

Considerations for Single-Arm Trials to Support Accelerated Approval of Oncology Drugs

Feinan Lu, MD; Tao Wang, PhD; Ying Lu, PhD; Jie Chen, PhD*

Author affiliations: Data Science, ECR Global, Shanghai, China (Feinan Lu, Tao Wang, Jie Chen); Biomedical Data Science, Stanford University, Stanford, California (Ying Lu)

Contents

1	Introduction	1
2	Conditions for Considering an SAT to Support Regulatory Approval	2
2.1	Life-threatening or serious conditions with no efficacious treatments	2
2.2	Rare cancers	3
2.3	Well-understood natural history of the cancer	3
2.4	Well-understood mechanism of action of the drug	4
2.5	Adequate dose optimization	4
2.6	Substantial evidence of treatment effects	5
2.7	Translation of SEs to clinical benefits	6
2.8	Favorable benefit-risk profile	7
2.9	Totality of evidence	8
2.10	Planning/initiation of confirmatory trials	9

*Correspondence to: Dr. Jie Chen, ECR Global, Shanghai, China (jie.chen8@ecr-global.com).

3 Other Considerations	9
3.1 Well-defined estimands	9
3.2 Adaptive designs	10
3.3 Communication with regulatory agencies	10
4 Concluding Remarks	11

Considerations for Single-Arm Trials to Support Accelerated Approval of Oncology Drugs

Abstract

In the last two decades, single-arm trials (SATs) have been effectively used to study anticancer therapies in well-defined patient populations using durable response rates as an objective and interpretable clinical endpoints. With a growing trend of regulatory accelerated approval (AA) requiring randomized controlled trials (RCTs), some confusions have arisen about the roles of SATs in AA. This paper is intended to elucidate conditions under which an SAT may be considered reasonable for AA. Specifically, the paper describes (1) two necessary conditions for designing an SAT, (2) three sufficient conditions that help either optimize the study design or interpret the study results, (3) four conditions that demonstrate substantial evidence of clinical benefits of the drug, and (4) a plan of a confirmatory RCT to verify the clinical benefits. Some further considerations are discussed to help design a scientifically sound SAT and communicate with regulatory agencies. Conditions presented in this paper may serve as a set of references for sponsors using SATs for regulatory decision.

Key words: Single-arm trials, life-threatening, rare cancer, natural history, mechanism of action, dose optimization, substantial evidence.

1 Introduction

There have been extensive discussions recently on single-arm trials (SATs) in support of regulatory accelerated approvals (AA).¹⁻¹⁰ These heated discussions stem from increasing withdrawals of oncology products that were approved based on SATs.¹¹⁻¹⁴ On the other hand, some see clear clinical values of SATs in bringing effective medicines to needed patients more efficiently.^{9,15-17} Recently issued regulatory guidance documents acknowledge that there are circumstance where SATs are appropriate in drug development for AA, although there are substantive limitations associated with the evidence generated from SATs.¹⁸⁻²⁰

Given the above background and considering (1) some criticisms on regulatory approvals based on SATs (e.g., potential patient selection bias,^{21,22} insufficient dose optimization,^{23,24} lack of overwhelming evidence of treatment effect,²⁵ and failure to demonstrate favorable clinical benefits and risks,²⁶ (2) some recent confusions about the roles of SATs in oncology drug development and regulatory approvals,^{3,5,10,13,27,28} and (3) the recognition of SATs

as an efficient approach to bringing novel anticancer therapies to well-defined patient populations with unmet need, ^{1,2,8,18,29} we intend to provide a summary of conditions, based on our experience and knowledge, under which an SAT may be appropriate to support a regulatory (accelerated) approval.

2 Conditions for Considering an SAT to Support Regulatory Approval

This section presents ten conditions when using SATs to support regulatory approval. The first two conditions are considered as necessary to design and conduct a SAT, the rest of the conditions are considered as providing either interpretability of results, optimal design, or generation of substantial evidence of treatment benefits from an SAT.

2.1 Life-threatening or serious conditions with no efficacious treatments

The majority of cancer types are life-threatening, especially those that are in terminal stages. Cancer patients who are relapsed or refractory after multiple prior-line therapies are generally in unmet medical needs, which often have few treatment options and poor clinical outcomes. ³⁰ For example: (1) patients with relapsed or refractory diffuse large B-cell lymphoma who failed at least two multi-agent systemic anticancer treatment regimens generally have poor prognosis with limited treatment available, ³¹ (2) the majority of patients with extensive-stage small-cell lung cancer (SCLC) will have disease progression within 6 months even after front-line treatments, ³² and (3) patients with locally advanced or metastatic urothelial cancer have limited treatment options because many of them are ineligible for cisplatin-based chemotherapy (a standard of care) due to substantial toxicity. ³³ All of these scenarios share the same or similar features of unmet medical needs—They are life-threatening or serious conditions with limited or no options of treatments, often resulting in unsatisfactory survival or poor quality of life for cancer patients. Therefore, it would be unethical to conduct an RCT to assign the patients to the control group where there are no efficacious treatments available.

2.2 Rare cancers

There is no universally acceptable definition for rare cancer. The US National Cancer Institute defines rare cancers as those that affect fewer than 15 out of 100,000 people each year³⁴ and the International Agency for Research on Cancer defines rare cancers as cancer types with less than 6 newly diagnosed cases in 100,000 people per year.³⁵ It is generally believed that a cancer with an annual incidence rate ≤ 5 per 200,000 people can be considered as a rare cancer.³⁶ In addition, some subtypes of common cancers are also rare, e.g., invasive triple-negative lobular carcinoma of breast cancer³⁷ and ERBB2 exon 20 mutations of non-small cell lung cancer.³⁸ Even though individually rare, the rare cancers collectively account for about 25–30% of all cancer diagnoses and 25% cancer deaths.³⁵ Studies have showed that since the launch of the US Orphan Drug Act (ODA) in 1983 up to 2019, the FDA approved 1,910 orphan drug designations for treatment of rare cancers, representing 37% of all approvals within the ODA.³⁹ However, the majority of rare cancers still do not have approved drugs because of the following challenges: (1) difficulty to enroll enough patients to clinical trials, (2) insufficient understanding of rare cancer pathophysiology and natural history, and (3) difficulty in designing and conducting RCTs due to lack of efficacious therapies. These challenges, together with others such as severity and early onset (often at childhood), are barriers to conduct an RCT; instead, an SAT with an external control, either at the population level or at individual patient level (see Section 3 for more discussion on external controls), is usually used to considered to treatment effects.⁴⁰

2.3 Well-understood natural history of the cancer

Understanding the natural history of a rare cancer is important to help (1) identify the right target population through defining appropriate eligibility criteria (including genotypes, phenotypes, prior lines of therapies), (2) detect changes in the pattern of disease course and assess clinical outcomes, (3) develop biomarkers for diagnosis and prognosis of the disease and for choosing appropriate endpoints.⁴¹ For example, knowing the natural history of a rare cancer can help differentiate whether the disease progression or improvement of conditions is due to the treatment under investigation or the natural course of the cancer. For many cancers, it is known that major tumor regression may not occur without effective treatment; therefore, objective response rates are often used to reflect the direct

drug effect as substantial evidence supporting AA, which can be very valuable for trials in refractory and relapsed cancers.⁴² Note that rare cancers often comprise a multitude of cancer subtypes affecting heterogeneous patient population, leading to even more difficult to-fully understand the etiology and natural history of many rare cancers.⁴³ Therefore, it is important to conduct natural history studies to characterize the pathophysiology, molecular attributes, and natural course of the cancer before planning an SAT.

2.4 Well-understood mechanism of action of the drug

Most modern anticancer treatments are targeted therapies that target proteins that control the growth, division, and/or spread of cancer cells. For example, a targeted therapy may (1) help the immune system destroy cancer cells, (2) stop cancer cells from growing by interrupting signals causing them to grow and divide, (3) stop signals that help form blood vessels, (4) deliver cell-killing substance to cancer cells, and (5) cause cancer cell death (apoptosis).⁴⁴ Understanding the mechanism of action (MOA) of a drug is essential for identifying surrogate markers (endpoints) of treatment effects, determining adequacy of dosage, selecting cancer patient (sub)population based on existence (or absence) of the target/receptor, and/or suggesting strategies for combination therapies. For example, (1) an anti-PD1 (programmed cell death 1) ligand (PDL1) drug blocking immune checkpoint pathway is effective against several cancer types, which helps identify subsets of patients who are likely responsive to anti-PDL1 therapy,⁴⁵ (2) an anti-CD19 combined with anti-CD20 CAR-modified T cells for B-cell is effective in treating patients with hematological malignancies with both CD19 and CD20 antigens expressed on their B cells,⁴⁶ and (3) an anti-drug conjugate, typically composed of monoclonal antibody, reaches the therapeutic target and then releases the cytotoxic payloads in the vicinity of the targets.⁴⁷

2.5 Adequate dose optimization

Traditional first-in-human dose-escalation studies determine the maximum tolerable dose (MTD), or a dose close to the MTD, which is often recommended for subsequent clinical studies without further dose optimization. This approach may well be suited to cytotoxic agents such as chemotherapies, but may not be appropriate for target therapies (e.g., kinase inhibitors, monoclonal antibodies, and anti-drug conjugates) that interact with a molecular

pathway and that demonstrate different dose-response relationship. The MTD approach is based only on a short period of observations with a limited number of subjects and ignores target interactions and off-target toxicities. ^{24,48-50} With target therapies, increasing doses beyond certain level may not improve anticancer activities and serious and intolerable adverse effects may occur after a multi-cycle, persistent treatment, leading to dose interruption and reduced compliance. ²³

The goal of dose optimization is to identify a dose or a dose range that produces the maximum possible efficacy while maintaining acceptable toxicity, which can be achieved by randomized dose optimization trials that focus on the relationship of drug exposure with antitumor activities including both efficacy and toxicity. In addition to the general considerations and recommendations for dose optimization studies in the regulatory guidance, ^{20,50} a key issue in such studies is the selection of the most appropriate endpoint that can accurately measure antitumor activities of the drug. ⁴⁹ Some statistical and practical considerations may include efficacy-integrated designs, benefit-risk trade-off, seamless phase I/II dose ranging design, and dose expansion cohorts. ⁵¹⁻⁵³

2.6 Substantial evidence of treatment effects

SATs seeking AA should demonstrate substantial evidence of treatment effects in terms of anticancer activities of the drug. Since most oncology SATs use objective response (ORR) or complete response rate (CRR) as a primary surrogate endpoint (SE) and duration of response (DOR) as a key secondary endpoint, the SAT should generate an ORR (and/or CRR) that is *clinically meaningful and statistically significantly higher* than the rate that the same patient population could experience without taking the drug or with some standard of care (SOC). In addition, the DOR among responders should be long enough to ensure that the observed response is due to treatment, not to the natural history of the cancer or bias of patient selection. Studies have showed that modest improvement on SEs may not last long enough and/or translate into clinically meaningful survival benefit of cancer patients. ^{5,16,25,28}

There are other intermediate efficacy endpoints such as disease-free survival (DFS), time-to-progression (TTP), probability of response maintenance (PRM), progression-free survival (PFS), and relapse-free survival (RFS). These are usually measured as secondary

endpoints, each of which reflects some specific aspect of treatment effect and should also be considered together with the primary endpoint(s) when applying for AA using SATs.⁵⁴

In general, assessment of substantial evidence should take into account the followings: (1) the magnitude of estimated effects in terms of selected (primary and key secondary) endpoints, (2) the target patient population, (3) external information about natural history, external controls, SOC, and unmet medical need, (4) statistical considerations with respect to sample size, hypothesis testing, multiplicity, missing data, and sensitivity analysis, and (5) rigorous supplementary and sensitivity analyses to fully explore all possible biases (e.g., endpoint assessment bias, attrition bias, immortal time bias, selection bias) and their impact on the estimated effects. Whether an SAT can generate substantial evidence of treatment effects depends on the clinical context and should be discussed with relevant regulatory agencies prior to initiation of the SAT.^{19,20}

2.7 Translation of SEs to clinical benefits

SEs such as ORR and/or DOR are often used in SATs for AA of anticancer drugs whose clinical benefits are commonly measured by prolongation of overall survival (OS) or improvement in quality of life.⁵⁴ The relationship between these SEs and survival has not been formally established in many cancer types treated with anticancer agents and may depend on many factors such as the stage of the cancer, number of prior lines of therapies, magnitude and duration of treatment effect, and safety profile of the drug and its MOA. Merino et al.²⁶ point out that ORR may not translate to overall survival benefit because (1) a modest magnitude of ORR may be transient or due to the natural history of the disease or patient selection bias and/or (2) a large ORR often accompany with a higher (suboptimal) dose that aims at producing a higher ORR but may be associated with intolerable toxicity (that causes early withdrawal with shorter follow-up time or even significant treatment-related deaths).^{55,56} On the other hand, the relationship between early tumor-based SEs and OS can be bidirectional, some trials have showed OS benefit without substantial improvement in ORR or PFS,⁵⁷⁻⁵⁹ which may be caused by the unique MOA for target therapies.²⁶

While the correlation between SEs and clinical benefits depends on the clinical context, the drug under investigation, the endpoint selected, and other design aspects (e.g., patient

selection), some additional considerations may include: (1) the magnitude of treatment effects as measured by the surrogates—the larger the observed effect, the higher the likelihood (in general) for the SEs to be translated into OS, (2) an established strong correlation of CR with OS in some cases,⁶⁰ (3) consistency in the components of composite SEs (e.g., ORR and DoR), (4) understanding relationship among the SEs, biological plausibility, disease progression, and OS, and (5) consultation with regulatory agencies to ensure alignment on the use of SEs and their relevance to clinical benefit.

2.8 Favorable benefit-risk profile

The benefit-risk assessment (BRA) is quite complex in clinical trials, requiring considerations on multiple aspects, e.g., analysis condition, alternate treatment options, benefits, risks, and risk management.^{61,62} It is even more challenging for SATs because of no comparison arm and difficulties to assess clinical benefits (due to shorter follow-up time) and to balance the observed antitumor effect with toxicity.⁶³ However, the following considerations may be helpful in the BRA of an SAT:

- **Benefits:** SEs are commonly used in BRA of SATs,^{1,8,64} which has the limitation of inability to precisely predict the long-term clinical benefits, the latter often being measured on how the patients feel, experience, and survival. To this end, it is essential to ensure transferability of measured SEs to clinical benefits. Some tools such as the magnitude of clinical benefit scale⁶⁵ can be useful in BRA of SATs. Although the strength of correlation among SEs, intermediate endpoints, and clinical endpoints depends on the clinical context,^{58,66–71} in general, (1) a durable response rate is usually associated with a better likelihood of having clinical benefits, (2) CR may be a better option than ORR in predicting OS, and (3) intermediate endpoints (e.g., PFS) may be better predictors of OS than ORR.
- **Risks:** Assessment of risk/harms in SATs should focus on (1) observed AEs and their clinical importance, (e.g., severity, frequency of occurrence, tolerability), (2) level of certainty for causality, (3) potential for misuse, and (4) manageability of the risks.^{62,72} Note that risk assessment is particularly challenging in SATs because (1) symptoms of the disease are often prominent and in many cases indistinguishable from drug-induced AEs and (2) true incidences of drug-induced AEs are inestimable due to the

absence of a control group.⁷³

The BRA can be performed quantitatively using a structured and well-defined process.^{62,74,75} Note that the BRA for SATs should take into account the clinical context (e.g., the consequence if patients do not receive the treatment under investigation) and often the benefit-risk profiles of external controls (if any).

2.9 Totality of evidence

Regulatory approvals of medical products are based on the totality of evidence on the product effectiveness. In addition to the evidence discussed in Sections 2.6–2.8, the following aspects may be considered to supplement the totality of evidence on product effectiveness.⁷⁶

- *Evidence from preclinical studies.* Evidence of efficacy and toxicity from *in vitro* and *in vivo* studies using the same endpoints that may translate to a similar clinical outcome.⁷⁷
- *Evidence from pharmacokinetic and pharmacodynamic (PK/PD) studies.* PK/PD data are required in almost all regulatory submissions to help understand the dose-response relationship, MOA of the drug, and disease pathophysiology.^{78,79}
- *Evidence from other indications.* For indication expansion of approved drugs, it is important to integrate all data at all stages from other (approved and unapproved) indications, especially those with related indications or MOA, which may provide further evidence on the plausibility of treatment benefits and safety information.⁸⁰
- *Evidence from studies of pharmacologically similar products.* Evidence from approved products in the same pharmacological class may include the MOA, treatment effects on the same endpoints, and consistency of treatment effects across class members.⁸¹
- *Real-world data (RWD) and real-world evidence (RWE).* External data, either at indication/study level or at individual patient level, are often used to determine the effectiveness of the drug, e.g., registry studies for natural history of a rare tumor and response rate for a terminal cancer treated with SoC. In many cases, RWD are used to select patients for external comparison group, for which there is extensive literature on

consideration in the design, conduct, analysis, and result interpretation of externally controlled trials. ^{82–87}

- *Evidence from expanded access.* In some cases, patients with serious or immediately life-threatening rare cancers that lack effective treatments may be offered the investigational product via an expanded access program (EAP). Evidence derived from such an EAP can provide effectiveness and safety information in support of regulatory decision. ^{88,89}

2.10 Planning/initiation of confirmatory trials

Planning and/or initiation of an RCT can help support AA and subsequent full approval within a reasonable time. Such a confirmatory RCT is intended to address the uncertainty about the relationship between SEs and clinical benefits. Details about the design and initiation of the confirmatory RCT should be discussed as early as possible with relevant regulatory agencies. ^{6,19,20,90}

3 Other Considerations

3.1 Well-defined estimands

Upon meeting the criteria described in Sections **2.1–2.5**, then an SAT can be designed to demonstrate treatment effects of the drug by clearly defining the study objective(s) and corresponding estimands, with the latter often being described through precise definitions of estimand attributes. ^{18,91} Using ORR as an example, the five attributes can be described as follows:

- Population: Patients with the cancer type of interest, possibly biomarker-defined
- Treatment: The new drug under investigation (and/or rescue therapies or SOC, if any)
- Endpoints: Responses (complete or partial response) by independent review committee (IRC), DOR

- Intercurrent events (ICEs): Discontinuation of the drug under investigation due to (1) intolerability, (2) start of another anticancer therapy (e.g., starts the next-line therapy because of disease progression (DP) by investigator’s assessment while no DP by IRC), (3) unknown status (e.g., loss to follow-up), (4) terminal events (e.g., death)
- Population-level summary: Proportion of responses

Most of the ICE handling strategies can be used in SATs. ^{71,92} For those seeking AA, the while-on-treatment strategy may be more relevant as it concerns responses to the treatment before the occurrence of an ICE. However, the hypothetical strategy may also be applied if there is a next-line therapy available as an SOC. Of note, for SATs with external controls, special attention should be given to precise definitions of target population (to minimize patient selection bias), treatment strategies (including rescue therapies), and different patterns of ICE occurrence between patients in the SAT and those in the external control. ^{86,93} In general, the average treatment effect among the treated (ATT) estimand in an SAT is of interest to regulators.

3.2 Adaptive designs

Alternative to the follow-up confirmatory RCT discussed in [2.10](#), one may consider some innovative study designs that take into account both tumor responses and patient survival in different stages of a single study, e.g., a seamless adaptive design that models the response-survival relationship using pre-specified statistical methods ^{94–97} and a two-stage transition design, in which the first stage is an SAT and the second stage is an RCT. ^{98,99} These adaptive designs can be more efficient while maintaining similar statistical rigor (e.g., type I error control).

3.3 Communication with regulatory agencies

It is highly recommended that sponsors communicate with relevant regulatory agencies on the suitability of an SAT to support AA before initiation of the study. ^{100,101} In the communication, the sponsors may consider at least the following aspects: (1) evidence from prior studies (including trial design, study population, treatment regimen, sample size, and endpoints); (2) safety and tolerability information (including dose limiting toxicity), AEs,

major organ toxicity, and dose-exposure-response characteristics; (3) clinical pharmacological data (including single- and multi-doses PK/PD data); (4) efficacy evidence (including target indication), all efficacy-related endpoints under the recommended dose for the target indication; (5) biomarker validation results if biomarker is used to define the target population; (6) background information about the target indication (including comprehensive review, incidence/prevalence, and current treatment options and associated effectiveness); (7) description of potential unmet medical needs of the investigational product for the target indication; (8) rationale for an SAT design (including complete protocol with eligibility criteria, primary and secondary efficacy endpoints, treatment regimen, sample size, statistical hypothesis) and planning for the confirmatory RCT; and (9) relevant information about the use of independent review committee and its charter.

4 Concluding Remarks

There is a growing tendency in oncology drug development and approval pathway moving from SATs towards RCTs. Nevertheless, there are occasions where SATs are appropriate to support regulatory decision. This paper is intended to describe (1) the necessary conditions (Sections 2.1–2.2) under which an SAT may be more appropriate, (2) additional considerations that can make the results of the SAT more interpretable (Sections 2.3–2.4) or the SAT optimal (Section 2.5), (3) evidence showing product effectiveness with clinical benefits (Sections 2.6–2.9), and planning/initiation of a confirmatory RCT (Section 2.10). In general, an SAT meeting as many of these conditions (Sections 2.1–2.10) as possible may have a higher likelihood of getting AA. However, it is strongly recommended that the sponsor discusses with relevant regulatory agencies before initiation of an SAT for the purpose of regulatory decision.

Acknowledgements

We would like to thank

References

1. Tenhunen, O, Lasch, F, Pean, E, Schiel, A, , and Turpeinen, M. [Single-arm clinical trials as pivotal evidence for cancer drug approval: a retrospective cohort study of centralized European marketing authorizations between 2010 and 2019](#). *Clinical Pharmacology and Therapeutics*, 108(3):653–660, 2020.
2. Agrawal, S, Arora, S, Vallejo, JJ, Gwise, T, Chuk, MK, Amiri-Kordestani, L, Pazdur, R, Kluetz, PG, and Beaver, JA. [Use of single-arm trials to support malignant hematology and oncology drug and biologic approvals: A 20-year FDA experience](#). 39, 39 (15suppl):e13572, 2021.
3. Hagberg, H. [Approval of new drugs in oncology—a changing pattern](#). *Acta Oncologica*, 60(2):141–142, 2021.
4. Rittberg, R, Czaykowski, P, and Niraula, S. [Feasibility of randomized controlled trials for cancer drugs approved by the Food and Drug Administration based on single-arm studies](#). *JNCI Cancer Spectrum*, 5(4):1–7, 2021.
5. Lemery, S and Pazdur, R. [Approvals in 2021: dangling accelerated approvals, drug dosing, new approvals and beyond](#). *Nature Reviews Clinical Oncology*, 19(4):217–218, 2022.
6. Agrawal, S, Arora, S, Amiri-Kordestani, L, de Claro, RA, Fashoyin-Aje, L, Gormley, N, Kim, T, Lemery, S, Mehta, GU, and Scott, EC. [Use of Single-Arm Trials for US Food and Drug Administration Drug Approval in Oncology, 2002-2021](#). *JAMA Oncology*, 9(2):266–272, 2023.
7. Luo, X, Du, X, Huang, L, Guo, Q, Lv, X, Wang, C, Liu, H, Zhou, Y, Xue, X, and Li, Z. [Evidence of pre-approval clinical trial supporting the granted conditional approval for novel cancer drugs in China between 2015 and 2022](#). *EClinicalMedicine—Part of The Lancet Discovery Science*, 63, 2023.
8. Mulder, J, Teerenstra, S, van Hennik, P, Pasmooij, A, Stoyanova-Beninska, V, Voest, E, and de Boer, A. [Single-arm trials supporting the approval of anticancer medicinal](#)

products in the European Union: contextualization of trial results and observed clinical benefit. *ESMO Open*, 8(2):101209, 2023.

9. Nierengarten, MB. [Single-arm trials for US Food and Drug Administration cancer drug approvals](#). *Cancer*, pages 1626–1627, 2023.
10. Hussein, A, Levy, V, and Chevret, S. [Single-arm phase 3 designs: An oxymoron?](#) *Contemporary Clinical Trials*, page 107506, 2024.
11. Selaru, P, Tang, Y, Huang, B, Polli, A, Wilner, K, Donnelly, E, and Cohen, D. [Sufficiency of single-arm studies to support registration of targeted agents in molecularly selected patients with cancer: Lessons from the clinical development of crizotinib](#). *Clinical and Translational Science*, 9(2):63–73, 2016.
12. Ribeiro, TB, Bennett, CL, Colunga-Lozano, LE, Araujo, APV, Hozo, I, and Djulbegovic, B. [Increasing FDA accelerated approval of single-arm trials in oncology \(1992 to 2020\)](#). *Journal of Clinical Epidemiology*, 159:151–158, 2023.
13. Koole, SN, Huisman, AH, Timmers, L, Westgeest, HM, van Breugel, E, Sonke, GS, and van Doorn, SBvW. [Lessons learned from postmarketing withdrawals of expedited approvals for oncology drug indications](#). *The Lancet Oncology*, 25(3):e126–e135, 2024.
14. Mellgard, GS, Fojo, T, and Bates, SE. [Lessons from withdrawn accelerated approvals in oncology](#). *Nature Cancer*, 5:211–215, 2024.
15. Collignon, O, Schritz, A, Spezia, R, and Senn, SJ. [Implementing historical controls in oncology trials](#). *The Oncologist*, 26(5):e859–e862, 2021.
16. Mullard, A. [Accelerated approval draft guidance paves way for “one-trial” programmes, warns against single-armed trials](#). *Nature Reviews Drug Discovery*, 22: 342–343, 2023.
17. Zhang, H, Liu, S, Ge, C, Liu, X, Liu, Y, Yin, C, Li, Y, An, J, Yan, Z, and Chen, X. [Single-arm trials for domestic oncology drug approvals in China](#). *Cancer Biology & Medicine*, 20(11):799–805, 2023.

18. EMA. [Reflection paper on establishing efficacy based on single arm trials submitted as pivotal evidence in a marketing authorisation—Considerations on evidence from single-arm trials](#). European Medicines Agency, 2023. Accessed: April 26, 2024.
19. FDA. [Clinical Trial Considerations to Support Accelerated Approval of Oncology Therapeutics—Guidance for Industry](#). U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, Food and Drug Administration, 2023.
20. NMPA. [Guidance on Single-Arm Trials Supporting Approval of Anticancer Drugs](#). The Center for Drug Evaluation, the National Medical Products Administration of China, 2023. Accessed: February 1, 2024.
21. Grayling, MJ and Mander, AP. [Do single-arm trials have a role in drug development plans incorporating randomised trials?](#) *Pharmaceutical Statistics*, 15(2):143–151, 2016.
22. Jung, SH. [Sources of bias for single-arm phase II cancer clinical trials](#). *Annals of Translational Medicine*, 10(18), 2022.
23. Shah, M, Rahman, A, Theoret, MR, and Pazdur, R. [The drug-dosing conundrum in oncology—when less is more](#). *The New England Journal of Medicine*, 385(16):1445–1447, 2021.
24. Moon, H. [FDA initiatives to support dose optimization in oncology drug development: the less may be the better](#). *Translational and Clinical Pharmacology*, 30(2):71–74, 2022.
25. Goldberg, P. [Pazdur expresses “profound concerns” about single-arm studies of PD-1/PD-L1 drugs; ODAC nixes retifanlimab for anal cancer](#). *The Cancer Letter*, 47(25): 28–30, 2021. Accessed: March 29, 2022.
26. Merino, M, Kasamon, Y, Theoret, M, Pazdur, R, Kluetz, P, and Gormley, N. [Irreconcilable Differences: The Divorce Between Response Rates, Progression-Free Survival, and Overall Survival](#). *Journal of Clinical Oncology*, 41(15):2706–2712, 2023.
27. Fashoyin-Aje, LA, Mehta, GU, Beaver, JA, and Pazdur, R. [The on- and off-ramps of oncology accelerated approval](#). *The New England Journal of Medicine*, 387(16): 1439–1442, 2022.

28. Ribeiro, TB, Colunga-Lozano, LE, Araujo, APV, Bennett, CL, Hozo, I, and Djulbegovic, B. [Single-arm clinical trials that supported FDA Accelerated Approvals have modest effect sizes and at high risk of bias.](#) *Journal of Clinical Epidemiology*, 2022.
29. Simon, R, Blumenthal, G, Rothenberg, M, Sommer, J, Roberts, SA, Armstrong, DK, LaVange, L, and Pazdur, R. [The role of nonrandomized trials in the evaluation of oncology drugs.](#) *Clinical Pharmacology & Therapeutics*, 97(5):502–507, 2015.
30. Lu, E, Shatzel, J, Shin, F, and Prasad, V. [What constitutes an “unmet medical need” in oncology? An empirical evaluation of author usage in the biomedical literature.](#) In *Seminars in Oncology*, volume 44, pages 8–12. Elsevier, 2017.
31. Caimi, PF, Ai, W, Alderuccio, JP, Ardeshtna, KM, Hamadani, M, Hess, B, Kahl, BS, Radford, J, Solh, M, and Stathis, A. [Loncastuximab tesirine in relapsed or refractory diffuse large B-cell lymphoma \(LOTIS-2\): a multicentre, open-label, single-arm, phase 2 trial.](#) *The Lancet Oncology*, 22(6):790–800, 2021.
32. Rosner, S and Levy, B. [Relapsed small-cell lung cancer: a disease of continued unmet need.](#) *The Lancet Respiratory Medicine*, 11(1):6–8, 2023.
33. Hoimes, CJ, Flaig, TW, Milowsky, MI, Friedlander, TW, Bilen, MA, Gupta, S, Srinivas, S, Merchan, JR, McKay, RR, and Petrylak, DP. [Enfortumab vedotin plus pembrolizumab in previously untreated advanced urothelial cancer.](#) *Journal of Clinical Oncology*, 41(1):22–31, 2023.
34. NCI. [NCI’s Dictionary of Cancer Terms.](#) National Cancer Institute, National Institutes of Health, 2023. Accessed: May 3, 2023.
35. IARC. [IARC highlights rare cancers to mark Rare Disease Day 2023.](#) International Agency for Research on Cancer, World Health Organization, 2023. Accessed: May 3, 2023.
36. Wang, S, Chen, R, Tang, Y, Yu, Y, Fang, Y, Huang, H, Wu, D, Fang, H, Bai, Y, Sun, C, et al. [Comprehensive genomic profiling of rare tumors: routes to targeted therapies.](#) *Frontiers in Oncology*, 10:536, 2020.

37. Thomas, A, Reis-Filho, JS, Geyer Jr, CE, and Wen, HY. [Rare subtypes of triple negative breast cancer: current understanding and future directions](#). *NPJ Breast Cancer*, 9(1):55, 2023.
38. Harada, G, Yang, SR, Cocco, E, and Drilon, A. [Rare molecular subtypes of lung cancer](#). *Nature Reviews Clinical Oncology*, 20(4):229–249, 2023.
39. Miller, KL, Fermaglich, LJ, and Maynard, J. [Using four decades of FDA orphan drug designations to describe trends in rare disease drug development: substantial growth seen in development of drugs for rare oncologic, neurologic, and pediatric-onset diseases](#). *Orphanet Journal of Rare Diseases*, 16(1):1–10, 2021.
40. ASA RWE SWG. The Current Landscape of Biostatistics in Rare Disease Drug Development: Regulations, Challenges, and Strategies. (*In preparation*), 2023.
41. FDA. [Rare Diseases: Natural History Studies for Drug Development. Guidance for Industry \(Draft guidance\)](#). US Food and Drug Administration, Silver Spring, MD, 2019.
42. Delgado, A and Guddati, AK. [Clinical endpoints in oncology—a primer](#). *American Journal of Cancer Research*, 11(4):1121–1131, 2021.
43. FDA. [OCE Rare Cancers Program—Promoting development of new drug and biological products to treat patients with rare cancers](#). U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, Food and Drug Administration, 2024. Accessed: April 26, 2024.
44. NCI. [Targeted Therapy to Treat Cancer](#). U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, National Institutes of Health, National Cancer Institute, 2022. Accessed: May 5, 2023.
45. Topalian, SL, Taube, JM, Anders, RA, and Pardoll, DM. [Mechanism-driven biomarkers to guide immune checkpoint blockade in cancer therapy](#). *Nature Reviews Cancer*, 16(5):275–287, 2016.
46. Sang, W, Shi, M, Yang, J, Cao, J, Xu, L, Yan, D, Song, X, Sun, C, Li, D, and Zhu, F. [Combination of Anti-CD19 and Anti-CD20 Chimeric Antigen Receptor T](#)

Cells for Relapsed and Refractory Diffuse Larger B Cell Lymphoma: An Open-Label, Single-Arm, Phase I/II Trial. *Blood*, 134:1590, 2019.

47. Fu, Z, Li, S, Han, S, Shi, C, and Zhang, Y. [Antibody drug conjugate: the “biological missile” for targeted cancer therapy](#). *Signal Transduction and Targeted Therapy*, 7(1): 93, 2022.
48. Fourie Zirkelbach, J, Shah, M, Vallejo, J, Cheng, J, Ayyoub, A, Liu, J, Hudson, R, Sridhara, R, Ison, G, and Amiri-Kordestani, L. [Improving dose-optimization processes used in oncology drug development to minimize toxicity and maximize benefit to patients](#). *Journal of Clinical Oncology*, 40(30):3489–3500, 2022.
49. Ratain, M, Tannock, I, and Lichter, A. [Optimize the dose: an optimal step forward for FDA](#). *Cancer Lett*, 47(23):15–16, 2021.
50. FDA. [Optimizing the Dosage of Human Prescription Drugs and Biological Products for the Treatment of Oncologic Diseases—Guidance for Industry](#). U.S. Department of Health and Human Services Food and Drug Administration, 2023. Accessed: September 2, 2023.
51. Dejardin, D, Huang, B, Yuan, Y, Beyer, U, Fridlyand, J, and Zhu, J. [Dose Optimization for Novel Oncology Agents: Design Options and Strategies](#). *Statistics in Biopharmaceutical Research*, pages 1–20, 2024.
52. Liu, R, Yuan, Y, Sen, S, Marchenko, O, Jiang, Q, Tian, H, Li, X, Lin, R, Lu, C, and Zhou, H. [Design Strategy and Consideration for Oncology Dose-Optimization: An Industry Perspective](#). *Statistics in Biopharmaceutical Research*, pages 1–15, 2024.
53. Yuan, Y, Zhou, H, and Liu, S. [Statistical and practical considerations in planning and conduct of dose-optimization trials](#). *Clinical Trials*, page 17407745231207085, 2024.
54. FDA. [Clinical Trial Endpoints for the Approval of Cancer Drugs and Biologics Guidance for Industry](#). Oncology Center of Excellence, US Food and Drug Administration, U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, 2018.
55. Bou Zeid, N and Yazbeck, V. [PI3k inhibitors in NHL and CLL: an unfulfilled promise](#). *Blood and Lymphatic Cancer: Targets and Therapy*, 13:1–12, 2023.

56. Gormley, N. [Oncology Endpoint Development](#). US Food and Drug Administration Oncology Center of Excellence (OCE), 2024. Accessed by May 2, 2024.
57. Borghaei, H, Paz-Ares, L, Horn, L, Spigel, DR, Steins, M, Ready, NE, Chow, LQ, Vokes, EE, Felip, E, and Holgado, E. [Nivolumab versus docetaxel in advanced non-squamous non–small-cell lung cancer](#). *New England Journal of Medicine*, 373(17): 1627–1639, 2015.
58. Prasad, V, Kim, C, Burotto, M, and Vandross, A. [The strength of association between surrogate end points and survival in oncology: a systematic review of trial-level meta-analyses](#). *JAMA Internal Medicine*, 175(8):1389–1398, 2015.
59. Burtness, B, Harrington, KJ, Greil, R, Soulières, D, Tahara, M, de Castro, G, Psyrri, A, Basté, N, Neupane, P, and Bratland, Å. [Pembrolizumab alone or with chemotherapy versus cetuximab with chemotherapy for recurrent or metastatic squamous cell carcinoma of the head and neck \(KEYNOTE-048\): a randomised, open-label, phase 3 study](#). *The Lancet*, 394(10212):1915–1928, 2019.
60. Huang, L, Kang, D, Zhao, C, and Liu, X. [Correlation between surrogate endpoints and overall survival in unresectable hepatocellular carcinoma patients treated with immune checkpoint inhibitors: a systematic review and meta-analysis](#). *Nature Scientific Reports*, 14(1):4327, 2024.
61. Raju, G, Gurusurthi, K, Domike, R, Kazandjian, D, Landgren, O, Blumenthal, GM, Farrell, A, Pazdur, R, and Woodcock, J. [A benefit–risk analysis approach to capture regulatory decision-making: multiple myeloma](#). *Clinical Pharmacology & Therapeutics*, 103(1):67–76, 2018.
62. FDA. [Benefit-Risk Assessment for New Drug and Biological Products](#). The US Food and Drug Administration, 2023.
63. FDA. [Phosphatidylinositol 3-Kinase \(PI3K\) Inhibitors in Hematologic Malignancies](#). US Food and Drug Administration Oncologic Drugs Advisory Committee Meeting, 2024. Accessed by May 2, 2024.

64. Pinto, CA, Balantac, Z, Mt-Isa, S, Liu, X, Bracco, OL, Clarke, H, and Tervonen, T. [Regulatory benefit–risk assessment of oncology drugs: A systematic review of FDA and EMA approvals](#). *Drug Discovery Today*, 28(10):103719, 2023.
65. ESMO. [The ESMO-Magnitude of Clinical Benefit Scale \(ESMO-MCBS\)](#). European Society for Medical Oncology, 2023.
66. Cortazar, P, Zhang, L, Untch, M, Mehta, K, Costantino, JP, Wolmark, N, Bonnefoi, H, Cameron, D, Gianni, L, and Valagussa, P. Pathological complete response and long-term clinical benefit in breast cancer: the ctneobc pooled analysis. *The Lancet*, 384(9938):164–172, 2014.
67. Agarwal, SK, Mangal, N, Menon, RM, Freise, KJ, and Salem, AH. [Response rates as predictors of overall survival: a meta-analysis of acute myeloid leukemia trials](#). *Journal of Cancer*, 8(9):1562–1567, 2017.
68. Gyawali, B, Hey, SP, and Kesselheim, AS. [Assessment of the clinical benefit of cancer drugs receiving accelerated approval](#). *JAMA Internal Medicine*, 179(7):906–913, 2019.
69. Kok, PS, Yoon, WH, Lord, S, Marschner, I, Friedlander, M, and Lee, CK. [Tumor response end points as surrogates for overall survival in immune checkpoint inhibitor trials: a systematic review and meta-analysis](#). *JCO Precision Oncology*, 5:1151–1159, 2021.
70. Daniele, P, Mamolo, C, Cappelleri, JC, Bell, T, Neuhof, A, Tremblay, G, Musat, M, and Forsythe, A. [Overall and complete response rates as potential surrogates for overall survival in relapsed/refractory multiple myeloma](#). *Future Oncology*, 19(6): 463–471, 2023.
71. Weber, HJ, Corson, S, Li, J, Mercier, F, Roychoudhury, S, Sailer, MO, Sun, S, Todd, A, and Yung, G. [Duration of and time to response in oncology clinical trials from the perspective of the estimand framework](#). *Pharmaceutical Statistics*, 23(1):91–106, 2024.
72. Califf, RM. [Benefit-risk assessments at the US Food and Drug Administration: finding the balance](#). *JAMA*, 317(7):693–694, 2017.

73. Pignatti, F, Jonsson, B, Blumenthal, G, and Justice, R. [Assessment of benefits and risks in development of targeted therapies for cancer—the view of regulatory authorities](#). *Molecular Oncology*, 9(5):1034–1041, 2015.
74. Noel, R, Hermann, R, Levitan, B, Watson, DJ, and Van Goor, K. [Application of the Benefit-Risk Action Team \(BRAT\) framework in pharmaceutical R&D: results from a pilot program](#). *Drug Information Journal*, 46(6):736–743, 2012.
75. IMI-PROTECT. [Recommendations for the methodology and visualisation techniques to be used in the assessment of benefit and risk of medicines](#). The PROTECT consortium (Pharmacoepidemiological Research on Outcomes of Therapeutics by a European Consortium, www.imiprotect.eu), 2023.
76. FDA. [Demonstrating Substantial Evidence of Effectiveness With One Adequate and Well-Controlled Clinical Investigation and Confirmatory Evidence](#). U.S. Department of Health and Human Services Food and Drug Administration, 2023.
77. ICH. [S9 Nonclinical Evaluation for Anticancer Pharmaceuticals](#). International Council on Harmonization of Technical Requirements for Registration of Pharmaceuticals for Human Use, 2009.
78. EMA. [Guideline on the evaluation of anticancer medicinal products in man](#). European Medicines Agency, 2013.
79. Araujo, D, Greystoke, A, Bates, S, Bayle, A, Calvo, E, Castelo-Branco, L, de Bono, J, Drilon, A, Garralda, E, and Ivy, P. [Oncology phase I trial design and conduct: time for a change—MDICT Guidelines 2022](#). *Annals of Oncology*, 34(1):48–60, 2023.
80. Gao, JJ, Osgood, CL, Feng, Z, Bloomquist, EW, Tang, S, Chang, CG, Ricks, TK, Hou, SC, Pierce, WF, and Rivera, DR. [FDA Approval Summary: Ribociclib Indicated for Male Patients with Hormone Receptor–Positive, HER2-Negative Advanced or Metastatic Breast Cancer](#). *Clinical Cancer Research*, 29(24):5008–5011, 2023.
81. Martini, DJ, Lalani, AKA, Bossé, D, Steinharter, JA, Harshman, LC, Hodi, FS, Ott, PA, and Choueiri, TK. [Response to single agent PD-1 inhibitor after progression](#)

- on previous PD-1/PD-L1 inhibitors: a case series. *Journal for ImmunoTherapy of Cancer*, 5:1–5, 2017.
82. Gökbuget, N, Kelsh, M, Chia, V, Advani, A, Bassan, R, Dombret, H, Doubek, M, Fielding, AK, Giebel, S, and Haddad, V. [Blinatumomab vs Historical Standard Therapy of Adult Relapsed/Refractory Acute Lymphoblastic Leukemia](#). *Blood Cancer Journal*, 6(9):e473–e473, 2016.
83. Jahanshahi, M, Gregg, K, Davis, G, Ndu, A, Miller, V, Vockley, J, Ollivier, C, Franolic, T, and Sakai, S. [The use of external controls in FDA regulatory decision making](#). *Therapeutic Innovation & Regulatory Science*, 55(5):1019–1035, 2021.
84. Mishra-Kalyani, P, Kordestani, LA, Rivera, D, Singh, H, Ibrahim, A, DeClaro, R, Shen, Y, Tang, S, Sridhara, R, and Kluetz, P. [External control arms in oncology: current use and future directions](#). *Annals of Oncology*, 2022.
85. Chen, J, Ho, M, Lee, K, Song, Y, Fang, Y, Goldstein, BA, He, W, Irony, T, Jiang, Q, and van der Laan, M. [The Current Landscape in Biostatistics of Real-World Data and Evidence: Clinical Study Design and Analysis](#). *Statistics in Biopharmaceutical Research*, 15(1):29–42, 2023.
86. Chen, J, Yuan, S, Yung, G, Ye, J, Tian, H, and Lin, J. [Considerations for Master Protocols Using External Controls](#). *arXiv preprint arXiv:2307.05050*, 2023.
87. FDA. [Considerations for the Design and Conduct of Externally Controlled Trials for Drug and Biological Products](#). U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, Food and Drug Administration, 2023.
88. Kempf, L, Goldsmith, JC, and Temple, R. [Challenges of developing and conducting clinical trials in rare disorders](#). *American Journal of Medical Genetics Part A*, 176(4): 773–783, 2018.
89. Feinberg, BA, Gajra, A, Zettler, ME, Phillips, TD, Phillips Jr, EG, and Kish, JK. [Use of real-world evidence to support FDA approval of oncology drugs](#). *Value in Health*, 23(10):1358–1365, 2020.

90. Jazowski, SA, Vaidya, AU, Donohue, JM, Dusetzina, SB, and Sachs, RE. [Time to Confirmatory Study Initiation After Accelerated Approval of Cancer and Noncancer Drugs in the US](#). *JAMA Internal Medicine*, 183(7):737–739, 2023.
91. ICH. [E9\(R1\) Statistical Principles for Clinical Trials: Addendum: Estimands and Sensitivity Analysis in Clinical Trials](#). International Conference on Harmonisation of Technical Requirements for Registration of Pharmaceuticals for Human Use, 2021.
92. Englert, S, Mercier, F, Pilling, EA, Homer, V, Habermehl, C, Zimmermann, S, and Kan-Dobrosky, N. [Defining estimands for efficacy assessment in single arm phase 1b or phase 2 clinical trials in oncology early development](#). *Pharmaceutical Statistics*, 22(5):921–937, 2023.
93. Chen, J, Scharfstein, D, Wang, H, Yu, B, Song, Y, He, W, Scott, J, Lin, X, and Lee, H. [Estimands in Real-World Evidence Studies](#). *Statistics in Biopharmaceutical Research*, 2023.
94. Lai, TL and Lavori, PW. [Innovative clinical trial designs: toward a 21st-century health care system](#). *Statistics in Biosciences*, 3(2):145–168, 2011.
95. Lai, TL, Lavori, PW, Shih, MCI, and Sikic, BI. [Clinical trial designs for testing biomarker-based personalized therapies](#). *Clinical Trials*, 9(2):141–154, 2012.
96. Chen, C, Anderson, K, Mehrotra, DV, Rubin, EH, and Tse, A. [A 2-in-1 adaptive phase 2/3 design for expedited oncology drug development](#). *Contemporary Clinical Trials*, 64:238–242, 2018.
97. Chen, C and Rubin, EH. [Adaptive phase 2/3 designs for oncology drug development—Time to hedge](#). *Contemporary Clinical Trials*, 125:107047, 2023.
98. Shi, H and Yin, G. [Two-stage seamless transition design from open-label single-arm to randomized double-arm clinical trials](#). *Statistical Methods in Medical Research*, 27(1):158–171, 2018.
99. Shi, H, Zhang, T, and Yin, G. [START: single-to-double arm transition design for phase II clinical trials](#). *Pharmaceutical Statistics*, 19(4):454–467, 2020.

100. NMPA. [Guidance on Technical Communications of Pre-Pivotal Single-Arm Clinical Trials for Anti-Cancer Drugs to Support Marketing Authorization](#). Center for Drug Evaluation, China National Medical Products Administration, 2020. Accessed: April 11, 2022.
101. Zou, L, Qi, Y, Jiang, Y, Tang, L, Du, Y, Zhao, B, Sun, Y, Xiang, M, Ma, J, and Yang, Z. [Criteria and regulatory considerations for the conditional approval of innovative antitumor drugs in China: from the perspective of clinical reviewers](#). *Cancer Communications*, 43(2):171, 2023.