

The Prostate Cancer Registry: First Results from an International, Prospective, Observational Study of Men with Metastatic Castration-Resistant Prostate Cancer (mCRPC)

Simon Chowdhury,¹ Alison J Birtle,² Anders Bjartell,³ Luis Costa,^{4,5} Susan Feyerabend,⁶ Luca Galli,⁷ Nicolaas Lumen,⁸ Ewa Kalinka-Warzocha,⁹ Pablo Maroto,¹⁰ Vsevolod B Matveev,¹¹ Thomas Paiss,¹² Dominique Spaeth,¹³ Edwin Klumper,¹⁴ Torunn Thingstad,¹⁵ Robert Wapenaar,¹⁶ Emma Lee¹⁷ ¹Guy's Hospital, London, UK; ²Rosemere Cancer Centre, Royal Preston, Hospital, Preston, UK; ³Skåne University Hospital Malmö, Sweden; ⁴Hospital de Santa Maria, Lisbon, Portugal; ⁵Instituto de Medicina Molecular, University of Lisbon, Portugal; ⁵Instituto de Medicina, Nersity of Lisbon, Portugal; ⁵Instituto Toscano Tumori, Pisa, Italy; ⁸Chent University Hospital, Ghent, Belgium; ⁹Wojewódzki Szpital Specjalistyczny im M Kopernika, Łodz, Poland; ¹⁰Hospital de Sant Pau, Barcelona, Spain; ¹¹N. N. Blokhin Cancer Research Centre, Moscow, Russia; ¹²Urologie de Gentilly, Nancy, France; ¹⁴SMS-oncology BV, Amsterdam, the Netherlands; ¹⁵Janssen-Cilag AS, Oslo, Norway; ¹⁶Janssen-Cilag BV, Tilburg, the Netherlands; ¹⁷EMEA Medical Affairs, Janssen Pharmaceutica, Beerse, Belgium

BACKGROUND

- Recent years have seen an evolution in the management of mCRPC, with the availability of several newer systemic treatments.
- Changes in the management of mCRPC are based on evidence from clinical trials however, there are gaps in our knowledge on how newer treatments are being integrated into routine clinical practice.
- There is a lack of large-scale registry data focusing on mCRPC and its clinical management. Observational patient registries can play a critical role by providing insights to complement clinical trials.²⁻
- The Prostate Cancer Registry, the first international, prospective, observational study of patients with mCRPC, was initiated to examine the management of patients with mCRPC in a real-world setting.

OBJECTIVES

- Document the characteristics and management of patients with mCRPC in routine clinical practice, independent of treatment used.
- Assess sequencing of treatments (initiation, termination and duration), relative effectiveness of treatments, medical resource utilisation, quality of life and survival.

METHODS

Study Design

e, non-interventional, multicentre registry of 3000 men with mCRPG (ClinicalTrials.gov identifier: NCT02236637; Figure 1).



- 192 centres are participating in Austria, Belgium, France, Germany, Israel, Italy Luxembourg, Poland, Portugal, Russia, Slovenia, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland, Turker and the UK (Figure 2).
- A range of clinical settings are represented, including oncology and urology specialis clinics, small and large practices, in both public and private healthcare systems.

Eligibility Criteria

- Male aged ≥ 18 years. Confirmed diagnosis of adenocarcinoma of the prostate with documented metastati
- disease, who may enrol at any time after diagnosis Documented castration resistance, defined by disease progression (despit)
- testosterone levels < 50 ng/dL and/or androgen deprivation therapy [ADT] and/or orchiectomy), defined as:
- Continuous rise in prostate-specific antigen: and/or Worsening of existing disease/symptoms; and/or
- Appearance of new metastases.
- Not currently receiving active treatment for mCRPC (except ADT and/or bone-sparie)
- therapies) or initiating new treatment for mCRPC within the 30 days preceding o following enrolment.
- Signed informed consent/participation agreement, as applicable
- Data Collection
- Baseline data collected at study entry include: Demographics.
- Disease history, including dates of diagnosis, metastasis and castration resistance tumour-node-metastasis (TNM) stage and Gleason score at diagnosis



- Prior prostate cancer treatment, including systemic therapy, radiotherapy and surgery.
- Clinical characteristics, including comorbidities, concomitant medication and Eastern Cooperative Oncology Group Performance Status (ECOG PS). Quality of life.
- Medical resource utilisation
- Clinical data collected prospectively at least every 3 months
- Systemic and local mCRPC treatment
- Rationale for treatment choice and reasons for discontinuation
- Duration and sequencing of treatment.
- Clinical assessments/outcomes, biological parameters and radiological responses
- Survival. Medical resource utilisation
- Ouality of life.
- All clinical data are subject to a validation process to ensure quality control.

FIRST ANALYSIS RESULTS

- Baseline demographics, clinical data and first treatments for the first 505 patient enrolled between June 2013 and January 2014 at sites in 12 European countries are reported (Figure 3).
- Patients were followed up for 9 months (or less, in case of patient withdrawal, loss t follow-up or death): not all data had sufficient maturity to be reported.

Figure 3. Distribution of Patients in the First Analysis



Disease History at Study Entry

Median time from diagnosis of prostate cancer until study entry was 4.7 years (Table 1) At initial prostate cancer diagnosis, the majority of patients (59.8%) had a Gleasor score of ≥ 8, while 26.5% had node-positive disease and 45.7% had distant metastase

Table 1. Disease History at Study Entry

Characteristic	First analysis cohort
	(
Median time from diagnosis to enrolment, years (range)	(n = 505)
	4.7 (0-22)
Gleason score at initial diagnosis, n (%)	(n = 458)
≤6	54 (11.8)
7	130 (28.4)
≥8	274 (59.8)
T stage at initial diagnosis, n (%)	(n = 488)
Tx	74 (15.2)
T1, T1a-c	51 (10.5)
Т2, Т2а-с	107 (21.9)
T3, T3a-b	194 (39.8)
T4	62 (12.7)
N stage at initial diagnosis, n (%)	(n = 483)
Nx	188 (38.9)
NO	167 (34.6)
NI	128 (26.5)
M stage at initial diagnosis, n (%)	(n = 484)
Mx	86 (17.8)
MO	177 (36.6)
M1	85 (17.6)
Mla	3 (0.6)
MID	126 (26.0)
Mic	7 (1.4)
Median time from initial diagnosis to first metastatic diagnosis,	(n = 369)
years (range)	2.7 (0-20)
Median time from initial diagnosis to castration resistance,	(n = 500)
years (range)	3.0 (0-20)

Treatment History at Study Entry

- Most patients (97.8%) had received systemic anti-cancer therapy, including endocrin therapy (97.4%; Table 2). 41.4% of patients had received chemotherapy and 58.6% were chemotherapy-naïve
- 55.2% of patients had received radiotherapy, including 33.3% of patients who had received radiotherapy to the prostate. In addition, 22.2% of patients had undergone radical

Table 2. Treatment History at Study Entry

Type of therapy, n (%)	First analysis cohort (n = 505)
Prior systemic anti-cancer therapy	494 (97.8)
Prior endocrine therapy	492 (97.4)
Anti-androgen	426 (84.4)
GnRH agonist	409 (81.0)
Steroids	200 (39.6)
Abiraterone	75 (14.9)
GnRH antagonist	34 (6.7)
Oestrogens and derivatives	21 (4.2)
Enzalutamide	15 (3.0)
Adrenal synthesis inhibitors	8 (1.6)
Other endocrine therapy	11 (2.2)
Chemotherapy	209 (41.4)
Docetaxel	204 (40.4)
Cabazitaxel	27 (5.3)
Other	17 (3.4)
Bone-targeted agents	202 (40.0)
Prior radiotherapy since diagnosis	279 (55.2)
Prostate	168 (33.3)
Spine	57 (11.3)
Limb	18 (3.6)
Costal	16 (3.2)
Brain	1 (0.2)
Other	118 (23.4)
Prior surgery	208 (41.2)
Orchiectomy	33 (6.5)
Radical prostatectomy	112 (22.2)
Others	81 (16.0)

Demographic and Clinical Characteristics at Study Entry

- Most patients were > 70 years (mean: 71.5 years) with ECOG PS 0 (40.9%) or 1 (42.6%). The bone was the most common site of metastasis (78.9% of patients) and 28.7%
- of patients had ≥ 10 bone lesions.

Table 3. Demographic and Clinical Characteristics at Study Entry

PSA, ng/mL (range) ECOC PS, n (%) 0 1 ≥2 Site of lesions, n (%) Bone Node Prostate Liver Lung Other Site of nodes, n (%) Site of nodes, n (%)
PSA, ng/mL (range) ECOG PS, n (%) 0 1 ≥ 2 Site of lesions, n (%) Bone Node Prostate Lung Other Site of nodes, n (%) Site of nodes, n (%)
ECOG PS, n (%) 0 1 ≥ 2 Site of lesions, n (%) Bone Node Prostate Liver Lung Other Site of neds, n (%) Site of neds, n (%)
0 1 ≥2 Site of lesions, n (%) Bone Node Prostate Liver Lung Other Site of neds, n (%) Site of neds, n (%)
1 ≥2 Site of lesions, n (%) Bone Node Prostate Liver Lung Other Site of nodes, n (%)
≥2 Site of lesions, n (%) Bone Node Prostate Liver Lung Other Site of nodes, n (%) Site displacements
Site of lesions, n (%) Bone Node Prostate Liver Lung Other Site of nodes, n (%)
Bone Node Prostate Liver Lung Other Site of nodes, n (%)
Node Prostate Liver Lung Other Site of nodes, n (%) Sub-displacements
Prostate Liver Lung Other Site of nodes, n (%)
Liver Lung Other Site of nodes, n (%)
Lung Other Site of nodes, n (%)
Other Site of nodes, n (%)
Site of nodes, n (%)
Sub-diaphragmatic
Sub-diapinaginatic
Supra-diaphragmatic
Number of bone metastases, n (%)
0
1-5
5-9
≥10
Not evaluable

Comorbidities and Concomitant Therapies at Study Entry

- 62.8% of patients had comorbidities requiring treatment (Table 4), the most com being cardiovascular disease (including hypertension), diabetes and neurological disorders.
- 79.2% of patients were receiving concomitant medications, with a high proportion receiving anti-hypertensives or other agents to treat cardiovascular dis
- Analgesics were being utilised by 47.9% of patients

Table 4. Comorbidities and Concomitant Medications at Study Entry

Type of therapy, n (%)
Comorbidities requiring treatment
Cardiovascular
Hypertension
Diabetes
Type 1 diabetes
Type 2 diabetes
Neurological
Respiratory
Renal
Hepatic
Infection
Concomitant therapies
Cardiovascular disease therapies
Hypertension therapies
Analgesics
Diabetes therapies
Anti-thrombotic agents
Nervous system disorder therapies
Anti-infective agents
Growth factors
Blood substitutes

.s at Study Elitiy		
	First analysis cohort	
	(n = 505)	
	71.5 (47-94)	
	(n = 491)	
	57.0 (0.0-10,710.0)	
	(n = 472)	
	193 (40.9)	
	201 (42.6)	
	78 (16.5)	
	(n = 384)	
	303 (78.9)	
	168 (43.8)	
	60 (15.6)	
	23 (6.0)	
	33 (8.6)	
	31 (8.1)	
_	(n = 167)	
	144 (86.2)	
	54 (32.3)	
	(n = 362)	
	15 (4.1)	
	93 (25.7)	
	61 (16.9)	
	104 (28.7)	
	89 (24.6)	
en		

	First analysis cohort (n = 505)
	317 (62.8)
	277 (54.9)
	225 (44.6)
	67 (13.3)
	11 (2.2)
	56 (11.1)
	44 (8.7)
	29 (5.7)
	37 (7.3)
	9 (1.8)
	4 (0.8)
	400 (79.2)
	281 (55.6)
	227 (45.0)
	242 (47.9)
	61 (12.1)
	49 (9.7)
	21 (4.2)
	14 (2.8)
	7 (1.4)
	6 (1.2)
_	

First Treatments for mCRPC

n the first analysis, 75.8% of patients initiated 1 or more new treatments for mCRP (Figure 4).



CONCLUSIONS

- The Prostate Cancer Registry is the first international, observational study of current treatment patterns and outcomes, in a real-world cohort of patients with mCRPC.
- This first analysis indicates the enrolment of a broad range of patients, with a high prevalence of comorbidities and concomitant medication use, reflecting the real-world nature of the population.
- As expected in the current treatment landscape, the majority of patients (76%) initiated a new treatment for mCRPC.
- We anticipate that future analyses of the Prostate Cancer Registry will provide unprecedented insights into contemporary management of mCRPC in routine clinical practice.
- These insights can be used as a real-world complement to clinical trial evidence to optimise future care and improve outcomes in mCRPC

REFERENCES

- 2. Gandaglia G, et al. Eur Urol. 2015; doi: 10.1016/j.eururo.2015.05.046. 3. Van Hemelrijck M, et al. Int J Epidemiol. 2013;42:956-967.
- 4. Evans SM, et al. BJU Int. 2013;111:E158-166
- 5. Porten SP, et al. World J Urol. 2011;29:265-271

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

ledge the dedicated efforts of the invest to the database and patients who allowed collection of their data. This study and the analyses presented en EMEA: writing assistance was n dad by BAREVEL and was funded by



