



AperTO - Archivio Istituzionale Open Access dell'Università di Torino

Randomized, phase III trial of figitumumab in combination with erlotinib versus erlotinib alone in patients with non-adenocarcinoma non-small cell lung cancer.

This is the author's manuscript	
Original Citation:	
Availability:	
This version is available http://hdl.handle.net/2318/150431	since 2018-08-31T15:07:33Z
Published version:	
DOI:10.1093/annonc/mdu517	
Terms of use:	

Open Access

Anyone can freely access the full text of works made available as "Open Access". Works made available under a Creative Commons license can be used according to the terms and conditions of said license. Use of all other works requires consent of the right holder (author or publisher) if not exempted from copyright protection by the applicable law.

(Article begins on next page)



UNIVERSITÀ DEGLI STUDI DI TORINO

Questa è la versione dell'autore dell'opera:

Randomized, phase III trial of figitumumab in combination with erlotinib versus erlotinib alone in patients with nonadenocarcinoma nonsmall-cell lung cancer.

<u>G. V. Scagliotti</u>, <u>I. Bondarenko</u>, <u>F. Blackhall</u>, <u>F. Barlesi</u>, <u>T.-C. Hsia</u>, <u>J. Jassem</u>, <u>J. Milanowski</u>, <u>S. Popat</u>, <u>J. M. Sanchez-Torres</u>, <u>S. Novello</u>, <u>R. J. Benner</u>, <u>S. Green</u>, <u>K. Molpus</u>, <u>J.-C. Soria</u>, <u>F. A. Shepherd</u>

Ann Oncol. 2015 Mar;26(3):497-504. doi: 10.1093/annonc/mdu517

La versione definitiva è disponibile alla URL: <u>http://annonc.oxfordjournals.org/content/26/3/497.long</u>

Randomized, phase III trial of figitumumab in combination with erlotinib versus erlotinib alone in patients with nonadenocarcinoma nonsmall-cell lung cancer

G. V. Scagliotti, I. Bondarenko, F. Blackhall, F. Barlesi, T.-C. Hsia, J. Jassem, J. Milanowski, S. Popat, J. M. Sanchez-Torres, S. Novello, R. J. Benner, S. Green, K. Molpus, J.-C. Soria, F. A. Shepherd

Author Affiliations

- 1. ¹Department of Oncology, University of Turin, Orbassano, Turin, Italy
- 2. ²Department of Oncology, Dnepropetrovsk Medical Academy, City Multiple-Discipline Clinical Hospital #4, Dnepropetrovsk, Ukraine
- 3. ³Manchester Cancer Research Centre Lung Group, Manchester University and Christie Hospital NHS Foundation Trust, Manchester, UK
- 4. ⁴Department of Multidisciplinary Oncology and Therapeutic Innovations, Aix Marseille University-Assistance Publique Hôpitaux de Marseille, Marseille, France
- 5. ⁵Department of Internal Medicine, China Medical University Hospital and China Medical University, Taichung, Taiwan
- 6. ⁶Department of Oncology and Radiotherapy, Medical University of Gdansk, Gdansk
- 7. ⁷Department of Pneumology, Oncology and Allergology, Medical University of Lublin, Lublin, Poland
- 8. ⁸Lung Unit, Royal Marsden Hospital, London, UK
- 9. ⁹Department of Medical Oncology, Hospital de la Princesa, Madrid, Spain
- 10. ¹⁰Department of Pfizer Oncology, Pfizer, Inc., Groton, USA
- 11. ¹¹Department of Clinical and Biological Sciences, Institut de Cancérologie Gustave Roussy and INSERM Unit 981, Villejuif, France
- 12. ¹²Department of Medical Oncology and Hematology, Princess Margaret Cancer Centre, University of Toronto, Ontario, Canada

Correspondence to: Prof. Giorgio V. Scagliotti, Department of Oncology, University of Torino; Division of Medical Oncology, S. Luigi Hospital, Regione Gonzole, 10, 10043 Orbassano, Turin, Italy. Tel: +39-11-9026-414; Fax: +39-11-9015-184; E-mail: giorgio.scagliotti@unito.it

Abstract

Background Figitumumab (CP-751,871) is a fully human IgG2 monoclonal antibody that inhibits the insulin-like growth factor 1 receptor. This multicenter, randomized, phase III study investigated the efficacy of figitumumab plus erlotinib compared with erlotinib alone in patients with pretreated, nonsmall-cell lung cancer (NSCLC).

Patients and methods Patients (stage IIIB/IV or recurrent disease with nonadenocarcinoma histology) who had previously received at least one platinum-based regimen were randomized to receive open-label figitumumab (20 mg/kg) plus erlotinib 150 mg/day or erlotinib alone every 3 weeks. The primary end point was overall survival (OS).

Results Of 583 patients randomized, 579 received treatment. The study was closed early by an independent data safety monitoring committee due to results crossing the prespecified futility boundary. At the final analysis, median OS was 5.7 months for figitumumab plus erlotinib and 6.2 months for erlotinib alone [hazard ratio (HR) 1.09; 95% confidence interval (CI) 0.91–1.31; P = 0.35]. Median progression-free survival was 2.1 months for figitumumab plus erlotinib and 2.6 months for erlotinib alone (HR 1.08; 95% CI 0.90–1.29; P = 0.43). Treatment-related nonfatal serious adverse events occurred in 18% and 5% of patients in the figitumumab arm or erlotinib alone arm, respectively. There were nine treatment-related deaths (three related to both drugs, four related to erlotinib alone and two related to figitumumab).

Conclusions The addition of figitumumab to erlotinib did not improve OS in patients with advanced, pretreated, nonadenocarcinoma NSCLC. Clinical development of figitumumab has been discontinued.

Clinical Trial ID NCT00673049.

Key words

figitumumab, erlotinib, nonsmall-cell lung cancer

Introduction

Most patients with advanced nonsmall-cell lung cancer (NSCLC) and activating mutations in the epidermal growth factor receptor (EGFR) gene respond initially to EGFR tyrosine kinase inhibitors (TKIs), but invariably become resistant over time. Sensitivity loss may involve signaling between EGFR and the insulin-like growth factor 1 receptor (IGF-1R) [1, 2]. Targeting both EGFR and IGF-1R delays or prevents resistance to EGFR TKIs in various cancer cells [2, 3], enhances antiproliferative activity against breast cancer and malignant glioma cells [4, 5] and inhibits tumor growth in NSCLC xenograft models [6]. In EGFR-overexpressing NSCLC cells, IGF-1R inhibition abolishes erlotinib resistance, reduces proliferation and promotes apoptosis [7]. These data provide a strong rationale for combining agents that target EGFR and IGF-1R against NSCLC.

Figitumumab (CP-751,871) is a fully human IgG2 monoclonal antibody inhibiting IGF-1R. In phase I studies, it was well tolerated alone or with chemotherapy [$\underline{8}, \underline{9}$]. A phase II study suggested activity in combination with paclitaxel and carboplatin against NSCLC, particularly in squamous cell histology [10]. However, corrected data (published 2012) showed it was less effective than previously reported [11].

This prospective, randomized, phase III study was initiated in 2008 to compare overall survival (OS) with figitumumab plus erlotinib to erlotinib alone in pretreated patients with advanced NSCLC. Based on the original analysis of the phase II study [10], the population was limited to nonadenocarcinoma NSCLC.

Previous SectionNext Section

Methods

patients

Eligible patients were \geq 18 years old, had histologically or cytologically confirmed advanced NSCLC and stage IIIB, stage IV or recurrent disease. Patients had primary histology of predominantly squamous cell, large cell or adenosquamous carcinoma and had previously received \geq 1 platinum-based regimen. Patients aged \geq 70 years were eligible if they had received \geq 1 single-agent therapy. At least 1 and 2 weeks, respectively, must have elapsed since the last radiotherapy or systemic therapy, with all acute toxicities resolved to National Cancer Institute Common Terminology Criteria for Adverse Events (NCI CTCAE v3.0) grade \leq 1. Patients had an Eastern Cooperative Oncology Group (ECOG) performance status of 0–2, measurable disease using Response Evaluation Criteria in Solid Tumors (RECIST v1.0) [12], and adequate organ function. Exclusion criteria included uncontrolled hypertension or diabetes [defined as glycosylated hemoglobin (HbA1c) level >8%], symptomatic brain metastases, other active malignancies, pregnancy or breast-feeding. A protocol amendment limited enrollment to patients with HbA1c <5.7% to reduce the risk of hyperglycemia, but was not implemented fully before study termination.

Medications for best supportive care and other concomitant systemic therapies were permitted, including insulin and other antidiabetic agents.

The study was conducted in accordance with the International Conference on Harmonization Good Clinical Practice guidelines, the declaration of Helsinki, and applicable local requirements/laws. Approval from the institutional review board or independent ethics committee was obtained for each center. All patients provided written informed consent.

study design and treatment

Patients were randomized 1 : 1 to receive open-label figitumumab plus erlotinib (investigational arm) or erlotinib alone (control arm). Randomization was stratified by gender, ECOG performance status (0/1 versus 2) and region (United States/Canada versus Europe versus rest of the world).

The primary end point was OS (the time from randomization to death from any cause). Secondary end points included progression-free survival (PFS), tumor response (RECIST v1.0; complete plus partial responses) and safety.

All patients received erlotinib 150 mg/day ≥ 1 h before or 2 h after food. In the investigational arm, patients received figitumumab 20 mg/kg i.v. on day 1 of each 3-week cycle with an additional dose on day 2 of cycle 1 to expedite steady-state drug levels. Treatment continued until disease progression, unmanageable toxicity or 17 cycles (longer if the investigator and sponsor considered that it was providing clinical benefit). Patients in the control arm who discontinued erlotinib because of disease progression could receive figitumumab alone (labelled as 'crossover'), as phase I studies in other malignancies suggested possible benefits of monotherapy with acceptable toxicity [9, 13]. Patients in the investigational arm who discontinued erlotinib could continue on single-agent figitumumab and vice versa until progression.

study procedures

Tumors were assessed at 6, 9, 12, 15 and 18 weeks after randomization and every 6 weeks thereafter, with objective responses confirmed \geq 4 weeks after initial observation. Off-treatment tumor assessments were to be carried out at least once every 8 weeks until objective disease progression. After progression, patients were to be followed for survival monthly by telephone until death or ~14 months after accrual completion. Adverse events (AEs) were graded using NCI CTCAE v3.0 and collected until 150 days after the last dose of study drugs, withdrawal of consent or initiation of subsequent anticancer therapy. Clinical and laboratory assessments occurred at baseline, day 1 of each cycle and end of treatment.

statistical analysis

The primary OS analysis was a 0.024-level stratified log-rank test, with one interim analysis. The primary PFS analysis was a 0.001-level stratified log-rank test with no interim. Statistical analyses were undertaken by Pfizer, the study sponsor. The <u>supplementary Material</u>, available at <u>Annals of</u> <u>Oncology online</u>, provides additional detail.

Previous SectionNext Section

results

patients and treatment exposure

Between 5 June 2008 and 2 March 2010, 583 patients were randomized and 579 received treatment (figitumumab plus erlotinib: n = 289; erlotinib alone: n = 290; Figure 1). Baseline characteristics generally were well balanced between treatments (Table 1). Fewer than 10% of patients in each arm received ≥ 3 prior treatment regimens.

Table 1.

Patient characteristics at baseline (all randomized, as randomized)

(harrist 11 00
Non-on-operation 0.00 10 0.00 <	Name of the Spectra Reservation Arrive 2000 Arrive Arrive
Name & and Rainwards Arrison Married States and Arrison Married States and Arrison Rainward Arrison and Arrison Married States and Arried States and Arried States and	Annotation and an and a second
Notest Ann	10000000 2100
	Particular discontration of the second secon
	And Andrewson an
	111127 13

Figure 1.

Patient disposition. AE, adverse event.

Enrollment was closed permanently in March 2010 by Data Safety Monitoring Committee (DSMC) recommendation because the results of the interim analysis crossed the prespecified futility boundary, indicating that the addition of figitumumab to erlotinib did not improve OS. Patients could continue study treatment if considered in their best interest, and if the local authorities permitted, but figitumumab was no longer offered to patients who progressed on single-agent erlotinib. Follow-up for survival continued until 31 March 2011. Three patients continued on treatment after this date (two in the figitumumab arm and one in the control arm) and are shown here as ongoing; additionally six patients were ongoing in safety or long-term follow-up.

Patients in the figitumumab arm received a median of three cycles of figitumumab and two cycles of erlotinib (range 1–37 for both), and patients in the control arm received a median of four cycles of erlotinib (range 1–26). In the figitumumab arm, figitumumab doses were delayed in 12% of patients and reduced in 5%; erlotinib doses were reduced in 21%. In the control arm, 14% of patients had dose reductions; 29% crossed over to figitumumab after progression and completed a median of two cycles; 2% of these patients had dose reductions.

efficacy

At the final analysis, 483 patients had died (241 figitumumab and 242 control). Median OS was 5.7 versus 6.2 months [HR 1.09; 95% confidence interval (CI) 0.91–1.31; P = 0.35; Figure <u>2</u>A]. No benefit of figitumumab on OS was demonstrated by gender, ECOG performance status, histology, smoking status, HbA1c and regional subset (<u>supplementary Figure S1, available at *Annals of Oncology* online). Median OS in patients with baseline HbA1c <5.7% was 6.9 months with figitumumab and 6.5 months with erlotinib alone; for patients with HbA1c \geq 5.7%, median OS was 4.6 and 6.1 months, respectively. Median PFS was 2.1 months with figitumumab and 2.6 months with erlotinib alone (HR 1.08; 95% CI 0.90–1.29; P = 0.43; Figure <u>2</u>B). Objective response rate was 5.5% versus 3.8% (P = 0.34; Table <u>2</u>).</u>

Table 2.

Efficacy results (all randomized, as randomized)



Figure 2.

Kaplan–Meier plot for (**A**) overall survival; (**B**) progression-free survival (as-randomized population). CI, confidence interval; OS, overall survival; PFS, progression-free survival.

safety

The most common all-causality AEs in both study arms were rash, diarrhea and decreased appetite (Table <u>3</u>). Grade 3/4 AEs that differed most between study arms included fatigue, asthenia, decreased appetite and dehydration. Any-grade rash occurred in a similar number of patients in each arm and was rarely severe. Hyperglycemia occurred more frequently with figitumumab but was mostly mild in severity. Antidiabetic agent use increased in figitumumab-treated patients from 8% before enrollment to 19% on-study (versus 10% at baseline and 11% on control treatment). The incidence of most AEs was similar in patients with baseline HbA1c <5.7% and \geq 5.7% (supplementary Tables S2 and 3, available at *Annals of Oncology* online), except hyperglycemia, which was more common in the latter. Five patients discontinued figitumumab due to hyperglycemia and three of them also discontinued erlotinib.

Table 3.

Most common treatment-emergent (all-causality) adverse events ($\geq 10\%$ of patients for any grade or >5% of patients for grade 3 and 4)

Among crossover patients, all-causality AEs were generally similar to those in the figitumumab plus erlotinib arm, with the exception of gastrointestinal events, which were somewhat less frequent with single-agent figitumumab (Table 3). The most frequent treatment-related AEs with single-agent figitumumab were rash (40%), decreased appetite (18%), asthenia (14%) and hyperglycemia (13%). One crossover patient discontinued figitumumab due to hyperglycemia.

The most common (all-causality) serious AEs (SAEs) in the figitumumab and erlotinib arms, respectively, were: dehydration (5% versus 2%), diarrhea (4% versus 1%), dyspnea (4% versus 1%) and pneumonia (3% versus 4%). Nonfatal treatment-related SAEs occurred in 18% versus 5%, respectively.

Nine deaths were considered treatment-related; five in the figitumumab arm, of which three were related to both drugs (pulmonary hemorrhage, cardiac arrest, acute respiratory distress syndrome) and two to erlotinib only (intestinal ischemia, allergic alveolitis). Four were in the control arm, of

which two were related to erlotinib (respiratory failure, pneumonia aspiration/renal failure/acute cardiac arrest), and two to figitumumab after crossover (pulmonary hemorrhage, cerebral hemorrhage) (supplementary Table S1, available at *Annals of Oncology* online).

In the figitumumab arm, 7% of patients discontinued treatment due to figitumumab-related AEs and 8% due to erlotinib-related AEs. In the control arm, 2% of patients discontinued treatment due to erlotinib-related AEs.

discussion

In this randomized, phase III study, adding figitumumab to erlotinib failed to improve survival over erlotinib alone in pretreated patients with advanced NSCLC, causing the DSMC to close the study early due to a survival HR that crossed the prespecified futility boundary. No significant difference was found between study arms for PFS.

These results are disappointing given preclinical findings that suggested blockade of IGF-1R signaling may sensitize tumors to inhibition of EGFR [4-7]. However, the results are consistent with another study showing that erlotinib combined with an IGF-1R-targeted antibody did not prolong survival and was associated with higher toxicity than erlotinib alone in unselected patients with advanced, pretreated NSCLC [14].

The response rate in our study was low in both arms, possibly reflecting the advanced stage of NSCLC and nonadenocarcinoma histology. We did not assess EGFR status in tumor tissue samples, but our patients were unlikely to harbor *EGFR* mutations based on their nonadenocarcinoma histology. The tumor response rate in the erlotinib arm of our study (3.8%) was similar to that (3%) in the EGFR-negative subgroup of erlotinib recipients in the pivotal registration study [<u>15</u>]. Our protocol included optional collection of tissue samples for exploratory biomarker analysis, but too few samples were collected.

Certain AEs (notably nausea/vomiting, diarrhea, decreased appetite/weight, asthenia, mucosal inflammation, dehydration and hyperglycemia) and SAEs (dehydration, diarrhea and dyspnea) were more common with figitumumab. For patients who crossed over from erlotinib to figitumumab, AEs reported after commencing figitumumab were documented in the figitumumab crossover arm, not the erlotinib control arm. Therefore, AE rates may be underestimated in the control arm. Rash was the most common any-grade AE reported and is a known toxicity of erlotinib.

Hyperglycemia, mostly transient, is a known side-effect of figitumumab [8, 9] and other IGF-1R inhibitors [16, 17]. Here, hyperglycemia (any grade) occurred in 15% (6% grade 3/4) of patients receiving figitumumab versus 4% (<1% grade 3/4) receiving erlotinib alone. In an exploratory analysis, OS in patients with baseline HbA1c \geq 5.7% was slightly worse with figitumumab than with erlotinib alone, while OS for patients with HbA1c <5.7% appeared similar.

A phase III clinical trial of figitumumab plus carboplatin and paclitaxel for advanced nonadenocarcinoma NSCLC was also closed early due to futility [18]. Initially, it was reported that a subset of figitumumab-treated patients with elevated circulating IGF-1 experienced longer PFS than those treated with chemotherapy alone. However, these data were subsequently retracted, and no biomarkers have been clearly associated with anti-IGF-1R activity [19].

When our study was designed, there was a good preclinical rationale for combining figitumumab with erlotinib in NSCLC. However, without phase II combination data, information may have been insufficient to predict success in phase III. Figitumumab development has been discontinued.

funding

Medical writing support was provided by Nicola Crofts at ACUMED (Tytherington, UK) and was funded by Pfizer, Inc.

disclosure

Employment or leadership position: RJB (Pfizer); SG (Pfizer); KM (Pfizer); Consultant or advisory role: F. Barlesi (Pfizer); F. Blackhall (Pfizer, Roche); SP (Pfizer, Roche); FAS (Pfizer); Stock ownership: RJB (Pfizer), SG (Pfizer), KM (Pfizer); Honoraria: F. Barlesi (Pfizer); F. Blackhall (Pfizer); SP (Pfizer); GVS (Eli Lilly, AstraZeneca, Roche, Pfizer); FAS (Pfizer); J.-C. S. (Pfizer); Research funding: F. Blackhall (Pfizer, Roche). All remaining authors have declared no conflicts of interest.

acknowledgements

The authors thank the participating patients and their families, as well as the network of investigators (Appendix), research nurses, study coordinators, and operations staff. They also wish to posthumously acknowledge the contribution of Dr Valentina Tzekova, University Hospital Queen Joanna, Sofia, Bulgaria, to the study. We also thank Jose Rodrigues Pereira, Piotr Koralewski and Andrzej Kazarnowicz for their contributions to the study.

Previous SectionNext Section

appendix

Investigators: Stephane Holbrechts, Didier Verhoeven, Carlos Moreira Ferreira, Helio Pinczowski, Jose Rodrigues Pereira, Gilberto Schwartsmann, Krassimir Dimitrov Koynov, Tatyana Vasileva Koynova, Violina Taskova, Constanta Velinova Timcheva, Valentina Ilieva Tzekova, Victor Cohen, Frances Shepherd, Osvaldo Aren, Kamil Klenha, Petr Klepetko, Jan Novotny, Petr Zatloukal, Fabrice Barlesi, Benjamin Besse, Eric Dansin, Pierre Fournel, Herve Lena, Fabrice Paganin, Gilles Robinet, Denis Moro-Sibilot, Vassilis Georgoulias, Christos N. Papandreou, Istvan Albert, Gabor Kovacs, Zsolt Szekely Papai, Janos Strausz, Ahmad Hudoyo, Benjamin P. Margono, Kenneth J. O'Byrne, Seamus O'Reilly, Janice Walshe, Alessandra Bearz, Eugenio Cammilluzzi, Pierfranco Conte, Adolfo Favaretto, Cesare Gridelli, Alberto Ravaioli, Giorgio Scagliotti, Heung Tae Kim, Joo-Hang Kim, Sang-We Kim, Alinta Hegmane, Gunta Purkalne, Jan Cieslicki, Jacek Jassem, Andrzej Kazarnowicz, Piotr Koralewski, Janusz Milanowski, Jerzy Tujakowski, Hector A. Velez Cortes, Tudor Eliade Ciuleanu, Anghel-Adrian Udrea, Constantin Volovat, Alexander P. Chuprina, Irina S. Davidenko, Dmitry Gladyshev, Vera Andreevna Gorbunova, Bogan N. Kotiv, Anatoly Makhson, Georgey M. Manikhas, Dmitriy P. Udovitsa, Svetislav Jelic, Dragana Jovanovic, Branislav Perin, Branko Zakotnik, Raymond Abratt, Michiel Christoffel Botha, L. Goedhals, Felipe Cardenal Alemany, Natividad Martinez Banaclocha, Joaquim Bosch Barrera, Pilar Lopez Criado, Luis De la Cruz Merino, Lara Iglesias Docampo, Yolanda Garcia Garcia, Ramon Garcia Gomez, Emilio Esteban Gonzalez, Luis Gonzalo Paz-Ares Rodriguez, Margarita Majem Tarruella, Silvia Catot Tort, Richard Cathomas, Cornelia Droege, Alfred Joseph Zippelius, Te-Chun Hsia, Han-Pin Kuo, Tsai Chun-Ming, Igor Mykolayovych Bondarenko, Oleksan S. Dudnichenko, Oleksan Yu. Popovych, Nataliya L. Voytko, Igor O. Vynnichenko, Fiona Helen Blackhall, Sanjaykumar Batuklal Popat, Michael Seckl, Ian Churchill Anderson, Rita Susan Axelrod, Steven Charles Buck, Vikki Ann Canfield, David Christianson, Grace K. Dy, Mitchell Allen Garrison, Brian Vincent Geister, Narender Rao Gorukanti, Missak Haigentz Jr, Thomas Harris, Nasser Janbay, Clyde Michael Jones, Vinni Juneja, Boriana Kamenova, Anita Kaul, Waseemullah Khan, Anthony Mark Landis, Corey Jay Langer, Bhoomi Mehrotra, Alexander Reed Menter, Alain Catalin Mita, Manish Monga, Raja Abi Ali Fuad Mudad, Stephen Daniel Myers, Gregory Alan Otterson, Sai-Hong Ignatius Ou, Haralambos E. Raftopoulos, Suresh Sakkarai Ramalingam, James R. Rigas, Michael T. Slaughter, Ronald George Steis, Sachdev Prakash Thomas, Guy W. Tillinghast, Roy Timothy

Webb, Geoffrey Roger Weiss, David William Zenk, Alfredo Carrato Mena, Carmen Guillen Ponce, Rut Porta Balanya, Jose Miguel Sanchez Torres, Ricardo Hitt Sabag, Raul Manuel Marquez Vazquez.

• © The Author 2014. Published by Oxford University Press on behalf of the European Society for Medical Oncology. All rights reserved. For permissions, please email: journals.permissions@oup.com.

Previous Section

references

1.

- 1. Nguyen KS,
- 2. Kobayashi S,
- 3. Costa DB

. Acquired resistance to epidermal growth factor receptor tyrosine kinase inhibitors in nonsmall-cell lung cancers dependent on the epidermal growth factor receptor pathway. Clin Lung Cancer 2009;10:281-289.

2.

- 1. Guix M,
- 2. Faber AC,
- 3. Wang SE,
- 4. et al

Acquired resistance to EGFR tyrosine kinase inhibitors in cancer cells is mediated by loss of IGF-binding proteins. J Clin Invest 2008;118:2609-2619.

3.

- 1. Nicholson RI,
- 2. Hutcheson IR,
- 3. Knowlden JM,
- 4. et al

Nonendocrine pathways and endocrine resistance: observations with antiestrogens and signal transduction inhibitors in combination. Clin Cancer Res 2004;10(1 Pt 2):346S-354S.

4.

- 1. Camirand A,
- 2. Zakikhani M,
- 3. Young F,
- 4. Pollak M

Inhibition of insulin-like growth factor-1 receptor signaling enhances growth-inhibitory and proapoptotic effects of gefitinib (Iressa) in human breast cancer cells. Breast Cancer Res 2005;7:R570-R579.

5.

- 1. Steinbach JP,
- 2. Eisenmann C,
- 3. Klumpp A,

4. Weller M

Co-inhibition of epidermal growth factor receptor and type 1 insulin-like growth factor receptor synergistically sensitizes human malignant glioma cells to CD95L-induced apoptosis. Biochem Biophys Res Commun 2004;321:524-530.

6.

- 1. Goetsch L,
- 2. Gonzalez A,
- 3. Leger O,
- 4. et al

A recombinant humanized anti-insulin-like growth factor receptor type I antibody (h7C10) enhances the antitumor activity of vinorelbine and anti-epidermal growth factor receptor therapy against human cancer xenografts. Int J Cancer 2005;113:316-328.

7.

- 1. Morgillo F,
- 2. Woo JK,
- 3. Kim ES,
- 4. Hong WK,
- 5. Lee HY

Heterodimerization of insulin-like growth factor receptor/epidermal growth factor receptor and induction of survivin expression counteract the antitumor action of erlotinib. Cancer Res 2006;66:10100-10111.

8.

- 1. Haluska P,
- 2. Shaw HM,
- 3. Batzel GN,
- 4. et al

Phase I dose escalation study of the anti-insulin-like growth factor-I receptor monoclonal antibody CP-751,871 in patients with refractory solid tumors. Clin Cancer Res 2007;13:5834-5840.

9.

- 1. Lacy MQ,
- 2. Alsina M,
- 3. Fonseca R,
- 4. et al

Phase I, pharmacokinetic and pharmacodynamic study of the anti-insulin-like growth factor type 1 receptor monoclonal antibody CP-751,871 in patients with multiple myeloma. J Clin Oncol 2008;26:3196-3203.

10.

- 1. Karp DD,
- 2. Paz-Ares LG,
- 3. Novello S,
- 4. et al

Phase II study of the anti-insulin-like growth factor type 1 receptor antibody CP-751,871 in combination with paclitaxel and carboplatin in previously untreated, locally advanced, or metastatic non-small-cell lung cancer. J Clin Oncol 2009;27:2516-2522.

11.

- 1. Karp DD,
- 2. Paz-Ares LG,
- 3. Novello S,
- 4. et al

Retraction. Phase II study of the anti-insulin-like growth factor type 1 receptor antibody CP-751,871 in combination with paclitaxel and carboplatin in previously untreated, locally advanced, or metastatic non-small-cell lung cancer. J Clin Oncol 2012;30:4179.

12.

- 1. Therasse P,
- 2. Arbuck SG,
- 3. Eisenhauer EA,
- 4. et al

New guidelines to evaluate the response to treatment in solid tumors. European Organization for Research and Treatment of Cancer, National Cancer Institute of the United States, National Cancer Institute of Canada. J Natl Cancer Inst 2000;92:205-216.

13.

- 1. Olmos D,
- 2. Postel-Vinay S,
- 3. Molife LR,
- 4. et al

Safety, pharmacokinetics, and preliminary activity of the anti-IGF-1R antibody figitumumab (CP-751,871) in patients with sarcoma and Ewing's sarcoma: a phase 1 expansion cohort study. Lancet Oncol 2010;11:129-135.

14.

- 1. Ramalingam SS,
- 2. Spigel DR,
- 3. Chen D,
- 4. et al

Randomized phase II study of erlotinib in combination with placebo or R1507, a monoclonal antibody to insulin-like growth factor-1 receptor, for advanced-stage non-small-cell lung cancer. J Clin Oncol 2011;29:4574-4580.

15.

- 1. Johnson JR,
- 2. Cohen M,
- 3. Sridhara R,
- 4. et al

Approval summary of erlotinib for treatment of patients with locally advanced or metastatic non–small cell lung cancer after failure of at least one prior chemotherapy regimen. Clin Cancer Res 2005;11:6414-6421.

.

- Atzori F,
 Tabernero J,
- Tabelliero J,
 Cervantes A,
- 4. et al

A phase I pharmacokinetic and pharmacodynamic study of dalotuzumab (MK-0646), an anti-insulin-like growth factor-1 receptor monoclonal antibody, in patients with advanced solid tumors. Clin Cancer Res 2011;17:6304-6312.

17.

- 1. Naing A,
- 2. Kurzrock R,
- 3. Burger A,
- 4. et al

Phase I trial of cixutumumab combined with temsirolimus in patients with advanced cancer. Clin Cancer Res 2011;17:6052-6060.

18.

- 1. Langer CJ,
- 2. Novello S,
- 3. Park K,
- 4. et al

Randomized, phase III trial of first-line figitumumab in combination with paclitaxel and carboplatin versus paclitaxel and carboplatin alone in patients with advanced non-small cell lung cancer. J Clin Oncol 2014;32:2059-66.

19.

- 1. Gualberto A,
- 2. Hixon ML,
- 3. Karp DD,
- 4. et al

Retraction. Pre-treatment levels of circulating free IGF-1 identify NSCLC patients who derive clinical benefit from figitumumab. Br J Cancer 2012;107:2024.

16.