Eastern Cooperative Oncology Group performance status of 0 or 1, no central nervous system metastases, and documented evidence by local testing methods (therascreen, cobas, etc.) that the tumor was positive for EGFR ex19del or ex21.L858R mutation. Patients known to have the T790M mutation were excluded.

Treatment Protocol

In period 1, the patients received RAM (10 mg/kg administered intravenously every 2 wk) plus GEF (250 mg orally once daily). In period 2, the eligible patients received RAM (10 mg/kg every 2 wk) plus OSI (80 mg orally once daily). Patients were eligible for period 2 if they had disease progression in period 1 and had confirmed T790M-positive metastatic NSCLC (Fig. 1A; Supplementary Methods). Patients received treatment (RAM + GEF; RAM + OSI) until disease progression according to Response Evaluation Criteria in Solid Tumours version 1.1, unacceptable toxicity to either drug, noncompliance, or investigator or patient decision.

Outcome Measures

Primary end point was 1-year PFS rate (investigator-assessed) in period 1. Secondary end points included the following: overall survival (OS) rates; objective response rate (ORR), disease control rate (DCR), duration of response (DOR), and second occurrence of progressive disease (PFS2). Outcome measures are defined in the Supplementary Methods. The safety of RAM was assessed by the occurrence of adverse events (AEs) and graded according to the National Cancer Institute Common Terminology Criteria for Adverse Events version 4.0.

Biomarker Analyses

Liquid biopsy samples at baseline and at postperiod 1 study treatment discontinuation (30-d follow-up) were analyzed by Guardant360 (Guardant Health, Redwood City, CA) NGS17 for T790M and TP53 mutations. Plasma samples from patients enrolled in the exploratory liquid biopsy addendum were collected at baseline, during treatment (cycle 4, cycle 13, and every six cycles until progression), and at 30-day follow-up for circulating tumor DNA (ctDNA) assessment. Somatic mutations and copy number variation were analyzed by droplet digital polymerase chain reaction (ddPCR).

Statistical Analysis

Approximately 80 patients with untreated EGFR-mutated metastatic NSCLC were planned to be enrolled and treated with RAM plus GEF (Supplementary Methods). Data cutoff dates were November 25, 2020 (efficacy, safety, and Guardant360 results), and February 8, 2021 (exploratory liquid biopsy addendum results).

Efficacy end points were evaluated in the period 1 intent-to-treat population (all patients enrolled to RAM + GEF in period 1); efficacy data were investigator-assessed. PFS, PFS2, OS, and DOR rates were estimated using the Kaplan-Meier method; corresponding 95% CIs were estimated using Brookmeyer and Crowley, or Greenwood, methods. Patients were censored at the date of their last radiographic tumor assessment if, at the data cutoff date, it was not known if they had died or had disease progression. ORR and DCR were calculated as defined by Response Evaluation Criteria in Solid Tumours version 1.1; 95% CIs were calculated using the Clopper-Pearson method. Patients with no postbaseline tumor response assessments for any reason were considered nonresponders and were included in the denominator when calculating the response rate. DOR analysis was for responders only; if a responder was not known to have died or have objective progression, then the patient was censored at the date of last evaluable tumor assessment.

Safety end points were assessed in the safety analysis populations (period 1 safety population, all patients who received at least one dose of any study treatment in
Table 1. Demographic and Clinical Characteristics of Patients at Baseline (Period 1 ITT Population)

| Characteristics                  | RAM + GEF (N = 82) |
|----------------------------------|--------------------|
| Sex                              |                    |
| Female                           | 54 (65.9)          |
| Male                             | 28 (34.1)          |
| Age, y                           |                    |
| Median                           | 68                 |
| Min-max                          | 44–85              |
| Race                             |                    |
| Asian                            | 82 (100)           |
| Country                          |                    |
| Japan                            | 68 (82.9)          |
| South Korea                      | 6 (7.3)            |
| Taiwan                           | 8 (9.8)            |
| Smoking history                  |                    |
| Ever                             | 26 (31.7)          |
| Never                            | 54 (65.9)          |
| Unknown or missing               | 2 (2.4)            |
| ECOG PS                          |                    |
| 0                                | 43 (52.4)          |
| 1                                | 39 (47.6)          |
| Disease classification           |                    |
| Primary metastatic               | 61 (74.4)          |
| Recurrent metastatic             | 21 (25.6)          |
| EGFR mutation type               |                    |
| Exon 19 deletion                 | 36 (43.9)          |
| Exon 21 (L858R) mutation         | 46 (56.1)          |
| EGFR testing method              |                    |
| therascreen and cobas            | 32 (39.0)          |
| Other PCR and sequencing-based   | 50 (61.0)          |
| methods                          |                    |

*Except where otherwise indicated, data are n (%).

Determined by local testing.

ECOG PS, Eastern Cooperative Oncology Group performance status; GEF, gefitinib; ITT, intent-to-treat; max, maximum; min, minimum; PCR, polymerase chain reaction; RAM, ramucirumab.

Table 1. Demographic and Clinical Characteristics of Patients at Baseline (Period 1 ITT Population)

estimated using the Kaplan-Meier method; HRs and corresponding 95% CIs were estimated using Cox regression models. Prognostic effects of baseline patient characteristics ($EGFR$ mutation detected by ddPCR [detected versus not detected], sex [male versus female], disease stage [metastatic disease versus recurrent metastatic disease], Eastern Cooperative Oncology Group performance status [1 versus 0], smoking history [other versus never], and age [$\geq 65$ versus $<65$ y]) on PFS were estimated using univariable and multivariable Cox proportional hazards regression and illustrated graphically using forest plots.

Results

Patient Disposition and Baseline Demographics

RELAY+ study enrollment occurred on December 18, 2017, to August 16, 2018. A total of 82 patients were enrolled and treated in period 1 (Fig. 1B). At data cutoff, 10 patients (12.2%) in period 1 remained on the study treatment and 72 patients (87.8%) had discontinued period 1 study treatment (Fig. 1B). The most common reasons for period 1 study treatment discontinuation were progressive disease (56.1%; 46 of 82 patients) and AEs (17.1%; 14 of 82 patients). Of the patients who had disease progression on RAM plus GEF in period 1, 16 patients provided informed consent to continue into period 2; six patients (37.5%) met the criteria to continue into period 2. The main reason for not meeting the criteria was negative T790M status on the basis of local testing (Fig. 1B). At data cutoff, all patients in period 2 (RAM + OSI) had discontinued study treatment (Figs. 1B and 2). The reasons for period 2 study treatment discontinuation were progressive disease (83.3%; five of six patients) and an AE (16.7%; one of six patients).

Baseline characteristics reflected the East Asian patient population with metastatic NSCLC with $EGFR$-activating mutations, excluding patients with central nervous system metastasis (Table 1). Most patients in period 1 were Japanese (82.9%), female (65.9%), had never smoked (65.9%), and had a diagnosis of primary metastatic disease (74.4%); median age was 68 years. The most common $EGFR$-activating mutation was ex21L858R (56.1%) compared with ex19del mutation (43.9%). Of the six patients who continued into period 2, median age (minimum [min]–maximum [max]) was 63.5 (56–80) years, three patients (50.0%) were female, and four (66.7%) had an ex19del mutation (Supplementary Table 1).

Efficacy

At data cutoff, median follow-up time was 27.6 (min–max: 2.6–35.3) months. The 1-year PFS rate with
Median PFS was 14.1 months (95% CI: 12.3–16.7). DOR rates (95% CI) at 6, 12, and 18 months were 80.1% (67.0–88.5), 60.7% (46.3–72.4), and 31.3% (19.3–44.1), respectively. OS and PFS2 were immature ( censoring rates, 73.2% and 54.9%, respectively). The OS rate (95% CI) was 94.9% (87.0–98.1) and 79.3% (68.5–86.8) at 1 and 2 years, respectively. The PFS2 rate was 86.0% (76.2–92.0) and 58.6% (46.9–68.7) at 1 and 2 years, respectively (Table 2).

### Treatment Exposure

In period 1 (safety population, N = 82), median (min–max) duration of exposure was 8.7 (0.5–33.6) and 11.8 (0.3–35.3) months, and median relative dose intensity was 95.0% and 99.6%, for RAM and GEF, respectively. In period 2 (safety population, n = 6), patients received RAM for a range of 15 to 225 days, with four patients discontinuing RAM within 42 to 54 days owing to an AE (grade 1 or 2) of decreased platelet count. Patients received OSI for a range of 15 to 270 days, with five patients discontinuing owing to progressive disease and one patient owing to an AE (grade 1) of decreased left ventricular ejection fraction. The median relative dose intensity was 100.0% and 98.7% for RAM and OSI, respectively.

### Postperiod 1 Therapy

Of the 72 patients who had discontinued period 1 study treatment, 59 patients received subsequent systemic therapy, including chemotherapy (n = 34), EGFR TKI therapy (n = 50), immunotherapy (n = 10), VEGF antibody therapy (n = 17), or unknown treatment type (n = 2) (Supplementary Table 2). Overall, 25 of 72 patients (34.7%) who had discontinued period 1 study treatment received OSI as a subsequent treatment, six of whom received OSI as period 2 study treatment. OSI was received as a first, second, third, and fourth subsequent line of treatment by 16, seven, three, and one patients, respectively, with three patients in Japan receiving the maximum of five subsequent lines of postperiod 1 treatment (Supplementary Table 2). Japanese patients tended to continue GEF after discontinuing RAM in period 1 and received EGFR TKI therapy (other than OSI) after period 1 more frequently than non-Japanese patients (Fig. 2).

### Safety

All patients in the period 1 safety population (RAM + GEF; N = 82) reported at least one TEAE
Any-grade TEAEs occurring in 50% of patients or more with RAM plus GEF treatment included dermatitis acneiform (69.5%), increased level of aspartate aminotransferase (AST; 63.4%), diarrhea (62.2%), increased level of alanine aminotransferase (ALT; 61.0%), and hypertension (51.2%). TEAEs of grade three or higher were reported by 60 of 82 patients (73.2%). TEAEs of grade three or higher occurring at a frequency of more than 15% were hypertension (25.6%, all grade 3) and increased ALT level (23.2%, all grade 3) (Table 3).

Overall, five patients (6.1%) had grade four TEAEs, which were aortic valve stenosis, ileus, increased AST level, pneumonitis, and laryngeal obstruction (one patient each, 1.2%). Any-grade AEs of special interest for antiangiogenic agents included bleeding or hemorrhage, 52.4% (primarily driven by low-grade epistaxis; grade ≥3 bleeding, 1.2%); hypertension, 51.2% (grade ≥3, 25.6%); proteinuria, 48.8% (grade ≥3, 2.4%); liver injury or liver failure, 75.6% (grade ≥3, 26.8%); and infusion-related reactions, 1.2% (grade 2) (Table 3). In total, 26 patients (31.7%) in the period 1 safety population had at least one serious AE. Two patients died due to AEs on study treatment (RAM + GEF); events included acute cardiac failure and congestive cardiac failure (one
patient each; 1.2%). Both events were deemed by the investigator as related to the study treatment.

All patients in the period 2 safety population (RAM + OSI; n = 6) reported at least one TEAE (Supplementary Table 3). Grade three TEAEs were reported by three of six patients (50.0%) and included diarrhea, decreased neutrophil count, decreased white blood cell count, pleural effusion, dermatitis acneiform, and pleurodesis (one patient each); no grade four events were observed. One patient discontinued study treatment owing to an AE (grade one ejection fraction decreased); no patient in the period 2 safety population died owing to an AE.

**Biomarker Analyses**

**Guardant360 Central Assessment.** The baseline TP53 mutation rate was 41.7% (30 of 72 evaluable patients); 58.3% (42 of 72 evaluable patients) were wild-type for TP53. Median PFS by baseline TP53 status was 10.7 versus 18.1 months (HR = 0.38 [95% CI: 0.22–0.68]) in the TP53 mutated versus TP53 wild-type groups, respectively (Supplementary Fig. 1). Treatment-emergent postprogression T790M rates were 48.0% (12 of 25 patients; 95% CI: 30.0–66.5) for population 1 and 81.0% (13 of 16 patients; 95% CI: 57.0–93.4) for population 2 (i.e., NGS results at 30-d follow-up contained an EGFR-activating mutation).

**Exploratory Liquid Biopsy Addendum.** Of the 68 patients enrolled in Japan, 48 patients participated in the optional exploratory liquid biopsy addendum. The TR-ddPCR population comprised 46 patients with valid baseline assay results (Supplementary Fig. 2). Median PFS was shorter for patients with an EGFR-activating mutation detected in ctDNA (n = 24) at baseline by ddPCR compared with patients with no EGFR-activating mutation detected in ctDNA (n = 22) at baseline (12.5 versus 27.7 mo, respectively; HR = 0.24 [95% CI: 0.10–0.57]) (Supplementary Fig. 3A). In the TR-ddPCR population, EGFR-activating mutation allele frequency decreased from cycle 4 and remained suppressed throughout treatment (Supplementary Fig. 3B). Median PFS was not different between patients with an EGFR-activating mutation detected at cycle 4 (n = 6) and patients with no EGFR-activating mutation detected at cycle 4 (n = 40) (Supplementary Fig. 4). Primary metastatic disease at baseline was identified as a negative prognostic factor by univariable analysis (HR = 0.20 [95% CI: 0.05–0.83]), but this was not confirmed by multivariable analyses. A detectable EGFR-activating mutation (ddPCR) in ctDNA was identified as a negative prognostic factor for PFS duration by both univariable (HR = 0.24 [95% CI: 0.10–0.57], Supplementary Fig. 3C) and multivariable regression analyses (HR = 0.26 [95% CI: 0.09–0.75]; Supplementary Fig. 3D).

**Discussion**

This is the first exploratory study to investigate RAM plus GEF treatment in East Asian patients with untreated...
The T790M rate at disease progression was 48.0% for patients with an NGS result at baseline and at 30-day follow-up and 81.0% for patients with an NGS result at 30-day follow-up containing an EGFR-activating mutation. More than one-third of patients (25 of 72) who discontinued RAM plus GEF treatment received OSI (six of whom received RAM + OSI) as a subsequent treatment during their full course of treatment post-disease progression. The totality of the efficacy and safety results reported for RAM plus GEF in patients with metastatic NSCLC with an EGFR-activating mutation indicates that RAM plus GEF provides an alternative treatment option for patients with EGFR-mutated NSCLC.

Gefitinib and erlotinib are widely used as monotherapy in East Asia for first-line treatment of patients with EGFR-mutated NSCLC. Clinical studies with Gefitinib and Erlotinib have revealed median PFS values of 9.2 to 10.8 months and 9.7 to 13.1 months, respectively. In the international Lux-Lung 7 study in patients with EGFR-mutated NSCLC (with and without brain metastases), median PFS and the 1-year PFS rate for Gefitinib monotherapy were 10.9 months (95% CI: 9.1–11.5) and 41.3% (95% CI: 33.0–49.5), respectively. Improvements in PFS were observed when Gefitinib was combined with the VEGF inhibitor bevacizumab in a single-arm phase 2 study of Japanese patients with EGFR-mutated NSCLC (median PFS = 14.4 mo [95% CI: 10.1–19.2]; 1-y PFS rate: 56.7% [95% CI: 39.9–70.5]) and in RELAY+ with RAM plus Gefitinib treatment (median PFS = 14.1 [95% CI: 12.3–17.9]; 1-y PFS rate = 62.9% [95% CI: 50.3–73.1]). In the phase 3 RELAY study, RAM plus Erlotinib was compared with PL plus Erlotinib and revealed improved efficacy with combination treatment (median PFS = 19.4 versus 12.4 mo, respectively; 1-y PFS rates = 71.9% versus 50.7%, respectively). These studies provide further support that combination treatment such as RAM plus Gefitinib or RAM plus Erlotinib may be more beneficial than first-generation EGFR TKI monotherapy for the treatment of EGFR-mutated NSCLC.

Despite the pitfalls of indirect comparison of study outcomes, when compared with other studies, the RELAY+ results indicate that OS rates, although immature in this report, may be improved with RAM plus Gefitinib compared with Gefitinib monotherapy. In the Asian subset of FLAURA, a phase 3 double-blind study comparing OSI with Gefitinib or Erlotinib, the 18-month OS rate for OSI versus Gefitinib was 82% versus 72%, respectively, both of which were numerically lower than the 18-month OS rate of 85.8% observed with RAM plus Gefitinib in RELAY+. In ARCHER 1050, a randomized, open-label, phase 3 study of dacomitinib versus Gefitinib, OS rates at 30 months (median duration of follow-up was 31.3 mo) were 56.2% versus 46.3%, respectively. In RELAY+, the 30-month OS rate (median follow-up duration, 27.6 mo) with RAM plus Gefitinib treatment was 69.3%. Furthermore, the 18-month OS rates of RAM plus Gefitinib observed in RELAY+ were comparable with those observed with RAM plus Erlotinib in the East Asian subgroup population of RELAY (85.8% versus 87.2%, respectively). Importantly, however, the FLAURA study included patients with brain metastases, but ARCHER 1050, RELAY+, and RELAY excluded these patients, and thus, this difference in the patient cohorts should be considered when comparing the OS rates of these studies.

### Table 3. TEAEs Occurring in ≥30% of Patients and AESIs for RAM (Period 1 Safety Population)

| Event                                      | RAM + GEF (N = 82) |
|--------------------------------------------|--------------------|
| TEAEs, n (%)                               | Any grade          | Grade ≥3 |
| ≥1 TEAE                                    | 82 (100.0)         | 60 (73.2) |
| Dermatitis acineform                      | 57 (69.5)          | 3 (3.7)  |
| Increased AST                              | 52 (63.4)          | 10 (12.2) |
| Diarrhea                                   | 51 (62.2)          | 5 (6.1)  |
| Increased ALT                              | 50 (61.0)          | 19 (23.2) |
| Hypertension                               | 42 (51.2)          | 21 (25.6) |
| Proteinuria                                | 38 (46.3)          | 1 (1.2)  |
| Paronychia                                 | 37 (45.1)          | 0 (0)    |
| Stomatitis                                 | 37 (45.1)          | 0 (0)    |
| Dry skin                                   | 29 (35.4)          | 0 (0)    |
| Epistaxis                                  | 25 (30.5)          | 0 (0)    |
| AESIs, n (%)                               | Any grade          | Grade ≥3 |
| Bleeding or hemorrhage                     | 43 (52.4)          | 1 (1.2)  |
| Epistaxis                                  | 25 (30.5)          | 0 (0)    |
| GI hemorrhage                              | 7 (8.5)            | 0 (0)    |
| Pulmonary hemorrhage                       | 2 (2.4)            | 0 (0)    |
| Hypertension                               | 42 (51.2)          | 21 (25.6) |
| Proteinuria                                | 40 (48.8)          | 2 (2.4)  |
| Liver injury or liver failure              | 62 (75.6)          | 22 (26.8) |
| Increased AST                              | 52 (63.4)          | 10 (12.2) |
| Increased ALT                              | 50 (61.0)          | 19 (23.2) |
| Increased blood bilirubin                  | 12 (14.6)          | 0 (0)    |
| Infusion-related reactions                  | 1 (1.2)            | 0 (0)    |
| Other TEAE of interest, n (%)              | Any grade          | Grade ≥3 |
|ILD[^a^]                                   | 2 (2.4)            | 2 (2.4)  |
Dermatitis acneiform, known to be associated with EGFR TKI treatment, was reported in 69.5% of RELAY+ patients treated with RAM plus GEF; this was lower than the incidence reported in the RELAY East Asian subset population treated with RAM plus ERL (78.7%). Paronychia, another skin toxicity associated with EGFR TKI treatment, was reported at a lower incidence in RELAY+ (45.1%) than in RELAY with RAM plus ERL (East Asian subset, 61%). Hypertension is a well-known class-related effect of VEGF/VEGF receptor antagonists. In RELAY+, grade three hypertension was the most frequently reported (25.6%) grade three event, which was also observed in RELAY for both the East Asian and Japanese subset populations with RAM plus ERL. AEs of special interest for RAM generally occurred at a higher incidence in RELAY+ (RAM + GEF) than in the RELAY East Asian safety population (RAM + ERL): hypertension (51.2% versus 42.7%), liver injury or liver failure (75.6% versus 66.5%), and proteinuria (48.8% versus 38.4%); an exception was bleeding and hemorrhage (52.4% versus 55.5%). No new safety issues or concerns were identified, although liver injury events of grade three or higher were more common in RELAY+ than in RELAY, consistent with the established safety profile of GEF. In period 2 (n = 6), low-grade decreased platelet count with no clinical sequelae was reported by four patients. Although the patient cohort was limited in size, RAM plus OSI treatment did not reveal any unexpected safety issues.

Japanese patients are at higher risk of developing interstitial lung disease (ILD), a known complication of EGFR TKI therapy. Patients who develop ILD cannot continue EGFR TKI therapy, and thus, cannot receive OSI if they acquire the T790M mutation. Furthermore, the survival of patients with EGFR-mutated NSCLC is generally longer than those with wild-type NSCLC. It is therefore important that the risk of ILD, and any other AEs, in first-line treatment is reduced. In RELAY+, ILD events were reported by two patients (2.4%), an occurrence similar to that observed in the RELAY Japanese and East Asian populations with RAM plus ERL (one patient [1.8%] and three patients [1.8%], respectively), and lower than that observed with PL plus ERL (five patients [4.8%] and six patients [3.5%], respectively). In a phase 3 study comparing GEF and standard chemotherapy in Japanese patients with EGFR-mutated NSCLC (NEJ002), the incidence of ILD with GEF monotherapy was 5.3% (six of 114 patients), indicating RAM plus GEF in RELAY+, or RAM plus ERL in RELAY, did not increase the number of ILD events.

In this patient cohort, the presence of a TP53 alteration at baseline, as well as a detectable EGFR mutation in ctDNA, was confirmed to be associated with a poor prognosis. Suppression of the EGFR-activating mutation allele frequency at cycle 4 with RAM plus GEF was not associated with prognosis. Emergence of the T790M mutation can lead to acquired resistance to EGFR TKIs resulting in treatment failure. Tumor-derived elements isolated from liquid biopsy samples provide a less invasive alternative to tumor biopsies. By Guardant360 NGS, the post-progression T790M rates with RAM plus GEF were 48.0% (12 of 25 patients) and 81.0% (13 of 16 patients) for patients with an NGS result at baseline and at 30-day follow-up and for those with an NGS result at 30-day follow-up containing an EGFR-activating mutation, respectively. These data suggest that treatment with an EGFR TKI targeted therapy, such as OSI, continues to be a subsequent treatment option.

RELAY+ implemented a relevant treatment combination using GEF for a study population of East Asian patients. This study was further strengthened with the addition of the exploratory liquid biopsy study to assess treatment-emergent T790M mutation rates. This study was limited by the open-label exploratory design without a control or comparator group, and the exploratory liquid biopsy addendum was limited to patients with a valid baseline sample. The study is ongoing, and the evaluation of RAM plus OSI after acquisition of the T790M mutation is still to be determined.

Conclusions

RELAY+ revealed a favorable benefit–risk profile for RAM plus GEF in the first-line treatment of East Asian patients with EGFR-mutated NSCLC. The addition of RAM to GEF did not result in new or unexpected safety findings. RAM plus GEF provides an alternative treatment option for patients with EGFR-mutated NSCLC whose preferred first-generation EGFR TKI is GEF. Further treatment with RAM plus OSI after T790M mutation acquisition is being studied.
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