

Randomized, Phase 3 Study of Second-Line Tislelizumab vs Chemotherapy in Advanced or Metastatic Esophageal Squamous Cell Carcinoma, RATIONALE 302: Asia Subgroup

**Authors:** Sung-Bae Kim,<sup>1\*†</sup> Kuaili Zhao,<sup>2</sup> Ken Kato,<sup>3</sup> Chih-Hung Hsu,<sup>4</sup> Sheng Hu,<sup>5</sup> Feng Wang,<sup>6</sup> Takashi Kojima,<sup>7</sup> Young Saing Kim,<sup>8</sup> Eric Van Cutsem,<sup>9</sup> Jaffer A. Ajani,<sup>10</sup> Liyun Li,<sup>11</sup> Ningning Ding,<sup>11</sup> Aiyang Tao,<sup>11</sup> Lin Shen<sup>12</sup>

**Affiliations:** <sup>1</sup>Department of Oncology, Asan Medical Center, University of Ulsan College of Medicine, Seoul, South Korea; <sup>2</sup>Department of Radiation Oncology, Fudan Cancer Hospital, Shanghai, China; <sup>3</sup>Department of Head and Neck Esophageal Medical Oncology, National Cancer Center Hospital, Tokyo, Japan; <sup>4</sup>Department of Oncology, National Taiwan University Hospital, Taipei, Taiwan; <sup>5</sup>Hubei Cancer Hospital, Wuhan, China; <sup>6</sup>Department of Medical Oncology, The First Affiliated Cancer Hospital of Zhengzhou University, Henan Cancer Hospital, Zhengzhou, Henan Province, China; <sup>7</sup>Department of Gastrointestinal Oncology, National Cancer Center Hospital East, Kashiwa, Japan; <sup>8</sup>Department of Internal Medicine, Gachon University Gil Medical Center, Incheon, Republic of Korea; <sup>9</sup>Department of Digestive Oncology, University Hospitals Gasthuisberg Leuven and KU Leuven, Belgium; <sup>10</sup>Department of Gastrointestinal Medical Oncology, University of Texas MD Anderson Cancer Center, Houston, Texas, USA; <sup>11</sup>BeiGene Ltd, Zhongguancun Life Science Park, Beijing, China; <sup>12</sup>Department of Gastrointestinal Oncology, Key Laboratory of Carcinogenesis and Translational Research (Ministry of Education/Beijing), Peking University Cancer Hospital & Institute, Beijing, China

**Abstract:**

**Background:** In the global phase 3 study RATIONALE 302 (NCT03430843), tislelizumab demonstrated statistically and clinically significant improvement in overall survival (OS) versus chemotherapy (median OS 8.6 vs 6.3 months; HR 0.70; 95% CI 0.57, 0.85;  $P=0.0001$ ) in patients with advanced or metastatic esophageal squamous cell carcinoma (ESCC). Here, we report data from the Asia subgroup.

**Method:** Eligible patients who had disease progression after first-line systemic therapy were randomized 1:1 to receive tislelizumab 200 mg intravenously once every 3 weeks or chemotherapy (paclitaxel, docetaxel, or irinotecan) until disease progression, intolerable toxicity, or withdrawal. The primary endpoint was OS in all randomized patients (intent-to-treat population). The key secondary endpoint was OS in patients with PD-L1 Tumor Area Positivity Score\*  $\geq 10\%$ ; other secondary endpoints included progression-free survival (PFS), objective response rate (ORR), duration of response (DoR), health-related quality of life, and safety.

**Results:** Of the 512 randomized patients, 404 (79%) were enrolled from China, Taiwan, Japan, and Korea and constituted the Asia subgroup ( $n=201$  tislelizumab,  $n=203$  chemotherapy). At data cut-off (December 1, 2020), median follow-up was 6.9 months in the Asia subgroup. Median OS was 8.5 months with tislelizumab versus 6.3

months with chemotherapy (HR 0.73; 95% CI 0.59, 0.90). Median PFS was 1.5 months with tislelizumab versus 1.7 months with chemotherapy (HR 0.81; 95% CI 0.64, 1.02). Tislelizumab resulted in a higher ORR (20.4% [95% CI 15.1, 26.6] vs 9.4% [95% CI 5.7, 14.2]) and longer median DoR (7.4 vs 4.0 months; HR 0.42; 95% CI 0.21, 0.84) versus chemotherapy. In the safety analysis set (n=201 tislelizumab, n=191 chemotherapy), patients treated with tislelizumab had fewer treatment-related adverse events (TRAEs) (74.1% vs 95.3%), fewer  $\geq$  grade 3 TRAEs (19.4% vs 57.1%), fewer serious TRAEs (15.4% vs 20.9%), and a similar incidence of TRAEs leading to death (2.5% vs 2.6%) versus chemotherapy.

**Conclusion:** In the Asia subgroup, tislelizumab improved OS and tumor response versus chemotherapy as second-line treatment in patients with advanced or metastatic ESCC and showed a well-tolerated safety profile. These findings were consistent with published results in the overall population.

\*The TAP score methodology has been previously referred to as visually-estimated combined positive score (vCPS) and was previously presented at the American Society of Clinical Oncology 2021, June 4–8, 2021, ESMO World Gastrointestinal Congress 2021, June 30–July 3, 2021, and The Chinese Society of Clinical Oncology 2021, September 25–29, 2021