Article Type: Primary

Clinical Trials: Targeted Therapy

Title: Efficacy and Safety of Dabrafenib in Pediatric Patients with *BRAF* V600 Mutation–Positive Relapsed or Refractory Low-Grade Glioma: Results from a Phase 1/2a Study

Authors: Darren Hargrave[1], Eric Bouffet[2], Uri Tabori[3], Alberto Broniscer[4], Kenneth J. Cohen[5], Jordan R. Hansford[6], Birgit Geoerger[7], Pooja Hingorani[8], Ira J. Dunkel[9], Mark W. Russo[10], Lillian Tseng[10], Kohinoor Dasgupta[11], Eduard Gasal[10], James A. Whitlock[2], and Mark W. Kieran[12]

Affiliations: [1]UCL Great Ormond Street Institute of Child Health, Pediatric Oncology Unit, London, UK. [2]Hospital for Sick Children, University of Toronto, Department of Pediatrics, Toronto, ON, Canada. [3]Arthur and Sonia Labatt Brain Tumor Research Center, Division of Hematology/Oncology, Hospital for Sick Children, University of Toronto, Toronto, ON, Canada. [4]Department of Oncology, St. Jude Children's Research Hospital, Memphis, TN, USA. [5]The Sidney Kimmel Comprehensive Cancer Center at Johns Hopkins, Division of Pediatric Oncology, Baltimore, MD, USA. [6]The Royal Children's Hospital, Murdoch Children's Research Institute, University of Melbourne, Department of Pediatrics, Melbourne, VIC, Australia. [7]Gustave Roussy Cancer Center, Department of Childhood and Adolescent Oncology, Université Paris-Saclay, Villejuif, France. [8]Phoenix Children's Hospital, Center for Cancer and Blood Disorders, Phoenix, AZ, USA. [9]Memorial Sloan Kettering Cancer Center, Department of Pediatrics, New York, NY, USA. [10]Novartis Pharmaceuticals Corporation, East Hanover, NJ, USA. [11]Novartis Healthcare Pvt. Ltd., Hyderabad, India. [12]Harvard Medical School, Boston Children's Hospital, Dana-Farber Cancer Institute, Boston, MA, USA

Running Title: Phase 1/2a study of dabrafenib in pediatric LGG

Keywords: BRAF, dabrafenib, pediatric cancer, low-grade glioma, targeted therapy

Financial Support: The trial was sponsored by GlaxoSmithKline; dabrafenib and trametinib were designated as assets of Novartis on March 2, 2015, after which Novartis took sponsorship of the trial.

Corresponding Author:

Prof. Darren Hargrave, MD
UCL Great Ormond Street Institute of Child Health
Great Ormond Street
London, UK, WC1N 3JH
Phone: +44 (20) 78138525
Fax: +44 (20) 78138588
Email: darren.hargrave@nhs.net

Disclosure of Potential Conflicts of Interest: D. Hargrave reports consultancy and advisory board participation for Novartis, AstraZeneca, Bayer, Boehringer Ingelheim, Celgene, Roche and research funding from AstraZeneca. E. Bouffet reports receiving research funding from Roche and Bristol-Myers Squibb (BMS). K.J. Cohen reports advisory board participation for Novartis, BMS, and DNATrix. I.J. Dunkel reports consultancy for Apexigen, Bayer, and Celgene. K. Dasgupta, L. Tseng, E. Gasal, and M.W. Russo are employees and stockholders of Novartis. J.A. Whitlock reports receiving research funding from Novartis and advisory board participation for Gilead, Jazz, and Shire. M.W. Kieran has received clinical trial support from Novartis and also serves on a Novartis scientific advisory board; consulting or advisory role from Bayer,

Boehringer Ingelheim, Sigma-Tau, Merck, BMS, and Takeda; speakers' bureau from Merck Sharp & Dohme (MSD); travel and accommodation expenses from MSD; and is currently an employee of BMS. No potential conflicts of interest were disclosed by the other authors.

Word Counts: abstract, 228/250 words; statement of translational relevance, 133/150 words; body of manuscript, 3,834/5,000 words

Figures/Tables: 3 figures, 3 tables (limit 6 tables/figures); 1 supplementary figure

References: 35 (limit 50)

Statement of Translational Relevance:

Low-grade gliomas (LGGs) are the most frequently occurring brain tumors in pediatric patients. This study represents the largest clinical trial demonstrating the activity and safety of a BRAF inhibitor (dabrafenib) in pediatric patients with tumors harboring a *BRAF* V600 driver mutation. Meaningful clinical benefit with dabrafenib was demonstrated in pediatric patients with relapsed or refractory *BRAF* V600–mutant LGG, with an objective response rate of 44% and a 1-year estimated progression-free survival rate of 85% by independent review. The safety profile was favorable and consistent with adverse events observed in adult patients. These safety and preliminary efficacy data demonstrate the potential of dabrafenib as a novel therapy in a pediatric patient population who have few effective treatment options, providing support for further investigation in patients with *BRAF* V600 mutation–positive tumors, including LGG.

Abstract

Purpose: Pediatric low-grade glioma (pLGG) is the most prevalent childhood brain tumor. Patients with *BRAF* V600 mutation–positive pLGG may benefit from treatment with dabrafenib. Part 2 of a phase 1/2a study, open-label study (NCT01677741) explores the activity and safety of dabrafenib treatment in these patients.

Experimental Design: Patients aged 1 to <18 years who had *BRAF* V600–mutant solid tumors (≥1 evaluable lesion) with recurrent, refractory, or progressive disease after ≥1 standard therapy were treated with oral dabrafenib 3.0–5.25 mg/kg/day (part 1) or at the recommended phase 2 dose (RP2D; part 2). Primary objectives were to determine the RP2D (part 1, results presented in a companion paper) and assess clinical activity (part 2). Here, we report the clinical activity, including objective response rates (ORRs) using RANO criteria and safety across parts 1 and 2.

Results: Overall, 32 patients with pLGG were enrolled (part 1, *n* = 15; part 2, *n* = 17). Minimum follow-up was 26.2 months. Among all patients, the ORR was 44% (95% confidence interval [CI] 26–62) by independent review. The 1-year progression-free survival rate was 85% (95% CI 64–94). Treatment-related adverse events (AEs) were reported in 29 patients (91%); the most common was fatigue (34%). Grade 3/4 treatment-related AEs were reported in nine patients (28%).

Conclusions: Dabrafenib demonstrated meaningful clinical activity and acceptable tolerability in patients with *BRAF* V600–mutant pLGG.

Introduction

Glioma accounts for nearly two-third of all pediatric malignant central nervous system tumors and comprises a diverse spectrum of low-grade (eg, pilocytic astrocytoma, diffuse (fibrillary) astrocytoma, and ganglioglioma) and high-grade (eg, anaplastic astrocytoma and glioblastoma) malignancies (1-3). Patients with pediatric low-grade glioma (pLGG) can be cured with complete surgical resection; however, most patients with incompletely resected tumor will require additional treatment (4). Current options for patients whose tumors are not amenable to definitive surgery or whose tumors have recurred or progressed include radiotherapy and chemotherapy, which may provide 3-year progression-free survival rates up to approximately 70% but are associated with significant morbidities (eg, cognitive/neurological dysfunction, secondary malignancies, and infertility) (4-7).

A greater understanding of the molecular mechanisms underlying pLGG has led to the identification of potential targets that can be evaluated for clinical intervention (8). Genetic alterations that result in constitutive activation of the BRAF kinase, including a nucleotide transversion resulting in the substitution of valine (V; most commonly with glutamic acid [E]) at position 600 [ie, V600E point mutation] or a tandem duplication resulting in the fusion of *KIAA1549* and *BRAF* [ie, *BRAF:KIAA1549*]), have been implicated in the development of pLGG (9-11). In one large series, *BRAF* V600E mutations were detected in 19% of pLGGs across a broad range of histologies (12). Pleomorphic xanthoastrocytomas and gangliogliomas have been reported to have the highest incidence of *BRAF* V600E mutations among pLGGs, while pilocytic astrocytoma has the highest incidence of *BRAF:KIAA1549* gene fusions (13,14). *BRAF* V600

mutation–positive LGG in pediatric patients has been associated with poor responses to chemotherapy and radiation as well as shorter duration of response and worse long-term outcomes vs non-*BRAF* V600 LGG (12); thus, these patients represent an important subpopulation in need of improved treatment options.

Dabrafenib, a potent and selective *BRAF* V600 inhibitor, has demonstrated clinical benefit in adult patients across a spectrum of *BRAF* V600–positive solid tumors, and is currently approved as a single agent and in combination with the MEK inhibitor trametinib in patients with unresectable or metastatic *BRAF* V600E/K–mutant melanoma. Dabrafenib as monotherapy or in combination with trametinib has shown activity against melanoma brain metastases in these patients (15). Additionally, dabrafenib plus trametinib is approved in patients with *BRAF* V600 mutation–positive non-small cell lung cancer (NSCLC) or anaplastic thyroid cancer and as an adjuvant therapy in patients with *BRAF* V600 mutation–positive resectable melanoma. The efficacy of dabrafenib in these adult populations suggests the potential for clinical benefit in pediatric patients with other tumor types driven by the *BRAF* V600 mutation, including pLGG.

Based on the mechanistic rationale, the ability to screen for the relevant driver mutations, and the availability of an age-appropriate formulation, we conducted a two-part, phase 1/2a, single-arm, open-label trial evaluating the safety, tolerability, and clinical activity of dabrafenib in pediatric patients (>12 months) with advanced *BRAF* V600 mutation–positive solid tumors (16). Part 1 was a dose-escalation study to determine the recommended phase 2 dose (RP2D) of dabrafenib in pediatric patients with advanced *BRAF* V600 mutation–positive solid tumors (including LGG) for

subsequent evaluation in part 2 of the study, and is reported in the companion paper to this manuscript (16). Age-dependent dose escalation of dabrafenib in part 1 established the RP2D at 5.25 mg/kg/day in patients <12 years of age and 4.5 mg/kg/day in patients ≥12 years of age, with no dose-limiting toxicities (DLTs) observed (16). Part 2 included four tumor-specific expansion cohorts of patients with *BRAF* V600 mutation–positive tumors (LGG, high-grade glioma [HGG], Langerhans cell histiocytosis, and other tumors such as melanoma and papillary thyroid carcinoma). Here, we report the activity and safety of dabrafenib treatment in pediatric patients with *BRAF* V600–mutant relapsed or refractory LGG.

Patients and Methods

Study design and participants

We performed a phase 1/2a multicenter, open-label study in pediatric patients with advanced *BRAF* V600 mutation–positive solid tumors (NCT01677741). The completed part 1 is detailed in a separate report (16). The dose-escalation decisions were made based on the DLTs observed during the first 28 days, overall toxicity profile, and pharmacokinetics data. Part 2 was an expansion study conducted in four *BRAF* V600 mutation–positive tumor-specific cohorts at 18 sites in eight countries (Australia, Canada, Denmark, France, Germany, Spain, UK, and USA). Patients enrolled in part 2 were treated with the established RP2D from part 1. Patients only participated in part 1 or part 2 of the study. The study will be completed after the last patient has been treated for ≥6 months in the last accruing stratum.

Eligible patients with LGG were aged 1 to <18 years and had at least one evaluable *BRAF* V600 mutation–positive tumor according to RANO criteria, determined locally by a Clinical Laboratory Improvement Amendments (CLIA)–approved laboratory (or equivalent), adequate organ function, and a Karnofsky (for ≥16 years of age) or Lansky (for <16 years of age) performance score ≥50. Baseline evaluable (but not measurable) disease was required. Patients were required to have recurrent, refractory, or progressive disease following receipt of ≥1 prior standard therapy. Patients could not have received chemotherapy or radiotherapy within 3 weeks (or 6 weeks for nitrosoureas or mitomycin C) or an investigational agent within 28 days (or five half-lives or twice the duration of the biological effect) prior to the first dose of dabrafenib. Only in part 2, patients were excluded if they had received previous treatment with a RAF inhibitor (including dabrafenib) or a MEK inhibitor; previous treatment with sorafenib was permitted. Treatment with dabrafenib was continued until disease progression, lack of clinical benefit from continued treatment, unacceptable toxicity, initiation of a new therapy, or consent withdrawal.

The study was conducted in accordance with the provisions of the Declaration of Helsinki, Good Clinical Practice guidelines, and all applicable regulatory requirements. The protocol was approved by the institutional review board or human research ethics committee at each study center. Written informed consent (or assent, for age-appropriate patients according to institutional guidelines) was obtained from each patient, patient's parent, or legal guardian prior to the performance of any study-specific procedures.

Procedures

For part 1 (see companion paper) (16), the initial cohort received a starting dose of 3.0 mg/kg/day, as two divided daily doses. Dabrafenib dose levels evaluated in part 1 were 3.0, 3.75 (corresponds to the approved adult dose of 150 mg twice daily), 4.5, and 5.25 mg/kg. The total daily dose was split evenly into morning and evening doses to follow the twice-daily regimen as administered in adults. Standard dabrafenib capsule strengths (50 mg and 75 mg) were administered to children who were able to swallow capsules. Lower strength capsules (10 mg and 25 mg) and an oral suspension formulation were used for patients who could not swallow the larger capsules. Follow-up dermatologic skin assessments were performed every 2–3 months for 6 months following discontinuation of dabrafenib or until initiation of another anticancer therapy.

The primary endpoint was objective response rate (ORR) as determined using RANO criteria. Responses were determined both by the investigator and by an independent pediatric neuro-radiologist. Imaging was performed using MRI. Radiographic tumor assessment occurred at baseline and every 8 weeks thereafter through 56 weeks; subsequent scans were performed every 12 weeks or as per the standard of care. Clinical activity was assessed based on the Response Assessment in Neuro-Oncology (RANO) criteria (19). Adverse events (AEs) were graded according to the National Cancer Institute Common Terminology Criteria for Adverse Events (NCI-CTCAE) version 4.0 criteria.

Outcomes

198 The RP2D of 5.25 mg/kg/day in patients <12 years of age and 4.5 mg/kg/day in patients
199 ≥12 years of age was determined in part 1 of the study and is described in the
200 companion paper (16). Further evaluation of the safety, tolerability, pharmacokinetics,
201 and clinical activity of dabrafenib in tumor-specific pediatric populations was performed
202 in part 2 of the study.

203 Statistical analysis

204 Data were summarized using descriptive statistical methods. For the part 1 dose-
205 escalation phase (16), a minimum of three patients per dose level were evaluated to
206 determine the RP2D. For the part 2 expansion, ≥10 patients per disease cohort were
207 enrolled. Planned analysis populations for statistical considerations included the all-
208 treated population of patients who received ≥1 dose of study treatment. The all-treated
209 population was used for the safety and efficacy analyses, and for summarizing the
210 baseline and disease characteristics.

211 Safety data were based on the initial dose of dabrafenib assigned and were
212 summarized for AEs and laboratory abnormalities based on the maximum toxicity
213 grade. The extent of exposure was summarized for all patients. For the results
214 described here, data were grouped for all pediatric patients with LGG enrolled across
215 parts 1 and 2.

216 Efficacy analyses were conducted in the all-treated population. In addition, sensitivity
217 analysis was performed on the response-evaluable population, which was defined as
218 the proportion of all-treated patients with a pre-dose and ≥1 post-dose efficacy
219 assessment. For efficacy analyses, assessments of response were based on the RANO

criteria for all pediatric patients with LGG (17,18). Per RANO criteria, a patient must have measurable disease at baseline in order to qualify for a complete response (CR) or partial response (PR) determination. The ORR was defined as the proportion of all treated patients with the best overall response of CR or PR (95% confidence intervals [CIs] were calculated). Both CR and PR were confirmed by repeat assessments not less than 4 weeks after the criteria for response were first met (17). The duration of response was defined as the time from the initial response (CR or PR) to the first documented disease progression or death.

Results

From December 2013 through July 2015, 32 pediatric patients with investigator-determined *BRAF* V600 mutation–positive, refractory or recurrent LGG were enrolled across 15 centers in Australia, Canada, France, Spain, and the United States across three dose levels, and were included in the efficacy and safety analyses (Supplementary Fig. S1). Fifteen patients were enrolled in part 1 (dose finding) and 17 were enrolled in part 2 (at the RP2D). In part 1, the RP2D was determined (16). Patients enrolled in part 2 were treated at the RP2D, determined as dabrafenib 5.25 mg/kg/day for patients <12 years of age (*n* = 9) and 4.5 mg/kg/day for patients ≥12 years of age (*n* = 8). There was no correlation between dose and response in this relatively small study. Overall, 24 patients were treated at the age-defined RP2D (seven in part 1 and 17 in part 2). Demographics and baseline disease characteristics of pediatric patients with LGG are summarized in Table 1. The median age was 8.5 years (range 2–17), and 22 of 32 patients (69%) were <12 years of age. Pilocytic astrocytoma (*n* = 13; 41%), ganglioglioma (*n* = 7; 22%), and pleomorphic xanthoastrocytoma (*n* = 3; 9%) were the

most common LGG diagnoses; other tumors are reported in Table 1. All 32 patients had a documented progression. The median time since initial LGG diagnosis (in 26 patients with available data) was 32 months (range 6–190). Ten of 32 patients did not have progressive disease within the previous 4 months and were eligible for enrolment with indolent disease as per the phase I part of the study. Twenty-two patients (69%) were initially diagnosed with grade 1 disease, nine patients (28%) with grade 2 disease, and one patient had undetermined grade 1 or grade 2 disease. Most patients had a good Karnofsky/Lansky performance status; only 13% of the patients had a performance status below 80 at baseline. Prior treatments were predominantly chemotherapy (*n* = 28; 88%) and radiotherapy (*n* = 6; 19%). Five patients had a best overall response of PR to the most recent therapy received before starting dabrafenib treatment; no prior CRs were reported.

As of the data cutoff date (September 12, 2017) with a minimum follow-up of 26.2 months, 15 patients (47%) were continuing treatment with dabrafenib (Table 1).

The study set no minimum treatment duration and the most common reason for treatment discontinuation was physician and/or parent decision. Four patients (13%) discontinued due to disease progression, including one patient who discontinued at week 8 of the treatment and underwent subsequent therapy, but later died due to disease progression. This patient was enrolled into this study 11 years after the initial diagnosis of LGG (pilocytic astrocytoma). At autopsy, this patient's tumor was found to have transformed into a *BRAF* V600–mutated, *PDGFRA*-amplified glioblastoma (World Health Organization grade 4). Two patients (6%) discontinued dabrafenib due to AEs. The median duration of dabrafenib exposure was 108 weeks (range <1–185; Table 1

and Fig. 1A), and 17 patients (53%) were on treatment for >2 years. Ten patients (31%) had dose reductions and/or interruptions.

The confirmed ORR with dabrafenib by independent radiological review was 44% (14/32, 95% CI 26–62), and included one patient with CR and 13 with PR (Table 2). Five of these 32 patients were not evaluable for CR or PR per RANO criteria due to non-measurable but evaluable disease at study entry; these five patients were evaluable for and met the definition of stable disease (SD). An example of PR (ongoing at data cutoff) achieved after 8 weeks of dabrafenib therapy in an 11-year-old male patient with *BRAF* V600–mutant ganglioglioma is shown by MRI scan (Fig. 2). Eight of 32 patients (25%) had a first response within 4 months of dabrafenib initiation. The median time to first response was 3.8 months (range 1.7–24.0; Fig. 1A). The median duration of response was 26 months (95% CI 9–not estimable). Eight out of 14 patients had an ongoing response at the time of data cutoff, and six out of 14 patients who relapsed had a duration of response of more than 2 years to dabrafenib. The disease control rate (CR+PR+SD) by independent review was 78% (95% CI 60–91). Among the 27 patients with measurable disease as determined by independent radiological review, 19 (73%) had at least one occurrence of a maximum reduction in lesion size of at least 50% from baseline (Fig. 1B).

The disease control rate (CR+PR+SD) by investigator assessment was 88% (95% CI 71–97). Among the 31 patients with measurable lesions as per investigator assessment, 22 (71%) achieved a maximum reduction in lesion size of at least 50% from baseline (Supplementary Fig. S2). Eleven of the patients with a best overall response of SD by independent review had significant tumor reductions that were categorized by

investigators as PRs, accounting for most of the observed discordance between the independent and investigator assessment of response.

A total of 11 disease progression events were determined by independent review, three of which occurred after ending dabrafenib treatment. Five of the eight patients determined as disease progression on treatment with independent review were continuing treatment at the data cutoff; these patients did not have progression per investigator assessment. The median progression-free survival (independent review) was 35.0 months (interquartile range 12.9–not estimable), and the Kaplan-Meier estimate of the proportion of patients with progression-free survival at 1 year of dabrafenib treatment was 85% (95% CI 64–94; Fig. 3). One survival event occurred after treatment discontinuation.

Treatment-related AEs of any grade occurred in 29 patients (91%); the most common were fatigue (34%), rash (31%), dry skin (28%), pyrexia (28%), and maculopapular rash (28%; Table 3). Grade 3/4 treatment-related AEs were reported in nine patients (28%) and included maculopapular rash (*n* = 3), arthralgia, lymphocytopenia, increased weight, thrombocytopenia, back pain, increased blood alkaline phosphatase, hypotension, neutropenia, and migraine (*n* = 1 each). In this pediatric population, there were no cases of squamous cell carcinoma of the skin or keratoacanthoma, as have been reported commonly in adult patients treated with dabrafenib. Note that new or increased size of melanocytic nevi was reported in 8 of 32 patients (25%), all grade 1 or 2. AEs were well managed by supportive care, dose interruption, and dose reduction. Ten patients had AEs that led to dose interruptions and/or reductions. AEs of allergic reaction/hypersensitivity (*n* = 1) and hip pain/arthralgia with erythema nodosum (*n* = 1)

led to treatment discontinuation in two patients (6%). Treatment-related serious AEs of any grade occurred in five patients (16%) and were reported as grade 3/4 in three patients (9%), which included arthralgia, disseminated intravascular coagulation with hypotension, and maculopapular rash (*n* = 1 each). No treatment-related deaths occurred in the study; one patient died due to disease progression 2 weeks after discontinuing the therapy.

Discussion

This study represents the largest report of successful outcomes from a clinical trial of a *BRAF* V600–targeted therapy in a pediatric population selected based on a specific driver mutation. Previous reports have been limited to case study observations (19-22) and the report of an adult glioma subset from the vemurafenib basket trial that included 9 adult patients with *BRAF* V600–mutant LGG (23). In this study, we demonstrated clinical activity of dabrafenib in pediatric patients with *BRAF* V600–mutant relapsed or refractory LGG in a clinical trial setting; a high proportion of these patients had a radiographic response. Dabrafenib was tolerable and demonstrated a manageable safety profile with a minimum follow-up of >2 years. These results in pediatric patients add to those previously reported for adult patients with other *BRAF* V600 mutation–positive tumors, including melanoma, NSCLC, anaplastic thyroid cancer, and gliomas (24-27). Taken together, these data clearly demonstrate the clinical benefit of targeting the V600 mutation with dabrafenib in pediatric patients with relapsed refractory *BRAF* V600 mutation–positive LGG.

Current treatment options for pediatric patients with progressive or recurrent LGG are limited to radiotherapy and chemotherapy. These are associated with various clinically significant long-term adverse effects, including risk of secondary malignancies, cognitive impairment, hormonal deficiencies, vasculopathies and infertility (5), which are of particular concern in a pediatric patient population. Standard chemotherapy treatments appear to have worse efficacy in patients with *BRAF* V600–mutant LGG than in those with non-*BRAF* V600 LGG (13), including a 10-year progression-free survival of 27% vs 60%. The apparent ORR (CR+PR at the 6-month milestone) observed in historical cohorts of this population treated with chemotherapy is approximately 10% (13). In this study, an ORR of 44% and a 1-year progression-free survival rate of 85% were reported by independent review using the RANO criteria. Approximately half of responders by independent review had an ongoing response at the time of data cutoff. Notably, among patients assessed by independent review, only two had a best response of progressive disease.

The most common reason for discontinuation of treatment in this study was physician and/or parent decision with the majority having at least one year of treatment. It is likely that the typical duration of standard chemotherapy for pLGG of 12-24 months had an impact on the decision to stop therapy in patients with SD or better. Further data generation is needed to determine the optimal duration of treatment, and if patients can be retreated successfully. Anecdotal reports from investigators of this clinical trial, showed that retreatment with dabrafenib can result in tumor control.

Observations from experienced neuro-oncologists and neuro-radiologists involved in the study suggest that *BRAF* V600–mutant LGG tumors may have some unique

characteristics on MRI imaging, which can prove challenging in recording tumor response consistently and accurately as illustrated by the disconcordance seen between the local and central independent review in this study. Generally, LGG tumors are monitored for response by T2/FLAIR MRI sequences, and these T2/FLAIR images are recommended for the observation of tumor size changes in LGG assessment (28). However, some of the LGG tumors on this study appeared more like typical HGG tumors and displayed enhancement in post-gadolinium T1-weighted images ("T1 enhancement"). Further, this enhancement can decrease quickly upon initiation of treatment with dabrafenib and occurs before changes in tumor size are observed on T2/FLAIR sequences. There are a few reports of rapid increase in T1 enhancement upon elective cessation of treatment, with subsequent decrease upon rechallenge with dabrafenib. The mechanism of this rapid change in T1 enhancement is not well understood, nor is its biologic significance. Until more experience is gained, caution should be exercised, as these rapid changes in the size of apparent T1-enhancing *BRAF* V600–mutant LGG tumors on starting or stopping dabrafenib treatment may not accurately represent true changes in tumor size.

The safety profile of dabrafenib in pediatric patients with LGG was manageable and was consistent with that observed in adult patients across other indications, except for the absence of observations of squamous cell carcinoma (as of April 2019). Similar to the observations in patients with melanoma and NSCLC (24,25), fatigue and pyrexia were among the most common treatment-related AEs observed in pediatric patients with LGG treated with dabrafenib; these AEs and others were manageable and did not lead to discontinuation.

Recent research from several different groups led to the identification of multiple molecular aberrations in pLGG tumors (20,21,29), including a *BRAF* V600–mutation rate of 15%–20% across LGG histologies (12,13). A recent study of gene expression profiling of 151 LGG biopsies from pediatric patients demonstrated that *BRAF* gene abnormalities were observed across a variety of histological subtypes, with *BRAF*:*KIAA1549* fusions occurring most frequently in pilocytic astrocytomas and *BRAF* V600 point mutations occurring most frequently in pleomorphic xanthoastrocytomas and gangliogliomas (29). Taken together with the results of the current report, these data suggest that only specific patient subgroups may be more likely to derive benefit from dabrafenib therapy. It is important to note that patients with the *BRAF* gene fusion or duplications should not receive BRAF inhibitor therapy, as preclinical data demonstrate that BRAF inhibition activates the MAPK signaling pathway in cells with wild-type *BRAF* at V600 (30). Furthermore, a phase 2 study of the multikinase inhibitor sorafenib, which targets BRAF, VEGFR, PDGFR, and c-kit, in pediatric patients with recurrent low-grade astrocytomas—some of whom harbored *BRAF* duplications—indicated that sorafenib treatment was associated with accelerated tumor growth (31). The authors concluded that sorafenib may have led to paradoxical ERK activation that caused rapid tumor progression. These data underscore the importance of detailed molecular profiling prior to treatment with BRAF inhibitors in pLGG patients.

The results presented here provide additional rationale for increased efforts worldwide to molecularly characterize newly diagnosed tumors in children, with the intent to identify targetable aberrations for each patient. Indeed, efforts ongoing at centers around the world, including INFORM (German Cancer Research Center), MAPPYACTS

(NCT02613962; Gustave Roussy, France), PEDS-MIONCOSEQ (University of Michigan), BASIC3 (Baylor College of Medicine), iCat (NCT01853345; Dana-Farber Cancer Institute), SMPaeds - Stratified Medicine Pediatrics (ISRCTN21731605; UK) and the Pediatric MATCH program (US NCI) among others, are showing good promise in the ability to provide targeted therapies for pediatric cancer patients who may otherwise have limited treatment options (32-35). Although the tumors of patients enrolled in this study were already determined to harbor the *BRAF* V600 mutation, it is apparent that broad molecular profiling of LGG tumors (as well as other pediatric tumor types) at diagnosis may lead to enhanced treatment options for an increasing number of pediatric cancer patients (36).

Overall, these results demonstrate a distinct clinical benefit and favorable tolerability for dabrafenib in pediatric patients with *BRAF* V600 mutation–positive relapsed or refractory LGG and provide support for further evaluation in this population. Determination of optimal duration of treatment and biological correlates of response to dabrafenib remains important areas of study. As has been demonstrated in several *BRAF* V600–mutant adult tumor types, the addition of trametinib to dabrafenib therapy may provide improved outcomes in pediatric patients with *BRAF* V600–mutant LGG. A phase 2 study of dabrafenib in combination with the MEK inhibitor trametinib in pediatric patients with *BRAF* V600 mutation–positive newly diagnosed LGG or recurrent HGG (NCT02684058) is ongoing.

Authors' Contributions

Conception and design: D. Hargrave, B. Geoerger, M.W. Kieran

Development of methodology: D. Hargrave, B. Geoerger, M. Russo

Acquisition of data (provided animals, acquired and managed patients, provided facilities, etc.): D. Hargrave, E. Bouffet, U. Tabori, A. Broniscer, K.J. Cohen, J.R. Hansford, B. Geoerger, P. Hingorani, I.J. Dunkel, J.A. Whitlock, M.W. Kieran

Analysis and interpretation of data (e.g., statistical analysis, biostatistics, computational analysis): D. Hargrave, B. Geoerger, M.W. Russo, L. Tseng, K. Dasgupta, E. Gasal

Writing, review, and/or revision of the manuscript: D. Hargrave, E. Bouffet, U. Tabori, A. Broniscer, K.J. Cohen, J.R. Hansford, B. Geoerger, P. Hingorani, I.J. Dunkel, M.W. Russo, L. Tseng, K. Dasgupta, E. Gasal, J.A. Whitlock, M.W. Kieran

Administrative, technical, or material support (i.e., reporting or organizing data, constructing databases): L. Tseng

Study supervision: L. Tseng

Acknowledgments

We thank the patients and their families for their participation in this trial, and we thank the investigators and site staff for their contributions. This trial was sponsored by GlaxoSmithKline and Novartis; dabrafenib is an asset of Novartis AG as of March 2, 2015. Medical writing and editorial assistance was provided by Staci Heise, PhD (ArticulateScience LLC), William Fazzone, PhD (ArticulateScience LLC), and Sharol

Janice Rodrigues (Novartis Healthcare Pvt. Ltd.), and was funded by Novartis Pharmaceuticals Corporation. Medical review assistance was provided by Mark Russo, MD, of Novartis Pharmaceuticals Corporation.

Role of funding source

This study was sponsored by GlaxoSmithKline and Novartis; dabrafenib is an asset of Novartis AG as of March 2, 2015. Data were collected by the clinical staff at each study site and monitored by the funder. The funder participated in the data analysis and interpretation as well as in the writing of this report. All authors had full access to the data in the study and accept responsibility for the decision to publish the report. IJD is supported by the NIH/NCI Support Grant (P30 CA008748). DH is supported by the National Institute for Health Research Biomedical Research Centre at Great Ormond Street Hospital for Children NHS Foundation Trust and University College London. JW is supported by the Women's Auxiliary Millennium Chair in Hematology/Oncology at The Hospital for Sick Children. EB and UT are supported by the Garron Family Chair in Childhood Cancer Research. M. Kieran was supported by the National Cancer Institute of the National Institutes of Health under Award Number P50CA165962. The content is solely the responsibility of the authors and does not necessarily represent the official views of the National Institutes of Health.

References

1. Ostrom QT, Gittleman H, Fulop J, Liu M, Blanda R, Kromer C, et al. CBTRUS statistical report: primary brain and central nervous system tumors diagnosed in the United States in 2008-2012. Neuro Oncol 2015;17 Suppl 4:iv1-iv62.
2. Qaddoumi I, Sultan I, Gajjar A. Outcome and prognostic features in pediatric gliomas: a review of 6212 cases from the surveillance, epidemiology, and end results database. Cancer 2009;115:5761-70.
3. Capper D, Jones DTW, Sill M, Hovestadt V, Schrimpf D, Sturm D, et al. DNA methylation-based classification of central nervous system tumours. Nature 2018;555:469-74.
4. Bandopadhayay P, Bergthold G, London WB, Goumnerova LC, Morales La Madrid A, Marcus KJ, et al. Long-term outcome of 4,040 children diagnosed with pediatric low-grade gliomas: an analysis of the Surveillance Epidemiology and End Results (SEER) database. Pediatr Blood Cancer 2014;61:1173-9.
5. Nageswara Rao AA, Packer RJ. Advances in the management of low-grade gliomas. Curr Oncol Rep 2014;16:398.
6. Packer RJ, Ater J, Allen J, Phillips P, Geyer R, Nicholson HS, et al. Carboplatin and vincristine chemotherapy for children with newly diagnosed progressive low-grade gliomas. J Neurosurg 1997;86:747-54.
7. Raikar SS, Halloran DR, Elliot M, McHugh M, Patel S, Gauvain KM. Outcomes of pediatric low-grade gliomas treated with radiation therapy: a single-institution study. J Pediatr Hematol Oncol 2014;36:e366-70.
8. Garcia MA, Solomon DA, Haas-Kogan DA. Exploiting molecular biology for diagnosis and targeted management of pediatric low-grade gliomas. Future Oncol 2016;12:1493-506.

9. Dougherty MJ, Santi M, Brose MS, Ma C, Resnick AC, Sievert AJ, et al. Activating mutations in BRAF characterize a spectrum of pediatric low-grade gliomas. Neuro Oncol 2010;12:621-30.
10. Penman CL, Faulkner C, Lowis SP, Kurian KM. Current understanding of BRAF alterations in diagnosis, prognosis, and therapeutic targeting in pediatric low-grade gliomas. Front Oncol 2015;5:54.
11. Jones DT, Kocialkowski S, Liu L, Pearson DM, Backlund LM, Ichimura K, et al. Tandem duplication producing a novel oncogenic BRAF fusion gene defines the majority of pilocytic astrocytomas. Cancer Res 2008;68:8673-7.
12. Lassaletta A, Mistry M, Arnoldo A, Ryall S, Stucklin ASG, Krishnatry R, et al. Relationship of BRAF V600E and associated secondary mutations on survival rate and response to conventional therapies in childhood low-grade glioma. Journal of Clinical Oncology 2016;34:10509.
13. Lassaletta A, Zapotocky M, Mistry M, Ramaswamy V, Honnorat M, Krishnatry R, et al. Therapeutic and prognostic implications of BRAF V600E in pediatric low-grade gliomas. J Clin Oncol 2017;35:2934-41.
14. Zhang J, Wu G, Miller CP, Tatevossian RG, Dalton JD, Tang B, et al. Whole-genome sequencing identifies genetic alterations in pediatric low-grade gliomas. Nat Genet 2013;45:602-12.
15. Long GV, Trefzer U, Davies MA, Kefford RF, Ascierto PA, Chapman PB, et al. Dabrafenib in patients with Val600Glu or Val600Lys BRAF-mutant melanoma metastatic to the brain (BREAK-MB): a multicentre, open-label, phase 2 trial. Lancet Oncol 2012;13:1087-95.
16. Kieran MW, Geoerger B, Dunkel IJ, Broniscer A, Hargrave D, Hingorani P, et al. A phase 1 and pharmacokinetic study of oral dabrafenib in children and adolescent patients with

recurrent or refractory BRAF V600 Mutation–Positive solid tumors. Clin Cancer Res 2019. doi: 10.1158/1078-0432.CCR-17-3572.

17. Wen PY, Macdonald DR, Reardon DA, Cloughesy TF, Sorensen AG, Galanis E, et al. Updated response assessment criteria for high-grade gliomas: response assessment in neuro-oncology working group. J Clin Oncol 2010;28:1963-72.

18. van den Bent MJ, Wefel JS, Schiff D, Taphoorn MJ, Jaeckle K, Junck L, et al. Response assessment in neuro-oncology (a report of the RANO group): assessment of outcome in trials of diffuse low-grade gliomas. Lancet Oncol 2011;12:583-93.

19. Lassaletta A, Guerreiro Stucklin A, Ramaswamy V, Zapotocky M, McKeown T, Hawkins C, et al. Profound clinical and radiological response to BRAF inhibition in a 2-month-old diencephalic child with hypothalamic/chiasmatic glioma. Pediatr Blood Cancer 2016;63:2038-41.

20. Laviv Y, Toledano H, Michowiz S, Dratviman-Storobinsky O, Turm Y, Fichman-Horn S, et al. BRAF, GNAQ, and GNA11 mutations and copy number in pediatric low-grade glioma. FEBS Open Bio 2012;2:129-34.

21. Ramkissoon SH, Bandopadhayay P, Hwang J, Ramkissoon LA, Greenwald NF, Schumacher SE, et al. Clinical targeted exome-based sequencing in combination with genome-wide copy number profiling: precision medicine analysis of 203 pediatric brain tumors. Neuro Oncol 2017;19:986-96.

22. Bautista F, Paci A, Minard-Colin V, Dufour C, Grill J, Lacroix L, et al. Vemurafenib in pediatric patients with BRAFV600E mutated high-grade gliomas. Pediatr Blood Cancer 2014;61:1101-3.

23. Kaley T, Touat M, Subbiah V, Hollebecque A, Rodon J, Lockhart AC, et al. BRAF inhibition in BRAF(V600)-mutant gliomas: results from the VE-BASKET study. J Clin Oncol 2018:Jco2018789990.

24. Hauschild A, Grob JJ, Demidov LV, Jouary T, Gutzmer R, Millward M, et al. Dabrafenib in BRAF-mutated metastatic melanoma: a multicentre, open-label, phase 3 randomised controlled trial. Lancet 2012;380:358-65.
25. Planchard D, Kim TM, Mazieres J, Quoix E, Riely G, Barlesi F, et al. Dabrafenib in patients with BRAF(V600E)-positive advanced non-small-cell lung cancer: a single-arm, multicentre, open-label, phase 2 trial. Lancet Oncol 2016;17:642-50.
26. Falchook GS, Millward M, Hong D, Naing A, Piha-Paul S, Waguespack SG, et al. BRAF inhibitor dabrafenib in patients with metastatic BRAF-mutant thyroid cancer. Thyroid 2015;25:71-7.
27. Wen P, De Greve J, Mason W, Hofheinz R-D, Dietrich S, de Vos F, et al. Efficacy and safety of dabrafenib + trametinib in patients with recurrent/refractory BRAF V600E–mutated low-grade glioma (LGG). Neuro Oncol 2018;20:vi238-vi9.
28. Wen PY, Chang SM, Van den Bent MJ, Vogelbaum MA, Macdonald DR, Lee EQ. Response assessment in neuro-oncology clinical trials. J Clin Oncol 2017;35:2439-49.
29. Bergthold G, Bandopadhayay P, Hoshida Y, Ramkissoon S, Ramkissoon L, Rich B, et al. Expression profiles of 151 pediatric low-grade gliomas reveal molecular differences associated with location and histological subtype. Neuro Oncol 2015;17:1486-96.
30. Maraka S, Janku F. BRAF alterations in primary brain tumors. Discov Med 2018;26:51-60.
31. Karajannis MA, Legault G, Fisher MJ, Milla SS, Cohen KJ, Wisoff JH, et al. Phase II study of sorafenib in children with recurrent or progressive low-grade astrocytomas. Neuro Oncol 2014;16:1408-16.
32. Mody RJ, Prensner JR, Everett J, Parsons DW, Chinnaiyan AM. Precision medicine in pediatric oncology: Lessons learned and next steps. Pediatr Blood Cancer 2017;64.

33. Worst BC, van Tilburg CM, Balasubramanian GP, Fiesel P, Witt R, Freitag A, et al. Next-generation personalised medicine for high-risk paediatric cancer patients - The INFORM pilot study. Eur J Cancer 2016;65:91-101.
34. Harris MH, DuBois SG, Glade Bender JL, Kim A, Crompton BD, Parker E, et al. Multicenter feasibility study of tumor molecular profiling to inform therapeutic decisions in advanced pediatric solid tumors: the individualized cancer therapy (iCat) study. JAMA Oncol 2016.
35. Harttrampf AC, Lacroix L, Deloger M, Deschamps F, Puget S, Auger N, et al. Molecular screening for cancer treatment optimization (MOSCATO-01) in pediatric patients: a single-institutional prospective molecular stratification trial. Clin Cancer Res 2017;23:6101-12.
36. Janeway KA, Place AE, Kieran MW, Harris MH. Future of clinical genomics in pediatric oncology. J Clin Oncol 2013;31:1893-903.

Table 1. Patient demographics, baseline characteristics, prior treatments, disposition, and dabrafenib exposure[a]

Characteristic	Part 1			Part 2	All patients treated with dabrafenib at RP2D (*n* = 24)	All patients with LGG (*N* = 32)
	Dabrafenib 3.75 mg/kg (*n* = 3)	Dabrafenib 4.5 mg/kg (*n* = 6)	Dabrafenib 5.25 mg/kg (*n* = 6)	Dabrafenib RP2D (*n* = 17)		
Median age (range), years	8 (4–13)	8.5 (2–16)	7.5 (3–11)	11 (2–17)	9.5 (2–17)	8.5 (2–17)
<2 years, *n*	0	0	0	0	0	0
2 to <6 years, *n*	1	2	2	5	7	10
6 to <12 years, *n*	1	3	4	4	8	12
12 to ≤18 years, *n*	1	1	0	8	9	10
Sex, *n* (%)						
Male	2 (67)	5 (83)	3 (50)	9 (53)	13 (54)	19 (59)
Female	1 (33)	1 (17)	3 (50)	8 (47)	11 (46)	13 (41)
Race, *n* (%)						
White	3 (100)	5 (83)	6 (100)	13 (76)	19 (79)	27 (84)
Black	0	1 (17)	0	2 (12)	3 (13)	3 (9)
Asian	0	0	0	2 (12)	2 (8)	2 (6)
Performance status, *n* (%)[b]						
100	2 (67)	3 (50)	3 (50)	9 (53)	12 (50)	17 (53)
80–90	1 (33)	1 (17)	2 (33)	7 (41)	10 (42)	11 (34)
<80	0	2 (33)	1 (17)	1 (6)	2 (8)	4 (13)
Histology at initial diagnosis, *n* (%)						
Pilocytic astrocytoma	1 (33)	3 (50)	1 (17)	8 (47)	10 (42)	13 (41)

Ganglioglioma	0	1 (17)	1 (17)	5 (29)	6 (25)	7 (22)
Pleomorphic xanthoastrocytoma	0	0	1 (17)	2 (12)	3 (13)	3 (9)
Pilomyxoid astrocytoma	1 (33)	0	0	1 (6)	1 (4)	2 (6)
Other[c]	1 (33)	2 (33)	3 (50)	1 (6)	4 (17)	7 (22)
Histological grade at initial diagnosis, *n* (%)[d]	2 (67)	4 (67)	4 (67)	12 (71)	16 (67)	22 (69)
Grade I	1 (33)	2 (33)	2 (33)	4 (24)	7 (29)	9 (28)
Grade II						
Median time since initial diagnosis (range), months	36 (32–39)	15 (11–90)	39 (18–83)	26 (6–190)	31 (6–190)	32 (6–190)
Prior treatments, *n* (%)[e]						
Chemotherapy	3 (100)	5 (83)	6 (100)	14 (82)	20 (83)	28 (88)
Radiotherapy	1 (33)	1 (17)	1 (17)	3 (18)	5 (21)	6 (19)
Small-molecule therapy	0	0	1 (17)	1 (6)	2 (8)	2 (6)
Immunotherapy	0	0	0	1 (6)	1 (4)	1 (3)
Other	0	0	0	3 (18)	3 (13)	3 (9)
Median time from last recurrence to dabrafenib start (range), months[f]	NA	NA	0.8 (0.2–1.3)	1.1 (0.1–81.5)	1.1 (0.1–81.5)	1.1 (0.1–81.5)
Median time from last progression to dabrafenib start (range), months[g]	7.6 (0.5–14.7)	0.8 (0.5–1.1)	1.8 (0.2–26.2)	1.6 (0.1–10.3)	1.5 (0.1–26.2)	1.1 (0.1–26.2)
Continuing treatment, *n* (%)	2 (67)	3 (50)	2 (33)	8 (47)	10 (42)	15 (47)
Discontinued treatment, *n* (%)	1 (33)	3 (50)	4 (67)	9 (53)	14 (58)	17 (53)
Reasons for discontinuation						
Investigator discretion	1 (33)	1 (17)	4 (67)	5 (29)	10 (42)	11 (34)

Disease progression Adverse event	0 0	2 (33) 0	0 0	2 (12) 2 (12)	2 (8) 2 (8)	4 (13) 2 (6)
Median duration of exposure to dabrafenib (range), weeks	157 (62–159)	120 (8–185)	96 (25–152)	105 (<1–149)	104 (<1–152)	108 (<1–185)
Patients with dose reductions and/or interruptions, *n* (%)	1 (33)	3 (50)	1 (17)	5 (29)	6 (25)	10 (31)

[a]As of data cutoff (September 12, 2017); [b]Using Karnofsky (≥16 years of age; *n* = 28) or Lansky (<16 years of age; *n* = 4) performance status, as appropriate; [c]Desmoplastic neuroepithelial neoplasm, cervicomedullary tumor, glioneuronal brain stem tumor, posterior fossa brain tumor, optic pathway glioma, gliomatosis cerebri, and other low-grade glioma; [d]One patient had missing data for disease grade at initial diagnosis but was confirmed to have LGG; [e]Patients may have had multiple therapies and prior therapy type was undetermined in 2 patients; best response to last therapy received included five patients with a partial response, 13 patients with stable disease, and nine patients with progressive disease (response to last therapy was undetermined in five patients); [f]In 11 patients with recurrence; [g]In 25 patients with disease progression.

Table 2. Dabrafenib efficacy

Characteristic	Part 1			Part 2	All patients treated with dabrafenib at RP2D (*n* = 24)	All patients with LGG (*N* = 32)
	Dabrafenib 3.75 mg/kg (*n* = 3)	Dabrafenib 4.5 mg/kg (*n* = 6)	Dabrafenib 5.25 mg/kg (*n* = 6)	Dabrafenib RP2D (*n* = 17)		
Independent review[a]						
Best overall response, *n* (%)						
Complete response	0	1 (17)	0	0	0	1 (3)
Partial response	2 (67)	2 (33)	2 (33)	7 (41)	9 (38)	13 (41)
Stable disease[b]	1 (33)	3 (50)	4 (67)	8 (47)	13 (54)	16 (50)
Progressive disease	0	0	0	2 (12)	2 (8)	2 (6)
Objective response, *n* (%)	2 (67)	3 (50)	2 (33)	7 (41)	9 (38)	14 (44)
[95% CI]	[9–99]	[12–88]	[4–78]	[18–67]	[19–59]	[26–62]
Median duration of response (range), months	-	-	-	-	11.0 (3.7–14.5)	11.0 (7.4–14.5)
Disease control, *n* (%)	3 (100)	5 (83)	5 (83)	12 (71)	18 (75)	25 (78)
[95% CI]	[29–100]	[36–100]	[36–100]	[44–90]	[53–90]	[60–91]
Median progression-free survival (95% CI), months[c]	35 (15–NE)	(NE–NE)	13 (13–NE)	(NE–NE)	14 (13–NE)	35 (13–NE)
1-year progression-free survival rate (95% CI), %[c]	100 (100–100)	80 (20–97)	100 (100–100)	78 (46–92)	79 (53–92)	85 (64–94)

Abbreviation: NE, not estimable.

[a]Using RANO criteria; [b]Includes five patients with independent review of stable disease but lacking any confirmation scan results; [c]Kaplan-Meier estimate.

Table 3. Safety summary and treatment-related AEs

	All patients with LGG (*N* = 32)	
	All grade	**Grade 3/4**
Patients with a treatment-related AE, *n* (%)	29 (91)	9 (28)
Treatment-related AEs (in >20% of patients), *n* (%)		
Fatigue	11 (34)	0
Rash	10 (31)	0
Dry skin	9 (28)	0
Pyrexia	9 (28)	0
Rash maculopapular	9 (28)	3 (9)
Arthralgia	8 (25)	1 (3)
Headache	7 (22)	0
Vomiting	7 (22)	0
AEs leading to discontinuation, *n* (%)	2 (6)	2 (6)
Treatment-related deaths, *n* (%)	0	0
Patients with a treatment-related serious AE, *n* (%)	5 (16)	3 (9)
Treatment-related serious AEs, *n* (%)		
Arthralgia	1 (3)	1 (3)
Disseminated intravascular coagulation	1 (3)	1 (3)
Ejection fraction decreased	1 (3)	0
Febrile neutropenia	1 (3)	0
Hypotension	1 (3)	1 (3)
Pyrexia	1 (3)	0
Rash maculopapular	1 (3)	1 (3)

Figure Legends

Figure 1. Dabrafenib treatment duration and best response.

A. Duration of exposure to dabrafenib analyzed by best overall response assessed by independent review using the RANO criteria.

B. Best reduction in tumor size analyzed by best overall response, assessed by independent review using the RANO criteria, for the subset of patients with measurable disease. Dashed line represents a 50% reduction from baseline, which corresponds to the threshold for partial response per the RANO criteria.

[a]Includes only patients with measurable disease and ≥1 post-baseline evaluation. Five of these patients had the best overall response as stable disease, with no confirmation from the scan results; one patient was not evaluable.

Figure 2. MRI of a partial response (ongoing) achieved after 8 weeks of dabrafenib therapy in an 11-year-old male patient with *BRAF* V600–mutant ganglioglioma determined using coronal T1 post-gadolinium contrast sequence.

Figure 3. Kaplan-Meier progression-free survival.

Kaplan-Meier estimates of progression-free survival. Eleven disease progression events occurred; eight were on-treatment and three were off-treatment. Tumor assessments were by independent review using the RANO criteria.

Figure 1


A
Patients with LGG
Complete response
Partial response
Stable disease
Progressive disease
First response
Time to progressive disease
Ongoing treatment
0
20
40
60
80
100
120
140
160
180
200
220
240
260
Treatment duration (weeks)
B
Maximum reduction from baseline, %
100
75
50
25
0
−25
−50
−75
−100
Complete response
Partial response
Stable disease
Progressive disease
n = 26a
Patients with LGG



Pre-treatment



Dabrafenib week 8

Figure 3


Probability of progression-free survival
1.00
0.75
0.50
0.25
0.00
N = 32
0 2 4 6 8 10 12 14 16 18 20 22 24 26 28 30 32 34 36 38 40
Treatment duration (months)
No. of patients at risk
32 26 25 24 22 21 20 14 9 8 8 8 4 4 4 4 4 3 1 1 1