

# Regorafenib in glioblastoma recurrence: how to deal with conflicting 'real-life' experiences?

Martin Glas and Sied Kebir 

To date, treatment options for glioblastoma recurrence are scarce. Based on efficacy data from randomized clinical trials, the nitrosourea compound CCNU (lomustine) is considered standard treatment after temozolomide failure. Treatment with lomustine in recurrent glioblastoma yields median overall survival (mOS) ranging from 8.6–9.8 months and median progression-free survival (mPFS) from 1.5–2.7 months.<sup>1–3</sup> In a recently published open-label, randomized, phase II trial (REGOMA trial) of patients with first glioblastoma recurrence, regorafenib was found superior to lomustine with mOS of 7.4 months in regorafenib-treated patients as opposed to 5.6 months in lomustine treated patients.<sup>4</sup> The radiographically assessed disease control rate (defined as complete/partial response or stable disease) was 44% in the regorafenib arm and 20% in the lomustine control arm. A yet unanswered question is whether regorafenib is going to replace lomustine as standard treatment should regorafenib superiority be confirmed in a planned randomized phase III trial.

In several countries, regorafenib is already being used in individual cases on a compassionate-use basis in patients with high-grade glioma. In a recently published single-center experience of regorafenib treatment in recurrent high-grade astrocytoma, we reported our experience with regorafenib under 'real-life' conditions.<sup>5</sup> Almost concurrently, another group reported on their experience with regorafenib for recurrent high-grade glioma.<sup>6</sup> Even though the sample size was rather low (total  $n = 30$ ), the shallow response rate to regorafenib treatment was noteworthy. Furthermore, in most patients, an increase in tumor size up to fivefold in follow-up MR imaging 8 weeks from baseline was evident. These findings stand in contrast to the published results from the phase II REGOMA trial. It also struck

us to find an unusually high incidence of Common Toxicity Criteria (CTC) grade 3 adverse events to regorafenib in all but one patient. Among the most debilitating adverse events was a case of hand-foot-syndrome that did not respond to topical dermatological treatment, and eventually led to the requirement for management with opioid analgesics to alleviate patient's symptoms. On the grounds of these preliminary results and the like from a few other centers,<sup>6</sup> one is tempted to call into question how to deal with these unfavorable 'real-life' data in light of a positive randomized phase II trial. Admittedly, there are some limitations to our findings for they merely rely on retrospective observations in a small number of patients. Also, regorafenib was not used at first glioblastoma recurrence but at a more advanced stage of disease of recurrent high-grade astrocytoma of WHO grades III and IV. It is conceivable that regorafenib is active in early glioblastoma recurrence only as opposed to later relapses. Indeed, it is self-evident that findings from a prospective randomized trial make for a higher level of evidence than data derived from case series, which is why we still consider regorafenib in recurrent glioblastoma.

On the other hand, it is noteworthy that the mOS of the lomustine control arm (5.6 months) in the REGOMA trial was considerably lower than that in two other phase III trials (8.6–9.3 months) testing the same population,<sup>1,2</sup> which raises the question how representative the results of the REGOMA trial are. It is to be expected that personalized, targeted treatment will gain traction in the near future in the field of glioblastoma treatment, with the focus being placed on identifying possible responders on molecular or clinical grounds. It should be added that the diverging

*Ther Adv Med Oncol*

2019, Vol. 11: 1–2

DOI: 10.1177/  
1758835919887667

© The Author(s), 2019.  
Article reuse guidelines:  
[sagepub.com/journals-  
permissions](https://sagepub.com/journals-permissions)

Correspondence to:

**Martin Glas**  
Division of Clinical  
Neurooncology,  
Department of Neurology,  
University Hospital Essen,  
University Duisburg-  
Essen, Hufelandstr. 55,  
45147 Essen, Nordrhein-  
Westfalen, Germany

DKFZ-Division  
Translational  
Neurooncology at the  
West German Cancer  
Center (WTZ), University  
Hospital Essen, Essen,  
Germany, German Cancer  
Consortium (DKTK),  
Partner Site University  
Hospital Essen, Essen,  
Germany

West German Cancer  
Center (WTZ), University  
Hospital Essen, University  
Duisburg-Essen, Essen,  
Germany

[Martin.Glas@uk-essen.de](mailto:Martin.Glas@uk-essen.de)

**Sied Kebir**  
Division of Clinical  
Neurooncology,  
Department of Neurology,  
University Hospital Essen,  
University Duisburg-  
Essen, Essen, Germany

DKFZ-Division  
Translational  
Neurooncology at the  
West German Cancer  
Center (WTZ), University  
Hospital Essen, Essen,  
Germany, German Cancer  
Consortium (DKTK),  
Partner Site University  
Hospital Essen, Essen,  
Germany

West German Cancer  
Center (WTZ), University  
Hospital Essen, University  
Duisburg-Essen, Essen,  
Germany

mechanism of action of regorafenib (a multikinase inhibitor of oncogenic receptor tyrosine kinases) and lomustine (an alkylating agent) may be a reason for why regorafenib and lomustine might benefit different patient populations. To further elucidate this idea, it would be instructive to test regorafenib on glioma populations stratified by key molecular alterations.<sup>7</sup> In this context, it is interesting to observe that patients treated with regorafenib experiencing a possibly daunting adverse event, such as hand-foot syndrome, might derive benefit from regorafenib as opposed to those that do not. This is similar to what has been suggested in metastatic colon cancer treated with regorafenib.<sup>6,8</sup> In conclusion, the fundamental question of how to deal with negative 'real-life' data with positive results from a randomized trial at hand remains to be elucidated and may come up again after the next positive phase II/III trial.

#### Acknowledgements

None

#### Author statement

Conception and design: Martin Glas, Sied Kebir

Collection and assembly of data: Martin Glas, Sied Kebir

Manuscript writing: All authors

#### Funding

The author(s) received no financial support for the research, authorship, and publication of this article.

#### Conflict of interest statement

Prof. Glas reports personal fees and other from Roche, personal fees and other from Novartis, personal fees and other from Daiichi Sankyo, personal fees and other from Novocure, personal fees and other from Medac, personal fees and other from Merck, personal fees and other from Kyowa Kirin,

personal fees and other from Bayer, personal fees and other from Jansen-Cilag, personal fees and other from Abbvie, outside the submitted work.

#### ORCID iD

Sied Kebir  <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-0678-5852>

#### References

1. Batchelor TT, Mulholland P, Neyns B, *et al.* Phase III randomized trial comparing the efficacy of cediranib as monotherapy, and in combination with lomustine, versus lomustine alone in patients with recurrent glioblastoma. *J Clin Oncol* 2013; 31: 3212–3218.
2. Wick W, Gorlia T, Bendszus M, *et al.* Lomustine and Bevacizumab in progressive glioblastoma. *N Engl J Med* 2017; 377: 1954–1963.
3. Silginer M, Weller M, Stupp R, *et al.* Biological activity of tumor-treating fields in preclinical glioma models. *Cell Death Dis* 2017; 8: e2753.
4. Lombardi G, De Salvo GL, Brandes AA, *et al.* Regorafenib compared with lomustine in patients with relapsed glioblastoma (REGOMA): a multicentre, open-label, randomised, controlled, phase 2 trial. *Lancet Oncol* 2019; 20: 110–119.
5. Kebir S, Rauschenbach L, Radbruch A, *et al.* Regorafenib in patients with recurrent high-grade astrocytoma. *J Cancer Res Clin Oncol* 2019; 145: 1037–1042.
6. Tzaridis T, Gepfner-Tuma I, Hirsch S, *et al.* Regorafenib in advanced high-grade glioma: a retrospective bicentric analysis. *Neuro Oncol.* Epub ahead of print 23 April 2019. DOI: 10.1093/neuonc/noz071.
7. Sun Y, Zhang W, Chen D, *et al.* A glioma classification scheme based on coexpression modules of EGFR and PDGFRA. *Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A* 2014; 111: 3538–3543.
8. Kobayashi K, Kawakami K, Yokokawa T, *et al.* Association of hand-foot skin reaction with regorafenib efficacy in the treatment of metastatic colorectal cancer. *Oncology* 2019; 96: 200–206.

# DuEPublico

Duisburg-Essen Publications online

UNIVERSITÄT  
DUISBURG  
ESSEN

*Offen im Denken*

ub

universitäts  
bibliothek

This text is made available via DuEPublico, the institutional repository of the University of Duisburg-Essen. This version may eventually differ from another version distributed by a commercial publisher.

**DOI:** 10.1177/1758835919887667

**URN:** urn:nbn:de:hbz:464-20200527-143612-4



This work may be used under a Creative Commons Attribution - NonCommercial 4.0 License (CC BY-NC 4.0) .