CP, and 8 in D; 9 pts were men, mean age was 59.3 years, and 20 pts had stage-IV disease. No AMG 386-related DLTs or AMG 386-related serious adverse events (SAEs) were reported. AEs reported after administration of AMG 386 plus chemotherapy included diarrhea (n = 7), nausea (n = 7), neutropenia (n = 6), and thrombocytopenia (n = 6). Six pts experienced SAEs. Of these, 1 pt had a grade-3 thrombosis not considered related to AMG 386 or chemotherapy. No neutralizing antibodies to AMG 386 were observed. F, CP, and D co-administered with AMG 386 did not appear to affect the PK profile of AMG 386. AMG 386 had no apparent effect on the PK profile of F, CP, or D. Tumor response data are available for 15 pts. One pt receiving AMG 386 plus CP for bladder cancer refractory to gemcitabine/cisplatin had a complete response (CR) at week 8 (confirmed at week 16). One pt receiving AMG 386 plus F for pancreatic cancer had a confirmed partial response (PR) at week 12 and continues to do well at week 30. Stable disease in 12 pts and progressive disease in 1 pt were also observed.
Conclusions: Weekly AMG 386 in combination with F, CP, or D appeared to be well tolerated. An early CR in bladder cancer and PR in pancreatic cancer suggested promising antitumor activity of AMG 386 in combination with chemotherapy. Further clinical studies of AMG 386 in combination with chemotherapy and other targeted agents are warranted.

709 POSTER

Characterization of electrocardiographic QTc interval in patients (pts) with advanced solid tumors: pharmacokinetic–pharmacodynamic evaluation of sunitinib

C.L. Bello[1], L.S. Rosen[2], M. Mulay[2], A. Van Vugt[2], M. Dinolfo[2], S. Levine[3], X. Huang[1], H.J. Fingert[4], M. Toh[1], C.M. Baum[1]. *[1]Pfizer Inc, Global Research and Development, La Jolla, USA; [2]Premiere Oncology, Clinical Research Unit, Santa Monica, USA; [3]St. John's Hospital, Santa Monica, California, USA; [4]Pfizer Inc., Global Research and Development, New London, USA*

Background: Prolongation of the QTc interval occurs with various drugs and is associated with increased risk of arrhythmia, including torsades de pointes. This study examined the effect of therapeutic and supratherapeutic exposures of sunitinib (SU) on QTc interval changes in pts with advanced solid tumors. SU is an oral, multitargeted tyrosine kinase inhibitor of VEGFRs, PDGFRs, KIT, RET, and FLT3, approved for the treatment of advanced RCC and imatinib-resistant or -intolerant GIST.
Materials and Methods: In this single-blind study, pts with advanced solid tumors were evaluated by serial EKG assessments on day −1 (D −1), then received a single dose of moxifloxacin (internal positive control) on D1, a single dose of placebo on D2, followed by a 1-wk course of SU (loading dose on D3 and D9, maintenance dose of 50 mg/d on D4–8). Granisetron (G) was given prior to dosing on D3 and D9, to minimize risk of nausea/vomiting, and prior to placebo on D2, to assess its effect on QTc interval. Serial triplicate ECGs time-matched to those on D −1 were performed before and after drug/placebo administration on D1, 2, 3, 9. Fridericia's correction for heart rate (QTcF) was used for the primary analyses. Loading doses on D3 and D9 were administered to increase plasma levels ⩾2x those normally achieved with an oral dose of 50 mg/d.
Results: 24 pts were evaluable. Moxifloxacin produced a placebo-adjusted QTc prolongation in the expected range, validating the study design. G did not affect ECG profile and was generally successful in preventing confounding by nausea/vomiting. SU produced QTc interval changes that correlated with drug exposure. At the 24 h postdose timepoint on D3 (therapeutic levels), maximum QTcF (placebo-adjusted time-matched correction) was 9.6 ms (90% CI: 4.1–15.1). On D9 (supra-therapeutic levels), the maximum QTcF was 15.4 ms (90% CI: 8.4–22.4). No pts developed 'severe' QTc prolongation (⩾ CTCAE grade 3) or had QTc values >500 ms at any time during the study.
Conclusions: SU treatment was associated with dose-dependent QTc interval prolongation, but the clinical significance is unclear. No pt developed QTc prolongations considered severe or values >500 ms (⩾CTC grade 3) with either therapeutic or supratherapeutic exposures in this study.

710 POSTER

Assessment of renal function in patients with cancer

L. Barraclough[1], C. Field[2], R. Swindell[3], G. Wieringa[2], S.E. Davidson[1]. *[1]Christie Hospital, Clinical Oncology, Manchester, United Kingdom; [2]Christie Hospital, Biochemistry, Manchester, United Kingdom; [3]Christie Hospital, Medical Statistics, Manchester, United Kingdom*

Aim: To assess the validity of measured creatinine clearance and estimated glomerular filtration rates (GFR) against radio-isotope GFR in cancer patients undergoing chemotherapy or radiotherapy.
Method: Radio-isotope Tc^{99m} DTPA GFR results were reviewed from April 2005 to January 2007. Cases with 24 hour urinary collection for creatinine clearance (CrCl) measured within 4 weeks of the isotope GFR were identified from this group. The urinary CrCl and estimated GFRs from the Cockroft-Gault, Modification of Diet in Renal Disease (MDRD) 175 ID-MS version and the Wright formulae were compared with the isotope GFR. Pearson correlation coefficients and mean absolute percentage errors were calculated. The cases with an isotope GFR of <50 millilitres per minute (ml/min) were analysed and the sensitivity and specificity of each formula were calculated. The sensitivity was set at 95% in order to minimise the numbers of cases inaccurately being reported as >50ml/min. The specificity was reported with the sensitivity set at 95%.
Results: 367 cases were identified. The mean age was 55 years (range 20−85), 66 were male and 301 were female. 237 (65%) cases had a gynaecological malignancy. The mean normalised isotope GFR was 81 ml/min (range 22–171). The correlation coefficients of the isotope GFR to the urinary CrCl, Cockroft-Gault, MDRD and Wright formulae were 0.57, 0.62, 0.68 and 0.7 respectively. The mean absolute percentage error was 28 for the urinary CrCl, 24 for the Cockfroft-Gault, 24 for the MDRD and 19 for the Wright formulae. 39 cases were identified with a GFR of <50 ml/min. The specificity was 33%, 46%, 39% and 66% for the CrCl, Cockroft-Gault, MDRD and Wright formulae respectively.
Conclusion: The urinary CrCl measurement is the most unreliable method of renal assessment tested here. The Wright formula gives the closest estimate of the isotope GFR in comparison to the Cockroft-Gault and the MDRD formulae. We would recommend the use of the Wright formula in follow up assessment of renal function during radiotherapy and chemotherapy after initial assessment with an isotope GFR.

711 POSTER

Sunitinib (SU) plus docetaxel (D) in patients (pts) with advanced solid tumors: a phase I dose-escalation and pharmacokinetic (PK) study

A. Traynor[1], A. Sandler[2], J.H. Schiller[3], J. Ilagan[4], K. Harper[5], W. VerMeulen[6], G. Liu[1], L. Tye[4], R. Chao[4], F. Robert[5]. *[1]University of Wisconsin, Paul P Carbone Comprehensive Cancer Center, Madison, USA; [2]Vanderbilt University Medical Center, Division of Hematology/Oncology, Nashville, USA; [3]UT Southwestern, Division of Hematology and Oncology, Dallas, USA; [4]Pfizer Inc, Global Research and Development, La Jolla, USA; [5]University of Alabama at Birmingham, Comprehensive Cancer Center, Birmingham, USA; [6]Vanderbilt Ingram Cancer Center, Vanderbilt University Medical Center, Nashville, USA*

Background: SU is an oral, multitargeted tyrosine kinase inhibitor of VEGFRs, PDGFRs, KIT, RET, and FLT3, approved multinationally for the treatment of advanced RCC and imatinib-resistant or -intolerant GIST. In a mouse xenograft model of breast cancer, SU enhanced the antitumor activity of D. This study was designed to assess the maximum tolerated doses (MTDs), PK profile and overall safety of SU administered in combination with D in pts with advanced solid tumors. Preliminary efficacy data were also collected.
Materials and Methods: This is an ongoing multicenter, open-label, phase I, dose-finding study of SU+D in pts with advanced solid tumors. Successive cohorts of pts were to receive oral SU at 25, 37.5, or 50 mg daily on a 6 wk cycle (4 wks on followed by 2 wks off treatment; 4/2 schedule) or 3 wk cycle (2 wks on followed by 1 wk off treatment; 2/1 schedule) in combination with IV D at 60 or 75 mg/m^2 every 21 days (q21d). The MTD was defined as the highest dose at which 0 of 3 or 1 of 6 pts encountered dose-limiting toxicities (DLTs) during cycle 1. Safety/tolerability were assessed by AEs and clinical laboratory analyses. Antitumor activity was assessed by CT or MRI scans and objective response determined by RECIST.
Results: 44 pts were enrolled as of Feb 2007, including 11 with mRCC and 15 with NSCLC. 10 pts received SU on the 4/2 schedule and 34 on the 2/1 schedule. On the 4/2 schedule, 2 DLTs were observed at D 60 mg/m^2/37.5 mg SU: G3 bilateral weakness and febrile neutropenia. On the 2/1 schedule, neutropenia (with or without fever; maximum G4) was the most commonly observed DLT (n = 5) occurring at the following dose levels: D 60 mg/m^2/25 mg SU (n = 2/9), D 75 mg/m^2/50 mg SU (n = 2/2) and D 75 mg/m^2/37.5 mg SU (n = 1/17), and was manageable/reversible. Other DLTs included: G3 GI hemorrhage (n = 1). The MTDs were SU 25 mg and D 60 mg/m^2 with the 4/2 schedule and SU 37.5 mg and D 75 mg/m^2 with the 2/1 schedule. Most frequently observed G3/4 adverse events on the 2/1 schedule included: fatigue (18/0%), neutropenia (12/47%), diarrhea (6/0%), stomatitis/oral discomfort (6/0%), and nausea (3/0%). The PK analysis is ongoing for pts receiving D 75 mg/m^2 and SU 37.5 mg on the 2/1 schedule.
Conclusions: The combination of oral SU 37.5 mg/day on the 2/1 schedule with D 75 mg/m^2 IV q21d has a manageable safety profile and was selected for further study in pts with advanced solid tumors. PK and preliminary efficacy analyses are ongoing to support these dosing combinations.