# Examples for Translational Research Projects Somatostatin Receptor Ligands

#### Damian Wild

Professor of Nuclear Medicine Division Head of Nuclear Medicine

Department of Radiology Division of Nuclear Medicine University of Basel Hospital



## Sst<sub>2</sub> receptors in cancer: incidence and density



Targeting of somatostatin receptors with radiolabelled peptides



[<sup>111</sup>In – DOTA<sup>0</sup> - DPhe<sup>1</sup>, Tyr<sup>3</sup>] - Octreotate (DOTATATE)



Imaging:

1. <sup>111</sup>In for SPECT and SPECT/CT

2. <sup>68</sup>Ga for PET and PET/CT

#### Therapy:

- 1. high energy  $\beta$ -emitter <sup>90</sup>Y
- **2.** low energy  $\beta$ -emitter <sup>177</sup>Lu
- 3. high energy  $\alpha$ -emitter <sup>213</sup>Bi

### Somatostatin receptor imaging in NETs

FDA etc. approved

investigation time: 24 h

radiationexposure: 9 mSv

sensitivity: ~ 70%



limited availability not approved

Investigation time: 90 min

radiationexposure: 3 mSv

#### sensitivity: > 90%

changes treatment in ~ 70 % of patients with negative Octreoscan<sup>®</sup>

M. Gabriel et al. J Nucl Med, 2007;48:508-18 I. Buchmann et al. Eur J Nucl Med Mol Imaging, 2007;34:1617-26 R. Srirajaskanthan et al. J Nucl Med, 2010;51:875-82

### Lung- and GEP NETs: sst receptor SPECT vs. PET

Comparison of <sup>68</sup>Ga-DOTA-TOC PET and Octreoscan<sup>®</sup> SPECT in 84 patients with lung- and GEP NETs (patient based analysis)

	<sup>68</sup> Ga-DOTA-TOC PET	Octreoscan SPECT
Sensitivity	97%	52%
Specificity	92%	92%
Accuracy	96%	58%

Gabriel et al. J Nucl Med, 2007, 48:508-518

Diagnostic performance of Gallium-68 sst receptor PET, meta-analysis in 567 patients (patient based analysis)					
	sstR PET				
Sensitivity (95% CI)	93% (91 – 95%)				
Specificity (95% CI)	91% (82 – 97%)				
	Tradia at al Endoarina 2012 12:00 07				



Treglia et al. Endocrine, 2012, 42:80-87

"Somatostatin receptor PET is superior

to somatostatin receptor SPECT in the detection of NET"

Gabriel et al. J Nucl Med, 2007; 48:508-18

"PET has a much higher spatial resolution and sensitivity than SPECT"

Martin et al. Radiology, 1996; 198:225-31

Affinity profile given as IC <sub>50</sub> (mean ± SEM in nM)						
Peptide	$sst_1$	sst <sub>2</sub>	sst <sub>3</sub>	sst <sub>4</sub>	sst <sub>5</sub>	
SS-28	5.2 ± 0.3	2.7 ± 0.3	7.7 ± 0.9	5.6 ± 0.4	4.0 ± 0.3	
<sup>111</sup> In-Octreoscan	>10'000	22 ± 3.6	182 ± 13	>1'000	237 ± 52	
<sup>68</sup> Ga-DOTATOC	>10'000	2.5 ± 0.5	613 ± 140	>1'000	73 ± 21	
<sup>68</sup> Ga-DOTATATE	>10'000	0.2 ± 0.04	>1'000	300 ± 140	377 ± 18	
Reubi et al., Eur J Nucl Med, 2000; 27:273-82						

Example of a 37-year old man with a pancreatic NET (G2) who had the primary tumor removed, known liver metastases ? Restaging before surgery



#### Lung- and GEP NETs: <sup>68</sup>Ga-DOTA-TOC PET vs. triple-phase CT

Comparison of <sup>68</sup> Ga-DOTA-TOC lung- and GEP NETs, evaluation	PET and triple-phase CT in 51 pati of 510 lesions (lesion based analysi	ents with is)
	<sup>68</sup> Ga-DOTA-TOC PET	Triple-phase CT
Sensitivity	73%	77%
Specificity	97%	85%
Accuracy	80%	80%
Specific detection rate	16% only PET	20% only tiple-phase CT
Body organs	pancreas, lymph node, liver	lung, bone, liver
	Puf at al	I Nucl Mad 2011 52:607 704

Ruf et al. J Nucl Med, 2011, 52:697-704



## **GPCR** expression in GEP NETs

Ileal carcinoid (n = 27)





D. Wild, J. Schmitt, H.R. Mäcke et al., Eur J Nucl Med Mol Imaging, 2003; 30:1338-47

Affinity profile given as IC <sub>50</sub> (mean ± SEM in nM)							
Peptid	sst <sub>1</sub>	sst <sub>2</sub>	sst <sub>3</sub>	sst <sub>4</sub>	sst <sub>5</sub>		
SS-28	5.2 ± 0.3	2.7 ± 0.3	7.7 ± 0.9	5.6 ± 0.4	$4.0 \pm 0.3$		
<sup>68</sup> Ga-DOTATOC	>10'000	2.5 ± 0.5	613 ± 140	>1'000	73 ± 21		
<sup>68</sup> Ga-DOTATATE	>10'000	0.2 ± 0.04	>1'000	300 ± 140	377 ± 18		



Example of a 37-year old man with a pancreatic NET (G2) who had the primary tumor removed, known liver metastases ? Restaging before surgery



CT scan



<sup>68</sup>Ga-DOTANOC PET 1h p.i. sst<sub>2,3,5</sub> receptor PET



### Comparison of <sup>68</sup>Ga-DOTATATE and <sup>68</sup>Ga-DOTANOC PET

Comparison of <sup>68</sup> Ga-DOTA-TATE PET and <sup>68</sup> Ga-DOTA-NOC PET in 18 patients with GEP NETs using a randomized cross-over design.						
		<sup>68</sup> Ga-DOTATATE PET sst <sub>2</sub> -selective tracer	<sup>68</sup> Ga-DOTANOC PET sst <sub>2,3,5</sub> -selective tracer			
patient by patient based analysis	sensitivity	<b>94%</b> (17/18)	<b>94%</b> (17/18)			
lesion by lesion based analysis						
all lesions	sensitivity	<b>86%</b> (212/250)	<mark>94%</mark> (232/248)			
Liver metastases	sensitivity	<b>73%</b> (68/93)	<mark>95%</mark> (88/93)			
Bone metastases	sensitivity	<b>100%</b> (89/89)	<mark>92%</mark> (82/92)			

D. Wild et al. J Nucl Med, 2013, 54:364-372



#### Targeting of somatostatin receptors with radiolabelled peptides

Peptide receptor radionuclide imaging and therapy = theranostic approach

[<sup>68</sup>Ga – DOTA<sup>0</sup> - DPhe<sup>1</sup>, Tyr<sup>3</sup>] - Octreotide (<sup>68</sup>Ga-DOTATOC) radionuclide chelator peptide = carrier



#### Personalized medicine & PRRT – theranostic approach



<sup>68</sup>Ga-DOTATOC PET

3 cycles of PRRT (total of 15 GBq)

<sup>68</sup>Ga-DOTATOC PET follow-up







<sup>68</sup>Ga-DOTATOC PET/CT





<sup>68</sup>Ga-DOTATOC PET/CT





## Summary PRRT-Results

Trial	Protocol		PD at entry	N	CR/PR (%)	Median PFS (months)	Median OS (months)
Open label 4 x <sup>177</sup> Lu-DOTATATI Phase II		1	Not required	310	30	33	46
Trials 2 x <sup>90</sup> Y-DOTATO	2 x <sup>90</sup> Y-DOTATOC <sup>2</sup>	Required		1109	34	12.7	44
Radiotracer (PRRT)	<sup>er</sup> 3 x <sup>90</sup> Y-DOTATOC <sup>3</sup> 1 x <sup>90</sup> Y-DOTATOC + 2 x <sup>177</sup> Lu-DOTATOC	)C	Required	237 249	28 26	10.4 10.4	47.1 66.1
Trial	Protocol	Hist	tology		CR/PR (%)	Biochemical Response (%)	Clinical Response (%)
Open label Phase II Trial	2 x <sup>90</sup> Y-DOTATOC <sup>2</sup> NET		T of the pancreas		49	14	38
			NET of the lleum		27	18	28





Rotterdam data: 1: Kwekkeboom, JCO, 2008; Basel data: 2: Imhof, JCO, 2011; 3: Villard, JCO, 2012

# 2 x <sup>90</sup>Y-DOTATOC in NETs (Theranostic approach)

Large open label phase II study, N = 1109



Imhof A et al. J Clin Oncol. 2011;29:2416-2423.



Tumor dose-response relationship in patients with neuroendocrine tumors Correlation between <sup>86</sup>Y-DOTA-TOC dosimetry and treatment outcome



Pauwels et al. J Nucl Med, 2005;46 (Suppl):S92-S98

Tumor dose-response relationship in 13 patients treated with <sup>90</sup>Y-DOTA-TOC.

Dosimetric calculations are based on <sup>86</sup>Y-DOTA-TOC PET and CT imaging.



### Specific targeting using radiolabeled antagonists

So far only radiolabeled agonists have been used for PRRT



### Sst<sub>2</sub> receptor targeting: agonist vs. antagonist

Scatchard-analysis in HEK-sst <sub>2</sub> cells ( $B_{max}$ -values: Mean ± SEM in pM)						
Substance	sst <sub>2</sub> - binding sites (B <sub>max</sub> -values)	Internalization				
<sup>111</sup> In labelled sst <sub>2</sub> -agonist	23 ± 1.0	sst <sub>2</sub> -specific internalization				
<sup>111</sup> In labelled sst <sub>2</sub> antagonist <b>354 ± 14</b>		no internalization				
		M. Ginj et al. PNAS, 2006; 103:16436-41				

Affinity profile given as IC <sub>50</sub> (mean ± SEM in nM)							
Peptide	$sst_1$	sst <sub>2</sub>	sst <sub>3</sub>	sst <sub>4</sub>	sst <sub>5</sub>		
<sup>68</sup> Ga-DOTA-TATE	>1′000	0.2 ± 0.04	>1′000	300 ± 140	377 ± 18		
<sup>68</sup> Ga-NODAGA-JR11	>1′000	1.2 ± 0.2	>1′000	>1'000	>1'000		
<sup>177</sup> Lu-DOTA-JR11	>1′000	0.73 ± 0.15	>1′000	>1′000	>1'000		



M. Fani et al. J Nucl Med, 2013, 54:364-372

#### Sst<sub>2</sub> receptor targeting: agonist vs. antagonist

 

Immunofluorescence microscopy using the sst2-specific antibody R2-88 in HEK-sst2 cells

No peptide
DOTA-TOC sst2-agonist
Ga-NODAGA-JR11 sst2-antagonist
Ga-NODAGA-JR11 + DOTA-TOC sst2-antagonist + agonist

Immunofluorescence
Immunofluorescence
Immunofluorescence
Immunofluorescence

No peptide
Immunofluorescence
Ga-NODAGA-JR11 sst2-antagonist
Ga-NODAGA-JR11 + DOTA-TOC sst2-antagonist + agonist

Immunofluorescence
Immunofluorescence
Immunofluorescence
Immunofluorescence

Immunofluorescence
Immunofluorescence
Immunofluorescence
Immunofluo

M. Fani et al. J Nucl Med, 2013, 54:364-372





G. Nicolas, D. Wild, M. Fani et al. not published data



Patient with metastatic ileal NET (G2), renal insufficiency grade III



n = 4 patients with progressive neuroendocrine tumors (NETs), dosimetry results are based on 3D voxel-dosimetry analysis							
	Patient 1	Patient 2	Patient 3	Patient 4	<b>Median</b> (inter quartile range)		
<b>Pre-treatment dosimetry:</b> Comparison of the mean radiation dose to tumors (Gy/GBq)							
<sup>177</sup> Lu-DOTA-TATE	1,1- 2,0	5,6 - 13	0,5 - 2,7	1,5 - 4,6	2,0 (1,2-4,6)		
<sup>177</sup> Lu-DOTA-JR11	5,7 - 7,4	16 - 29	4,8 - 5,9	4,2 - 20	7,0 (5,7-16)		
Treatment dosimetry	Treatment dosimetry: Mean total radiation dose to tumors (Gy)						
<sup>177</sup> Lu-DOTA-JR11	23 - 59	283 - 487	33 - 130	39 - 302	47 (37-283)		
Treatment outcome: Response according to RESIST version 1.1							
<sup>177</sup> Lu-DOTA-JR11	Mixed response	PR	SD	PR			
<b>Treatment toxicity:</b> Toxicity according to WHO Common Toxicity Criteria version 2.0							
Hematologic toxcitiy	Grade 2	Grade 3	Grade 2	Grade 2	Grade 2		



Wild et al. J Nucl Med, 2014, 55:1248-1252

## Summary and conclusion

► Somatostatin receptor PET is superior to Octreoscan. It is indicated for surgery planning/staging of patients with NETs (G1/G2).

- ► Targeting of multiple somatostatin receptors might be superior to targeting of sst<sub>2</sub> receptors only. Further evaluation is needed.
- PRRT is a palliative systemic therapy for patients with somatostatin receptor positive advanced NETs who show progression.
- ► The theranostik approach can select patients who benefit most of PRRT. The treatment benefit is tumor dose dependent.
- ► Further improvement of somatostatin receptor imaging and PRRT seems possible, e.g. with the use of somatostatin receptor antagonists instead of agonists. Further evaluation is needed.



### Acknowledgement

#### Coworkers

<u>MDs:</u> **G. Nicolas**, Ch. Rottenburger, F. Kaul, O. Maas, M. Braun, T. Baumann, A. Sauter, M.

Radiochemistry: Prof. Th. Mindt, **M. Fani,** A. Baumann and coworkers

Med. Physics/Dosimetry: L. McDougall

<u>Technicians:</u> M. Nagy and coworkers

Nurses: M. Speiser and coworkers

Assistant / Logistics: B. Avis, A. Guggiana, Ch. Evard

#### Collaboration

J.C. Reubi, University of Bern, Switzerland P.J. Ell, M.A. Caplin, University College London, London, GB H.R. Mäcke, University Hospital Freiburg, Germany H. Bouterfa, Octeopharm GmbH, Berlin, Germany





### Thank you for your attention

