OPTIMIS - Outcomes of HCC patients treated with TACE followed or not followed by sorafenib and the influence of timing to initiate sorafenib

First published: 22/08/2013

Last updated: 02/07/2024





Administrative details

PURI

https://redirect.ema.europa.eu/resource/26404

EU PAS number

EUPAS4564

Study ID

26404

DARWIN EU® study

No

Study countries
Austria
Brazil
Canada
China
Egypt
France
Greece
Hungary
India
Indonesia
Japan
☐ Kazakhstan
Korea, Republic of
☐ Mexico
Netherlands
Pakistan
Russian Federation
Singapore
Slovakia
Sweden
Switzerland
Taiwan
Thailand
Türkiye
☐ Viet Nam

Study description

This study will collect data of patients who are treated with TACE followed by sorafenib for hepatocellular carcinoma (HCC) or patients without Sorafenib after

TACE. In contrast to a prior observational study on sorafenib (GIDEON study), where pre-treatment with TACE was documented retrospectively, this study will collect more detailed information about the TACE treatment and the status of a patient when treatment with sorafenib is started.

Study status

Finalised

Research institutions and networks

Institutions

Bayer AG

First published: 01/02/2024

Last updated: 01/02/2024

Institution

Multiple centres: 25 centres are involved in the study

Contact details

Study institution contact

Bayer Clinical Trials Contact Bayer AG

Study contact

clinical-trials-contact@bayer.com

Primary lead investigator

Bayer Clinical Trials Contact Bayer AG

Primary lead investigator

Study timelines

Date when funding contract was signed

Planned: 05/12/2012

Actual: 05/12/2012

Study start date

Planned: 01/09/2013

Actual: 28/10/2013

Date of final study report

Planned: 30/06/2018

Actual: 07/06/2018

Sources of funding

• Pharmaceutical company and other private sector

More details on funding

Bayer AG

Study protocol

OPTIMIS PRO.pdf(1.86 MB)

OPTIMIS PRO v3 2015-09-04 FINAL.pdf(2.17 MB)

Regulatory

Was the study required by a regulatory body?

No

Is the study required by a Risk Management Plan (RMP)?

Not applicable

Methodological aspects

Study type

Study type list

Study topic:

Disease /health condition

Human medicinal product

Study type:

Non-interventional study

Scope of the study:

Drug utilisation

Effectiveness study (incl. comparative)

Data collection methods:

Combined primary data collection and secondary use of data

Main study objective:

The primary objective of this study is the comparison of two cohorts of hepatocellular carcinoma patients regarding overall survival (OS) from time of TACE non-eligibility. The two cohorts of special interest are defined based on the investigators' treatment decisions (i.e. patients with early start of Sorafenib treatment vs. patients without early start of Sorafenib treatment).

Study Design

Non-interventional study design

Cohort

Study drug and medical condition

Name of medicine

NEXAVAR

Anatomical Therapeutic Chemical (ATC) code

(L01XE05) sorafenib

sorafenib

Medical condition to be studied

Hepatocellular carcinoma

Population studied

Short description of the study population

Patient with a diagnosis of unresectable Hepatocellular carcinoma (HCC).
Patients having following criteria were included:
☐ Patients with histologically/cytologically documented or radiographically
diagnosed HCC. Radiographic diagnosis needs typical findings of HCC by
radiographic method i.e. on multidimensional dynamic CT, CT hepatic
arteriography (CTHA)/CT arterial portography (CTAP) or MRI.
☐ Patients with BCLC stage B or higher.
 Patients in whom a decision to treat with TACE has been made at time of
study enrollment. Patients that have received one TACE in the past also can be
enrolled, if the TACE was done at the same site and all required data about
such previous TACEs are available. TACE includes both conventional TACE with
lipidiol (or similar agents) and chemotherapeutic agent(s) and TACE with DC
Beads® excluding TAE without chemotherapeutic agent.
☐ Patients with unresectable HCC (incurable with curative treatments including
resection or ablation or not eligible for resection or local ablation)
☐ Patients must have signed an informed consent form
☐ Patients must have a life expectancy of at least 8 weeks
Age groups
Adults (18 to < 46 years)
Adults (46 to < 65 years)
Adults (65 to < 75 years)
Adults (75 to < 85 years)
Adults (85 years and over)
Special population of interest
Hepatic impaired

Study design details

Outcomes

Overall survival, defined as time (in days) from time of TACE non-eligibility to death due to any cause. Patients lost to follow-up or alive at the end of the study will be censored at the last date known to be alive. 1) Overall survival from initial TACE2) Progression-free survival from initial TACE3) Time to progression from initial TACE4) Tumor response according to mRECIST criteria5) Duration of treatment6) Number of patients with TEAEs (treatment emergent adverse events)For more secondary outcome measures please visit https://clinicaltrials.gov/ct2/show/NCT01933945

Data analysis plan

In general, statistical analyses will be of explorative and descriptive nature. Analyses will be performed for the total study population (overall analysis) and separately for the two patient cohorts of special interest, as appropriate. The primary efficacy endpoint is Overall Survival (OS). It is defined in this study as the time period from documented TACE non-eligibility to death due to any cause. For the two cohorts of special interest, Kaplan-Meier (KM) estimates for OS will be displayed. Furthermore, these two cohorts will be compared regarding overall survival using a Cox proportional hazards model. Where applicable, the propensity score approach will be applied in order to compare the two cohorts.

Documents

Study results

16560 EU PAS Abstract 2018-10-10.pdf(227.73 KB)

Study report

16560 OPTIMIS_Report Addendum_v1.0_20181015_Redacted.pdf(1.1 MB) 16560 OPTIMIS Report v1.0 20180529 Redacted.pdf(2.77 MB)

Study, other information

16560 OPTIMIS Report v1.0 20180529 Redacted.pdf(2.77 MB)

Data management

Data sources

Data sources (types)

Other

Data sources (types), other

Prospective patient-based data collection, Medical records, routine measurements (e.g. tumor assessment), patients, other physicians

Use of a Common Data Model (CDM)

CDM mapping

No

Data quality specifications

Unknown

Check completeness

Check conformance

Unknown

Check stability

Unknown

Check logical consistency

Unknown

Data characterisation

Data characterisation conducted

Unknown