Real-World Progression Patterns in First and Second Lines of Systemic Therapy for Endometrial Cancer





Gabriela Abreu, PhD¹, Juliana Queiroz, MSc¹, Thiago Luiz Nogueira da Silva, PhD¹, Claudia Soares, MD, PhD¹, Patricia Menezes, MBA¹, Rosana Felice, MD², Mariano Carrizo, MD², Paula Scibona, MD³, Ventura A Simonovich, MD³, María C Riggi, MD³, José M Saadi, MD³, Florencia Cravero, MD³, Laura Jotimliansky, MD²

¹GSK, Rio de Janeiro, Brazil; ²GSK, Buenos Aires, Argentina; ³Hospital Italiano de Buenos Aires, Buenos Aires, Argentina





progressed after 2L Unadjusted median follow-up: 6.4 months

*Time from the first dispensed drug of the line of therapy (any systemic therapy, considering surgery or radiotherapy within a 90-day window before or after the systemic therapy start and end dates) to the progression (new systemic therapy, surgery, radiotherapy or death) after 1L and 2L.



Adjusted median represents patients who progressed, including censored time by loss to follow-up.





Background

- EC is ranked as the sixth most common cancer among women worldwide,¹ with increasing global incidence²
- Real-world data on disease progression for patients with EC,³ particularly in Latin America,⁴ are limited
- Investigating risk of progression using real-world clinical data is a valuable approach to addressing this gap
- Investigating disease progression can help contextualise the outcomes of trials in EC to **improve patient outcomes**



Patients with EC treated with systemic therapy demonstrated high progression rates following 1L and 2L treatment

Almost half of 1L and two-thirds of 2L progression events happened during the first year of treatment



The high rates of progression emphasise the need for more effective agents to prevent disease progression and improve outcomes in the 1L, given the extremely poor outcomes observed in the recurrent and 2L setting

Abbreviations

1L, first-line; BMI, body mass index; EC, endometrial cancer; ECHOS-A, Endometrial Cancer Health Outcomes Study; FIGO, International Federation of Gynaecology and Obstetrics; SD, standard deviation.

References

1. World Cancer Research Fund International. Available at: https://www.wcrf.org/cancertrends/endometrial-cancer-statistics/ (accessed 4 October 2023). 2. International Agency for Research on Cancer. Available at: https://gco.iarc.fr/tomorrow/en/dataviz/ bars?cancers=24&key=percent&show_bar_mode_prop=0 (accessed 4 October 2023). 3. Colombo N et al. Ann Oncol 2016;27:16–41. 4. Paulino E et al. JCO Glob Oncol 2020:6:1617-1630.

Acknowledgements

Medical writing support was provided by Pallavi Patel of Apollo, OPEN Health Communications, and was funded by GSK, in accordance with Good Publication Practice (GPP) guidelines (www.ismpp.org/gpp-2022).

Disclosures

This study was funded by GSK (study ID: 217348). The authors declare the following real or perceived conflicts of interest during the past 3 years in relation to this presentation: CS, PM, RF, MC and LJ are employees of, and hold stocks in, GSK. GA, JQ and TLNS are complementary employees of GSK and do not hold stocks or shares. MCR reports receiving speaker fees from GSK. PS, VAS, JMS and FC have no conflicts of interest to declare.

International Society for Pharmacoeconomics and Outcomes (ISPOR) | 12–15 November 2023 | Copenhagen, Denmark Presenting author: Gabriela Abreu, gabriela.x.abreu@gsk.com