
Innovations and Challenges in Prostate Cancer: Summary Statement for the 6th Cambridge Conference

Philip W. Kantoff, Tomasz M. Beer, Anthony V. D'Amico, Robert S. DiPaola, Mario A. Eisenberger, Maha H. A. Hussain, William Kevin Kelly, Paul Mathew, Michael J. Morris, Charles J. Ryan, Howard M. Sandler, Ian M. Thompson and Peter R. Carroll

From the Lank Center for Genitourinary Oncology (PWK), Dana-Farber Cancer Institute (AVDA) and Department of Radiation Oncology, Brigham and Women's Hospital (AVDA), Boston, Massachusetts, Division of Hematology and Medical Oncology and Oregon Health and Science University Cancer Institute, Oregon Health and Science University (TMB), Portland, Oregon, Cancer Institute of New Jersey (RSDP), New Brunswick, New Jersey, Departments of Oncology and Urology, Johns Hopkins University (MAE), Baltimore, Maryland, Departments of Internal Medicine (Division of Hematology and Oncology) (MHAH) and Radiation Oncology and Urology (HMS), University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, Michigan, Department of Medical Oncology, Yale University (WKK), New Haven, Connecticut, M. D. Anderson Cancer Center (PM), Houston and Department of Urology, University of Texas Health Science Center at San Antonio (IMT), San Antonio, Texas, Genitourinary Oncology Service, Department of Medicine and Sidney Kimmel Center for Prostate and Urologic Cancers, Memorial Sloan-Kettering Cancer Center and Department of Medicine, Joan and Sanford E. Weill College of Medicine of Cornell University (MJM), New York, New York, and Departments of Medicine (CJR) and Urology, Program in Urologic Oncology, Urologic Outcomes Research Group (PRC), University of California-San Francisco Comprehensive Cancer Center (CJR), University of California-San Francisco, San Francisco, California

Key Words: prostate, prostatic neoplasms, clinical conference [publication type]

The Sixth Cambridge Conference on Innovations and Challenges in Prostate Cancer, a symposium held in Cambridge, Massachusetts, October 30 and 31, 2006, was convened to review and discuss new data and recommendations related to prostate cancer. The forum addressed promising agents in development for treatment and prevention, and current approaches and recommendations for assessing and treating early stage disease as well as patients with biochemical failure (increasing PSA), castration resistant nonmetastatic, castration resistant metastatic and taxane refractory metastatic disease. The conference format combined brief presentations with extended periods of discussion. The conclusions and recommendations are summarized in this article and presented in more detail in the individual reports that follow.

CHEMOPREVENTION

Prostate cancer chemoprevention first attracted increased interest with the completion of the first phase III clinical trial, the Prostate Cancer Prevention Trial, reported in 2003 with more than 18,000 patients. The trial was closed early because of evidence that a decrease in prostate cancer risk was seen with the administration of finasteride.¹ Although a significant reduction in cancers was seen, an increase in the number and proportion of tumors with Gleason scores of 7 to 10 led to initial concern with the use of the drug for this purpose. A recent analysis shed light on this paradox, finding that finasteride significantly improved the sensitivity of PSA and biopsy for overall cancer and high grade cancer.² The results of ongoing studies will ultimately help guide us in making a recommendation regarding the use of 5 α -reductase inhibitors as preventive agents. Vitamin E and selenium are now being assessed in an ongoing phase III study, the Selenium and Vitamin E Cancer Prevention Trial.

LOW RISK PROSTATE CANCER

Although curative therapy has been shown to decrease cancer specific and overall mortality for select men with prostate cancer,³ all available therapies may have a significant negative effect on patient health related quality of life.⁴ Furthermore, as more men are diagnosed with curable tumors at younger ages, the course of the disease is lengthening. Thus, patients and physicians must consider seriously the long-term implications of disease management decisions. Risk assessment at diagnosis based on available clinical data can help guide clinician-patient decision making with respect to the optimal treatment strategy. Patients with a PSA level of less than 10 ng/ml, a biopsy Gleason score of 6 and a clinical stage of T1c or T2a have typically been classified as low risk.⁵

On a national level the use of active surveillance (watchful waiting) decreased sharply among patients at low risk throughout the 1990s, even as low risk tumors accounted for a steadily increasing proportion of diagnosed tumors.⁶ Current results show that the proportion of prostate cancer patients assigned to the low risk group as defined has stabilized at just less than half of patients with newly diagnosed prostate cancer in the first 6 years of the new millennium. However, in this group there are significant and ongoing trends toward lower risk at presentation. Rates of active surveillance in patients at low risk have increased since the start of this decade but, despite the ongoing downward trends in risk, a period of surveillance rather than immediate treatment is likely underused as a first management option for many such men. Standardized methods for surveillance are needed. Studies that critically assess optimal methods of followup (intervals of assessment, PSA kinetics, optimal use of biopsy, etc) and, moreover, methods for selecting out those appropriate for active surveillance using clinical and molecular markers are greatly needed.

INTERMEDIATE AND HIGH RISK PROSTATE CANCER

The optimal treatment of intermediate and high risk prostate cancer is still debated. The subgroup of patients with a PSA level of greater than 10 ng/ml, a biopsy Gleason score of 7 or higher and clinical tumor category of T2b or T2c are at a higher risk for cancer specific death after standard treatment, suggesting that EBRT plus ADT or alternatively RP alone may be inadequate therapy for many men with such cancers. Patients with clinically organ confined disease may be considered for RP or high dose, well targeted radiation. Relapse rates can be significant and to our knowledge no evidence exists to date for combined modality treatment with surgery. Short-term ADT before surgery has not proved to be of clinical benefit. In contrast, dose escalation of EBRT appears to decrease relapse rates, although no evidence for a survival benefit yet exists. The addition of ADT to EBRT for patients at intermediate and high risk appears to be of benefit with respect to progression-free and overall survival in most studies. The optimal duration of this combination therapy is still under study. Whether higher doses of EBRT supplant the need for EBRT combined with ADT is not known. Chemotherapy has activity in those with prostate cancer but it is of uncertain clinical benefit. Ongoing trials are testing the role of chemotherapy in neoadjuvant and adjuvant settings with RP and radiotherapy.

INCREASING PSA AFTER LOCAL THERAPY

In patients with clinically localized prostate cancer who undergo focal treatment increasing serum PSA levels usually precede clinically detectable or metastatic disease by many years. Although many of these patients are unlikely to die of the disease, they may live with uncertainty and may be at risk for disease related morbidity.

In general increasing PSA values indicate recurrent disease after surgery. A PSADT that is short generally indicates clinically significant recurrence. A significant amount of work has been done in identifying relapsed patients at high risk for early metastases and prostate cancer specific mortality. PSA kinetics inform subsequent treatment strategies. Patients with low PSA values will have no detectable metastases. Local therapy after surgery, ie radiation, should be considered for select patients in the absence of metastases but the results are most satisfactory for those with later relapse and slowly increasing serum PSA levels, especially in those with positive surgical margins at initial surgery. The role of local salvage treatments for patients treated with primary radiation therapy has not been firmly established. Among the methods most often applied are surgery, cryotherapy and brachytherapy.

Patients with a Gleason score of 7 or less, who relapse after 2 years and who have PSADT longer than 10.0 months have a 3, 5 and 7-year probability of distant metastasis of 95%, 92% and 87%, respectively.⁷ Patients who have relapse before 2 years, have a Gleason score of greater than 7 and have PSADT shorter than 10.0 months have a 3, 5 and 7-year probability of distant metastasis of 54%, 30% and 21%, respectively.⁷ Although such patients are at higher risk for prostate cancer specific mortality, there is currently no consensus on the appropriate timing and form of systemic therapy for

these patients. Thus, encouraging participation in clinical trials is essential to improving patient care.

The use of bisphosphonates in hormone naive patients treated with ADT should be reserved for those with significant osteopenia or osteoporosis. No data are available to support their use as preventive agents against metastases and, moreover, long-term use may be associated with renal dysfunction, anemia and osteonecrosis of the jaw.

CASTRATION RESISTANT DISEASE

Castration Resistant Nonmetastatic Disease

In patients with an increasing PSA level after primary therapy a detectable PSA nadir is the earliest sign of impending androgen independent prostate cancer and a strong prognostic factor for death from prostate cancer. However, because of the low initial disease burden, the prognosis in these patients is better than the prognosis in patients with clinically advanced metastases.

Although a variety of therapies, eg secondary hormonal therapies, are used and are active for CRPC, adequately designed studies to detect a clinical benefit, ie a delay in the development of metastases or enhanced survival, have not been done. Ongoing randomized studies should enhance our understanding of the natural history of this disease state and future clinical trial design. One group reported that PSADT and PSA level predicted the time to clinical progression⁸ and, therefore, these baseline measures may be useful for selecting and/or stratifying patients in clinical trials. Clinical trials should be designed to include conventional study end points, such as time to clinical metastasis and survival. Such trials will provide the necessary information on the relationship between potential intermediate end points, such as PSA dynamics, other clinical and laboratory variables, and time to clinically evident metastasis and survival that can be used in clinical practice decisions and clinical trial design.

Castration Resistant Metastatic Disease

The only therapy that has proven to prolong survival in this clinical context is docetaxel based chemotherapy. Whether all patients should be treated up front with docetaxel as soon as they enter this clinical state remains uncertain. The consensus is that chemotherapy for patients with rapidly progressive or symptomatic disease should be initiated early. There is scant evidence that asymptomatic patients with slowly progressive or otherwise low risk disease are at any disadvantage by trying additional hormonal or investigational maneuvers before initiating chemotherapy. Patients who are candidates for chemotherapy should be registered for a variety of trials that are under way to test the value of adding other agents to docetaxel. The results of randomized trials are pending.

The use of bisphosphonates in this setting is based on 1 study that demonstrated a decrease in skeletal related events.⁹ The consensus of this group was that in the absence of a confirmatory study, the seemingly modest benefits associated with their use and the possibility of adverse effects, the indiscriminate use of bisphosphonates should be discouraged and further study identifying those most likely to benefit is needed. Moreover, the identification of more effective bone directed therapies is needed.

Taxane Refractory Prostate Cancer

In general CRPC is poorly controlled after resistance to front line chemotherapy with a time to progression of 3 months or less with second line therapy and a median survival of approximately 12 months. For patients presenting with taxane refractory disease it is appropriate to reassess disease progression, comorbidities, and palliative and therapeutic opportunities. This includes assessing whether a modified taxane regimen or reconsideration of secondary hormone deprivation is appropriate. For patients with small cell histological evolution studies have demonstrated a clinical effect with etoposide-cisplatin therapy.¹⁰

Mitoxantrone is currently considered a standard option for men with taxane resistant CRPC due to its pain palliation, although its activity is modest and there is no proven survival benefit. Combinations of taxanes and biologically active compounds are of considerable interest for treating CRPC and clinical studies in the second line setting are in progress. The results of a large, randomized study of sa-traplatin, an oral platin, as second line chemotherapy is pending analysis. Active agents must be identified. An alternate taxane or antitubular agent, or cyclophosphamide based therapy may be considered, although there is no evidence of a survival or quality of life benefit.¹¹

PROMISING NEW AGENTS IN DEVELOPMENT

Several new therapeutic strategies are being evaluated to treat prostate cancer, including a variety of bone targeted agents, immunotherapeutic agents and novel targeted systemic agents. Bone metastasis occurs in the setting of a complex system of multiple interacting proteins and pathways that regulate the actions of osteoblasts, osteoclasts, the bone microenvironment and the growth of metastatic tumors. New insights into the pathways that affect bone growth and remodeling have led to the development of several therapeutic agents, which are being assessed as therapies for metastatic disease and bone loss, including bisphosphonates, radiopharmaceuticals, RANK ligand signal inhibitors and several others. As mentioned, commonly used agent zoledronic acid, a bisphosphonate, has demonstrated a modest palliative effect but no antitumor activity or significant clinical benefit for prostate cancer in phase III randomized trials. Likewise radiopharmaceutical agents have shown some palliative effect but no clinical benefit for prostate cancer. It is recommended that future therapy development should be combination based, focusing on simultaneous targeting of multiple relevant pathways, most importantly the direct targeting of prostate cancer cells.

Immunotherapeutic agents attempt to use the immune response to block prostate cancer growth and kill residual cancers. Clinical trials are under way or being initiated for several vaccine approaches. APC8015 (Provenge®), a dendritic vaccine, has completed initial phase III testing in patients with hormone refractory prostate cancer. GVAX®, a tumor cell vaccine, is in phase III testing in patients with CRPC alone and in combination with docetaxel. Prostavac®, a poxvirus based vaccine, is also under study.

Several systemic agents are being investigated that target specific pathways in prostate cancer cell growth. Chief among them are cytotoxic agents, particularly microtubule inhibitors and agents that interfere with androgen signaling by reducing ligand or inhibiting signaling molecules. Candi-

dates in development include heat shock protein 90 inhibitors and histone deacetylase inhibitors. Another important pathway under investigation is the IGF-1/PTEN signaling pathway, which has a role in activating Akt to target mTOR. Several candidates are being evaluated in the clinic, including IGF-1R antibodies, phosphoinositide-3 kinase, Akt and mTOR inhibitors. Several agents that target other pathways shown to be important for solid tumor growth include platelet-derived growth factor inhibitors, represented by bevacizumab, vascular endothelial growth factor signaling inhibitors, represented by sunitinib and sorafenib, and thalidomide and lenolide, which are thought to block angiogenesis.

RECOMMENDATIONS

Certain consensus recommendations were proposed by the conference faculty to advance prostate cancer research and disease management, and improve patient care. 1) Develop methods for identifying patients appropriate for active surveillance using clinical and molecular markers. 2) Perform clinical trials to test novel therapies as adjuvants to surgery or radiation with the objective of improving disease-free and overall survival in patients with intermediate and high risk disease. 3) Perform studies to better define the natural history of castration resistant disease, and develop and fully support informative clinical trial designs suited to this patient population. 4) Use combination strategies for future therapy development, focusing on simultaneous targeting of multiple relevant pathways. 5) Consider new opportunities to test efficacy using long-term treatment strategies, including the use of agents that modulate metabolic processes that may affect multiple pathways.

Abbreviations and Acronyms

ADT	=	androgen deprivation therapy
CRPC	=	castration resistant prostate cancer
EBRT	=	external beam radiation therapy
PSA	=	prostate specific antigen
PSADT	=	PSA doubling time
RP	=	radical prostatectomy

REFERENCES

1. Thompson IM, Goodman PJ, Tangen CM, Lucia MS, Miller GJ, Ford LG et al: The influence of finasteride on the development of prostate cancer. *N Engl J Med* 2003; **349**: 215.
2. Thompson IM, Chi C, Ankerst DP, Goodman PJ, Tangen CM, Lippman SM et al: Effect of inasteride on the sensitivity of PSA for detecting prostate cancer. *J Natl Cancer Inst* 2006; **98**: 1128.
3. Bill-Axelsson A, Holmberg L, Ruutu M, Haggman M, Andersson SO, Bratell S et al: Radical prostatectomy versus watchful waiting in early prostate cancer. *N Engl J Med* 2005; **352**: 1977.
4. Wei JT, Dunn RL, Sandler HM, McLaughlin PW, Montie JE, Litwin MS et al: Comprehensive comparison of health-related quality of life after contemporary therapies for localized prostate cancer. *J Clin Oncol* 2002; **20**: 557.
5. D'Amico AV: Combined-modality staging in predicting prostate-specific antigen outcome after definitive local therapy for men with clinically localized prostate cancer. In: *Prostate Cancer: Principles and Practice*. Philadelphia: Lippincott Williams & Wilkins 2002; pp 254–268.

6. Cooperberg MR, Lubeck DP, Meng MV, Mehta SS and Carroll PR: The changing face of low-risk prostate cancer: trends in clinical presentation and primary management. *J Clin Oncol* 2004; **22**: 2141.
7. Eisenberger MA, Partin AW, Pound C, Roostelaar CV, Epstein J and Walsh P: Natural history of progression in patients with biochemical (PSA) relapse following radical prostatectomy: update. *Proc Am Soc Clin Oncol* 2003; **22**: 1527.
8. Stewart AJ, Scher HI, Chen MH, McLeod DG, Carroll PR, Moul JW and D'Amico AV: Prostate-specific antigen nadir and cancer-specific mortality following hormonal therapy for prostate-specific antigen failure. *J Clin Oncol* 2005; **23**: 6556.
9. Saad F, Gleason DM, Murray R, Tchekmedyian S, Venner P, Lacombe L et al: A randomized, placebo-controlled trial of zoledronic acid in patients with hormone-refractory metastatic prostate carcinoma. *J Natl Cancer Inst* 2002; **94**: 1458.
10. Papandreou CN, Daliani DD, Thall PF, Tu SM, Wang X, Reyes A et al: Results of a phase II study with doxorubicin, etoposide, and cisplatin in patients with fully characterized small-cell carcinoma of the prostate. *J Clin Oncol* 2002; **20**: 3072.
11. Hellerstedt B, Pienta KJ, Redman BG, Esper P, Dunn R, Fardig J et al: Phase II trial of oral cyclophosphamide, prednisone, and diethylstilbestrol for androgen-independent prostate carcinoma. *Cancer* 2003; **98**: 1603.