

TYRA-300 pharmacokinetic and pharmacodynamic analysis in SURF301 demonstrates PD activity and selectivity over FGFR1

Yohann Loriot¹, Allison Zhang², Aaron Hansen³, Charlene Mantia⁴, Valentina Boni⁵, Andrew Weickhardt⁶, Evan Y. Yu⁷, Marie Robert⁸, Gopa Iyer⁹, Andrew Murtha¹⁰, Sherry Owens¹¹, Ben Suttle¹², Gillian Vandekerkhove¹⁰, Alexander Wyatt¹⁰, Guy Gammon¹¹, Timothy Burn¹¹, Ben Tran¹³

BACKGROUND

Activating FGFR3 gene alterations are present in up to 20% of advanced/metastatic urothelial cancers (mUC). While FGFR+ mUC is responsive to treatment with FGFR inhibitors, the lack of FGFR isoform specificity in current pan-FGFR inhibitors leads to on-target FGFR1/2/4 toxicity. In particular, hyperphosphatemia (FGFR1 inhibition), ocular toxicities (FGFR2 inhibition), stomatitis (FGFR2 inhibition), and skin and nail toxicity (FGFR2 inhibition).

Additionally, loss of activity to current generation FGFR inhibitors has been demonstrated in the clinic due to development of on-target resistance mutations (e.g., FGFR3 V555M/L gatekeeper). TYRA-300 was designed to be more selective for FGFR3 as well as target FGFR3 gatekeeper mutations.¹ TYRA-300 is in development for the treatment of FGFR3 gene alteration positive mUC and other solid tumors (SURF301 - NCT05544552).

METHODS

Eligible adults with advanced malignancies with/without FGFR3 alterations received oral TYRA-300 in continuous 28-day cycles. Dose escalation (10mg -120mg QD) allowed any FGF/FGFR pathway alteration. Dose expansion (40-90mg QD) required FGFR3 alterations. The current analysis included 41 patients from the QD cohorts. Steady-state PK was assessed at C1D15. Phosphate levels were assessed as part of laboratory chemistries. PD and ctDNA analysis

were performed on available plasma samples collected at Baseline, C1D15 and C2D1. Changes in plasma proteins were determined using the Olink[®] platform (Waltham, MA). On treatment Olink[®] data was compared to baseline with a paired T-Test using the 60-120 mg QD participants and a cut-off of P < 0.01 and an absolute fold-change of 1.5. Changes in ctDNA fraction were assessed in a subset of patients with available ctDNA samples (n=19) using a custom deep targeted sequencing approach.²



RESULTS







Greater than dose proportional exposure observed. FGFR1-4 target exposures are based on protein binding adjusted Ba/F3 cellular assays. Doses \geq 90 mg exceeded the FGFR3 IC90 target coverage that resulted in tumor regressions in an FGFR3 p.S249C mUC xenograft model.¹ (Error bars are Mean ± SEM).



120 ma 40 mg

FGF19 binds to FGFR3 and FGFR4 and to co-receptor KLB⁶



Compromised Collagen 2a1 and 9a1 secretion causes overactive FGFR3 signaling in Slc26a2 deficient chondrocytes⁷ linking collagen secretion to FGFR3.

FGF19 and KLB increased as potential compensatory mechanism to FGFR3 inhibition. No differences in response based on tumor type or FGFR3 status, consistent endogenous and not tumor derived response. Confirmation of FGFR3 dependence ongoing with FGFR4 PD analysis.

ctDNA



Decreases in ctDNA observed for participants with FGF/FGFR3 altered tumors treated with 90 mg QD . A molecular response was defined as a >50% decrease.⁸

0.5

90mg 120mg 120mg 40mg 90mg 40mg 60mg 60mg

No hyperphosphatemia was observed at levels > 7 mg/dLacross all doses with 7 mg/dL being the level requiring intervention for currently approved panFGFR inhibitors.³⁻⁵

AUTHOR AFFILIATIONS

- 1. Institut de Cancerologie Gustave Roussy, Villejuif, France
- 2. Macquarie University Health Sciences Centre, Macquarie Park, NSW, Australia.
- 3. Princess Alexandra Hospital & University of Queensland, Woolongaba, QLD, Australia.
- 4. Harvard Medical School, Boston, MA, USA.
- 5. NEXT Madrid, Hospital Quironsalud, Madrid, Spain.
- 6. Olivia Newton-John Cancer and Wellness Centre, Austin Health, Melbourne, VIC, Australia
- 7. Fred Huthinson Cancer Center and University of Washington, Seattle, WA, USA

8. Institut de Cancerologie de l'Ouest, Saint Hebran, France.

9. Department of Medicine, Memorial Sloan Kettering Cancer Center, New York, NY, USA.

40mg

90mg

60mg

No compensatory increase in

with selectivity against FGFR1.

Dotted green lines denote 1.5-

fold absolute fold change.

FGF21 (FGFR1 ligand) consistent

120mg

- 10. Vancouver Prostate Centre, Department of Urologic Sciences, University of British Columbia, Vancouver, BC, Canada
- 11. Tyra Biosciences, Inc, Carlsbad, CA, USA.
- 12. qPharmetra, 506 Grant Forest Lane. Cary, North Carolina 27519, USA
- 13. Department of Medical Oncology, Sir Peter MacCallum Cancer Centre, Melbourne, VIC, Australia.

CONCLUSIONS

In the ongoing SURF301 study, TYRA-300 had demonstrated exposures above the IC_{90} for FGFR3 inhibition that are below the IC₅₀ for FGFR1/2/4. TYRA-300 led to changes in FGFR3 PD markers, a low incidence of hyperphosphatemia and decreases in plasma ctDNA fractions for all four participants with available samples.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The authors would like to thank all patients, caregivers, all the SURF301 investigators and study personnel at study sites. The authors would like to acknowledge the efforts of Jennifer Davis and Alexandra Balcer on this study. We also thank Rob Wishnowsky of Cruxio, Inc. for his contributions to the poster.

REFERENCES

- 1. Starrett J, Allen A, Balcer AM, Bensen DC et al. Annals of Oncology, Volume 33, S751
- 2. Vandekerkhove G, Lavoie JM, Annala M, Murtha AJ, Sundahl N et al. Nat Commun. 2021 Jan 8;12(1):184. doi: 10.1038/s41467-020-20493-6.
- 3. Janssen Pharmaceutical Companies. BALVERSA® (erdafitinib) [package insert]. U.S. Food and Drug Administration.
- https://www.accessdata.fda.gov/drugsatfda_docs/label/2024/212018s007s008s00 9lbl.pdf. Accessed 27 September 2024.
- 4. Incyte Corporation. PEMAZYRE[™] (pemigatinib) [package insert]. U.S. Food and Drug Administration.
- https://www.accessdata.fda.gov/drugsatfda_docs/label/2022/213736s002lbl.pdf. Accessed 27 September 2024.
- 5. Taiho Pharmaceutical Co. LYTGOBI[®] (futibatinib) [package insert]. U.S. Food and Drug Administration.
- https://www.accessdata.fda.gov/drugsatfda_docs/label/2024/214801s002lbl.pdf. Accessed 27 September 2024.
- 6. Tao Z, Cui Y, Xu X, Han T.. Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A. 2022 Oct 4;119(40):e2208844119. doi: 10.1073/pnas.2208844119.
- 7. Zheng C, Lin X, Xu X, Wang C et al. EBioMedicine. 2019 Feb;40:695-709.
- 8. Zhang Q, Luo J, Wu S, Si H, Gao C et al. Cancer Discov. 2020 Dec;10(12):1842-1853. doi: 10.1158/2159-8290.

Download a copy of

this poster here

