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Background

- Sunitinib was approved by the EMA and US FDA for patients with advanced pancreatic NET based on a randomized, phase III, double-blind study showing an improved PFS vs placebo (primary endpoint) 11.4 vs 5.5 months (HR: 0.42; 95% CI: 0.26–0.66; P<0.001)\(^1\)
- At trial closure, there was an advantage for sunitinib over placebo in OS (secondary endpoint)
- 69% of patients randomized to placebo crossed over to sunitinib upon disease progression or trial closure, potentially confounding OS analysis
- We now present OS data 2 years after study closure and updated OS analyses after adjusting for crossover


NET, neuroendocrine tumor
Eligibility criteria
• Well-differentiated, malignant pancreatic NET
• Disease progression in past 12 months
• Not amenable to treatment with curative intent

Balanced by region
• Europe, Asia, Americas, Australia

N=340 (planned)

Primary endpoint: PFS
Secondary endpoints: OS, ORR, time to tumor response, duration of response, safety, PROs

CDD, continuous daily dosing; PROs, patient-reported outcomes

With best supportive care; somatostatin analogs permitted

Early trial closure occurred due to differences in deaths, serious AEs, and PFS
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**Demographic and Baseline Characteristics**

- A total of 171 patients were enrolled between June 2007 and April 2009

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Sunitinib (n=86)</th>
<th>Placebo (n=85)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Median (range) age, years</td>
<td>56 (25–84)</td>
<td>57 (26–78)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male/female, n (%)</td>
<td>42/44 (49/51)</td>
<td>40/45 (47/53)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ECOG performance status, n (%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>53 (62)</td>
<td>41 (48)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>33 (38)</td>
<td>43 (51)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1 (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Involved disease sites, n (%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pancreas</td>
<td>35 (41)</td>
<td>31 (36)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lymph node</td>
<td>29 (34)</td>
<td>41 (48)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liver</td>
<td>79 (92)</td>
<td>78 (92)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>30 (35)</td>
<td>44 (52)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^a\)Protocol violation

\(^b\)Includes both target and non-target sites; sites with multiple lesions counted once

# Tumor Functionality and Prior Therapy

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Sunitinib (n=86)</th>
<th>Placebo (n=85)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Tumor functionality at baseline</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-functioning</td>
<td>42 (49)</td>
<td>44 (52)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Functioning</td>
<td>25 (29)</td>
<td>21 (25)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unknown/missing</td>
<td>19 (22)</td>
<td>20 (24)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Prior surgery</strong></td>
<td>76 (88)</td>
<td>77 (91)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Prior systemic therapy</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anthracyclines</td>
<td>27 (31)</td>
<td>35 (41)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Streptozocin</td>
<td>24 (28)</td>
<td>28 (33)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fluoropyrimidines</td>
<td>20 (23)</td>
<td>25 (29)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Number of prior systemic regimens</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>20 (23)</td>
<td>25 (29)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>15 (17)</td>
<td>13 (15)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>≥3</td>
<td>10 (12)</td>
<td>12 (14)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Concomitant somatostatin analog</strong></td>
<td>23 (27)</td>
<td>25 (29)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*aExcluding chemoembolization and regimens with somatostatin analog only

PFS (Primary Endpoint)

Sunitinib (n=86)
Median: 11.4 months

Placebo (n=85)
Median: 5.5 months

HR: 0.42
95% CI: 0.26–0.66
P<0.001

OS at 2 Years After Trial Closure: ITT Analysis

- Median duration of follow-up: 34.1 months

**Sunitinib (n=86)**
- Events: 40 (47%)
- Median: 33.0 months

**Placebo (n=85)**
- Events: 47 (55%)
- Median: 26.7 months

HR: 0.71
95% CI: 0.47−1.09
P=0.115
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- Crossover causes bias in two ways
  - Mixing of treatment effects: outcomes in control arm reflect benefit of experimental drug among patients who cross over
  - Selection bias: patients who cross over are usually those most likely to benefit from experimental drug and are not comparable to initially randomized population

- Since crossover usually occurs after progression, endpoints occurring after progression, such as OS, are affected

Impact of Crossover (cont’d)

- The timing of crossover can vary; early crossover may influence endpoints at early stages.

Early crossover implies that even early portions of the placebo curve are biased.

Separation of the curves despite crossovers suggests likely effect benefit for sunitinib that is attenuated by crossover.

Crossover in Placebo Arm

- Of patients in the placebo arm:
  - with PD, 38 (79%) crossed over to sunitinib treatment
  - without PD, 21 (58%) crossed over on trial closure

- Crossover occurred early
  - ~30% of patients crossed over by 3 months
  - ~50% of patients crossed over by 6 months
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1. Censoring placebo-arm data at crossover
   - Associated with selection bias
   - May result in underestimation of OS in experimental arm

2. Cox model analysis with treatment as a time-dependent covariate
   - Also has risk of selection bias

3. Rank-preserving structural failure time (RPSFT) analysis
   - Assumes treatment with experimental drug affects survival time uniformly in all patients
   - Times on treatment after crossover adjusted to reflect what would have happened if patients had stayed on control treatment

4. Extended RPSFT analysis
   - Assumes active treatment likely to change over time, with less effect the longer crossover is delayed (e.g., by 30% if crossover occurred 3 months after start of control treatment)
## Analysis of OS with Adjustment for Crossover

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>OS analysis/treatment group</th>
<th>Deaths</th>
<th>Median (months)</th>
<th>HR&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</th>
<th>95% CI</th>
<th>P</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ITT − no adjustment for crossover</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sunitinib (n=86)</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>33.0</td>
<td>0.71</td>
<td>0.47–1.09</td>
<td>0.115</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Placebo (n=85)</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>26.7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Adjustment for crossover (placebo; n=85)</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Censoring at crossover</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>16.3</td>
<td>0.43</td>
<td>0.24–0.77</td>
<td>0.004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time-dependent Cox model</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>26.7</td>
<td>0.49</td>
<td>0.28–0.85</td>
<td>0.010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RPSFT model</td>
<td>41&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>16.4</td>
<td>0.43</td>
<td>0.17–1.20&lt;sup&gt;c&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>0.115&lt;sup&gt;d&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extended RPSFT model</td>
<td>40&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>19.1</td>
<td>0.57</td>
<td>0.18–1.09&lt;sup&gt;c&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>0.115&lt;sup&gt;d&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<sup>a</sup>Sunitinib vs. placebo  
<sup>b</sup>After recensoring  
<sup>c</sup>From 20,000 bootstrap samples  
<sup>d</sup>The RPSFT method does not alter the P value obtained using the ITT method  
<sup>e</sup>Assuming active treatment effect reduced progressively based on length of crossover delay (eg, by 30% if crossover occurred 3 months after start of control treatment)
OS with and without Adjustment for Crossover

- Placebo (n=85)
  - Median: 16.4 months

- Sunitinib (n=86)
  - ITT analysis Median: 33.0 months
  - Median: 26.7 months
OS with and without Adjustment for Crossover

Placebo (n=85)
- RPSFT model
  - Median: 16.4 months

Extended RPSFT model
- Median: 19.1 months

Sunitinib (n=86)
- ITT analysis
  - Median: 33.0 months

Placebo (n=85)
- ITT analysis
  - Median: 26.7 months

Probability of survival (%) vs. Time (months)
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Conclusions

● In this phase III study, updated OS based on ITT analysis continued to favor sunitinib, with a clinically meaningful improvement of 6.3 months in median OS.

● This result was not statistically significant for reasons that may include:
  – treatment crossover
  – limited statistical power

● Four different methods of adjusting for crossover suggested that the effect of sunitinib on OS may have been more pronounced had no crossover occurred.

● These analyses demonstrate a survival advantage and further support the clinical benefit of sunitinib for patients with advanced, progressive pancreatic NET.
We would like to thank all of the participating patients and their families, as well as the global network of investigators, research nurses, study coordinators, and operations staff.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Europe</th>
<th>Asia–Pacific</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>P Ruszniewski, France</td>
<td>B Wiedenmann, Germany</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P Hammel, France</td>
<td>T Gress, Germany</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F Duffaud, France</td>
<td>J Tabernero, Spain</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JF Seitz, France</td>
<td>R Passalacqua, Italy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L Dahan, France</td>
<td>D Jaeger, Germany</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C Lombard-Bohas, France</td>
<td>N Begum, Germany</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D Smith, France</td>
<td>F Goldwasser, France</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D Hörsch, Germany</td>
<td>P Garcia Alfonso, Spain</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D Castellano, Spain</td>
<td>A Santoro, Italy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C Louvet, France</td>
<td>J-L Van Laethem, Belgium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J Feliu, Spain</td>
<td>G von Wichert, Germany</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J Neoptolemos, UK</td>
<td>D Anthoney, UK</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E Van Cutsem, Belgium</td>
<td>N Fazio, Italy</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>North America</th>
<th>Asia–Pacific</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>P Metrakos, Canada</td>
<td>J-S Chen, Taiwan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A Vinik, USA</td>
<td>G Van Hazel, Australia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H Kennecke, Canada</td>
<td>C-H Hsu, Taiwan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J Picus, USA</td>
<td>H-M Chang, Korea</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R Letourneau, Canada</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L Siu, Canada</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D Berg, USA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M Kane, USA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D Rayson, Canada</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R Kerr, USA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B Piperdi, USA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This study was supported by funding from Pfizer Inc. Medical writing support was provided by Wendy Sacks at ACUMED® (New York, NY, USA) with funding from Pfizer Inc.