Title: Adjuvant pembrolizumab after upfront multimodal therapy for stage IVB Anaplastic Thyroid Cancer

Authors: Maria E. Cabanillas[1], Naifa L. Busaidy[1]*, Gary B. Gunn[2]*, Priyanka C. Iyer[1], Renata Ferrarotto[3],
Maria Gule-Monroe[4], Anastasios Maniakas[5], Michelle D. Williams[6], Suyu Liu[7], Bryan Fellman[7], Michael
Spiotto[2], Sarah Hamidi[1], Neal Akhave[3], Anna Lee[2], Jennifer R. Wang[5], Luana de Sousa[3], Vicente R.
Marczyk[1], Mark Zafereo[5] and Ramona Dadu[1]

Affiliations: Institution: Departments of [1]Endocrine Neoplasia and Hormonal Disorders, [2]Radiation
Oncology, [3]Head and Neck Medical Oncology, [4]Neuroradiology, [5]Head and Neck Surgery, [6]Pathology,
[7]Biostatistics, The University of Texas MD Anderson Cancer, Houston, TX, USA 77030

*denotes dual second author position

Running Title: Adjuvant pembrolizumab for stage IVB ATC

Word Count: 3406

Address for Correspondence:

Maria E. Cabanillas, M.D.

University of Texas M. D. Anderson Cancer Center

1515 Holcombe Blvd, Unit 1461

Houston, TX 77030

Ph: 713-563-0764

mcabani@mdanderson.org

Abstract:

Background: ATC has historically been almost uniformly fatal. In patients with loco-regional disease
(stage IVB), multimodal therapy (upfront surgery when feasible, radiation +/- concurrent chemotherapy)
followed by observation is the current standard of care.

Methods: Stage IVB ATC patients treated with multimodal therapy, followed by adjuvant pembrolizumab
were studied. Data were combined from a prospective, phase 2 trial (NCT05059470) that closed early
due to poor accrual, and a retrospective cohort of consecutive patients who received adjuvant
pembrolizumab and mirrored the trial eligibility criteria. Patients received adjuvant pembrolizumab
starting within 6 weeks after completion of radiation. An age and treatment-matched control arm
treated with multimodal therapy without adjuvant pembrolizumab was selected for comparison. The
primary objectives included median progression-free survival (PFS) and recurrence rate. The secondary
objective was median overall survival (OS). Descriptive statistics and Kaplan-Meier method for survival
analysis were used.

Results: Between March 2020 and February 2024, 16 patients were treated with adjuvant
pembrolizumab. The control arm included 16 patients. The median age in both groups was 59 years. The
median PDL1 score and tumor mutation burden in the adjuvant pembrolizumab arm were 50% (range, 0-
95%) and 3 mut/Mb (range, 0.5-29). There were more RAS mutated patient tumors in the adjuvant arm
(40%) compared to the historical control group (18%). The majority, 14/16 (88%), had upfront surgery in
both groups. The median follow-up time was 24.3 months in the adjuvant arm and 56.7 months in the
control arm. The median PFS in the adjuvant and control arm was not reached, and 5.4 months (95%CI
2.04-16.20), respectively (p=0.006; HR 0.24 (95%CI: 0.08, 0.73)). The median OS was not reached in the
adjuvant pembrolizumab group. In the control group the median OS was 31 months (95%CI 13.9, NA) (p
= 0.009; HR 0.11 (95%CI: 0.01, 0.83)). The 12-and 24-month survivals were 80% (95%CI 0.51-0.93) and
52% (95%CI 0.25-0.74), respectively, in the control arm, whereas all patients in the adjuvant arm were
still alive at 1- and 2- years.

Conclusion: Adjuvant pembrolizumab appears to be a safe and effective strategy to prevent recurrences
and prolong survival in stage IVB ATC patients following multimodal therapy.

Introduction:

Until recently, a diagnosis of anaplastic thyroid cancer (ATC) was considered uniformly fatal. However, the past decade has ushered in a number of systemic therapies and treatment approaches which have shown efficacy in these patients (1-5). Patients with stage IVA (tumor confined to the thyroid) or IVB (loco-regional disease) have a far better prognosis than patients with distant metastatic disease (stage IVC) when treated with multimodal therapy. Traditional multimodal therapy consists of upfront surgery when feasible, radiation plus concurrent cytotoxic chemotherapy, followed by observation. This is the current standard of care included across all guidelines for ATC (6-8). However, relapse rates are high with multimodal treatment, likely due to microscopic metastatic disease, highlighting the need for effective adjuvant therapy. The Mayo Clinic group reported a 12-and 24-month overall survival (OS) of 68% and 48%, respectively, in this population. Relapses carry a very high risk of mortality, as 42% of patients died within 6 months (9).

In ATC, the PD-1 receptor-ligand interaction is a major pathway hijacked by tumors to suppress immune control and most ATC tumors express PD-L1 (10-12). Pembrolizumab, an anti-PD1 checkpoint inhibitor, blocks the interaction of PD1 and PDL1, resulting in an anti-tumor immune response. Thus, we hypothesized that adjuvant pembrolizumab would provide a local control benefit, in addition to targeting microscopic metastatic disease.

Methods:

Patients with stage IVB ATC who were undergoing or had completed upfront multimodal therapy were given consideration for a prospective, phase 2 trial with adjuvant pembrolizumab (NCT05059470), called IMPAACT ("IMRT followed by pembrolizumab in the adjuvant setting in anaplastic cancer of the thyroid"). Unfortunately, the trial closed early due to poor accrual. Subsequently, a new study combining the data from 6 patients treated in the IMPAACT prospective trial with a retrospective cohort of consecutive stage IVB ATC patients who received adjuvant pembrolizumab outside of trial was created. An age- and treatment-matched historical group of patients with stage IVB ATC was selected as the control group. This study was performed in compliance with Good Clinical Practice guidelines and in accordance with the Declaration of Helsinki. The protocol and amendments were approved by the institutional IRB.

The retrospective cohort of patients treated with adjuvant pembrolizumab was chosen by using criteria that mirrored the trial eligibility criteria for IMPAACT. Eligibility criteria included: stage IVB ATC,

completion of multimodal therapy (surgery when feasible and external beam radiation to the neck with

or without concomitant cytotoxic chemotherapy), and adjuvant pembrolizumab within 6 weeks (+2

weeks allowed to account for latent toxicity resolution)) after the completion of radiation. As this was an

intention-to-treat analysis, patients who were thought to have stage IVB disease due to small, FDG-non-

avid equivocal lesions who were later identified as having metastases were included. Pembrolizumab

dosing in the IMPAACT trial was 400mg IV every 6 weeks. Patients outside of trial could have received

the 400mg IV every 6 weeks or 200mg IV every 3 weeks. For patients receiving infusions every three

weeks, treatment cycles were defined as six-week periods, with each cycle consisting of two infusions.

Patients in the clinical trial were planned to receive pembrolizumab for 1 year with an optional 2nd year

per patient and physician discretion.

Patients in the historical control arm were selected from our IRB-approved ATC database. Those having

received adjuvant immunotherapy during radiation or adjuvant treatment after radiation therapy were

excluded. Patients were observed off all treatment after the completion of multimodal therapy, which is

the current standard of care These patients were age-matched within 5 years of age, and treatment-

matched by extent of surgery (R0/R1 vs R2) and dose of radiation ($\geq$ 45 Gy vs < 45 Gy radiation). No

patients prior to 2014 were selected.

The primary objectives of this trial were to estimate the recurrence rate and median progression-free

survival (PFS) in stage IVB ATC patients treated with adjuvant pembrolizumab after the completion of

initial standard therapy and compare them to the age and treatment-matched historical control group.

PFS was determined by using the start date of pembrolizumab (for the adjuvant treated patients) or end

of radiation (for the historical control patients), to the last radiographic assessment of progression or

date of death. Secondary objective was to estimate and compare the median overall survival (OS) in the

two cohorts, using the same starting dates as PFS.

RECIST v1.1 was used to evaluate relapses. For the efficacy endpoints, OS and PFS, the Kaplan-Meier

method were used to estimate their survival functions. The marginal comparisons in PFS and OS were

performed using the log-rank test. Cox regression model was used to estimate the hazard ratio (HR) of

using adjuvant pembrolizumab, stratified by the matching factors of age and treatment.

Results:

Treatment groups:

A total of 16 patients between March 2020 and February 2024, were included in the adjuvant

pembrolizumab group and an equal number of historical control patients between May 2014 and

January 2024. Table 1 shows the baseline characteristics of both groups. Six (34%) of the adjuvant

pembrolizumab patients were accrued in the IMPAACT trial, while 10 (63%) were identified from the

retrospective study. Both arms were well balanced in terms of age, sex, and extent of surgery. The

adjuvant arm had only one patient with a dose of radiation <45 Gy and that patient did not receive

radiosensitizing chemotherapy, whereas all patients in the control arm received $\geq$45 Gy and concomitant

radiosensitizing chemotherapy. The median dose of radiation between the groups was similar.

Mutation and PDL1 analysis:

All patient tumors were sent for molecular analysis. Only 1 patient's tumor (in the adjuvant

pembrolizumab arm) could not be genotyped due to a very high immune infiltrate. Thus, 15/16 (94%) of

the adjuvant arm tumors were evaluated by NGS for mutations and 13/16 (81%) evaluated for RNA

fusions. In the matched historical control arm, all (100%) patient tumors were evaluated by NGS for

mutations; 9/16 (56%) evaluated for RNA fusions. Figure 1 shows the oncoprint with patient

characteristics and NGS data. In summary, there were more RAS mutations identified in the adjuvant

pembrolizumab group (6/15, 40%) compared to the matched controls (3/16, 18%). Otherwise, there

were similar numbers of driver oncofusions and mutations in BRAFV600E and PTEN. The median tumor

mutation burden was 3 mut/Mb (range, 0.5-29) but there was insufficient aggregate information in the

matched controls due to the historical nature of this group. The median PDL1 (Clone 22C3, Dako

PharmDx) Tumor Proportion Score (TPS) was 50% (range, 0-95%) in the 15 patients whose tumors were

tested in the adjuvant pembrolizumab arm. Insufficient aggregate data for PDL1 was available in the

matched control arm.

Efficacy results:

Median follow-up time was 24.3 months for the adjuvant pembrolizumab group versus 56.7 months for

the control arm. In the adjuvant pembrolizumab group, patients received a median of 16 cycles

(normalized to 6-week cycles for the analysis; range 1-19 cycles) of pembrolizumab. At the data cut-off,

only 2 patients were in active treatment with pembrolizumab. These two patients had completed 11 and

16 cycles of pembrolizumab.

There were 3/16 (19%) patients who were counted as having recurrence in the adjuvant pembrolizumab

group and 14/16 (82%) in the matched control arm (p=<0.001). All 3 patients in the adjuvant

pembrolizumab arm relapsed at distant sites, however in retrospect the metastatic lesions were all

present at the time of starting pembrolizumab. These metastatic lesions were considered non-specific at

the time of diagnosis and are discussed below. One patient treated with adjuvant pembrolizumab died

after 2.74 years without having experienced progression. The median PFS was not reached in the

adjuvant pembrolizumab arm but 5.4 months (95%CI 2.04, 16.20; p=0.006) in the matched control arm.

The estimated HR was 0.24 (95%CI: 0.08, 0.73). The median OS was not reached in the adjuvant

pembrolizumab groups. In the control group the median OS was 31 months (95%CI 13.9, NA; p = 0.009).

The estimated hazard ratio was 0.11 (95%CI: 0.01, 0.83). At 1 and 2 years, all patients were alive in the

adjuvant pembrolizumab arm, whereas 81% (95%CI 0.53, 0.95) and 54% (95%CI 0.27, 0.75) were alive in

the matched control arm, respectively. Figure 2 shows the PFS (figure 2A) and OS (figure 2B) Kaplan-

Meier curves, and the swimmer's plot (figure 2C) of patients in the adjuvant pembrolizumab and

historical control arms.

In terms of serious adverse events (SAE) in the adjuvant pembrolizumab arm, grade 2 pneumonitis was

reported in 1 patient. The patient was treated with steroids and pembrolizumab was permanently

discontinued after 4 cycles. It was unclear if the SAE in the patient who died after developing gastric

ischemia was related to pembrolizumab. The patient had chronic lymphocytic leukemia and was also

taking acalabrutinib. He was admitted to an outside hospital with a diarrheal illness and found to have

ischemic injury to his stomach leading to sepsis and death. No other serious adverse events were

identified.

Adjuvant patients who progressed:

There were no true recurrences in the adjuvant arm. The 3 patients who were counted as having

progression on adjuvant pembrolizumab were patients who had metastatic disease to the lungs prior to

course 1 of adjuvant pembrolizumab. All three patients were alive at the data cut-off. Two of the three

have required salvage therapy with targeted oral kinase inhibitors.

The first case is a 55-year-old man status post total thyroidectomy, central and lateral neck dissection

and excision of tumor thrombus from the left jugular vein (R0 resection) and radiation to the neck. His

tumor's PLD1 score was 20%, and the TMB was 5. He presented for the first cycle of adjuvant

pembrolizumab in the clinical trial within 26 days after completing radiation. The baseline imaging

showed growth of a small lung nodule which was present in a previous CT-scan but deemed

indeterminate. This was biopsied and consistent with ATC. He proceeded with pembrolizumab, and at

cycle 6 was found to have a complete response in the lungs. He completed 18 cycles of adjuvant

pembrolizumab and then the treatment was stopped, as he had a complete response. He was alive

without recurrence 27.8 months after starting pembrolizumab.

The second case was a 79-year-old woman with RET fusion papillary thyroid cancer (PTC) diagnosed 22

years prior, which transformed into ATC. She underwent surgical resection with final surgical pathology

showing ATC in background of PDTC in a lymph node. PDL1 was 0% and TMB was 0.5. She received

radiation to the neck after surgery and started adjuvant pembrolizumab 47 days after completion of

radiation. At baseline she had lung nodules, which then grew while she was on adjuvant pembrolizumab.

These lung nodules were not biopsied nor confirmed to be ATC. She was removed from the clinical trial

and started on a selective RET inhibitor with a partial response.

The third case was a 77-year-old man with BRAFV600E mutated ATC who had an R2 surgery followed by

radiation to the neck. PDL1, TMB and full molecular profile could not be performed due to high

lymphocytic infiltrate in the tumor. The day he was scheduled to start adjuvant pembrolizumab outside

of the trial, his CT chest showed new lung nodules. He proceeded with pembrolizumab, with the infusion

starting 37 days after the completion of radiation. However, upon restaging, progression of the lung

nodules was observed, and dabrafenib/trametinib were subsequently added to his immunotherapy. He

achieved a complete response to triplet therapy.

Discussion:

This is the first clinical trial with adjuvant pembrolizumab for 1-2 years in stage IVB ATC. We found that

the patients treated with adjuvant pembrolizumab within 4 weeks after completing multimodal therapy

had a significantly longer median PFS and OS compared to the historical, age- and treatment-matched

control patients who were observed after upfront multimodal therapy. The median PFS and OS have not

been reached in the adjuvant pembrolizumab treated group with a median follow up time of 2 years.

The only recurrences within the adjuvant pembrolizumab group were found to have been present prior

to the first dose of adjuvant pembrolizumab. Even so, the recurrence rate was much lower in the

adjuvant pembrolizumab patients, and these recurrences were ultimately deemed to be progressions of

prior indeterminate lung lesions. Importantly, there were not locoregional recurrences/progression in

the patients receiving adjuvant pembrolizumab.

There are several clinical trials in ATC showing that the outcome of patients with locoregionally confined

diseases (M0) is far superior to those with distant metastatic disease (M1), however, all of these

demonstrate that the vast majority of patients with locoregionally confined disease relapse or die within

1-2 years of their diagnosis, despite surgery and radiation (9, 13, 14). The NRG Oncology RTOG 0912

clinical trial with adjuvant pazopanib vs. placebo subanalysis showed in that patients with M0/MX status,

median survival in the placebo arm was 8.6 months (95% CI 4.9, 16.2)(14). By the 2nd year, only 4/21

(19%) patients in the placebo arm were still alive. However, these patients are not directly comparable to

our historical control population due to differences in the surgical extent, which influences survival

significantly. A retrospective study from MD Anderson showed that the median time to failure in stage

IVB patients was 6.2 months and median OS was 12.3 months(13), however, only 41% had been treated

with upfront surgery. Despite this, within 2 years almost all patients had relapsed and/or died.

A retrospective study from the Mayo Clinic of stage IVB patients from 2003-2015 with multimodal

therapy showed that at 1 and 2 years, 68% and 48% were alive, respectively, compared to our current

trial's historical cohort at 80% and 52%, respectively. In the Mayo cohort 19/22 (86%) patients had

relapsed within the first 2 years after completion of multimodal therapy. All but 2 of these patients

relapsed at distant sites. At 5 years, 20/22 (91%) patients had relapsed. The difference between our

historical cohort (31 months) and the Mayo cohort (22months) is possibly due to better salvage

therapies in more recent years because we only selected patients who presented after 2014. Our

patients would have had access to more modern treatments such as BRAF/MEK inhibitors,

lenvatinib/pembrolizumab and clinical trials. This could explain the improvement in 1 year survival,

however, at 2 years the MD Anderson and Mayo historical cohorts appear equivalent. This highlights the

need for an adjuvant therapy to address micrometastatic disease. In our study, the patients treated with

adjuvant pembrolizumab patients seem to have far better outcomes than both the MD Anderson and

the Mayo Clinic historical cohorts, with no patients having true progression and only one death which

was not due to ATC recurrence. Longer follow-up is needed to determine if disease recurrences will

appear after 1-2 years of adjuvant pembrolizumab treatment. ATC patients likely need at least 5 years of

follow up to understand whether the patients are cured.

All patients in the control arm and all but one in the adjuvant pembrolizumab arm had upfront surgery.

More data is needed on outcomes of patients who receive palliative radiation (ie, < 45 Gy) without

upfront surgery, followed by adjuvant pembrolizumab, as many patients do not undergo surgical

resection either due to unresectable disease or unacceptable surgical morbidity. On the other hand, if

adjuvant pembrolizumab after upfront multimodal therapy is found to be curative, it may be time to

consider performing more radical surgeries in otherwise healthy patients with non-BRAF mutated stage

IVB disease, similar to mucosal squamous cell carcinoma patients. Total laryngectomy has up to now

largely been discouraged in these patients in the treatment guidelines for ATC. However, if a substantial

number of stage IVB ATC patients are able to achieve long-term control with adjuvant pembrolizumab,

then upfront extensive surgery (e.g. laryngectomy) becomes more acceptable in situations where

checkpoint inhibitor therapy is possible.

Tumor driver mutation is important for determining prognosis in ATC patients. The presence of a somatic

BRAFV600E mutation, which is actionable with BRAF/MEK inhibitor therapy, is associated with far better

prognosis than RAS mutations (15). Since BRAFV600E mutated ATC patients usually undergo neoadjuvant

BRAF/MEK inhibitor/anti-PD1 inhibitor, only 1 patient with BRAFV600E mutated ATC was included in the

treatment arm. Thus, it is unclear if the strategy of adjuvant pembrolizumab alone is sufficient for the

BRAFV600E mutated ATC patient. At this time, we continue to treat BRAFV600E mutated patients with

neoadjuvant and adjuvant dabrafenib/trametinib/pembrolizumab (16). In our study, there were more

patients with RAS mutated tumors in the adjuvant pembrolizumab arm, thus favoring the control arm

since RAS mutations are associated with far worse outcomes than BRAF-mutant ATC (15). There was no

difference in the number of patients with actionable mutations or fusions in the control versus adjuvant

pembrolizumab groups. TMB and PDL1 scores were as expected in the adjuvant pembrolizumab arm but

there was insufficient data in the control group, as many NGS panels did not include TMB, and testing for

PDL1 score was not part of our standard practice prior to 2018.

The only serious adverse event that was clearly related to pembrolizumab group was pneumonitis, a

known adverse effect of the checkpoint inhibitors. Immune-related adverse events associated with these

drugs can be life-threatening and warrant careful follow-up prior to each infusion. Another patient died 4

months after the last pembrolizumab infusion due to gastric ischemia/sepsis but it is not clear if this was

a related event.

Unfortunately, the prospective clinical trial, IMPAACT, closed early for poor accrual, therefore we pooled

data from the IMPAACT trial and from consecutive ATC patients who were treated "off-label" with

adjuvant pembrolizumab. A number of factors could have contributed to the poor accrual to the trial.

First, the trial was opened to enrollment in 2021, during the COVID-19 pandemic which severely slowed

accrual. Second, pembrolizumab is commercially available in the United States and many physicians

treated their patients outside of clinical trial for the convenience of the patient. Therefore, we combined

data from the prospective clinical trial with real-world data in patients treated similarly. In order to

determine whether the adjuvant treatment group benefitted from pembrolizumab, we created an age

and treatment matched cohort. However, questions remain regarding efficacy of adjuvant

pembrolizumab in patients with unresectable disease who undergo radiation to gross disease, as only

one such patient was treated in our study. The patient has been alive and free of disease nearly 5 years.

Other questions remain regarding adjuvant pembrolizumab treatment of patients with stage IVA disease.

The major limitation of this study includes the small number of patients; however, this is expected given

the rarity of ATC. There is also a lead-time bias in the historical control group which could favor the

adjuvant pembrolizumab group, as these patients were diagnosed more recently, and therefore have

significantly less follow-up time. The control group could have worse outcomes due to being diagnosed

in earlier years and there is likely a referral bias of patients who have relapsed. Even so, compared to

data from other institutions, the overall survival of our historical controls is significantly longer at 31

months.

Based on the findings from this study we propose an update to the algorithm for patients with stage IVB

ATC with BRAF wild-type disease (figure 3). Once a stage IVB patient is identified, a biopsy specimen

should be rapidly analyzed to determine the BRAF status by immunohistochemistry or single gene

BRAFV600E mutation testing. If BRAFV600E has been ruled out, we recommend surgery if an R0/R1

surgery can be accomplished, followed by external beam radiation to the neck with concomitant

radiosensitizing chemotherapy. Palliative radiation can also be considered when full dose radiation is not

possible. Adjuvant treatment should be started within 4-6 weeks of completing radiation since

recurrences have been seen as early as 4 weeks in our historical cohort. Patients should be treated with

1-2 years of adjuvant pembrolizumab. Longer treatments are not advisable because of the risk of

developing an immunotherapy-related serious adverse event, which can occur at any point during

treatment with checkpoint inhibitor therapy. However, shortening treatment to 1 year could be studied

in the future. Another area of future research is the use of adjuvant pembrolizumab in patients with

stage IVA ATC, as well as those with BRAFV600E mutated tumors. Our trial did not include sufficient

numbers of the latter. Because neoadjuvant therapy in BRAFV600E mutated ATC patients has been

studied extensively, this is the preferred treatment for those patients. However, in countries where

complicated surgeries are not possible or BRAF/MEK inhibitors are unavailable, adjuvant pembrolizumab

could be considered for stage IVB BRAFV600E mutated ATC.

We conclude that adjuvant pembrolizumab appears to be a safe and effective strategy to prevent

recurrences and prolong survival in stage IVB patients following upfront multimodal therapy and

treatment guidelines should include this strategy.

Acknowledgements: We wish to thank Merck for providing drug support and the Petrick philanthropic
funds for providing the funding for the trial. We also thank the brave patients and their families for their
participation in the clinical trial and for entrusting their care to us.

Author Contribution statement: Drafting of the manuscript: Maria E. Cabanillas. Conceptualization of
the study: Naifa Busaidy, Gary B. Gunn, Renata Ferrarotto, Maria Gule-Monroe, Mark Zafereo, Ramona
Dadu. Critical review and editing of the manuscript: All authors.

Author Disclosure Statement: M. E. Cabanillas has received consulting fees from Bayer, Exelixis, Lilly,
Novartis and research funding from Merck, Genentech, Eisai, Exelixis. N. Busaidy reports research
funding from Eisai and personal consulting fees from Eisai and Eli Lilly. R. Ferrarotto reports personal fees
from Regeneron, Eisai Inc, Remix Therapeutics, Coherus BioSciences, Rgenta Therapeutics, BioAtla,
Bicara Therapeutics, RAPT Therapeutics, and LEK consultant. She reports non-financial support (to
institution) from ISA Therapeutics, Merck Serono, Viracta, Gilead, Remix Therapeutics, Rgenta
Therapeutics, and Mersana Therapeutics outside the submitted work. A. Maniakas reports research
funding from JAZZ Pharmaceuticals and Thryv Therapeutics Inc. MD Williams has research funding from
Bayer. N. Akhave has sponsored research with Aveo Pharmaceuticals, Innocare Pharma, Bicara
Therapeutics, and Pfizer/Genmab and has received consulting fees from Genmab/Pfizer. Zafereo has
received research funding from Merck, Eli Lilly, and Exelixis. R. Dadu reports research funding from Eisai,
Merck, Exelixis and AstraZeneca, and personal fees from Bayer and Exelixis. Gary B. Gunn P. Iyer, S. Liu, B.
Fellman, S. Hamidi, A. Lee, M. Spiotto, L. de Sousa, V. Marczyk, J.R. Wang have nothing to disclose.

References:

1.   Wang JR, Zafereo ME, Dadu R, Ferrarotto R, Busaidy NL, Lu C, et al. Complete Surgical Resection
Following Neoadjuvant Dabrafenib Plus Trametinib in BRAF(V600E)-Mutated Anaplastic Thyroid
Carcinoma. Thyroid. 2019;29(8):1036-43.
2.   Zhao X, Wang JR, Dadu R, Busaidy NL, Xu L, Learned KO, et al. Surgery After BRAF-Directed
Therapy Is Associated with Improved Survival in BRAF(V600E) Mutant Anaplastic Thyroid Cancer: A
Single-Center Retrospective Cohort Study. Thyroid. 2023;33(4):484-91.
3.   Subbiah V, Kreitman RJ, Wainberg ZA, Cho JY, Schellens JHM, Soria JC, et al. Efficacy of dabrafenib
(D) and trametinib (T) in patients (pts) with BRAF V600E–mutated anaplastic thyroid cancer (ATC). J Clin
Oncol 2017;35((suppl; abstr 6023)).

4.   Sehgal K, Pappa T, Shin KY, Schiantarelli J, Liu M, Ricker C, et al. Dual Immune Checkpoint
Inhibition in Patients With Aggressive Thyroid Carcinoma: A Phase 2 Nonrandomized Clinical Trial. JAMA
Oncol. 2024;10(12):1663-71.
5.   Cabanillas ME, Dadu R, Ferrarotto R, Gule-Monroe M, Liu S, Fellman B, et al. Anti-Programmed
Death Ligand 1 Plus Targeted Therapy in Anaplastic Thyroid Carcinoma: A Nonrandomized Clinical Trial.
JAMA Oncol. 2024.
6.   Bible KC, Kebebew E, Brierley J, Brito JP, Cabanillas ME, Clark TJ, Jr., et al. 2021 American Thyroid
Association Guidelines for Management of Patients with Anaplastic Thyroid Cancer. Thyroid.
2021;31(3):337-86.
7.   Haddad RI, Bischoff L, Ball D, Bernet V, Blomain E, Busaidy NL, et al. Thyroid Carcinoma, Version
2.2022, NCCN Clinical Practice Guidelines in Oncology. J Natl Compr Canc Netw. 2022;20(8):925-51.
8.   Filetti S, Durante C, Hartl DM, Leboulleux S, Locati LD, Newbold K, et al. ESMO Clinical Practice
Guideline update on the use of systemic therapy in advanced thyroid cancer. Ann Oncol. 2022;33(7):674-
84.
9.   Prasongsook N, Kumar A, Chintakuntlawar AV, Foote RL, Kasperbauer J, Molina J, et al. Survival in
Response to Multimodal Therapy in Anaplastic Thyroid Cancer. J Clin Endocrinol Metab.
2017;102(12):4506-14.
10.   Chintakuntlawar AV, Rumilla KM, Smith CY, Jenkins SM, Foote RL, Kasperbauer JL, et al.
Expression of PD-1 and PD-L1 in Anaplastic Thyroid Cancer Patients Treated With Multimodal Therapy:
Results From a Retrospective Study. J Clin Endocrinol Metab. 2017;102(6):1943-50.
11.   Bastman JJ, Serracino HS, Zhu Y, Koenig MR, Mateescu V, Sams SB, et al. Tumor-Infiltrating T Cells
and the PD-1 Checkpoint Pathway in Advanced Differentiated and Anaplastic Thyroid Cancer. J Clin
Endocrinol Metab. 2016;101(7):2863-73.
12.   Zhu X, Hu C, Zhang Z, Zhu Y, Liu W, Zheng B, et al. PD-L1 and B7-H3 are Effective Prognostic
Factors and Potential Therapeutic Targets for High-Risk Thyroid Cancer. Endocr Pathol. 2024;35(3):230-
44.
13.   Rao SN, Zafereo M, Dadu R, Busaidy NL, Hess K, Cote GJ, et al. Patterns of Treatment Failure in
Anaplastic Thyroid Carcinoma. Thyroid. 2017;27(5):672-81.
14.   Sherman EJ, Harris J, Bible KC, Xia P, Ghossein RA, Chung CH, et al. Radiotherapy and paclitaxel
plus pazopanib or placebo in anaplastic thyroid cancer (NRG/RTOG 0912): a randomised, double-blind,
placebo-controlled, multicentre, phase 2 trial. Lancet Oncol. 2023;24(2):175-86.
15.   Wang JR, Montierth M, Xu L, Goswami M, Zhao X, Cote G, et al. Impact of Somatic Mutations on
Survival Outcomes in Patients With Anaplastic Thyroid Carcinoma. JCO Precis Oncol. 2022;6:e2100504.
16.   Hamidi S, Dadu R, Zafereo ME, Ferrarotto R, Wang JR, Maniakas A, et al. Initial Management of
BRAF V600E-Variant Anaplastic Thyroid Cancer: The FAST Multidisciplinary Group Consensus Statement.
JAMA Oncol. 2024;10(9):1264-71.

Tables:

Table 1: Baseline patient characteristics

	Adjuvant pembrolizumab arm (N=16) 1/2020-1/2024	Matched control arm (N=16) 6/2014-3/2024
Median age (range)	59 (47-76)	59 (45-78)
Sex, n (%) Female Male	10 (62) 6 (38)	9 (56) 7 (44)
Surgery R0/R1 R2 or biopsy only	14 (87.5) 2 (12.5)	14 (87.5) 2 (12.5)
IMRT dose $\geq$ 45 Gy < 45 Gy	15 (94) 1 (6)	16 (100) 0
Median dose of RT (Gy)	60	66
Radiosensitizing chemotherapy yes no	15 (94) 1 (6)	16 (100) 0

Figures and figure legend:

Figure 1. Oncoprint of targeted somatic gene mutations by Next-Generation Sequencing of tumors in patients with stage IVB Anaplastic Thyroid Cancer (ATC) in the adjuvant pembrolizumab and historical control arms. Several CLIA-certified panels were used to assay for mutations in oncogenes of ATC tumors, including liquid biopsy (shown in figure). One patient with BRAFV600E positive immunohistochemistry, who was in the adjuvant pembrolizumab arm, is not included in the oncoprint because mutation profile was not possible on his tumor.

Figure 2. Median progression-free (2A) and overall survival (2B) in the adjuvant pembrolizumab cohort
vs matched historical controls of stage IVB ATC patients. (2C) Swimmer's plot showing the time in years
from completion of radiation to progression and survival in stage IVB patients treated with adjuvant
pembrolizumab or no adjuvant treatment. All patients, with the exception of patient 16, had upfront
surgery prior to radiation. This patient had palliative radiation (30 Gy) to gross disease before starting
adjuvant pembrolizumab.

Figure 3: Proposed algorithm for patients with stage IVB anaplastic thyroid cancer without a BRAFV600E mutation. Once BRAFV600E has been ruled out, we recommend surgery when feasible, followed by external beam radiation to the neck with radiosensitizing chemotherapy. Palliative radiation may be considered when full dose radiation is not possible or acceptable. Patients should be restaged prior to adjuvant pembrolizumab. Ideally, adjuvant pembrolizumab should be started within 4-6 weeks for a period of 1-2 years. ATC=anaplastic thyroid cancer; EBRT=external beam radiation therapy

445