Published in final edited form as:

Eur J Cancer. 2011 December ; 47(18): 2706–2714. doi:10.1016/j.ejca.2011.09.002.

Phase 2 Trial of Linifanib (ABT-869) in Patients with Advanced Renal Cell Cancer (RCC) after Sunitinib Failure

Nizar M. Tannir¹, Yu-Ning Wong², Christian K. Kollmannsberger³, Marc S. Ernstoff⁴, David J. Perry⁵, Leonard J. Appleman⁶, Edwin M. Posadas⁷, Daniel Cho⁸, Toni K. Choueiri⁹, Andrew Coates¹⁰, Neeraj Gupta¹⁰, Rajendra Pradhan¹⁰, Jiang Qian¹⁰, Jihong Chen¹⁰, Frank A. Scappaticci¹¹, Justin L. Ricker¹⁰, Dawn M. Carlson¹⁰, and M. Dror Michaelson¹²

¹University of Texas MD Anderson Cancer Center, Houston, TX, USA

²Fox Chase Cancer Center, Philadelphia, PA, USA

³British Columbia Cancer Agency Vancouver Cancer Center, Vancouver, BC, Canada

⁴Dartmouth Hitchcock Medical Center, Lebanon, NH, USA

⁵Washington Cancer Institute, Washington DC, USA

⁶University of Pittsburgh Medical Center, Pittsburgh, PA, USA

⁷Samuel Oschin Comprehensive Cancer Institute, Cedar Sinai Medical Center, Los Angeles, CA, USA

⁸Beth Israel Deaconess Medical Center, Boston, MA, USA

⁹Dana-Farber Cancer Institute, Boston, MA, USA

¹⁰Abbott Laboratories, Abbott Park, IL, USA

¹¹Genentech, Inc., South San Francisco, CA, USA

¹²Massachusetts General Hospital Cancer Center, Boston, MA, USA

Abstract

Purpose—This study assessed the efficacy and safety of linifanib in patients with advanced renal cell carcinoma (RCC) who were previously treated with sunitinib.

Materials and Methods—This open-label, multicenter, phase 2 trial of oral linifanib 0.25 mg/kg/day enrolled patients who had prior nephrectomy and adequate organ function. The primary endpoint was objective response rate (ORR) per RECIST by central imaging. Secondary endpoints

© 2011 Elsevier Ltd. All rights reserved.

Corresponding Author: Nizar M. Tannir, MD, FACP, University of Texas, MD Anderson Cancer Center, 1515 Holcombe Blvd, Houston, TX 77030, Phone: 713-792-2830, ntannir@mdanderson.org.

Publisher's Disclaimer: This is a PDF file of an unedited manuscript that has been accepted for publication. As a service to our customers we are providing this early version of the manuscript. The manuscript will undergo copyediting, typesetting, and review of the resulting proof before it is published in its final citable form. Please note that during the production process errors may be discovered which could affect the content, and all legal disclaimers that apply to the journal pertain.

Conflict of Interest Statement

The other authors have no conflicts of interest.

were progression-free survival (PFS), overall survival (OS), and time to progression (TTP). Safety was also assessed.

Results—Fifty-three patients, median age 61 years (range 40–80) were enrolled (August 2007 to October 2008) across 12 North-American centers. Median number of prior therapies was two (range 1–4); 42 patients (81%) had clear-cell histology. ORR was 13.2%, median PFS was 5.4 months (95% CI: 3.6, 6.0) and TTP was the same; median OS was 14.5 months (95% CI: 10.8, 24.1). The most common treatment-related adverse events (AEs) were diarrhea (74%), fatigue (74%), and hypertension (66%), and the most common treatment-related Grade 3/4 AE was hypertension (40%).

Conclusions—Linifanib demonstrated clinically meaningful activity in patients with advanced RCC after sunitinib failure. At 0.25 mg/kg/day, significant dose modifications were required. An alternative, fixed-dosing strategy is being evaluated in other trials.

Keywords

Renal cell carcinoma; sunitinib; ABT-869; VEGFR; angiogenesis inhibitors

Introduction

The most common kidney cancer in adults is renal cell cancer (RCC).¹ Approximately 85% of RCC tumors have clear-cell histology, characterized by over-expression of VEGF and PDGF.^{2, 3} As VEGF and PDGF tyrosine kinases mediate tumor progression via multiple mechanisms, their simultaneous inhibition by linifanib may result in greater antitumor activity.^{4–6} Nearly one-third of patients with RCC have metastatic disease at initial diagnosis and approximately one-fourth of patients with localized disease develop metastases following nephrectomy.^{1, 3, 7} Cytokine-based therapy has been associated with low response rates and significant treatment-related toxicities.^{2, 3}

Treatments approved in the United States for patients with untreated, advanced RCC, based on improved progression-free survival (PFS), include the multi-targeted tyrosine-kinase inhibitors (TKIs) sunitinib and pazopanib, the dual TKI and serine/threonine kinase inhibitor, sorafenib,^{8–10} the regimen of bevacizumab with interferon alpha¹¹, and the selective inhibitor of mTOR, temsirolimus.^{12, 13} Optimal treatment regimens for advanced RCC following failure of first-line TKI therapy have been under evaluation. Trials evaluating inhibitors of VEGFR and different cellular pathways such as mTOR^{14–17} show that patients with post-therapy progressive disease (PD) may respond to another TKI with different target specificities and/or pharmacologic properties. The mTOR inhibitor everolimus is approved for advanced RCC following sunitinib or sorafenib failure.¹⁸ A phase 3 trial of temsirolimus¹⁹ versus sorafenib as second-line therapy in advanced RCC is ongoing. In a recent phase 3 trial, axitinib showed superiority to sorafenib in terms of PFS.^{20, 21}

Linifanib (ABT-869) is a novel, adenosine triphosphate competitive inhibitor, selective for all VEGFR and PDGFR tyrosine kinases with minimal activity against unrelated receptor tyrosine kinases, cytosolic tyrosine kinases, and serine/threonine kinases.²² A phase 1 study

in patients with refractory solid malignancies provided evidence of the safety and activity of single-agent linifanib.²³ Dose-limiting toxicities of hypertension and proteinuria were seen at 0.30 mg/kg; therefore, the recommended phase 2 dose was 0.25 mg/kg once daily with continuous dosing.²³ This current phase 2 study²⁴ assessed the efficacy and safety of linifanib in patients with advanced RCC after sunitinib failure.

Materials and Methods

Patients

Patients were adults with advanced RCC, prior nephrectomy, 1 unidimensionally measurable lesion (RECIST²⁵), who had disease progression within 100 days pre-screening following at least two cycles (12 weeks) of sunitinib therapy. Sunitinib failure was defined as treatment discontinuation due to disease progression. Additional eligibility criteria included ECOG performance score (PS) 0–1, life expectancy of at least 4 months, and adequate bone marrow, renal and hepatic function. Exclusion criteria included anti-cancer therapy or major surgery within 21 days before linifanib administration and prior treatment with a TKI other than sunitinib or sorafenib (prior bevacizumab was permitted). All patients gave written, informed consent.

Study design and treatment

This single-arm, open-label, multicenter phase 2 trial assessed the efficacy and safety of linifanib 0.25 mg/kg, administered once daily, fasting, at bedtime until disease progression or intolerable toxicity. Treatment was discontinued if patients required radiotherapy, surgery, or alternate anti-neoplastic agents due to tumor progression. Independent ethics committees and/or institutional review boards of participating institutions approved the protocol. The study was conducted in accordance with the Declaration of Helsinki and all applicable regulations and guidelines governing clinical study conduct.

Assessments

Within 21 days before the first linifanib dose, a physical examination, assessment of ECOG PS, a pregnancy test for female patients of childbearing potential, and laboratory tests were conducted. Baseline radiographic tumor assessments included CT scans of the chest and abdomen and optional DCE-MRI. Optional FDG-PET scans were performed at three selected study sites with PET-scanning capabilities.

Clinical disease progression was assessed at each visit. Radiographic tumor assessments were performed using RECIST²⁵ every 8 weeks and at the final visit. Assessments were implemented by a central imaging center, and the readers were not blinded to study and sequence. Post-baseline DCE-MRI scans at Day 15 assessed changes in vascular permeability and endothelial surface area (K^{trans}).²⁶ Post-baseline FDG-PET scans at the end of the first 8 weeks, with CT attenuation when available, evaluated tumor metabolic activity as assessed by standard uptake value (SUV).²⁷

The primary efficacy endpoint was objective response rate (ORR), defined as the percentage of all dosed patients with confirmed CR or PR based on RECIST²⁵ by central imaging

center. Complete response or PR required confirmation at two assessments at least 28 days apart. Secondary efficacy endpoints included PFS, overall survival (OS), and time to progression (TTP). A subgroup analysis evaluated PFS and OS by Memorial Sloan-Kettering Cancer Center (MSKCC) prognostic risk groups based on corrected serum calcium, hemoglobin, and Karnofsky performance status.²⁸

Safety evaluations included physical examinations, laboratory tests, and assessment of ECOG PS and adverse events (AEs).

Pharmacokinetics

Blood samples were collected on Days 8, 15, 29, 50, and 77, and analyzed for plasma concentration of linifanib using liquid chromatography and tandem mass spectrometry. A nonlinear mixed-effect population modeling approach with NONMEM® software described the disposition of linifanib and identified significant covariates.

Statistical analysis

A sample size of 44 patients was required to test the null hypothesis that the response rate to linifanib was 5% compared with the alternate hypothesis that ORR was 15%, with 80% power and a 1-sided type 1 error rate of 0.10. A target enrollment of approximately 50 patients accounted for potential dropouts.

The primary efficacy endpoint was calculated for all dosed patients with at least one measurable lesion at baseline. The proportion of patients with a confirmed complete response (CR) or partial response (PR) was estimated based on tumor assessment by the central imaging center using RECIST²⁵ and the exact binomial distribution was used to construct a 95% CI for the estimated ORR. Secondary efficacy endpoints were analyzed for all dosed patients. Statistical significance for all analyses was determined by a two-sided *p*-value 0.05. Time to event endpoints were analyzed using the Kaplan-Meier method,²⁹ with median times and two-sided 95% CIs presented.

Death occurring within 56 days of the last tumor assessment was counted as an event in the PFS analysis. When progression was not observed, death was counted as an event if it occurred within one scan interval (56 days).

Patients with at least one dose of linifanib were included in all safety analyses. Safety evaluations included study-drug exposure, AEs, serious AEs, deaths, laboratory findings, and vital signs. Adverse events were summarized according to MedDRA. The number and percent of patients experiencing an AE were summarized by NCI-CTCAE v3³⁰ toxicity grade, relationship to study drug, association with study drug discontinuation, and severity. Survival information was collected at 4–6-month intervals after the last study visit and for 2 years after patients have been removed from the study.

Results

Patient characteristics

Fifty-three patients, median age 61 years, were enrolled from August 2007 to October 2008 from 12 North American sites. Most patients had clear-cell histology and ECOG PS 1 (Table 1). The median initial daily dose was 20.0 mg (range, 12.5–25.0). The response rate to prior sunitinib treatment was 13.2%. Thirty-three patients (62%) received systemic therapy with a cytokine, bevacizumab, sorafenib, and/or temsirolimus in addition to sunitinib. Seventeen patients (32%) had received two prior lines of therapy, and 10 patients (19%) had received >2 (Table 1). One patient continued on linifanib. The dose intensity of linifanib was 63.8%.

Efficacy

All patients were included in the efficacy analysis. Seven patients had confirmed radiographic PRs according to image assessment by central imaging for an ORR of 13.2% (95% CI: 5.5, 25.3) (Table 2, Figure 1), six of which occurred with linifanib as second-line therapy, and one with linifanib as third-line therapy. The responders' median time on study was 12.9 months (range: 5.0–26.6 months). Two of 10 patients with non-clear cell histology achieved a PR. One of the seven responders had not responded to prior sunitinib therapy. The median PFS was 5.4 months (95% CI: 3.7, 6.0 months) (Table 2, Figure 2A) and median TTP was the same; median OS was 14.5 months (95% CI: 10.8, 24.1) (Figure 2B). Patients who had received one prior systemic therapy had similar PFS and OS, compared with those who had received more than one (PFS hazard ratio 0.80 [0.44, 1.49], $p=0.49$; OS hazard ratio 1.28 [0.64, 2.54], $p=0.49$). Overall, 12 of 17 patients (71%) with pre- and post-treatment DCE-MRI scans had at least a 40% reduction in K^{trans} , consistent with an antiangiogenic effect from linifanib. Three of 10 patients (30%) who underwent FDG-PET at baseline and at Week 8 had at least a 25% reduction in maximum SUV. Although exploratory, the FDG-PET results indicate decreased metabolic tumor activity in a subset of patients.

Data for 53 patients were available for analysis of PFS and OS according to MSKCC risk factors²⁸ (Figure 3). For the nine patients in the favorable-risk group, median PFS was 7.5 months, and median OS was not reached. For the 44 patients in the intermediate/poor-risk group, median PFS was 4.0 months, and median OS was 13.3 months. Of the seven confirmed PRs per central imaging, two (22.2%) occurred in the favorable-risk group, and five (11.4%) in the intermediate/poor-risk group.

Safety

Forty-one patients discontinued therapy due to PD (clinical, radiographic, or AE related to PD), eight discontinued due to AEs not related to PD, two due to withdrawal of consent, and one due to surgery. The most common treatment-related AEs are shown in Table 3. Non-hematological AEs Grade 3/4 included hypertension (39.6%), fatigue (24.5%), diarrhea (20.8%), and hand-foot syndrome (22.6%) (Table 3). Most hematological AEs were mild to moderate. The only hematological AEs occurring in ≥5% of patients were anemia (20.8%), lymphopenia (7.5%), and leukopenia (5.7%). Three patients experienced Grade 3/4

hematological AEs, two (3.8%) with lymphopenia, and one (1.9%) with neutropenia (Table 3).

Most patients had dose interruptions (84.9%) or dose reductions (66.0%) due to AEs. Dose interruption for hypertension and proteinuria were mandated by protocol. The most common AEs leading to dose interruption were diarrhea (30.2%), hand-foot syndrome (26.4%), fatigue (20.8%), proteinuria (18.9%), hypertension (15.1%), nausea (13.2%), and vomiting (13.2%), and these were reversible. Adverse events not related to PD leading to discontinuation included fatigue, abdominal pain, nausea, vomiting, decreased appetite, decreased weight, hemoptysis, and myocardial infarction. The myocardial infarction occurred in a patient with multiple cardiac risk factors, who had a prior myocardial infarction treated with angioplasty and stenting. There were two events of deep venous thrombosis; one was Grade 3, possibly related to linifanib. There were no deaths due to treatment-related AEs.

Pharmacokinetics

Pharmacokinetic data were available for 42 patients and are described by a 1-compartment model³¹ with first-order absorption and elimination. Influence of covariates on pharmacokinetic parameters was assessed by following a forward addition and backward elimination method.³² Only the most significant relationships between covariates and pharmacokinetic parameters were included in the final model. The model containing gender as a covariate on both apparent clearance and volume of distribution, and body weight as a covariate on apparent volume of distribution became the final population pharmacokinetics model for this dataset. Creatinine clearance was not a significant covariate on apparent clearance or volume of distribution. Body weight was not a significant covariate on apparent clearance. The average apparent clearance value was 3.9 L/h and the terminal half-life was 21.6 hours ($N=42$) based on the parameter estimates from the final model.

Discussion

A number of targeted agents have demonstrated activity in advanced RCC. Sunitinib is considered a standard of care for initial therapy of patients with favorable- and intermediate-prognosis advanced clear-cell RCC, based on demonstrated superiority compared with IFN α in this patient population.^{9, 33} Temsirolimus is the standard of care for patients with poor-prognosis advanced RCC.^{12, 13} Optimal therapeutic regimens for patients with RCC who develop PD during sunitinib or temsirolimus therapy are being defined. In a randomized phase 3 trial in patients with clear-cell RCC with prior TKI therapy who developed PD with sunitinib, sorafenib, or both,^{18, 34} everolimus demonstrated improved PFS (median 4.9 months) and 2% ORR, compared to median PFS 1.9 months and 0% ORR with placebo. Additionally, in phase 2 trials, sorafenib demonstrated occasional activity in patients with PD during first-line sunitinib therapy,¹⁶ and axitinib showed activity in sorafenib-refractory patients, including a subset who had also received sunitinib.¹⁷ In a phase 3 trial of axitinib vs. sorafenib as second-line therapy for RCC, PFS for patients with prior sunitinib favored axitinib (4.8 vs. 3.4 months, $p=0.0107$).²¹ In this trial, we examined the anti-tumor activity of the novel agent linifanib, with greater selectivity toward VEGFR and PDGFR, in patients

with advanced RCC who experienced disease progression during sunitinib therapy exclusively within 100 days from enrollment. Single-agent linifanib demonstrated clinically relevant activity (ORR 13.2%, median PFS 5.4 months per central imaging, median OS 14.5 months). Investigator assessments of PFS (median 5.8 months) and ORR (22.6%) were generally consistent with the central imaging assessments reported above. Although this was a small, uncontrolled single-arm study in a highly refractory population (median prior therapies of 2, range 1–4), results indicate at least the same order of activity as reported for the everolimus phase 3 study mentioned above, the axitinib vs. sorafenib phase 3 trial,^{20, 21} and with a similar phase 2 study evaluating sorafenib activity in patients with disease progression during sunitinib treatment (ORR 9.6%, median TTP 16 weeks per investigator assessments, and median OS 32 weeks).¹⁶

The main limitation of this study was the rate of non-hematological AEs at the studied dose. Grade 3/4 AEs including hypertension, fatigue, hand-foot syndrome, and diarrhea occurred at a higher rate than with sunitinib or sorafenib.^{14, 16} Proteinuria, which has not been routinely reported with other in-class agents, may be mechanism-based.³⁵ Administration at 0.25 mg/kg daily (maximum 25 mg) was associated with high rates of dose interruptions and dose reductions with a median (range) dose intensity of 63.8% (37.2, 100), which was suboptimal. Further linifanib studies are evaluating an alternative, fixed-dosing strategy: 17.5 mg as monotherapy, and 7.5 or 12.5 mg in combination with chemotherapy. Additionally, analyses of correlative linifanib biomarkers are ongoing, including alternative imaging, which may be predictive of improved patient outcome or permit improved AE management and/or dose optimization.

The extent of renal impairment, measured by creatinine clearance, was not a significant covariate in the population pharmacokinetics model, indicating that dose adjustment for renal dysfunction is not needed for linifanib. The terminal half-life of approximately 1 day in this study is similar to the half-life from other linifanib studies. However, increased toxicity seen in this study compared with the phase 1 results at the same dose level may indicate that these patients with advanced RCC are more susceptible to AEs than other patient populations.

Linifanib may be differentiated from other multi-targeted receptor TKIs in a number of respects. Linifanib simultaneously demonstrates potent inhibition, greater selectivity toward VEGFR and PDGFR kinases, and may result in fewer off-target effects than other angiogenesis inhibitors.²² Consistent with this hypothesis, we observed a lower rate of hematological AEs (neutropenia, thrombocytopenia) of all grades and Grade 3/4 than observed in a phase 2 sorafenib trial in patients with RCC whose disease progressed on sunitinib.¹⁶ These results support further evaluation of this inhibitor as a single agent or in combination with other agents. Ongoing studies are evaluating the efficacy of single-agent linifanib in other malignancies including a phase 3 trial versus sorafenib in unresectable or metastatic hepatocellular carcinoma.³⁶

Conclusions

The results observed in this study suggest that further evaluation of linifanib in patients with advanced RCC is warranted. Future trials would need to investigate alternative approaches. These may include an alternative fixed-dose regimen and biomarker assessment at baseline to identify a subset of patients who may experience improved outcome³⁷ as compared to a defined standard of care.

Acknowledgments

This work was supported by Abbott Laboratories, IL, USA and Genentech, Inc., CA, USA. Abbott Laboratories participated with study investigators in the development of the study design, the collection, analysis, and interpretation of data, the writing of the manuscript, and the decision to submit for publication.

The authors would like to thank Qin Qin, MS and Wen Zhou, PhD, both from Abbott Laboratories, IL, for performing statistical analyses; Arunava Chakravarty, Abbott for providing DCE-MRI and FGD-PET scan analyses; Roy Garcia, PhD, Health Science Communications, NY, for writing and editorial assistance; and Jody Bennett, Abbott, for editorial assistance for the manuscript. This support was funded by Abbott.

NMT has had a consultant/advisory role for Abbott, Novartis, Genentech, Seattle Genetics, and Aveo Pharmaceuticals, Inc., and has conducted research funded by Abbott, Pfizer, Novartis, Lilly, Amgen and Seattle Genetics. MSE has had a consultant/advisory role for Abbott, owns stock in Abbott, and conducted research funded by Abbott. DJP conducted research funded by Abbott, and attended a Genentech advisory board. LJA received research funding from Abbott. DC has had a consultant/advisory role for Genentech Inc. TKC has had a consultant/advisory role for Abbott. AC, RP, JQ, JLR, and DMC are employees of Abbott and own Abbott stock.. NG and JC are former employees of Abbott and own Abbott stock; NG is currently employed at Millennium: The Takeda Oncology Company, Cambridge, MA, and JC is currently employed at Astellas Pharma Global Development, Inc., Deerfield, IL. FAS is an employee of Genentech, Inc., South San Francisco, CA, and owns stock in Roche. MDM has had a consultant/advisory role for Abbott and Pfizer, and received honoraria from Wyeth.

Abbreviations

AE	Adverse event
CI	Confidence interval
CT	Computerized tomography
DCE-MRI	Dynamic contrast-enhanced magnetic resonance imaging
ECOG PS	Eastern Cooperative Oncology Group Performance Status
FDG-PET	Fluorodeoxyglucose positron emission tomography
MSKCC	Memorial Sloan-Kettering Cancer Center
mTOR	Mammalian target of rapamycin
ORR	Objective response rate
OS	Overall survival
PD	Progressive disease
PDGFR	Platelet-derived growth factor receptor
PFS	Progression-free survival
PR	Partial response

RCC	Renal cell carcinoma
RECIST	Response evaluation criteria in solid tumors
SUV	Standardized uptake value
TKI	Tyrosine kinase inhibitor
TTP	Time to progression
VEGFR	Vascular endothelial growth factor receptor

References

1. Mohammed A, Shergill I, Little B. Management of metastatic renal cell carcinoma: current trends. *Expert Rev Mol Diagn.* 2009; 9:75–83. [PubMed: 19099350]
2. Motzer RJ, Molina AM. Targeting renal cell carcinoma. *J Clin Oncol.* 2009; 27:3274–3276. [PubMed: 19451422]
3. Larkin JMG, Kipps ELS, Powell CJ, Swanton C. Review: Systemic therapy for advanced renal cell carcinoma. *Ther Adv Med Oncol.* 2009; 1:15–27. [PubMed: 21789110]
4. Bergers G, Song S, Meyer-Morse N, Bergsland E, Hanahan D. Benefits of targeting both pericytes and endothelial cells in the tumor vasculature with kinase inhibitors. *J Clin Invest.* 2003; 111:1287–1295. [PubMed: 12727920]
5. Erber R, Thurnher A, Katsen AD, et al. Combined inhibition of VEGF and PDGF signaling enforces tumor vessel regression by interfering with pericyte-mediated endothelial cell survival mechanisms. *FASEB J.* 2004; 18:338–340. [PubMed: 14657001]
6. Pietras K, Hanahan D. A multitargeted, metronomic, and maximum-tolerated dose •chemo-switch• regimen is antiangiogenic, producing objective responses and survival benefit in a mouse model of cancer. *J Clin Oncol.* 2005; 23:939–952. [PubMed: 15557593]
7. Lam JS, Shvarts O, Leppert JT, Figlin RA, Belldegrun AS. Renal cell carcinoma 2005: new frontiers in staging, prognostication and targeted molecular therapy. *J Urol.* 2005; 173:1853–1862. [PubMed: 15879764]
8. Bayer Healthcare Pharmaceuticals, Inc. Sorafenib [package insert]. Emeryville, CA: 2009. http://berlex.bayerhealthcare.com/html/products/pi/Nexavar_PI.pdf.
9. Pfizer Labs. Sunitinib [package insert]. New York, NY: 2008. <http://labeling.pfizer.com/ShowLabeling.aspx?id=607>.
10. GlaxoSmithKline. Pazopanib [package insert]. Research Triangle Park, NC: 2009. http://us.gsk.com/products/assets/us_votrient.pdf.
11. Escudier B, Pluzanska A, Koralewski P, et al. Bevacizumab plus interferon alfa-2a for treatment of metastatic renal cell carcinoma: a randomised, double-blind phase III trial. *Lancet.* 2007; 370:2103–2111. [PubMed: 18156031]
12. Hudes G, Carducci M, Tomczak P, et al. Temsirolimus, interferon alfa, or both for advanced renal-cell carcinoma. *N Engl J Med.* 2007; 356:2271–2281. [PubMed: 17538086]
13. Wyeth Pharmaceuticals, Inc. Temsirolimus [package insert]. Philadelphia, PA: 2008. <http://www.wyeth.com/content/showlabeling.asp?id=490>.
14. Rini BI, Michaelson MD, Rosenberg JE, et al. Antitumor activity and biomarker analysis of sunitinib in patients with bevacizumab-refractory metastatic renal cell carcinoma. *J Clin Oncol.* 2008; 26:3743–3748. [PubMed: 18669461]
15. Shepard DR, Rini BI, Garcia JA, et al. A multicenter prospective trial of sorafenib in patients (pts) with metastatic clear cell renal cell carcinoma (mccRCC) refractory to prior sunitinib or bevacizumab. *J Clin Oncol (Meeting Abstracts).* 2008; 26
16. Di Lorenzo G, Carteni G, Autorino R, et al. Phase II study of sorafenib in patients with sunitinib-refractory metastatic renal cell cancer. *J Clin Oncol.* 2009; 27:4469–4474. [PubMed: 19652053]

17. Rini BI, Wilding G, Hudes G, et al. Phase II study of axitinib in sorafenib-refractory metastatic renal cell carcinoma. *J Clin Oncol*. 2009; 27:4462–4468. [PubMed: 19652060]
18. Novartis Pharma Stein AG. Everolimus [package insert]. Stein, Switzerland: 2009. <http://www.pharma.us.novartis.com/product/pi/pdf/afinitor.pdf>.
19. National Institutes of Health. A randomized trial of temsirolimus versus sorafenib as second-line therapy in patients with advanced renal cell carcinoma who have failed first-line sunitinib therapy. Protocol: (NCT00474786). <http://clinicaltrials.gov/>.
20. National Institutes of Health: Axitinib (AG 013736) As second line therapy for metastatic renal cell cancer: Axis trial. Protocols: (NCT00678392). <http://clinicaltrials.gov/>.
21. Rini BI, Escudier B, Tomczak P, et al. Axitinib versus sorafenib as second-line therapy for metastatic renal cell carcinoma (mRCC): Results of phase III AXIS trial. *J Clin Oncol* (Meeting Abstracts). 2011; 29
22. Albert DH, Tapang P, Magoc TJ, et al. Preclinical activity of ABT-869, a multitargeted receptor tyrosine kinase inhibitor. *Mol Cancer Ther*. 2006; 5:995–1006. [PubMed: 16648571]
23. Wong CI, Koh TS, Soo R, et al. Phase I and biomarker study of ABT-869, a multiple receptor tyrosine kinase inhibitor, in patients with refractory solid malignancies. *J Clin Oncol*. 2009; 27:4718–4726. [PubMed: 19720910]
24. National Institutes of Health. An open-label, phase 2 study to evaluate the efficacy and tolerability of ABT-869 in subjects with advanced renal cell carcinoma (RCC) who have previously received treatment with sunitinib. Protocol: (NCT00486538). <http://clinicaltrials.gov/>.
25. Therasse P, Arbuck SG, Eisenhauer EA. New guidelines to evaluate the response to treatment in solid tumors. *J Natl Cancer Inst*. 2000; 92:205–216. [PubMed: 10655437]
26. O'Connor JP, Jackson A, Parker GJ, Jayson GC. DCE-MRI biomarkers in the clinical evaluation of antiangiogenic and vascular disrupting agents. *Br J Cancer*. 2007; 96:189–195. [PubMed: 17211479]
27. Thie JA. Understanding the standardized uptake value, its methods, and implications for usage. *J Nucl Med*. 2004; 45:1431–1434. [PubMed: 15347707]
28. Motzer RJ, Bacik J, Schwartz LH, et al. Prognostic factors for survival in previously treated patients with metastatic renal cell carcinoma. *J Clin Oncol*. 2004; 22:454–463. [PubMed: 14752067]
29. Bland JM, Altman DG. Survival probabilities (the Kaplan-Meier method). *BMJ*. 1998; 317:1572. [PubMed: 9836663]
30. NCI. Common Terminology Criteria for Adverse Events v3.0 (CTCAE). 2006. http://ctep.cancer.gov/protocolDevelopment/electronic_applications/docs/ctcae_v3.pdf.
31. Shargel, L.; Wu-Pong, S.; Yu, AB. *Applied Biopharmaceutics and Pharmacokinetics*. 4th edition. McGraw-Hill; 2005.
32. Wählby U, Jonsson E, Karlsson M. Comparison of stepwise covariate model building strategies in population pharmacokinetic-pharmacodynamic analysis. *AAPS PharmSci*. 2002; 4:E27. [PubMed: 12645999]
33. Motzer RJ, Hutson TE, Tomczak P, et al. Sunitinib versus interferon alfa in metastatic renal-cell carcinoma. *N Engl J Med*. 2007; 356:115–124. [PubMed: 17215529]
34. Motzer RJ, Escudier B, Oudard S, et al. Efficacy of everolimus in advanced renal cell carcinoma: a double-blind, randomised, placebo-controlled phase III trial. *Lancet*. 2008; 372:449–456. [PubMed: 18653228]
35. Izzedine H, Massard C, Spano JP, Goldwasser F, Khayat D, Soria JC. VEGF signalling inhibition-induced proteinuria: Mechanisms, significance and management. *Eur J Cancer*. 2010; 46:439–448. [PubMed: 20006922]
36. National Institutes of Health. Efficacy and tolerability of ABT-869 versus sorafenib in advanced hepatocellular carcinoma (HCC). Protocol: (NCT01009593). <http://clinicaltrials.gov/>.
37. Posadas EM, Tannir NM, Wong Y, et al. Phase II trial of linifanib in patients (pts) with advanced renal cell carcinoma (RCC): Analysis of pts receiving extended therapy. *J Clin Oncol* (Meeting Abstracts). 2011; 29

Figure 1. Best Percentage Change From Baseline in Tumor Size in Evaluable Patients Treated With Linifanib

Pre- and post-treatment target lesions were assessed by central imaging using RECIST.

Figure 2. Kaplan-Meier Curves of Progression-Free Survival and Overall Survival in Patients Treated With Linifanib

A. Progression-free survival (PFS) plot. B. Overall survival (OS) plot.

Figure 3. Progression-Free Survival and Overall Survival by MSKCC Risk Groups

A. Progression-free survival (PFS) plot. B. Overall survival (OS) plot. Abbreviations: MSKCC, Memorial Sloan-Kettering Cancer Center.

Table 1**Patient and Disease Characteristics**

Baseline Characteristics		All Patients, N=53
Median age, yrs (range)		61 (40–80)
Male, n (%)		42 (79)
ECOG PS, n (%)	0	19 (36)
	1	34 (64)
Histology, n (%)	Clear cell	43 (81)
	Non-clear cell	10 (19)
Number of prior systemic therapies, n (%)	1	26 (49)
	2	17 (32)
	>2	10 (19)
Type of prior systemic therapies, ^a n (%)	Cytokine ^b	12 (23)
	Sorafenib	10 (19)
	Temsirolimus ^c	2 (4)
	Bevacizumab	9 (17)
Response rate to prior sunitinib (%)		13.2

^a All patients had received prior sunitinib therapy: 28 in first-line, 15 in second-line, 8 in third-line, 2 in fourth-line. Other prior therapies included erlotinib (*n*=4), gemcitabine (*n*=2), vaccine (*n*=2), zoledronic acid (*n*=1), ABT-510 (*n*=1), atrasentan (*n*=1). Two patients received sunitinib retreatment as a separate line of therapy. Two patients received another line of treatment after sunitinib, but prior to linifanib; both had progressed on prior sunitinib within 100 days of the linifanib study per protocol.

^b Includes IL-2 (*n*=8), INFα (*n*=3), IL-2 plus INFα for (*n*=1).

^c One patient received temsirolimus in combination with bevacizumab.

Abbreviations: ECOG PS, Eastern Cooperative Oncology Group Performance Status.

Table 2

Efficacy Results

		All Patients, N=53	
Endpoints		Central Imaging	Site Assessment
Primary	ORR ^a , % [95% CI]	13.2 [5.5, 25.3]	22.6 [12.3, 36.2]
Secondary	PFS ^b , median months [95% CI]	5.4 [3.6, 6.0]	5.8 [3.9, 7.3]
	Number of events (%)	43 (81.1)	46 (86.8)
	OS, median months [95% CI]	14.5 [10.8, 24.1]	
	Number of events (%)	33 (62.3)	

^a All responses were confirmed at 2 visits >4 weeks apart.

^b TTP was the same as PFS.

Abbreviations: ORR, objective response rate; PFS, progression-free survival; TTP, time to progression; OS, overall survival; NR; not reached.

Table 3**Adverse Events**

Adverse Events	Grades 1 or 2, n (%) <i>N</i> =53	Grades 3 or 4, n (%) <i>N</i> =53
Treatment-Related^a		
Diarrhea	28 (52.8)	11 (20.8)
Nausea	27 (50.9)	3 (5.7)
Fatigue	26 (49.1)	13 (24.5)
Weight loss	23 (43.4)	1 (1.9)
Decreased appetite	20 (37.7)	3 (5.7)
Proteinuria	17 (32.1)	3 (5.7)
Vomiting	17 (32.1)	3 (5.7)
Hypertension	14 (26.4)	21 (39.6)
Rash	14 (26.4)	0
Hypothyroidism	13 (24.5)	0
Mucosal inflammation	12 (22.6)	0
Hand-foot syndrome ^b	11 (20.7)	12 (22.6)
Hematologic^c		
Anemia	11 (20.8)	0
Leukopenia	3 (5.7)	0
Lymphopenia	2 (3.8)	2 (3.8)
Thrombocytopenia	2 (3.8)	0
Polycythemia	1 (1.9)	0
Neutropenia	0	1 (1.9)
Serum Chemistry^c		
AST increased	9 (17.0)	1 (1.9)
ALT increased	8 (15.1)	1 (1.9)
Creatinine increased	6 (11.3)	0
Alkaline phosphatase increased	5 (9.4)	1 (1.9)
Bilirubin increased	4 (7.5)	1 (1.9)
Phosphorus decreased	4 (7.5)	1 (1.9)
Uric acid increased	4 (7.5)	2 (3.8)
Carbon dioxide decreased	3 (5.7)	0
Cholesterol increased	2 (3.8)	0
Glucose increased	2 (3.8)	0
Magnesium decreased	2 (3.8)	0

^a By >20% of patients with treatment-related Grades 1 or 2. There were no deaths due to treatment-related AEs.

^b Coded as palmar-plantar erythrodysesthesia.

^c Regardless of relationship to linifanib. Serum Chemistry AEs by 2 patients with Grades 1 or 2.

Abbreviations: ALT, alanine transaminase; AST, aspartate transaminase; WBC, white blood cell.