

**Pharmacokinetics and Pharmacodynamics effects
of Everolimus and Sorafenib combination:
Impact of doses and sequence of administration
on the combination**

Thesis

Submitted in Partial Fulfillment of Ph.D
Degree of Pharmaceutical Science

By

Mevidette Adel El Madani

M.Sc. of Pharmacy

Under Supervision of

Prof. Osama Ahmed Badary

Professor of Clinical Pharmacy

Faculty of Pharmacy – Ain Shams University

Prof. Ebtehal El Demerdash Zaki

Professor of Pharmacology and Toxicology

Faculty of Pharmacy – Ain Shams University

Prof. Siham Mostafa El Shenawy

Professor of Pharmacology

Pharmacology Department – Medical Division

National Research Center

Dr. Benoit You

Oncologist, at Hospices Civils de Lyon Investigational Center

for Treatments in Oncology and Hematology

Prof. Michel Tod

Professor of Pharmacology

At Research unit "Therapeutic Cibling in Oncology",

Croix-Rousse Hospital - University Lyon I

**Faculty of Pharmacy
Ain Shams University (Cairo)**

**Faculty of Medicine
Claude-Bernard University (Lyon)**

2017

Acknowledgment

*I'd like to express my respectful thanks and profound gratitude to **Dr. Benoît You**, my principle supervisor in France, who gave me the chance to join his team in EMR 3738 Laboratory at Centre Hospitalier, Lyon Sud. I am very grateful for the learning experience that I got by working with his team, who were always keen to deliver the best of their scientific knowledge. I also appreciate all the kind advices brought to me by himself that gave me strength and motivation to push my limits.*

*I am also delighted to express my deepest gratitude and thanks to **Pr. Michel Tod**, my co-supervisor in France for his keen guidance, that helped me to apprehend the scientific context of the project. I am also very thankful for his kind supervision, valuable advice and continuous encouragement, which made possible the completion of this work.*

*I wish to introduce my deep respect and thanks to **Olivier Colomban**, biostatistician at EMR 3738 laboratory for his kind care, continuous supervision, valuable instructions, constant help and great assistance throughout this work.*

*I am deeply thankful to **Catherine Barrois**, Head of clinical research associates at Centre Hospitalier, Lyon Sud and her team for their great help and for getting me an access to patient's data used in the analysis of the current work.*

*I would like also to express my deep appreciation to **Emilie Hénin**, for her active participation in the project and for her continuous scientific support throughout this work.*

*A special thanks is addressed to **Pr. Claire Rodriguez-Lafrasse** and **Pr. Jérôme Guitton** for their cooperation in this work.*

*I would like to express my hearty thanks to my family in Egypt and to all my colleagues, **Mélanie, Philippe, Klervi and Olivia** for their support till this work was completed.*

*I owe a special thanks to **Fabienne and Raymonde** for giving me a great moral and for their support in all administrative tasks.*

*Finally, I would like to thank my supervisors in Egypt, **Prof. Osama Badary, Prof. Ebtehal EL-Demerdash and Prof. Siham EL-Shenawy** for their encouragement during writing the current thesis and their valuable advices throughout the work that made me moving forward*

Last but not least my sincere thanks and appreciation to all patients participated in this study.

List of Contents

Title	Page No.
List of Tables	5
List of Figures.....	7
List of Abbreviations	10
Introduction	1
Review of Literature	
I- Hypothesis	17
II- Rationale.....	18
III- Drugs acting on cancer signaling pathways RAS-RAF- ERK and P3K-AKT-mTOR	23
IV- Rationale for the combination of everolimus and sorafenib	32
V- Analysis of the literature data.....	38
VI- Thesis objectives	40
Aim of the Work.....	42
Patients and Methods.....	44
Results	80
Discussion.....	145
Summary and Conclusion.....	163

List of Tables

Table No.	Title	Page No.
Table (1):	Previous early phases clinical trials of everolimus and sorafenib	37
Table (2):	Drug dosing and drug dosing levels in the EVESOR trial.	46
Table (3):	Conventional 3+3 dose escalation rule for schedules C and D	49
Table (4):	Pharmacokinetic sampling schedule.....	51
Table (5):	Sampling strategies of peripheral blood mononuclear cells (PBMCs) and soluble markers of angiogenesis for each dosing schedule	56
Table (6):	Specific dose modifications for hematologic adverse events (for within a cycle or at the beginning of a cycle)	73
Table (7):	Dose modifications for non-hematological toxicities.	74
Table (8):	Specific dose modifications for diarrhea.	75
Table (9):	Specific dose modifications for hand-foot syndrome.	76
Table (10):	Specific dose modifications for non infectious pneumonitis.	77
Table (11):	Patient demographics and clinical characteristics	81
Table (12):	Treatment related adverse events	88
Table (13):	Criteria of gravity of serious adverse events	92
Table (14):	Analysis of serious adverse events by system organ class (SOC).....	93
Table (15):	Compartmental estimated PK parameters for sorafenib and everolimus.....	96
Table (16):	PK interaction between different treatment groups association of sorafenib and everolimus.....	104
Table (17):	Comparison of biological toxicities* between different treatment schedules.....	106
Table (18):	Comparison of clinical toxicities* between different treatment schedules.....	106

Table (19):	Comparison of gastric toxicities* between different treatment schedules.....	106
Table (20):	Comparison of cutaneous toxicities* between different treatment schedules.....	107
Table (21):	Comparison of uncommon toxicities* between different treatment schedules.....	107
Table (22):	Correlation between toxicities subclasses and estimated PK parameters	108
Table (23):	Correlation between PK parameters and clinical response	134
Table (24):	Correlation between biomarker concentration and clinical response.....	135
Table (25):	Correlation between biomarker slope and clinical response	138
Table (26):	Comparison between different administration schedules and area under the curve of tumor biomarkers	140
Table (27):	Comparison between different administration schedules and slopes of tumor biomarkers.	142

List of Figures

Fig. No.	Title	Page No.
Figure (1):	Relationships between all parameters (doses, dosing schedules, pharmacokinetic, pharmacogenomic, pharmacodynamic and clinical effects) required to optimize study drug administrations	12
Figure (2):	The phosphatidylinositol 3-kinase (PI3K) signaling cascade. PI3K signaling impacts on cell growth, survival, and metabolism	21
Figure (3):	Description of the RAS-RAF-ERK and PI3K-AKT-mTor signaling pathways	22
Figure (4):	Sorafenib targeting dysregulated signals in tumor cell, Endothelial (vascular or lymphatic cell) or pericyte	25
Figure (5):	Rationale for dual inhibition of RAS-RAF-ERK and PI3K-AKT-mTor signaling pathways using combination of everolimus and sorafenib	33
Figure (6):	Design of EVESOR trial during cycle 1	45
Figure (7):	Frequency of adverse events in different treatment schedules A, B, C and D	90
Figure (8):	Diagnostic goodness-of-fit plots for the sorafenib structural model	97
Figure (9):	Diagnostic goodness-of-fit plots for the everolimus structural model	98
Figure (10):	Diagnostic goodness-of-fit plots for the sorafenib structural models, showing weighted residuals versus time (hours) after dose	98
Figure (11):	Diagnostic goodness-of-fit plot for the everolimus structural models, showing weighted residuals versus time (hours) after dose	99
Figure (12):	Visual predictive check for the structural model of sorafenib with the median, 75 th , and 25 th predicted and observed percentiles	99
Figure (13):	Visual predictive check for the structural model of everolimus, with the median, 75 th , and 25 th predicted and observed percentiles	100

Figure (14):	Individual plots: everolimus vs time (Hr)	101
Figure (15):	Individual plots: sorafenib vs Time (Hr)	102
Figure (16):	VEGF biomarker profile of schedule A dosing regimen describing serum VEGF concentration (pg/ml) measured at different time points of sampling taken during cycle 1 and cycle 2.....	110
Figure (17):	VEGFR1 biomarker profile of schedule A dosing regimen describing serum VEGFR1 concentration (pg/ml) measured at different time points of sampling taken during cycle 1 and cycle 2.....	113
Figure (18):	VEGFR2 biomarker profile of schedule A dosing regimen describing serum VEGFR1 concentration (pg/ml) measured at different time points of sampling taken during cycle 1 and cycle 2.....	116
Figure (19):	ERK Total biomarker profile of schedule A dosing regimen describing serum ERK Total concentration (pg/mg) measured at different time points of sampling taken during cycle 1 and cycle 2	118
Figure (20):	ERK phosphorylated biomarker profile of schedule A dosing regimen describing serum ERK phosphorylated concentration (mUnits/mg protein) measured at different time points of sampling taken during cycle 1 and cycle 2	121
Figure (21):	AKT Total biomarker profile of schedule A dosing regimen describing serum AKT Total concentration (pg/mg protein) measured at different time points of sampling taken during cycle 1 and cycle 2	124
Figure (22):	pAKT biomarker profile of schedule A dosing regimen describing serum p AKT concentration (pg/mg protein) measured at different time points of sampling taken during cycle 1 and cycle 2	127
Figure (23):	p70S6K biomarker profile of schedule A dosing regimen describing serum p70S6K concentration (ng/mg protein) measured at different time points of sampling taken during cycle 1 and cycle 2	130
Figure (24):	Waterfall plot of best overall change from baseline in target lesion measurement by RECIST (Response Evaluation Criteria in Solid Tumors)	

	guidelines for patients at different administration Schedule	133
Figure (25):	Boxplot correlating tumor biomarker concentrations and clinical response.	137
Figure (26):	Boxplot correlating tumor biomarker slope and clinical response	139
Figure (27):	Boxplot comparing different administration schedules and area under the curve of tumor biomarkers	141
Figure (28):	Boxplot comparing different administration schedules and slopes of tumor biomarkers.	143

List of Abbreviations

Abb.	Full term
([18F] FLT)-PET	[18F]-fluorodeoxy-L-thymine
(AUC _T)	Areas under the concentration versus time curves within the dosing interval
4E-BP1	eIF4E-binding proteins
AEs	Adverse event
AGT	Human <i>O</i> ⁶ -alkylguanine-DNA alkyltransferase
AKT Total	Protein kinase B
AKT1	Serine/Threonine Kinase 1
AUC	Area under the curve
CI	Confidence Interval
Cl/F	Apparent oral clearance
C _{max}	Peak concentration
CR	Complete response
CRF	Case report form
CTCAE	Common terminology criteria of adverse events
CV	Coefficient of variation
CYP3A4	Cytochrome P450 3A4
DCE-MRI	Dynamic contrast enhanced magnetic resonance imaging.
DLT	Dose limiting toxicity
EGFR	Epidermal growth factor receptor
EMA	European medical agency
ERK Total	Total extracellular signal regulated kinase
FOCEI	First order conditional estimation method with an interaction option.
GEMM	Genetically engineered mouse model
HCC	Hepatocellular Carcinoma
HER2	Human epidermal growth factor receptor2
HIF-1α	Hypoxia-inducible factor
IBW	Ideal Body Weight
IC ₅₀	Inhibitory concentration 50
IOV	Inter-occasion variability
K _a	Absorption rate constant
KRAS	V-Ki-ras2 Kirsten rat sarcoma viral oncogene homolog

LC-MS/MS	Liquid chromatography MS/MS
M&S	Modeling and simulation
MBDD	Model based drug design
MEK	Mitogen activated protein kinase
MH.....	Morris Hepatoma
MP	Molecular profiling
MTA	Microtubule-targeting agents
MTD	Maximum tolerated dose
mTOR	Mammalian target of rapamycin
NONMEM.....	Non-linear mixed effect modeling
NSCLC	Non small cell lung cancer
OBD.....	Optimal biological dose
p70-S6K.....	Phosphorylated p70 ribosomal protein S6 kinase
pAKT	Phosphorylated protein kinase B
PBMCs	Peripheral Blood Mononuclear cells
PD	Pharmacodynamics
PDXs.....	Patient derived xenografts
p-ERK.....	Phosphorylated extracellular signal regulated kinase
PFS	Progression free survival
PGDE.....	Pharmacologically guided dose escalation
PgP.....	Glycoprotein P
PI3K.....	Phosphatidylinositol 3-kinase
PIK3CA	Phosphatidylinositol-4,5-Bisphosphate 3-Kinase Catalytic Subunit Alpha
PK	Pharmacokinetics
PK-PD.....	Pharmacokinetics-pharmacodynamics
PR	Partial response
PtdInsP3.....	Phosphatidylinositol 3,4,5-trisphosphate
PTEN	Phosphatase and tensin homolog
Q/F.....	Intercompartmental clearance.
R&D	Research and development
RAF	Serine/threonine specific protein kinases
RAS	Reticular activating system
RP2D	Recommended phase 2 dose
RSE.....	Relative standard error
RTK	Receptor tyrosine kinase
SAEs	Serious adverse event
SIGMA	Exponential residual error
SOC	System Organ Class
SUSARs.....	Suspected unexpected serious adverse reactions

TRAIL	Tumour Necrosis Factor-Related Apoptosis-Inducing Ligand
UGT1A1	UDP-glucuronosyltransferases 1A1
UGT1A9	UDP-glucuronosyltransferases 1A9
V _{2/F}	Peripheral volume of distribution
V _{d_{central}}	Central volume of distribution
VEGF	Vascular endothelial growth factor
VEGFR1	Vascular endothelial growth factor receptor 1
VEGFR2	Vascular endothelial growth factor receptor 2
VPC	Visual predictive check

Introduction

The translation of cancer research to successful clinical application has been proved to be very challenging over the past decade. The attrition rate of drug development remains high despite the efforts and the financial investments that have been brought by many different parties including scientists, researchers and pharmaceutical companies.

Only 5% of agents that have anticancer activity in preclinical development are licensed after demonstrating sufficient efficacy in phase III testing, which is much lower than, other diseases. This issue involved also many new cancer agents including microtubule-targeting agents (MTA) that were withdrawn or suspended with 40–50% of development programs being discontinued even in clinical Phase III ^{1,2}.

Diverse reasons were reported as factors contributing for the high attrition rate of anticancer agents³. The concepts used for development of cytotoxic drugs were not adequate for new targeted agents: toxicity based escalation trials, MTD. Therefore, limitations and major challenges for the research based drug development could be summarized in the following:

- *Poorly predictive preclinical models in cancer research*: the limitations of preclinical tools such as inadequate cancer-cell-line and mouse models might explain the challenging mission of the scientists to make a discovery that will have an impact in the clinic ⁴. Despite the progress of genetically engineered mouse model (GEMMs) and patient derived xenografts (PDXs), these models still not widely implemented ⁵. However, recently, GEMMs have been used to

identify the importance of mTOR and EGFR inhibitors in neuroendocrine cancers, leading to the successful translation of mTOR inhibitors into clinical practice in this tumor type ^{6,7}. PDXs are also increasingly used to guide personalised therapy ^{8,9}.

- *Lack of reliability of published data:* An analysis by Prinz F et al., 2011 was based on input received from 23 scientists and collected data from 67 projects, revealed that in almost two-thirds of the projects there were inconsistencies between published data and in-house data. This concern has been addressed based on what some scientists have claimed about the presentation of specific experiments that supported their underlying hypothesis which were not reflective of the entire data set. Also, data were not routinely analyzed by investigators blinded to the experimental versus the control group. On the other hand, in studies for which findings could be reproduced, authors had paid close attention to controls, reagents, investigator bias and describing the complete data set ¹⁰.
- *Starting dose determination:* endpoints based on optimal biological doses (OBD) were used to determine the recommended phase 2 dose (RP2D) for several FDA approved agents, such as bevacizumab, imatinib and vismodegib, as they didn't reach an established MTD in the phase I trial. Accordingly, a new approach was set using PK or PD as an endpoint to determine biologically active dose in preclinical experiments. This could be applied alongside with preclinical toxicology data to inform starting dose decisions. This binomial approach has the potential to reduce the number of dose escalations while keeping an optimised benefit /risk ratio. A number of

conditional and accelerated approvals have been granted based on phase II data relying on patient benefit ^{11 12}.

- *Patient selection:* Multiple genomic aberrations that drive oncogenesis may act as treatment targets. Therefore, the identification of a sufficient number of patients with a specific molecular aberration can significantly slow clinical trial accrual as the majority of these abnormalities have been reported with low frequency. In these cases multi-center studies with frequent communications between investigator sites should ameliorate these limitations. Geographic heterogeneity due to spatial variations in molecular aberrations has been demonstrated within a single tumor, or between different lesions. Multiple tumor biopsies, ultra deep sequencing and non-invasive tumor imaging could potentially overcome the limitations of geographic heterogeneity ¹³⁻¹⁵.
- *The concept of target-based drug discovery with the related complexity of target selection:* the reliance on standard criteria for evaluating tumour response and the challenges of selecting patients prospectively also play a significant part in the success rate of a new molecule to be translated to clinic ¹⁶. The disappointing results in the clinic produced by some anticancer agents like mitotic kinases could be partially related to the lack of a balanced benefit /risk ratio as their efficacy was at the expense of high toxic effects. This might be explained by a non ‘druggable’ tumor cells which means that the activity of the key target of the anticancer agents was not inhibited in the tumor cells¹⁷.