Abstract CT058

Ripretinib (DCC-2618) Pharmacokinetics (PK) in a Phase 1 Study in Patients with Gastrointestinal Stromal Tumors (GIST) and other Advanced Malignancies: A Retrospective Evaluation of the PK Effects of Proton Pump Inhibitors (PPIs) decīphera

BACKGROUND

- Ripretinib is an investigational broad spectrum, small molecule KIT and PDGFRα switch control kinase inhibitor. Encouraging clinical benefit has previously been reported from the phase 1 dose escalation and expansion trial, as measured by preliminary ORR (best response), DCR and PFS in 2nd 3rd, and \geq 4th line GIST patients with a favorable tolerability profile at doses \geq 100 mg/day (ESMO 2018, abstract #16030) (Figure 1)
- Phase 3 trial in ≥4th line, INVICTUS (NCT03353753) is fully enrolled, and data are expected mid-2019
- Phase 3 trial in 2nd line, INTRIGUE (NCT03673501) was initiated December 2018
- More than 40% of GIST patients use acid-reducing agents. PPIs are the most potent acid-reducing agents that may impair the absorption of kinase inhibitors ^{1,2}
- Ripretinib is a weak base drug with slightly pH-dependent solubility (<2 fold differences between pH 2 and 6.5), leading to the question whether gastric acid suppression by acid-reducing agents would potentially impair ripretinib absorption
- Therefore, a retrospective analysis of the Phase I trial was conducted as preliminary exploration to address this question

OBJECTIVE

• To evaluate the impact of coadministration of PPIs on ripretinib PK

METHODS

- The analysis assessed the impact of PPIs on the plasma concentration of ripretinib using PK data from the expansion cohort of study DCC-2618-01-001 at the recommended Phase 2 dose of 150 mg QD.
- The plasma concentrations of the active metabolite DP-5439 were also evaluated, as impaired absorption of ripretinib may lead to reduced in vivo formation of the metabolite.
- Plasma concentrations of ripretinib and metabolite DP-5439 were compared on Cycle 1 Day 1 (C1D1, n=106) and Day 15 (C1D15, n=102).
- Log-transformed concentrations were compared using an ANOVA model with PPI use as a fixed effect, and geometric mean ratios were computed with 95% confidence intervals (C.I.).
- In the current analysis, patients using PPIs were defined as those who continuously took PPIs for at least 4 days prior to C1D1 or C1D15.
- Patients who did not use PPIs were defined as those who did not take PPIs or any other acid-reducing agents during the study.
- This retrospective analysis is based on data from patients without a history of gastrectomy.
- The analysis group (N=113) was comprised of 88 GIST (77.9%) patients and 25 non-GIST (22.1%) patients.

Figure 1. Ripretinib: Encouraging background data from Phase 1 in GIST (NCT NCT02571036)

Line of Therapy	mPFS (ripretinib)
2	42 weeks
3	40 weeks
≥4	24 weeks
2&3	40 weeks

Preliminary mPFS data with ripretinib @ ≥100mg daily exceeds registration trial data for approved 2nd & 3rd line therapies

Notes: (1) Based on cutoff date of August 31, 2018; RECIST data per investigator assessmer

Characteristics	Category
Gender	Female
	Male
Age (years)	
Race	American Indian or Ala Asian Black or African An White
	Other
Ethnicity	Hispanic or Lat Not Hispanic or L
	Not Reported
BMI (kg/m ²) [1]	
Diagnosis	GIST
	Non-GIST

[1] BMI = weight[kg]/height[m]².

F Janku¹, M Heinrich², P Chi³, A Abdul Razak⁴, M von Mehren⁵, M Gordon⁶, K Ganjoo⁷, J Trent⁸, RL Jones⁹, H Gelderblom¹⁰, K Running¹¹, J Wang¹¹, R Ruiz-Soto¹¹, S George¹² ¹The University of Texas MD Anderson Cancer Center, Houston, TX; ²Portland VA Health Care System and Knight Cancer Institute, Oregon Health & Science University, Portland, OR; ³Department of Medicine, Memorial Sloan Kettering Cancer Center, New York, NY; ⁴Princess Margaret Cancer Centre, Toronto, ON, Canada; ⁵Fox Chase Cancer Center, Philadelphia, PA; ⁶Pinnacle Oncology Hematology, Arizona Center, Scottsdale, AZ; ⁷Stanford Cancer Institute, Stanford, CA; ⁸Sylvester Comprehensive Cancer Center, Miami, FL; ⁹Royal Marsden Hospital, The Institute of Cancer Research, London, United Kingdom; ¹⁰Leiden University Medical Center, Leiden, Netherlands; ¹¹Deciphera Pharmaceuticals, Inc, Waltham, MA; ¹²Dana-Farber Cancer Institute/Harvard Medical School, Boston, MA



RESULTS

Table 1: Patient Demographics and Baseline Characteristics

y	Statistic	Patients Using PPIs (N=26)	Patients Not Using PPIs (N=87)	Total (N=113)	
9	n (%)	8 (30.8)	32 (36.8)	40 (35.4)	
	n (%)	18 (69.2)	55 (63.2)	73 (64.6)	
	Ν	26	87	113	
	Median	62	60	60	
	Min , Max	23 , 82	19 , 86	19,86	
Alaska Native	n (%)	0	3 (3.4)	3 (2.7)	
	n (%)	1(3.8)	5 (5.7)	6 (5.3)	
American	n (%)	0	4 (4.6)	4 (3.5)	
	n (%)	23 (88.5)	70 (80.5)	93 (82.3)	
	n (%)	2 (7.7)	5 (5.7)	7 (6.2)	
Latino	n (%)	1 (3.8)	7 (8.0)	8 (7.1)	
or Latino	n (%)	24 (92.3)	76 (87.4)	100 (88.5)	
rted	n (%)	1 (3.8)	4 (4.6)	5 (4.4)	
	Ν	26	78	104	
	Median	29	26	27	
	Min , Max	19,40	19,54	19,54	
	n (%)	17 (65.4)	71 (81.6)	88 (77.9)	
ST	n (%)	9 (34.6)	16 (18.4)	25 (22.1)	

Table 2. PK Exposure of Ripretinib and Metabolite DP-5439 in Patients Using or not Using PPIs [Arithmetic Mean]

PK	Ripretinib in ng/mL		DP-5439 in ng/mL		Ripretinib + DP-5439 in ng/mL		
Concentrations	[arithmetic mean (CV%)]		[arithmetic mean (CV%)]		[arithmetic mean (CV%)]		
	Using PPIs	Not using PPIs	Using PPIs	Not using PPIs	Using PPIs	Not using PPIs	
C1D1 6 hr	566 (58%)	670 (53%)	302 (64%)	297 (59%)	862 (54%)	975 (48%)	
	n=24	n=82	n=23	n=82	n=23	n=82	
C1D15 pre-dose	364 (79%)	344 (63%)	960 (80%)	889 (86%)	1350 (72%)	1260 (75%)	
	n= 24	n=78	n=24	n=78	n=24	n=78	
C1D15 6 hr	834 (51%)	871 (47%)	1170 (69%)	1060 (67%)	2040 (53%)	1960 (49%)	
	n=24	n=73	n=24	n=73	n=24	n=73	

- Ripretinib and metabolite DP-5439 plasma concentrations (Table 2) were characterized in patients using and not using PPIs, respectively.
- Comparable ripretinib exposure (Table 3, Figures 2) was observed in patients using and not using PPIs.
- Comparable DP-5439 exposure (Table 3, Figures 3) was also confirmed in these two groups.
- In summary, PK profiles were consistent between patients using and not using PPIs, indicating a low likelihood of a clinically significant drug interaction between PPIs and ripretinib.

Table 3. PK Exposure of Ripretinib and Metabolite DP-5439 in Patients Using or not Using PPIs [Geometric Mean Ratios]

РК	Ripretinib in ng/mL		Geometric	95% C.I.	DP-5439 in ng/mL		Geometric	95% C.I.
Concentrations	[geometric mean (CV%)]		Mean Ratios		[geometric mean (CV%)]		Mean Ratios	
	Using PPIs	Not using			Using PPIs	Not using		
		PPIs				PPIs		
C1D1 6 hr	460 (87.2%)	587 (56.7%)	0.78	0.60 - 1.02	231 (103.1%)	246 (72.8%)	0.94	0.67 – 1.32
	n=24	n=82			n=23	n=82		
C1D15 pre-dose	280 (85.2)	269 (89.8)	1.04	0.73 – 1.48	705 (105.0)	622 (121.4)	1.13	0.73 – 1.76
	n= 24	n=78	1.04	0.73 - 1.48	n=24	n=78		
C1D15 6 hr	732 (58.8%)	782 (50.5%)	0.94	0.74 - 1.18	928 (83.6%)	870 (74.0%)	1.07	0.78 – 1.46
	n=24	n=73			n=24	n=73		
Notes: Geometri	Notes: Geometric mean ratios: exposure of patients using PPIs to patients not using PPIs							

Boxplots: The solid and dashed lines in the box represent the mean and the median, respectively. Lower end of box – lower 25th percentile, upper end of box – upper 75th percentile. The whiskers represent the minimum or maximum values within 1.5*IQR (interquantile range). The solid black circles (if any) represent the data points beyond 1.5*IQR.

Acknowledgment: We would like to thank the patients, their families, and the site staff of the DCC-2618-01-001 trial.

Figure 2: Boxplot of Ripretinib Plasma Concentration in Patients Using vs. Not Using PPIs



Figure 3: Boxplot of Metabolite DP-5439 Plasma Concentration in Patients Using vs. Not Using PPIs



CONCLUSIONS

- Geometric mean ratios (95% C.I.) between patients using and not using PPIs did not indicate a difference between these groups.
- This preliminary retrospective PK analysis provides supporting evidence that restriction of coadministration of PPIs with ripretinib may not be necessary.
- The use of PPIs is not expected to impact the efficacy of ripretinib
- A dedicated drug interaction study is planned to provide a definitive assessment.

References

- 1. Smelick et al, Mol. Pharmaceutics 2013, 10, 4055–4062
- 2. Budha et al, Clin Pharmacol Ther. 2012, 92(2):203-13