

Veliparib with carboplatin and paclitaxel in BRCA-mutated advanced breast cancer (BROCADE3): a randomised, double-blind, placebo-controlled, phase 3 trial

Véronique Diéras, Hyo S Han, Bella Kaufman, Hans Wildiers, Michael Friedlander, Jean-Pierre Ayoub, Shannon L Puhalla, Igor Bondarenko, Mario Campone, Erik H Jakobsen, et al.

▶ To cite this version:

Véronique Diéras, Hyo S Han, Bella Kaufman, Hans Wildiers, Michael Friedlander, et al.. Veliparib with carboplatin and paclitaxel in BRCA-mutated advanced breast cancer (BROCADE3): a randomised, double-blind, placebo-controlled, phase 3 trial. Lancet Oncology, 2020, 21, pp.1269 - 1282. 10.1016/S1470-2045(20)30447-2. hal-03492139

HAL Id: hal-03492139 https://hal.science/hal-03492139v1

Submitted on 17 Oct 2022

HAL is a multi-disciplinary open access archive for the deposit and dissemination of scientific research documents, whether they are published or not. The documents may come from teaching and research institutions in France or abroad, or from public or private research centers. L'archive ouverte pluridisciplinaire **HAL**, est destinée au dépôt et à la diffusion de documents scientifiques de niveau recherche, publiés ou non, émanant des établissements d'enseignement et de recherche français ou étrangers, des laboratoires publics ou privés.



Distributed under a Creative Commons Attribution - NonCommercial 4.0 International License

Version of Record: https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S1470204520304472 Manuscript_e00ec531b5f3e6a5395e470fe002dfaf

1 Veliparib with carboplatin and paclitaxel in *BRCA* mutated advanced breast

2 cancer: a randomised, placebo-controlled, phase 3 trial

- 3 Véronique Diéras, MD,* Hyo S. Han, MD,* Bella Kaufman, MD, Prof Hans Wildiers, MD, Prof.
- 4 Michael Friedlander, MBChB, Jean-Pierre Ayoub, MD, Shannon L. Puhalla, MD, Prof. Igor
- 5 Bondarenko, MD, Prof. Mario Campone, MD, Erik H. Jakobsen, MD, Mathilde Jalving, MD,
- 6 Cristina Oprean, MD, Marketa Palácová, MD, Yeon Hee Park, MD, Yaroslav Shparyk, MD,
- 7 Eduardo Yañez, MD, Nikhil Khandelwal, PhD, Madan G. Kundu, PhD, Matthew Dudley, PhD,
- 8 Christine K. Ratajczak, PhD, David Maag, PhD, Prof. Banu K. Arun, MD

- 10 Institut Curie, Paris, and Centre Eugène Marquis, Rennes, France (V Diéras MD);
- 11 Moffitt Cancer Center, Tampa, FL, USA (H S Han MD);
- Sheba Medical Center, Tel Hashomer, and Tel-Aviv University, Tel-Aviv, Israel (B KaufmanMD);
- Department of General Medical Oncology, University Hospitals Leuven, Leuven, Belgium (Prof
 H Wildiers MD;
- Prince of Wales Clinical School UNSW and Prince of Wales Hospital, Sydney, Australia (Prof M
 Friedlander MBChB);
- 18 Centre Hospitalier de l'Université de Montréal, Montreal, QC, Canada (J P Ayoub MD;
- 19 UPMC Cancer Centers, Pittsburgh, PA, USA (S L Puhalla MD);
- Dnipropetrovsk Medical Academy, City Clinical Hospital No.4, Dnipro, Ukraine (Prof I
 Bondarenko MD);
- 22 Institut de Cancérologie de l'Ouest -Pays de la Loire, France (Prof M Campone MD);
- 23 Vejle Hospital/Lillebaelt Hospital, Vejle, Denmark (E H Jakobsen MD);
- University Medical Center Groningen, University of Groningen, Groningen, The Netherlands (MJalving MD);
- University of Medicine and Pharmacy Timisoara; Oncomed SRL, Timisoara, Romania (COprean MD);
- 28 Masaryk Memorial Cancer Institute, Brno, Czech Republic (M Palácová MD);

- 29 Samsung Medical Center, Seoul, Korea (Y H Park MD);
- 30 Lviv State Regional Treatment and Diagnostic Oncology Center, Lviv, Ukraine (Y Shparyk MD);
- 31 Universidad de la Frontera, Temuco, Chile (E Yañez MD);
- AbbVie Inc., North Chicago, IL, USA (N Khandelwal PhD, M G Kundu PhD, M Dudley PhD, CK
- 33 Ratajczak PhD, D Maag PhD);
- The University of Texas M.D. Anderson Cancer Center, Houston, TX, USA (Prof B K Arun MD)
- 35 <u>*Co-first authors</u>
- 36

37 **Correspondence to:**

- 38 Véronique Diéras, M.D.
- 39 Oncologie sénologique /Breast Oncology
- 40 Centre Eugène Marquis
- 41 Avenue de la bataille Flandres-Dunkerque
- 42 CS 44229, 35042 Rennes Cedex, France
- 43 Email: v.dieras@rennes.unicancer.fr
- 44 Phone: +332 99 25 29 66
- 45
- 46
- 47 Keywords: PARP inhibitor, chemotherapy, breast cancer, BRCA
- 48
- 40
- 49
- 50
- 51

52 SUMMARY

53 Background

BRCA1/2 mutated breast cancers are sensitive to PARP inhibitors and platinum agents due to deficiency in homologous recombination repair of DNA damage. This study compared veliparib versus placebo in combination with carboplatin and paclitaxel, and continued as monotherapy if carboplatin and paclitaxel were discontinued prior to progression, in patients with HER2-negative advanced breast cancer and a *BRCA1* or *BRCA2* germline mutation.

60 Methods

This was a double-blind, randomised, placebo-controlled phase 3 trial conducted at 147 61 centres in 36 countries. Eligible patients (aged \geq 18 years) had deleterious germline (g) 62 BRCA1/2 mutation-associated, advanced HER2-negative breast cancer, ≤2 prior lines 63 of chemotherapy for metastatic disease, and an Eastern Cooperative Oncology Group 64 performance status of 0-2. Patients were randomised (2:1) by interactive response 65 technology using permuted blocks within strata (block size of 3 or 6) to carboplatin (area 66 under the concentration curve [AUC] 6 mg/mL/min intraveneously, day 1) every 3 weeks 67 and paclitaxel (80 mg/m² intraveneously, day 1, 8, and 15) weekly combined with either 68 veliparib (120 mg p.o. BID, day -2 through 5) or placebo. If patients discontinued 69 carboplatin and paclitaxel prior to progression, they could continue veliparib or placebo 70 at an intensified dose (300 mg BID continuous, escalating to 400 mg BID if tolerated) 71 until progression. Randomisation was stratified by prior platinum use, history of CNS 72 73 metastases, and estrogen/progesterone receptor status. The primary end point was investigator-assessed progression-free survival (PFS) per Response Evaluation Criteria 74

in Solid Tumors version 1.1. Efficacy analyses were done by intention-to-treat, which
included all randomised patients with *BRCA* mutation confirmed by the core lab, and
safety analyses included all patients who received at least one dose of study drug.
These are results of the primary analysis of this ongoing trial. This study is registered
with ClinicalTrials.gov, number NCT02163694.

80 Findings

Between July 30, 2014 and January 17, 2018, 513 patients were randomised. In the 81 intention-to-treat population, 337 patients were assigned to receive veliparib plus 82 carboplatin/paclitaxel (investigational arm) and 172 to placebo plus 83 carboplatin/paclitaxel (control arm). Median follow-up at data cutoff (April 5, 2019) was 84 85 35.7 months (IQR 24.9–43.6) in the investigational arm and 35.5 months (IQR 23.1– 45.9) in the control arm. The hazard ratio for PFS was 0.71 (95% confidence interval 86 [CI], 0.57–0.88; p=0.0016), with median PFS of 14.5 months (95% CI 12.5–17.7) for 87 the investigational arm versus 12.6 months (10.6–14.4) for the control arm. The most 88 89 common grade 3 or higher adverse events were neutropenia (272 [81%] of 336 patients in the investigational group vs. 143 [84%] of 171 patients in the control group), anemia 90 (142 [42%] vs. 68 [40%]), and thrombocytopenia (134 [40%] vs. 48 [28%]). Serious 91 adverse events occurred in 115 (34%) patients in the investigational arm vs. 49 (29%) 92 patients in the control arm. There were no study drug-related deaths. 93

94 Interpretation

Addition of veliparib to a highly active platinum doublet, with continuation as

- 96 monotherapy if the doublet was discontinued, resulted in significant and durable
- ⁹⁷ improvement in PFS in patients with gBRCA mutation-associated advanced breast

- se cancer. These data indicate the utility of combining platinum and PARP inhibitors in this
- 99 patient population.
- 100 **Funding** AbbVie

102 **RESEARCH IN CONTEXT**

103 Evidence before this study

We searched PubMed in November 2019, using the search terms "*BRCA1*", "*BRCA2*"
and "breast cancer" for primary publications published between June 2015 and
November 2019. We selected phase 2 or phase 3 studies of platinum chemotherapy,
poly(adenosine diphosphate–ribose) polymerase (PARP) inhibitors, or both, in patients
with advanced breast cancer and germline (g) *BRCA* mutations.

The phase 3 TNT trial demonstrated a higher proportion of objective responses and 109 improved progression-free survival (PFS) when advanced triple-negative breast cancer 110 (TNBC) patients carrying gBRCA1/2 mutations were treated with carboplatin compared 111 112 to docetaxel. The phase II trial TBCRC009 evaluated cisplatin or carboplatin in patients with metastatic TNBC, demonstrating a higher proportion of objective responses in the 113 subgroup of patients with gBRCA mutations. These trials indicate that platinum 114 chemotherapy may be particularly effective in treating patients with gBRCA mutation-115 associated advanced TNBC, and this has led to recent updates to both National 116 117 Comprehensive Cancer Network and ESO-ESMO breast cancer guidelines where platinum chemotherapy is now included as a preferred regimen for these patients. 118 119 The phase 3 OlympiAD and EMBRACA trials demonstrated improved PFS with olaparib (median 7.0 months) and talazoparib (median 8.6 months) monotherapy, respectively, 120 when compared to physicians' choice of non-platinum chemotherapy in patients with 121 advanced, HER2-negative breast cancer and a gBRCA mutation. 122 The phase 2 BROCADE trial demonstrated numerical trends towards improved PFS 123

and overall survival upon addition of veliparib to carboplatin and paclitaxel in patients

with advanced g*BRCA*-associated breast cancer, without substantial additional toxicity
or dose intensity reduction in the platinum doublet. These results warranted further
study in a larger phase 3 trial.

128

129 Added value of this study

130 To our knowledge, BROCADE3 is the first phase 3 study to evaluate a PARP inhibitor with platinum doublet chemotherapy for BRCA-associated breast cancer, demonstrating 131 significant improvement in PFS upon the addition of veliparib to carboplatin and 132 paclitaxel, a highly active comparator with a median PFS of over one year. When added 133 to carboplatin and paclitaxel, veliparib more than doubled the proportion of patients alive 134 135 and progression free at three years. The PFS benefit was similar in patients with TNBC and patients with hormone receptor-positive breast cancer. The addition of veliparib to 136 carboplatin and paclitaxel also resulted in improvement in PFS2 and duration of 137 response. There was no statistically significant difference in overall survival at the 138 planned interim analysis. 139

140

The most common adverse events were hematologic toxicities, with the most notable differences between treatment arms being a 10% absolute increase in the incidence of anemia (any grade) and a 12% absolute increase in the incidence of grade 3/4 thrombocytopenia in the veliparib arm. Importantly, patient-reported outcomes revealed no clinically meaningful increase in symptom burden with the addition of veliparib to the platinum doublet.

147

148 Implications of all the available evidence

Deleterious mutations in BRCA1 or BRCA2 impair the ability of cancer cells to repair 149 150 DNA damage via homologous recombination, thereby conferring additional sensitivity to platinum salts and PARP inhibitors. Clinical evidence to date has demonstrated that this 151 152 vulnerability can be exploited for the treatment of advanced, HER2-negative breast cancer, and has led to the inclusion of both classes of agents in current treatment 153 guidelines. However, reports of the emergence of reversion mutations that restore 154 155 BRCA function in patients treated with either platinum chemotherapy or PARP inhibitors have led to concerns about cross resistance, and for this reason patients who are 156 resistant or refractory to platinum chemotherapy are often excluded from PARP inhibitor 157 clinical trials. Given this concern, combination and maintenance strategies are rational 158 approaches to maximize the therapeutic benefit derived from exploiting pathogenic 159 BRCA mutations. BROCADE3 demonstrated for the first time that the combination of a 160 PARP inhibitor, veliparib, with platinum chemotherapy significantly improves PFS with 161 limited additional toxicity in patients with advanced HER2-negative breast cancer and a 162 BRCA mutation. The PFS benefit was durable, with a quarter of patients in the veliparib-163 containing arm alive and progression free at three years. These data suggest that 164 veliparib, in combination with carboplatin and paclitaxel, should be considered as a new 165 treatment option for patients with BRCA-associated advanced breast cancer who are 166 candidates for chemotherapy. 167

168 **INTRODUCTION**

Approximately 5% of all breast cancers are associated with germline mutations in *BRCA1/2*, and these patients are more likely to be diagnosed at a young age and to have triple-negative breast cancer (TNBC), for which treatment options are limited in the metastatic setting.¹⁻³ The reported 5-year survival rate for patients with metastatic breast cancer is 27%, and is only 11% for patients with metastatic TNBC.⁴ Thus, new treatments that provide durable benefit for patients with g*BRCA*-associated advanced breast cancer are needed.

176

BRCA1/2 mutated breast cancers have a deficiency in homologous recombination
repair of DNA damage, and are known to be sensitive to both PARP inhibitors and
platinum agents.⁵⁻⁸ There is a strong scientific rationale to combine PARP inhibitors with
platinum chemotherapy based on common mechanisms of sensitivity and acquired
resistance,⁹ and observed potentiation of platinum activity by PARP inhibitors
preclinically.¹⁰ However clinical application of these combinations has been
challenging,^{11,12} largely due to hematologic toxicity.¹³⁻¹⁴

184

Veliparib (ABT-888) is a potent, orally bioavailable, selective PARP1/2 inhibitor¹⁰ that
has shown antitumour activity and acceptable toxicity as a single-agent and in
combination with carboplatin and paclitaxel.^{15,16} Veliparib selectively inhibits the
polymerase activity of PARP without substantial trapping of PARP protein onto DNA
damage repair intermediates.^{17,18} This makes veliparib more suitable than other PARP
inhibitors to be administered in combination with platinum-based chemotherapy, as

PARP trapping has been shown to be associated with myelosuppression.¹⁹ In a 191 randomised, placebo-controlled phase 2 study (BROCADE), numerical (though not 192 statistically significant) increases in median PFS and OS were observed with the 193 addition of veliparib to carboplatin and paclitaxel versus carboplatin and paclitaxel alone 194 in patients with BRCA-mutated advanced breast cancer. The safety profile was 195 comparable between arms, with common adverse events generally hematologic and 196 gastrointestinal.²⁰ Here, we report results from BROCADE3, a phase 3 trial comparing 197 veliparib versus placebo in combination with carboplatin and paclitaxel, and continued 198 as monotherapy if carboplatin and paclitaxel are discontinued prior to progression, in 199 patients with HER2-negative inoperable locally advanced or metastatic breast cancer 200 with BRCA1 or BRCA2 germline mutation. 201

202

203 METHODS

204 Study design and participants

BROCADE3 is a phase 3, double-blinded, randomized, placebo-controlled study, fully funded by AbbVie, conducted at 147 centres in 36 countries (appendix p.1).

207

Patients (\geq 18 years of age) with metastatic or locally advanced unresectable HER2negative breast cancer and suspected deleterious or deleterious g*BRCA1/2* mutations and an Eastern Cooperative Oncology Group performance status of 0–2 were enrolled. Patients had adequate hematologic, renal, and hepatic function (absolute neutrophil count \geq 1500 cells per mm³, platelet count \geq 100,000 cells per mm³, haemoglobin \geq 95 g/L, serum creatine \leq 1.5 times the upper limit of normal (ULN) or creatine clearance \geq 50

mL/min/1.73 m², bilirubin ≤1.5 times the ULN, aspartate aminotransferase and alanine 214 transaminase concentrations ≤2.5 times the ULN, activated partial thromboplastin time 215 ≤1.5 times the ULN, and international normalized ratio <1.5). All patients were tested for 216 gBRCA1/2 mutations by the core lab. Patients with gBRCA1/2 mutations based on local 217 testing were eligible but retesting by the core laboratory was required. Patients had 218 received ≤2 prior lines of cytotoxic chemotherapy for metastatic breast cancer, and ≤1 219 220 prior line of platinum therapy without progression within 12 months of completing treatment. Patients could have prior taxane for neo-adjuvant/adjuvant therapy or to treat 221 locally advanced disease, if given >6 months before study start. Prior taxane for 222 223 metastatic breast cancer was not allowed unless it was administered without progression >12 months before study start. Prior treatment with targeted agents was 224 allowed except for prior PARP inhibitor therapy. Hormone receptor-positive patients and 225 226 patients with bone-only metastases were to be considered appropriate candidates for combination chemotherapy. Patients with active brain metastases, leptomeningeal 227 disease, history of uncontrolled seizure disorder, pre-existing neuropathy exceeding 228 grade 1, or previous or concurrent cancer distinct from breast cancer were not included 229 in this study. Also any patients with clinically significant uncontrolled active infection, 230 231 symptomatic congestive heart failure, unstable angina pectoris, cardiac arrhythmia, myocardial infarction within 6 months before randomisation, hepatitis B or C, 232 uncontrolled hypertension, or major surgery within 3 weeks of randomisation were 233 excluded. Additional eligibility criteria are in the protocol (p.3-6). 234

235

The study was conducted according to the protocol approved by institutional review boards at investigational sites, International Conference on Harmonization Good Clinical Practice guidelines, regulations governing clinical study conduct, and ethical principles with their origin in the Declaration of Helsinki. All patients provided written informed consent. An independent data monitoring committee reviewed safety data.

241

242 Randomisation and masking

Patients were prospectively randomised in a 2:1 ratio to carboplatin and paclitaxel with 243 veliparib (investigational arm) or carboplatin and paclitaxel with placebo (control arm) by 244 an interactive response technology (IRT) system using permuted blocks within strata. 245 246 Variable block sizes of 3 and 6 were used. Randomisation in a 2:1 ratio was intended to facilitate recruitment of this patient population with a rare biomarker. Randomisation was 247 stratified according to estrogen and/or progesterone receptor expression (positive or 248 negative), prior platinum therapy (yes or no), and history of CNS metastases (yes or no). 249 The randomisation schedule was created by the AbbVie statistics department and 250 forwarded to a third-party vendor to be implemented via the IRT system. 251

252

All parties were blinded to treatment assignment until investigator-assessed disease progression, after which the physician and patient could be unblinded to determine eligibility for crossover therapy. The primary analysis was conducted by statistics personnel employed by AbbVie who remained blinded throughout the course of the study, and were unmasked at the time of the primary analysis.

258

259 **Procedures**

Patients received veliparib (120 mg p.o. BID) or placebo (capsules matching 260 veliparib capsules BID) on Days -2 to 5, carboplatin (C; AUC 6 mg/mL/min IV) on Day 261 1, and paclitaxel (P; 80 mg/m² IV) on Days 1, 8, and 15 (21-day cycles) until disease 262 progression or unacceptable toxicity. Any of the three agents could be dose reduced or 263 discontinued individually at the discretion of the investigator to manage toxicity (protocol 264 p.91-94). The dose of blinded study drug could be reduced to 80 or 40 mg. The dose of 265 C could be reduced to AUC 5 or 4, and the dose of P could be reduced to 70 or 60 266 mg/m². Treatment interruptions were required if hematologic parameters were below 267 268 protocol-specified thresholds (absolute neutrophil count of ≥1500 cells per mm³, platelet count of $\geq 100,000$ cells per mm³ on cycle day 1) or in the event of grade 3 or higher 269 toxicity. Patients discontinuing both carboplatin and paclitaxel for reasons other than 270 disease progression received continuous single-agent veliparib or placebo at 300 mg 271 BID, increasing to 400 mg BID if tolerated. Patients in the control arm could receive 272 273 crossover open-label veliparib monotherapy after disease progression.

274

CT or MRI of the full chest, abdomen, and pelvis, and brain MRI or contrast CT,
occurred at screening (within 28 days of randomization) and every 9 weeks thereafter
until disease progression. Post-baseline brain MRI or contrast CT was required only for
patients with CNS lesions at baseline. Evaluation of tumour response was done by both
the local investigator and by blinded independent central review (BICR). Subsequent
treatment and survival information was collected every 2 months until death or loss to
follow-up. Laboratory evaluations included haematology and blood chemistry, and were

done at day -2 of cycle 1, days 1, 8, and 15 of each treatment cycle, the final visit, and 282 the 30-day follow-up visit. Patients were assessed for adverse events on the same 283 schedule. Adverse events were graded according to the National Cancer Institute 284 Common Terminology Criteria for Adverse Events, version 4.03. Patient-reported 285 outcomes (PROs) questionnaires were administered pre-dose at day -2 and day 1 of 286 cycle 1, day 1 of every other cycle thereafter beginning with cycle 2, final visit, and at 287 follow-up visit (appendix p.60). Eastern Cooperative Oncology Group (ECOG) 288 performance status was evaluated at day 1 of each cycle, final visit, and follow-up visit. 289

290

291 *Outcomes*

292 The primary end point was progression-free survival (PFS) (time from randomisation to disease progression or death from any cause within 63 days of last tumor assessment) 293 according to Response Evaluation Criteria in Solid Tumors, version 1.1, as assessed by 294 the local investigator. Secondary end points were overall survival (OS) (time from 295 randomisation to death from any cause), clinical benefit rate (CBR, progression-free 296 rate at 24 weeks), objective response rate (ORR) (proportion of confirmed responders), 297 298 and PFS2 (time from randomisation to disease progression on first subsequent therapy or death from any cause). Tertiary endpoints included duration of overall response (time 299 from response to disease progression) and PROs assessed using European 300 Organization for Research and Treatment of Cancer (EORTC) guestionnaire for 301 patients with cancer (EORTC-QLQ-C30) and the breast cancer-specific EORTC 302 questionnaire for patients with breast cancer (QLQ-BR23), the EuroQoL 5Dimension 5-303

Level (EQ-5D-5L), and the Brief Pain Inventory – Short Form (BPI-SF). PFS as assessed by BICR was evaluated as a sensitivity analysis.

306

307 Statistical analysis

308 The trial sought to enroll 500 patients to accrue 344 PFS events to provide ≥90% power at a 2-sided alpha level of 0.05 (assuming a hazard ratio of 0.69) to detect a statistically 309 significant treatment effect. The sample size was increased to 500 patients on June 17, 310 2016 due to a pre-planned blinded sample size re-estimation based on the hazard ratio 311 observed in the phase 2 BROCADE study²⁰ for which data became available during the 312 course of the current study. Efficacy analyses were performed on the intent-to-treat 313 314 population, which included all randomised patients with a suspected deleterious or deleterious BRCA mutation per the core laboratory (Myriad BRACAnalysis CDx assay). 315 Safety analyses included all patients who received at least one dose of 316 veliparib/placebo. Data-cutoff for the primary analysis was April 5, 2019. 317

318

For the primary analysis, between-group differences were determined with a two-sided
log-rank test, stratified by prior platinum therapy (yes, no) and hormone receptor status
(ER and/or PgR positive, ER/PgR negative). History of CNS metastases was not
included as stratification factor in the analysis as few patients were anticipated to have a
history of CNS metastases. Statistical significance was measured using a two-sided α of
0.05. Hazard ratios and 95% confidence intervals were estimated using a stratified Cox
proportional hazard model. The Kaplan-Meier method was used to generate time-to-

event curves and calculate landmark values including medians and the proportion of 326 patients alive and progression free at 24 and 36 months. If statistical significance was 327 shown for the primary endpoint analysis of PFS per investigator, secondary end points 328 were to be tested using a fixed-sequence testing procedure in the following order: OS, 329 CBR, ORR, and PFS2. Duration of overall response was changed from a secondary 330 endpoint to a tertiary endpoint on May 30, 2019 prior to database lock for the primary 331 analysis. Interim OS was analyzed at the time of primary PFS analysis as part of a pre-332 planned analysis. The final OS analysis is planned when 357 events have been 333 observed. Hazard ratios (HR) were estimated using stratified Cox regression model. 334 PFS per BICR was exploratory. Results of investigator-assessed PFS for pre-specified 335 sub-groups are also presented. PROs are reported as mean change from baseline to 336 each scheduled post-baseline visit for the EORTC QLQ-C30 (overall and domain-337 338 specific scores), EORTC QLQ-BR23 (domain-specific scores), Brief Pain Inventory (pain interference and overall severity) and EQ-5D-5L (visual analog scale and health 339 index score) questionnaires. 340

341

Visual inspection of the Kaplan-Meier curves for PFS suggested nonproportionality of hazards between treatment arms, where treatment effect increases as time from randomization increases. Due to the observed delayed separation of the curves, we sought to evaluate the influence of the transition of a subset of patients to blinded monotherapy (at an intensified dose and schedule) on the primary analysis of PFS. Therefore, a post-hoc analysis of PFS (Cox model) with a time-varying covariate, indicating the transition from veliparib/placebo in combination with chemotherapy to

veliparib/placebo as monotherapy, was developed to model the main effect of treatment
(i.e., placebo vs. treatment), treatment phase (i.e., the combination phase *vs* the
subsequent monotherapy phase) and their interaction. The Cox model was stratified by
prior platinum therapy (yes *vs* no) and receptor status (ER and/or PgR positive *vs*ER/PgR negative).

Analyses were done with SAS version 9.4 or later under the UNIX operating system.
This study is ongoing and is registered with ClinicalTrials.gov (NCT02163694).

356 Role of the funding source

AbbVie Inc. provided financial support for this study and participated in the design, study conduct, analysis and interpretation of the data, as well as the writing, review, and approval of this manuscript. All authors had access to full data and vouch for its integrity and completeness and were responsible for writing the manuscript, with editorial assistance funded by AbbVie. All authors reviewed draft and final versions of the manuscript prior to submission and have approved the final manuscript. The corresponding author had the final responsibility to submit for publication.

364

365 **RESULTS**

Between July 30, 2014 and January 17, 2018, 513 patients were randomised (**Fig.S1**). A total of 509 patients (n=337, investigational arm; n=172, control arm) had a gBRCA1/2 mutation confirmed by the core laboratory; these patients comprised the ITT population. Among all randomised patients, 507 received \geq 1 dose of veliparib or placebo and were included in safety analyses. Baseline characteristics were balanced

between arms (Table 1). Approximately half the patients had triple-negative breast
cancer (i.e. were ER and PgR negative). Most patients had received prior
chemotherapy in the neo-adjuvant or adjuvant setting; however, the majority had not
received prior cytotoxic chemotherapy in the metastatic setting. Among 266 total
patients with hormone receptor positive breast cancer, 174 (65%) had received prior
endocrine therapy in any setting (Table S1).

377

Patients in the investigational arm remained on blinded study drug longer than those in 378 the control arm, with means (SD) of 237 (272) and 181 (209) treatment days, 379 380 respectively (excludes non-treatment days during intermittent study drug dosing in 381 combination with carboplatin and paclitaxel). A subset of patients discontinued carboplatin and paclitaxel prior to disease progression and received blinded study drug 382 monotherapy. This included 40.5% (136/336) of patients in the investigational arm and 383 33.9% (58/171) of patients in the control arm. Mean (SD) overall duration of blinded 384 385 monotherapy in these patients was 350 (318) vs 252 (263) days, in the investigational 386 and control arms, respectively (Table S2). Chemotherapy exposure prior to transitioning to blinded monotherapy was highly variable (Fig.S2), with the most frequent point of 387 transition being after six cycles of combination therapy. Among patients receiving 388 monotherapy, 31% (42/136) in the investigational arm and 55% in the control arm 389 (32/58) escalated the dose of blinded study drug from 300 mg BID to 400 mg BID. At 390 391 the time of data-cutoff, 192 (57%) of 337 patients in the investigational arm and 121 392 (70%) of 171 in the control arm had discontinued study drug due to disease progression. 393

394

Patients in both arms received a similar duration of chemotherapy. In the investigational 395 and control arms, mean (SD) durations of carboplatin and paclitaxel were 10.7 (8.5) 396 cycles vs. 11.0 (8.2) cycles and 11.5 (10) cycles vs 10.6 (8.6) cycles, respectively 397 398 (Table S2). The mean [SD] duration of cycle delays was similar between treatment arms (5.9 [4.3] vs 5.1 [3..7] days for carboplatin and 5.2 [3.9] vs 4.6 [3.6] days for 399 paclitaxel). Rates of dose reductions of carboplatin and paclitaxel were similar between 400 401 treatment arms (carboplatin: 88% [293/335] vs 86% [145/169]; paclitaxel: 74% [248/335] vs 70% [119/169]). Each chemotherapy agent could be discontinued individually to 402 manage toxicity. Carboplatin was administered with blinded study drug in 23% (77/336) 403 of patients in the investigational arm and 29% (50/171) of patients in the control arm 404 after paclitaxel discontinuation, for a mean (SD) duration of 6.1 (7.4) and 7.2 (8.4) 405 cycles, respectively. Paclitaxel was administered with blinded study drug after 406 carboplatin discontinuation in 21% (69/336) of patients in the investigational arm and 407 19% (33/171) of patients in the control arm for a mean (SD) duration of 10.4 (10.4) and 408 9.1 (9.2) cycles, respectively. 409

410

At the time of data-cutoff, median follow-up time was $35 \cdot 7$ months (IQR $24 \cdot 9-43 \cdot 6$) in the investigational arm and 35.5 months (IQR $23 \cdot 1-45 \cdot 9$) in the control arm. At data cutoff, progression-free survival events had been recorded in 217 (64%) of 337 patients in the investigational arm and 132 (77%) of 172 patients in the control arm. Median PFS (95% CI) was $14 \cdot 5$ (12.5–17.7) months in the investigational arm *vs* 12.6 (10.6–14.4) months in the control arm (HR 0.71, 95% CI 0.57–0.88; 2-sided log-rank p=0.0016)

(Fig.1A). More patients were alive and progression-free in the investigational vs control 417 arm at 2 years (34% vs 20%) and at 3 years (26% vs 11%). Blinded independent 418 central review demonstrated a similar PFS HR (HR 0.70, 95% CI 0.54-0.90; median 419 PFS [95% CI] 19.3 [16.5–23.3] vs 13.5 [12.5–16.3] months; 159 [47%] events in 337 420 patients vs. 94 (55%) events in 172 patients) (Fig.S3), although difference in median 421 PFS was greater by central than by investigator review due to an earlier separation of 422 423 the curves. Concordance between investigator and central review was high and comparable between arms (>75%), and the lack of systemic evaluation bias is 424 supported by the nearly identical HRs. Analyses of PFS in pre-specified subgroups, 425 426 including patients with ER/PgR-positive breast cancer (HR 0.69, 95% CI 0.52-0.92) and with TNBC (ER and PgR-negative) (0.72, 95% CI 0.52–1.01]), were conducted (Fig.2, 427 Table S3). Due to limited sample sizes, point estimates in smaller subgroups such as 428 429 patients with prior platinum therapy, patients with prior cytotoxic therapy for metastatic disease and patients with a history of CNS metastases should be interpreted with 430 caution. 431

432

In a pre-planned interim analysis, median overall survival was 33.5 months (95% CI 27.6–37.9) for the investigational arm and 28.2 months (95% CI 24.7-35.2) for the control arm (HR 0.95, 95% CI 0.73–1.23; p=0.667; 167 [50%] events in 337 patients vs. 87 [51%] events in 172 patients) (**Fig.1B**). At the time of analysis, 44% of patients randomised to the control arm had received open label veliparib (crossover) as first subsequent therapy. Per investigator assessment, clinical benefit rate (95% CI) was estimated as 90.7% (87.9–92.9) for the investigational arm and 93.2% (89.5–95.7) for

the control arm. ORR (95% CI) was 75.8% (70.4-80.6) versus 74.1% (66.1-81.1) 440 (Table 3). Among patients with a confirmed complete or partial response, duration of 441 response was 14.7 months (95% CI 12.1–18.7) vs 11.0 months (95% CI 10.2–12.3) 442 (Fig.S4). Median PFS2 was 21.3 (19.8-25.1) months for the investigational arm and 443 17.4 (16.0–20.0) months for the control arm (HR 0.76, 95% CI 0.60–0.96; nominal 444 p=0.020; 196 [58%] events in 337 patients vs. 114 [66%] events in 172 patients) 445 (Fig.S5). Table S5 summarizes subsequent therapies. Changes from baseline in ECOG 446 performance status at each cycle were generally comparable between treatment arms 447 (**Fig.S6**). 448

449

450 The delayed separation noted in the Kaplan-Meier curves for PFS suggested the presence of non-proportional hazards, which may have been influenced by the 451 transition of a subset of patients (38% of the ITT) to monotherapy prior to disease 452 progression. To further characterize the impact of this transition on the PFS treatment 453 454 effect, a Cox model for PFS with a time-varying covariate indicating the transition from 455 veliparib/placebo in combination with chemotherapy to veliparib/placebo as monotherapy was fitted in a post-hoc analysis. The nominal P value for the interaction 456 effect was 0.0384. The interaction term was therefore retained in the fitted model 457 together with the indicator variables for combination therapy and monotherapy. The 458 PFS HR estimates were < 1 during both combination therapy and monotherapy (Table 459 460 S4).

461

Mean changes from baseline to each subsequent cycle in global health status/quality of life score based on the EORTC QLQ-C30 questionnaire v.3.0 (©1995, EORTC Quality of Life Group) are shown in **Fig.3**. No clinically meaningful difference between treatment arms was apparent. Mean changes from baseline for all functional and symptom scales of the EORTC QLQ-C30 v.3.0 are shown in **Fig.S7**. No clinically meaningful difference between treatment arms was evident in any of the 14 scores.

468

Systemic therapy side effects as assessed by QLQ-BR23 generally worsened in both
treatment arms and were consistently reported for each group through Cycle 36
(Fig.S8). No clinically meaningful differences between treatment arms were apparent in
any of the domains for QLQ-BR23. Similarly, outcomes reported via the EQ-5D-5L
(visual analog scale and health index score) and BPI (pain interference and overall pain
severity) questionnaires were comparable between treatment arms (Fig.S9).

475

Adverse events were evaluated for the entire veliparib/placebo treatment period
including both combination therapy and monotherapy if applicable, and separately
during the blinded monotherapy period only in the applicable subset of patients.

Common adverse events occurring more frequently (absolute difference of ≥5%) in the
investigational arm *vs* control arm during the entire blinded treatment period were
thrombocytopenia, anemia, nausea, and diarrhea; peripheral sensory neuropathy
occurred less frequently in the investigational arm (**Table 2**). Serious adverse events
(**Table S6**) were more frequent in the investigational arm, occurring in 115 (34%) of 336

patients compared to 49 (29%) of 171 patients in the control arm. Serious adverse 485 events that occurred more frequently (absolute difference between arms of $\geq 2\%$) in the 486 investigational arm vs control arm were neutropenia (8 patients [2.4%] vs 0) and 487 pneumonia (7 patients [2.1%] vs 0). Study-drug related serious adverse events occurred 488 in 41 patients (12.2%) in the investigational arm and 7 patients (4.1%) in the control 489 arm; the most common study drug-related serious adverse events in the investigational 490 491 arm were anemia in 12 patients (3.6%) and thrombocytopenia in 11 patients (3.3%). The most common grade 3 or higher adverse events were neutropenia (272 [81%] vs. 492 143 [84%]), anemia (142 [42%] vs. 68 [40%]), and thrombocytopenia (134 [40%] vs. 48 493 494 [28%]). Grade 3 or higher adverse events occurring more frequently (absolute difference of \geq 3%) in the investigational arm vs control arm were thrombocytopenia and 495 fatigue. Grade 3 or higher infections within 14 days of neutropenia occurred in 18 496 497 patients (5.4%) vs 3 patients (1.8%), and grade 3 or higher hemorrhage within 14 days of thrombocytopenia occurred in 1 patient (0.3%) vs 0 patients in the investigational and 498 control arms, respectively (Table S7). Adverse events leading to study drug dose 499 reductions occurred in 58 patients (17%) and 13 patients (7.6%) in the investigational 500 and control arms. In the investigational arm, the adverse events most commonly leading 501 to study drug dose reductions were neutropenia (18 patients [5.4%]), thrombocytopenia 502 503 (16 patients [4.8%]), and nausea (14 patients [4.2%]). During all blinded veliparib/placebo exposure, grade 5 AEs occurred in 6 patients (1.8%) in the 504 investigational arm (4 malignant neoplasm progression, 1 pulmonary embolism, 1 505 sepsis), and in 3 patients (1.8%) in the control arm (2 malignant neoplasm progression, 506 1 pulmonary artery thrombosis). No grade 5 event was considered study-drug related. 507

508

509 The majority of patients in each arm experienced an adverse event leading to study 510 drug interruption at some time during the entire treatment period (301 [90%] of 336 patients in the investigational arm and 147 [86%] of 171 patients in the control arm), 511 512 most commonly due to neutropenia (231 patients [69%] and 125 patients [73%]) and thrombocytopenia (213 patients [63%] and 89 patients [52%]). Adverse events led to 513 study drug discontinuation in 53 patients (16%) and 18 patients (11%), respectively 514 515 (**Table S8**). These events were considered related to study drug in 19 patients (5.7%) and 5 patients (2.9%); the most common of these related events in the investigational 516 arm was fatigue (3 patients). Adverse events led to carboplatin discontinuation in 168 517 patients (50%) in the investigational arm and 70 patients (41%) in the control arm, most 518 commonly owing to thrombocytopenia (60 patients [18%] vs. 16 patients [9.4%]) and 519 neutropenia (32 patients [9.5%] vs. 19 patients [11.1%]). Adverse events led to 520 521 paclitaxel discontinuation in 156 patients and 78 patients (46% in both arms), most commonly owing to neutropenia (38 patients [11%] vs. 25 patients [15%]) and 522 peripheral sensory neuropathy (42 patients [13%] vs. 31 patients [18%]). 523

524

In the subgroup of patients who received blinded study drug monotherapy, the most common adverse events that occurred more frequently (absolute difference of \geq 5%) with veliparib *vs* placebo were nausea, fatigue, and diarrhea. The only grade 3 or higher adverse event that occurred more frequently (absolute difference of \geq 3%) in patients receiving veliparib *vs* placebo was nausea (**Table S10**). The only serious adverse event occurring more frequently (absolute difference between arms \geq 2%) in patients receiving

veliparib vs placebo was seizure (3 [2.2%] of 136 patients vs 0 of 58) (Table S6). One 531 patient experiencing a seizure event had a history of CNS metastases. The seizure 532 events (all grade 2) occurred after approximately 1 year of veliparib 400 mg BID in 2 533 patients (1 of whom inadvertently took a second dose of 400 mg later the same morning 534 on the day of the event) and after the initial dose of 300 mg in another patient. Two 535 patients resumed veliparib monotherapy at a reduced dose (300 mg BID) after 536 treatment with levetiracetam and continued until disease progression (6-9 months later) 537 without another seizure event. During blinded single agent veliparib/placebo exposure, 538 grade 5 AEs occurred in 2 patients (1.5%; 1 malignant neoplasm progression, 1 sepsis) 539 receiving veliparib and none receiving placebo. No grade 5 AEs were considered 540 related to study drug by the investigator. 541

542

543 **DISCUSSION**

BROCADE3 is the first phase 3 clinical trial to evaluate a PARP inhibitor in combination 544 with platinum-based chemotherapy in patients with metastatic breast cancer. When 545 added to carboplatin and paclitaxel, and continued as monotherapy if carboplatin and 546 547 paclitaxel are discontinued before disease progression, veliparib resulted in durable improvement in PFS, with benefit evident at the 2-year and 3-year landmarks, in 548 patients with advanced HER2-negative breast cancer and a germline BRCA1/2 549 mutation. These results are noteworthy given the high activity of the 550 carboplatin/paclitaxel control arm, for which median PFS was greater than 1 year. 551 Overall survival was not yet mature at the time of the primary analysis, and the results 552 of the pre-planned interim analysis were not statistically significant. 553

554

555 Overall, the addition of veliparib to carboplatin and paclitaxel was well-tolerated, with toxicity leading to discontinuation in fewer than 10% of patients. Dose reductions of 556 veliparib were relatively infrequent, however dose reductions were very frequent in both 557 558 arms for carboplatin and paclitaxel. The starting dose of carboplatin (AUC6) is recommended by the NCCN.²¹ however the recommended dose of paclitaxel is 175-200 559 mg/m² (every 3 weeks) when combined with carboplatin. The paclitaxel dose and 560 561 schedule chosen for this study (80 mg/m², weekly) reflects a general trend towards more frequent use of dose dense paclitaxel and is consistent with standard practice in 562 other solid tumors where C/P is the standard of care. However, in such cases, treatment 563 is often limited to six cycles. Further research is required to determine if alternate doses 564 or schedules of C/P or a limited treatment duration would improve outcomes in patients 565 566 with advanced breast cancer, for whom treatment until disease progression is standard. 567

Although hematologic toxicities were generally frequent in both treatment arms, the 568 incidences of clinically important sequelae, including grade 3 or higher infections 569 570 associated with neutropenia and grade 3 or higher hemorrhages associated with thrombocytopenia, were relatively infrequent. For the subgroup of patients who 571 transitioned to blinded monotherapy at a more intensive dose and schedule, the only 572 grade 3 or higher adverse event that occurred more frequently with veliparib vs placebo 573 was nausea, and the only serious adverse event that occurred more frequently was 574 seizure. The clinical significance of the difference in seizure frequency between 575 treatment arms is unclear. Seizures were observed to be exposure dependent in 576

nonclinical studies primarily involving dogs, however the seizure rate observed in this 577 study is consistent with background rates based on a comparable patient population 578 identified in a real-world database (data on file). Patient-reported outcomes revealed no 579 clinically meaningful differences between treatment arms, indicating that the addition of 580 veliparib to C/P does not increase treatment-related symptom burden. Moreover, these 581 analyses revealed no systematic, clinically meaningful deterioration in global health 582 status/quality of life scores with time, suggesting that the regimen was generally well-583 tolerated. 584

585

586 The Kaplan-Meier curves for PFS (Fig.1) exhibited a delayed separation between 587 treatment arms and persistent "tail" in the investigational arm. The delayed separation suggests nonproportionality of hazards between treatment arms, where the treatment 588 effect increases as time from randomization increases. One possibility is that a well-589 represented clinically or biologically defined subgroup of patients do not experience 590 591 benefit with the addition of veliparib. However, subgroup analyses of PFS did not 592 identify such a subgroup defined by clinical characteristics. Further research is warranted to identify biomarkers than can select patients likely to benefit. 593

594

As the proportion of patients receiving blinded monotherapy also increased with time from randomization, it is plausible to hypothesize that the transition to monotherapy by a subset of patients contributed to the delayed separation of curves observed. A post-hoc exploratory analysis using a Cox model for PFS with a time-varying covariate (**Table S4**) indicating the transition from combination therapy to monotherapy suggested that

600 the transition indeed contributes to nonproportionality. It is noteworthy that the estimated HR for combination therapy is nearly identical to that observed in the phase 2 601 BROCADE study, which compared C/P with veliparib to C/P with placebo in a similar 602 patient population and did not allow treatment with veliparib/placebo monotherapy.²⁰ 603 Collectively, these results suggest that the overall PFS benefit observed in BROCADE3 604 is derived both from the inclusion of veliparib with C/P and from the continuation of 605 606 veliparib monotherapy when chemotherapy is discontinued prior to disease progression. However, these HR estimates cannot be interpreted as isolating the treatment effect for 607 each treatment phase because all patients receiving veliparib monotherapy did so after 608 609 first receiving veliparib in combination with C/P. Moreover, the subset of patients receiving monotherapy does not represent a randomized sample, and the decision to 610 transition (and the variable timing thereof) may be influenced in part by depth and 611 612 duration of response to combination therapy. The inability to isolate the treatment effect during combination therapy and monotherapy is a limitation of the study design. 613

614

Another limitation of the trial is that it does not allow for the identification of the optimal duration of combination therapy with veliparib and cytotoxic chemotherapy before transitioning to single agent veliparib. The potential for veliparib to maintain responses after a fixed duration of veliparib, carboplatin, and paclitaxel warrants further investigation, as this strategy would represent a paradigm shift in the treatment of metastatic breast cancer, akin to recently validated strategies in ovarian cancer.²²

The potential for crossover to confound interpretation of the PFS2 analysis is another limitation, particularly if treatment with platinum chemotherapy during the blinded portion of the trial led to resistance to subsequent PARP inhibitor therapy in some patients. The sequencing of PARP inhibitors and platinum chemotherapy requires further investigation.

627

The results of this trial indicate that veliparib, in combination with C/P and continued as 628 monotherapy after discontinuation of chemotherapy, is a compelling treatment option for 629 patients with advanced HER2-negative breast cancer and a germline BRCA mutation 630 631 who are candidates for cytotoxic chemotherapy. This population includes patients with 632 TNBC and those with hormone-receptor positive metastatic breast cancer. Although the role of cytotoxic chemotherapy differs between these two patient subgroups, treatment 633 guidelines converge in cases where hormone-receptor positive patients are no longer 634 candidates for endocrine therapy. Treatment guidelines generally recommend 635 636 sequential single-agent chemotherapy, however the durable PFS and OS observed with the control regimen in this trial and the phase 2 BROCADE trial suggest that the 637 carboplatin/paclitaxel combination may provide unique benefit to this particular group of 638 patients.20 639

640

The utility of a carboplatin/taxane doublet for the first-line treatment of metastatic TNBC was recently demonstrated by the phase 2 tnAcity trial, which demonstrated superior PFS with carboplatin and *nab*-paclitaxel compared to doublets of carboplatin with gemcitabine or *nab*-paclitaxel with gemcitabine.²³ In this trial, patients treated with

carboplatin and *nab*-paclitaxel experienced a median PFS of 8.3 months and a median 645 OS of 16.8 months. In addition, a growing body of evidence supports the use of 646 platinum chemotherapy in patients with advanced TNBC and a germline BRCA1/2 647 mutation.^{7,8,20,23} Studies of single-agent platinum chemotherapy reported median PFS of 648 3·3–6·8 months,^{7,8} and OS of 13·7 months.⁸ The median PFS of 16·6 months and 649 median OS of 35 months observed in the TNBC subgroup of BROCADE3 suggest that 650 combination therapy with veliparib, carboplatin and paclitaxel may improve long-term 651 outcomes relative to sequential single-agent therapy for this patient population with 652 more limited treatment options and poorer prognosis compared to other breast cancer 653 subtypes. 654

655

In hormone receptor-positive breast cancer, established guidelines^{21,24} indicate that 656 chemotherapy is most appropriate in patients who are not candidates for endocrine 657 therapy, and combination chemotherapy should generally be reserved for those with 658 659 visceral metastases or rapidly progressive disease. Real world evidence indicates that 660 the usage of chemotherapy, including combination regimens, is more common in early lines than might be expected according to these guidelines.²⁵ This is consistent with the 661 observation in this study that only 65% of hormone-receptor positive patients enrolled 662 had prior endocrine therapy. Of note, CDK4/6 inhibitors were largely unavailable in most 663 participating countries during enrollment of this trial and in some participating countries 664 endocrine therapy options are limited in premenopausal women. Treatment utilization 665 666 patterns should continue to evolve, given recent evidence demonstrating an OS benefit with the addition of CDK4/6 inhibitors to endocrine therapy, along with the previously 667

reported PFS benefit and manageable safety profile.²⁶ However, limited information 668 exists regarding the benefits of these therapies in patients with hormone receptor-669 positive breast cancer associated with a germline *BRCA* mutation. Although more 670 research is required to further define the appropriate role of chemotherapy in these 671 patients, endocrine therapy with or without a CDK4/6 inhibitor remains the standard of 672 care for eligible patients. For patients who are no longer candidates for endocrine 673 therapy with or without CDK4/6 inhibitors, those with BRCA-associated hormone 674 receptor-positive metastatic breast cancer may be suitable for combination 675 chemotherapy, because they are more likely to have tumours with aggressive luminal B 676 features²⁷ and are often younger with fewer comorbidities. The veliparib and 677 carboplatin/paclitaxel regimen may be a beneficial option for this group of patients, in 678 whom a median PFS and OS of 13.0 months and 32.4 months was observed. Further 679 680 characterization of this subgroup, including those with no prior endocrine therapy, would be of interest. 681

682

683 Two recent phase 3 trials have supported regulatory approvals of the PARP inhibitors olaparib and talazoparib as monotherapy for treatment of patients with HER2-negative 684 advanced breast cancer and gBRCA1/2 mutations, based on improved PFS when 685 compared to physicians' choice of single-agent chemotherapy.^{5,6} Notably, these trials 686 did not include platinum amongst the comparator therapies, and the objective response 687 rates (60-63%) and median PFS (7.0-8.6 months) reported for PARP inhibitor 688 689 monotherapy were comparable to previously reported data for carboplatin monotherapy in gBRCA1/2 mutation positive patients with TNBC.7 As such, it remains an unanswered 690

691 question whether PARP inhibitor monotherapy is superior to single-agent platinum chemotherapy. Also unknown is the optimal sequence of PARP inhibitors and platinum-692 based chemotherapy in patients with gBRCA1/2 mutations. In cells with BRCA 693 mutations, treatment with platinum agents or PARP inhibitors has been shown to 694 produce BRCA-reversion mutations, which can restore function and mediate treatment 695 resistance.²⁸ As such, combining platinum and PARP inhibitors may be a rational 696 697 strategy to allow patients to benefit from both agents before developing crossresistance. Accordingly, while median overall survival reported for a subgroup of 698 patients receiving single-agent olaparib for first-line treatment of BRCA-associated 699 700 advanced breast cancer was 14.7 months,²⁹ the median overall survival observed in the interim analysis for veliparib plus carboplatin/paclitaxel in the BROCADE3 study was 701 33.5 months, suggesting the treatment strategy under investigation in this study may 702 703 provide a promising alternative to conventional sequential single-agent therapy with PARP inhibitors and chemotherapy. 704

705

In the phase 3 BrighTNess trial,³⁰ the addition of veliparib to neoadjuvant chemotherapy 706 with C/P, followed by doxorubicin and cyclophosphamide, did not improve the frequency 707 of pathological complete response in patients with early stage TNBC, with similar results 708 in the subgroup of patients with gBRCA1/2 mutations. These results are consistent with 709 the observation that the addition of veliparib did not improve the high objective response 710 rate observed with C/P in BROCADE3. Follow up for event-free survival in BrighTNess 711 712 is ongoing and it remains to be determined if the long-term benefit observed in BROCADE3 will also be seen in patients with early stage TNBC; however a direct 713

- comparison of the two trials will be confounded by differences in dose and schedule of
- veliparib and differences in patient population.

716

718 CONTRIBUTORS

- 719 Conception, design, and recruitment: all authors;
- Provision of patients and patient care: VD, HSH, BK, HW, MF, J-PA, SLP, IB, MC, EHJ, MJ,
- 721 CO, MP, YHP, YS, EY, BA;
- 722 Data analysis, collection, and interpretation: all authors;
- All authors were responsible for writing the manuscript and have approved the final manuscript.
- 724

725 DECLARATION OF INTERESTS

- 726 VD: Consulting/advisory role Roche/Genentech, Novartis, Lilly, Pfizer, AbbVie, MSD, Daiichi
- 727 Sankyo, Seattle Genetics, Astra Zeneca. Speakers fees: Roche/Genentech, Novartis, Lilly,
- 728 Pfizer, Astra Zeneca, Daiichi Sankyo.
- HSH: Research funding to institution: AbbVie, Prescient, Horizon, Karyopharm, BMS, Novartis,
 Pfizer, Tesaro, TapImmune, Seattle Genetics. Grant: Department of Defense. Speakers'
- 731 bureau: Lilly.
- 732 **BK:** No Conflicts of Interest.
- 733 **HW:** His institution received consulting fees and honoraria from Roche, Astra Zeneca, Amgen,
- Lilly, Novartis, AbbVie, Vifor Pharma, Pfizer, Celldex Therapeutics, Janssen-CILAG, TRM
- Oncology, PUMA Biotechnology, ORION Corporation and an unrestricted research grant from
 Roche. He received travel support from Roche and Pfizer.
- 737 **MF:** Consulting/advisory role: AstraZeneca, MSD, AbbVie, Lilly, Takeda, Novartis. Speakers'
- bureau: Astra Zeneca. Honoraria: AstraZeneca, MSD, Lilly, Takeda. Research funding:
- 739 BeiGene, Novartis, Astra Zeneca
- JPA: Research funding to institution: AbbVie, Boston Biomedical. Consultancy: AstraZeneca,
 Eisai, Eli Lilly, Novartis, Pfizer, Puma, Roche.
- 742 SLP: Consultant: AbbVie, MedImmune, Celldex, Puma, Pfizer, AstraZeneca, Eisai, Nanostring.
- 743 Research funding to institution: AbbVie, Pfizer, Lilly, Novartis, Incyte, Covance-Bayer,
- AstraZeneca, Genentech, Medivation.
- 745 **IB and E Y:** No Conflicts of Interest.
- 746 MC: Consulting/advisory role: AstraZeneca, Sanofi, Servier, AbbVie, Lilly, Accord. Speakers'
 747 bureau: Novartis. Honoraria: Lilly.
- 748 **EJ:** Consulting/advisory role: Pfizer, Roche, Novartis, Eli Lilly.

- 749 **MJ:** Advisory Board, honoraria to institution: Merck, BMS, Novartis, Pierre Fabre, Tesaro,
- 750 AstraZeneca. Speakers fees: Sanofi. Clinical studies: BMS, AbbVie, Merck, Cristal
- 751 Therapeutics.
- CO: Advisory Board: Eli Lilly, Sandoz, Merck, Pfizer; Speaker: Eli Lilly, Roche, Teva, BMS,
 Sanofi, Boehringer Ingelheim, Novartis, AstraZeneca, Astellas, Janssen, Sandoz; Research
 /Clinical studies: BMS, AbbVie, Roche, Genentech, Novartis, Boehringer Ingelheim, BeiGene,
 Trio Oncology.
- 756 **MP:** Received fees as the speaker from Pfizer, Roche, Eisai.
- YHP: Consultancy or advisory board member for AstraZeneca, Pfizer, Eisai and Novartis
 Pharmaceuticals. Research fund from AstraZeneca, Eisai, Merck, Pfizer, Novartis and Roche.
- YS: Advisory Board: Pfizer; Speaker: Roche, AstraZeneca, Pfizer; Research /Clinical studies:
 AbbVie, Roche, MSD, Boehringer Ingelheim.
- BKA: Research support to the Institution: AbbVie, PharmaMar, Astra Zeneca, Invitae. Steering
 committee (non-paid): AbbVie.
- 763 **NKI, MGK, CKR, and DM:** AbbVie employees and own stock.
- 764 **MD:** Former AbbVie employee and may own stock.

765

766 ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

- AbbVie Inc. provided financial support for this study (NCT02163694) and participated in the
- design, study conduct, analysis and interpretation of the data, as well as the writing, review, and
- approval of this manuscript. No honoraria or payments were made for authorship. AbbVie and
- the authors thank all the trial investigators and the patients who participated in this clinical trial,
- the study coordinators, support staff, and all study investigators for their contributions. We thank
- 772 Bruce A. Bach, M.D., Ph.D., Stacie Peacock Shepherd, M.D., Ph.D., Marlene Schumansky, and
- 773 Melissa Shah for clinical trial oversight, and George Somlo, M.D. for his participation as a
- member of the steering committee. Medical writing assistance was provided by Ana Mrejeru,
- Ph.D., an employee of AbbVie.

777 AVAILABILITY OF DATA AND MATERIAL

778 AbbVie is committed to responsible data sharing regarding the clinical trials we 779 sponsor. This includes access to anonymized, individual and trial-level data (analysis data sets), as well as other information (e.g., protocols and Clinical Study Reports), as 780 long as the trials are not part of an ongoing or planned regulatory submission. This 781 includes requests for clinical trial data for unlicensed products and indications. 782 This clinical trial data can be requested by any gualified researchers who engage in 783 rigorous, independent scientific research, and will be provided following review and 784 approval of a research proposal and Statistical Analysis Plan (SAP) and execution of a 785 786 Data Sharing Agreement (DSA). Data requests can be submitted at any time and the 787 data will be accessible for 12 months, with possible extensions considered. For more information on the process, or to submit a request, visit the following link: 788 https://www.abbvie.com/our-science/clinical-trials/clinical-trials-data-and-information-789 sharing/data-and-information-sharing-with-qualified-researchers.html. 790

REFERENCES

794	1.	Malone KE, Daling JR, Doody DR, et al. Prevalence and predictors of BRCA1 and
795		BRCA2 mutations in a population-based study of breast cancer in white and black
796		American women ages 35 to 64 years. Cancer Res 2006; 66: 8297-308.
797	2.	Peto J, Collins N, Barfoot R, et al. Prevalence of BRCA1 and BRCA2 gene mutations in
798		patients with early-onset breast cancer. J Natl Cancer Inst 1999; 91: 943-49.
799	3.	Atchley DP, Albarracin CT, Lopez A, et al. Clinical and pathologic characteristics of
800		patients with BRCA-positive and BRCA-negative breast cancer. J Clin Oncol 2008;
801		26 :4282-8.
802	4.	National Cancer Insitute. SEER Cancer Stat Facts: Female Breast Cancer Subtypes.
803		Website: https://seer.cancer.gov/statfacts/html/breast-subtypes.html. Accessed Jan 13,
804		2020.
805	5.	Litton JK, Rugo HS, Ettl J, et al. Talazoparib in Patients with Advanced Breast Cancer
806		and a Germline BRCA Mutation. N Engl J Med 2018; 379: 753-763.
807	6.	Robson M, Im SA, Senkus E, et al. Olaparib for Metastatic Breast Cancer in Patients
808		with a Germline BRCA Mutation. N Engl J Med 2017; 377: 523-533.
809	7.	Tutt A, Tovey H, Cheang MCU, et al. Carboplatin in BRCA1/2-mutated and triple-
810		negative breast cancer BRCAness subgroups: the TNT Trial. <i>Nature Medicine</i> 2018; 24:
811		628-637.
812	8.	Isakoff SJ, Mayer EL, He L, et al. TBCRC009: A Multicenter Phase II Clinical Trial of
813		Platinum Monotherapy With Biomarker Assessment in Metastatic Triple-Negative Breast
814		Cancer. <i>J Clin Oncol</i> 2015; 33 : 1902-9.
815	9.	Lord CJ, Ashworth A. PARP inhibitors: Synthetic lethality in the clinic. Science 2017;
816		355 :1152-1158.

- 10. Donawho CK, Luo Y, Luo Y, et al. ABT-888, an orally active poly(ADP-ribose)
- 818 polymerase inhibitor that potentiates DNA-damaging agents in preclinical tumor models.

819 *Clin Cancer Res* 2007; **13**: 2728-2737.

- 11. Dhawan MS, Bartelink IH, Aggarwal RR, et al. Differential toxicity in patients with and
- without DNA repair mutations: phase I study of carboplatin and talazoparib in advanced
 solid tumors. *Clin Cancer Res* 2017; 23: 6400–6410.
- Lee JM, Hays JL, Chiou VL, et al. Phase I/Ib study of olaparib and carboplatin in women
 with triple negative breast cancer. *Oncotarget* 2017; 8: 79175-87.
- 13. Faraoni I, Graziani G. Role of BRCA Mutations in Cancer Treatment with Poly(ADP-
- ribose) Polymerase (PARP) Inhibitors. *Cancers* (Basel) 2018;**10**: pii E487.
- McCann KE, Hurvitz SA. Advances in the use of PARP inhibitor therapy for breast
 cancer. *Drugs Context* 2018; **7**: 212540.
- 15. Somlo G, Frankel PH, Arun BK, et al. Efficacy of the PARP Inhibitor Veliparib with
- 830 Carboplatin or as a Single Agent in Patients with Germline BRCA1- or BRCA2-
- 831 Associated Metastatic Breast Cancer: California Cancer Consortium Trial
- 832 NCT01149083. *Clin Cancer Res* 2017; **23**: 4066-76.
- 16. Puhalla S, Beumer JH, Pahuja S, et al. Final results of a phase 1 study of single-agent
- veliparib (V) in patients (pts) with either BRCA1/2-mutated cancer (BRCA+), platinum-
- refractory ovarian, or basal-like breast cancer (BRCA-wt). *J Clin Oncol* 2014; **32** (Suppl
 15): abst 2570.
- Murai J, Huang SY, Das BB, et al. Trapping of PARP1 and PARP2 by Clinical PARP
 Inhibitors. *Cancer Res* 2012; **72**: 5588-99.
- 839 18. Pommier Y, O'Connor MJ, de Bono J. Laying a trap to kill cancer cells: PARP inhibitors
 840 and their mechanisms of action. *Sci Transl Med* 2016; **8** (362): 362ps17.

- Hopkins TA, Ainsworth WB, Ellis PA, et al. PARP1 Trapping by PARP Inhibitors Drives
 Cytotoxicity in Both Cancer Cells and Healthy Bone Marrow. *Mol Cancer Res* 2019; 17:
 409-19.
- 20. Han HS, Dieras V, Robson M, et al. Veliparib with temozolomide or carboplatin/paclitaxel
- 845 versus placebo with carboplatin/paclitaxel in patients with BRCA1/2 locally recurrent/
- metastatic breast cancer: randomized phase II study. *Ann Oncol* 2018; **29**: 154-161.
- 847 21. National Comprehensive Cancer Network. NCCN clinical practice guidelines in
- 848 oncology: breast cancer, version 4.2020. 2020 (https://www .nccn .org/
- 849 professionals/physician_gls/ pdf/ breast.pdf).
- Moore K, Colombo N, Scambia G, et al. Maintenance Olaparib in Patients with Newly
 Diagnosed Advanced Ovarian Cancer. *N Engl J Med* 2018; **379**: 2495-2505.
- Yardley DA, Coleman R, Conte P, et al. nab-Paclitaxel plus carboplatin or gemcitabine
 versus gemcitabine plus carboplatin as first-line treatment of patients with triple-negative
 metastatic breast cancer: results from the tnAcity trial. *Ann Oncol* 2018; **29**: 1763-70.
- 855 24. Cardoso F, Senkus E, Costa A, et al. 4th ESO-ESMO International Consensus
- B56 Guidelines for Advanced Breast Cancer (ABC 4)⁺. *Ann Oncol* 2018; **29**:1634-57.
- 25. Dalal AA, Gauthier G, Gagnon-Sanschagrin P, et al. Treatment and Monitoring Patterns
 Among Premenopausal Women with HR+/HER2- Advanced Breast Cancer. *Adv Ther*2018; **35**: 1356-67.
- 860 26. Han Y, Wang J, Wang Z, Xu B. Comparative efficacy and safety of CDK4/6 and
- 861 PI3K/AKT/mTOR inhibitors in women with hormone receptor-positive, HER2-negative
- 862 metastatic breast cancer: a systematic review and network meta-analysis. *Curr Probl*
- *Cancer* 2020; 100606 [ePub May 12]. doi:10.1016/j.currproblcancer.2020.100606.
- Larsen MJ, Kruse TA, Tan Q, et al. Classifications within molecular subtypes enables
 identification of BRCA1/BRCA2 mutation carriers by RNA tumor profiling. *PLoS One*2013; 8: e64268.

867 28. Waks AG, Cohen O, Kochupurakkal B, et al. Reversion and non-reversion mechanisms of resistance (MoR) to PARP inhibitor (PARPi) or platinum chemotherapy (chemotx) in 868 patients (pts) with BRCA1/2-mutant metastatic breast cancer (MBC). J Clin Oncol 2019; 869 **37** (15_suppl): 1085-1085. doi: 10.1200/JCO.2019.37.15_suppl.1085. 870 29. Robson ME, Tung N, Conte P, et al. OlympiAD final overall survival and tolerability 871 results: Olaparib versus chemotherapy treatment of physician's choice in patients with a 872 germline BRCA mutation and HER2-negative metastatic breast cancer. Ann Oncol 2019; 873 **30**: 558-566. 874 30. Loibl S, O'Shaughnessy J, Untch M, et al. Addition of the PARP inhibitor veliparib plus 875 876 carboplatin or carboplatin alone to standard neoadjuvant chemotherapy in triple-negative breast cancer (BrighTNess): a randomised, phase 3 trial. Lancet Oncol 2018; 19: 497-877

878 879 509.

880 Figure Legends

881

902

Figure 1. Kaplan Meier Analysis of Progression-free Survival and Overall Survival 882 Distributions were estimated using Kaplan-Meier method for (A) progression-free 883 survival (PFS) by investigator assessment, and (B) overall survival. PFS was compared 884 by stratified log-rank test. Hazard ratios estimated by Cox model stratified by same 885 factors as log-rank test. Kaplan-Meier estimates of the proportion progression-free at 24 886 months and 36 months are shown. 887 888 889 Figure 2. Subgroup Analysis of Progression-free Survival. 890 891 CNS, central nervous system; ER, estrogen receptor; PgR, progesterone receptor; TNBC, triple-negative breast cancer. 892 Hazard ratio compares progression-free survival for the veliparib plus carboplatin and 893 894 paclitaxel arm to the control arm. Hazard ratios presented for subgroups other than ER/PgR are from a Cox model stratified by ER/PgR status. The ER/PgR subgroup 895 hazard ratios are from an unstratified model. 896 897 Figure 3. Mean Change from Baseline in EORTC QLQ-C30 Global Health Status/ 898 **Quality of Life for ITT Patients.** 899 Mean change from baseline (with standard error bars) is shown for each treatment arm. 900 Score was determined on Day 1 of Cycles shown on X-axis. Number of observations for 901

41

each treatment arm is shown below graphs. Asterisk denotes a statistically significant

- 903 (P<0.05) difference between treatment groups. Increases in the Global Health Status
- 904 Quality of Life score represent improvements in functioning.
- 905 C/P, carboplatin and paclitaxel; Pbo, placebo; Vel, veliparib.

906	Table 1. Patient	Demographic and	Clinical	Characteristics

Characteristic, no. (%)	Veliparib + Carboplatin/Paclitaxel (N = 337)	Placebo + Carboplatin/Paclitaxel (N = 172)
Sex		
Female	333 (98.8)	169 (98.3)
Male	4 (1.2)	3 (1.7)
Age, years, median (range)	47 (24–82)	45 (28–75)
Race		
White	294 (87.2)	153 (89.0)
Asian	24 (7.1)	12 (7.0)
Black	14 (4.2)	6 (3.5)
Other	5 (1.5)	1 (0.6)
Geographic region		
United States	46 (13.6)	27 (15.7)
Non-United States	291 (86.4)	145 (84.3)
ECOG performance status		
0	208 (61.7)	102 (59.3)
1	121 (35.9)	63 (36.6)
2	8 (2.4)	7 (4.1)
Measurable disease	285 (84.6)	143 (83.6)
Liver or Lung Metastases	219 (65.0)	104 (60.8)
Bone-only disease	11 (3.3)	9 (5.3)
Prior platinum therapy use	27 (8.0)	16 (9.3)
Prior chemotherapy in neo- adjuvant/adjuvant setting Prior taxane in neo- adjuvant/adjuvant setting	236 (70.0) 175 (51.9)	113 (65.7) 86 (50.0)

Prior chemotherapy in metastatic setting Prior taxane in the metastatic setting	63 (18.7) 20 (5.9)	33 (19.2) 9 (5.2)
History of CNS metastases	16 (4.7)	10 (5.8)
Hormone receptor expression		
ER or PgR positive	174 (51.6)	92 (53.5)
ER and PgR negative	163 (48.4)	80 (46.5)
<i>BRCA1/2</i> mutation status by core lab		
BRCA1 mutation positive	177 (52.5)	89 (51.7)
BRCA2 mutation positive	167 (49.6)	86 (50)
Stage at diagnosis		
0	3 (0.9)	1 (0.6)
1	43 (13.0)	22 (13.0)
Ш	128 (38.6)	69 (40.8)
111	84 (25.3)	39 (23.1)
IV	74 (22.3)	38 (22.5)
	1	1

907

908 C/P, carboplatin/paclitaxel; CNS, central nervous system; ER, estrogen receptor; PgR, progesterone

909 receptor. Percentages are calculated on non-missing values.

910 Table 2. Summary of Adverse Events

n (%)	Veliparib + Carboplatin/Paclitaxel				Placebo + Carboplatin/Paclitaxel				
All blinded veliparib/placebo exposure									
		N =	336		N = 171				
	G1/2	G3	G4	G5*	G1/2	G3	G4	G5*	
Any adverse event	10 (3%)	174 (52%)	144 (43%)	6 (2%)	8 (5%)	94 (55%)	66 (39%)	3 (2%)	
Neutropenia	28 (8%)	161 (48%)	111 (33%)	0	13 (8%)	94 (55%)	49 (29%)	0	
Thrombocytopenia	137 (41%)	97 (29%)	37 (11%)	0	74 (43%)	40 (23%)	8 (5%)	0	
Anemia	128 (38%)	139 (41%)	3 (<1%)	0	51 (30%)	67 (39%)	1 (<1%)	0	
Nausea	224 (67%)	20 (6%)	0	0	102 (60%)	7 (4%)	0	0	
Alopecia	181 (54%)	0	0	0	87 (51%)	0	0	0	
Fatigue	145 (43%)	24 (7%)	0	0	79 (46%)	7 (4%)	0	0	
Peripheral sensory neuropathy	141 (42%)	14 (4%)	1 (<1%)	0	80 (47%)	8 (5%)	0	0	
Diarrhea	136 (41%)	16 (5%)	0	0	57 (33%)	5 (3%)	0	0	
Leukopenia	37 (11%)	86 (26%)	12 (4%)	0	18 (11%)	44 (26%)	3 (2%)	0	
Headache	116 (35%)	4 (1%)	0	0	57 (33%)	3 (2%)	0	0	
Vomiting	107 (32%)	13 (4%)	0	0	58 (34%)	3 (2%)	0	0	
Constipation	113 (34%)	1 (<1%)	0	0	54 (32%)	1 (<1%)	0	0	
Asthenia	76 (23%)	8 (2%)	0	0	40 (23%)	3 (2%)	0	0	
Hypomagnesemia	74 (22%)	6 (2%)	2 (<1%)	0	28 (16%)	4 (2%)	4 (2%)	0	
Decreased appetite	76 (23%)	3 (<1%)	0	0	46 (27%)	0	0	0	
Cough	70 (21%)	0	0	0	28 (16%)	0	0	0	
Dyspnea	67 (20%)	3 (<1%)	0	0	32 (19%)	2 (1%)	0	0	
Dizziness	65 (19%)	1 (<1%)	0	0	29 (17%)	1 (<1%)	0	0	
Dysgeusia	65 (19%)	1 (<1%)	0	0	28 (16%)	0	0	0	
Pain in extremity	65 (19%)	1 (<1%)	0	0	27 (16%)	0	1 (<1%)	0	
Back pain	57 (17%)	8 (2%)	0	0	38 (22%)	1 (<1%)	1 (<1%)	0	
Peripheral edema	64 (19%)	0	0	0	17 (10%)	1 (<1%)	0	0	

Epistaxis	63 (19%)	0	0	0	29 (17%)	0	0	0
Arthralgia	62 (18%)	0	0	0	37 (22%)	2 (1%)	0	0
Pyrexia	59 (18%)	3 (<1%)	0	0	36 (21%)	1 (<1%)	0	0
Blinded monotherapy veliparib/placebo exposure								
		N=1	136		N=58			
	G1/2	G3	G4	G5*	G1/2	G3	G4	G5*
Any adverse event	78 (57%)	40 (29%)	5 (4%)	2 (2%)	36 (62%)	11 (19%)	1 (2%)	0
Nausea	64 (47%)	7 (5%)	0	0	5 (9%)	1 (2%)	0	0
Fatigue	25 (18%)	6 (4%)	0	0	6 (10%)	1 (2%)	0	0
Headache	26 (19%)	3 (2%)	0	0	9 (16%)	1 (2%)	0	0
Diarrhea	27 (20%)	1 (<1%)	0	0	5 (9%)	0	0	0

911

Adverse events (AEs) occurring in at least 20% of patients at any grade during all blinded 912 veliparib/placebo exposure or during blinded single-agent veliparib/placebo exposure are 913 914 shown. The "all blinded veliparib/placebo exposure" AE rates include all AEs during the 915 treatment-emergent period, which includes veliparib/placebo in combination with 916 carboplatin/paclitaxel and veliparib/placebo single-agent, if applicable. The "blinded single-agent 917 veliparib/placebo exposure" AE rates include all treatment-emergent AEs during blinded single-918 agent veliparib/placebo dosing. Tables S9 and S10 include a complete listing of all AEs by maximum grade. 919 *During all blinded veliparib/placebo exposure, grade 5 AEs occurred in 6 patients (1.8%) on 920 veliparib+carboplatin/paclitaxel (4 malignant neoplasm progression, 1 pulmonary embolism, 1 921 sepsis), and in 3 patients (1.8%) on placebo+carboplatin/paclitaxel (2 malignant neoplasm 922 progression, 1 pulmonary artery thrombosis). During blinded single agent veliparib/placebo 923 exposure, grade 5 AEs occurred in 2 patients (1.5%; 1 malignant neoplasm progression, 1 924 sepsis) on veliparib and none on placebo+carboplatin/paclitaxel. No grade 5 AEs were 925 926 considered related to study drug by the investigator.

927 Table 3. Additional Efficacy Analyses

928

	Veliparib +	Placebo +		
Variable	Carboplatin/Paclitaxel	Carboplatin/Paclitaxel		
	(N = 337)	(N = 172)		
Clinical benefit rate (week 24	90.7	93.2		
progression free rate, % (95%CI)	(87.9, 92.9)	(89.5, 95.7)		
	216 / 285 (75.8)	106 / 143 (74.1)		
	(70.4, 80.6)	(66.1, 81.1)		
PFS2				
Events, n (%)	196 (58.2)	114 (66.3)		
Median BES2 (95% CI) months	21.3	17.4		
	(19.8, 25.1)	(16.0, 20.0)		
Hazard Ratio (95% CI)	0.76 (0.60, 0.96)			
Duration of response				
Events, n/N (%) [†]	128 / 216 (59.3)	87 / 106 (82.1)		
Median duration of response (95% CI),	14.7	11.0		
months	(12.1, 18.7)	(10.2, 12.3)		

929

930 CR, complete response; ORR, objective response rate; PFS2, time from randomization

until disease progression on subsequent therapy or death; PR, partial response.

932 Data are per investigator assessment.

*Includes patients with at least one measurable disease per investigator.

1934 †Includes patients with at least one measurable disease at baseline. Patients who never

experienced a confirmed PR or CR are not included in the analysis.

937 Figure 1. Kaplan Meier Analysis of Progression-free Survival and Overall Survival



938 A. PFS by Investigator Assessment

 Veliparib+C/P
 337
 316
 301
 282
 250
 207
 181
 154
 137
 126
 107
 92
 81
 72
 60
 51
 45
 38
 32
 25
 20
 16
 8
 4
 1
 0

 (0)
 (13)
 (16)
 (21)
 (24)
 (29)
 (32)
 (34)
 (37)
 (40)
 (44)
 (51)
 (56)
 (60)
 (68)
 (75)
 (80)
 (87)
 (90)
 (97)
 (101)
 (105)
 (113)
 (117)
 (119)
 (119)
 (120)

 Control+C/P
 172
 160
 153
 140
 123
 99
 82
 64
 47
 39
 35
 27
 23
 18
 15
 15
 12
 8
 8
 6
 5
 5
 4
 3
 0

 (0)
 (8)
 (10)
 (15)
 (17)
 (21)
 (22)
 (23)
 (25)
 (29)
 (30)
 (31)
 (32)
 <t

	No. of events/ No. of patients (%)	Median PFS, months (95% CI)	24-month rate of PFS, % (95% CI)	36-month rate of PFS, % (95% CI)
Veliparib + C/P	217 / 337 (64.4)	14.5 (12.5, 17.7)	34 (28, 39)	26 (20, 31)
Control + C/P	132 / 172 (76.7)	12.6 (10.6, 14.4)	20 (14, 27)	11 (6, 17)

943 B. Overall Survival



	No. of events/ No. of patients (%)	Median OS, months (95% CI)
Veliparib + C/P	167 / 337 (49.6)	33.5 (27.6, 37.9)
Control + C/P	87 / 172 (50.6)	28.2 (24.7, 35.2)

Figure 2. Subgroup Analysis of Progression-free Survival

Subgroup	Veliparib+C/P No. of patients w	Placebo+C/P	Hazard Ratio for Disease Progression	or Death (95% CI)
All patients	217/337	132/172	⊢-●1	0.70 (0.57, 0.87)
Hormone receptor status				
ER positive and/or PgR positive	124/174	74/92	⊢ —●—↓	0.69 (0.52, 0.92)
ER negative and PgR negative (TNBC)	93/163	58/80	⊢	0.72 (0.52, 1.01)
BRCA status				
BRCA1 mutation	113/177	68/89	⊢ ● 1	0.72 (0.53, 0.97)
BRCA2 mutation	106/167	67/86	⊢ ● – •	0.66 (0.48, 0.89)
Prior platinum therapy				
Prior platinum therapy	19/27	14/16		0.70 (0.34, 1.44)
No prior platinum therapy	198/310	118/156	⊢ ●1	0.71 (0.56, 0.89)
Prior cytotoxic therapy for metastatic diseas	e			
Prior chemotherapy in metastatic setting	46/63	29/33		0.80 (0.50, 1.27)
No prior chemotherapy in metastatic settin	ig 171/274	103/139	⊢ ●→	0.69 (0.54, 0.88)
History of CNS metastases				
Yes	14/16	8/10	► -	H 2.08 (0.78, 5.52)
No	203/320	124/161	<u>⊢</u> ●	0.66 (0.53, 0.83)
			0.1 1	10
			←	
			Favors veliparib+C/P Favors p	lacebo+C/P

Figure 3.

