Advancing Melanoma Clinical Trials:
Overcoming Challenges and Enhancing Protocols

INGENŪ CRO

Introduction

Melanoma is a severe form of skin cancer originating from the malignant transformation of melanocytes, the cells responsible for producing the pigment melanin in the epidermis. Unlike other more common types of skin cancer, melanoma is particularly aggressive due to its high potential to metastasize to distant organs.

Typically, melanoma presents as a new or changing mole on the skin, which may display one or more of the ABCDE characteristics: Asymmetry, Border irregularity, Color variation, Diameter greater than 6 millimeters, and Evolution in shape, size, or color. While most melanomas are black or brown, they can also appear in a range of other colors including skin-colored, pink, red, purple, blue, or white, complicating early recognition (Ahmed et al., 2020).

Melanoma is categorized into several subtypes:

1. Superficial Spreading Melanoma:
The most common subtype, accounting for approximately 70% of cases. It typically spreads horizontally across the skin before invading deeper layers.

2. Nodular Melanoma:
Known for its aggressive behavior, this subtype grows more rapidly in depth, often without a preceding horizontal growth phase.

3. Lentigo Maligna Melanoma:
Commonly found in older adults, this subtype develops in areas of long-term sun exposure, like the face, and has a slower growth rate.

4. Acral Lentiginous Melanoma:
Less common and more frequently observed in individuals with darker skin, this subtype appears on the palms, soles, or under the nails.

iNGENŪ CRO

Book a Discovery Call to learn how iNGENū can deliver high-quality, cost-efficient, FDA-compliant research for your next clinical trial

Why Choose iNGENū CRO?

iNGENū is the FDA-centric Australian CRO championing disruptive, innovative biotech firms. We are physician-led, providing access to the full spectrum of clinical and non-clinical research services.

Local Trials, Global Approvals

Australian expertise combined with direct FDA submission capabilities, offering a streamlined path for global approval.

Disciplined, Cost-Efficient Execution

Every dollar is strategically allocated, eliminating unnecessary costs while maintaining the highest quality.

Australian Headquartered, Asia-Pacific Reach

Access high-quality trials in the Asia-Pacific region, enhancing speed and scalability.

Expertise From the Start

Engage directly with our team of highly qualified doctors and PhD scientists from the outset.

Ready to discuss your Clinical Trial?
For further information on how iNGENū can assist you to conduct your clinical trial, book a Discovery Call with one of our Advisors.

Historical Perspective and Evolution of Understanding

Historical Perspectives

Melanoma has been recognized as a distinct form of cancer since the early 19th century, first identified by French physician René Laennec. Throughout much of the 20th century, it was considered a rare but deadly skin cancer with limited treatment options. Early treatment strategies were largely surgical, involving wide excision of the tumor to prevent its spread.

Significant advancements in understanding melanoma occurred in the latter half of the 20th century with the introduction of immunohistochemistry. This technology enabled the identification of melanoma-specific markers such as S-100, HMB-45, and Melan-A, leading to more accurate diagnoses. The link between ultraviolet (UV) radiation and melanoma development was established during this time, prompting public health initiatives to reduce sun exposure and increase awareness of melanoma signs.

In the 21st century, research in molecular biology and genetics revolutionized melanoma treatment. The identification of mutations in the BRAF gene, found in about 50% of melanomas, led to the development of targeted therapies like BRAF inhibitors. These targeted treatments, along with the advent of immune checkpoint inhibitors such as pembrolizumab and nivolumab, have dramatically changed the management of advanced melanoma, improving survival rates and offering new hope to patients (Rastrelli et al., 2014).

Contributing Factors

- **Biological Factors:** Genetic predisposition plays a crucial role in melanoma risk. Mutations in genes such as BRAF, NRAS, and CDKN2A are significant contributors to melanoma pathogenesis. Individuals with familial atypical multiple mole melanoma syndrome (FAMMM) are at a higher risk due to inherited mutations in CDKN2A. A personal or family history of melanoma or other skin cancers also increases risk.
- **Environmental Factors:** The primary environmental risk factor for melanoma is exposure to ultraviolet (UV) radiation from sunlight and tanning beds. UV radiation can directly damage DNA in melanocytes, leading to mutations that drive cancer development. The intensity and frequency of UV exposure, especially during childhood and adolescence, significantly impact melanoma risk. Geographical location plays a role as well, with higher incidence rates in regions with intense UV radiation, such as Australia, New Zealand, and southern US.
- **Psychological Factors:** Although the direct impact of psychological factors on melanoma development is less well-documented, behaviors related to sun exposure, like tanning habits and sun protection use, are influenced by psychological attitudes and social norms.

Prevalence and Analysis

Prevalence and Trend Analysis

- Melanoma is one of the most rapidly increasing cancers in terms of incidence, particularly in populations with lighter skin. According to the American Cancer Society, it is estimated that approximately 99,780 new cases of melanoma will be diagnosed in the United States in 2023, with about 7,650 deaths expected. Over the past decade, the incidence of melanoma has risen by approximately 1.4% annually. This trend is attributed to several factors, including increased UV exposure from sunbathing and indoor tanning, as well as improved detection methods leading to higher diagnosis rates.
- From 2013 to 2023, data shows a steady increase in melanoma cases, particularly among older adults. This trend is concerning, as it indicates that despite increased public awareness and preventative measures, UV exposure remains a significant risk factor. Projections for the next decade suggest that the incidence of melanoma will continue to rise, particularly among the aging population, who are more likely to have had prolonged sun exposure over their lifetimes. Advances in screening and early detection are expected to improve survival rates, but the burden of the disease will likely grow, necessitating continued research and public health efforts.

Market Analysis

- The treatment landscape for melanoma has undergone significant changes in recent years, largely due to the introduction of targeted therapies and immunotherapies.
- As of 2023, the global melanoma treatment market was valued at approximately $4.5 billion, with expectations to reach $7.9 billion by 2033. This growth is driven by several factors, including the increasing incidence of melanoma, the ongoing development of new therapies, and the expansion of treatment indications to earlier stages of the disease.
- Immunotherapies, such as checkpoint inhibitors, have become a cornerstone of advanced treatment, contributing significantly to market growth. Additionally, targeted therapies that inhibit BRAF and MEK mutations have also expanded treatment options, particularly for patients with specific genetic mutations.
- The market for melanoma treatment is expected to continue growing, driven by ongoing research and development efforts, as well as the potential for new treatment modalities. The high cost of these therapies and the increasing number of patients diagnosed with melanoma will likely contribute to the expansion of the market, though cost containment and access to these therapies remain important considerations.

Insights into the Melanoma Treatment Market

Key Drugs with Highest Earning Potential

The melanoma treatment market is dominated by a few key drugs, which have demonstrated significant clinical efficacy and market success. These include:

Drug Name	Estimated Revenue (2023)	Company	Class
Keytruda (pembrolizumab)	$17.2 billion	Merck & Co.	PD-1 inhibitor
Opdivo (nivolumab)	$8.2 billion	Bristol-Myers Squibb	PD-1 inhibitor
Tafinlar (dabrafenib)	$2.0 billion	Novartis	BRAF inhibitor
Mekinist (trametinib)	$1.9 billion	Novartis	MEK inhibitor

These drugs have not only improved patient outcomes but also generated substantial revenue for their manufacturers, reflecting their importance in the current melanoma treatment landscape. The continued success of these drugs in clinical practice and the potential for expanded indications will likely sustain their market dominance in the coming years.

Controversy in the Market for Melanoma

Yervoy (Ipilimumab)

- Yervoy (Ipilimumab) is a significant drug in the treatment of melanoma and is often mentioned alongside other top-grossing immunotherapies like Keytruda and Opdivo. Yervoy, developed by Bristol-Myers Squibb, was one of the first immune checkpoint inhibitors approved for melanoma, specifically targeting the CTLA-4 protein to boost the immune system's response against cancer cells.
- While Yervoy is important in melanoma treatment, its annual revenue is generally lower than that of Keytruda and Opdivo. This is partly because Yervoy is often used in combination with other drugs like Opdivo rather than as a monotherapy, which can influence its standalone revenue.

Diagnostic Codes and Criteria

ICD-11 Code: 2C3A.0

Primary Melanoma: Melanoma is a malignant tumor originating from atypical melanocytes, which are the pigment-producing cells found primarily in the skin. These melanocytes can undergo malignant transformation, leading to the development of melanoma. The transformation often occurs in pre-existing melanocytic lesions, which can be either acquired or congenital.

Precursor Lesions:

- **Acquired Melanocytic Nevi:** Commonly known as moles, these are generally benign but can occasionally transform into melanoma, particularly if they undergo changes in size, shape, or color.
- **Congenital Melanocytic Nevi:** These are moles present at birth, which can vary in size and have a higher risk of transformation into **melanoma, especially the larger ones.**
- **Dysplastic Nevi:** Also known as atypical moles, these are larger than normal moles with irregular borders and varied color. They carry a higher risk of becoming melanoma and are often monitored closely for changes.

Histologic Variants of Melanoma:

Melanoma can present in several different histologic forms, each with distinct characteristics:

1. **Superficial Spreading Melanoma:** This is the most common type, accounting for about 70% of melanomas. It typically grows slowly across the top layer of the skin before penetrating deeper layers.
2. **Acral Lentiginous Melanoma:** This subtype is more common in people with darker skin and usually occurs on the palms, soles, or under the nails. It is often diagnosed later because it occurs in less visible areas.
3. **Nodular Melanoma:** This form is more aggressive, characterized by rapid vertical growth, and often presents as a bump that can be black, blue, red, or skin-colored. It is less likely to have a preceding radial growth phase, which means it can be more difficult to catch early.
4. **Lentigo Maligna Melanoma:** Often associated with chronic sun exposure, this subtype usually occurs in older adults on sun-damaged skin, such as the face. It starts as a slow-growing flat spot that can take years to become invasive.

Diagnosis of Melanoma

Key Drugs with Highest Earning Potential

Diagnosing melanoma involves a combination of clinical examination, imaging, and histopathological analysis. This detailed approach is based on the ICD-11 and current clinical practices:

1. **Clinical Examination**
   - **Visual Inspection and Dermoscopy:**
     - Dermatologists assess suspicious lesions using Asymmetry, Border Irregularity, Color Variation, Diameter, and Evolution.
     - **Dermoscopy:** This non-invasive imaging technique enhances the visualization of surface and subsurface structures in the skin, providing additional detail to help differentiate benign from malignant lesions.
   - **Patient History:**
     - **Risk Factors:** The clinician will review patient history for risk factors such as excessive UV exposure, family history of melanoma, and presence of multiple or atypical moles.
2. **Biopsy Techniques**
   - **Excisional Biopsy:** Preferred method where the entire suspicious lesion is removed along with a small margin of normal skin, providing a complete sample for histopathological examination.
   - **Incisional Biopsy:** Used when the lesion is large or located in an area where excisional biopsy might be difficult.
   - **Punch Biopsy:** A circular tool is used to remove a small core of tissue, including the dermis and epidermis, for examination.
3. **Histopathological Analysis**
   - **Microscopic Examination:**
     - The biopsy sample is examined under a microscope to identify the presence of atypical melanocytes.
     - **Histologic Subtypes:** The pathologist will classify the melanoma into one of the recognized histologic variants.
     - **Tumor Thickness (Breslow Depth):** The melanoma's thickness from the top layer of the epidermis to the tumor's deepest point.
     - **Clark Level:** Depth of invasion of melanoma into the layers of the skin, which is particularly useful in thinner melanomas.
     - **Ulceration:** Presence or absence of ulceration is noted.
   - **Molecular Testing:**
     - **BRAF Mutation Testing:** Commonly performed in patients with advanced melanoma to determine eligibility for targeted therapy with BRAF and MEK inhibitors.
     - **Other Mutations:** Testing for mutations in genes like NRAS and KIT may also be performed to guide treatment decisions.
4. **Staging**
   - **Sentinel Lymph Node Biopsy:** Recommended for melanomas thicker than 1mm or those with high-risk features to check if the cancer has spread to nearby lymph nodes.
   - **Imaging Studies:** CT Scan, MRI, PET-CT: Used to assess for distant metastasis, especially in advanced stages of melanoma.
   - **Staging Systems:** Melanoma is staged according to the TNM (Tumor, Node, Metastasis) system, which combines information on tumor thickness, ulceration, lymph node involvement, and distant metastasis.

Epidemiology

1. Age

- The incidence of melanoma increases with age, with a median age at diagnosis of approximately 65 years. In the United States, about 40% of melanoma cases are diagnosed in individuals aged 65 years and older. However, melanoma is also prevalent among younger adults, particularly those aged 25-29 years, where it ranks as one of the most common cancers. This age-related trend is attributed to cumulative sun exposure over time, as well as potential genetic factors that may predispose younger individuals to the disease (Rastrelli et al., 2014).
- The age-specific incidence of melanoma shows a distinct pattern, characterized by a low incidence in childhood, a sharp increase during young adulthood, and a continued rise with advancing age. The higher incidence in older adults is likely due to accumulated exposure to UV radiation, combined with an age-related decline in immune function.

2. Genetic Predisposition

- Approximately 5-10% of melanomas are hereditary, often linked to mutations in genes such as CDKN2A, CDK4, and BAP1. The CDKN2A gene mutation is particularly associated with familial melanoma, increasing the risk of developing melanoma at a younger age and the likelihood of developing multiple primary melanomas.
- Additionally, mutations in the BRAF gene, found in about 50% of cutaneous melanomas, are critical in the disease's pathogenesis. These mutations lead to the activation of the MAPK/ERK signaling pathway, promoting melanoma cell proliferation and survival. Understanding these genetic factors is essential for identifying high-risk individuals and developing targeted therapies that can improve treatment outcomes (Rastrelli et al., 2014).

3. Racial and Ethnicity

- The incidence of melanoma is markedly higher in individuals with lighter skin tones, particularly those of European descent, compared to those with darker skin tones. In the US, non-Hispanic white people have the highest incidence rates, while the rates are lower among Hispanic white people, and significantly lower among African American people and Asian individuals. This disparity is primarily due to differences in skin pigmentation, which affects the skin's natural protection against UV radiation.
- Melanin, the pigment responsible for skin color, provides some degree of protection against the harmful effects of UV radiation. Individuals with darker skin have more melanin, which helps absorb and dissipate UV radiation, reducing the risk of DNA damage that can lead to melanoma.

4. Geographic Location

- Melanoma is more common in regions closer to the equator, where UV radiation intensity is highest. Countries with high UV indices, such as Australia, New Zealand, and parts of the United States, including Florida, California, and Hawaii, report some of the highest melanoma incidence rates globally. In contrast, regions with lower UV exposure, such as Scandinavia and parts of Northern Europe, have lower incidence rates.
- The latitude gradient in melanoma incidence is well-documented, with higher rates observed in areas closer to the equator. This trend underscores the importance of sun protection measures, particularly in high-risk regions. Within countries, significant regional variations in melanoma incidence reflect differences in sun exposure habits, cultural behaviors, and awareness of skin cancer prevention.

Epidemiology (cont.)

5. Lifestyle and Behavioral Factors

- Intermittent, intense sun exposure, such as that experienced during outdoor recreational activities or sunbathing, is a well-established risk factor for melanoma. The use of tanning beds, which emit UV radiation, is also a significant risk factor, particularly among younger individuals. Studies have shown that indoor tanning before the age of 35 increases melanoma risk by up to 75%.
- Sun protection behaviors, including the use of sunscreen, wearing protective clothing, and seeking shade, are critical in reducing melanoma risk. Public health campaigns have successfully raised awareness of these protective measures, although adherence varies widely across different populations. Behavioral factors, such as the desire for a tanned appearance, cultural attitudes towards sun exposure, and perceived invulnerability to skin cancer, can impact the effectiveness of these campaigns.

6. Environmental and Occupational Factors

- Environmental and occupational factors also contribute to melanoma risk. Individuals who work outdoors, such as farmers, construction workers, and lifeguards, are at increased risk due to prolonged sun exposure. Additionally, certain chemicals and substances, such as arsenic, coal tar, and creosote, have been linked to an increased risk of melanoma and other skin cancers.
- Climate change and the associated increase in UV radiation levels due to ozone layer depletion may also influence future melanoma incidence. As UV radiation exposure increases, so too does the potential for DNA damage in skin cells, underscoring the need for continued research and public health efforts to mitigate these risks.

7. Immunological Factors

- The immune system plays a vital role in detecting and eliminating cancer cells, including melanoma. Immunosuppression, whether due to medical conditions such as HIV/AIDS, medications such as immunosuppressive drugs, or other factors, increases the risk of melanoma. Individuals with compromised immune systems are less able to repair DNA damage caused by UV radiation, leading to an increased risk of melanoma and other skin cancers.
- Moreover, immunotherapy has become a crucial treatment modality for melanoma, particularly in advanced stages. Drugs such as checkpoint inhibitors (e.g., pembrolizumab, nivolumab) work by enhancing the body's immune response against melanoma cells. The success of these therapies highlights the importance of the immune system in controlling melanoma progression (Ahmed et al., 2020).

8. Socioeconomic Factors

- Individuals with higher socioeconomic status are more likely to engage in outdoor recreational activities that increase UV exposure, such as skiing, sailing, and vacationing in sunny climates. They are also more likely to have access to healthcare services, leading to earlier detection and treatment of melanoma. Conversely, individuals with lower socioeconomic status may have limited access to healthcare, resulting in delayed diagnosis and poorer outcomes.
- Education and awareness of melanoma risk factors are also influenced by socioeconomic status. Higher education levels are associated with better knowledge of sun protection behaviors and skin cancer prevention, while lower education levels may be linked to riskier sun exposure behaviors and less frequent skin examinations.

INGENŪ CRO

Pivotal Endpoints for Melanoma Clinical Trials, Key Challenges and Solutions

1. Overall Survival (OS)

2. Progression-Free Survival (PFS)

3. Objective Response Rate (ORR)

4. Duration of Response (DoR)

5. Disease Control Rate (DCR)

6. Quality of Life (QoL)

INGENŪ CRO

1. Endpoint: Overall Survival

- Overall Survival (OS) is the length of time from the start of the treatment or from diagnosis until death from any cause. It is the most definitive endpoint as it directly measures the survival benefit of a treatment.

Challenges:

- OS requires long follow-up periods, making trials time-consuming and expensive. Additionally, OS can be influenced by subsequent therapies a patient receives after the trial, complicating the attribution of survival benefits to the trial drug.

Solutions:

- **Use of Interim Analyses:** Implement interim analyses with pre-specified stopping rules to allow for earlier conclusions if significant survival benefits are observed. This can reduce the time required for follow-up while still providing robust data.
- **Statistical Methods to Adjust for Subsequent Therapies:** Use statistical adjustments, such as the rank-preserving structural failure time (RPSFT) model or inverse probability of censoring weights (IPCW), to account for the effects of subsequent therapies on OS. These methods help isolate the impact of the trial drug on survival.
- **Real-World Evidence Integration:** Combine clinical trial data with real-world evidence (RWE) to validate OS outcomes in a broader patient population. RWE can provide additional insights into the long-term survival benefits of the treatment.

2. Endpoint: Progression-Free Survival

- PFS measures the length of time during and after the treatment that a patient lives with the disease without it worsening. It serves as a surrogate endpoint for OS in many trials.

Challenges:

- Determining disease progression requires regular imaging and clinical assessments, which can be subjective and vary between evaluators. Moreover, PFS may not always correlate with OS, especially in trials involving immunotherapies, where initial progression might be followed by prolonged stabilization or response.

Solutions:

- **Centralized and Blinded Imaging Review:** Use a centralized and blinded review process for imaging to reduce subjectivity and variability in assessing disease progression. This ensures consistency in evaluating PFS across different sites.
- **Use of Biomarkers:** Incorporate biomarkers that correlate with disease progression to provide additional, objective data supporting PFS. This can be particularly useful in immunotherapy trials where traditional imaging may not fully capture treatment response.
- **Extended Follow-Up for Immunotherapy Trials:** In trials involving immunotherapies, consider extending follow-up periods for PFS assessments to capture delayed responses and stabilization, providing a more comprehensive view of the treatment's impact.

INGENŪ CRO

3. Endpoint: Objective Response Rate

- ORR is the proportion of patients whose tumors shrink by a predefined amount and for a minimum time period. It includes complete responses (CR) and partial responses (PR).

Challenges:

- ORR does not account for the duration of response, which is crucial for understanding the long-term benefits of a treatment. Also, some patients may benefit from the treatment without achieving measurable tumor shrinkage.

Solutions:

- **Combined Endpoint with Duration of Response (DoR):** Pair ORR with DoR as a combined endpoint to provide a more comprehensive understanding of the treatment's efficacy, considering both the response rate and its sustainability.
- **Use of Response-Based Surrogate Endpoints:** Develop and validate surrogate endpoints that correlate with long-term outcomes, such as disease-free survival (DFS) or durable response rate (DRR), to complement ORR.
- **Incorporate Patient-Reported Outcomes:** Include patient-reported outcomes (PROs) to capture subjective benefits of treatment, such as symptom relief or improved QoL, that may not be reflected in Objective Response Rate.

4. Endpoint: Duration of Response

- DoR measures the length of time that a tumor continues to respond to treatment without growth. This is particularly relevant in evaluating the sustained effectiveness of treatments.

Challenges:

- DoR requires ongoing monitoring and regular assessments, which can be resource-intensive. Additionally, the interpretation of what constitutes a response can vary depending on imaging techniques and criteria used.

Solutions:

- **Standardized Imaging Protocols:** Implement standardized imaging protocols and response criteria (e.g., RECIST) across trial sites to ensure consistent measurement of response duration.
- **Digital Tools for Remote Monitoring:** Utilize digital health tools and remote monitoring technologies to facilitate frequent assessments without overburdening patients or trial sites. This can streamline the collection of DoR data.
- **Adaptive Trial Designs:** Employ adaptive trial designs that allow for modifications based on early DoR results. This flexibility can help optimize trial resources and focus on the most promising treatment regimens.

INGENŪ CRO

5. Endpoint: Disease Control Rate

- DCR includes the percentage of patients who have achieved complete response, partial response, or stable disease. It is a broader measure of the drug's activity.

Challenges:

- Like ORR, DCR does not account for the quality or duration of the responses and may include patients whose disease is merely stable, rather than improving.

Solutions:

- **Incorporate Duration Metrics:** Pair DCR with duration metrics such as duration of stable disease (DSD) or duration of response (DoR) to provide more detailed insights into how long the disease control is maintained. This helps differentiate between transient and sustained disease control.
- **Granular Analysis of Stable Disease:** Perform a more granular analysis of the stable disease category, potentially segmenting it by minor responses or minimal disease progression, to better understand the impact of the treatment on patients who do not achieve significant tumor reduction.
- **Patient Subgroup Analysis:** Conduct subgroup analyses to identify which patient populations benefit the most from achieving DCR. This can help tailor treatment approaches and provide clearer insights into the drug's efficacy across different groups.

6. Endpoint: Quality of Life

- QoL assessments evaluate the impact of the disease and its treatment on patients' daily functioning and well-being. These are often measured using validated questionnaires.

Challenges:

- QoL is subjective and can be influenced by many factors unrelated to the treatment. Ensuring consistent and accurate reporting by patients can be difficult, and QoL improvements might not always correlate with survival benefits.

Solutions:

- **Use of Standardized and Validated Questionnaires:** Implement widely accepted and validated QoL assessment tools, such as the EORTC QLQ-C30 or FACT-M, to standardize data collection and ensure consistency across different trials.
- **Incorporate Objective Measures:** Complement QoL assessments with objective measures of physical function and symptom burden, such as activity trackers or clinical assessments of pain and fatigue. This can help corroborate subjective QoL reports with tangible health outcomes.
- **Regular Monitoring and Feedback:** Regularly monitor QoL throughout the trial and provide feedback to patients to ensure accurate and consistent reporting.
- **Longitudinal Studies:** This approach provides a more comprehensive view of how QoL evolves with treatment.

FDA Approved Drugs

Immunotherapy Drugs

1. **Keytruda (Pembrolizumab):** A PD-1 inhibitor that enhances the immune system's ability to detect and destroy melanoma cells.
2. **Opdivo (Nivolumab):** Another PD-1 inhibitor, often used alone or in combination with other therapies for advanced melanoma.
3. **Yervoy (Ipilimumab):** A CTLA-4 inhibitor that works by increasing the activity of T-cells to fight melanoma.
4. **Opdualag (Nivolumab and Relatlimab-rmbw):** A combination of PD-1 and LAG-3 inhibitors that has shown effectiveness in treating advanced melanoma.

Targeted Therapy Drugs

1. **Tafinlar (Dabrafenib Mesylate):** Targets BRAF V600E mutations in melanoma cells, inhibiting their growth.
2. **Mekinist (Trametinib Dimethyl Sulfoxide):** A MEK inhibitor that is often used in combination with BRAF inhibitors like Tafinlar.
3. **Zelboraf (Vemurafenib):** Another BRAF inhibitor, effective against BRAF V600E mutant melanoma.
4. **Braftovi (Encorafenib):** A BRAF inhibitor used in combination with Mektovi for treating advanced melanoma with BRAF mutations.
5. **Mektovi (Binimetinib):** A MEK inhibitor, typically used with Braftovi.
6. **Cotellic (Cobimetinib Fumarate):** A MEK inhibitor used in combination with Zelboraf.
7. **Imlygic (Talimogene Laherparepvec):** An oncolytic viral therapy for the local treatment of lesions in the skin and lymph nodes.

Cellular Therapy

1. **Amtagvi (Lifileucel):** A tumor-infiltrating lymphocyte (TIL) therapy, the first FDA-approved cell-based therapy for melanoma. It is designed for patients with unresectable or metastatic melanoma who have not responded to other treatments.

Chemotherapy

1. **Dacarbazine:** One of the older chemotherapy drugs used for melanoma, though its use has declined with the advent of newer therapies.
2. **Hepzato (Melphalan Hydrochloride):** A newer chemotherapy option for melanoma that has spread to the liver.

Other Drugs

1. **Interferon Alfa-2b (Intron A):** Used in adjuvant therapy for melanoma to reduce the risk of recurrence after surgery.
2. **Aldesleukin (IL-2, Proleukin):** An immune modulator used in the treatment of metastatic melanoma, though its use has decreased with the availability of newer immunotherapies.

NGENŪ CRO

Top 5 Most Commonly Prescribed Drugs for Melanoma

Drug Name	Year of Approval	Sponsor	Mechanism of Action	Therapeutic Effects
Keytruda (pembrolizumab)	2014	Merck & Co.	PD-1 inhibitor	Boosts the immune response against melanoma cells
Opdivo (nivolumab)	2014	Bristol-Myers Squibb	PD-1 inhibitor	Enhances immune system's ability to attack melanoma cells
Yervoy (ipilimumab)	2011	Bristol-Myers Squibb	CTLA-4 inhibitor	Promotes immune response by blocking CTLA-4 checkpoint
Tafinlar (dabrafenib)	2013	Novartis	BRAF inhibitor	Targets and inhibits BRAF V600E mutation in melanoma cells
Mekinist (trametinib)	2013	Novartis	MEK inhibitor	Inhibits MEK1/MEK2, often used in combination with BRAF inhibitors for enhanced effect

Pivotal Trials that Demonstrated the Efficacy of FDA Approved Drugs

Drug Name	Clinical Identifier/ Trial Acronym	Sample Size	Key Findings and Statistical Data
Pembrolizumab (Keytruda)	KEYNOTE-006	834	Showed a significant improvement in overall survival (OS) with a 12-month OS rate of 74.1% compared to 58.2% with ipilimumab. Median PFS was 5.5 months versus 2.8 months with ipilimumab.
Nivolumab (Opdivo)	CheckMate-037	405	Demonstrated an objective response rate (ORR) of 32% in patients previously treated with ipilimumab, with a median OS of 16.8 months versus 14.4 months for chemotherapy.
Ipilimumab (Yervoy)	MDX010-20	676	Improved overall survival with a median OS of 10.1 months compared to 6.4 months with the control treatment (gp100 peptide vaccine).
Vemurafenib (Zelboraf)	BRIM-3	675	Showed a median OS of 13.6 months in the vemurafenib group compared to 9.7 months in the dacarbazine group. PFS was significantly improved at 6.9 months versus 1.6 months.
Dabrafenib (Tafinlar)	BREAK-3	250	Achieved a median PFS of 5.1 months compared to 2.7 months with dacarbazine. ORR was 52% in the dabrafenib group.
Nivolumab + Ipilimumab (Opdivo + Yervoy)	CheckMate-067	945	Combination therapy led to a median PFS of 11.5 months, significantly higher than 2.9 months with ipilimumab alone. The ORR was 58% with the combination, compared to 19% with ipilimumab alone.
Lifileucel (Amtagvi)	C-144-01	153	Achieved an ORR of 36.4% in patients with advanced melanoma, with a median duration of response (DoR) of 8.4 months. This trial was crucial for its approval in 2024.

Approved Product Analysis: Keytruda

14.1 Melanoma

Ipilimumab-Naive Melanoma

Population	Endpoint	Scales Used	Time Point	Sample Size	Magnitude of Improvement
Unresectable or Metastatic Melanoma	Overall Survival (OS)	BICR using RECIST v1.1	Median: 9 months follow-up	KEYTRUDA 10 mg/kg every 2 weeks (n=279) KEYTRUDA 10 mg/kg every 3 weeks (n=277) Ipilimumab 3 mg/kg every 3 weeks (n=278)	KEYTRUDA 10 mg/kg every 2 weeks: HR = 0.63 (0.47, 0.83), p < 0.001 KEYTRUDA 10 mg/kg every 3 weeks: HR = 0.69 (0.52, 0.90), p = 0.004 Significant improvement in OS for both KEYTRUDA regimens vs. ipilimumab.
Unresectable or Metastatic Melanoma	Progression-Free Survival (PFS)	BICR using RECIST v1.1	Median: KEYTRUDA 10 mg/kg every 2 weeks: 5.5 months KEYTRUDA 10 mg/kg every 3 weeks: 4.1 months Ipilimumab: 2.8 months	KEYTRUDA 10 mg/kg every 2 weeks (n=279) KEYTRUDA 10 mg/kg every 3 weeks (n=277) Ipilimumab 3 mg/kg every 3 weeks (n=278)	KEYTRUDA 10 mg/kg every 2 weeks: HR = 0.58 (0.46, 0.72), p < 0.001 KEYTRUDA 10 mg/kg every 3 weeks: HR = 0.58 (0.47, 0.72), p < 0.001 Significant improvement in PFS for both KEYTRUDA regimens vs. ipilimumab.
Unresectable or Metastatic Melanoma	Objective Response Rate (ORR)	Best Objective Response by BICR	Not specified	KEYTRUDA 10 mg/kg every 2 weeks (n=279) KEYTRUDA 10 mg/kg every 3 weeks (n=277) Ipilimumab 3 mg/kg every 3 weeks (n=278)	KEYTRUDA 10 mg/kg every 2 weeks: ORR = 34% (28, 40) KEYTRUDA 10 mg/kg every 3 weeks: ORR = 33% (27, 39) Ipilimumab: ORR = 12% (8, 16) Significant improvement in ORR for both KEYTRUDA regimens vs. ipilimumab.
Unresectable or Metastatic Melanoma	Complete Response Rate	Best Objective Response by BICR	Not specified	KEYTRUDA 10 mg/kg every 2 weeks (n=279) KEYTRUDA 10 mg/kg every 3 weeks (n=277) Ipilimumab 3 mg/kg every 3 weeks (n=278)	KEYTRUDA 10 mg/kg every 2 weeks: 5% KEYTRUDA 10 mg/kg every 3 weeks: 6% Ipilimumab: 1%
Unresectable or Metastatic Melanoma	Partial Response Rate	Best Objective Response by BICR	Not specified	KEYTRUDA 10 mg/kg every 2 weeks (n=279) KEYTRUDA 10 mg/kg every 3 weeks (n=277) Ipilimumab 3 mg/kg every 3 weeks (n=278)	KEYTRUDA 10 mg/kg every 2 weeks: 29% KEYTRUDA 10 mg/kg every 3 weeks: 27% Ipilimumab: 10%

Approved Product Analysis: Keytruda (cont.)

14.1 Melanoma (cont.)

Ipilimumab-Refractory Melanoma

Population	Endpoint	Scales Used	Time Point	Sample Size	Magnitude of Improvement
Unresectable or Metastatic Melanoma	Progression-Free Survival (PFS)	BICR using RECIST v1.1	Median: KEYTRUDA 2 mg/kg: 2.9 months KEYTRUDA 10 mg/kg: 2.9 months Chemotherapy: 2.7 months	KEYTRUDA 2 mg/kg every 3 weeks (n=180) KEYTRUDA 10 mg/kg every 3 weeks (n=181) Chemotherapy (n=179)	KEYTRUDA 2 mg/kg every 3 weeks: HR = 0.57 (0.45, 0.73), p < 0.001 KEYTRUDA 10 mg/kg every 3 weeks: HR = 0.50 (0.39, 0.64), p < 0.001 Significant improvement in PFS for both KEYTRUDA regimens vs. chemotherapy.
Unresectable or Metastatic Melanoma	Overall Survival (OS)	BICR using RECIST v1.1	Median: KEYTRUDA 2 mg/kg: 13.4 months KEYTRUDA 10 mg/kg: 14.7 months Chemotherapy: 11.0 months	KEYTRUDA 2 mg/kg every 3 weeks (n=180) KEYTRUDA 10 mg/kg every 3 weeks (n=181) Chemotherapy (n=179)	KEYTRUDA 2 mg/kg every 3 weeks: HR = 0.86 (0.67, 1.10), p = 0.117 KEYTRUDA 10 mg/kg every 3 weeks: HR = 0.74 (0.57, 0.96), p = 0.011* No statistically significant difference for KEYTRUDA 2 mg/kg vs. chemotherapy; significant improvement for KEYTRUDA 10 mg/kg vs. chemotherapy.
Unresectable or Metastatic Melanoma	Objective Response Rate (ORR)	BICR using RECIST v1.1	Not specified	KEYTRUDA 2 mg/kg every 3 weeks (n=180) KEYTRUDA 10 mg/kg every 3 weeks (n=181) Chemotherapy (n=179)	KEYTRUDA 2 mg/kg every 3 weeks: ORR = 21% (15, 28) KEYTRUDA 10 mg/kg every 3 weeks: ORR = 25% (19, 32) Chemotherapy: ORR = 4% (2, 9) Significant improvement in ORR for both KEYTRUDA regimens vs. chemotherapy.
Unresectable or Metastatic Melanoma	Complete Response Rate	BICR using RECIST v1.1	Not specified	KEYTRUDA 2 mg/kg every 3 weeks (n=180) KEYTRUDA 10 mg/kg every 3 weeks (n=181) Chemotherapy (n=179)	KEYTRUDA 2 mg/kg every 3 weeks: 2% KEYTRUDA 10 mg/kg every 3 weeks: 3% Chemotherapy: 0%
Unresectable or Metastatic Melanoma	Partial Response Rate	BICR using RECIST v1.1	Not specified	KEYTRUDA 2 mg/kg every 3 weeks (n=180) KEYTRUDA 10 mg/kg every 3 weeks (n=181) Chemotherapy (n=179)	KEYTRUDA 2 mg/kg every 3 weeks: 19% KEYTRUDA 10 mg/kg every 3 weeks: 23% Chemotherapy: 4%

Approved Product Analysis: Keytruda (cont.)

14.1 Melanoma (cont.)

Adjuvant Treatment of Resected Melanoma

Population	Endpoint	Scales Used	Time Point	Sample Size	Magnitude of Improvement
Completely Resected Stage III Melanoma	Recurrence-Free Survival (RFS)	Investigator-assessed	Median: KEYTRUDA: Not Reached (NR) Placebo: 20.4 months (16.2, NR)	KEYTRUDA 200 mg every 3 weeks (n=514) Placebo (n=505)	KEYTRUDA 200 mg every 3 weeks: HR = 0.57 (0.46, 0.70), $p < 0.001$ Significant improvement in RFS for KEYTRUDA vs. placebo.
Completely Resected Stage III Melanoma (PD-L1 Positive Tumors)	Recurrence-Free Survival (RFS)	Investigator-assessed	Median: KEYTRUDA: NR Placebo: NR	KEYTRUDA 200 mg every 3 weeks (n=514) Placebo (n=505)	KEYTRUDA 200 mg every 3 weeks: HR = 0.54 (0.42, 0.69), $p < 0.001$ Significant improvement in RFS for KEYTRUDA vs. placebo regardless of PD-L1 expression.

Approved Product Analysis: Opdivo

14.1 Unresectable or Metastatic Melanoma

Previously Treated Metastatic Melanoma

Population	Endpoint	Scales Used	Time Point	Sample Size	Magnitude of Improvement
Unresectable or Metastatic Melanoma	Overall Survival (OS)	BICR using RECIST 1.1	Median: OPDIVO: 15.7 months (12.9, 19.9) Investigator's Choice: 14.4 months (11.7, 18.2)	OPDIVO 3 mg/kg every 2 weeks (n=272) Investigator's Choice of chemotherapy (n=133)	OPDIVO 3 mg/kg every 2 weeks: HR = 0.95 (0.73, 1.24) No significant difference in OS between OPDIVO and Investigator's Choice.
Unresectable or Metastatic Melanoma	Objective Response Rate (ORR)	BICR using RECIST 1.1	Not specified	OPDIVO 3 mg/kg every 2 weeks (n=120)	OPDIVO 3 mg/kg every 2 weeks: ORR = 32% (23, 41) Consisting of 4 complete responses and 34 partial responses.
Unresectable or Metastatic Melanoma	Duration of Response (DoR)	BICR using RECIST 1.1	Not specified	OPDIVO 3 mg/kg every 2 weeks (n=120)	OPDIVO 3 mg/kg every 2 weeks: DoR ranged from 2.6+ to 10+ months 87% of responses were ongoing, with 13 patients having responses of 6 months or longer.

Approved Product Analysis: Opdivo (cont.)

14.1 Unresectable or Metastatic Melanoma (cont.)

Previously Untreated Metastatic Melanoma – CHECKMATE-066

Population	Endpoint	Scales Used	Time Point	Sample Size	Magnitude of Improvement
BRAF V600 Wild-Type Unresectable or Metastatic Melanoma	Overall Survival (OS)	Investigator-assessed RECIST v1.1	Median: OPDIVO: Not Reached (NR) Dacarbazine: 10.8 months (9.3, 12.1)	OPDIVO 3 mg/kg every 2 weeks (n=210) Dacarbazine 1000 mg/m² every 3 weeks (n=208)	OPDIVO 3 mg/kg every 2 weeks: HR = 0.42 (0.30, 0.60), p < 0.0001 Significant improvement in OS for OPDIVO vs. dacarbazine.
BRAF V600 Wild-Type Unresectable or Metastatic Melanoma	Progression-Free Survival (PFS)	Investigator-assessed RECIST v1.1	Median: OPDIVO: 5.1 months (3.5, 10.8) Dacarbazine: 2.2 months (1.5, 2.4)	OPDIVO 3 mg/kg every 2 weeks (n=210) Dacarbazine 1000 mg/m² every 3 weeks (n=208)	OPDIVO 3 mg/kg every 2 weeks: HR = 0.43 (0.34, 0.56), p < 0.0001 Significant improvement in PFS for OPDIVO vs. dacarbazine.
BRAF V600 Wild-Type Unresectable or Metastatic Melanoma	Objective Response Rate (ORR)	Investigator-assessed RECIST v1.1	Not specified	OPDIVO 3 mg/kg every 2 weeks (n=210) Dacarbazine 1000 mg/m² every 3 weeks (n=208)	OPDIVO 3 mg/kg every 2 weeks: ORR = 34% (28, 41) Dacarbazine: ORR = 9% (5, 13) Significant improvement in ORR for OPDIVO vs. dacarbazine.
BRAF V600 Wild-Type Unresectable or Metastatic Melanoma	Complete Response Rate	Investigator-assessed RECIST v1.1	Not specified	OPDIVO 3 mg/kg every 2 weeks (n=210) Dacarbazine 1000 mg/m² every 3 weeks (n=208)	OPDIVO 3 mg/kg every 2 weeks: 4% Dacarbazine: 1%
BRAF V600 Wild-Type Unresectable or Metastatic Melanoma	Partial Response Rate	Investigator-assessed RECIST v1.1	Not specified	OPDIVO 3 mg/kg every 2 weeks (n=210) Dacarbazine 1000 mg/m² every 3 weeks (n=208)	OPDIVO 3 mg/kg every 2 weeks: 30% Dacarbazine: 8%

Approved Product Analysis: Opdivo (cont.)

14.1 Unresectable or Metastatic Melanoma (cont.)

Previously Untreated Metastatic Melanoma – CHECKMATE-067

Population	Endpoint	Scales Used	Time Point	Sample Size	Magnitude of Improvement
Previously Untreated, Unresectable or Metastatic Melanoma	Overall Survival (OS)	Investigator-assessed RECIST v1.1	Median: OPDIVO + Ipilimumab: Not Reached (NR) OPDIVO: 36.9 months Ipilimumab: 19.9 months	OPDIVO + Ipilimumab (n=314) OPDIVO (n=316) Ipilimumab (n=315)	OPDIVO + Ipilimumab vs. Ipilimumab: HR = 0.55 (0.44, 0.69), p < 0.0001 OPDIVO vs. Ipilimumab: HR = 0.63 (0.50, 0.78), p < 0.0001 Significant improvement in OS for both OPDIVO-containing arms vs. Ipilimumab alone.
Previously Untreated, Unresectable or Metastatic Melanoma	Progression-Free Survival (PFS)	Investigator-assessed RECIST v1.1	Median: OPDIVO + Ipilimumab: 11.5 months OPDIVO: 6.9 months Ipilimumab: 2.9 months	OPDIVO + Ipilimumab (n=314) OPDIVO (n=316) Ipilimumab (n=315)	OPDIVO + Ipilimumab vs. Ipilimumab: HR = 0.42 (0.34, 0.51), p < 0.0001 OPDIVO vs. Ipilimumab: HR = 0.57 (0.47, 0.69), p < 0.0001 Significant improvement in PFS for both OPDIVO-containing arms vs. Ipilimumab alone.
Previously Untreated, Unresectable or Metastatic Melanoma	Confirmed ORR	Investigator-assessed RECIST v1.1	Not specified	OPDIVO + Ipilimumab (n=314) OPDIVO (n=316) Ipilimumab (n=315)	OPDIVO + Ipilimumab: ORR = 50% (44, 55) OPDIVO: ORR = 40% (34, 46) Ipilimumab: ORR = 14% (10, 18) Significant improvement in ORR for both OPDIVO-containing arms vs. Ipilimumab alone.
Previously Untreated, Unresectable or Metastatic Melanoma	Complete Response Rate	Investigator-assessed RECIST v1.1	Not specified	OPDIVO + Ipilimumab (n=314) OPDIVO (n=316) Ipilimumab (n=315)	OPDIVO + Ipilimumab: 8.9% OPDIVO: 8.5% Ipilimumab: 1.9%
Previously Untreated, Unresectable or Metastatic Melanoma	Partial Response Rate	Investigator-assessed RECIST v1.1	Not specified	OPDIVO + Ipilimumab (n=314) OPDIVO (n=316) Ipilimumab (n=315)	OPDIVO + Ipilimumab: 41% OPDIVO: 31% Ipilimumab: 12%
Previously Untreated, Unresectable or Metastatic Melanoma	Duration of Response	Investigator-assessed RECIST v1.1	Range: OPDIVO+Ipilimumab: 1.2+ to 15.8+ months OPDIVO: 1.3+ to 14.6+ months Ipilimumab: 1.0+ to 13.8+ months	OPDIVO + Ipilimumab (n=314) OPDIVO (n=316) Ipilimumab (n=315)	Proportion with ≥6 months in duration: OPDIVO + Ipilimumab: 76% OPDIVO: 74% Ipilimumab: 63%

Approved Product Analysis: Opdivo (cont.)

14.2 Adjuvant Treatment of Melanoma

Population	Endpoint	Scales Used	Time Point	Sample Size	Magnitude of Improvement
Completely Resected Stage IIIB/C or Stage IV Melanoma	Recurrence-Free Survival (RFS)	Investigator-assessed	Median: OPDIVO: Not Reached (NR) Ipilimumab: 16.56 months (NR)	OPDIVO 3 mg/kg every 2 weeks (n=453) Ipilimumab 10 mg/kg every 3 weeks (n=453)	OPDIVO vs. Ipilimumab: HR = 0.65 (0.53, 0.80), p < 0.0001 Significant improvement in RFS for OPDIVO vs. Ipilimumab.
Completely Resected Stage IIIB/C or Stage IV Melanoma	Overall Survival (OS)	Investigator-assessed	Median: Not Reached (NR) for both arms	OPDIVO 3 mg/kg every 2 weeks (n=453) Ipilimumab 10 mg/kg every 3 weeks (n=453)	OPDIVO vs. Ipilimumab: HR = 0.87 (0.67, 1.14), p = 0.3148 No statistically significant difference in OS between OPDIVO and Ipilimumab.

Approved Product Analysis: Yervoy

14.1 Unresectable or Metastatic Melanoma

Population	Endpoint	Scales Used	Time Point	Sample Size	Magnitude of Improvement
Unresectable or Metastatic Melanoma (HLA-A2*0201 genotype)	Overall Survival (OS)	Investigator-assessed	Median: YERVOY 3 mg/kg: 10 months (8.0, 13.8) YERVOY 3 mg/kg + gp100: 10 months (8.5, 11.5) gp100: 6 months (5.5, 8.7)	YERVOY 3 mg/kg (n=137) YERVOY 3 mg/kg + gp100 (n=403) gp100 (n=136)	YERVOY vs. gp100: HR = 0.66 (0.51, 0.87), p = 0.0026 YERVOY + gp100 vs. gp100: HR = 0.68 (0.55, 0.85), p = 0.0004 Significant improvement in OS for both YERVOY arms vs. gp100 alone.
Unresectable or Metastatic Melanoma (HLA-A2*0201 genotype)	Best Overall Response Rate (BORR)	Investigator-assessed	YERVOY 3 mg/kg + gp100: 11.5 months	YERVOY 3 mg/kg (n=137) YERVOY 3 mg/kg + gp100 (n=403) gp100 (n=136)	YERVOY 3 mg/kg: BORR = 10.9% (6.3%, 17.4%) YERVOY 3 mg/kg + gp100: BORR = 5.7% (3.7%, 8.4%) gp100: BORR = 1.5% (0.2%, 5.2%) Median duration of response: YERVOY + gp100: 11.5 months; NR for other arms.

14.2 Adjuvant Treatment of Melanoma

Population	Endpoint	Scales Used	Time Point	Sample Size	Magnitude of Improvement
Resected Stage IIIA (>1 mm nodal involvement), IIIB, and IIIC Melanoma	Recurrence-Free Survival (RFS)	Independent Review Committee (IRC)-assessed	Median: YERVOY 10 mg/kg: 26 months (19, 39) Placebo: 17 months (13, 22)	YERVOY 10 mg/kg every 3 weeks for 4 doses, then every 12 weeks (n=475) Placebo (n=476)	YERVOY vs. Placebo: HR = 0.75 (0.64, 0.90), p < 0.002 Significant improvement in RFS for YERVOY vs. Placebo.
Resected Stage IIIA (>1 mm nodal involvement), IIIB, and IIIC Melanoma	Overall Survival (OS)	Not specified	Median: Not Reached (NR) for both arms	YERVOY 10 mg/kg every 3 weeks for 4 doses, then every 12 weeks (n=475) Placebo (n=476)	YERVOY vs. Placebo: HR = 0.72 (0.58, 0.88), p < 0.002 Significant improvement in OS for YERVOY vs. Placebo.

Approved Product Analysis: Tafinlar

14.1 BRAF V600E Mutation-Positive Unresectable or Metastatic Melanoma – TAFINLAR As a Single Agent

Population	Endpoint	Scales Used	Time Point	Sample Size	Magnitude of Improvement
BRAF V600E Mutation-Positive, Unresectable or Metastatic Melanoma	Progression-Free Survival (PFS)	Investigator-assessed	Median: TAFINLAR: 5.1 months (4.9, 6.9) Dacarbazine: 2.7 months (1.5, 3.2)	TAFINLAR 150 mg orally twice daily (n=187) Dacarbazine 1000 mg/m² intravenously every 3 weeks (n=63)	TAFINLAR vs. Dacarbazine: HR = 0.33 (0.20, 0.54), p < 0.0001 Significant improvement in PFS for TAFINLAR vs. Dacarbazine.
BRAF V600E Mutation-Positive, Unresectable or Metastatic Melanoma	Overall Response Rate (ORR)	Investigator-assessed	Not specified	TAFINLAR 150 mg orally twice daily (n=187) Dacarbazine 1000 mg/m² intravenously every 3 weeks (n=63)	TAFINLAR: ORR = 52% (44%, 59%) Dacarbazine: ORR = 17% (9%, 29%) Significant improvement in ORR for TAFINLAR vs. Dacarbazine.
BRAF V600E Mutation-Positive, Unresectable or Metastatic Melanoma	Complete Response Rate	Investigator-assessed	Not specified	TAFINLAR 150 mg orally twice daily (n=187) Dacarbazine 1000 mg/m² intravenously every 3 weeks (n=63)	TAFINLAR: 3% Dacarbazine: 0%
BRAF V600E Mutation-Positive, Unresectable or Metastatic Melanoma	Partial Response Rate	Investigator-assessed	Not specified	TAFINLAR 150 mg orally twice daily (n=187) Dacarbazine 1000 mg/m² intravenously every 3 weeks (n=63)	TAFINLAR: 48% Dacarbazine: 17%
BRAF V600E Mutation-Positive, Unresectable or Metastatic Melanoma	Duration of Response (DoR)	Investigator-assessed	Median: TAFINLAR: 5.6 months (5.4, NR) Dacarbazine: NR (5.0, NR)	TAFINLAR 150 mg orally twice daily (n=187) Dacarbazine 1000 mg/m² intravenously every 3 weeks (n=63)	Significant improvement in DoR for TAFINLAR vs. Dacarbazine.

Approved Product Analysis: Tafinlar (cont.)

BREAK-MB Study

Population	Endpoint	Scales Used	Time Point	Sample Size	Magnitude of Improvement
BRAF V600E Mutation-Positive Melanoma, Metastatic to the Brain	Overall Intracranial Response Rate (OIRR)	Independent Radiology Review Committee (IRRC)-assessed	Median duration of intracranial response was 4.6 months	Cohort A: No prior local therapy for brain metastases (n=74) Cohort B: Prior local therapy for brain metastases (n=65)	Cohort A: OIRR = 18% (95% CI: 10%, 28%) Cohort B: OIRR = 18% (95% CI: 10%, 30%) Median duration of intracranial response: 4.6 months in both cohorts.

Approved Product Analysis: Tafinlar (cont.)

14.2 BRAF V600E or V600K Unresectable or Metastatic Melanoma – TAFINLAR With Trametinib COMBI-d Study and COMBI-v Study

Population	Endpoint	Scales Used	Time Point (Median)	Sample Size	Magnitude of Improvement
BRAF V600E/K Mutation-Positive Unresectable or Metastatic Melanoma	Overall Survival (OS)	Investigator-assessed RECIST v1.1	COMBI-d Study TAFINLAR + Trametinib: 25.1 months (19.2, NR) TAFINLAR + Placebo: 18.7 months (15.2, 23.1) COMBI-v Study TAFINLAR + Trametinib: Not Reached (NR, 18.3, NR) Vemurafenib: 17.2 months (16.4, NR)	COMBI-d Study TAFINLAR + Trametinib (n=211) TAFINLAR + Placebo (n=212) COMBI-v Study TAFINLAR + Trametinib (n=352) Vemurafenib (n=352)	COMBI-d Study: HR = 0.71 (0.55, 0.92), p = 0.01 COMBI-v Study: HR = 0.69 (0.53, 0.89), p = 0.005 Significant improvement in OS for TAFINLAR + Trametinib vs. both TAFINLAR + Placebo and Vemurafenib.
BRAF V600E/K Mutation-Positive Unresectable or Metastatic Melanoma	Progression-Free Survival (PFS)	Investigator-assessed RECIST v1.1	COMBI-d Study TAFINLAR + Trametinib: 9.3 months (7.7, 11.1) TAFINLAR + Placebo: 8.8 months (5.9, 10.9) COMBI-v Study TAFINLAR + Trametinib: 11.4 months (9.9, 14.9) Vemurafenib: 7.3 months (5.8, 7.8)	COMBI-d Study TAFINLAR + Trametinib (n=211) TAFINLAR + Placebo (n=212) COMBI-v Study TAFINLAR + Trametinib (n=352) Vemurafenib (n=352)	COMBI-d Study: HR = 0.75 (0.57, 0.99), p = 0.035 COMBI-v Study: HR = 0.56 (0.46, 0.69), p < 0.001 Significant improvement in PFS for TAFINLAR + Trametinib vs. both TAFINLAR + Placebo and Vemurafenib.
BRAF V600E/K Mutation-Positive Unresectable or Metastatic Melanoma	Overall Response Rate (ORR)	Investigator-assessed RECIST v1.1	Not specified	COMBI-d Study TAFINLAR + Trametinib (n=211) TAFINLAR + Placebo (n=212) COMBI-v Study TAFINLAR + Trametinib (n=352) Vemurafenib (n=352)	COMBI-d Study: TAFINLAR + Trametinib: 66% (60%, 73%) TAFINLAR + Placebo: 51% (44%, 58%), p < 0.001 COMBI-v Study: TAFINLAR + Trametinib: 64% (59%, 68%) Vemurafenib: 51% (46%, 56%), p < 0.001 Significant improvement in ORR for TAFINLAR + Trametinib vs. both TAFINLAR + Placebo and Vemurafenib.
BRAF V600E/K Mutation-Positive Unresectable or Metastatic Melanoma	Complete Response Rate	Investigator-assessed RECIST v1.1	Not specified	COMBI-d Study TAFINLAR + Trametinib (n=211) TAFINLAR + Placebo (n=212) COMBI-v Study TAFINLAR + Trametinib (n=352) Vemurafenib (n=352)	COMBI-d Study: TAFINLAR + Trametinib: 13% TAFINLAR + Placebo: 8% COMBI-v Study: TAFINLAR + Trametinib: 13% Vemurafenib: 8%
BRAF V600E/K Mutation-Positive Unresectable or Metastatic Melanoma	Partial Response Rate	Investigator-assessed RECIST v1.1	Not specified	COMBI-d Study TAFINLAR + Trametinib (n=211) TAFINLAR + Placebo (n=212) COMBI-v Study TAFINLAR + Trametinib (n=352) Vemurafenib (n=352)	COMBI-d Study: TAFINLAR + Trametinib: 56% TAFINLAR + Placebo: 42% COMBI-v Study: TAFINLAR + Trametinib: 51% Vemurafenib: 43%
BRAF V600E/K Mutation-Positive Unresectable or Metastatic Melanoma	Duration of Response (DoR)	Investigator-assessed RECIST v1.1	COMBI-d Study TAFINLAR + Trametinib: 9.2 months (7.4, NR) TAFINLAR + Placebo: 7.5 months (5.5, NR) COMBI-v Study TAFINLAR + Trametinib: 13.8 months (11.0, NR) Vemurafenib: 7.3 months (5.9, NR)	COMBI-d Study TAFINLAR + Trametinib (n=211) TAFINLAR + Placebo (n=212) COMBI-v Study TAFINLAR + Trametinib (n=352) Vemurafenib (n=352)	Significant improvement in DoR for TAFINLAR + Trametinib vs. both TAFINLAR + Placebo and Vemurafenib.

Approved Product Analysis: Tafinlar (cont.)

4.2 BRAF V600E or V600K Unresectable or Metastatic Melanoma – TAFINLAR With Trametinib

COMBI-MB Study

Population	Endpoint	Scales Used	Time Point	Sample Size	Magnitude of Improvement
BRAF V600E/K Mutation-Positive Melanoma, Metastatic to the Brain	Intracranial Response Rate (IRR)	RECIST v1.1 (modified)	Median duration of intracranial response: 6.4 months	TAFINLAR + Trametinib (n=121)	Intracranial Response Rate: 50% (95% CI: 41, 60) Complete Response Rate: 4.1% Partial Response Rate: 46%
BRAF V600E/K Mutation-Positive Melanoma, Metastatic to the Brain	Duration of Intracranial Response	RECIST v1.1 (modified)	Median: 6.4 months (range: 1 to 31 months)	TAFINLAR + Trametinib (n=121)	9% of patients with intracranial response had stable or progressive disease as their best overall response.

14.3 Adjuvant Treatment of BRAF V600E or V600K Mutation-Positive Melanoma

Population	Endpoint	Scales Used	Time Point	Sample Size	Magnitude of Improvement
Stage III Melanoma with BRAF V600E or V600K Mutations	Relapse-Free Survival (RFS)	Investigator-assessed	Median: TAFINLAR + Trametinib: Not Estimable (NE) (44.5 months, NE) Placebo: 16.6 months (12.7, 22.1)	TAFINLAR + Trametinib (n=438) Placebo (n=432)	TAFINLAR + Trametinib vs. Placebo: HR = 0.47 (0.39, 0.58), $p < 0.0001$ Significant improvement in RFS for TAFINLAR + Trametinib vs. Placebo.

Approved Product Analysis: Mekinist

14.1 BRAF V600E or V600K Mutation-Positive Unresectable or Metastatic Melanoma

MEKINIST as a Single Agent

Population	Endpoint	Scales Used	Time Point	Sample Size	Magnitude of Improvement
BRAF V600E/K Mutation-Positive, Unresectable or Metastatic Melanoma	Progression-Free Survival (PFS)	Investigator-assessed RECIST v1.1	Median: MEKINIST: 4.8 months (4.3, 4.9) Chemotherapy: 1.5 months (1.4, 2.7)	MEKINIST 2 mg once daily (n=214) Chemotherapy (n=108)	MEKINIST vs. Chemotherapy: HR = 0.47 (0.34, 0.65), p < 0.0001 Significant improvement in PFS for MEKINIST vs. Chemotherapy.
BRAF V600E/K Mutation-Positive, Unresectable or Metastatic Melanoma	Overall Response Rate (ORR)	Investigator-assessed RECIST v1.1	Not specified	MEKINIST 2 mg once daily (n=214) Chemotherapy (n=108)	MEKINIST: ORR = 22% (17%, 28%) Chemotherapy: ORR = 8% (4%, 15%) Significant improvement in ORR for MEKINIST vs. Chemotherapy.
BRAF V600E/K Mutation-Positive, Unresectable or Metastatic Melanoma	Complete Response Rate	Investigator-assessed RECIST v1.1	Not specified	MEKINIST 2 mg once daily (n=214) Chemotherapy (n=108)	MEKINIST: 2% Chemotherapy: 0%
BRAF V600E/K Mutation-Positive, Unresectable or Metastatic Melanoma	Partial Response Rate	Investigator-assessed RECIST v1.1	Not specified	MEKINIST 2 mg once daily (n=214) Chemotherapy (n=108)	MEKINIST: 20% Chemotherapy: 8%
BRAF V600E/K Mutation-Positive, Unresectable or Metastatic Melanoma	Duration of Response (DoR)	Investigator-assessed RECIST v1.1	Median: MEKINIST: 5.5 months (4.1, 5.9) Chemotherapy: Not Reached (3.5, NR)	MEKINIST 2 mg once daily (n=214) Chemotherapy (n=108)	Significant improvement in DoR for MEKINIST vs. Chemotherapy.

Approved Product Analysis: Mekinist (cont.)

MEKINIST with Dabrafenib

COMBI-d Study

Population	Endpoint	Scales Used	Time Point	Sample Size	Magnitude of Improvement
Unresectable (Stage IIIc) or Metastatic (Stage IV) BRAF V600E/K Mutation-Positive Melanoma	Progression-Free Survival (PFS)	Investigator-assessed RECIST v1.1	Median: MEKINIST + Dabrafenib: 9.3 months (7.7, 11.1) Placebo + Dabrafenib: 8.8 months (5.9, 10.9)	MEKINIST + Dabrafenib (n=211) Placebo + Dabrafenib (n=212)	MEKINIST + Dabrafenib vs. Placebo + Dabrafenib: HR = 0.75 (0.57, 0.99), p = 0.035 Significant improvement in PFS for MEKINIST + Dabrafenib vs. Placebo + Dabrafenib.
Unresectable (Stage IIIc) or Metastatic (Stage IV) BRAF V600E/K Mutation-Positive Melanoma	Overall Survival (OS)	Investigator-assessed RECIST v1.1	Median: MEKINIST + Dabrafenib: 25.1 months (19.2, NR) Placebo + Dabrafenib: 18.7 months (15.2, 23.1)	MEKINIST + Dabrafenib (n=211) Placebo + Dabrafenib (n=212)	MEKINIST + Dabrafenib vs. Placebo + Dabrafenib: HR = 0.71 (0.55, 0.92), p = 0.01 Significant improvement in OS for MEKINIST + Dabrafenib vs. Placebo + Dabrafenib.
Unresectable (Stage IIIc) or Metastatic (Stage IV) BRAF V600E/K Mutation-Positive Melanoma	Overall Response Rate (ORR)	Investigator-assessed RECIST v1.1	Not specifed	MEKINIST + Dabrafenib (n=211) Placebo + Dabrafenib (n=212)	MEKINIST + Dabrafenib: ORR = 66% (60%, 73%) Placebo + Dabrafenib: ORR = 51% (44%, 58%), p < 0.001 Significant improvement in ORR for MEKINIST + Dabrafenib vs. Placebo + Dabrafenib.
Unresectable (Stage IIIc) or Metastatic (Stage IV) BRAF V600E/K Mutation-Positive Melanoma	Complete Response Rate	Investigator-assessed RECIST v1.1	Not specifed	MEKINIST + Dabrafenib (n=211) Placebo + Dabrafenib (n=212)	MEKINIST + Dabrafenib: 10% Placebo + Dabrafenib: 8%
Unresectable (Stage IIIc) or Metastatic (Stage IV) BRAF V600E/K Mutation-Positive Melanoma	Partial Response Rate	Investigator-assessed RECIST v1.1	Not specifed	MEKINIST + Dabrafenib (n=211) Placebo + Dabrafenib (n=212)	MEKINIST + Dabrafenib: 56% Placebo + Dabrafenib: 42%
Unresectable (Stage IIIc) or Metastatic (Stage IV) BRAF V600E/K Mutation-Positive Melanoma	Duration of Response (DoR)	Investigator-assessed RECIST v1.1	Median: MEKINIST + Dabrafenib: 9.2 months (7.4, NR) Placebo + Dabrafenib: 10.2 months (7.5, NR)	MEKINIST + Dabrafenib (n=211) Placebo + Dabrafenib (n=212)	No significant difference in DoR between the two treatment arms.

Approved Product Analysis: Mekinist (cont.)

COMBI-MB Study

Population	Endpoint	Scales Used	Time Point	Sample Size	Magnitude of Improvement
BRAF V600E/K Mutation-Positive Melanoma, Metastatic to the Brain	Intracranial Response Rate (IRR)	RECIST v1.1 (modified) assessed by independent review	Median duration of intracranial response =6.4 months	MEKINIST + Dabrafenib (n=121)	Intracranial Response Rate: 50% (95% CI: 40, 60) Complete Response Rate: 4.1% Partial Response Rate: 46%
BRAF V600E/K Mutation-Positive Melanoma, Metastatic to the Brain	Duration of Intracranial Response	RECIST v1.1 (modified)	Median: 6.4 months (range: 1 to 31 months)	MEKINIST + Dabrafenib (n=121)	9% of patients with intracranial response had stable or progressive disease as their best overall response.

14.2 Adjuvant Treatment of BRAF V600E or V600K Mutation-Positive Melanoma

Population	Endpoint	Scales Used	Time Point	Sample Size	Magnitude of Improvement
Stage III Melanoma with BRAF V600E or V600K Mutations	Relapse-Free Survival (RFS)	Investigator-assessed	Median: MEKINIST + Dabrafenib: Not Estimable (NE) (44.5 months, NE) Placebo: 16.6 months (12.7, 22.1)	MEKINIST + Dabrafenib (n=438) Placebo (n=432)	MEKINIST + Dabrafenib vs. Placebo: HR = 0.47 (0.39, 0.58), $p < 0.0001$ Significant improvement in RFS for MEKINIST + Dabrafenib vs. Placebo.

Summary of Failed Drug Candidates for Melanoma (Last 10 Years)

Name of Drug	Clinical Trial Identifier	Reason for Termination / Drug Failure	Analysis
Selumetinib	NCT01974752	Failed to improve progression-free survival in combination with dacarbazine, compared to dacarbazine alone.	Analysis: Selumetinib's lack of efficacy in combination therapy suggests that MEK inhibition alone may not be sufficient, especially when paired with less effective agents like dacarbazine.
Oblimersen (Genasense)	AGENDA	Failed to achieve the primary endpoint of improved overall survival in patients with advanced melanoma when combined with dacarbazine.	Analysis: Oblimersen targeted the anti-apoptotic protein Bcl-2, but its failure suggests that this target alone is not sufficient to overcome the complex survival mechanisms of melanoma cells.
Trametinib (MEK inhibitor)	NCT01320085	Failed in combination with ipilimumab due to high levels of liver toxicity, leading to early termination of the trial.	Analysis: The combination of MEK inhibitors with immune checkpoint inhibitors needs careful monitoring due to potential overlapping toxicities, highlighting the challenges in combining targeted therapy with immunotherapy.
Interferon alfa-2b	NCT00723710	The lack of significant benefit combined with the high toxicity profile suggests that interferon alfa-2b may not be the optimal choice for adjuvant therapy in melanoma.	Analysis: The outcomes of this trial reinforced the need for continued research into more effective and less toxic treatment options for melanoma.
Aldesleukin	NCT01683188	This trial was terminated due to slow accrual.	Analysis: While Aldesleukin (interleukin-2) was one of the earlier immunotherapies used in melanoma, its high toxicity and modest efficacy have made it less favorable compared to newer immunotherapies, such as checkpoint inhibitors which have shown greater efficacy with a more manageable safety profile.

INGENŪ CRO

Common Failure Points in Melanoma Clinical Trials

1. Heterogeneity of Melanoma:

Melanoma is a highly heterogeneous disease. This heterogeneity can lead to varying responses to treatment within the trial population, complicating the assessment of the overall efficacy of a treatment.

2. Immunotherapy-Related Pseudoprogression:

Pseudoprogression is where tumors initially appear to grow on imaging before eventually shrinking, due to immune cell infiltration. This can be misinterpreted as treatment failure if progression is assessed too early.

3. Variability in Response to Targeted Therapies:

In melanoma patients with BRAF mutations, targeted therapies show initial high response rates, but resistance often develops rapidly due to tumor heterogeneity and adaptive resistance mechanisms.

4. Challenges in Assessing Long-Term Outcomes:

Many melanoma treatments have the potential for long-term durable responses. However, capturing these outcomes requires extended follow-up, which can be challenging in the context of a clinical trial.

5. Inconsistent Biomarker Expression:

Melanoma tumors can exhibit inconsistent biomarker expression over time and between primary and metastatic sites. This can lead to challenges in patient selection and treatment response prediction.

6. Trial Design Complexity with Combination Therapies:

Melanoma treatment often involves combination therapies. Designing trials that adequately assess each component's contribution can be challenging.

7. High Attrition Rates in Long-Term Follow-Up:

In melanoma trials that require long-term follow-up, especially those involving chronic therapies, patient attrition can be a significant issue. High dropout rates can lead to incomplete data and biased outcomes.

8. Unanticipated Toxicity Profiles:

Melanoma therapies, particularly novel or combination treatments, may present unanticipated toxicity profiles that are not detected in early-phase trials but emerge during larger, later-phase studies.

Safety Concerns in Melanoma Treatment

1. Immunotherapy-Related Safety Concerns:

- Immune-Related Adverse Events (irAEs): Immunotherapy, particularly checkpoint inhibitors like Keytruda (pembrolizumab), Opdivo (nivolumab), and Yervoy (ipilimumab), works by enhancing the immune system's ability to fight cancer. However, this heightened immune response can lead to immune-related adverse events (irAEs), where the immune system attacks healthy tissues.
- Management of irAEs: The management of irAEs typically involves the use of corticosteroids or other immunosuppressive agents to reduce inflammation. Early recognition and intervention are critical to prevent severe complications. Regular monitoring and patient education on recognizing early symptoms are essential components of managing these side effects.

2. Targeted Therapy-Related Safety Concerns:

- Secondary Cancers and Skin Toxicities: Patients treated with BRAF inhibitors are at an increased risk of developing secondary skin cancers and can also cause skin toxicities.
- Cardiotoxicity and Ocular Toxicity: MEK inhibitors, when used in combination with BRAF inhibitors, can cause cardiotoxicity, including cardiomyopathy and heart failure, as well as ocular toxicities like retinal vein occlusion and serous retinopathy.
- Management Strategies: The management of side effects from targeted therapies involves regular monitoring and preventive measures, such as using sunscreen to prevent photosensitivity and performing frequent skin checks to detect secondary cancers early.

3. Chemotherapy-Related Safety Concerns:

- Myelosuppression and Organ Toxicity: Traditional chemotherapy agents like dacarbazine are associated with myelosuppression (reduced white blood cells, red blood cells, and platelets), which increases the risk of infections, anemia, and bleeding. Dacarbazine can also cause hepatotoxicity and other organ toxicities.
- Management Strategies: Managing the side effects of chemotherapy involves supportive care, such as growth factor support to stimulate blood cell production, antiemetics for nausea and vomiting, and close monitoring of liver and kidney function. Patients should also be educated about signs of infection and the importance of reporting symptoms early.

4. Cellular Therapy-Related Safety Concerns:

- Cytokine Release Syndrome (CRS) and Neurological Toxicity: Cellular therapies, such as tumor-infiltrating lymphocyte (TIL) therapy (e.g., Lifileucel), can lead to severe side effects like cytokine release syndrome (CRS), which is characterized by fever, low blood pressure, and organ dysfunction. Neurological toxicities, including confusion, seizures, and encephalopathy, are also concerns with these therapies.
- Management Strategies: The management of CRS and neurological toxicities often requires hospitalization and intensive monitoring. Treatments may include corticosteroids, tocilizumab (an IL-6 receptor antagonist), and other supportive measures. Preventive strategies include pre-treatment with anti-inflammatory medications and close post-treatment monitoring.

1. Endpoint: RSBQ

Importance for FDA Approval: Improvements in RSBQ scores indicate a reduction in the severity of symptoms and are crucial for demonstrating a drug's efficacy in managing the core behavioral manifestations of Rett syndrome. This endpoint was used as a co-primary measure in the pivotal LAVENDER Phase 3 trial of trofinetide, where statistically significant improvements led to FDA approval

Challenges: The subjective nature of caregiver reporting can introduce variability in scoring, and caregiver expectations may influence perceived improvements. Additionally, the wide range of symptoms assessed by the RSBQ can make it difficult to capture treatment effects on specific domains, such as motor function or communication.

Solutions: To minimize variability, trials can combine RSBQ outcomes with objective biomarkers or clinician assessments. Additionally, caregiver training in recognizing and scoring symptoms can help standardize responses across trial sites

2. Endpoint: Clinical Global Impression-Improvement (CGI-I)

Importance for FDA Approval: The CGI-I provides an overall assessment of how the treatment affects the patient across all symptom domains, capturing the clinician's holistic view of the patient's progress. This endpoint was also used in the LAVENDER trial, where significant improvements were noted, supporting the approval of Daybue

Challenges: The subjective nature of this endpoint can result in clinician bias, especially when patients exhibit fluctuating symptoms over time. Differences in scoring between clinicians may also introduce inconsistency in data interpretation.

Solutions: To address subjectivity, standardized clinician training across trial sites can improve the reliability of CGI-I scoring. Using blinded assessments or incorporating video recordings for centralized review can further reduce bias and ensure consistent evaluation

3. Endpoint: Motor Function and Hand Stereotypy Assessments:

Importance for FDA Approval: Assessing motor function, particularly the reduction in stereotypic hand movements, directly correlates with improvements in quality of life. While not always the primary endpoint, motor assessments are often secondary endpoints that provide valuable insights into treatment efficacy.

Challenges: Measuring subtle changes in motor function can be difficult, particularly in severely affected patients who may show only minor improvements. Moreover, subjective assessments by clinicians or caregivers can miss these nuances.

Solutions: Incorporating objective tools such as motion-capture technology or standardized scales like the Gross Motor Function Measure (GMFM) can improve the accuracy of motor assessments. Combining these with caregiver reports can offer a comprehensive view of the patient's motor abilities.

4. Endpoint: Communication and Symbolic Behavior Scales (CSBS):

Importance for FDA Approval: Improvements in communication directly impact social engagement and quality of life for Rett syndrome patients. Enhancing a patient's ability to communicate, even non-verbally, can be life-changing for both the patient and their caregivers.

Challenges: Assessing communication improvements in non-verbal patients is complex, as many rely on alternative communication methods like eye-gaze tracking. Standard verbal communication assessments may not be sufficient to capture these subtle improvements

Solutions: Utilizing eye-tracking technology to assess non-verbal communication and combining this with CSBS scores can provide a more accurate measure of treatment impact. Extended observation periods are also important, as communication improvements may take longer to manifest than motor or behavioral changes

Standard of Care Treatment Options

1. **Surgical Management:**
   - **Wide Local Excision:** Surgery remains the primary treatment for localized melanoma. Wide local excision with appropriate margins is the standard approach for primary melanoma. The goal is to remove the tumor with a margin of healthy tissue to reduce the risk of local recurrence.
   - **Sentinel Lymph Node Biopsy:** For melanomas with a higher risk of spread, sentinel lymph node biopsy is performed to assess for the presence of metastases. If the sentinel lymph node is positive, a complete lymph node dissection may be considered.

2. **Adjuvant and Neoadjuvant Therapies:**
   - **Immunotherapy and Targeted Therapy:** For patients with high-risk melanoma, adjuvant therapy with immunotherapy (e.g., pembrolizumab, nivolumab) or targeted therapy (e.g., dabrafenib and trametinib for BRAF-mutant melanoma) is used to reduce the risk of recurrence after surgery. Neoadjuvant therapy, given before surgery, is an emerging approach that aims to shrink the tumor and improve surgical outcomes. Recent clinical trials have shown promising results for neoadjuvant combinations of immunotherapy and targeted therapy in high-risk melanoma.

3. **Non-Pharmacological Interventions:**
   - **Systemic Therapy:** For patients with advanced or metastatic melanoma, systemic therapy is the mainstay of treatment. The choice of therapy depends on the molecular profile of the tumor and the patient's overall health. Options include immunotherapy, targeted therapy, and combination regimens.
   - **Checkpoint Inhibitors:** Checkpoint inhibitors are often used as first-line treatment for advanced melanoma. These drugs can be used alone or in combination to enhance the immune response against melanoma cells.
   - **Targeted Therapy:** Patients with BRAF-mutant melanoma are treated with combinations of BRAF and MEK inhibitors, which have been shown to improve survival and reduce the risk of disease progression.

4. **Supportive and Palliative Care:**
   - **Symptom Management:** Supportive care is an integral part of the standard of care for melanoma, particularly for patients with advanced disease. Symptom management includes pain control, nutritional support, and psychological support.
   - **Palliative Care:** For patients with metastatic melanoma who do not respond to systemic therapy, palliative care focuses on relieving symptoms and improving quality of life. Palliative interventions may include radiation therapy for symptomatic metastases, pain management, and counseling services.

INGENŪ CRO

Strategies to Improve Clinical Trial Protocols for FDA Approval

Improving clinical trial protocols for Melanoma is pivotal to advancing our understanding and treatment. The goal is not only to discover new therapeutic strategies but also to ensure these interventions meet the high safety and efficacy standards required.

1. Overall Survival (OS):
Use interim analyses with predefined stopping rules for efficacy. If interim data shows a significant OS benefit, an early submission for accelerated approval may be possible. Ensure that the trial design includes a control arm that reflects the current standard of care to provide a robust comparison.

2. Progression-Free Survival (PFS):
Incorporate PFS as a primary or co-primary endpoint, especially if the treatment shows a clear and early benefit in delaying disease progression. Consider a Bayesian adaptive trial design, allowing for early stopping if PFS benefit is demonstrated, thereby expediting the approval process.

3. Objective Response Rate (ORR):
In early-phase trials (Phase I/II), focus on achieving a high ORR with durable responses. Present data showing a significant percentage of patients achieving partial or complete responses. If the ORR is compelling, the FDA may grant accelerated approval, contingent upon confirmatory trials.

4. Durable Response Rate (DRR):
Emphasize the duration of responses in clinical trial data. If the responses are durable (lasting months or years), this can be a strong argument for the efficacy of the drug, leading to expedited review and approval.

5. Disease Control Rate (DCR):
Use DCR as a secondary endpoint to support the primary endpoints. Demonstrating a high DCR can help show that the drug is beneficial for a broader patient population, aiding in gaining FDA approval.

6. Quality of Life (QoL):
Include validated QoL instruments in clinical trials to collect data on how the drug affects patients' lives. If the drug significantly improves QoL, this can be a persuasive factor in the FDA's benefit-risk evaluation, especially in cases where survival benefits are modest.

Notable Key Opinion Leaders in Melanoma Research

Name	Specialty	Designation	Location	Brief Bio
Georgina V Long (BSc PhD MBBS FRACP FAHMS)	Medical Oncology	Professor, University of Sydney	New South Wales, Australia	Georgina V. Long is a Professor of Medical Oncology at the University of Sydney and Co-Medical Director of the Melanoma Institute Australia (MIA). She is a globally recognized leader in melanoma research, particularly in the areas of targeted therapy and immuno-oncology. Professor Long has received numerous awards for her contributions to melanoma research, including the prestigious NSW Premier's Award for Outstanding Cancer Researcher of the Year in 2018. She has also been appointed an Officer of the Order of Australia (AO) for her services to medicine, particularly in melanoma.
Grant A McArthur (MBBS, PhD, FRACP)	Hematology; Medical Oncology	Professor, University of Melbourne	Victoria, Australia	Grant A. McArthur is a Professor of Hematology and Medical Oncology at the University of Melbourne. He is also the Executive Director of the Victorian Comprehensive Cancer Centre (VCCC) and a Senior Principal Research Fellow at the Peter MacCallum Cancer Centre in Victoria, Australia. As the Executive Director of the VCCC Alliance since 2017; the Lorenzo Galli Chair in Melanoma and Skin Cancers at The University of Melbourne, and Head, Molecular Oncology Laboratory, Consultant Medical Oncologist and Senior Principal Research Fellow (NHMRC) at Peter MacCallum Cancer Centre, Grant's academic excellence and long list of qualifications, honours and awards reflect his significant standing in the medical world.
Alexander M Menzies (MBBS, PhD, FRACP)	Medical Oncology	Associate Professor, Northern Clinical School the University of Sydney	New South Wales, Australia	Alexander M. Menzies is an Associate Professor of Medical Oncology at the Northern Clinical School, University of Sydney. He also serves as a Senior Staff Specialist at the Melanoma Institute Australia (MIA), where he is a key figure in melanoma research and treatment. Associate Professor Menzies is known for his pioneering work in the field of melanoma, particularly in immunotherapy and targeted therapies. His research has led to significant advancements in understanding how melanoma cells resist treatment and how these resistances can be overcome. He is a leading investigator in clinical trials that have established new standards of care for melanoma patients globally.
Richard A Scolyer (BMedSci, MBBS, MD, FRCPA, FRCPath, FAHMS)	Clinical Laboratory/ Pathology	Clinical Professor, University of Sydney	New South Wales, Australia	Richard A. Scolyer is a Clinical Professor of Pathology at the University of Sydney and Co-Medical Director at the Melanoma Institute Australia (MIA). He is one of the world's leading pathologists specializing in melanoma. Professor Scolyer has received numerous awards, including the prestigious "Excellence in Research" award from the Royal College of Pathologists of Australasia. He has also been honored with the NSW Premier's Award for Outstanding Cancer Researcher of the Year.
Danny Rischin (MBBS, FRACP)	Medical Oncology; Internal Medicine	Professor, University of Melbourne	Victoria, Australia	Danny Rischin is a Professor of Medical Oncology and Internal Medicine at the Peter MacCallum Cancer Centre in Victoria, Australia. He is also the Director of the Department of Medical Oncology at the same institution, one of the leading cancer treatment and research centers in the world. Professor Rischin has received numerous accolades for his work in oncology, including recognition by the American Society of Clinical Oncology (ASCO) for his contributions to clinical research. He is also a Fellow of the Royal Australasian College of Physicians (FRACP). Professor Rischin is a leading figure in clinical trials and has been instrumental in advancing the use of novel therapies for melanoma and other cancers.

References

- Ahmed, S. K., Toma, M., Myers, J., & Wong, L. (2020). The impact of genetic predisposition and environmental factors on melanoma development. *Journal of Dermatological Science*, 98(3), 163-171.
- American Cancer Society. (2023). *Key statistics for melanoma skin cancer*. Retrieved from https://www.cancer.org/cancer/melanoma-skin-cancer/about/key-statistics.html
- Global burden of COPD: Systematic review and meta-analysis - PubMed (nih.gov). (2023). Retrieved from https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/...
- Med Xpress. (2024). *Breakthrough trial results show potential for pre-surgical melanoma treatment*. Retrieved from https://medicalxpress.com/news/...
- National Center for Biotechnology Information. (2023). *Reflectance confocal microscopy in the diagnosis of melanoma*. Retrieved from https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/...
- Rastrelli, M., Tropea, S., Rossi, C. R., & Alaibac, M. (2014). Melanoma: Epidemiology, risk factors, pathogenesis, diagnosis and classification. *In Vivo*, 28(6), 1005-1011.
- Tandfonline. (2019). *The evolving role of liquid biopsy in melanoma*. *Journal of Dermatological Treatment*, 30(8), 792-800.

iNGENū CRO

The Australian CRO championing innovative biotech firms for global success.
Delivering high-quality, FDA-compliant clinical research.

If you would like further information on how iNGENū CRO can assist you to conduct your clinical trial, please contact Dr Sud Agarwal or Adam Moodie:

Dr Sud Agarwal
Chief Executive Officer
BSc (Hons), MB ChB FANZCA DDU
dr.sudhanshu@ingenucro.com

Adam Moodie
Director, Scientific Engagement
BSc
adam.moodie@ingenucro.com

Unit 22, 456 St Kilda Road, Melbourne, 3004

www.ingenuCRO.com