

Transdermal Oestradiol for Androgen Suppression in Prostate Cancer: Long-term Cardiovascular Outcomes from the Randomised Prostate Adenocarcinoma Transcutaneous Hormone (PATCH) Trials Programme

Authors Information:

1. Professor Ruth E Langley	PhD	MRC Clinical Trials Units at University College London, ruth.langley@ucl.ac.uk
2. Dr Duncan C Gilbert	PhD	MRC Clinical Trials Units at University College London, duncan.gilbert@ucl.ac.uk
3. Trinh Duong	MSc	MRC Clinical Trials Units at University College London, t.duong@ucl.ac.uk
4. Professor Noel Clarke	ChM	The Christie and Salford Royal NHS Foundation Trusts, noel.clarke@srft.nhs.uk
5. Matthew Nankivell	MSc	MRC Clinical Trials Units at University College London, m.nankivell@ucl.ac.uk
6. Professor Stuart D Rosen	MD	National Heart and Lung Institute, Imperial College, London stuart.rosen@imperial.ac.uk
7. Dr Stephen Mangar	MD	Charing Cross Hospital, Imperial College Healthcare NHS Trust, stephen.mangar@nhs.net
8. Dr Archie Macnair	FRCR	MRC Clinical Trials Units at University College London, a.macnair@ucl.ac.uk
9. Mr Subramanian Kanaga Sundaram	FRCS	Mid Yorkshire NHS Trust, Subramanian.KanagaSundaram1@nhs.net
10. Mr Marc E Laniado	FRCS(Urol)	Wexham Park Hospital, Frimley Health Foundation Trust, marc.laniado@nhs.net
11. Dr Sanjay Dixit	FRCR	Scunthorpe General Hospital, sanjay.dixit@nhs.net
12. Professor Sanjeev Madaan	PhD	Dartford and Gravesham NHS Trust, sanjeev.madaan@nhs.net
13. Dr Caroline Manetta	FRCR	Brighton and Sussex University Hospitals NHS Trust, caroline.manetta@nhs.net
14. Mr Alvan Pope	MD	The Hillingdon Hospitals NHS Foundation Trust and Imperial College Healthcare NHS Trust, alvan.pope1@nhs.net
15. Dr Christopher D Scrase	FRCR	Ipswich Hospital, East Suffolk North Essex NHS Foundation Trust, christopher.scrase@esneft.nhs.uk
16. Dr Stephen Mckay	FRCR	Forth Valley Royal Hospital, Larbert; Beatson West of Scotland Cancer Centre, Glasgow, stephenmckay@nhs.net
17. Dr Iqtedar A Muazzam	FCPS	Hull University Teaching Hospitals NHS Trust, iqtedar.muazzam@hey.nhs.uk
18. Mr Gerald N Collins	MD	Macclesfield District General Hospital, East Cheshire NHS Trust, gerald.collins@stockport.nhs.uk
19. Dr Jane Worthing	FRCR	University Hospital Coventry, jane.worthing@uhcw.nhs.uk
20. Mr Simon T Williams	FRCS(Urol)	Royal Derby Hospital, simon.williams3@nhs.net
21. Mr Edgar Paez	MD	Newcastle Urology, Freeman Hospital, Newcastle upon Tyne, edgar.paez@nhs.net
22. Dr Angus Robinson	FRCR	Sussex Cancer Centre, angus.robinson@nhs.net

23. Mr Jonathan McFarlane	FRCS(Urol)	Royal United Hospitals Bath NHS Foundation Trust, jmcfarlane2@nhs.net
24. John V Deighan	MBE	MRC Clinical Trials Units at University College London, deighansjb@gmail.com
25. Dr John Marshall	PhD	MRC Clinical Trials Units at University College London, idandamarshall@aol.com
26. Dr Silvia Forcat	PhD	MRC Clinical Trials Units at University College London, s.forcat@ucl.ac.uk
27. Dr Melanie Weiss	PhD	MRC Clinical Trials Units at University College London, melanie.weiss@ucl.ac.uk
28. Professor Roger Kockelbergh	DM	Department of Urology, University Hospitals of Leicester; University of Leicester, roger.kockelbergh@uhl-tr.nhs.uk
29. Dr Abdulla Alhasso	FRCR	Beatson West of Scotland Cancer Centre, Abdulla.Alhasso@ggc.scot.nhs.uk
30. Professor Howard Kynaston	MD	Division of Cancer and Genetics, Cardiff University Medical School, Howard.Kynaston@wales.nhs.uk
31. Professor Mahesh Parmar	DPhil	Unit director, MRC Clinical Trials Units at University College London, m.parmar@ucl.ac.uk

Corresponding author:

Professor Ruth Langley

MRC Clinical Trials Unit at UCL

Email: ruth.langley@ucl.ac.uk

Telephone: 02076704714

Short title: Transdermal oestradiol for androgen deprivation

Key words: transdermal oestradiol, androgen deprivation, prostate cancer, cardiovascular outcomes

1 **Abstract**

2 **Background:**

3 Androgen suppression is a central component of prostate cancer management but causes
4 significant long-term toxicity. Oestrogen produces castrate levels of testosterone in men and
5 mitigates the oestrogen-depleting effects (osteoporosis, adverse metabolic profiles, hot
6 flushes and impaired quality of life) of Luteinising Hormone Releasing Hormone agonists
7 (LHRHa). Transdermal administration of oestradiol (tE2) circumvents first-pass hepatic
8 metabolism and therefore should also avoid the cardiovascular (CV) toxicity seen with oral
9 oestrogen.

10 **Methods:**

11 Men with locally advanced or metastatic prostate cancer were randomly allocated (1:2 and
12 from 2011 1:1), within an adaptive phase II/III multi-centre trial to LHRHa according to local
13 practice or tE2 patches (four 100 µg patches/24hrs changed twice weekly reducing to 3
14 patches twice weekly if castrate at 4 weeks.) CV events: heart failure; acute coronary
15 syndrome; thromboembolic stroke and other thromboembolic events (confirmed using pre-
16 defined criteria/source data), and CV risk factors after allocation to LHRHa and tE2 were
17 compared.

18 **Findings:**

19 Between 2007-2019, 1,694 men (790 LHRHa, 904 tE2) were randomly allocated. Castration
20 rates (testosterone \leq 1.7nmol/L) at 1 and 3 months: LHRHa 65% and 93%, tE2 83% and 93%.
21 157 events from 145 men met pre-defined CV criteria with an additional 10 sudden deaths
22 with no post-mortem. Twenty six (1.5%) of 1694 patients had fatal CV events, LHRHa 15/790

23 (1.9%) tE2 11/904 (1.2%). On intention-to-treat analysis, the CV event hazard ratio (HR) was
24 1.11 (95% confidence interval (CI) 0.80 to 1.53) including the no post-mortem deaths and 1.20
25 (CI 0.86 to 1.68) for the confirmed group only. 34% of tE2 CV events occurred more than three
26 months after tE2 was stopped/changed to LHRHa. At 12 months mean percentage change
27 (95% CI) LHRHa v tE2: glucose +5.9% (3.7% to 8.1%) v -1.1% (-2.7% to 0.6%) p<0.0001,
28 cholesterol +3.1% (1.4% to 4.8%) v -5.7% (-7.0% to 4.5%) p<0.0001. Gynaecomastia (all
29 grades) LHRHa 38% v tE2 86% p<0.001, hot flushes (all grades) LHRHa 86% v 35% tE2.

30

31 **Interpretation:** Long-term data show no evidence of a difference in CV mortality or morbidity
32 and improved metabolic profiles comparing tE2 to LHRHa. Oestrogens administered
33 transdermally should be reconsidered for androgen suppression in the management of
34 prostate cancer.

35

36

37

38

39

40

41

42

43

44

45

46

47 **Research in Context**

48 **Evidence before this Study**

49 Oestrogen is not routinely used to produce androgen suppression in men with prostate
50 cancer because previous studies using oral oestrogen (stilboestrol) reported increased rates
51 of cardiovascular embolic events. Administering oestradiol parenterally (e.g. through a
52 transdermal patch (tE2)) avoids first-pass hepatic metabolism and should avoid the
53 cardiovascular toxicity.

54 **Added Value**

55 This large (n=1694), long-term, randomised study shows no evidence of a difference in
56 cardiovascular mortality or morbidity between men receiving tE2 compared to Luteinising
57 Hormone Releasing Hormone agonists (LHRHa) for the management of locally advanced and
58 metastatic prostate cancer.

59 **Implications**

60 Oestrogens in men are derived from the aromatisation of androgens therefore most
61 androgen suppression strategies used to treat prostate cancer, such as LHRHa, cause a dual
62 set of toxicities related to both androgen and oestrogen depletion. Using tE2 to produce
63 castrate levels of testosterone in men with prostate cancer mitigates the side effects of
64 LHRHa caused by oestrogen depletion (e.g. hot flushes, osteoporosis and adverse metabolic
65 profiles), as well as avoiding the cardiovascular toxicity seen with oral oestrogen.
66 Oestrogens administered transdermally should be considered for androgen suppression in
67 the management of prostate cancer.

68

69 **Introduction**

70 Prostate cancer therapy has evolved significantly over the last 20 years resulting in improved
71 outcomes, but as a result some men receive androgen depleting therapies for many years, if
72 not decades (1). Androgen suppression is the cornerstone of management in metastatic
73 disease and is also utilised in combination with radiotherapy, either adjuvantly or neo-
74 adjuvantly, in the locally advanced setting. Currently, the most commonly employed method
75 of achieving androgen suppression is Luteinising Hormone Releasing Hormone agonists
76 (LHRHa). Toxicities from LHRHa include erectile dysfunction and loss of muscle mass as a
77 result of testosterone suppression (2-4). Additionally, most androgen depleting strategies
78 also lower oestrogen levels (as oestrogens in men are derived from the aromatization of
79 testosterone), thought to be the primary driver of osteoporosis, osteoporotic fractures, hot
80 flushes and adverse metabolic effects such as hyperlipidaemia and increased glucose levels
81 (5-8).

82 Exogenous oestrogen, through a negative feedback loop on the hypothalamus and pituitary
83 (9, 10), is a potential strategy for achieving castrate levels of testosterone and avoids the
84 physiological effects of oestrogen depletion. This approach was first investigated using oral
85 oestrogen (stilboestrol) but it was found to cause increased thromboembolic cardiovascular
86 (CV) disease (11), and as a result the use of oestrogen in the management of prostate cancer
87 was largely discontinued. However, as the embolic events seen with oral oestrogen are
88 attributed to first-pass hepatic metabolism and associated activation of coagulation pathways
89 they should be avoided by transdermal administration of oestrogen (tE2). In women the dose
90 of oral oestrogen required to have the same therapeutic effect as transdermal administration

91 is approximately ten-fold higher highlighting the significant effect of intestinal and hepatic
92 metabolism on the pharmacokinetics of exogenous oestrogen. Levels of several proteins
93 involved in the coagulation pathway are altered by oral oestrogen including anti-thrombin III
94 and coagulation factor VII (12).

95

96 PATCH (Prostate Adenocarcinoma TransCutaneous Hormones, MRC PR09
97 (ISRCTN:70406718)) is an adaptive randomised trials programme, designed to evaluate the
98 safety and efficacy of tE2 compared to LHRHa for the treatment of advanced prostate cancer
99 using a seamless phased approach (Supplementary Appendix Figure 1). The first stage, a
100 phase IIa evaluation (n=254), previously published, assessed early toxicity and feasibility (13).
101 Recruitment was then extended to a phase IIb evaluation to provide early data on efficacy.
102 Following this recruitment continued within the PATCH trial network sites and was extended
103 into the STAMPEDE (Systemic Therapy in Advancing or Metastatic Prostate cancer: Evaluation
104 of Drug Efficacy ISRCTN:78818544) trial network to widen experience with the transdermal
105 patches in the treatment of advanced prostate cancer (14). The aim of the analysis presented
106 is to compare long-term CV outcomes between those randomly allocated to receive LHRHa
107 and tE2.

108

109 **Study Design and Participants**

110 PATCH is a seamless phase II/III randomised, multi-centre trials programme. The stages of the
111 development programme with number of men recruited are shown in the consort diagram
112 (**Figure 1**). The co-primary outcome measure for the phase III design is overall survival (OS)
113 and progression-free survival (PFS). The original recruitment target was 2150 but due to a
114 lower than anticipated event rate this has been extended to 2550. The non-inferiority margin

115 hazard ratio (HR) for OS is 1.16 (with tE2 assumed to be associated with an absolute
116 improvement in OS of 1% at 5 years compared to LHRHa) with 88% power and a one-
117 sided significance level of 0.03. The PFS analysis was planned with 88% power and one-
118 sided significance level of 0.03 and a non-inferiority margin HR of 1.16.

119 This analysis was pre-defined to include all men recruited through the PATCH trial sites as
120 these centres had agreed to provide additional supporting data to verify the CV events at the
121 end of the original phase III recruitment. This included the phase IIa, (n=203), phase IIb
122 (n=482) and the original phase III design (overall target accrual for PATCH and STAMPEDE sites
123 2150) (n=1009), in total 1694 men. The first 51 patients randomised in the PATCH trial were
124 excluded from this analysis as they received an initial dosing schedule of the patches that
125 produced lower than anticipated castration rates (15). Throughout the study phases men
126 from participating UK centres were eligible if they had locally advanced (M0) or metastatic
127 (M1) prostate cancer (newly diagnosed or relapsing after radical treatment) and were
128 scheduled to start long-term (≥ 3 years) continuous hormonal therapy.

129

130 Patients with a previous history of major CV disease were excluded. These exclusions were
131 defined as: 1) cerebral ischaemia (e.g. stroke or transient ischaemic attack) within 2 years of
132 randomisation; 2) history of deep vein thrombosis or pulmonary embolus confirmed
133 radiologically or a known thrombophilic disorder; 3) history of myocardial infarction/acute
134 coronary syndrome within the last 6 months or greater than 6 months with evidence of q-
135 wave anterior infarct on electrocardiogram (ECG); 4) unstable angina within the last year; 5)
136 angina that occurs on walking 100 metres on the level or after climbing one flight of stairs at
137 a normal pace and in normal condition, or angina that causes marked limitation of ordinary
138 physical activity or occurs at rest; 6) New York Heart Association grade III/IV heart failure; and

139 7) pulmonary oedema on CXR. Patients were also required to have evidence of a controlled
140 blood pressure prior to randomisation (systolic BP <160 and diastolic <100 mmHg).

141 **Funding:** The trial is funded by CRUK (grant number C471/A12443, trial CRUK/06/001) and
142 the MRC Clinical Trials Unit at UCL. The protocol was approved by the Leeds East Multi-centre
143 Research Ethics Committee (MREC 05/Q1206/168) and all patients gave written consent to
144 participate.

145

146 **Randomisation and Masking**

147 Participants were randomly allocated to receive LHRHa or tE2 without blinding in 1:2 ratio
148 before February 2011, and thereafter 1:1. The 1:2 ratio was used in the first phase of the
149 evaluation to increase experience of using the patches. Randomisation was performed using
150 a computer-based minimisation algorithm with a random element (80%) and stratification
151 factors: disease stage; age (<70; and ≥70 years); smoking status; family history of cardiac
152 disease; which LHRHa agent to be used; prostate specific antigen (PSA) level at baseline (<50,
153 ≥50 to <500, ≥500 ng/mL); study centre and from 2013, intention to give radical radiotherapy;
154 and from 2015 intention to give upfront docetaxel.

155

156 **Procedures**

157 The patches (tE2) were administered as four oestradiol 100 microgram/24hr patches
158 (FemSeven or Progynova TS), self-administered and changed twice weekly during the first 4
159 weeks. Provided the testosterone concentration reached castrate levels (≤ 1.7 nmol/L) at 4
160 weeks, the dose was reduced to three patches changed twice weekly. Serum oestradiol and
161 testosterone levels were monitored every 12 weeks up to six months and then every 6 months

162 during follow up to ensure appropriate testosterone suppression was maintained. LHRHa was
163 administered intramuscularly or subcutaneously as per local practice. Prostate cancer
164 radiotherapy was mandated (since January 2014) for all locally advanced (N0, M0) patients
165 unless contraindicated, and the use of upfront docetaxel was permitted for all patients (since
166 October 2015) reflecting evolving standard of care.

167

168 If there was evidence of cancer progression, subsequent therapy was at the discretion of the
169 treating clinician. Men could remain on their allocated first-line hormonal therapy with the
170 addition of other therapies (e.g. anti-androgen, corticosteroids, cytotoxic chemotherapy). A
171 switch to LHRHa for patients progressing on tE2 was permitted. Until May 2019 the protocol
172 mandated treatment with tE2 be discontinued if the patient experienced one of the pre-
173 defined CV outcome events. Subsequently clinician discretion has been allowed when such
174 an event occurred.

175 CV outcome events were defined as follows: 1) Heart failure: new symptoms or clinical signs
176 consistent with a diagnosis of new or decompensated cardiac failure with supporting
177 evidence from chest X-ray, echocardiogram or rise in serum brain natriuretic peptide (BNP). 2)
178 Acute coronary syndrome (including unstable angina, ST-elevation and non-ST-elevation
179 myocardial infarction (STEMI and NSTEMI): new onset cardiac chest pain, confirmed as
180 ischaemic in origin by ECG and/or troponin rise +/- coronary angiography. 3) Thromboembolic
181 stroke: new neurological symptoms and clinical signs with confirmatory evidence from brain
182 CT or MRI. For transient ischaemic attacks, corroborative data from carotid duplex scanning
183 was sought and evidence of pre-existing or new, persistent or paroxysmal, atrial fibrillation.
184 4) Other arterial embolic events: detected by new clinical symptoms and supporting
185 radiological evidence. 5) Venous thromboembolism: thromboses confirmed radiologically

186 (Doppler ultrasound scan/cross sectional imaging) or pulmonary embolism confirmed by
187 means of CT pulmonary angiogram (CTPA), ventilation/perfusion scans or angiography. 6)
188 Death attributed to any of the above (where the event was not documented according to the
189 definitions provided above). Cardiac events were reported by investigators on follow-up
190 forms (at three and six months and six-monthly thereafter) or as notable events, or identified
191 from reports of serious adverse events and routinely collected toxicity data. All potential
192 events and requested supporting evidence (which included original investigation reports,
193 clinic and hospital discharge letters) were reviewed not blind to treatment allocation by RL,
194 DG or AM as they occurred and prior to this analysis reviewed again for consistency.
195 Sudden/unexpected deaths were attributed to a CV category if a confirmatory post mortem
196 report was available. Sudden/unexplained deaths where no post-mortem report were
197 available were classified as other significant events recognising that the most likely causes
198 would include myocardial infarction/arrhythmia, pulmonary embolism or a cerebrovascular
199 event.

200

201 **Statistical analyses**

202 No formal sample size calculation was specified for this analysis but the nature and timing
203 was pre-specified in the protocol and scheduled for the end of the original phase III
204 recruitment period. A formal request was made to the Independent Data Monitoring
205 Committee (IDMC) by the Trial Management Group to permit publication of this analysis
206 without prior knowledge of the results. The aim was to potentially provide further supporting
207 evidence for ongoing research and information for patients and their physicians. The primary
208 outcome measure was CV morbidity and mortality. The proportion of patients with a
209 confirmed CV event (as defined above) was summarised by original treatment allocation,

210 stratified by randomisation period before and after the change in randomisation allocation
211 ratio (since those randomised under 1:2 allocation ratio had longer duration of follow-up).
212 Kaplan-Meier methods were used to describe time to first CV event by treatment group,
213 based on an intention-to-treat approach. Follow-up of each patient was considered up to the
214 date of first CV event, or date of death or last follow-up for those without an event. The
215 treatment effect on CV risk was estimated using Cox proportional-hazards models, adjusted
216 for pre-selected stratification factors (age, smoking status, and family history of cardiac
217 disease) and stratified by randomisation period (1:2 randomisation and 1:1 randomisation).
218 Heterogeneity of the treatment effect over the two randomisation periods (2:1 and 1:1) was
219 checked by assessing the interaction between randomisation period and treatment, with the
220 overall treatment effect presented if no evidence interaction was found. To assess whether
221 cardiovascular risk varied with cumulative exposure time on original allocated treatment,
222 follow-up in a given patient was divided according to time on treatment from randomisation
223 (<12, 12-23.99, 24-35.99, ≥ 36 months) and accounting for when treatment stopped, which
224 was analysed as a time-varying covariate.

225

226 Castration rates were assessed at four weeks, then three, six and twelve months, with
227 patients being deemed castrate if their testosterone levels were ≤ 1.7 nmol/L. Patients were
228 included if they were still on their allocated treatment without additional systemic anticancer
229 therapy, and for tE2 patients with an oestradiol level of at least 250 pmol/L. Data were
230 included if tests were conducted at four weeks \pm two weeks, and at three, six, and 12 months
231 \pm six weeks. The percentage of castrate patients in each treatment arm are presented, but
232 were not formally compared.

233

234 Toxicities experienced whilst patients were receiving their original allocated treatment are
235 summarised overall and separately for each randomisation cohort (1:2 and 1:1). The
236 percentage of patients experiencing any toxicity, and toxicity of CTCAEv3.0 grade three or
237 worse, are presented. The percentage of patients experiencing any toxicity on each treatment
238 arm are compared using a logistic regression model, with patients recruited in each
239 randomisation cohort being combined using a fixed effects meta-analysis. Toxicities were
240 assessed at each follow-up visit, and data from a particular visit excluded from summaries if
241 the patient had stopped their allocated treatment prior to that visit. This is to ensure that only
242 toxicities definitely attributed to their original allocated treatment are included.

243

244 Changes in cardiovascular risk factors (fasting blood glucose, fasting total cholesterol, and
245 high-density lipoprotein (HDL) cholesterol concentrations, weight, and blood pressure) at 6
246 and 12 months were compared between treatment groups using analysis of covariance
247 (ANCOVA) models, adjusting for baseline values and study cohorts. These analyses were
248 based on patients still on original allocated treatment without additional systemic anticancer
249 therapy who had a fasting blood sample at the relevant follow-up assessments. Men on tE2
250 with oestradiol levels <250 pmol/L were considered not to be adhering to the patch regimen
251 and were therefore excluded. Statistical analyses were performed using Stata version 15
252 (Stata Corporation, College Station, TX, USA).

253

254 **RESULTS**

255 Between August 2007 and August 2019, a total of 1694 patients were recruited through the
256 PATCH trial network (52 sites) in the UK. This includes 203 patients in the IIa phase (August
257 2007 – April 2010), 482 patients in the IIb (July 2010 – October 2013) and 1009 patients in

258 phase III (Feb 2014 – August 2019). In total, 790 were allocated to LHRHa and 904 to tE2, the
259 initial randomization ratio was 1:2 and 1:1 from 2011 (**Figure 1**). The baseline characteristics
260 were similar between treatment groups (**Table 1**). Median age of the overall cohort was 73
261 years (interquartile range [IQR] 68–78) with a median (IQR) body mass index (BMI) of 27.1
262 (24.6-30.0). WHO performance status 0, 1 and 2 respectively at randomisation was 1197/1694
263 (71%), 437/1694 (26%) and 60/1694 (4%). 1000/1694 (59%) were current or previous
264 smokers, 375/1694 (22%) long-term regular aspirin users and 493/1676 (29%) reported heart
265 disease in a first degree relative. From a prostate cancer perspective, 670/1694 (40%) had
266 metastatic disease and median PSA level at randomisation was 35 (14.9–96.8) ng/ml. For
267 426/458 (93%) of M0 N0 patients radical radiotherapy to the prostate was planned since this
268 was included in the protocol in 2013. Upfront docetaxel was planned in 171/319 (54%) M1
269 patients overall since 2015 (<70 yrs 84/110 (76%) and \geq 70 yrs 87/209 (42%)). Overall median
270 follow-up was 3.9 years (IQR 2.4-7.0 years), with 1657/1694 (98%) having at least three
271 months' follow-up data.

272
273 Only 1 patient (in the tE2 group) did not commence allocated treatment (**Figure 1**). At four
274 weeks post randomisation, for men still receiving their allocated treatment without additional
275 anti-cancer therapy, with oestradiol levels of at least 250 pmol/L in the tE2 group and a blood
276 test within the analysis window, the proportion with testosterone concentrations \leq 1.7 nmol/L
277 was 65% (415/640) LHRHa, and 83% (661/793) tE2. By three months the rates were very
278 similar (643/693 (93%) LHRH, 721/776 (93%) tE2) and remained so over time (**Figure 2 and**
279 **Appendix Table S1**). There was no evidence of an early testosterone surge with tE2. The
280 median oestradiol level at four weeks post randomisation was 70 (5th–95th centile range 18-
281 124) pmol/L in LHRHa group and 845 (376-2280) pmol/L in tE2 group (**Appendix Table S2**).

282

283 A total of 311 CV events were reviewed, of which 157 experienced by 145 patients fulfilled
284 study endpoint definitions. A further ten events were classed as “other significant events”,
285 these were sudden unexplained deaths with no post-mortem available to confirm the
286 endpoint definition. They are presented with the main analysis as the most likely clinical
287 causes are CV e.g. myocardial infarction/arrhythmia and thromboembolic events (pulmonary
288 embolism). Of the 144 events deemed not to meet the primary outcome definitions these
289 included: non-cardiac chest pain, stable angina or investigation for a silent myocardial
290 infarction that was not confirmed (n=38); symptoms that might indicate congestive cardiac
291 failure or venous thromboembolism, such as dyspnoea or leg swelling, but investigations did
292 not confirm the diagnosis or symptoms were attributed to another cause (n=27); other
293 cardiac events, including atrial fibrillation, hypotension, hypertension, collapse, valve disease
294 and non-embolic peripheral vascular disease (n=54); possible intracerebral bleed, acute TIA
295 or stroke that was not confirmed on imaging or associated history (n=13); death where on
296 clinical review there was sufficient evidence for a non-CV cause e.g. progression of prostate
297 cancer (n=10); other medical events (n=2).

298

299 Patients experiencing a CV event were more likely than those without an event to be current
300 or former smokers (68% vs 58%), and were slightly older (median 75 vs 73 years). No other
301 baseline factors were associated with having a CV event. The nature of the event is shown in
302 **Table 2** with no consistent differences between the type of event across the 2 groups. Twenty
303 six (1.5%) of 1694 patients had fatal CV events, LHRHa 15/790 (1.9%) versus tE2 11/904
304 (1.2%). The proportion of patients with at least one CV endpoint/sudden death was similar
305 between treatment groups in the 1:2 cohort LHRHa 17.1% (14/82) versus tE2 19.8% (32/162)

306 and in the 1:1 cohort LHRHa 7.1% (50/708) and tE2 7.7% (57/742). The higher rate in the 1:2
307 cohort is accounted for by the longer follow-up. At the time of this intention-to-treat analysis
308 417 of those allocated to tE2 had changed therapy to LHRHa.

309

310 The overall HR for time to first CV endpoint in the intention to treat analysis, comparing tE2
311 versus LHRHa group was 1.11 (95% confidence interval (CI) 0.80 to 1.53), p=0.539 including
312 the patients with no post-mortem. This HR translates from an event rate of 7.2% at 3 years in
313 the LHRHa group (Table 3) to an estimate of the absolute difference at 3 years of 0.8% with
314 an upper (95%) bound to the absolute difference estimate of 3.6%. For the confirmed group
315 only the HR was 1.20 (95% CI 0.86 to 1.68, P = 0.283 **Figure 3**). The effect was similar in both
316 cohorts: 1:2 HR 1.10 (95% CI 0.59 to 2.06) including the patients with no post-mortem and HR
317 1.35 (95% CI 0.68 to 2.68) in the confirmed group and in the 1:1 cohort HR 1.11 (95% CI 0.76
318 to 1.62) including the patients with no post-mortem and HR 1.16 (95% CI 0.79 to 1.71) in the
319 confirmed group. Within the tE2 group, 30 of the 89 (34%) events occurred more than 3
320 months after the patient stopped tE2 treatment with 27/89 (30%) occurring more than 6
321 months after tE2 was stopped (Appendix **Table S3**).

322

323 The rate of a CV events over time remained constant (Appendix **Table S3**). The proportion of
324 patients experiencing a CV endpoint by 1 year was 2.8% (95% CI 1.8 to 4.2%) for LHRHa and
325 2.8% (1.9 to 4.2%) tE2 group; corresponding figures for 2 years were 5.3% (3.8 to 7.3%) and
326 6.4% (4.8 to 8.4%), respectively. A potential cumulative effect was assessed by length of time
327 on therapy (Appendix **Table S3**) and again the effect remained constant for both drugs over
328 time. Inclusion of the treatment arm as a time-varying covariate also provided no evidence
329 that the treatment effect differed with increased time on treatment. By including oestradiol

330 level as a time varying covariate, there was no evidence that higher levels of oestradiol with
331 patches was associated with an increased risk of a CV event. Similarly, among the 186
332 metastatic patients (90 LHRHa, 96 tE2) planned to receive upfront docetaxel treatment as
333 part of first-line treatment, 7.0% LHRHa and 7.9% tE2 patients experienced a CV event by two
334 years, compared to 7.8% LHRHa and 6.1% tE2 in metastatic patients not receiving docetaxel
335 suggesting no evidence of increased CV toxicity with the patches when administered with
336 docetaxel (**Appendix Table S4**).

337

338 At 6 and 12 months, changes in fasting glucose and total cholesterol concentrations differed
339 significantly between treatment groups among men still on their original allocated treatment,
340 with levels increasing from baseline in LHRHa group while decreasing in tE2 group (**Table 3**).

341 At 12 months, mean percentage change in fasting glucose concentration was +5.9% (95%CI
342 3.7% to 8.1%) in LHRHa group and -1.1% (-2.7% to 0.6%, $P < 0.0001$) in tE2 group;
343 corresponding change in total fasting cholesterol concentration was LHRHa +3.1% (1.4% to
344 4.8%) versus tE2 -5.7% (-7.0% to -4.5%, $P < 0.0001$). Both HDL cholesterol concentrations and
345 weight increased by similar amounts in the two groups at 6 months and 12 months. Systolic
346 and diastolic blood pressure increased between baseline and 6 months with LHRHa and
347 decreased with tE2, though the changes were relatively small (relevant data not collected at
348 12 months).

349

350 Other adverse events experienced whilst patients were known to be receiving their allocated
351 treatment were as expected and predominantly grade 1-2 (see **Table 4**). Gynaecomastia was
352 significantly more common in tE2 patients (LHRHa 279/730 38% v tE2 690/807 86%,
353 $p < 0.0001$) and hot flushes more common in LHRHa (LHRHa 628/730 86% v tE2 280/807 35%,

354 p<0.0001). Sexual and reproductive toxicities were similar between the two groups as
355 expected.

356

357 **Discussion**

358 For over 40 years, since the publication of the Veterans Administration Cooperative Urological
359 Research Group (VACURG) studies, (11) oestrogens have been side-lined as a treatment for
360 prostate cancer because of concerns about an increased risk of thromboembolic CV
361 complications. Our data confirm that the administration of oestrogen transdermally via a
362 patch, rather than orally as in the previous studies, abrogates this risk. Over a prolonged
363 follow-up period there was no evidence of excess CV toxicity observed with tE2 compared to
364 LHRHa, the current standard and widely used approach to achieving androgen suppression.
365 These data are consistent with the hypothesis underpinning the PATCH programme: (i) with
366 previous prostate cancer studies where oestrogens were administered intramuscularly (16);
367 and (ii) with the data from hormone replacement studies in both cis-gender and transgender
368 populations comparing oral and transdermal administration (17-19).

369

370 tE2 has three key pharmacological characteristics that make it particularly attractive as a
371 method for producing androgen suppression in men with prostate cancer. Firstly, it avoids
372 the oestrogen-depleting effects (loss of bone mineral density, adverse metabolic profiles and
373 hot flushes) seen with other androgen-depleting strategies which cause significant long-term
374 morbidity, secondly, transdermal administration avoids the embolic CV toxicity seen with oral
375 oestrogen and thirdly the absence of an early testosterone flare negates the need for co-
376 administration of anti-androgens that is usually required with LHRHa administration.

377

378 We have previously shown a significant difference in bone mineral density in the first 2 years
379 of therapy with tE2 compared with LHRHa. For men who remained on allocated treatment,
380 lumbar spine bone mineral density mean percentage change was -3.0% for LHRHa and +7.9%
381 for tE2 $p < 0.001$ (20). The loss of bone mineral density with LHRHa is attributed to a reduction
382 in circulating oestrogens. Additionally, we have previously published self-reported quality of
383 life (QoL) data from 727 men within the PATCH programme. Overall higher global QoL scores
384 were reported with tE2 compared to LHRHa (mean difference +4.2, 95% CI 1.2 to 7.1; $P =$
385 0.006), attributed to a reduction in hot flushes and fatigue (21). Our current data confirm the
386 reduction in hot flushes with tE2 compared to LHRHa and also as anticipated the increase in
387 gynaecomastia

388

389 Our current data demonstrate clear differences in fasting glucose and lipid levels over time
390 between the two treatment approaches. The rise in fasting glucose levels/insulin resistance
391 on LHRHa is consistent with the established literature (22) and may contribute to the
392 increased CV mortality associated with LHRHa detected in epidemiological studies. The
393 improvement in metabolic parameters with tE2 is consistent with previous studies: a) of post-
394 menopausal women where it was shown that oestrogen improves lipid profiles (23) and b) in
395 a previous study in men with prostate cancer where tE2 was administered with LHRHa to
396 alleviate side effects (24). To date the improvement in metabolic parameters we observed
397 with tE2 compared to LHRHa has not translated into a clinical benefit in terms of CV outcomes
398 but further follow-up is required since the expected time from for such benefits would be of
399 the order of 5-10 years. In comparison to LHRHa the only increased toxicity seen with tE2 was
400 gynaecomastia (**Table 4**). Overall skin toxicity was reported at similar rates between the two
401 groups, although this is likely to reflect different aetiologies, discomfort or irritation around

402 the injection site for LHRHa patients and erythema/pruritus and issues with adherence more
403 common for the men receiving tE2.

404

405 Among the strengths of our study is the randomised nature, the detailed review of all
406 potential CV events and the length of follow-up. In epidemiological studies LHRHa have been
407 associated with an increased risk of developing the metabolic syndrome and CV disease (25,
408 26), although data from randomised trials primarily designed to evaluate oncological
409 outcomes has been less consistent (27, 28). Endpoint review is common practice in CV trials
410 as the symptoms associated with CV disease may be similar to, or subsequently attributed to,
411 another disease process. We initially employed a broad and conservative approach for events
412 to be included in our detailed CV review based on symptoms/initial reports and used the
413 additional clinical information received to confirm or refute our defined CV event with only
414 167/311 (53%) subsequently meeting our criteria. The initial inclusive approach minimised
415 the risk of under reporting CV events but provides confidence of accurate categorisation. In
416 addition the intention-to-treat analysis (where a substantial proportion of tE2 patients had
417 already changed to LHRHa) provides data on the CV effect of any exposure to tE2 over a
418 prolonged period even when the medication has been stopped. The rates of CV disease that
419 we observed are consistent with our original estimates based on previous literature (29).

420

421 A limitation of our study was that the review of CV events was not blind to treatment
422 allocation but it was supported by additional/confirmatory source data from the sites.
423 Agreement on cases was reached by consensus of the clinical reviewers. A further limitation
424 may be perceived to be the length of follow up (median (IQR) 3.9 (2.4-7.0) years). However,
425 in the original VACURG studies the increased CV toxicity became apparent within the first year

426 and the rate remained constant over time. There has been no evidence of an increased rate
427 of CV events on the patches compared to LHRHa over time and with the planned extension
428 of recruitment described below there will be ongoing follow-up.

429

430 The PATCH project has been an evolving programme over the course of 15 years. During that
431 time outcomes and treatment paradigms for M0 and M1 patients have diverged with
432 radiotherapy to the prostate becoming standard of care for M0 patients and upfront
433 docetaxel (and more recently abiraterone and other androgen-receptor targeting agents such
434 as enzalutamide) entering clinical practice for more advanced disease (1). Most clinical trials
435 now consider M0 and M1 patients as two separate entities and for this reason we aim to
436 continue recruiting to the PATCH programme to provide 2 separate cohorts for M0 and M1
437 patients with conventional statistical power to assess prostate cancer efficacy based on a non-
438 inferiority design. This will include patients recruited from both the PATCH and STAMPEDE
439 networks and it is anticipated that the efficacy results for the M0 cohort will be available in
440 2023 and those for the M1 cohort in 2024. These results on efficacy will be required for a full
441 assessment of this therapeutic approach and its role in the treatment of both locally advanced
442 and metastatic prostate cancer. In parallel, we have assessed the patches alongside other
443 evolving standards of care (1) including radiotherapy and docetaxel as presented in this paper
444 with ongoing work to assess the patches in combination with androgen receptor targeted
445 agents such as abiraterone and enzalutamide. During the course of this development
446 programme, all the accumulating data including efficacy data has been monitored by an
447 Independent Data Monitoring Committee who have supported the continued recruitment at
448 each phase.

449

450 To date this has been a re-purposing project utilising oestradiol patches manufactured for the
451 relief of menopausal symptoms in women. A practical limitation of this approach is that the
452 current patches need to be changed twice weekly, whilst this is a simple procedure, it
453 contrasts with a single intramuscular injection given monthly or 3 monthly for LHRHa. In
454 addition in a randomised trial comparing the LHRH antagonist relugolix with leuprolide
455 castration rates were higher and fewer serious adverse cardiovascular events were reported
456 with relugolix (30). The reason for the reduction in toxicity is unknown though it has been
457 seen in other trials of LHRH antagonists (31).

458

459 Given the castration rate data, in particular that castration is achieved more quickly with tE2
460 compared to LHRHa and the extensive toxicity data, there is arguably already sufficient
461 information to support the use of tE2 for short-term use (< 6 months) for example alongside
462 radiotherapy in men with localised intermediate risk prostate cancer. Equally for patients who
463 are significantly affected by the side effects of LHRHa (or for those where the cost of standard
464 therapy is prohibitive) this data provides the basis for a more detailed and personalised
465 discussion around the different approaches to androgen deprivation.

466

467 In summary in terms of toxicity, there is no evidence of a difference in CV events between tE2
468 and LHRHa. While treatment with tE2 results in higher rates of gynaecomastia importantly
469 there are fewer hot flushes, increased bone health, improved metabolic profiles and higher
470 overall QL scores.

471

472

473 **Author Contribution**

474

475 Ruth E Langley, Mahesh Parmar (and Paul Abel) developed the trial and oversaw study conduct. The
476 team at the coordinating trials unit was led by Ruth Langley with the support of Mahesh Parmar and
477 Duncan Gilbert. Statistical analyses were performed by Trinh Duong and Matthew Nankivell who had
478 direct access to the data and double programmed the primary outcome analysis. Silvia Forcat and
479 Melanie Weiss were responsible for trial co-ordination.

480

481 Abdulla Al-Hasso, Noel Clarke, Roger Kockelbergh, Howard Kynaston, Stephen Mangar, Archie
482 Macnair and Stuart D Rosen, were clinical members of the Trial Management Group with Stuart D
483 Rosen providing cardiovascular expertise. Ruth Langley, Duncan Gilbert and Archie Macnair
484 reviewed all cardiovascular events for consistency.

485

486 Subramanian Kanaga Sundaram/ Marc Laniado/ Sanjay Dixit/ Sanjeev Madaan/ Caroline Manetta/
487 Alvan Pope/ Christopher Scrase/ Stephen Mckay/ Iqtedar Muazzam/ Gerald Collins/ Jane Worthing/

488 Simon Williams/ Edgar Paez/ Angus Robinson/ Jonathan McFarlane recruited and treated patients.

489

490 John Marshall and John Deighan were patient and public involvement representatives for the study.

491

492 All authors reviewed and approved the final version.

493

494 **Declaration of interests**

495

496 All authors have completed the ICMJE uniform disclosure form at www.icmje.org/coi_disclosure.pdf
497 and declare: no support from any organisation for the submitted work, however, Dr. Langley reports
498 grants from Cancer Research UK , grants from UK Medical Research Council, during the conduct of
499 the study; personal fees from Aspirin Foundation, outside the submitted work; Dr. Muazzam reports
500 in the last 3 years that he had received honoraria for advisory boards and chairing/speaking at
501 educational/pharma meetings with the following companies: Ipsen, EUSA Pharma, Novartis and
502 Pzfizer.

503

504 **Acknowledgements**

505

506 We acknowledge the central role and major contribution Professor Paul Abel from Imperial College
507 London made to this project. It was his original idea, and his commitment and enthusiasm drove the
508 project forward. Unfortunately, due to ill health he was unable to be so closely involved in recent
509 years.

510

511 We thank all the patients who participated in the PATCH trial and their families; the National
512 Institute for Health Research (NIHR) Cancer Research Network for staff support; the
513 research staff at the participating hospitals; the PATCH Trial Management Group, Trial Steering
514 Committee, and the Independent Data Monitoring Committee (see **Appendix Table S5**). We would
515 also like to thank our previous patient and public involvement representatives for their invaluable
516 contribution Michael Philips and John Dwyer. We also appreciate the support of our current patient
517 and public representative John Marshall and John Deighan.

518

519 **Funding**

520 The PATCH study is funded by Cancer Research UK, grant number C17093/A12443 (trial
521 CRUK/06/001) and the MRC CTU at University College London (UCL). The trial is now sponsored by
522 UCL and was previously sponsored by Imperial College London. The funding sources and sponsor had
523 no role in the study design; collection, management, analysis, or interpretation of the data;
524 preparation, review, or approval of the manuscript; nor decision to submit the manuscript for
525 publication.
526

527 **Data sharing statement**

528 Data will be shared according to the Medical Research Council Clinical Trials Unit controlled access
529 approach, based on the following principles: no data should be released that would compromise an
530 ongoing trial or study; there must be a strong scientific or other legitimate rationale for the data to
531 be used for the requested purpose; investigators who have invested time and effort into developing
532 a trial or study should have a period of exclusivity in which to pursue their aims with the data, before
533 key trial data are made available to other researchers; the resources required to process requests
534 should not be underestimated, particularly successful requests that lead to preparing data for
535 release, thus adequate resources must be available to comply in a timely manner or at all, and the
536 scientific aims of the study must justify the use of such resources; and data exchange complies with
537 Information Governance and Data Security Policies in all the relevant countries. Researchers wishing
538 to access data from the PATCH study should contact mrctcu.pr09@ucl.ac.uk in the first instance.

539

540

541 **References**

542

- 543 1. Parker C, Castro E, Fizazi K, Heidenreich A, Ost P, Procopio G, et al. Prostate cancer: ESMO
544 Clinical Practice Guidelines for diagnosis, treatment and follow-up. *Annals of Oncology*.
545 2020;31(9):1119-34.
- 546 2. Alibhai SMH, Breunis H, Timilshina N, Naglie G, Tannock I, Krahn M, et al. Long-term impact of
547 androgen-deprivation therapy on physical function and quality of life. *Cancer*. 2015;121(14):2350-7.
- 548 3. Benedict C, Traeger L, Dahn JR, Antoni M, Zhou ES, Bustillo N, et al. Sexual Bother in Men with
549 Advanced Prostate Cancer Undergoing Androgen Deprivation Therapy. *The Journal of Sexual*
550 *Medicine*. 2014;11(10):2571-80.
- 551 4. Bourke L, Kirkbride P, Hooper R, Rosario AJ, Chico TJA, Rosario DJ. Endocrine therapy in
552 prostate cancer: time for reappraisal of risks, benefits and cost-effectiveness? *British Journal of*
553 *Cancer*. 2013;108(1):9-13.
- 554 5. Smith MR, Finkelstein JS, McGovern FJ, Zietman AL, Fallon MA, Schoenfeld DA, et al. Changes
555 in Body Composition during Androgen Deprivation Therapy for Prostate Cancer. *The Journal of Clinical*
556 *Endocrinology & Metabolism*. 2002;87(2):599-603.
- 557 6. Gonzalez BD, Jim HSL, Donovan KA, Small BJ, Sutton SK, Park J, et al. Course and Moderators
558 of Hot Flash Interference during Androgen Deprivation Therapy for Prostate Cancer: A Matched
559 Comparison. *J Urol*. 2015;194(3):690-5.
- 560 7. Nguyen PL, Alibhai SMH, Basaria S, D'Amico AV, Kantoff PW, Keating NL, et al. Adverse Effects
561 of Androgen Deprivation Therapy and Strategies to Mitigate Them. *European urology*. 2015;67(5):825-
562 36.
- 563 8. Shahinian VB, Kuo Y-F, Freeman JL, Goodwin JS. Risk of Fracture after Androgen Deprivation
564 for Prostate Cancer. *New England Journal of Medicine*. 2005;352(2):154-64.
- 565 9. Hayes FJ, Seminara SB, DeCruz S, Boepple PA, Crowley WF, Jr. Aromatase Inhibition in the
566 Human Male Reveals a Hypothalamic Site of Estrogen Feedback. *The Journal of Clinical Endocrinology*
567 *& Metabolism*. 2000;85(9):3027-35.
- 568 10. Finkelstein JS OL, Whitcomb RW, Crowley WF Jr. Sex Steroid Control of Gonadotropin
569 Secretion in the Human Male. II. Effects of Estradiol Administration in Normal and Gonadotropin-
570 Releasing Hormone-Deficient Men. *The Journal of Clinical Endocrinology & Metabolism*.
571 1991;73(3):621-8.
- 572 11. Byar DP. Proceedings: The Veterans Administration Cooperative Urological Research Group's
573 studies of cancer of the prostate. *Cancer*. 1973;32(5):1126-30.
- 574 12. von Schoultz B, Carlström K, Collste L, Eriksson A, Henriksson P, Pousette Å, et al. Estrogen
575 therapy and liver function—metabolic effects of oral and parenteral administration. *The Prostate*.
576 1989;14(4):389-95.
- 577 13. Langley RE, Cafferty FH, Alhasso AA, Rosen SD, Sundaram SK, Freeman SC, et al. Cardiovascular
578 outcomes in patients with locally advanced and metastatic prostate cancer treated with luteinising-
579 hormone-releasing-hormone agonists or transdermal oestrogen: the randomised, phase 2 MRC
580 PATCH trial (PRO9). *The Lancet Oncology*. 2013;14(4):306-16.
- 581 14. Gilbert DC, Duong T, Sydes M, Bara A, Clarke N, Abel P, et al. Transdermal oestradiol as a
582 method of androgen suppression for prostate cancer within the STAMPEDE trial platform. *BJU*
583 *International*. 2018;121(5):680-3.
- 584 15. Langley RE, Godsland IF, Kynaston H, Clarke NW, Rosen SD, Morgan RC, et al. Early hormonal
585 data from a multicentre phase II trial using transdermal oestrogen patches as first-line hormonal
586 therapy in patients with locally advanced or metastatic prostate cancer. *BJU international*.
587 2008;102(4):442-5.
- 588 16. Norman G, Dean ME, Langley RE, Hodges ZC, Ritchie G, Parmar MKB, et al. Parenteral
589 oestrogen in the treatment of prostate cancer: a systematic review. *British journal of cancer*.
590 2008;98(4):697-707.

- 591 17. Canonico M, Plu-Bureau G, Lowe GDO, Scarabin P-Y. Hormone replacement therapy and risk
592 of venous thromboembolism in postmenopausal women: systematic review and meta-analysis. *BMJ*.
593 2008;336(7655):1227-31.
- 594 18. van Kesteren PJ, Asscheman H, Megens JA, Gooren LJ. Mortality and morbidity in transsexual
595 subjects treated with cross-sex hormones. *Clin Endocrinol (Oxf)*. 1997;47(3):337-42.
- 596 19. Ott J, Kaufmann U, Bentz EK, Huber JC, Tempfer CB. Incidence of thrombophilia and venous
597 thrombosis in transsexuals under cross-sex hormone therapy. *Fertil Steril*. 2010;93(4):1267-72.
- 598 20. Langley RE, Kynaston HG, Alhasso AA, Duong T, Paez EM, Jovic G, et al. A Randomised
599 Comparison Evaluating Changes in Bone Mineral Density in Advanced Prostate Cancer: Luteinising
600 Hormone-releasing Hormone Agonists Versus Transdermal Oestradiol. *European urology*.
601 2016;69(6):1016-25.
- 602 21. Gilbert DC, Duong T, Kynaston HG, Alhasso AA, Cafferty FH, Rosen SD, et al. Quality-of-life
603 outcomes from the Prostate Adenocarcinoma: TransCutaneous Hormones (PATCH) trial evaluating
604 luteinising hormone-releasing hormone agonists versus transdermal oestradiol for androgen
605 suppression in advanced prostate cancer. *BJU International*. 2017;119(5):667-75.
- 606 22. Morote J, Gómez-Caamaño A, Alvarez-Ossorio JL, Pesqueira D, Tabernero A, Gómez Veiga F,
607 et al. The metabolic syndrome and its components in patients with prostate cancer on androgen
608 deprivation therapy. *J Urol*. 2015;193(6):1963-9.
- 609 23. Walsh BW, Schiff I, Rosner B, Greenberg L, Ravnikar V, Sacks FM. Effects of postmenopausal
610 estrogen replacement on the concentrations and metabolism of plasma lipoproteins. *N Engl J Med*.
611 1991;325(17):1196-204.
- 612 24. Purnell JQ, Bland LB, Garzotto M, Lemmon D, Wersinger EM, Ryan CW, et al. Effects of
613 transdermal estrogen on levels of lipids, lipase activity, and inflammatory markers in men with
614 prostate cancer. *J Lipid Res*. 2006;47(2):349-55.
- 615 25. Bosco C, Bosnyak Z, Malmberg A, Adolfsson J, Keating NL, Van Hemelrijck M. Quantifying
616 observational evidence for risk of fatal and nonfatal cardiovascular disease following androgen
617 deprivation therapy for prostate cancer: a meta-analysis. *European urology*. 2015;68(3):386-96.
- 618 26. O'Farrell S, Garmo H, Holmberg L, Adolfsson J, Stattin P, Van Hemelrijck M. Risk and timing of
619 cardiovascular disease after androgen-deprivation therapy in men with prostate cancer. *Journal of
620 clinical oncology : official journal of the American Society of Clinical Oncology*. 2015;33(11):1243-51.
- 621 27. Nguyen PL, Je Y, Schutz FAB, Hoffman KE, Hu JC, Parekh A, et al. Association of Androgen
622 Deprivation Therapy With Cardiovascular Death in Patients With Prostate Cancer: A Meta-analysis of
623 Randomized Trials. *JAMA*. 2011;306(21):2359-66.
- 624 28. Wilcox C, Kautto A, Steigler A, Denham JW. Androgen Deprivation Therapy for Prostate Cancer
625 Does Not Increase Cardiovascular Mortality in the Long Term. *Oncology*. 2012;82(1):56-8.
- 626 29. Hedlund PO, Henriksson P. Parenteral estrogen versus total androgen ablation in the
627 treatment of advanced prostate carcinoma: effects on overall survival and cardiovascular mortality.
628 The Scandinavian Prostatic Cancer Group (SPCG)-5 Trial Study. *Urology*. 2000;55(3):328-33.
- 629 30. Shore ND, Saad F, Cookson MS, George DJ, Saltzstein DR, Tutrone R, et al. Oral Relugolix for
630 Androgen-Deprivation Therapy in Advanced Prostate Cancer. *N Engl J Med*. 2020;382(23):2187-96.
- 631 31. Albertsen PC, Klotz L, Tombal B, Grady J, Olesen TK, Nilsson J. Cardiovascular Morbidity
632 Associated with Gonadotropin Releasing Hormone Agonists and an Antagonist. *European urology*.
633 2014;65(3):565-73.

634

635

636

637

639

640 **Table 1: Patient characteristics at randomisation**

641

	Treatment allocated					
	LHRHa (N=790)		Patches (N=904)		Total (N=1694)	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Age at randomisation (years)						
Median (IQR)	73 (67-78)		73 (68-78)		73 (68-78)	
Min-Max	52-96		49-91		49-96	
Inclusion criteria						
Newly diagnosed locally advanced prostate cancer	358	45%	414	46%	772	46%
Newly diagnosed node positive or metastatic prostate cancer	312	39%	352	39%	664	39%
Newly diagnosed prostate cancer with bone mets & PSA ≥50ng/ml, without histology	74	9%	84	9%	158	9%
Relapsing with PSA≥4ng/ml	7	1%	15	2%	22	1%
Relapsing with PSA≥20ng/ml	18	2%	20	2%	38	2%
Relapsing with documented metastases and PSA≥4ng/ml	21	3%	19	2%	40	2%
Tumour status						
T0	5	1%	3	<1%	8	<1%
T1	5	1%	4	<1%	9	1%
T2	30	4%	43	5%	73	4%
T3	567	72%	660	73%	1,227	72%
T4	124	16%	128	14%	252	15%
TX	59	7%	66	7%	125	7%
Nodal status						
N0	396	50%	416	46%	812	48%

	Treatment allocated					
	LHRHa (N=790)		Patches (N=904)		Total (N=1694)	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
N+	233	29%	251	28%	484	29%
NX	161	20%	237	26%	398	23%
Does patient have metastases?						
No	469	59%	555	61%	1,024	60%
Yes	321	41%	349	39%	670	40%
Does M1 patient have bone metastases?						
No	38	12%	40	11%	78	12%
Yes	283	88%	309	89%	592	88%
PSA at randomisation (ng/ml)						
Median (IQR)	35.0 (14.8-95.2)		34.9 (14.9-97.1)		35.0 (14.9-96.8)	
Min-Max	0.7-6247.0		0.6-6710.0		0.6-6710.0	
<i>Missing data</i>	12	2%	8	1%	20	1%
Gleason sum score at diagnosis¹						
4-6	46	6%	54	6%	102	6%
7	227	29%	280	31%	507	30%
8-10	443	56%	476	53%	919	54%
Newly diagnosed, without histology	54	7%	74	8%	128	8%
<i>Missing/not yet received</i>	20	3%	20	2%	40	2%
WHO Performance status						

	Treatment allocated					
	LHRHa (N=790)		Patches (N=904)		Total (N=1694)	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Normal activity without restriction	555	70%	642	71%	1,197	71%
Strenuous activity restricted, can do light work	208	26%	229	25%	437	26%
Up and about >50% of waking hours, capable of self-care	27	3%	33	4%	60	4%
Baseline BMI²						
Median (IQR)	27.0 (24.4-30.0)		27.1 (24.8-30.1)		27.1 (24.6-30.0)	
Min-Max	15.0-47.0		17.7-45.8		15.0-47.0	
<i>Missing/not initially collected</i>	134	17%	164	18%	298	18%
Is the patient a smoker?						
Never smoked	322	41%	372	41%	694	41%
Previous smoker	390	49%	440	49%	830	49%
Current smoker	78	10%	92	10%	170	10%
History of heart disease in first degree relative³						
No	551	70%	632	71%	1,183	71%
Yes	234	30%	259	29%	493	29%
Is patient taking regular long-term aspirin?						
0 No	630	80%	684	76%	1,314	78%
1 Yes	157	20%	219	24%	376	22%
<i>Missing data</i>	3	<1%	1	<1%	4	<1%
If the patient is randomised to the control arm,						

	Treatment allocated					
	LHRHa (N=790)		Patches (N=904)		Total (N=1694)	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
1 Leuprorelin (Prostap)	359	45%	409	45%	768	45%
2 Goserelin (Zoladex)	319	40%	377	42%	696	41%
3 Other	51	6%	49	5%	100	6%
4 Triptorelin (Decapeptyl)	61	8%	69	8%	130	8%
Intend to give the patient first-line docetaxel?						
No	301	38%	325	36%	626	37%
Yes	90	11%	96	11%	186	11%
<i>Missing/not initially relevant</i>	399	51%	483	53%	882	52%
Intend to give the patient first-line docetaxel? M1 patients only						
No	79	25%	69	20%	148	22%
Not available, pt randomised before October 2015	161	50%	190	54%	351	52%
Yes	81	25%	90	26%	171	26%
Do you intend to give radiotherapy to the prostate?						
0 No	463	59%	541	60%	1,004	59%
1 Yes	318	40%	347	38%	665	39%
<i>Missing data</i>	9	1%	16	2%	25	1%
Do you intend to give radiotherapy to the prostate? M0 patients only						
0 No	173	37%	216	39%	389	38%
1 Yes	290	62%	328	59%	618	60%

	Treatment allocated					
	LHRHa (N=790)		Patches (N=904)		Total (N=1694)	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
<i>Missing data</i>	6	1%	11	2%	17	2%

642 ¹Of the patients missing gleason sum score, 20/40 (50%) are due to baseline CRF not yet received.
643

644 ²Baseline BMI weight not initially reported

645

646 ³The initial versions of the CRF asked about a personal history of cardiac disease, rather than a family history,
647 and are not included in this table. 3/5 LHRHa, and 2/13 tE2 patients answered “yes” to a personal history of
648 cardiac disease. Note that in analyses which include history of cardiac disease as a covariate, personal history
649 is used in lieu of family history for these patients.

650

651

652

653
654

Table 2: Number of CV events reviewed and classified as an cardiovascular endpoint

	1:2 cohort		1:1 cohort		Total (N=1694)
	LHRHa (N=82)	tE2 (N=162)	LHRHa (N=708)	tE2 (N=742)	
Number of events reviewed	38	73	88	112	311
Number of events fulfilling endpoint criteria (fatal) ¹	16 (6)	35 (5)	56 (9)	60 (6)	167 (26)
Type of event					
Heart failure	2 (0)	4 (1)	7 (2)	12 (1)	25 (4)
Acute coronary syndrome	3 (1)	12 (2)	16 (2)	18 (3)	49 (8)
Thromboembolic stroke	5 (1)	6 (0)	16 (1)	15 (0)	42 (2)
Other arterial embolic events	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	2 (0)	2 (0)
Venous thromboembolism	2 (0)	12 (1)	14 (1)	11 (0)	39 (2)
Other significant event ²	4 (4)	1 (1)	3 (3)	2 (2)	10 (10)
Number of patients with a CV endpoint event, including sudden death with no post-mortem (%)	14(17.1%)	32(19.8%)	50(7.1%)	57(7.7%)	153(9.0%)
Number of patients with a confirmed CV endpoint event (%)	11(13.4%)	31(19.1%)	47(6.6%)	56(7.5%)	145(8.6%)

655

656 ¹ Of the 95 events that occurred in patients initially randomised to tE2, 34 occurred when tE2 had been
657 stopped and LHRHa started.

658 ² Other significant events are unexpected death, but where no post-mortem took place and therefore the
659 endpoint definition could not be verified.

661
662

Table 3: Six and 12 month changes from baseline in cardiovascular risk factors

	Arm	N ¹	Mean change (95% CI)	Mean % change (95% CI)	Treatment effect p-value ²
Fasting Glucose (mmol/L)					
6 month change	LHRHa	531	0.14 (0.04, 0.24)	3.1% (1.6%, 4.7%)	<0.0001
	tE2	553	-0.20 (-0.29, -0.12)	-2.4% (-3.7%, -1.0%)	
12 month change	LHRHa	433	0.31 (0.17, 0.46)	5.9% (3.7%, 8.1%)	<0.0001
	tE2	473	-0.11 (-0.22, -0.01)	-1.1% (-2.7%, 0.6%)	
Fasting Cholesterol (mmol/L)					
6 month change	LHRHa	551	0.19 (0.11, 0.26)	5.3% (3.7%, 6.9%)	<0.0001
	tE2	575	-0.32 (-0.38, -0.26)	-5.3% (-6.5%, -4.1%)	
12 month change	LHRHa	456	0.10 (0.01, 0.18)	3.1% (1.4%, 4.8%)	<0.0001
	tE2	486	-0.34 (-0.40, -0.28)	-5.7% (-7.0%, -4.5%)	
Fasting HDL (mmol/L)					
6 month change	LHRHa	528	0.05 (0.02, 0.09)	6.7% (4.3%, 9.0%)	0.023
	tE2	554	0.11 (0.08, 0.15)	11.6% (8.6%, 14.6%)	
12 month change	LHRHa	432	0.04 (-0.01, 0.08)	5.8% (2.4%, 9.2%)	0.188
	tE2	466	0.07 (0.04, 0.11)	8.5% (6.0%, 11.0%)	
Weight (Kg)					
6 month change	LHRHa	518	1.74 (1.17, 2.30)	2.3% (1.7%, 2.9%)	0.318
	tE2	569	1.43 (0.85, 2.01)	1.9% (1.3%, 2.5%)	
12 month change	LHRHa	421	2.16 (1.51, 2.80)	2.8% (2.0%, 3.5%)	0.161
	tE2	452	1.68 (1.09, 2.28)	2.2% (1.7%, 2.7%)	
Systolic blood pressure (mmHg)⁺					
6 month change	LHRHa	547	1.90 (0.50, 3.31)	1.9% (0.9%, 3.0%)	<0.0001
	tE2	609	-2.07 (-3.39, -0.75)	-0.8% (-1.8%, 0.1%)	
Diastolic blood pressure (mmHg)⁺					
6 month change	LHRHa	547	1.27 (0.37, 2.18)	2.6% (1.4%, 3.9%)	<0.0001
	tE2	608	-1.77 (-2.60, -0.95)	-1.5% (-2.6%, -0.4%)	

663

664 ¹N includes patients still receiving their randomly allocated treatment at the time of assessment. For tE2
665 patients, oestradiol levels needed to be at least 250 pmol/L. Among patients who reported any cardiovascular
666 risk factors, at six months 54 LHRHa and 111 tE2 patients are excluded due to having stopped their allocated
667 treatment, 25 tE2 patients are excluded due to having low oestradiol, and 13 are excluded due to not reporting
668 an oestradiol value. At 12 months, 95 LHRHa and 158 tE2 patients were excluded due to having stopped
669 allocated treatment, 19 tE2 patients for reporting low oestradiol, and 7 oestradiol patients for not reporting an
670 oestradiol value.

671 ²P-values are from ANCOVA models comparing mean change in each risk factor.

672

673

674 **Table 4: Adverse events**

675

	Cohort	LHRHa			tE2			P-value*
		Pts N	Any grade N (%)	Grade 3 N (%)	Pts N	Any grade N (%)	Grade 3 N (%)	
Gynaecomastia	Both cohorts	730	279 (38%)	6 (1%)	807	690 (86%)	34 (4%)	<0.0001
	1:2	79	38 (48%)	1 (1%)	147	121 (82%)	19 (13%)	
	1:1	651	241 (37%)	5 (1%)	660	569 (86%)	15 (2%)	
Hot flushes	Both cohorts	730	628 (86%)	23 (3%)	807	280 (35%)	1 (0%)	<0.0001
	1:2	79	66 (84%)	5 (6%)	147	52 (35%)	1 (1%)	
	1:1	651	562 (86%)	18 (3%)	660	228 (35%)	0 (0%)	
Skin/subcutaneous toxicity	Both cohorts	730	474 (65%)	11 (2%)	807	548 (68%)	2 (0%)	0.197
	1:2	79	56 (71%)	3 (4%)	147	92 (63%)	0 (0%)	
	1:1	651	418 (64%)	8 (1%)	660	456 (69%)	2 (0%)	
Sexual / reproductive toxicity	Both cohorts	730	671 (92%)	48 (7%)	807	732 (91%)	56 (7%)	0.583
	1:2	79	71 (90%)	13 (16%)	147	125 (85%)	34 (23%)	
	1:1	651	600 (92%)	35 (5%)	660	607 (92%)	22 (3%)	

676

677 Note: Toxicities experienced whilst patients are still known to be receiving allocated treatment are
678 included.

679 *P-values compare the rate of toxicity at any grade, using a logistic regression model, and combining the two
680 randomisation cohorts using a fixed effects meta-analysis.

681

682

683

684

685

686

687


688

689

690

691 **Figure 1. Patient flow diagram**

692




693

694 ¹ 51 additional patients randomised as part of the initial cohort, treated using a different tE2 dose, are
695 excluded from all analyses.

696 Note: Patients are included for analysis of CV risk factors if they have data at baseline and at six months, with
697 tests performed whilst still receiving allocated treatment.

698 Note: Patients are included in analysis of adverse events if they return any toxicity data whilst still receiving
699 allocated treatment

Figure 2: Castration rate ($\leq 1.7\text{nmol/L}$) by treatment arm, up to 12 months




1. Patients included in analysis at 4 weeks (LHRHa 640, tE2 793); 3 months (693 LHRHa, 776 tE2); 6 months (633 LHRHa, 683 tE2); 12 months (511 LHRHa, 540 tE2).

2. Data are included if tests are conducted at 4 weeks \pm 2 weeks, and at 3, 6 and 12 months \pm 6 weeks and patient still on allocated treatment

Figure 3: Time to first CV endpoint event, intention-to-treat analysis


Figure 3a



Numbers at risk (and events, over time from randomisation)

Cohort	Arm	Time from randomisation (years)					Total
		0-	2-	4-	6-	8-	
2:1	LHRHa	82 (4)	64 (3)	43 (2)	34 (4)	21 (1)	82 (14)
	tE2	162 (13)	119 (6)	88 (8)	64 (3)	42 (2)	162 (32)
1:1	LHRHa	708 (31)	430 (11)	184 (7)	73 (1)	13 (0)	708 (50)
	tE2	742 (35)	446 (14)	189 (6)	87 (2)	18 (0)	742 (57)

Figure 3b



Numbers at risk (and events, over time from randomisation)

Cohort	Arm	Time from randomisation (years)					Total
		0-	2-	4-	6-	8-	
1:2	LHRHa	82 (4)	64 (2)	43 (2)	33 (2)	21 (1)	82 (11)
	tE2	162 (13)	119 (6)	88 (7)	64 (3)	42 (2)	162 (31)
1:1	LHRHa	708 (30)	430 (10)	184 (6)	73 (1)	13 (0)	708 (47)
	tE2	742 (34)	446 (14)	189 (6)	87 (2)	18 (0)	742 (56)

Figure 3a Time to first CV endpoint event, includes patients with sudden/unexplained death and no post-mortem.

Figure 3b Time to first CV endpoint event – confirmed event only

Appendix tables.

Table S1: Castration rates

		1 month		3 months		6 months		12 months	
		LHRHa	tE2	LHRHa	tE2	LHRHa	tE2	LHRHa	tE2
No testosterone data	Total	129	57	66	45	106	88	193	201
Reason for no data	Died	0	0	3	2	10	7	26	35
	Censored	14	8	15	10	21	25	58	59
	Test outside analysis window	54	31	6	6	22	31	47	58
	No data	61	18	42	27	53	25	62	49
Testosterone data	Total	661	847	724	859	684	816	597	703
Reason to exclude data	Off treatment	21	16	31	50	51	104	86	141
	Low oestradiol	-	32	-	28	-	22	-	18
	No oestradiol	-	6	-	5	-	7	-	4
Eligible data	Total	640	793	693	776	633	683	511	540
Is patient castrate?	No	225 (35%)	132 (17%)	50 (7%)	55 (7%)	54 (9%)	55 (8%)	23 (5%)	32 (6%)
	Yes	415 (65%)	661 (83%)	643 (93%)	721 (93%)	579 (91%)	628 (92%)	488 (95%)	508 (94%)

Note: "Censored" means a patient has provided no trial data at or beyond this point in the trial.

Note: For data to be included in analysis, tests need to have been conducted at 1 month \pm 2 weeks, and at 3, 6 and 12 months \pm 6 weeks.

Table S2: Oestradiol levels (pmol/L) over time.

Month	LHRH				tE2			
	N*	Median	5% - 95%	Min - Max	N*	Median	5% - 95%	Min - Max
1	675	70	18 - 124	0.4 - 578	823	845	376 - 2280	251 - 5424
3	690	70	18 - 100	0.4 - 503	789	723	334 - 1996	250 - 5627
6	628	70	18 - 100	2 - 496	692	776.5	356 - 2080	252 - 5299
12	526	70	18 - 100	1 - 440	570	820.5	397 - 2239	261 - 6200
18	394	70	18 - 100	3 - 1416	434	795.5	372 - 2087	267 - 4753
24	345	70	18 - 100	18 - 306	360	819	371 - 2183	261 - 3908
30	120	70	18 - 100	18 - 167	279	802	369 - 2001	250 - 3245
36	80	70	18 - 104	18 - 117	204	812	381 - 1677	252 - 3458

*N includes patients still receiving their randomly allocated treatment at the time of assessment. For tE2 patients, oestradiol levels needed to be at least 250 pmol/L.

Table S3: Proportion of patients experiencing CV event/sudden death

	LHRH (N=790)	Patches (N=904)
Overall rate		
By 12 months	2.8% (1.8%, 4.2%)	2.8% (1.9%, 4.2%)
By 24 months	5.3% (3.8%, 7.3%)	6.4% (4.8%, 8.4%)
By 36 months	7.2% (5.4%, 9.6%)	8.0% (6.2%, 10.4%)
Rate by previous exposure to treatment (months)		
<6	3.5% (2.1%, 6.0%)	3.5 (2.3%, 5.2%)
6-11.99	2.5% (1.3%, 4.7%)	2.7 (1.6%, 4.7%)
≥12	2.4% (1.8%, 3.2%)	2.8 (2.1%, 3.7%)

Treatment status at time of event.		
Number with event	64	89
Patient still on tE2		42 (47%)
Patient off tE2 treatment		47 (53%)
<3 months after stopping tE2		17
3-5.99 months		3
6-11.99 months		6
12-23.99 months		9
≥24 months		12

Table S4: Overall CV event/sudden deaths over time, by metastatic status and docetaxel use

	LHRH (N=790)	Patches (N=904)
Overall rate		
By 12 months	2.8% (1.8%, 4.2%)	2.8% (1.9%, 4.2%)
By 24 months	5.3% (3.8%, 7.3%)	6.4% (4.8%, 8.4%)
By 36 months	7.2% (5.4%, 9.6%)	8.0% (6.2%, 10.4%)
All M0 patients		
By 12 months	2.3% (1.2%, 4.2%)	2.5% (1.4%, 4.2%)
By 24 months	3.6% (2.2%, 5.9%)	5.2% (3.6%, 7.7%)
By 36 months	5.9% (3.9%, 8.9%)	6.6% (4.6%, 9.3%)
All M1 patients		
By 12 months	3.4% (1.9%, 6.3%)	3.4% (1.9%, 6.1%)
By 24 months	8.0% (5.2%, 12.2%)	8.5% (5.7%, 12.6%)
By 36 months	9.3% (6.1%, 13.9%)	10.8% (7.4%, 15.5%)
M1 patients, no Docetaxel		
By 12 months	4.4% (1.5%, 13.2%)	6.1% (2.3%, 15.4%)
By 24 months	7.8% (3.3%, 17.8%)	6.1% (2.3%, 15.4%)
By 36 months	7.8% (3.3%, 17.8%)	12.7% (5.5%, 27.8%)
M1 patients, Docetaxel		
By 12 months	1.4% (0.2%, 9.3%)	0.0% (NA)
By 24 months	7.0% (2.2%, 21.1%)	7.9% (3.0%, 20.0%)
By 36 months	7.0% (2.2%, 21.1%)	7.9% (3.0%, 20.0%)

Table S5: PATCH committee members

Committee	Current/former member	Name	Institution	
Trial management group	Current	Ruth Langley	MRC Clinical Trials Unit at UCL	
		Duncan Gilbert	MRC Clinical Trials Unit at UCL	
		Matthew Nankivell	MRC Clinical Trials Unit at UCL	
		Archie Macnair	MRC Clinical Trials Unit at UCL	
		Silvia Forcat	MRC Clinical Trials Unit at UCL	
		Melanie Weiss	MRC Clinical Trials Unit at UCL	
		Cindy Goldstein	MRC Clinical Trials Unit at UCL	
		Will Hudson	MRC Clinical Trials Unit at UCL	
		Abdulla Alhasso	Beatson West of Scotland Cancer Centre	
		Noel Clarke	The Christie and Salford Royal, Manchester	
		Roger Kockelbergh	Leicester General Hospital	
		Howard Kynaston	Cardiff University Medical School	
		Stuart D Rosen	National Heart and Lung Institute, Imperial College	
		Stephen Mangar	Charing Cross Hospital	
		Mahesh Parmar	MRC Clinical Trials Unit at UCL	
		John Marshall	Patient and Public Representative	
		John V Deighan	Patient and Public Representative	
		Former	Paul Abel	Hammersmith Hospital, London
			Trinh Duong	MRC Clinical Trials Unit at UCL
Trial Steering Committee	Current	Jeremy Whelan	University College London Hospitals Trust	
		John Chester	University of Cardiff	
		Emma Crosbie	University of Manchester	
		Ann Thomas	University of Leicester	
		Lucy Kilburn	Institute of Cancer Research	
		Anne Russell	Patient and Public Representative	
Independent Data Monitoring Committee	Current	Laurence Collette	European Organisation for Research and Treatment of Cancer (EORTC)	
		Richard Adams	Velindre Cancer Centre	
		Philip Smith	Retired urologist	
MRC CTU at UCL staff	Former	Trinh Duong	Project Lead	
		Fay Cafferty	Project Lead	
		Charlotte Tyson	Trial Manager	
		Andy Welland	Trial Manager	
		Ben Spittle	Trial Manager	

		Phil Pollock	Trial Manager
		Lisa McDonald	Trial Manager
		Montse Wells	Trial Manager
		Gordana Jovic	Statistician
		Suzanne Freeman	Statistician
		Rachel Morgan/Jinks	Statistician
		Katherine Beaney	Data Manager
		Robin Carpenter	Data Manager
		Vicky Tsipouri	Data Manager
		Mark Hall	Data Manager
		Katharina Waneck	Data Manager
		Hassan Khan	Data Manager
		James Pickering	Data Manager
		Phil Pollock	Data Manager

Supplementary Figure 1 PATCH Development Programme

