Neuro-Oncology 17:v1–v9, 2015.
doi:10.1093/neuonc/nov206.16

Abstracts

ATCT-16. CODEL (ALLIANCE-N0577; EORTC-26081/2208; NRG-1071; NCIC-CEC-2): PHASE III RANDOMIZED STUDY OF RT VS. RT + TMZ VS. TMZ FOR NEWLY DIAGNOSED 1p/19q-CODELETED ANAPLASTIC GLIOMA. ANALYSIS OF PATIENTS TREATED ON THE ORIGINAL PROTOCOL DESIGN

Kurt Jaeckle[1], Michael Vogelbaum[2], Karla Ballman[3,4], Caterina Giannini[4], Kenneth Aldape[5], Jane Cerhan[4], Jeffrey Wefel[6], Donald Nordstrom[7], Robert Jenkins[4], Martin Klein[8], Jeffrey Raizer[9], Martin van den Bent[10], Wolfgang Wick[11], Patrick Flynn[12], Frederick Dhermain[13], Gregory Cairncross[14], and Paul Brown[4]; [1]Mayo Clinic, Jacksonville, FL, USA; [2]Cleveland Clinic Neurological Institute, Cleveland, OH, USA; [3]Alliance Statistics and Data Center, Rochester, MN, USA; [4]Mayo Clinic, Rochester, MN, USA; [5]Toronto General Hospital, Princess Margaret Cancer Centre, Toronto, ON, Canada; [6]MD Anderson Cancer Center, Houston, TX, USA; [7]Abben Cancer Center, Spencer, IA, USA; [8]VU University Medical Center, Amsterdam, The Netherlands; [9]Northwestern University, Chicago, IL, USA; [10]Rotterdam Cancer Center, Rotterdam, The Netherlands; [11]University of Heidelberg, Heidelberg, Germany; [12]Park Nicollet Medical Center, Saint Louis Park, MN, USA; [13]Institut Gustave Roussy, Villejuif CEDEX, France; [14]Foothills Medical Centre, Calgary, AB, Canada

BACKGROUND: CODEL originally included an RT-alone control arm. Following EORTC 26951/RTOG 9402 reports, the original study closed for revision of the control arm to RT + adjuvant PCV. We performed an analysis of pts randomized per the original CODEL design. METHODS: Adults (>18 yr) with newly diagnosed, 1p/19q codeleted WHO grade III anaplastic glioma were randomized to RT (5940 cGy) (Arm A); vs. RT + TMZ (75mg/M2/D +RT; 150-200mg/M2, D1-5 q28D X 6-12 (Arm B); vs. TMZ (150-200 mg/M2, D1-5q28D X 12 (Arm C). Stratification included Age (< or > 50); Group [North America vs EORTC]; and ECOG status (0-1 vs. 2). Primary endpoint was overall survival. PFS was compared by logrank test (Arm C vs. Arms A + B (pooled). RESULTS: 36 pts (N.A.-53%, EORTC-47%) were randomized (Arm A-12; Arm B-12; Arm C-12), with balance for age, ECOG status, and extent of resection. Grade 3+ toxicity occurred in 25%, 41% and 31% (Arms A, B and C, respectively). No pts withdrew or died from toxicity. All treatment cycles were completed in 92%, 83% and 58% (Arms A, B and C, respectively). Progression during treatment occurred in 5/12 (42%) TMZ alone pts, vs. 0/24 (0%) on RT arms. With median follow-up of 3.4 yrs, 6/12(50%) of the TMZ alone pts have progressed, vs. 2/24(8%) on RT Arms ($p = 0.002$); death from disease progression occurred in 5%(3/12) TMZ alone pts vs. 4% (1/24) on RT Arms (A-0; B-1). Median PFS was 2.5 yr for TMZ alone vs. not reached for pts on RT Arms. CONCLUSIONS: In this preliminary analysis, patients receiving TMZ alone experienced shorter PFS and time to death from tumor progression, compared to those receiving RT alone or RT + TMZ. Accordingly, the Alliance DSMC recommended closure of Arm C. CODEL has been revised to a two-arm comparison of RT + adjuvant PCV vs. RT + concomitant/adjuvant TMZ. (Support: U10CA180821)