JOURNAL OF CLINICAL ONCOLOGY

Reaffirming and Clarifying the American Society of Clinical Oncology's Policy Statement on the Critical Role of Phase I Trials in Cancer Research and Treatment

Jeffrey S. Weber, *New York University Langone Medical Center, New York, NY* Laura A. Levit, *American Society of Clinical Oncology, Alexandria, VA* Peter C. Adamson, *The Children's Hospital of Philadelphia, Philadelphia, PA* Suanna S. Bruinooge, *American Society of Clinical Oncology, Alexandria, VA* Howard A. Burris, *Sarah Cannon Research Institute, Nashville, TN* Michael A. Carducci, *Sidney Kimmel Comprehensive Cancer Center, Baltimore, MD* Adam P. Dicker, *Jefferson Medical College of Thomas Jefferson University, Philadelphia, PA* Mithat Gönen, *Memorial Sloan Kettering Cancer Center, New York, NY* Stephen M. Keefe, *University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia, PA* Michael A. Postow, *Memorial Sloan Kettering Cancer Center, New York, NY* Michael A. Thompson, *Aurora Health Care, Milwaukee, WI* David M. Waterhouse, *Oncology Hematology Care, Cincinnati, OH* Susan L. Weiner, *Children's Cause for Cancer Advocacy, Washington, DC* Lynn M. Schuchter, *University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia, PA*

See accompanying article on page 135

On behalf of ASCO, we thank Dr Jonathan Kimmelman for highlighting a number of important issues in the design and conduct of phase I clinical trials in oncology.¹ The ethics surrounding cancer phase I trials have been an important topic of discussion throughout the modern history of clinical cancer research and continue to be important in the development of new drugs. We would like to reaffirm and clarify ASCO's position on phase I cancer clinical trials² and to agree or disagree with some of Dr Kimmelman's points.

ASCO and Dr Kimmelman agree that phase I trials have therapeutic intent and that such intent is necessary, but not sufficient, to support conduct of such trials in patients with cancer. As noted in ASCO's 2015 policy statement update on this topic,² these trials must also have the potential to provide clinical benefit. In offering an interventional trial, the physician and patient have the goal of attempting to treat the cancer. The same goal applies when a physician and patient pursue therapeutic options outside a clinical trial.

Dr Kimmelman challenges the underlying assumptions and evidence on which the potential therapeutic benefit of participation in phase I trials rests. His reasoning begins with the tenet that the riskbenefit assessment is always made against the current standard of care. However, the risk-benefit assessment must also take into account the disease setting, which necessarily includes the known risks associated with progressive cancer. The standard of care for patients who participate in phase I trials usually is either to forego anticancer treatment and pursue symptom management or to receive off-label cancer drugs with little proven effectiveness. Trial participation has the advantage over standard care of generating data on patient outcomes, safety, and efficacy for therapies. ASCO supports the registration of all trials in the national trials registry (ClincialTrials.gov) and the publication of research results to ensure these data are available to the public.³

In addition, ASCO wishes to again emphasize the evolving landscape of cancer drug development and its commitment to protecting human patients and ensuring the ethical conduct of cancer research. Innovative phase I trial designs can and should limit the risks of patients receiving a dose of a drug that is too low to be effective. The use of biomarker selection strategies can increase the probability of obtaining clinical benefit. Indeed, emerging data show that biomarkerdirected therapies are associated with improved response and progression-free survival in the phase I setting,⁴ and it is no longer uncommon to offer patients the option of a phase I trial even before all standard treatment approaches have been used. The recent history of oncology trials, particularly in the field of immunotherapy, suggests that patients have clearly benefited from early-phase trials of drugs such as ipilimumab, nivolumab, pembrolizumab, and atezolizumab, and the trials that led to their approval were in some cases the actual phase I studies that were extended to include a broader patient population.⁵ According to a recent estimate, approximately two thirds of agents tested in phase I trials proceed to the next phase of development.⁶

Although response rate may in some cases be a poor surrogate for overall survival, response rate is typically accepted by the US Food and Drug Administration as an end point reasonably likely to predict clinical benefit and thus provide a basis for accelerated approval. In fact, several of these recent approvals were based on response data that ultimately were translated into improved survival outcomes and prominent long-term tails on the survival curve in later-phase randomized studies.⁷

Patients considering participation in any type of trial need understandable information about the uncertainty for potential benefit and risk⁸ as well as the research objectives of the study. Given the evolving landscape of cancer drug development, ASCO recommends that informed consent documents and patient educational materials rely on peer-reviewed data to present the known and unknown benefits and risks of an investigational earlyphase agent. These documents should be written at an 8th grade reading level, because many current forms are long, complex, and highly technical.9 ASCO continually advocates that informed consent forms be simplified to optimize comprehensibility and clarity, reduce intimidating language, and place potential benefits and risks in a proper context.¹⁰ In addition, it is critical that clinicians discuss this information in the informed consent process with the goal of ensuring that potential trial participants and their family members make fully informed decisions about whether to enroll in the trial.

AUTHORS' DISCLOSURES OF POTENTIAL CONFLICTS OF INTEREST

Disclosures provided by the authors are available with this article at ascopubs.org/journal/jco.

AUTHOR CONTRIBUTIONS

Administrative support: Laura A. Levit Manuscript writing: All authors Final approval of manuscript: All authors

REFERENCES

1. Kimmelman J: Is participation in cancer phase I trials really therapeutic? J Clin Oncol 10.1200/JCO.2016.67.9902

2. Weber JS, Levit LA, Adamson PC, et al: American Society of Clinical Oncology policy statement update: The critical role of phase I trials in cancer research and treatment. J Clin Oncol 33:278-284, 2015

3. American Society of Clinical Oncology: ASCO Comment Letter on Proposed Rule and Draft Policy on Clinical Trials Registration and Results Submission, February 2015. http://www.asco.org/sites/new-www.asco.org/files/content-files/ blog-release/documents/2015-ascos-comments-to-nih-on-clinical-trial-data-policy. pdf

 Schwaederle M, Zhao M, Lee JJ, et al: Association of biomarker-based treatment strategies with response rates and progression-free survival in refractory malignant neoplasms: A meta-analysis. JAMA Oncol [epub ahead of print on June 6, 2016]

 Ribas A, Hamid O, Daud A, et al: Association of pembrolizumab with tumor response and survival among patients with advanced melanoma. JAMA 315: 1600-1609, 2016

6. Hay M, Thomas DW, Craighead JL, et al: Clinical development success rates for investigational drugs. Nat Biotechnol 32:40-51, 2014

7. Topalian SL, Sznol M, McDermott DF, et al: Survival, durable tumor remission, and long-term safety in patients with advanced melanoma receiving nivolumab. J Clin Oncol 32:1020-1030, 2014

8. Jansen LA, Mahadevan D, Appelbaum S, et al: The impact of unrealistic optimism on informed consent in early-phase oncology trials. IRB: Ethics & Human Research 38, 2016

9. Manta CJ, Ortiz J, Moulton BW, et al: From the patient perspective, consent forms fall short of providing information to guide decision making. J Patient Saf [epub ahead of print on August 3, 2016]

10. American Society of Clinical Oncology: American Society of Clinical Oncology policy statement: Oversight of clinical research. J Clin Oncol 21:2377-2386, 2003

DOI: 10.1200/JCO.2016.70.4692; published at ascopubs.org/journal/jco on November 28, 2016.

AUTHORS' DISCLOSURES OF POTENTIAL CONFLICTS OF INTEREST

Reaffirming and Clarifying the American Society of Clinical Oncology's Policy Statement on the Critical Role of Phase I Trials in Cancer Research and Treatment

The following represents disclosure information provided by authors of this manuscript. All relationships are considered compensated. Relationships are self-held unless noted. I = Immediate Family Member, Inst = My Institution. Relationships may not relate to the subject matter of this manuscript. For more information about ASCO's conflict of interest policy, please refer to www.asco.org/rwc or ascopubs.org/jco/site/ifc.

Jeffrey S. Weber

Stock or Other Ownership: Altor BioScience, Celldex, cCam Biotherapeutics

Honoraria: Bristol-Myers Squibb, Merck, Genentech, AbbVie, AstraZeneca, Daiichi Sankyo, GlaxoSmithKline, Eisai, Altor BioScience, Lion Biotechnologies, Amgen, Roche, Ichor Medical Systems, Celldex, cCam Biotherapeutics, Pieris Pharmaceuticals

Consulting or Advisory Role: Celldex, Ichor Medical Systems, cCam Biotherapeutics, Lion Biotechnologies, Pieris Pharmaceuticals, Altor BioScience, Bristol-Myers Squibb, Merck, Genentech, Roche, Amgen, AstraZeneca, GlaxoSmithKline, Daiichi Sankyo, AbbVie, Eisai **Research Funding:** Bristol-Myers Squibb (Inst), Merck (Inst),

GlaxoSmithKline (Inst), Genentech (Inst), Astellas Pharma (Inst), Incyte (Inst), Roche (Inst), Novartis (Inst)

Patents, Royalties, Other Intellectual Property: Patent filed by Moffitt Cancer Center regarding a biomarker for ipilimumab

Travel, Accommodations, Expenses: Bristol-Myers Squibb, GlaxoSmithKline, Daiichi Sankyo, Pieris Pharmaceuticals, cCam Biotherapeutics, Lion Biotechnologies, Roche, Celldex, Amgen, Merck, AstraZeneca, Genentech

Laura A. Levit

No relationship to disclose

Peter C. Adamson

Stock or Other Ownership: Johnson & Johnson, Merck, Pfizer, Baxter **Research Funding:** Bristol-Myers Squibb (Inst), Celgene (Inst), Pfizer (Inst), Genentech (Inst)

Travel, Accommodations, Expenses: Genentech, Celgene, Nektar Therapeutics, Bayer AG, Celgene, Eisai, AstraZeneca/MedImmune

Suanna S. Bruinooge

No relationship to disclose

Howard A. Burris

Employment: HCA Healthcare/Sarah Cannon **Leadership:** HCA Healthcare/Sarah Cannon

Stock and Other Ownership Interests: HCA Healthcare/Sarah Cannon Consulting or Advisory Role: Mersana Therapeutics (Inst), AstraZeneca (Inst), FORMA Therapeutics (Inst), Janssen (Inst), Novartis (Inst), Roche/ Genentech (Inst), TG Therapeutics (Inst), MedImmune (Inst), Bristol-Myers Squibb (Inst)

Research Funding: Roche/Genentech (Inst), Bristol-Myers Squibb (Inst), Incyte (Inst), Tarveda Therapeutics (Inst), Mersana Therapeutics (Inst), AstraZeneca (Inst), MedImmune (Inst), Macrogenics (Inst), Novartis (Inst), Boehringer Ingelheim (Inst), Eli Lilly (Inst), Seattle Genetics (Inst), AbbVie (Inst), Bayer (Inst), Celldex Therapeutics (Inst), Merck (Inst), Celgene (Inst), Agios Pharmaceuticals (Inst), Jounce Therapeutics (Inst), Moderna Therapeutics (Inst), CytomX Therapeutics (Inst), GlaxoSmithKline (Inst), Verastem (Inst), Tesaro (Inst), Immunocore (Inst), Takeda (Inst), Millennium (Inst), BioMed Valley Discoveries (Inst), Pfizer (Inst), PTC Therapeutics (Inst), TG Therapeutics (Inst), Loxo (Inst), Vertex (Inst), eFFECTOR Therapeutics (Inst), Janssen (Inst), Gilead Sciences (Inst), Valent Technologies (Inst), BioAtla (Inst), CicloMed (Inst), Harpoon Therapeutics (Inst), Jiangsu Hengrui Medicine (Inst), Revolution Medicines (Inst), Daiichi Sankyo (Inst), H3 Biomedicine (Inst), Neon Therapeutics (Inst), OncoMed (Inst), Regeneron (Inst), Sanofi (Inst) Expert Testimony: Novartis

Michael A. Carducci

Consulting or Advisory Role: Medivation, Astellas Pharma, AstraZeneca, Clovis Oncology, Merck

Adam P. Dicker

Consulting or Advisory Role: Merck KGaA, Glenview Capital Management, GenomeDx, Johnson & Johnson Speakers' Bureau: Bayer AG Travel, Accommodations, Expenses: Bayer AG, Varian Medical Systems, Merck KGaA, Vertex Pharmaceuticals Other Relationship: NRG Oncology, Department of Defense-Prostate Cancer Research Program

Mithat Gönen No relationship to disclose

Stephen M. Keefe Employment: Merck

Michael A. Postow

Honoraria: Bristol-Myers Squibb, Merck Consulting or Advisory Role: Amgen, Bristol-Myers Squibb, Novartis Research Funding: Bristol-Myers Squibb (Inst) Travel, Accommodations, Expenses: Bristol-Myers Squibb

Michael A. Thompson

Stock or Other Ownership: Doximity

Consulting or Advisory Role: Celgene (Inst), Gilead Sciences (Inst), Bristol-Myers Squibb (Inst), AIM Specialty Health (Inst), Via Oncology, Takeda Pharmaceuticals

David M. Waterhouse

Consulting or Advisory Role: Bristol-Myers Squibb Speakers' Bureau: Bristol-Myers Squibb, Genentech, Celgene, Eli Lilly

Susan L. Weiner

Travel, Accommodations, Expenses: Bristol-Myers Squibb

Lynn M. Schuchter

Research Funding: GlaxoSmithKline (Inst), Merck (Inst), Bristol-Myers Squibb (Inst)