Trends in Phase II trials for cancer therapies

Faruque Azam[1] and Alexei Vazquez[1,2]

[1]Institute of Cancer Sciences, College of Medical, Veterinary, and Life Sciences, University of Glasgow, Glasgow, G61 1QH, UK

[2]Cancer Research UK Beatson Institute, Glasgow, G61 1BD, UK

*Corresponding author

Alexei Vazquez

Cancer Research UK Beatson Institute

Switchback Road, Bearsden, Glasgow, G61 1BD, UK

Email: alexei.vazquezvazquez@glasgow.ac.uk

Running title

Trends in cancer therapy

Abstract

Background

Drug combinations are the standard of care in cancer treatment. Identifying effective cancer drug combinations has become more challenging because of the increasing number of drugs. However, a substantial number of cancer drugs stumble at Phase III clinical trials despite exhibiting favourable efficacy in the earlier Phase.

Methods

We analysed recent Phase II cancer trials comprising 2,165 response rates to uncover trends in cancer therapies and used a null model of non-interacting agents to infer synergistic and antagonistic drug

combinations. We compared our latest efficacy dataset with a previous dataset to assess the progress of cancer therapy.

Results

We demonstrate that targeted therapies should be used in combination with cytotoxic drugs to reach high response rates. We identify 4 synergistic and 10 antagonistic combinations based on the observed and expected response rates. We also demonstrate that recent targeted agents have not significantly increased the response rates.

Conclusions

We conclude either we are not making progress or response rate measured by tumour shrinkage is not a reliable surrogate endpoint for the targeted agents.

Keywords

Cancer, Overall response rate, Clinical trials, Phase II, Drug combinations

Background

Although cancer cure largely depends on early detection, around 90% of all cancer deaths occur at advanced/metastatic stage.[1] The high mortality in advanced/metastatic disease is because of the unsatisfactory efficacy of currently available treatments including targeted therapies. However, little progress has been made to inhibit metastasis owing to the poor understanding of the underlying metastatic process, infrequent use of preclinical metastatic models for drug screening, and complex tumour microenvironment.[2] Cancer metastasis follows a series of multicellular events involving interactions of neoplastic cells with non-cancerous stromal and immune cells of the tumour microenvironment.[3] These immune cells modulate immune responses following cancer immunotherapy[4] and partly regulate chemotherapy sensitivity, and combinatorial treatment blocking tumour-associated macrophages has shown to enhance chemotherapy efficacy and restrict metastatic spread in transgenic breast cancer mouse

models.[5,6] The rational integration of new targeted agents with cytotoxic drugs targeting the tumour and its microenvironment together could reduce cancer deaths significantly.

The influx of novel anticancer drugs along with existing chemotherapies poses a major challenge to the selection of effective drug combinations. The number of FDA approved targeted therapies has increased five fold compared to cytotoxic drugs.[7] Moreover, 63 distinct anticancer drugs were released on the market by the FDA between 2006 and 2016,[8] which would generate at least 39,000 different 3-agent combinations with an exponential growth. Unfortunately, the trend of trials testing combinatorial cancer therapies has lately decreased significantly relative to all oncology trials.[9]

One important aspect of monitoring the trends of new cancer therapies is to minimise the high attrition rate of cancer drugs in Phase III trials. A recent comparative study reports that the success rate of cancer drugs is only 3.4%, whereas the overall success rate excluding oncology drugs is 20.9%.[10] Moreover, a few cancer drugs that pass-through Phase III trials do not always confer clinical benefit in the wider population. For instance, only one-third (45/133) of the single-arm trials supported by FDA-approval and 13 out of 37 released cancer drugs were translated to "meaningful clinical benefit" (MCB) according to ASCO's (American Society of Clinical Oncology) scales.[8,11] In addition, a combined analysis from two independent studies[12,13] investigating 243 randomised controlled trials (RCTs) of predominant cancers unravelled that 36% (87/243) of the RCTs reached the minimum threshold of MCB scale of ESMO (European Society for Medical Oncology).

Post-market studies also point towards the incoherent performance of new cancer drugs between approval-time and afterwards. Davis et al. analysed 48 EMA approved anticancer drugs, and they found that most of the drugs did not extend survival or improve quality of life for a minimum of 3.3 years after market approval, although 35% of the indicated cancers were associated with significant survival benefit at approval-time.[14] Likewise, Grössmann et al. argue that approval status of a cancer drug does not represent MCB as most of the EMA approved drugs between 2011-2016 had not reached ESMO's MCB scale.[15]

Altogether, these discrepant post-approval performances of new cancer drugs in larger populations provide evidence towards the necessity to monitor trends and combination patterns of new cancer drugs before reaching Phase III trials.

The varying degrees of performances of targeted cancer agents in Phase III trials have been rendering the trends more difficult to study. This is possibly due to the surrogate endpoints, overall response rate (ORR) and progression-free survival (PFS), used in earlier trials that are not sufficient to predict the overall survival (OS). In concordance with this, several analyses[16–21] highlight that improved ORR or longer PFS do not always correlate to survival benefit, and there are often little or unknown correlations between surrogate endpoints and OS. Undoubtedly, targeted cancer therapies have impacted the treatment outcome profoundly, although effective only in a small cancer subpopulation with specific biomarkers, while chemotherapy has made a modest difference across all the stages of disease in all population.[22]

The question regarding the superiority of the targeted agents over chemotherapies is disputable. This dichotomy has resurfaced from the failure of the targeted agents to deliver a survival benefit even in biomarker-specific subset of population. For instance, Camidge emphasised that the majority number of Phase III studies of tyrosine kinase inhibitors (TKIs) testing EGFR-mutated non-small cell lung cancer (NSCLC) patients could not demonstrate OS superiority over chemotherapy regardless of the significant ORR and PFS improvement.[22] However, multiple Phase II and III studies[23–29] of HER2+ metastatic breast cancer proved that rational combinations of chemotherapies to targeted agents are more safe and effective. In retrospect, owing to all incongruent results of targeted agents, it is one of the clinical unmet needs to understand how novel cancer drugs are performing in Phase II trials and analyse them in large numbers to detect small differences and recognise the pattern of synergy/antagonism for prospective Phase III trials.

Combinatorial therapy in metastatic disease can deliver key advantages over monotherapy given the complex interactions of the tumour immune microenvironment.[6] It allows combination of multiple biologically distinct drugs to gain superior activity over monotherapy by enhancing pharmacodynamic

activity through synergy, overcoming the resistance problem, reducing the required concentrations of each combined agent, and minimising the dose-dependent toxicity.[30–33] Furthermore, it is well known that combination chemotherapy results in better efficacy and response rate compared to monotherapy, although as explained above for targeted therapies, the role of combination therapy on overall survival remains ambiguous.[34]

In the search for effective cancer drug combinations, a balanced approach is to analyse a large number of Phase II trial data to monitor trends of new cancer drugs and understand the response pattern and interactions, thus identify potential synergistic and antagonistic combinations. Moreover, Phase II trials have a reasonable number of study participants as opposed to a very little participants in Phase I trials. On the other hand, there are considerably a greater number of Phase II trials available to study than Phase III trials. Meta-analyses and pooling together a large number of clinical data have been analysed to assess the efficacy of novel cancer drugs against standard treatments.[35–38] Hence, interpretations from bulk clinical data could potentially shed light on the current hazy situation rendered by the abundant choices of cancer drugs.

In this study, we accumulated 2,165 Phase II trials' ORR data covering three decades and identified a trend of cancer drugs, inferred synergistic and antagonistic combinations, and also explored how the trends of cancer treatments have changed over time.

Experimental Methods

To investigate the trends in cancer combination therapy we have collected ORRs from Phase II clinical trials (Fig. 1).

Endpoint Clinical Variable

The overall response rate (ORR) in a clinical trial is defined as the total percentage of patients achieving a complete and partial response after treatment. A complete response refers to the patients whose tumour

disappeared after treatment and a partial response generally refers to the patients achieving a predefined reduction (usually ≥ 30%) in the target lesions or tumour volume or cell number.

ORR Data Source and Selection Criteria

The ORR data were collected from PubMed. On April 15, 2020, data were searched with the following: cancer Phase II clinical trial overall response rate. From the returned list of abstracts, 1,002 ORR data were extracted from the most recent Phase II clinical trials as they appeared in order. The collected ORR data in a clinical trial consisted of the patients who were evaluable for tumour response after treatment, excluding the intention-to-treat population ORR data. In some cases where the ORR was not directly specified, the ORR was manually calculated by combining complete and partial response data from the efficacy result or supplementary data. Clinical trials that did not have the ORR as primary or secondary endpoint were disregarded. In our collected dataset, the ORR for solid tumours testing non-targeted agents (cytotoxic) was assessed by Response Evaluation Criteria in Solid Tumours (RECIST v1) and the RECIST v1.1 was used for targeted agents. On June 20, 2020, a total of 1,002 Phase II clinical trials with response data comprising of 44,429 subjects were compiled in a spreadsheet for subsequent analysis (Supplementary Information).

Agent Classification

Conventional chemotherapeutic and cytotoxic drugs were classified as non-targeted agents. In contrast, synthetic hormonal therapies targeting specific receptor or receptors, monoclonal antibodies, molecularly targeted cancer drugs such as small molecule kinase inhibitors, and modern immunotherapies including checkpoint blockers and CAR-T cell were classified as targeted agents.

Statistical Analysis

When two groups were compared for a difference in mean ORR, all the performed statistical tests were two-tailed Student's t-test at 5% significance level. Bonferonni correction was employed when simultaneous significance tests had been done within the same ORR groups in order to minimise the experiment-wise error rate.

Clinical Synergy and Antagonism

Clinical synergy and antagonism for combinations were calculated using a null model of non-interacting agents, which was postulated by Kang et al.[38] This model accounts for synergy or antagonism of drugs based on observed ORR and expected ORR of a combination, while assuming no interactions between the agents. Evidence of synergy was found when the observed ORR of a drug combination was significantly greater ($P_{synergy} < 0.05$) than the expected ORR. In contrast, evidence of antagonism was found if the observed ORR was significantly lesser ($P_{antagonism} < 0.05$) than the expected ORR. The expected ORR for a combination consisting of drug A and drug B was calculated by the following equation:

"$ORR_{expected} = 100\% [1 - (1 - ORR_A/100\%) (1- ORR_B/100\%)]$", where ORR_A and ORR_B correspond to the mean ORR from the trials testing drug A and drug B as single-agent, respectively. Consequently, the observed ORR for the combination (drug A + drug B) was all the ORRs from trials testing drug A and drug B together.

Results

Trends with the number of agents in the combination

The ORRs are reported in Fig. 2a,b, binned according to the number of drug combinations in the clinical trials. The ORR started from 29% for clinical trials testing a single-agent and significantly increased to reach 54% for 3-agent combinations (Fig. 2b). For trials testing 4 and 5-agent combinations the ORRs did not significantly exceed the ORR of 3-agent trials (Fig. 2b). For trials testing 6 or 7-agent combinations the average ORR exhibited wide variations (Fig. 2b). First, the ORR goes up by almost a 30% from trials testing 3-5 agents to 6-agent trials. Then the ORR drops down by a 45% from trials testing 6 agents to 7-agent trials. These wide variations are most likely due to the low number of reported trials testing 6 and 7 agents (Fig. 2a). In the following we restrict our attention to trials testing 1-5 combinations. Finally, when we restrict the analysis to trials testing at least one targeted agent, we observe the exact same trends with slightly better ORRs for 4 and 5-agent combinations (Fig. 2c).

One versus multiple targeted agents

The data shown above indicate that, on average, increasing the number of agents increases the ORR. It is worth asking if increasing the number of targeted agents will give an advantage compared to adding non-targeted agents. To address this question, we compared clinical trials with the same number of agents but stratified into having one (single) or more than one (multiple) targeted agents. Overall, we did not observe a clear improvement in the ORR of multiple-targeted agents when compared to corresponding single-targeted agent combinations (Fig. 3). For example, the ORR of 2-agent single-targeted agents (one targeted plus one non-targeted agent) was significantly higher (46% vs 35%) than two targeted agents combined. Conversely, in 4-agent combinations, the ORR of one targeted plus three non-targeted agents was significantly lower (54% vs 72%) than two targeted plus two non-targeted agents. These data suggest that the combination of targeted agents has not been sufficiently optimized for non-targeted agents.

Trends across time

To analyse the trends in cancer therapy, we compared the current results (2013-2020) with a dataset from a previous study covering Phase II clinical trials between the year 1990-2011 (modern vs previous). As expected, the modern dataset contains an increased proportion of targeted agents when compared to the older dataset (Fig. 4a). Overall, except for the 2-agent combinations, we do not observe significant differences between the modern and previous trends of the ORR as a function of the number of agents (Fig. 4b). There are some variations for combinations of 5 or more agents but, as discussed above, these are probably due to the lack of clinical data on those bins. Unexpectedly, the enrichment with targeted agents in modern Phase II trials is not translated into an average increase in the ORR.

Synergistic and antagonistic combinations

Synergy and antagonism of drug combinations can be estimated using a null model that assumes no interactions between agents.[38] A combination is deemed synergistic if the observed ORR (ORR_O) from the clinical trials of that combination significantly exceeds the expectation from the null model of non-interacting agents (ORR_E). Likewise, a combination is deemed antagonistic if the ORR_E significantly

exceeds ORR_O. The application of this methodology to evaluable Phase II trial data uncovered several synergistic ($P_{synergy} < 0.05$) and antagonistic ($P_{antagonism} < 0.05$) combinations (Fig. 5, Table 1).

Discussion

We observed varying degrees of ORR trends of cancer drugs depending on the types and number of agents in combinations and also inferred 4 synergistic and 10 antagonistic combinations. Targeted agents clearly demonstrated superior efficacy over non-targeted cytotoxic agents in our dataset. However, one targeted agent with one non-targeted agent significantly produced better efficacy than two targeted agents combined. Unexpectedly, the comparison of the modern dataset with the previous efficacy dataset revealed no significant increase in the ORR trend of the targeted agents in recent trials.

In our analysis, the ORR trends of targeted agents **(Fig. 2c)** and all cancer agents **(Fig. 2b)** followed a similar increasing trend with no discernible differences. However, 4-agent and 5-agent combinations of targeted agents exhibited a slightly higher ORRs than all cancer agents. This indicates that targeted agents perform optimally with non-targeted agents when the combination size is four to five. In light of this finding, replacing a targeted agent by a non-targeted agent is proven to be optimal in a combination of two targeted agents **(Fig. 3).**

We suggest that recent targeted agents are not optimised properly in chemotherapy combinations. To demonstrate, the addition of panitumumab[39] and cetuximab[40] to bevacizumab-chemotherapy combinations in metastatic colorectal cancer (mCRC) RCTs reduced PFS and OS, and found to be suboptimal. Many promising targeted agents stumble in clinical trials despite a favourable preclinical profile. In line with this, a recent umbrella trial assessing precision medicine in NSCLC exposes that most of the investigational single-targeted agents have shown poor response rates (< 10%) and few treatment cohorts have been discarded because of insufficient efficacy, whereas response rates were much higher for double-targeted agents.[41] Moreover, targeted agents' performance is difficult to predict in a wider drug-biomarker specific subpopulation. For instance, two randomised Phase III trials suggest that afatinib failed to prolong patient

life in the whole tested population of EGFR-mutant advanced lung cancer,[42] however, afatinib significantly extended survival by 3 months to a specific EGFR-mutated subgroup compared to chemotherapy.[43]

To make matters more complicated, inconsistent performances among different generations of EGFR-TKIs have been noticed when multiple trials' results are being analysed. A randomised controlled Phase II trial assessing the performance of first-generation (gefitinib) and second-generation (afatinib) EGFR-TKIs revealed a significant improved PFS of afatinib in EGFR-mutant NSCLC.[44] However, a recent network meta-analysis of eight studies has identified that gefitinib is associated with longer OS than afatinib despite displaying a shorter PFS in EGFR-mutant NSCLC brain metastasis.[21] Likewise, Camidge argued that TKIs in NSCLC do not considerably extend patient survival while conferring a better PFS and ORR at the initial Phases.[22] However, this transient benefit simply reallocates the total available survival time compared to historical chemotherapy data. Although it is undeniable to overlook targeted agents' profound impact on overall survival benefit but all of these studies indicate toward investigation for more specific and actionable biomarkers of targeted agents.[2,22]

Interestingly, we observed that the ORR trend in our modern dataset is relatively lower than the previous dataset, which reflects no treatment improvements over time. However, an alternative explanation of this incongruous trend could be the insufficiency of ORR as an endpoint to evaluate targeted agents. In our dataset, the response rate of the targeted agents in solid tumour trials was largely assessed by the RECIST 1.1,[45] while the previous version (RECIST v1.0) was used for trials of cytotoxic drugs. This is because the RECIST v1.0 was originally developed to assess the efficacy of cytotoxic drugs.

The RECIST is based on tumour shrinkage and involves unidimensional radiographic measurement of target lesions. Multiple studies[46–49] have suggested that tumour size reduction may not always be symmetrical especially for targeted agents because of their mechanisms which do not regress tumour by cytotoxicity, and complex tumour microenvironment. Furthermore, several retrospective studies[48,50–53] evidence toward bevacizumab's superior pathological response than chemotherapy regardless of the similar

RECIST response rates, and suggest that pathological response defined by the cell's morphological change could be a better predictor of OS for preoperative chemotherapy in colorectal hepatic metastases.[52,54,55] However, more precise non-invasive methods for determining pathological response rate need to be developed.

We suggest that the response rate of targeted agents measured by the RECIST method might not be a reliable surrogate endpoint for overall survival. In line with this, two independent Phase III studies[56,57] have reported that cetuximab and bevacizumab do not improve RECIST-defined ORR significantly when combined with standard chemotherapy regimens in mCRC, however, the addition of bevacizumab significantly prolonged PFS but failed to extend OS and ORR, whereas cetuximab extended OS without changing the ORR and PFS. This implies that ORR is incapable of predicting the OS for bevacizumab and cetuximab, and no concordance between ORR and PFS. Meta-analysis combining three Phase III trials of metastatic breast cancer consisting of 2,695 subjects unravelled that bevacizumab significantly enhanced ORR and PFS when added to chemotherapy, although this increase did not reflect into significant OS benefit.[36] Therefore, all of these discrepant studies point toward the failure of the RECIST response rate as an indicator of patient benefit for targeted agents in mCRC[58] and breast cancer.

As mentioned in the results section, the ORR of the 5-agent trials is likely to be outliers because largest ORR differences were originating from it. Besides, the ORRs data from 5-agent to 7-agent trials itself had been less reliable as the number of those trials in our dataset decreased dramatically for the higher number of combinations. We expected our 5-agent combinations' ORR to be relatively higher and concluded that after comparing our dataset (modern) with an older dataset (previous). Therefore, a closer look into the lowest ORRs within 5-agent combination trials uncovered an unusual combination appearing six times. The suspected 5-agent combination consisted of celecoxib, thalidomide, fenofibrate, cyclophosphamide, and etoposide, and the mean ORR was only 6.75%, ranging from various CNS tumours to bone cancer trials. This specific combination skewed down the 5-agent trials' ORR. On the other hand, we tried to identify which agents had contributed to the high ORR of the 6-agent combinations. Two specific combinations

containing three distinct targeted agents, venetoclax plus obinutuzumab and venetoclax plus rituximab, partly contributed to the heightened ORR of 6-agent combinations because of their frequent appearance in those trials.

We found the combination of cetuximab and FOLFOXIRI (leucovorin, fluorouracil, oxaliplatin, irinotecan) chemotherapy regimen antagonistic in mCRC. Moreover, we identified that the combination of cetuximab and irinotecan itself was antagonistic in mCRC (**Table 1**), which further substantiates the antagonism between cetuximab and FOLFOXIRI. However, using the same methodology, Kang et al. found that oxaliplatin and irinotecan combination was synergistic in colorectal cancer,[38] implying that at least one synergistic and one antagonistic two-drug interactions exist between the five drugs. This finding is relevant in light of the results from clinical trials where cetuximab, bevacizumab, and panitumumab were somewhat not recommended and subject to careful addition to oxaliplatin or irinotecan based chemotherapy regimens in mCRC patients.[39,40,56] Looking in our synergistic drug pairs **(Table 1)**, we identified doxorubicin and carboplatin combination was synergistic in ovarian cancer. In line with this, Kang et al. inferred a similar but not identical combination, doxorubicin and oxaliplatin, to be synergistic in ovarian cancer.[38]

There are caveats associated with the inferred synergy and antagonism. Firstly, the identification of a particular synergistic/antagonistic combination was confined by the availability of the trials testing that combination and their respective single-agent trials in our dataset. Secondly, the null model would not account for drugs that are not mutually exclusive such as drugs with similar mechanisms of actions interacting with each other.[59] Thirdly, varying degrees of synergy/antagonism of the inferred combination would be expected in vitro at different dose-ratio. This is because the shape of the dose-effect curve of the inferred combination depends on the specific dose-ratio used in those trials in our dataset. Fourthly, a significant greater combined effect does not necessarily indicate synergy, which can result from additive effects or even a minor antagonism.[60] Therefore, synergy needs to be verified and quantified in vitro by Chou-Talalay's method.[59]

Our analysis does not apply to a specific cancer type for a given combination, rather it was focused on a macro-level to explore overall trends of new cancer drug combinations. However, results relating to a specific molecularly targeted agent would likely applicable to specific cancer subtypes, i.e., trastuzumab for Her2+ breast and stomach cancer. Reflecting on the response rate endpoint, it is not clear as to whether an increased ORR conferred by the targeted agents translates into a survival benefit, or the ORR itself measured by the RECIST method is not representing the true performance of the targeted agents. However, it is reasonable to conclude that the ORR of targeted agents is not a reliable surrogate endpoint for OS. Nonetheless, our analysis could be influenced by publication bias as trials with negative outcomes would more likely to remain unpublished. Altogether, our findings will provide insight on how new cancer drugs are performing in general and the need for optimising them in combinatorial therapies.

Acknowledgements

FA thanks the directors and postgraduate programme leads of the Institute of Cancer Sciences of the University of Glasgow for facilitating this study. We thank Catherine Winchester for helpful comments about the manuscript.

Author's contributions

FA and AV conceived the project. FA collected the data and performed the statistical analyses. FA and AV wrote the manuscript.

Ethics approval and concept to participate

Not applicable.

Data availability

All data is included within the submission.

Competing interests

The authors declare no competing interests.

Funding information

This work was supported by Cancer Research UK C596/A21140 awarded to AV and A17196 (core funding to the CRUK Beatson Institute).

Supplementary Information

Supplementary table on the collected 1,002 ORR data is available.

References

1. Chaffer CL, Weinberg RA. A perspective on cancer cell metastasis [Internet]. Vol. 331, Science. Science; 2011 [cited 2020 Nov 20]. p. 1559–64. Available from: https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/21436443/
2. Maeda H, Khatami M. Analyses of repeated failures in cancer therapy for solid tumors: poor tumor-selective drug delivery, low therapeutic efficacy and unsustainable costs. Clin Transl Med [Internet]. 2018 Dec [cited 2020 Nov 25];7(1):11. Available from: /pmc/articles/PMC5852245/?report=abstract
3. Goubran HA, Kotb RR, Stakiw J, Emara ME, Burnouf T. Regulation of Tumor Growth and Metastasis: The Role of Tumor Microenvironment. Cancer Growth Metastasis [Internet]. 2014 Jan [cited 2020 Nov 20];7:CGM.S11285. Available from: https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/24926201/
4. Cha YJ, Koo JS. Role of Tumor-Associated Myeloid Cells in Breast Cancer [Internet]. Vol. 9, Cells. NLM (Medline); 2020 [cited 2020 Nov 26]. Available from: /pmc/articles/PMC7464644/?report=abstract
5. Shree T, Olson OC, Elie BT, Kester JC, Garfall AL, Simpson K, et al. Macrophages and cathepsin proteases blunt chemotherapeutic response in breast cancer. Genes Dev [Internet]. 2011 Dec 1 [cited 2020 Nov 25];25(23):2465–79. Available from: http://www.genesdev.org/cgi/doi/10.1101/gad.180331.111.
6. DeNardo DG, Brennan DJ, Rexhepaj E, Ruffell B, Shiao SL, Madden SF, et al. Leukocyte complexity predicts breast cancer survival and functionally regulates response to chemotherapy. Cancer Discov [Internet]. 2011 [cited 2020 Nov 26];1(1):54–67. Available from: /pmc/articles/PMC3203524/?report=abstract
7. Sun J, Wei Q, Zhou Y, Wang J, Liu Q, Xu H. A systematic analysis of FDA-approved anticancer drugs. BMC Syst Biol [Internet]. 2017 Oct 3 [cited 2020 Aug 15];11(Suppl 5). Available from:

/pmc/articles/PMC5629554/?report=abstract

8. Tibau A, Molto C, Borrell M, Del Paggio JC, Barnadas A, Booth CM, et al. Magnitude of Clinical Benefit of Cancer Drugs Approved by the US Food and Drug Administration Based on Single-Arm Trials [Internet]. Vol. 4, JAMA Oncology. American Medical Association; 2018 [cited 2020 Aug 18]. p. 1610–1. Available from: /pmc/articles/PMC6584270/?report=abstract
9. Wu M, Sirota M, Butte AJ, Chen B. Characteristics of drug combination therapy in oncology by analyzing clinical trial data on clinicaltrials.gov. In: Pacific Symposium on Biocomputing [Internet]. NIH Public Access; 2015 [cited 2020 Aug 19]. p. 68–79. Available from: /pmc/articles/PMC4361221/?report=abstract
10. Wong CH, Siah KW, Lo AW. Estimation of clinical trial success rates and related parameters. Biostatistics [Internet]. 2019 Apr 1 [cited 2020 Aug 16];20(2):273–86. Available from: www.clinicaltrials.gov
11. Vivot A, Jacot J, Zeitoun JD, Ravaud P, Crequit P, Porcher R. Clinical benefit, price and approval characteristics of FDA-approved new drugs for treating advanced solid cancer, 2000-2015. Ann Oncol Off J Eur Soc Med Oncol [Internet]. 2017 May 1 [cited 2020 Aug 18];28(5):1111–6. Available from: https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/28453694/
12. Del Paggio JC, Azariah B, Sullivan R, Hopman WM, James F V., Roshni S, et al. Do contemporary randomized controlled trials meet ESMO thresholds for meaningful clinical benefit? Ann Oncol [Internet]. 2017 Jan 1 [cited 2020 Aug 18];28(1):157–62. Available from: https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/27742650/
13. Tibau A, Molto C, Ocana A, Templeton AJ, Del Carpio LP, Del Paggio JC, et al. Magnitude of Clinical Benefit of Cancer Drugs Approved by the US Food and Drug Administration. J Natl Cancer Inst [Internet]. 2018 May 1 [cited 2020 Aug 18];110(5):486–92. Available from: https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/29244173/
14. Davis C, Naci H, Gurpinar E, Poplavska E, Pinto A, Aggarwal A. Availability of evidence of benefits on overall survival and quality of life of cancer drugs approved by European Medicines Agency: Retrospective cohort study of drug approvals 2009-13. BMJ. 2017;359.
15. Grössmann N, Del Paggio JC, Wolf S, Sullivan R, Booth CM, Rosian K, et al. Five years of EMA-approved systemic cancer therapies for solid tumours—a comparison of two thresholds for meaningful clinical benefit. Eur J Cancer. 2017 Sep 1;82:66–71.
16. Kim C, Prasad V. Strength of Validation for Surrogate End Points Used in the US Food and Drug Administration's Approval of Oncology Drugs. Mayo Clin Proc [Internet]. 2016 Jun 1 [cited 2020 Aug 17];91(6):713–25. Available from: https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/27236424/
17. Kim C, Prasad V. Cancer drugs approved on the basis of a surrogate end point and subsequent

overall survival: An analysis of 5 years of us food and drug administration approvals [Internet]. Vol. 175, JAMA Internal Medicine. American Medical Association; 2015 [cited 2020 Aug 17]. p. 1992–4. Available from: https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/26502403/

18. Hotta K, Suzuki E, Di Maio M, Chiodini P, Fujiwara Y, Takigawa N, et al. Progression-free survival and overall survival in phase III trials of molecular-targeted agents in advanced non-small-cell lung cancer. Lung Cancer [Internet]. 2013 Jan [cited 2020 Aug 16];79(1):20–6. Available from: https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/23164554/
19. Maemondo M, Inoue A, Kobayashi K, Sugawara S, Oizumi S, Isobe H, et al. Gefitinib or chemotherapy for non-small-cell lung cancer with mutated EGFR. N Engl J Med [Internet]. 2010 Jun 24 [cited 2020 Aug 16];362(25):2380–8. Available from: https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/20573926/
20. Chen EY, Haslam A, Prasad V. FDA Acceptance of Surrogate End Points for Cancer Drug Approval: 1992-2019 [Internet]. Vol. 180, JAMA Internal Medicine. American Medical Association; 2020 [cited 2020 Aug 18]. p. 912–4. Available from: /pmc/articles/PMC7186918/?report=abstract
21. Koo S-M, Kim K-U, Kim Y-K, Uh S-T. Efficacy of Afatinib, Erlotinib, and Gefitinib on epidermal growth factor receptor (EGFR) mutant non-small cell lung cancer (NSCLC) patients with brain metastasis: a network meta-analysis. In: European Respiratory Journal [Internet]. European Respiratory Society (ERS); 2018 [cited 2020 Nov 14]. p. PA2802. Available from: https://erj.ersjournals.com/content/52/suppl_62/PA2802
22. Camidge DR. Targeted therapy vs chemotherapy: which has had more impact on survival in lung cancer? Does targeted therapy make patients live longer? Hard to prove, but impossible to ignore. Clin Adv Hematol Oncol [Internet]. 2014 Nov [cited 2020 Aug 16];12(11):763–6. Available from: http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/25674715
23. Redana S, Donadio M, Nolè F, Jacomuzzi ME, Beano A, Martinello R, et al. Trastuzumab with either docetaxel or vinorelbine as first-line treatment for patients with HER2-positive advanced breast cancer: A retrospective comparison. BMC Cancer [Internet]. 2010 Feb 1 [cited 2020 Nov 19];10(1):1–9. Available from: https://link.springer.com/articles/10.1186/1471-2407-10-28
24. Heinemann V, di Gioia D, Vehling-Kaiser U, Harich HD, Heinrich B, Welt A, et al. A prospective multicenter phase II study of oral and i.v. vinorelbine plus trastuzumab as first-line therapy in HER2-overexpressing metastatic breast cancer. Ann Oncol. 2011 Mar 1;22(3):603–8.
25. Wilks S, Puhalla S, O'Shaughnessy J, Schwartzberg L, Berrak E, Song J, et al. Phase 2, multicenter, single-arm study of eribulin mesylate with trastuzumab as first-line therapy for locally recurrent or metastatic HER2-positive breast cancer. Clin Breast Cancer. 2014 Dec 1;14(6):405–12.

26. Balduzzi S, Mantarro S, Guarneri V, Tagliabue L, Pistotti V, Moja L, et al. Trastuzumab-containing regimens for metastatic breast cancer [Internet]. Vol. 2014, Cochrane Database of Systematic Reviews. John Wiley and Sons Ltd; 2014 [cited 2020 Nov 19]. Available from: http://doi.wiley.com/10.1002/14651858.CD006242.pub2
27. McCormack PL. Pertuzumab: A review of its use for first-line combination treatment of her2-positive metastatic breast cancer. Drugs [Internet]. 2013 Sep [cited 2020 Aug 20];73(13):1491–502. Available from: https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/23982598/
28. Swain SM, Kim SB, Cortés J, Ro J, Semiglazov V, Campone M, et al. Pertuzumab, trastuzumab, and docetaxel for HER2-positive metastatic breast cancer (CLEOPATRA study): Overall survival results from a randomised, double-blind, placebo-controlled, phase 3 study. Lancet Oncol [Internet]. 2013 May [cited 2020 Aug 20];14(6):461–71. Available from: https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/23602601/
29. Baselga J, Cortés J, Kim S-B, Im S-A, Hegg R, Im Y-H, et al. Pertuzumab plus Trastuzumab plus Docetaxel for Metastatic Breast Cancer. N Engl J Med [Internet]. 2012 Jan 12 [cited 2020 Nov 19];366(2):109–19. Available from: https://www.nejm.org/doi/full/10.1056/NEJMoa1113216
30. Ehrlich P. Address in pathology, on chemiotherapy. Br Med J [Internet]. 1913 Aug 16 [cited 2020 Aug 13];2(2746):353–9. Available from: https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC2345634/
31. Chakravarty J, Sundar S. Drug resistance in leishmaniasis. J Glob Infect Dis [Internet]. 2010 [cited 2020 Aug 13];2(2):167. Available from: https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/20606973/
32. Foucquier J, Guedj M. Analysis of drug combinations: current methodological landscape [Internet]. Vol. 3, Pharmacology Research and Perspectives. Wiley-Blackwell Publishing Ltd; 2015 [cited 2020 Aug 20]. Available from: https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/26171228/
33. Sun W, Sanderson PE, Zheng W. Drug combination therapy increases successful drug repositioning [Internet]. Vol. 21, Drug Discovery Today. Elsevier Ltd; 2016 [cited 2020 Aug 12]. p. 1189–95. Available from: /pmc/articles/PMC4907866/?report=abstract
34. Pronzato P, Rondini M. First line chemotherapy of metastatic breast cancer. Ann Oncol [Internet]. 2006 May [cited 2020 Aug 20];17(SUPPL. 5). Available from: https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/16807448/
35. Xiao YY, Zhan P, Yuan DM, Liu HB, Lv TF, Song Y, et al. Chemotherapy plus multitargeted antiangiogenic tyrosine kinase inhibitors or chemotherapy alone in advanced NSCLC: A meta-analysis of randomized controlled trials. Eur J Clin Pharmacol [Internet]. 2013 Feb [cited 2020 Aug 19];69(2):151–9. Available from: https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/22729611/
36. Rossari JR, Metzger-Filho O, Paesmans M, Saini KS, Gennari A, De Azambuja E, et al.

Bevacizumab and breast cancer: A meta-analysis of first-line phase III studies and a critical reappraisal of available evidence. J Oncol [Internet]. 2012 [cited 2020 Aug 19];2012. Available from: https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/23008712/

37. Zheng R, Han S, Duan C, Chen K, You Z, Jia J, et al. Role of taxane and anthracycline combination regimens in the management of advanced breast cancer a meta-analysis of randomized trials. Med (United States) [Internet]. 2015 May 1 [cited 2020 Aug 19];94(17):e803. Available from: https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/25929935/

38. Kang W, Dipaola RS, Vazquez A. Inference of synergy/antagonism between anticancer drugs from the pooled analysis of clinical trials. BMC Med Res Methodol [Internet]. 2013 Dec 12 [cited 2020 May 28];13(1):77. Available from: http://bmcmedresmethodol.biomedcentral.com/articles/10.1186/1471-2288-13-77

39. Hecht JR, Mitchell E, Chidiac T, Scroggin C, Hagenstad C, Spigel D, et al. A Randomized Phase IIIB Trial of Chemotherapy, Bevacizumab, and Panitumumab Compared With Chemotherapy and Bevacizumab Alone for Metastatic Colorectal Cancer. J Clin Oncol [Internet]. 2008 [cited 2020 Nov 27];27:672–80. Available from: www.jco.org.

40. Tol J, Koopman M, Cats A, Rodenburg CJ, Creemers GJM, Schrama JG, et al. Chemotherapy, Bevacizumab, and Cetuximab in Metastatic Colorectal Cancer. N Engl J Med [Internet]. 2009 Feb 5 [cited 2020 Nov 25];360(6):563–72. Available from: https://www.nejm.org/doi/full/10.1056/NEJMoa0808268

41. Precision Medicine Stumbles in Umbrella Trial. Cancer Discov [Internet]. 2020 Oct 1 [cited 2020 Nov 11];10(10):1435.1-1435. Available from: https://cancerdiscovery.aacrjournals.org/content/10/10/1435.1

42. Yang JCH, Wu YL, Schuler M, Sebastian M, Popat S, Yamamoto N, et al. Afatinib versus cisplatin-based chemotherapy for EGFR mutation-positive lung adenocarcinoma (LUX-Lung 3 and LUX-Lung 6): Analysis of overall survival data from two randomised, phase 3 trials. Lancet Oncol [Internet]. 2015 Feb 1 [cited 2020 Nov 13];16(2):141–51. Available from: http://www.thelancet.com/article/S1470204514711738/fulltext

43. Sebastian M, Chih-Hsin Yang J, Sequist L, Schuler M, Mok T, Yamamoto N, et al. Analysis of overall survival (OS) in two large open-label phase III studies (LUX-Lung 3 [LL3] and LUX-Lung 6 [LL6]) comparing afatinib with chemotherapy (CT) in patients (pts) with advanced non-small cell lung cancer (NSCLC) harboring common (Del19/L858R…. Eur Respir J. 2014;44(Suppl 58).

44. Park K, Tan EH, O'Byrne K, Zhang L, Boyer M, Mok T, et al. Afatinib versus gefitinib as first-line treatment of patients with EGFR mutation-positive non-small-cell lung cancer (LUX-Lung 7): A phase 2B, open-label, randomised controlled trial. Lancet Oncol [Internet]. 2016 May 1 [cited 2020

Nov 14];17(5):577–89. Available from: https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/27083334/

45. Eisenhauer EA, Therasse P, Bogaerts J, Schwartz LH, Sargent D, Ford R, et al. New response evaluation criteria in solid tumours: Revised RECIST guideline (version 1.1). Eur J Cancer [Internet]. 2009 Jan [cited 2020 Sep 1];45(2):228–47. Available from: https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/19097774/

46. Choi H, Charnsangavej C, Faria SC, Macapinlac HA, Burgess MA, Patel SR, et al. Correlation of computed tomography and positron emission tomography in patients with metastatic gastrointestinal stromal tumor treated at a single institution with imatinib mesylate: Proposal of new computed tomography response criteria. J Clin Oncol [Internet]. 2007 May 1 [cited 2020 Sep 1];25(13):1753–9. Available from: https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/17470865/

47. Benjamin RS, Choi H, Macapinlac HA, Burgess MA, Patel SR, Chen LL, et al. We should desist using RECIST, at least in GIST. J Clin Oncol [Internet]. 2007 May 1 [cited 2020 Sep 1];25(13):1760–4. Available from: https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/17470866/

48. Vera R, Gomez Dorronsoro M, Lopez-Ben S, Viudez A, Queralt B, Hernandez I, et al. Retrospective analysis of pathological response in colorectal cancer liver metastases following treatment with bevacizumab. Clin Transl Oncol [Internet]. 2014 [cited 2020 Sep 1];16(8):739–45. Available from: https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/24338508/

49. Aykan NF, Özatlı T. Objective response rate assessment in oncology: Current situation and future expectations. World J Clin Oncol [Internet]. 2020 Feb 18 [cited 2020 Sep 1];11(2):53–73. Available from: /pmc/articles/PMC7046919/?report=abstract

50. Ribero D, Wang H, Donadon M, Zorzi D, Thomas MB, Eng C, et al. Bevacizumab improves pathologic response and protects against hepatic injury in patients treated with oxaliplatin-based chemotherapy for colorectal liver metastases. Cancer [Internet]. 2007 Dec 15 [cited 2020 Sep 1];110(12):2761–7. Available from: https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/17960603/

51. Klinger M, Tamandl D, Eipeldauer S, Hacker S, Herberger B, Kaczirek K, et al. Bevacizumab improves pathological response of colorectal cancer liver metastases treated with XELOX/FOLFOX. Ann Surg Oncol [Internet]. 2010 Aug [cited 2020 Sep 1];17(8):2059–65. Available from: https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/20177795/

52. Blazer DG, Kishi Y, Maru DM, Kopetz S, Chun YS, Overman MJ, et al. Pathologic response to preoperative chemotherapy: A new outcome end point after resection of hepatic colorectal metastases. J Clin Oncol [Internet]. 2008 Nov 20 [cited 2020 Sep 1];26(33):5344–51. Available from: https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/18936472/

53. Chun YS, Vauthey JN, Boonsirikamchai P, Maru DM, Kopetz S, Palavecino M, et al. Association of computed tomography morphologic criteria with pathologic response and survival in patients

treated with bevacizumab for colorectal liver metastases. JAMA - J Am Med Assoc [Internet]. 2009 Dec 2 [cited 2020 Sep 2];302(21):2338–44. Available from: https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/19952320/

54. Rubbia-Brandt L, Giostra E, Brezault C, Roth AD, Andres A, Audard V, et al. Importance of histological tumor response assessment in predicting the outcome in patients with colorectal liver metastases treated with neo-adjuvant chemotherapy followed by liver surgery. Ann Oncol [Internet]. 2007 Feb [cited 2020 Nov 15];18(2):299–304. Available from: https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/17060484/

55. Adam R, Wicherts DA, De Haas RJ, Aloia T, Lévi F, Paule B, et al. Complete pathologic response after preoperative chemotherapy for colorectal liver metastases: Myth or reality? J Clin Oncol [Internet]. 2008 [cited 2020 Nov 15];26(10):1635–41. Available from: https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/18375892/

56. V H, LF von W, T D, A K, U V-K, SE A-B, et al. FOLFIRI plus cetuximab versus FOLFIRI plus bevacizumab as first-line treatment for patients with metastatic colorectal cancer (FIRE-3): A randomised, open-label, phase 3 trial. Lancet Oncol [Internet]. 2014 [cited 2020 Sep 2];15(10):1065–75. Available from: https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/25088940/

57. Saltz LB, Clarke S, Díaz-Rubio E, Scheithauer W, Figer A, Wong R, et al. Bevacizumab in combination with oxaliplatin-based chemotherapy as first-line therapy in metastatic colorectal cancer: A randomized phase III study. J Clin Oncol [Internet]. 2008 [cited 2020 Nov 15];26(12):2013–9. Available from: https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/18421054/

58. Grothey A, Hedrick EE, Mass RD, Sarkar S, Suzuki S, Ramanathan RK, et al. Response-independent survival benefit in metastatic colorectal cancer: A comparative analysis of N9741 and AVF2107. J Clin Oncol [Internet]. 2008 Jan 10 [cited 2020 Nov 15];26(2):183–9. Available from: https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/18182660/

59. Chou TC. Theoretical basis, experimental design, and computerized simulation of synergism and antagonism in drug combination studies [Internet]. Vol. 58, Pharmacological Reviews. Pharmacol Rev; 2006 [cited 2020 Aug 28]. p. 621–81. Available from: https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/16968952/

60. Chou TC. Drug combination studies and their synergy quantification using the chou-talalay method [Internet]. Vol. 70, Cancer Research. Cancer Res; 2010 [cited 2020 Aug 29]. p. 440–6. Available from: https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/20068163/

Tables and Figure Legends

Figure 1: Study design and workflow. Previous 1,163 ORR and null model from Kang et al.[38]

Figure 2: ORR increases with increasing number of agents in combination. **a**, Distribution of the collected Phase II trials' ORRs according to combination size. **b**, ORR trends of all cancer drug combinations of the collected Phase II trials. **c**, ORR trends of the targeted agents in combination with non-targeted agents, excluding trials with no targeted agents, n = 721. Points and error bars represent the mean ORR and 95% confidence interval, respectively. Data were analysed by two-tailed Student's t-test with Bonferroni correction. *P < 0.007, **P < 0.001, ***P < 0.0001.

Figure 3: Increasing the number of targeted agents does not increase ORR. Single and multiple-targeted agent combinations contain one and more than one targeted agents, respectively, with or without non-targeted agents. Single-targeted agent trials, n = 290 and multiple-targeted agent trials, n = 167. The bars and error bars represent the mean ORRs and 95% confidence interval, respectively. The statistical significance was estimated by two-tailed Student's t-test, *P < 0.05.

Figure 4: ORR trends over time. a, Proportion of targeted and non-targeted agent trials in the previous and modern ORR datasets. **b,** ORR as a function of the number of agents according to the combination tested in the previous and modern datasets. Previous dataset, n = 1,163 and modern dataset, n = 1,002. Points and error bars represent the mean ORR and 95% confidence interval, respectively. The statistical significance was estimated by two-tailed Student's t-test, *P < 0.05. Previous dataset from Kang et al.[38]

Figure 5: Clinical synergy and antagonism. The observed ORRs (ORR_O) as a function of the expected ORR (ORR_E) assuming no agent-agent interactions (null model). The diagonal line represents the perfect agreement with the null model. The left side and right side of the diagonal line correspond to the region of synergy and antagonism, respectively. (+) denotes combinations having evidence for synergy: ORR_O >

ORR_E, $P_{synergy} < 0.05$; (×) combinations having evidence for antagonism: $ORR_O < ORR_E$, $P_{antagonism} < 0.05$; and black squares (■) no significant difference from the null model.

Table 1: List of inferred synergistic and antagonistic drug combinations.



Figure 1: **Study design and workflow.**



Figure 2: **ORR increases with increasing number of agents in combination**.



Figure 3: **Increasing the number of targeted agents does not increase ORR.**



Figure 4: **ORR trends over time.**



Fig. 5: **Clinical synergy and antagonism.**

Table 1: List of drug combinations deemed synergistic and antagonistic.

Synergistic Combinations					
Agent 1	**Agent 2**	**Expected ORR_E (%)**	**Observed ORR_O (%)**	**$P_{synergy}$**	**Cancer Subtype**
Doxorubicin	Carboplatin	27	58	9.33E-03	Ovarian cancer
Carboplatin	Nab-Paclitaxel	28	59	4.87E-03	Lung (NSCLC*), Oropharyngeal, Breast cancer (TNBC**)
Rituximab	Ibrutinib	86	94	1.71E-03	Chronic lymphocytic leukaemia
S-1	Nab-Paclitaxel	31	58	2.59E-02	Gastric, Pancreatic cancer
Antagonistic Combinations					
Agent 1 / Combination 1	**Agent 2**	**Expected ORR_E (%)**	**Observed ORR_O (%)**	**$P_{antagonism}$**	**Cancer Subtype**
Afatinib	Bevacizumab	35	18	1.88E-02	Lung cancer (NSCLC*, EGFR Mutant)
Carboplatin	Gemcitabine	88	43	5.33E-03	Ovarian, Breast (TNBC**), Lung cancer (Squamous NSCLC*)
Ibrutinib	Durvalumab	86	26	1.30E-03	Non-Hodgkin lymphoma
Erlotinib	Bevacizumab	36	10	1.67E-04	Hepatocellular carcinoma
Erlotinib	Gemcitabine	89	13	4.96E-03	Metastatic pancreatic cancer
Nab-Paclitaxel	Gemcitabine	88	33	8.87E-06	Pancreatic, Breast, Bile duct cancer
Gemcitabine	Paclitaxel	89	39	3.87E-02	Metastatic breast cancer
Trastuzumab	Neratinib	54	27	3.27E-02	Breast cancer (HER2+)***
Irinotecan	Cetuximab	45	28	1.94E-02	Metastatic colorectal cancer (KRASwt, BRAFwt)****
FOLFOXIRI#	Cetuximab	56	34	4.00E-03	Metastatic colorectal cancer

* Non-small cell lung cancer
** Triple negative breast cancer
*** Human epidermal growth factor receptor 2
**** Wild type KRAS, wild type BRAF
# Leucovorin + Fluorouracil + Oxaliplatin + Irinotecan


PubMed: Cancer Phase II Clinical Trials
1,002 Clinical Trial ORR Data
Manual Inspection of Trials
Clinical Synergy and Antagonism
ORR Trend
Comparison of Datasets
Null Model of Non-interacting Agents
Previous 1,163 Clinical Trial ORR Data
Optimal Combination Size
ORR Trends Over Time


a
ORR Distribution of the Collected Phase II Trials
ORR (%)
100
90
80
70
60
50
40
30
20
10
0
One-Agent
Two-Agent
Three-Agent
Four-Agent
Five-Agent
Six-Agent
Seven-Agent


b
Overall ORR Trends of Cancer Drug Combinations
Mean ORR (%)
100
85
70
55
40
25
10
***
***
ns
ns
***
***
*
29
41
54
52
47
81
36
0
1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
Number of Agents


c
ORR Trends of Targeted Agent Combinations
Mean ORR (%)
100
85
70
55
40
25
10
***
***
ns
ns
***
***
*
29
40
56
57
55
83
36
0
1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
Number of Agents


Single vs Multiple Targeted Agent Combinations
Mean ORR (%)
100
80
60
40
20
0
*
ns
*
ns
ns
46
35
54
72
Two-Agent Trials
Three-Agent Trials
Four-Agent Trials
Five-Agent Trials
Six-Agent Trials
Single Targeted Agents
Multiple Targeted Agents


a
Comparison of Datasets
Trial Number
1400
1200
1000
800
600
400
200
0
899
264
281
721
Previous Dataset
Modern Dataset
Targeted Agent Trial
Non-targeted Agent Trial


b
ORR Change Over Time
Mean ORR (%)
95
85
75
65
55
45
35
25
ns
*
ns
***
45
41
54
79
47
81
0
1
2
3
4
5
6
7
Number of Agents
Previous Dataset
Modern Dataset


Clinical Data
+ Synergy
x Antagonism
Null
Synergy
Antagonism
100
80
60
40
20
0
0
20
40
60
80
100
ORR$_O$ (%)
ORR$_E$ (%)

Table 1: List of drug combinations deemed synergistic and antagonistic.

Synergistic Combinations					
Agent 1	**Agent 2**	**Expected ORR_E (%)**	**Observed ORR_O (%)**	**$P_{synergy}$**	**Cancer Subtype**
Doxorubicin	Carboplatin	27	58	9.33E-03	Ovarian cancer
Carboplatin	Nab-Paclitaxel	28	59	4.87E-03	Lung (NSCLC*), Oropharyngeal, Breast cancer (TNBC**)
Rituximab	Ibrutinib	86	94	1.71E-03	Chronic lymphocytic leukaemia
S-1	Nab-Paclitaxel	31	58	2.59E-02	Gastric, Pancreatic cancer
Antagonistic Combinations					
Agent 1 / Combination 1	**Agent 2**	**Expected ORR_E (%)**	**Observed ORR_O (%)**	**$P_{antagonism}$**	**Cancer Subtype**
Afatinib	Bevacizumab	35	18	1.88E-02	Lung cancer (NSCLC*, EGFR Mutant)
Carboplatin	Gemcitabine	88	43	5.33E-03	Ovarian, Breast (TNBC**), Lung cancer (Squamous NSCLC*)
Ibrutinib	Durvalumab	86	26	1.30E-03	Non-Hodgkin lymphoma
Erlotinib	Bevacizumab	36	10	1.67E-04	Hepatocellular carcinoma
Erlotinib	Gemcitabine	89	13	4.96E-03	Metastatic pancreatic cancer
Nab-Paclitaxel	Gemcitabine	88	33	8.87E-06	Pancreatic, Breast, Bile duct cancer
Gemcitabine	Paclitaxel	89	39	3.87E-02	Metastatic breast cancer
Trastuzumab	Neratinib	54	27	3.27E-02	Breast cancer (HER2+)***
Irinotecan	Cetuximab	45	28	1.94E-02	Metastatic colorectal cancer (KRASwt, BRAFwt)****
FOLFOXIRI#	Cetuximab	56	34	4.00E-03	Metastatic colorectal cancer

* Non-small cell lung cancer
** Triple negative breast cancer
*** Human epidermal growth factor receptor 2
**** Wild type KRAS, wild type BRAF
# Leucovorin + Fluorouracil + Oxaliplatin + Irinotecan