

- Cancer Chemother Rep* 1972, **56**, 769–777.
13. Kroner T, Obrecht JP, Jungi WF. Etoposide as single agent and in combination with cis-platinum for malignant lymphomas. *Cancer Treat Rev* 1982, **9**(Suppl A), 39–43.
 14. Schmoll H. Review of etoposide single-agent activity. *Cancer Treat Rev* 1982, **9**(Suppl A), 21–30.
 15. Rowe TC, Tewey LM, Liu LF. Identification of the breakage-reunion subunit of T4 DNA topoisomerase. *J Biol Chem* 1984, **259**, 9177–9181.
 16. van Maanen JMS, Retel J, deVries J, Pinedo HM. Mechanism of action of antitumor drug etoposide: a review. *J Natl Cancer Inst* 1988, **80**, 1526–1533.
 17. Cavalli F, Sonntag RW, Jungi F *et al.* VP-16-213 monotherapy for remission induction of small cell lung cancer: a randomized trial using three dosage schedules. *Cancer Treat Rep* 1978, **62**, 473–475.
 18. Roed H, Vindelov LL, Chistensen IJ *et al.* The effect of the two epipodophyllotoxin derivatives etoposide (VP16) and teniposide (VM-26) on cell lines established from patients with small cell carcinoma of the lung. *Cancer Chemother Pharmacol* 1987, **19**, 16–20.
 19. Miller JC, Loehrer PJ, Williams SD, Einhorn LH. Phase II study of daily oral VP-16 in refractory germ cell tumors. *Proc Am Soc Clin Oncol* 1989, **8**, 145 (Abstr.)
 20. Johnson DH, Greco FA, Strupp J, Hande KR, Hainsworth JD. Prolonged administration of oral etoposide in patients with relapsed or refractory small cell lung cancer: a phase II trial. *J Clin Oncol* (in press).
- Acknowledgement**—This study was supported in part by Bristol-Myers.

Eur J Cancer, Vol. 26, No. 7, pp. 821–823, 1990.
Printed in Great Britain

0277-5379/90\$3.00 + 0.00
© 1990 Pergamon Press plc

Pirarubicin in Advanced Breast Cancer: A French Cooperative Phase II Study

M. Spielmann, P. Kerbrat, T. Delozier, P. Fumoleau, A. Monnier, B. Chevallier, Ph. Bastit, M. Namer, A. Cattan, P. Lucas, H. Roche, Ch. Chevreau, M. Mousseau, B. Coiffier, M.J. Goudier and P. Herait

79 patients with advanced breast cancer were given Pirarubicin 20–25 mg/m² during 3 consecutive days every 3 or 4 weeks. 78 were evaluable for response (41 without previous chemotherapy and 37 with only one previous regimen). The overall response rate was 35% (95% CI 24–45) and the complete response rate was 8%. In previously untreated patients, the response rate reached 41.5%. The limiting toxicity was a non-cumulative granulocytopenia, sometimes severe at these high doses, with a prompt recovery. The non-haematological toxicities were mild, and included 13% with grade 3 alopecia.

Eur J Cancer, Vol. 26, No. 7, pp. 821–823, 1990.

INTRODUCTION

PIRARUBICIN (4'-O-tetrahydropyranyl-doxorubicin) has a higher preclinical therapeutic index than doxorubicin[1,2] with low cardiotoxicity in different animal models[3–5]. Pharmacokinetic studies show a half-life shorter than that of doxorubicin with an earlier cellular uptake and a higher cellular concentration of the drug[6,7]. Phase I studies have shown that the limiting toxicity was granulocytopenia and that the optimal dose was between 45 and 75 mg/m² every 3 weeks.

In Japanese phase II reports, the spectrum of activity of pirarubicin was close to that of doxorubicin with less toxicity, especially alopecia[8]. Mathe *et al.*[9] reported a response rate of 28% in 50 patients with advanced breast cancer, mostly heavily pretreated. They suggested that a 3 day schedule gave a better tolerance than bolus administration. We have done a cooperative phase II study of pirarubicin in non-heavily pretreated advanced breast cancer.

PATIENTS AND METHODS

Eligibility criteria

All female patients with a pathologically proven advanced breast cancer (metastatic and/or with locoregional relapse), aged under 70, had been enrolled if they had at least one measurable or evaluable site of evaluation (except isolated bone disease), and either no previous chemotherapy or only one previous regimen containing less than 300 mg/m² doxorubicin (or equivalent) at least 1 year before inclusion. Performance status (ECOG) under 2 was required, as well as white cell counts over $4 \times 10^9/l$, platelets over $120 \times 10^9/l$, serum bilirubin under 35 $\mu\text{mol/l}$, and serum creatinine under 135 $\mu\text{mol/l}$. All patients gave oral informed consent.

Exclusion criteria

Congestive heart failure, previous myocardial infarction, severe rhythm abnormalities or left ventricular ejection fraction

Table 1. Dose adjustment

Nadir value (day 8 or 15)		Value at 3 weeks*		Further dose (% starting dose)
PMN	Plt	PMN	Plt	
≥ 0.5	≥ 50	≥ 2.0	≥ 120	100%
—	—	1.5–1.9	75–119	75%
< 0.5	< 50	Any value	Any value	75%

* When PMN < 1.5 or Plt < 75 at day 21, the following cycle was postponed for 1–2 weeks until recovery.

PMN = polymorphonuclear cells and Plt = platelets.

(LVEF) below 0.50, severe current infection, previous history of another cancer, and symptomatic central nervous system localization were exclusion criteria. Furthermore, at least one site of evaluation had to be outside a field of previous radiotherapy.

Treatment

Pirarubicin was provided by the Laboratoire Roger Bellon, Neuilly, as lyophilized red powder reconstituted with sterile water at 1 mg/ml. The drug was administered on 3 consecutive days as an intravenous bolus followed by washing of the vein. The starting dose was 25 mg/m² per day in the first 22 patients, then reduced to 20 mg/m² per day because of severe haematological toxicity. The cycles were repeated every 3–5 weeks according to the haematological recovery and a dose adjustment was planned as shown in Table I. Treatment was discontinued in cases of stabilization after at least 3 cycles or of objective disease progression whatever the cycle, patient's refusal, or severe toxicity.

Assessments

The initial assessment included physical examination, blood cell counts and differential, blood chemistry, electrocardiogram, chest X-ray, abdominal ultrasound or computed tomography, radionuclide cardiography, and bone scan. Blood counts were done every week and biochemistry at each cycle. LVEF was checked at the cumulative dose of 300 mg/m², then every cycle.

Response and toxicity

All patients achieving 2 complete cycles were adequately evaluated for response. Patients having an objective progression before the second cycle were classed as failures. All patients were evaluated for toxicity. WHO criteria[10] were used to evaluate efficacy and toxicity, except cardiotoxicity, which was

Table 2. Characteristics of 78 patients evaluable for response

Age (yrs)	54	(30–70)
Time from diagnosis (yrs)	4.2	(0–26)
Post-menopause	69	(88%)
Previous therapies		
Surgery	64	(82%)
Radiotherapy	59	(76%)
Hormonotherapy	35	(45%)
Chemotherapy	27	(35%)
Adjuvant	10	(13%)
Palliative with anthracycline*	25	(32%)
Evaluable lesions (N = 115)		
Node	21	(27%)
Lung	23	(29%)
Liver	27	(35%)
Skin	16	(21%)
Breast	14	(18%)
Bone	9	(12%)
Others	5	(6%)

* Mean cumulative dose of anthracycline 271 mg/m² (95–300).

assessed by criteria of Alexander *et al.*[11]. Special attention was given to alopecia and patients with scalp-cooling systems were not evaluable, except in case of complete (grade 3) hair-loss.

Quality control

All clinical report forms were checked by the monitor of the Laboratoire Roger Bellon. Every 6 months a meeting of investigators took place to confirm observed responses, discuss equivocal data, and complete missing data.

RESULTS

Patients

From December 1986, to June 1988, 82 patients were enrolled. 3 were ineligible (1 with a non-cancer site of evaluation, 1 with a performance score of 3, and 1 with isolated bone metastases). 79 patients were evaluable for toxicity and 78 for efficacy.

41 patients were never given previous chemotherapy and 37 had been pretreated: 27 with adjuvant chemotherapy and 10 with only one palliative regimen (Table 2). Out of these 10, 6 had received an anthracycline. The mean number of involved organs per patient was 1.5 (1–3).

Treatment

Patients received an average of 4.7 cycles (2–13) and a mean cumulative dose of 274 mg/m² (120–825). The 25 patients previously treated with an anthracycline finally received a cumulative dose of 518 mg/m² (325–780) of anthracycline.

Efficacy

6 complete responses (8%) and 21 partial responses (27%) were observed, giving an overall response rate of 35% (95% CI 24–45%). There were 32 with no change (41%) and 13 with progressive diseases (17%), 5 early deaths and 1 non-lethal severe early haematological toxicity.

In previously untreated patients, there were 4 CRs and 13 PRs (41%, 95% CI 22–57), whereas in pretreated patients, there were 2 CRs and 8 PRs (27%, 95% CI 13–41%). 4 out of 6 patients previously given an anthracycline for advanced disease and

Correspondence to M. Spielmann.

M. Spielmann is at the Institut Gustave Roussy, Rue Camille Desmoulins, 94805 Villejuif, France; P. Kerbrat is at the Centre Eugène Marquis, Rennes; T. Delozier is at the Centre François Baclesse, Caen; P. Fumoleau is at the Centre René Gauducheau, Nantes; A. Monnier is at the Centre Hospitalier Général, Montbéliard; B. Chevallier and Ph. Bastit are at the Centre Henri Becquerel, Rouen; M. Namer is at the Centre Antoine Lacassagne, Nice; A. Cattani and P. Lucas are at the Centre Jean Godinot, Reims; H. Roche and Ch. Chevreau are at the Centre Claudius Regaud, Toulouse; M. Mousseau is at the Hôpital des Sablons, Grenoble; B. Coiffier is at the Centre Hospitalier Lyon-Sud, Pierre Bénite; M.J. Goudier is at the Centre Hospitalier Général, Lorient; and, P. Herait is at the Laboratoire Roger Bellon, Neuilly, France.

Table 3. Acute toxicities*

	WHO grade				
	0	1	2	3	4
Granulocytopenia (nadir) (n = 78)	15	4	12	21	26
Thrombocytopenia (nadir) (n = 77)	57	7	5	6	2
Anaemia (n = 77)	37	10	15	12	3
Nausea vomiting (n = 75)	27	23	12	12	1
Stomatitis (n = 75)	66	2	4	2	1
Diarrhoea (n = 75)	69	3	2	0	1
Infection (n = 78)	62	4	4	3	5†
Haemorrhage (n = 78)	76	0	0	0	2†
Alopecia (n = 73)‡	24	23	8	8	—

* n = total no. of evaluable patients. † related to severe haematological toxicity.

‡ Grades 2 and 3 alopecia were considered as severe (needing a wig).

having achieved a first response responded again to pirarubicin.

The response rate according to the site of disease was node 44%, skin 41%, breast 26%, lung 22%, liver 18%, and bone 11%.

The median duration of the responses was not reached at 12 months. CR occurred after 2–6 cycles (mean 4.3).

Acute toxicity

The limiting toxicity was granulocytopenia, which was maximal at day 15 and responsible for 2–4 early deaths (Table 3). 2 early deaths were obviously toxic (septic shock during aplasia) and 2 others were questionable because septic shock occurred after complete haematological recovery. Another patient died early from thromboembolism. All 5 patients with severe haematological toxicity had liver metastases. The maximal toxicity always occurred in the first cycle even without any dose reduction, suggesting a lack of cumulative toxicity.

Thrombocytopenia was mild except in patients with severe leucopenia. Anaemia, in exceptional cases, required transfusions and was mainly related to disease rather than treatment. Recovery was prompt since 61% patients gained a normal granulocyte count at day 21 and 83% at day 28, and 100% regained a normal platelet count at day 21.

The acute non-hematological toxicities were marginal. Alopecia was mild for an anthracycline with 13% complete and 13% partial hair loss; 26% of patients with partial or complete alopecia might have needed a wig. This toxicity did not increase with the number of cycles.

Cardiac toxicity

1 patient died after only 1 cycle and a total dose of 60 mg/m² from septic shock (after haematological recovery) with congestive heart failure and multivisceral failure. In the absence of necropsy, any responsibility of the drug cannot be assessed.

28 patients were evaluable for change in LVEF. Among these, 3 had a grade 3 toxicity (with decrease of 15–42% from control values of 0.37–0.45), without any clinical symptoms, but needing withdrawal of drug. These patients were given cumulative doses of anthracyclines of 225, 390, and 480 mg/m², respectively. 7 additional patients had a grade 2 toxicity (with decrease of 12–26% of initial value and control values of 0.49–0.70) and they could continue the treatment under repeated assessments which did not confirm toxicity[11].

DISCUSSION

Pirarubicin was effective in advanced breast cancer with a 35% response rate in 78 patients not heavily pretreated. The response rate in 41 patients without previous chemotherapy was 41% (95% CI 26–56%) and was therefore in the same range as that of doxorubicin[12–15, 17] or epirubicin [13,16,17].

The only limiting toxicity was granulocytopenia which may be severe at the dose of 60–75 mg/m² per cycle. These doses have to be considered as high doses for the drug and the dose of 50 mg/m² should be further evaluated for efficacy. Other toxicities were mild, especially alopecia since about 25% patients might need a wig. Cardiac toxicity cannot be evaluated in this small series of patients. Pirarubicin is a candidate for further evaluation in breast cancer, especially in terms of quality of life.

1. Umezawa H, Yamada K, Oki T. Comparative experimental studies on 4'-O-tetrahydropyranyl-adriamycin and adriamycin. In: Mathe G, De Jager R, and Maral R, eds. *Anthracyclines: Current Status and Future Developments*. New York, Masson 1983, 183–188.
2. Tsuruo T, Iida H, Tsukagoshi S, Sakurai Y. 4'-O-tetrahydropyranyl-adriamycin as a potential new antitumor agent. *Cancer Res*. 1982, 42, 1462–1476.
3. Dantchev D, Paintraud M, Bourut C, Pignot J, Maral R, Mathe G. Comparative experimental study and evaluation of the degree of cardiotoxicity and alopecia of twelve different anthracyclines using the golden hamster model. In: Mathe G, De Jager R and Maral R, eds. *Anthracyclines: Current Status and Future Developments*. New York, Masson, 1983, 25–36.
4. Domae N, Ando S, Kagawa D *et al*. Comparative studies of cardiomyopathy induced in rabbits by various anthracyclines and anthraquinones. *J Jpn Soc Cancer Therapy* 1984, 10, 304 (Abst p. 14–3).
5. Giovannini L, Bertelli AAE, Dell'Osso L, Romano MR, Mazzanti L, Bertelli A. Toxicological evaluation of aclacinomycin (ACM) and thepirubicin (THP) in rats. *14th Intl Cong Chemother Kyoto (Japan)* June 1985: 324 (Abst p. 18–32).
6. Majima H, Ohta K. Pharmacokinetic studies on THP-ADM (tetrahydropyranyl-adriamycin). *Jpn J Cancer Chemother* 1986, 13, 542–548.
7. Munck JN, Timus M, Bennoun M, Tapiero HJ. Plasma and cellular levels of adriamycin and 4'-O-tetrahydropyranyl-adriamycin in human. *Progress in Cancer Chemo-Immunotherapy; Proc Fr Jpn Conf Antibiotics in Tumor Pharmacol* Paris 5–6 Sept. 1983, pp. 55–58.
8. Saito T. Phase II study on tetrahydropyranyl adriamycin (THP) in solid tumor. *Jpn J Cancer Chemother* 1986, 13, 1060–1069.
9. Mathe G, Umezawa H, Brienza H *et al*. Pirarubicin (Phase I and II trial). *8th Intl Symp Fut Trends Chemother Tirrenia*, 28–30 March 1988: 69 (Abst).
10. Miller AB, Hoogstraten B, Staquet M, Winckler A. Reporting results of cancer treatment. *Cancer* 1981, 47, 207–214.
11. Alexander J, Dainiak N, Berger HJ *et al*. Serial assessment of doxorubicin cardiotoxicity with quantitative radionuclide angiography. *New Engl J Med*; 1979, 300, 278–283.
12. Henderson IC, Allegra JC, Woodcock T *et al*. Randomized clinical trial comparing mitoxantrone with doxorubicin in previously treated patients with metastatic breast cancer. *J Clin Oncol* 1989, 7, 560–571.
13. Hortobagyi GN, Yap H-Y, Kau SW, Fraschini G, Ewer MJ, Chawla SP, Benjamin RS. A comparative study of doxorubicin and epirubicin in patients with metastatic breast cancer. *Am J Clin Oncol* 1989, 12, 57–62.
14. Jones SE. Breast cancer. In: Jones SE, ed. *Current concepts in the use of doxorubicin chemotherapy*. Milano 1982, pp. 23–35.
15. Tormey DC. Adriamycin (NSC-123127) in breast cancer: an overview of studies. *Cancer Chemother Rep* 1975, 6/2, 319–327.
16. Armand JP, Hurlteloup P, Bastit Ph *et al*. A 3 arms randomized trial of anthracycline in breast cancer: single agent, 2 doses levels of combination chemotherapy. *Proc 4th Eur Conf Clin Oncol*, Madrid, 1–4 Nov. 1987: (Abst 399)
17. Brambilla C, Rossi A, Bonfante U, Ferrari L, Villani F, Crippa F, Bonadonna G. Phase II study of doxorubicin versus epirubicin in advanced breast cancer. *Cancer Treat Rep* 1986, 70, 261–266.

Acknowledgement—This study was supported by Laboratoire Roger Bellon, Neuilly sur Seine, France.