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Background

- Over past few years, both IO/IO (ipilimumab/nivolumab) and multiple IO/tyrosine kinase inhibitor (TKI) options (e.g. pembrolizumab/axitinib) have been approved for first-line treatment of intermediate/poor risk metastatic renal cell carcinoma (RCC).
- However, there has been no phase III trial comparing IO/IO vs. IO/TKI.

Primary Objective: Determine what percentage of oncologists choose IO/IO vs. IO/TKI.

Objective 2: Determine what factors drive physician decision-making:
- Long-term toxicities
- Short-term toxicities
- Risk of death
- Efficacy
- Convenience to patients
- Cost

Objective 3: Correlate choice of therapy with provider characteristics:
- Type of practice – disease-focused/academics vs. general oncologist
- Years in practice
- PI on any RCC trials
- Outside income from companies making therapies (BMS, Merck, etc.)

Objective 4: Determine if providers feel comfortable enrolling pts into a phase III trial comparing IO/IO vs. IO/TKI.

Methods

- Created a 10-question survey, starting with a patient scenario of patient with int/poor risk metastatic RCC
- Sent survey to 294 oncologists throughout the country – both academic/disease-focused and general
- Used RedCAP to send surveys and record responses
- Provided incentive - $10 Amazon gift card vs. donation to Kidney Cancer Association
- Received 105 responses (36% response rate)

Patient Scenario:
A 60 y/o M presents with hematuria. CT A/P showed an 8-cm mass in the L kidney, multiple enlarged retroperitoneal LNs and bilateral pulmonary nodules. Brain MRI is negative for brain mets. Dx of the kidney mass showed clear cell RCC. Past medical hx includes only diabetes. Karnofsky Performance Status is 70%. Labs are normal except for a Ca level of 10.8. What is the initial treatment you would prescribe for this patient?
- IO/IO
- IO/TKI

Results

Figure 1: Choice of therapy for patient scenario

- 61% (n = 64) chose IO/IO
- 39% (n = 41) chose IO/TKI

Figure 2: Practice type of oncologists

- 78% (n = 82) in Academic/GU chose IO/IO
- 22% (n = 23) in General chose IO/IO

Objective 3: Correlate choice of therapy with provider characteristics:

Academic/GU Oncologists

- 78%, (n = 82)

General Oncologists

- 22%, (n = 23)

p = 0.004

Figure 3: Association between practice type and choice of therapy

- Academic/GU Oncologists - 68%
- General Oncologists - 65%

Figure 4: Main issue with IO/TKI or IO/IO

- Short-Term Toxicities
- Long-Term Toxicities
- Less Effective
- Risk of Death
- Less Convenient
- More Costly

Figure 5: Comfort with a phase III trial comparing IO/IO vs. IO/TKI

- 88% (n = 92) were comfortable
- 12% (n = 13) were uncomfortable

Conclusions

- When given a representative patient scenario of int/poor risk metastatic RCC, 61% of oncologists chose IO/IO, 39% chose IO/TKI
- However 78% of respondents were academic/GU-focused, so may have been a skewed sample
- Academic/GU oncologists were significantly more likely to choose IO/IO than general oncologists (p = 0.004)
- Those who chose IO/TKI were worried about short-term toxicities and efficacy of IO/IO
- Those who chose IO/IO commented that they chose it because of:
  - Durability of response
  - Ability to discontinue treatment if stable disease
- Despite provider differences, there is still equipoise around this issue – 88% supported a phase III trial of IO/IO vs. IO/TKI
- We plan to perform a larger study to better understand preferences of general oncologists and better evaluate decision-making with more choices re how providers choose
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