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The 5th Bench-to-Bedside Uro-Oncology: GU Cancers Triad Meeting, organized in conjunction with the 43rd Annual Congress of the Société Internationale d’Urologie, was held on October 13th, 2023, at the Istanbul Lutfi Kirdar International Convention and Exhibition Centre in Istanbul, Türkiye, and transmitted live on the SIU@U virtual platform. The session on renal cell carcinoma (RCC) took place in the morning and was chaired by Dr. Simon Tanguay (Canada). This session started with presentations on the novel imaging approaches to predict histologic subtypes of RCC and how artificial intelligence (AI) can help improve characterization of complex renal cysts, followed by a debate on whether triple therapy is the optimal treatment for intermediate-risk metastatic RCC (mRCC). Next were presentations on the most important endpoint to select first-line regimen, optimal patient selection for adjuvant therapy post nephrectomy, and the use of belzutifan in sporadic and hereditary RCC. The session concluded with an update on key ongoing clinical trials in RCC.

Dr. Tarik Esen (Türkiye) discussed novel imaging options and how those can be used to predict histologic subtypes of small, solid renal masses [1]. Incidental detection of renal lesions increases every year. Nevertheless, between 20% and 30% of resected small renal masses are benign, with an estimated 5600 benign lesions unnecessarily resected in the United States alone every year [2,3].

The European Association of Urology (EAU) guidelines recommend the use of contrast-enhanced computed tomography (CT) or magnetic resonance imaging (MRI) to diagnose or differentiate between small renal masses. Biopsy is particularly recommended for patients undergoing active surveillance [4]. However, the histopathological classification of renal tumours has become increasingly complex with the description of new subtypes that ultimately make differential diagnosis more challenging.

There are several challenges for the differential diagnosis of small renal masses: first, the differentiation between a benign and a malignant tumour, such as the case of an oncocytoma vs. chromophobe RCC, a fat-poor angiomyolipoma vs. RCC, and a complicated cyst vs. papillary RCC; second, the discrimination between low-grade and high-grade RCC, which can be used to guide decisions for active surveillance management; and lastly, the differentiation between clear cell RCC (ccRCC) vs. non-ccRCC, which has important implications for systemic therapy selection in the metastatic setting. Renal mass biopsy might help the differential diagnosis; however, this is an invasive procedure, with a high nondiagnostic rate (10% to 15%). It often leads to erroneous diagnosis resulting from tumour...
Conventional imaging has limited utility to characterize renal masses. Aside from detecting macroscopic fat, which leads to the diagnosis of angiomyolipoma, there is significant overlap of conventional imaging findings\[6\]. For instance, CT and MRI cannot achieve definitive diagnosis of renal lesions. In fact, oncocytoma, low-grade oncocytic tumour, and chromophobe RCC look very similar on conventional imaging alone. These limitations emphasize the need for superior imaging modalities to characterize renal masses.

Over the years, new imaging modalities have been developed and employed in the diagnosis of renal masses. Contrast-enhanced ultrasound (CEUS) is a non-invasive approach that was shown to perform at least as well as or better than contrast-enhanced CT and MRI, both in sensitivity as well as specificity, in a meta-analysis of 16 studies\[7\]. Multiparametric MRI (mpMRI) of the kidney, although not as frequently used as in prostate cancer, has relatively high diagnostic power to predict ccRCC (85% sensitivity, 76% specificity) and papillary RCC (80% sensitivity, 94% specificity)\[8\].

One approach that harnessed interest in the last few years is technetium-99m (\textsuperscript{99m}Tc)-sestamibi single-photon emission CT (SPECT)/CT. \textsuperscript{99m}Tc-sestamibi is a lipophilic cation that accumulates by affinity in cells with high density of mitochondria, such as oncocytoma. ccRCC, by contrast, has low density of mitochondria; because of low affinity, there is no intracellular accumulation of \textsuperscript{99m}Tc-sestamibi, which is pumped out of the cell by multidrug resistance pumps\[9\]. The first study reporting on the diagnostic performance of \textsuperscript{99m}Tc-sestamibi SPECT/CT included 50 patients with a solid cT1 renal mass. Overall, the observed sensitivity was 87.5% and specificity was 95.2%, with only 2 false positives identified on \textsuperscript{99m}Tc-sestamibi SPECT/CT\[10\]. Relative uptake of \textsuperscript{99m}Tc-sestamibi was higher in oncocytomas and hybrid oncocytic/chromophobe tumours than in RCC. The diagnostic accuracy of \textsuperscript{99m}Tc-sestamibi SPECT/CT was reviewed systematically across 4 studies with a total of 117 renal lesions. The meta-analysis demonstrated superior performance of this approach in diagnosing oncocytoma compared to other renal lesions\[11\]. In a cost effectiveness analysis of competing management strategies for a small, asymptomatic renal mass, \textsuperscript{99m}Tc-sestamibi SPECT/CT followed by confirmatory biopsy had very low risk of untreated malignant tumours (0.2%), the highest probability of leaving a benign tumour untreated (84.4%), and the lowest cost-effectiveness ratio ($18,812 US/quality-adjusted life years)\[12\].

Another approach explored for imaging in ccRCC is carbonic anhydrase IX (CAIX), which becomes upregulated in hypoxic conditions. Loss or inactivation of the VHL gene also results in hypoxia-inducible factor (HIF) increase, which upregulates CAIX\[13\]. CAIX is upregulated in 95% of ccRCC. Girentuximab (previously termed G250) is a chimeric monoclonal antibody that binds to CAIX with high affinity. Initial investigation of girentuximab bound to the radionuclide iodine-124 (\textsuperscript{124I}-girentuximab) as a radiotracer for positron-emission tomography (PET)/CT in small renal masses was reported in a pilot study of 26 patients\[14\]. \textsuperscript{124I}-girentuximab PET/CT performed before surgical resection was able to accurately identify 15/16 ccRCC. All 9 non-ccRCC were negative for the tracer. For ccRCC, the tracer performed with sensitivity of 94%, specificity of 100%, positive predictive value (PPV) of 100%, and negative predictive value (NPV) of 90%. In the REDECT trial, the diagnostic performance of \textsuperscript{124I}-girentuximab PET/CT was compared with contrast-enhanced CT in 195 patients\[15\]. \textsuperscript{124I}-girentuximab PET/CT vs. contrast-enhanced CT had greater sensitivity (86.2% vs. 75.5%; \textit{P} = 0.23) and specificity (85.9% vs. 46.8%; \textit{P} = 0.005) to detect ccRCC. More recently, another radiotracer zirconium-89 (\textsuperscript{89Zr})-girentuximab was evaluated in the multicentre phase 3 ZIRCON trial, which enrolled 300 patients. In the full analysis set (n = 284), the sensitivity, specificity, PPV, NPV, and accuracy of \textsuperscript{89Zr}-girentuximab PET/CT were 85.5%, 87%, 93%, 75%, and 86%, respectively\[16\]. Similar diagnostic performance was seen in small renal masses (cT1a). Most adverse events were mild, and only 18 (6%) of cases were grade ≥ 3. Other radiotracers, such as fluorine-18-fluodeoxyglucose (\textsuperscript{18F}-FDG) and prostate-specific membrane antigen (PSMA) have limited sensitivity and are not used routinely for histologic subtyping of renal masses\[17,18\].
Lastly, radiomics combined with AI has become the focus of new developments for the histologic diagnosis of small renal masses. Radiomics is able to identify hidden textural information in a tissue that is imperceptible to the human eye[19]. This approach has been implemented to differentiate fat-poor angiomyolipoma from ccRCC using both CT[20,21] as well as MRI texture analysis[22]. In fact, a systematic review and meta-analysis of 113 studies demonstrated significant log odds ratio of radiomics for distinguishing RCC from angiomyolipoma (2.89, 95% confidence interval [CI] 2.40 to 3.39; \( P < 0.001 \)), oncocytoma (3.08; 95% CI, 2.09 to 4.06, \( P < 0.001 \)), and unspecified renal tumours (3.57; 95% CI, 2.69 to 4.45, \( P < 0.001 \))[19]. Machine learning integrating \(^{99m}\)Tc-sestamibi SPECT/CT and radiomics has also demonstrated potential for characterization of renal masses. In a prospective study of 54 renal tumours, \(^{99m}\)Tc-sestamibi SPECT/CT combined with radiomics had better performance than radiomics alone in oncocytomas from RCC (area under the curve [AUC] = 98.3% vs. 75%, respectively)[23].

While further validation is required, new molecular imaging approaches and AI show great promise to overcome the clinical challenges in the differential diagnosis of small solid renal masses, which could have a positive impact on surgical decision-making in clinical practice.

During the Q&A, Dr. Esen discussed whether new molecular imaging, such as \(^{89}\)Zr-girentuximab PET/CT, would be able to replace renal biopsy to guide clinical decisions regarding surgery or active surveillance. While biopsy may still be required in select cases, \(^{89}\)Zr-girentuximab PET/CT shows great promise as a novel diagnostic approach, especially in highly suspicious cases where a diagnosis is necessary before surgery. Furthermore, he pointed out that the ZIRCON trial could be the first step for a possible therapeutic use of girentuximab bound to radioligands (e.g., lutetium-177) to manage metastatic ccRCC and to downsize renal tumour burden.

Next, Dr. Patrick O. Richard (Canada) highlighted how AI will help improve characterization of complex renal cysts. Kidney cancer is a prevalent malignancy with a rapidly growing incidence of 1% to 2% yearly. This increase in incidence is associated with greater incidental detection of tumours through imaging[24]. Despite an increase in surgery, kidney cancer–associated mortality has remained predominantly stable for the last 40 years.

Why is there a discordance between incidence and mortality? First, nearly 50% of all newly diagnosed renal lesions are small renal masses[25]. Of those, 20% to 30% will be benign[26–28]. Even for malignant lesions, the vast majority will be indolent, with slow growth and low metastatic potential[26,27]. Second, 5% to 10% of lesions will be complex renal cysts, of which up to 50% are benign[29]. Even if malignant, stage for stage, malignant complex cysts have a better prognosis than solid RCCs[30]. Lastly, with average age of diagnosis from 65 to 70, the majority of patients have comorbidities that put them more at risk of death by other causes than from kidney cancer[31]. If patients with a renal lesion continue to be managed by surgery, it is likely that many will be overtreated. Per definition, overtreatment consists of an intervention that does not benefit the patient or where the risk of harm from the intervention is likely to outweigh any benefit the patient would receive.

One of the reasons why most patients are overtreated is the limitations of conventional imaging (CT and MRI) to distinguish between a benign vs. a malignant tumour. In a systematic review including 3036 complex renal cysts categorized with the Bosniak classification system, the estimated surgical number needed to treat to prevent metastatic disease of Bosniak III and IV cysts was 140 and 40, respectively[32]. This highlights the low effectiveness of the Bosniak classification for complex renal cysts category III. In recognition of the impact of overtreatment, the Canadian Urological Association has recently published guidelines on the management of cystic renal lesions, emphasizing the role of active surveillance[29].

Radiomics is a technique that extracts quantitative features from conventional imaging (e.g., CT, MRI, PET) that are invisible to the naked eye. According to the Image Biomarker Standardisation Initiative (IBSI), these can be classified into 79 nontextural features, such as tumour morphology and pixel intensity, and 94 textural features, such as pixel organization in the tumour area. To perform radiomics, it is necessary to
identify the area of interest, which is done in most studies by manual segmentation: the lesion is delineated manually, usually on each slice of the CT scan or MRI. This process is laborious and time consuming, especially for large lesions.

Machine learning and AI can be used to facilitate this process by automating the segmentation computationally, as seen in several studies, which may streamline the process and make the use of radiomics feasible in daily practice. Several studies investigating AI-automated segmentation have shown an AUC of approximately 0.80 [33–36], demonstrating that this approach can be further improved. Machine learning can also be used to develop predictive models and be applied to evaluate benign vs. malignant tumours, RCC subtypes, RCC aggressiveness, and even help to evaluate response to treatment in the metastatic setting. In studies of machine learning model–based radiomics to discriminate between benign vs. malignant solid renal lesions, the AUC ranged from 0.68 to 0.84 [37, 38], highlighting potential for improvement. Importantly, a meta-analysis has demonstrated a 3-fold detection improvement of benign lesions in patients who underwent CT- or MRI-based radiomics investigation [19]. Another interesting future avenue is the development of radiogenomics, the combination of radiomics features with genomic data, which may help clinicians to better define stratification risk, guide treatment selection and follow-up strategy, as well as better determine disease prognosis [39].

Compared to solid renal masses, the role of radiomics on cystic renal lesions has not been as well explored. One study of 150 patients examined a CT-based radiomics nomogram to identify malignant and benign Bosniak IIF lesions. The radiomics nomogram performed with an accuracy of 0.935 [40]. A limitation of this study was the number of malignant Bosniak IIF lesions (> 20%) in the cohort, which is much higher than seen in clinical practice (usually < 5%). It is also important to note that the Bosniak classification system is subject to inter-reader variability.

A more relevant approach moving forward is using radiomics instead of the Bosniak system to predict malignancy. This approach was employed in a study led by Dr. Caroline Reinhold at McGill University. The study included 149 cystic renal lesions in the training dataset and 50 cystic renal lesions in the testing dataset. In both datasets, the radiomics model had excellent performance, with sensitivity of 88% and specificity of 97% in the testing dataset [41]. The radiomics model was then built into a clinical decision algorithm to determine appropriate management (no follow-up, active surveillance, or surgery). Using radiomics combined with a clinical decision algorithm, the authors were able to reliably predict management. This decision algorithm is promising but must be prospectively validated in a multicentre study including Bosniak IIF, III, and IV lesions.

Additionally, different mathematical formulae can be used to extract quantitative features from images. In another study, the use of a fusion feature–based classifier machine learning algorithm demonstrated excellent diagnostic performance to accurately distinguish malignant and benign cystic renal lesions, outperforming the Bosniak-2019 version classification with improved utility in clinical decision-making [42].

There is an ongoing need for noninvasive approaches to decrease the overtreatment of renal lesions. Radiomics holds promise as a new clinical decision tool. Some needed improvements to this tool include further development of automated segmentation, as well as larger and higher-quality studies, particularly for cystic renal lesions, to validate the role of radiomics in clinical practice.

During a Q&A, Dr. Richard further delved into the limitations of AI and radiomics in the kidney cancer practice. He believes that the main limiting factor is the manual segmentation of conventional imaging. So far, no studies have been able to use automated segmentation reliably, i.e., use AI to identify the region of interest, and make the segmentation process faster. Several groups are looking into strategies to improve segmentation. He also added that there are studies investigating MRI-based radiomics, but those have not been superior to radiomics based on CT scans.

Following was a debate on whether triple therapy is the best treatment option for patients with intermediate-risk RCC according to the International mRCC
Database Consortium (IMDC) classification. Dr. Karima Oualla (Morocco) presented the pros, whereas Dr. Christian Kollmannsberger (Canada) presented the cons of this approach.

Dr. Oualla started by highlighting the evolution of the treatment landscape in mRCC in the last 2 decades, progressing from very few therapeutic options with limited survival benefit to contemporary treatments with immunotherapy-immunotherapy (IO-IO) and immunotherapy-tyrosine kinase inhibitor (IO-TKI) and combinations. Such advances have contributed to meaningful improvements in overall survival (OS) for patients in the advanced setting.

Ipilimumab-nivolumab is the only first-line IO-IO combination therapy available for mRCC. This combination demonstrated improved OS and progression-free survival (PFS) against sunitinib in the randomized phase 3 CheckMate 214 trial in patients with intermediate- and poor-risk mRCC. Five-year follow-up data demonstrated continued benefit of ipilimumab-nivolumab combination vs. sunitinib. Available IO-TKI options are pembrolizumab-axitinib (KEYNOTE-426), nivolumab-cabozantinib (CheckMate 9ER), and pembrolizumab-lenvatinib (CLEAR). All available IO-TKI combinations have demonstrated improved objective response rate (ORR), PFS, and OS compared to sunitinib in the respective phase 3 trials. Median OS for avelumab-axitinib (JAVELIN Renal 101) has not been reached.

There are certain advantages to each treatment combination strategy, in addition to improved OS. IO-IO combination has the most mature follow-up data demonstrating durable responses and long-term survival. IO-TKI combinations, on the other hand, have demonstrated improved objective response rate (ORR), PFS, and OS compared to sunitinib in the respective phase 3 trials. Median OS for avelumab-axitinib (JAVELIN Renal 101) has not been reached.

The phase 3 COSMIC-313 trial examined this strategy as first-line treatment in mRCC. Patients were randomized to receive ipilimumab + nivolumab + cabozantinib in the treatment arm vs. ipilimumab + nivolumab + placebo in the control arm. Ipilimumab was stopped in both arms after the fourth cycle. Patients received maintenance nivolumab for up to 2 years. The trial met its primary endpoint of improved median PFS with the triplet combination (hazard ratio [HR] = 0.73; 95% CI, 0.57 to 0.94, \( P = 0.01 \)). Interestingly, the PFS and ORR benefits with the triplet combination were observed only in IMDC intermediate-risk patients, but not in poor-risk patients. Early separation of curves was seen in intermediate-risk patients, indicating an early effect of the triplet combination. In this group, triplet therapy resulted in 32% reduction of the risk of progression or death. Despite the differences in PFS benefit, Dr. Oualla noted that ipilimumab + nivolumab + cabozantinib resulted in high disease control rate (DCR) and low progressive disease rate, even in the poor-risk population. However, higher rates of adverse events and treatment discontinuations were seen with the triplet therapy compared to ipilimumab + nivolumab.

COSMIC-313 represents an important milestone for the treatment of mRCC, as this is the first randomized controlled trial in this space to have a contemporary doublet control arm (i.e., not sunitinib). This is the first positive trial evaluating a triplet therapy. It demonstrates not only early response to treatment but also maintenance of the PFS benefit and suggests potential advantages of combining the IO-IO and IO-TKI treatment strategies. OS data are highly anticipated. However, there are several limitations to the current results. It is still unclear why no benefit was seen with the triplet combination in poor-risk patients, who have more aggressive disease. Toxicity was higher with the triplet than the doublet therapy, as expected. It is thus important to better select patients who may benefit from an intensified treatment through a risk-adapted approach. Biomarker studies may support these treatment decisions. Other ongoing trials are investigating triplet combinations (LITESPARK-012, NCT04736706) and a risk-adapted approach (PDIGREE, NCT03793166) for the treatment of mRCC.

Dr. Kollmannsberger started by explaining that optimal therapy is therapy that maximizes the benefit and minimizes the risk. While this definition is subjective, there is a general agreement that benefit can be defined by tumour shrinkage, disease control, and/
or extension of survival. Risk, on the other hand, can be defined as type, timing, and duration of treatment toxicity, inconvenience of treatment, and/or financial toxicity.

In the COSMIC-313 trial, after a median follow-up of 17.7 months, PFS benefit with the triplet combination was seen in the IMDC intermediate-risk group (HR = 0.68; 95% CI, 0.54 to 0.86) but not in the poor-risk group (HR = 0.93; 95% CI, 0.64 to 1.35) [50]. This analysis by IMDC risk group appears to be an exploratory subgroup analysis that was not adjusted for multiplicity. This adjustment is important because it potentially inflates the risk for a type 1 error, i.e., there is an increased risk of reporting a false positive result. Therefore, these results should be interpreted with caution.

Compared with the doublet, the triplet combination in the intermediate-risk group resulted in higher ORR (45% vs. 36%), higher DCR (88% vs. 74%), and lower progressive disease (7% vs. 20%) [50]. However, it is important to examine the distribution of responses to properly interpret the data. In the intermediate-risk triplet therapy group, there were more responses and less progressive disease, but lower depth of response compared to the doublet therapy group [51]. This is particularly relevant because the depth of response correlates with survival and duration of response (DoR) [52–54].

Another issue with the triplet combination investigated in COSMIC-313 is the overlapping toxicity between IOs and TKIs, such as rash, diarrhea, hepatitis, and hypothyroidism. These toxicities may become more pronounced depending on the TKI. Cabozantinib has the longest half-life (~99 h) among TKIs approved for the treatment of mRCC [55], which has important implications for the treatment of mRCC. Cabozantinib has the longest half-life (~99 h) among TKIs approved for the treatment of mRCC, which has important implications for the treatment of mRCC [55].

During the Q&A, Dr. Tanguay pointed out that there are limited mechanisms of action of the treatment options in mRCC. He enquired what the ideal magnitude of benefit would need to be to make triplet combinations feasible in clinical practice. Dr. Kollmannsberger highlighted that triplet therapies have rarely performed better than doublets in the history of medical oncology. Currently, the PFS and ORR.
benefit observed in the triplet comes at the cost of high toxicity and, likely, DoR. The situation could change if there was a clear OS benefit. Dr. Oualla added that risk stratification is presently based on archaic criteria. She stressed the need to develop biomarkers to more accurately stratify patients for treatment.

Next, the panel addressed the criteria for having pre-specified patient-reported outcomes data, such as quality of life (QoL), in phase 3 clinical trials and how these may help inform the benefit/risk ratio of treatment. Dr. Kollmannsberger finds it difficult to include patient-reported outcomes in clinical trial design. First, the current tools are not validated for specific diseases, such as kidney cancer, as the questions are not relevant for specific patient populations. Second, the patient experience is influenced by several factors, some of which may not be related to the treatment or the disease. Third, the time of assessment of toxicity may impact the outcomes reported. For these reasons, patient-reported outcomes are subjective and, therefore, difficult to base a statistical clinical trial design on.

Lastly, the debaters discussed the reason behind the lack of response in the poor-risk group, even though that group was expected to benefit from treatment intensification with triplet therapy. Dr. Oualla commented that there is high heterogeneity in the poor-risk group, which could explain why no benefit was observed. Further analysis could help identify certain characteristics in the poor-risk patients that may be associated with response to the triplet combination. Dr. Kollmannsberger added that, even though there were no differences in treatment delivery between the 2 risk groups, the reduced treatment exposure may have had a greater impact on the poor-risk group. Dr. Oualla noted that, despite the limitations, COSMIC-313 represents an important landmark in clinical trials in mRCC on which future trials can improve.

Next, Dr. Kollmannsberger discussed which clinical trial endpoint (PFS, ORR, or OS) is the most important for selecting first-line therapy in mRCC. Endpoints may be classified as traditional endpoints (ORR, PFS, OS), nontraditional endpoints (DoR, landmark PFS, long-term OS, treatment-free survival), early endpoints (ORR, PFS, early OS), and late endpoints (DoR, landmark PFS, long-term OS, treatment-free survival). How endpoints are structured hierarchically has an impact on treatment choice. However, patient presentation, such as the presence of comorbidities and the benefit seen with a specific regimen (short term vs. long term) may impact the hierarchy of endpoints as well.

An ideal treatment regimen would decrease the risk of early treatment failure and increase the chance of achieving a durable response. Across the different IO-IO and IO-TKI combinations available, there is little variation in the HR for OS (0.70 to 0.84)[60–63], which makes it a challenge for clinicians to discern between different treatments based on OS alone. Generally, IO-TKI regimens show significant benefits in terms of early endpoints, such as lower primary progressive disease rate and higher DCR[64–66] relative to IO-IO combination[60]. With respect to PFS, a plateau has been observed after a 24-month follow-up with IO-IO combination, and approximately 30% of patients remain progression-free 5 years after follow-up[60], whereas the development of a plateau has not been observed to the same degree with IO-TKI combinations. Similarly, the median DoR with IO-IO has not been reached even after a median follow-up of 6 years[67]. The majority of patients who achieved remission remain in remission, with a significant proportion of these patients being completely off treatment. IO-IO combination has also demonstrated durable and persistent long-term outcomes in terms of PFS, OS, and best observed response of complete response (CR)[60]. For the IO-TKI combinations, the median DoR has been reached and ranges from 21.5 to 27 months[64,65,68].

One critical aspect to consider is what endpoints are important to patients. In a recent survey developed by the Kidney Cancer Research Alliance (KCCure), it was observed that most patients want to aim for cure, the chance of eliminating all evidence of disease, as well as durability[69]. Therefore, patients appear to favour durable endpoints, such as DoR and long-term survival, rather than short-term benefits.
Dr. Kollmannsberger shared his strategy for selecting first-line therapy after a thorough discussion with the patient. When the goal is achieving CR or a chance for long-term survival (or cure), then he aims to maximize a chance of long-term survival with an IO-IO combination, in which long-term benefit is more robust. In this context, patients are willing to favour efficacy over toxicity for the potential benefit of long-term survival. Alternatively, in patients who are highly symptomatic, who show wide-spread disease, and in whom second-line therapy is unlikely, response rate becomes more important to minimize the risk of primary progression.

Comorbidities also have an impact on the first-line choice for mRCC. IO-IO combination should be avoided when the patient has a pre-existing autoimmune disease or other conditions that prevent the administration of high-dose steroids, such as diabetes or decreased mobility. If the patient lives in a rural setting with limited access to resources, that may also prevent access to high-dose steroids. On the other hand, IO-TKI combinations should be avoided in patients who have uncontrolled hypertension, posterior reversible encephalopathy syndrome, recent stroke or myocardial infarction, poor kidney function, and/or recent bleeding episodes.

Defining which endpoint to favour when selecting first-line therapy (i.e., the hierarchy of endpoints) depends on a number of factors, including patient preference and patient presentation. Overall, patients prefer long-term outcomes over short-term outcomes, toxicity, and cost. Importantly, physicians should thoroughly discuss the goals of treatment with their patients because the physician and patient view on the importance of outcome parameters may differ. When the primary goal of treatment is response rate and tumour control, physicians may favour IO-TKI combinations given their strong early benefit for high tumour control and improved PFS. Alternatively, if the goal of treatment is long-term survival, then IO-IO combination retains a greater advantage in terms of long-term benefit observed from a PFS plateau, DoR, long-term OS, and conditional survival. Ultimately, OS remains the most important endpoint for selecting treatment.

However, if there are several treatment options with similar OS, physicians should examine other endpoints in conjunction with the goal of treatment and patient preference to guide decision-making.

During a Q&A session, Dr. Kollmannsberger discussed whether the lack of plateau for IO-TKI combinations may derive from a suboptimal TKI dosing regimen compared to the TKI monotherapy. He agrees that the TKI dosing in the combination would require adjustment to optimize efficacy, as seen with single-agent TKI regimes. However, he is uncertain whether the lower TKI dose in the IO-TKI may explain the lack of a long-term plateau. This is because the number of long-term survivors in single-agent TKI studies is low, suggesting that TKIs are not the main driver of long-term outcomes with IO-TKI combinations.

The next talk, by Dr. Öner Sanli (Türkiye), covered optimal patient selection for adjuvant therapy post nephrectomy. Around 30% of patients with ccRCC will progress within the first 5 years after surgery. Progression may be associated with higher tumour grade (independent of stage), stage ≥ T3, sarcomatoid differentiation, and lymph node metastasis of up to 80%. In this setting, adjuvant therapy is vital in eliminating residual, undetectable, microscopic disease after curative resection. Of several targeted agents evaluated for adjuvant treatment, sunitinib is the only TKI that demonstrated disease-free survival (DFS) improvement compared to placebo, as seen in the phase 3 S-TRAC trial. More recently, the adjuvant treatment with the immune checkpoint inhibitor pembrolizumab demonstrated significant DFS improvement compared to placebo based on results of the phase 3 KEYNOTE-564 trial.

Optimal patient selection for adjuvant therapy will depend on certain criteria. It is important to understand which patients may be at higher risk for progression, which treatment should be selected, if there are any biomarkers available to guide decision-making (e.g., programmed cell death ligand-1 [PD-L1] status), and if the patient can tolerate treatment.

Five prognostic models are supported by EAU guidelines to assess the risk of progression after
surgery: UISS, Leibovich 2003, Leibovich 2018, VENUSS, and GRANT[4]. In a head-to-head comparison of prognostic models to predict clinical progression and cancer-specific mortality, models demonstrated different prognostic performance according to RCC subtype: Leibovich 2018 was more accurate in predicting ccRCC outcomes, whereas VENUSS and UISS had better prognostic accuracy for papillary and chromophobe RCC, respectively[74]. In different studies of adjuvant therapy post nephrectomy, different prognostic models were used and the investigators often modified those. This makes inferences on risk stratification across clinical trials more challenging. Given its simplicity, Dr. Sanli prefers to use the American Urological Association (AUA) guideline on renal mass and localized renal cancer for risk stratification after surgery in his practice[75].

The choice of treatment may also vary from patient to patient. In the S-TRAC trial, subgroup analysis suggested a greater DFS benefit of adjuvant sunitinib in patients who were younger (< 45 years of age), had normal weight, good performance status, neutrophil-to-lymphocyte ratio ≤ 3, Fuhrman grade 3/4, and were high risk[72]. In KEYNOTE-564, subgroup analysis indicated a superior DFS benefit in M1 patients with no evidence of disease and those presented with sarcomatoid features[73]. Other trials are ongoing in the adjuvant setting, such as RAMPART (dauvelumab ± tremelimumab, NCT03288432) and LITESPARK-022 (pembrolizumab + belzutifan, NCT05239728), that may provide a better understanding of which patients may derive more benefit from adjuvant therapy. Dr. Sanli also noted that while DFS has been used as an early clinical surrogate for OS, its adoption is controversial. In a meta-analysis of 13 studies in the adjuvant setting, there was no correlation between 5-year DFS and 5-year OS rates, suggesting the need for an alternative early endpoint that better reflects clinical outcomes[76]. Median OS has not been reported for KEYNOTE-564.

Regarding biomarkers, PD-L1 expression and tumour mutational burden are predicted in response to immune checkpoint inhibitors in many immunogenic tumours, such as bladder cancer and melanoma. However, RCC responds to immune checkpoint inhibitor therapy irrespective of PD-L1 expression levels, as seen in KEYNOTE-564[73] and IMmotion010[77]. Additionally, higher expression of PD-L1 may not uniformly correlate with improved outcomes. In recent years, there have been several efforts to identify genomic biomarkers to optimize risk stratification in RCC. One example is ClearCode34, a 34-gene classifier-based model shown to improve upon established algorithms for assessing the risk of recurrence and death for nonmetastatic ccRCC[78]. Another study has identified a 16-gene expression panel associated with risk stratification for recurrences[79]. More recently, several studies have investigated liquid biomarkers in urine, serum, and plasma, although none have yet been validated for use in clinical practice[80].

Lastly, Dr. Sanli examined the tolerability of adjuvant treatment. In KEYNOTE-564, improved DFS was seen in patients younger than 65 years and those who had performance status ≤ 1[73]. However, the benefit observed in clinical trials may differ from that seen in the daily clinic. As seen in a study of 1459 patients, those who were included in clinical trials were generally younger, healthier, and had better estimated outcomes than patients in the real-world population[81]. Moreover, while patient-reported outcomes suggest no compromise to QoL with adjuvant pembrolizumab[82], physicians in daily practice will likely see patients who are generally older and frailer. An adequate management plan involving multiple specialties, such as geriatrics and medical oncology, should be developed.

Currently, data on adjuvant treatment of RCC post nephrectomy are limited. While the benefit observed with adjuvant pembrolizumab is presently based on DFS, OS data are required to guide decision-making. Optimal patient selection for adjuvant treatment requires adequate risk stratification and evaluation of performance status.

During a Q&A, Dr. Sanli examined whether he sees promise in combining genomic classifiers with current prognostic models to improve risk stratification and treatment selection. Despite the recent efforts in developing genomic classifiers for RCC, those are still
in early stages. Further development will be required before RCC genomic classifiers can be implemented in clinical practice.

The following presentation was by Dr. Tian Zhang (United States), who discussed treatment with belzutifan in sporadic and hereditary RCC. Von Hippel-Lindau (VHL) syndrome is a disease caused by germline pathogenic variants in the VHL gene. The syndrome is associated with an increased risk for the development of benign and malignant tumours in multiple organs and systems, such as the pancreas, central nervous system, and the retina, as well as the kidneys, where it manifests as ccRCC[83].

The VHL protein plays an important role in cellular oxygen sensing. Under normal oxygen conditions, the HIFα transcription factor hydroxylates and interacts with VHL, which is an E3 ligase allowing ubiquitination of HIFα and subsequent proteasomal degradation. Conversely, under hypoxic conditions, HIFα is not hydroxylated and does not bind to VHL. Instead, it dimerizes with an aryl hydrocarbon receptor nuclear translocator (ARNT) and translocates to the nucleus, where the HIFα-ARNT complex acts as a transcription factor for downstream expression of several genes, such as EPO, TGFβ, PDGF, and VEGF, which are involved in erythropoiesis, metabolism, and angiogenesis. Normally, this pathway serves to promote acute or chronic adaptation to hypoxia[84]. However, if the VHL protein is defective, there is constitutive activation of HIF2α, a subunit of HIFα, that mimics hypoxic conditions even under normal oxygen levels. This leads to upregulation of angiogenesis and tumourigenesis, as seen in VHL-defective ccRCC[85]. Importantly, around 95% of patients with sporadic ccRCC have a defective VHL protein.

The ability to target the HIF complex for therapeutic purposes evolved thanks to the elucidation of its crystal structure and, in particular, the identification of the HIF2α PAS-B domain. This domain is essential for HIF2α dimerization with ARNT[86]. Over time, several small molecules were developed to target the HIF2α PAS-B domain and prevent dimerization, which culminated with the development of the HIF2α inhibitor belzutifan[85].

The first-in-human study of belzutifan included a dose-expansion cohort of 52 patients. Most were IMDC intermediate or poor risk (76%) and had received ≥ 3 prior lines of systemic therapy. Treatment with belzutifan resulted in an ORR of 25% (all partial responses) and a median PFS of 14.5 months[87], suggesting encouraging early response as monotherapy in patients with ccRCC.

In patients with VHL syndrome, belzutifan was investigated in the phase 2 LITESPARK-004 trial. The trial enrolled 61 patients diagnosed with VHL syndrome based on germline mutation who had at least 1 measurable RCC tumour. Daily belzutifan treatment resulted in 49% of patients achieving partial response and another 49% achieving stable disease. Importantly, all patients experienced a reduction of surgical procedures for VHL-associated tumours after being treated with belzutifan[88]. All patients in the trial had a VHL-associated tumour outside the kidney and also experienced an improvement in those tumours from baseline with belzutifan treatment[89].

Another phase 2 trial examined belzutifan in combination with cabozantinib in advanced or metastatic ccRCC in 2 cohorts: cohort 1 included patients who had not received prior IO in this setting, and cohort 2 included patients previously exposed to IO treatment. Results of cohort 2 were recently published[90]. Most patients in this cohort had previously received an IO-IO or IO-TKI combination. Treatment with belzutifan in combination with cabozantinib resulted in DCR of 90% and ORR of 22% (all partial responses). Treatment-related adverse events were on target, resulting more commonly in anaemia, fatigue, and hand-foot syndrome.

There are several ongoing studies of belzutifan in refractory ccRCC. The phase 3 LITESPARK-005 trial recently reported positive results for belzutifan vs. everolimus, with significant improvements in ORR and PFS but not OS[91]. In the phase 2 LITESPARK-013 trial, similar efficacy and safety were seen with 120 mg vs. 200 mg of belzutifan daily[92]. In addition, the phase 3 LITESPARK-011 trial (NCT04586231) is investigating the combination of belzutifan with lenvatinib vs. cabozantinib.
Phase 3 trials are also ongoing in earlier ccRCC settings. In the first-line metastatic setting, the LITESPARK-012 trial (NCT04736706) is randomizing patients to 3 treatment arms: belzutifan + lenvatinib + pembrolizumab, quavonlimab + lenvatinib + pembrolizumab, or lenvatinib + pembrolizumab. In the adjuvant setting after nephrectomy, LITESPARK-022 (NCT05239728) is investigating the combination of pembrolizumab + belzutifan vs. pembrolizumab + placebo.

Other small molecule HIF2α inhibitors (NKT2152, DFF332, AB521) as well as silencing small interfering RNA (siRNA) are also under investigation in early-phase trials.

While the results observed with belzutifan are encouraging, prolonged inhibition of a pathway often results in acquired resistance. In a study using tumour xenograft models, researchers identified acquired mutations in the HIF1β gene (F446) and HIF2α gene (G323) that confer resistance to PT2399, a small molecule HIF2α inhibitor [93]. The HIF2α G233 mutation has been identified in a patient after prolonged treatment with PT2385, a predecessor of belzutifan, resulting in acquisition of resistance [94]. This is an important consideration for patient management.

In summary, HIF2α is now targetable, with belzutifan having a positive impact as standard of care treatment for patients with VHL syndrome. As further trials read out, the role of belzutifan may be expanded for sporadic ccRCC in the refractory setting. Combinations of belzutifan with other effective therapies in ccRCC may also start to impact the landscape of treatment options in earlier settings of first-line metastatic and adjuvant ccRCC. However, it is important to acknowledge that treatment resistance will start to impact HIF inhibition in patients who have prolonged exposure to treatment, posing an additional challenge to patient management.

During a Q&A, Dr. Zhang discussed the toxicity of belzutifan and how to manage it in the clinic. Compared with toxicities from other systemic therapies in this space, those from belzutifan appear more tolerable. She noted that dose titration is an adequate option in those patients, and she also prescribes erythropoietin for patients presenting with severe anemia. For the combination of belzutifan with cabozantinib, patients may experience diarrhea, hypertension, and hand-foot syndrome. Hypoxia and shortness of breath, while not frequent adverse events with belzutifan monotherapy, may be of concern for an older patient population. When they occur, pausing or titrating to a lower dose may be recommended. Usually, these side effects are resolved with a lower dose. Dr. Zhang also noted that, given the prevalence of somatic VHL inactivation and HIF-driven tumorigenesis in ccRCC, trials have so far enrolled all comers. As belzutifan may start to move into earlier settings, markers of treatment resistance may become important for decision-making. Dr. Zhang also discussed the current multidisciplinary management of patients with VHL syndrome who have localized ccRCC. In her practice, the choice of management by a urologist or a medical oncologist will be time dependent. She typically sees patients who have had a radical unilateral nephrectomy and have developed a tumour on the contralateral kidney. To spare renal function, these patients typically start on systemic therapy, such as belzutifan. Dr. Zhang emphasized the need for collaboration between urologists and medical oncologists to optimize outcomes for patients with VHL syndrome.

The final talk was an update on emerging clinical trial data in RCC presented by Dr. Axel Bex (the Netherlands). First, Dr. Bex provided an update on IO-IO and IO-TKI combinations in first-line metastatic ccRCC. As discussed earlier in the Kidney Cancer session, four phase 3 trials have demonstrated improvement in OS HR for IO-IO combination with nivolumab + ipilimumab (CheckMate 214) and IO-TKI combinations with pembrolizumab + axitinib (KEYNOTE-426), nivolumab + cabozantinib (CheckMate 9ER), and pembrolizumab + lenvatinib (CLEAR). However, while OS HR were similar at initial report [43,45–47], extended follow-up revealed an increase in OS HR for IO-TKI combinations over time [61–63]. It is important to note that the proportion of IMDC risk groups included in all 4 trials was different. The IO-TKI trials also included favourable-risk patients in the extended OS analysis,
which may have contributed to the OS HR increase. This differs from the statistical analysis from CheckMate 214[60]. Alternatively, these results may support different strategies discussed earlier in the meeting, where IO-TKI combinations may be used if a rapid response is needed, whereas IO-IO combination may provide a more durable response. Key clinical trials on the horizon examining IO in combination with other agents in the metastatic ccRCC setting include triplet combinations in LITESPARK-012 (NCT04736706) and nivolumab + ipilimumab followed by a risk-adapted approach in PDIGREE (NCT03793166).

Dr. Bex then provided an update on non-ccRCC trials. To date, the majority of trials have been conducted in patients with papillary mRCC. In a phase 2 trial comparing sunitinib, cabozantinib, crizotinib, and savolitinib, PFS was significantly longer with cabozantinib compared to sunitinib[95]. This trial introduced cabozantinib as standard of care for papillary mRCC. Crizotinib and savolitinib arms closed early due to futility. Interestingly, savolitinib appears to have more pronounced activity in patients with MET alterations. This hypothesis is currently under investigation in the phase 3 SAMETA trial (NCT05043090), which is randomizing patients to savolitinib + durvalumab vs. durvalumab vs. sunitinib. Confirmed MET-driven papillary mRCC by next-generation sequencing is an inclusion criterion for the trial.

Other basket trials have investigated new treatment approaches in non-ccRCC subtypes. Of note is the phase 2 KEYNOTE-B61, which examined the efficacy of pembrolizumab + lenvatinib as first-line treatment for metastatic non-ccRCC. The trial demonstrated an ORR of 49% in the overall population, 54% in papillary RCC, and 28% in chromophobe RCC (all partial responses)[96]. Other trials in IO monotherapy had not demonstrated activity in chromophobe RCC. In KEYNOTE-B61, the estimated 12-month PFS was 63%, and the 12-month OS was 82%[96]. In the phase 2 CaNi Triplet trial, triple therapy with cabozantinib + nivolumab + ipilimumab followed by cabozantinib + ipilimumab was investigated in variant RCC histology. The observed ORR was 18% (25% in papillary and 9% in chromophobe RCC), and the estimated 12-month PFS and OS were 51% and 79%, respectively[97]. However, higher toxicity was also observed with the triplet combination.

Key trials have recently been reported in the second and later lines of therapy for mRCC. The phase 3 CONTACT-03 trial did not meet its co-primary endpoints of PFS and OS with the combination of atezolizumab + cabozantinib vs. cabozantinib alone[98]. The phase 3 LITESPARK-005 trial reported positive results for belzutifan vs. everolimus with significant improvements in ORR and PFS but not OS[91]. Dr. Bex pointed out that a different comparator, such as cabozantinib, might have made the results of LITESPARK-005 more impactful. Also of note in this setting is the phase 3 LITESPARK-011 trial (NCT04586231) investigating the combination of belzutifan + lenvatinib vs. cabozantinib. This trial completed accrual in August 2023.

In the adjuvant setting, IMmotion010[77], PROSPER[99], CheckMate 914 part A[100], and EVEREST[101] all failed to meet their primary endpoints. CheckMate 914 part B (NCT03138512) randomized patients to nivolumab, nivolumab + ipilimumab, or placebo. Results of this cohort are highly anticipated. To date, pembrolizumab is the only agent with positive DFS results in the adjuvant RCC setting based on KEYNOTE-564[73]. On the horizon, adjuvant pembrolizumab in combination with belzutifan is being investigated in LITESPARK-022 (NCT05239728).

Several trials are ongoing in the neoadjuvant setting. Notably, the phase 2 NESCO trial (NCT05148546) is one of the few in this space randomizing patients to different treatment arms: nivolumab, nivolumab + ipilimumab, or nivolumab + relatlimab, all followed by nephrectomy. The primary endpoint is pathologic response rate according to the international melanoma classification.

There are also some ongoing trials in the metastatic setting investigating deferred treatment of the primary tumour by cytoreductive nephrectomy (NORDIC-SUN, NCT03977571; PROBE, NCT04510597) or stereotactic body radiation therapy (CYTOSHRINK, NCT04090710). There are signals that patients eligible for those trials are living much longer with immune
checkpoint inhibitor combination therapy than previously expected based on vascular endothelial growth factor receptor (VEGFR)-TKI data, which indicate that the TKI event rate on which those trials are modelled may be much lower.

Dr. Bex concluded his presentation by emphasizing that the first-line landscape for metastatic ccRCC appears consolidated with the current long-term data available; however, the use of triplet therapies in this setting requires further investigation. IO-TKI combination therapies have demonstrated efficacy in non-ccRCC, including chromophobe RCC. Additional options are under investigation in the second and later lines of therapy and will likely improve the current understanding in this setting. In the perioperative landscape, trials completed thus far have demonstrated contradictory results, and further trials are ongoing to help elucidate the role of systemic therapies in this setting.

In the Q&A, Dr. Bex noted that the majority of contemporary clinical trials have not sufficiently explored opportunities to improve risk stratification and the development of biomarkers in RCC. He emphasized that trials designed and led by academic centres may help to drive future developments in this particular field.

Abbreviations Used in the Text

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Abbreviation</th>
<th>Definition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$^{89}\text{Zr}$</td>
<td>zirconium-89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$^{99}\text{mTc}$</td>
<td>technetium-99m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$^{124}\text{I}$</td>
<td>iodine-124</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AI</td>
<td>artificial intelligence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ARNT</td>
<td>aryl hydrocarbon receptor nuclear translocator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AUC</td>
<td>area under the curve</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAIX</td>
<td>carbonic anhydrase IX</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ccRCC</td>
<td>clear cell renal cell carcinoma</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CI</td>
<td>confidence interval</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CR</td>
<td>complete response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CT</td>
<td>computed tomography</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DCR</td>
<td>disease control rate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DFS</td>
<td>disease-free survival</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DoR</td>
<td>duration of response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EAU</td>
<td>European Association of Urology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HiF</td>
<td>hypoxia-inducible factor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HR</td>
<td>hazard ratio</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IMDC</td>
<td>International mRCC Database Consortium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IO</td>
<td>immunotherapy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mRCC</td>
<td>metastatic renal cell carcinoma</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MRI</td>
<td>magnetic resonance imaging</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NPV</td>
<td>negative predictive value</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ORR</td>
<td>objective response rate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OS</td>
<td>overall survival</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PD-L1</td>
<td>programmed cell death ligand-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PET</td>
<td>positron-emission tomography</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PFS</td>
<td>progression-free survival</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PPV</td>
<td>positive predictive value</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QoL</td>
<td>quality of life</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RCC</td>
<td>renal cell carcinoma</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPECT</td>
<td>single-photon emission computed tomography</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TKI</td>
<td>tyrosine kinase inhibitor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VHL</td>
<td>von Hippel-Lindau</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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