

1 **Feasibility of an Evolutionary Tumor Board for Generating Novel Personalized**  
2 **Therapeutic Strategies**

3 Mark Robertson-Tessi<sup>1</sup>, Joel S. Brown<sup>1</sup>, Maria I. Poole<sup>2</sup>, Matthew Johnson<sup>2</sup>, Andriy  
4 Marusyk<sup>3</sup>, Jill A. Gallaher<sup>1</sup>, Kimberly A. Luddy<sup>1</sup>, Christopher J. Whelan<sup>3</sup>, Jeffrey West<sup>1</sup>,  
5 Maximillian Strobl<sup>1</sup>, Virginia Turati<sup>1</sup>, Heiko Enderling<sup>1</sup>, Michael J. Schell<sup>4</sup>, AikChoon  
6 Tan<sup>5</sup>, Terry Boyle<sup>6</sup>, Rikesh Mankanji<sup>7</sup>, Joaquim Farinhas<sup>7</sup>, Hatem Soliman<sup>8</sup>, Dawn  
7 Lemanne<sup>9,10</sup>, Robert A. Gatenby<sup>7</sup>, Damon R. Reed<sup>11</sup>, Alexander R. A. Anderson<sup>1,\*</sup> and  
8 Christine H. Chung<sup>2,\*</sup>

9  
10 <sup>1</sup>Department of Integrated Mathematical Oncology, <sup>2</sup>Department of Head and Neck-  
11 Endocrine Oncology, <sup>3</sup>Department of Cancer Physiology, <sup>4</sup>Department of Biostatistics  
12 and Bioinformatics, <sup>6</sup>Department of Pathology, <sup>7</sup>Department of Radiology, <sup>8</sup>Department  
13 of Breast Oncology, <sup>11</sup>Department of Individualized Cancer Management; H. Lee Moffitt  
14 Cancer Center and Research Institute, Tampa, Florida

15 <sup>5</sup>Department of Oncological Sciences, Huntsman Cancer Institute, University of Utah,  
16 Salt Lake City, UT

17 <sup>9</sup>Oregon Integrative Oncology, Ashland, Oregon

18 <sup>10</sup>Department of Medicine, University of Arizona, Tucson, Arizona

19

20 **Running Title:** Evolutionary Tumor Board for Novel Therapeutic Strategies

21

22 **Key words:** evolution, multi-disciplinary cancer care, adaptive therapy, mathematical  
23 models, evolutionary therapy

24 **\*Co-Corresponding authors:**

25 Christine H. Chung, MD

26 [Christine.Chung@Moffitt.Org](mailto:Christine.Chung@Moffitt.Org)

27 Alexander R. A. Anderson, PhD

28 [Alexander.Anderson@Moffitt.Org](mailto:Alexander.Anderson@Moffitt.Org)

29 12902 Magnolia Dr. Tampa FL, 33612

30

31 **Potential Conflict of Interest:** HE holds U.S. Patent 63/279,994: Bayesian Framework  
32 to Augment Tumor Board Decision Making (provisional), U.S. Patent  
33 62/040,579: Predicting glioma treatment response (provisional), and U.S. Patent  
34 62/944,804: Methods for prostate cancer intermittent adaptive therapy (provisional). TB  
35 received Research funding support from Bristol Myers Squibb and has stock ownership  
36 in Ionis Pharmaceuticals. HS received honoraria from AstraZeneca, Seattle Genetics,  
37 Merck, and Novartis for serving in *ad hoc* scientific advisory boards. DRR received  
38 honoraria from Springworks and Eisai for serving in Data Safety Monitoring Committee.  
39 CHC received honoraria from Sanofi, Merck, Brooklyn ImmunoTherapeutic, Fulgent,  
40 and Exelixis for serving in *ad hoc* scientific advisory boards. All other authors declared  
41 no conflict of interest.

42

43 **ABSTRACT**

44 The current paradigm of clinical trials treating patients until disease progression using  
45 maximum tolerated dose does not account for the dynamic tumor-host-drug interactions  
46 that result in acquired resistance. Here, we present the concept of an Evolutionary  
47 Tumor Board (ETB) and report interim results from a prospective, non-interventional  
48 pilot study in which novel therapeutic strategies based on evolutionary principles were  
49 developed under the ETB framework. The ETB approach relies on an interdisciplinary  
50 team that integrates clinical, preclinical, and theoretical knowledge and the application  
51 of mathematical modeling to predict patient responses to different therapies, including  
52 novel approaches derived from eco-evolutionary first principles. We have previously  
53 proposed several evolutionary therapies that aim to enhance the efficacy of an overall  
54 treatment regimen, using existing agents for a given disease. Key among these  
55 evolutionary therapies is the idea of “first-strike second-strike”, where different agents  
56 are administered in sequence, and new strikes are applied as soon as the efficacy of  
57 the previous strike is nearing a minimum, as opposed to waiting until progression is  
58 identified on periodic imaging. This approach requires careful analysis of longitudinal  
59 patient data coupled with predictive dynamics generated by mathematical models. Here  
60 we describe the ETB process and the interim results from 15 patients enrolled in the  
61 feasibility trial. In addition, we describe the challenges faced as well as the solutions  
62 that can be implemented via improved modeling approaches, better patient data  
63 collection, and a reassessment of how we understand tumor dynamics in the light of  
64 evolutionary principles.

65

## 66 INTRODUCTION

67 Cancer is one of the major public health concerns globally, and the American Cancer  
68 Society estimates approximately 1,918,030 new cases will be diagnosed in the United  
69 States alone in 2022<sup>1</sup>. With breakthrough advances in cancer screening, targeted  
70 therapies, and immunotherapies, overall cancer mortalities have been decreasing.  
71 However, cancer is still the second leading cause of death in the U.S., with an  
72 estimated 609,360 people expected to die from cancer in 2022. Therefore, the  
73 development of novel strategies to improve outcomes remains urgent.

74  
75 The general paradigm of novel therapy development in currently “incurable” cancers (by  
76 current standard of care) that are recurrent and/or metastatic with resistance to existing  
77 treatments has been focused on molecular characterization of a tumor for targeted  
78 therapies, leveraging immune checkpoint inhibition, and identifying predictive  
79 biomarkers to select the most efficacious regimen. However, this approach benefits only  
80 a limited number of patients with targetable genomic aberrations and tumors with  
81 immune responsive phenotypes; furthermore, most of these patients exhibit transient  
82 responses due to the evolution of acquired resistance over time. This limitation is, at  
83 least in part, due to the lack of a comprehensive evaluation of the dynamic tumor-host-  
84 treatment interactions over time. Consideration of evolution under treatment selection  
85 and subsequent changes in tumor phenotype is not a novel concept; nevertheless,  
86 strategies for using this perspective to guide systemic therapies are lacking. Too often  
87 oncology strategies are static. The prevailing clinical intervention is reactionary after  
88 resistance develops, and not proactive to curtail evolutionary dynamics<sup>2</sup>. From the

89 development of the first cancer cell, natural selection favors phenotypes that increase  
90 fitness and eliminates those that do not, and this process continues through therapy<sup>3,4</sup>.  
91 We continue to select systemic therapies empirically based on the observable response  
92 in the dominant population because we are often unable to account for resistant minor  
93 populations during the treatments that will eventually lead to recurrence. For patients  
94 with incurable cancers, we must better understand the evolutionary dynamics that lead  
95 to the emergence and predominance of therapy-resistant phenotypes, eventually  
96 rendering even initially useful therapies to be ultimately ineffective. This highlights our  
97 currently inability to incorporate evolutionary dynamics into routine clinical treatment to  
98 delay or avoid the emergence of treatment resistance. But what is a better way?

99  
100 There are several concepts from evolution and ecology that can potentially address  
101 these limitations. For example, Anthropocene species extinctions have commonly  
102 occurred when a cataclysmic perturbation (first strike) spatially fragments a large  
103 population into small remnant populations with less genetic diversity and increased  
104 sensitivity to stochasticity that then become susceptible to what otherwise might be  
105 survivable minor perturbations (second strikes, third strikes, etc.). This concept could be  
106 leveraged to develop an “extinction treatment” regimen that aims to improve therapy by  
107 using a “first-strike” agent to generate a “cataclysmic” response, followed by a sequence  
108 of second-strike therapy agents that might offer patients the chance of cure or complete  
109 response<sup>5</sup>. Furthermore, even if cure is not possible with such a sequence of strikes,  
110 moving agents forward to apply them near the nadir of the previous strike has the

111 potential to foment greater overall tumor decline, and the dynamics of these diminished  
112 tumor burdens may prolong survival.

113  
114 The vast majority of currently employed strategies against cancer can be considered as  
115 first strikes. Practically speaking, first strikes are any intervention such as surgery,  
116 radiation, or systemic therapy agent(s) that induce an observable response. Current first  
117 strikes are evaluated by how large a response occurs (with partial or complete  
118 responses seen as desirable) and how durable the response remains before  
119 progression. In the current fixed maximum tolerated dose paradigm, the subsequent  
120 therapy is not initiated until the observation of clear disease progression after the first  
121 strike. However, changing therapies upon disease progression is far too late in eco-  
122 evolutionary terms. Clinical progression simply provides delayed proof of the  
123 evolutionary and ecological recovery of cancer cell populations, often weeks or even  
124 months (or years or more) after the fact. Instead, the second strike should occur when,  
125 or even before, the cancer cell population is the smallest after the first strike. Second-  
126 strike therapies do not need to have a proven track record for producing a large tumor  
127 response like first-strike agents. Importantly, any remnant cancer populations survived  
128 by the first strike may have vulnerabilities (i.e., collateral sensitivity) to second-strike  
129 agents<sup>5,6</sup>.

130  
131 Application of extinction-based therapies poses two questions to practicing clinicians: 1)  
132 what is the appropriate timing of the second strike? and 2) what therapeutic agent(s)  
133 should be selected as the second strike? To address these fundamental questions, we

134 adapted the existing framework of the clinical tumor board that determines the best  
135 treatment options using multidisciplinary approaches and formed the Evolutionary  
136 Tumor Board (ETB), broadening the traditional tumor board to include the non-clinical  
137 disciplines such as Cancer Biology, Evolutionary Biology, Mathematical Oncology, and  
138 Bioinformatics. The ETB explicitly considers the ecological (changes in tumor burden  
139 and distribution of tumors) and evolutionary (changes in the heritable characteristics of  
140 the cancer cell populations) dynamics of cancer. We hypothesize that this ETB  
141 approach can develop novel therapeutic strategies based on eco-evolutionary principles  
142 that may provide longer lasting responses by using currently available drugs in new  
143 ways.

144  
145 At the heart of evolutionarily inspired cancer therapies, cancer is seen as a complex,  
146 adaptive dynamic system governed by natural selection. Evolutionary therapies model  
147 cancer cells within a tumor as an adapting and phenotypically heterogeneous  
148 population. Central to capturing cancers' complex dynamics is patient-specific  
149 mathematical modelling (e.g. using differential equations or game theory), with its ability  
150 to exploit historic response data (for model calibration) and forecast future therapy  
151 combinations and schedules<sup>7</sup>. Integrating clinical experience, completed clinical trial  
152 data, retrospective patient data analysis, extensive literature review, and detailed  
153 patient specific analysis facilitates a unique dialogue among the many involved  
154 disciplines. This results in a patient-specific decision tool, driven by predictive  
155 mathematical modeling, for evaluating the possible consequences of different treatment  
156 options. Importantly, this approach allows for detailed reassessment of care decisions

157 as follow-up data is received during treatment. Here, we report a description of the ETB  
158 workflow and framework, its feasibility, and the interim results of this pilot study.

159

## 160 **METHODS**

### 161 **Study Design and Patient Selection**

162 The prospective, non-interventional pilot study was conducted at Moffitt Cancer Center  
163 under an IRB-approved protocol (MCC 20417, Feasibility of Generating Novel  
164 Therapeutic Strategies based on Evolutionary Tumor Board, NCT04343365).  
165 Institutional IRB approval was obtained in accordance with the Department of Health  
166 and Human Services Federal Policy for the Protection of Human Subjects (US Common  
167 Rule) at Moffitt Cancer Center. The study was initiated after the IRB approvals and  
168 written consents were obtained. Patients were eligible for enrollment if they were  
169 deemed to be incurable given the current standards of care, had a life expectancy over  
170 3 months, an Eastern Cooperative Oncology Group (ECOG) performance status of 0-2,  
171 had a primary oncologist willing to consider the therapeutic strategies recommended by  
172 the ETB, and were willing to be followed over time and allowing clinical data collection  
173 over time. This includes patients in remission but at high risk of recurrence, patients with  
174 suboptimal responses to previous therapy, or patients with many potentially beneficial  
175 (but not curative) options for care. There were no exclusion criteria.

176

177 The primary endpoint of the study is to determine the rate of developing evolutionary-  
178 therapy-based treatment strategies for ETB-enrolled patients without curative options.  
179 Exploratory aims include other potential results of this process: 1) To determine the rate



180 of implementing evolution-inspired plans by the treating physician through a chart  
181 review; 2) To assess whether evolutionary strategies recommended by the ETB  
182 improve prognosis compared to *a priori* prognosis for patients who have exhausted  
183 curative strategies through a chart review; 3) To assess the feasibility to build and refine  
184 mathematical models to explore duration of effect and survival for ETB  
185 recommendations; 4) To assess the feasibility to analyze radiologic features of cancer  
186 over time to predict duration of effect and survival for ETB recommendations; 5) To  
187 assess whether changes in the circulating cell-free DNA (cfDNA) over time as a variable  
188 is or is not informative in building mathematical models; 6) To assess whether presence  
189 of certain tumor genomic abnormalities by whole exome sequencing as a variable is or  
190 is not informative in building mathematical models; and 7) To assess the feasibility of  
191 generating impact hypotheses based on evolutionary and/or ecological principles to  
192 improved cancer therapy.

193

## 194 **The ETB Process**

195 Once enrolled, a patient's disease history and treatment summary were compiled by the  
196 oncologist and the ETB coordinator. The remaining options for care and anticipated  
197 response rates along with prognosis in terms of progression-free survival (PFS) and  
198 overall survival (OS) were annotated from the literature. Collected data points include 1)  
199 demographics, 2) social history including alcohol and tobacco use history, 3) family  
200 history, 4) Eastern Cooperative Oncology Group performance status, 5) pathology, 6)  
201 any clinically relevant laboratory test and biomarker results, 7) prior therapies and  
202 associated tumor measurements during the therapies, and 8) potentially available

203 subsequent therapies for consideration by the ETB. The tumor measurements were  
204 obtained as 1-dimensional measurements using the RECIST v1.1 criteria as a guideline  
205 and 3-dimensional measurements for volumetric quantification of all measurable  
206 lesions. In addition, for the purpose of calibrating the model, we typically utilize  
207 retrospective clinical data for the drugs under consideration for a given patient. For the  
208 specific exemplar patient below, we used data from a phase II study of cetuximab and  
209 nivolumab in recurrent and/or metastatic (R/M) head and neck squamous cell  
210 carcinoma (HNSCC; NCT03370276). The detailed study population and results were  
211 previously published<sup>8,9</sup>.

212  
213 For each patient, at least 2 preparatory discussion meetings occurred among a subset  
214 of the key ETB members in advance to the ETB meeting, consisting at least of primary  
215 oncologists that oversee the treatment implementation of the patient being discussed,  
216 mathematical modelers, preclinical experimentalists, ecologists, radiologists, and often  
217 other oncology disciplines and additional *ad hoc* members. During these discussions,  
218 the current clinical standard was discussed along with alternatives. Evolutionary  
219 strategies were proposed to establish what interventions were possible and what  
220 measurements of responses were feasible. Predictions from a patient-calibrated  
221 mathematical model and several iterations of the clinical questions in response to them  
222 often occurred during the generation of the ETB recommended treatment plan.

223  
224 The ETB itself was convened monthly and consisted of clinical oncologists (surgical,  
225 radiation, medical, and pediatric), radiologists, pathologists, evolutionary biologists,

226 mathematicians, research scientists, statisticians, data scientists, and clinical trial-  
227 related personnel at Moffitt Cancer Center. The primary oncologist typically started by  
228 presenting their case to the multidisciplinary ETB, followed by the mathematical  
229 modelling team presenting the process and initial thoughts and plans for the patient.  
230 The interdisciplinary discussion that followed often refined and sometimes changed a  
231 therapeutic strategy, and also generated hypotheses that influenced directions for follow  
232 up preclinical work, future clinical trials, or other areas of investigation.

233

## 234 **RESULTS**

### 235 **Patient Characteristics**

236 A total of 15 patients were enrolled to the ETB protocol between 5/5/2020 and 4/7/2022.  
237 As described below, we also used a retrospective cohort to calibrate the model. This  
238 cohort consisted of a total of 26 patients with HNSCC and were obtained from the  
239 phase II clinical trial of cetuximab and nivolumab<sup>8,9</sup>. The patient characteristics for the  
240 ETB and retrospective patients are summarized in **Table 1**. The prior line of therapy is  
241 defined as the number of treatment regimens that the patient received from the time of  
242 recurrent and/or metastatic disease diagnosis. Most patients were heavily treated  
243 before enrolling to the trial, but 14 of 15 (93%) patients had good performance status  
244 with ECOG PS 0-1.

245

### 246 **Development of Therapeutic Strategies based on Mathematical Modeling**

247 The overall ETB workflow is summarized in **Figure 1A**. Each individual patient's history  
248 was collected based on the protocol requirement and summarized. Examples of the  
249 prior treatment history and data collection along with available treatment options and

250 their estimated outcome are shown in **Supplemental Table 1** and **Supplemental Table**  
251 **2**. The collected data were graphed to visualize an accurate timeline of disease burden  
252 based on the radiographical imaging studies, drug dosing, and all sequences of  
253 previous treatments (**Figure 1B**). If imaging data informed tumor burden, then the  
254 volume dynamics, appearance, and disappearance of each lesion were also included.  
255 Aggregating this information into a standardized visual treatment and response chart  
256 has proved to be an invaluable tool for ETB discussion.

257  
258 The available clinical data points were integrated to calibrate mathematical models that  
259 explore treatment options using a system of ordinary differential equations (ODEs). The  
260 equations have sufficient complexity to capture the key disease dynamics observed in  
261 patients and remain simple enough to avoid overfitting (**Figure 1C**). Data available for  
262 each individual patient tend to be sparse in terms of the number of time points, and thus  
263 unsuitable for fitting models with numerous parameters<sup>10</sup>. In our primary model, termed  
264 the GDRS model, we focus on four aspects of tumor dynamics: tumor Growth, tumor  
265 Death, evolution of drug Resistance, and drug re-Sensitization. The model is an  
266 extension of a tumor-growth inhibition model<sup>11-14</sup> and consists of  $n+m$  differential  
267 equations, where  $n$  is the number of distinct lesions, and  $m$  the number of drugs that are  
268 administered. We let  $T_i$  be the volume of lesion  $i=1, \dots, n$ ; and  $D_j$  be the dose (as a  
269 function of time) of drug  $j=1, \dots, m$ . The efficacy of each drug over time ( $E_j$ ) is distinct for  
270 each drug, and changes to reflect the evolution of resistance or subsequent  
271 re-sensitization. In the following equations,  $T_i$ ,  $D_j$  and  $E_j$  are time-dependent:

$$\dot{T}_i = \left( \begin{array}{c} \text{Growth} \\ \tilde{\gamma}_i - \overbrace{\sum_j \delta_j E_j D_j}^{\text{Treatment response}} \end{array} \right) T_i$$

$$\dot{E}_j = \left( \begin{array}{c} \overbrace{s_j(1 - E_j)(1 - D_j)}^{\text{Sensitization}} - \overbrace{\tilde{r}_j \tilde{D}_j}^{\text{Evolution of Resistance}} \end{array} \right) E_j$$

$$D_j = D_j(t)$$

272 In this eco-evolutionary model,  $T_i$  models the ecological dynamics,  $E_j$  the evolutionary  
 273 dynamics, and  $D_j$  the choices of the physician and patient. The model is further  
 274 described in **Supplemental File 1**.

275

## 276 **Model Calibration using ETB Patient Specific Data**

277 To apply the model to an ETB patient's data, we made the following assumptions. First,  
 278 we assumed that all the lesions within a patient shared the same growth parameter ( $\gamma$ )  
 279 unless there were significant indications from the data suggesting that a particular lesion  
 280 should have its own individualized fit. Thus, tumors within a patient only differed in  
 281 terms of their date of first appearance and initial size. When possible, growth rates were  
 282 calculated from a pair of consecutive increasing volumetric measurements for a lesion.  
 283 These pairs of points were picked with the following prioritization scheme: 1) two  
 284 measurements for the primary lesion prior to initial therapy; 2) two measurements for  
 285 any metastatic lesion while off therapy; 3) maximal growth rate found within all  
 286 increasing sequential measured volumetric pairs regardless of therapy status. In cases  
 287 where multiple pairs of points satisfied the same level from the prioritization scheme, the  
 288 maximal growth rate was used as the baseline. The growth rate,  $\gamma$ , thus derived is set to

289 be the exponential growth parameter for the patient as a whole, for all lesions. An  
290 exception arises if one or more lesions are clearly significantly different in its growth  
291 rates, in which case the outlier lesion is given its own growth rate  $\gamma_i$ .

292  
293 An additional factor can affect the growth rates, namely the appearance of new lesions  
294 relative to the dates of patient scans. When a new lesion is detected, the volume is  
295 noted. Following that, the previous scan of that same area is rechecked for any prior  
296 evidence of that lesion. This is a relevant check as the threshold for identifying a lesion  
297 *de novo* is larger than identifying it *post hoc*, when the location is now known from later  
298 scans. In either case, imaging has a lower limit of measurable size determined by  
299 contrast, voxel size, etc. When tracing a new lesion back through previous scans,  
300 eventually a scan is reached where there is no evidence of that lesion. For the model,  
301 we set its initial size in accordance with the minimal detection size of the instrument.  
302 Thus, this may be an over-estimate and consequently may underestimate the tumor's  
303 growth rate when calculated from the next scan, where the lesion was identified and  
304 measured. In some cases, this underestimate may still be higher than the growth rates  
305 measured from other lesions, in which case the new lesion may receive its own higher  
306 growth rate for fitting purposes. This approach of tracking individual lesions backwards  
307 in time is a novel aspect of the ETB, allowing for the extraction of additional data  
308 regarding the lesion dynamics that would otherwise not be available.

309  
310 To fully fit the drug-induced death and resistance parameters, at least two volumetric  
311 measurements while on the same therapy are needed. In this case, the starting tumor

312 size (calculated from the pre-treatment scan), the growth rate, and the two on-treatment  
313 time points are sufficient to fit the ‘U-shaped’ ecological dynamics of the tumors. The  
314 model then reflects initial drug efficacy (drug-induced death rate,  $\delta$ ) followed by  
315 increasing drug resistance. In cases where there is only one on-treatment  
316 measurement, drug-induced death rate and rate of increasing drug resistance,  $r$ , cannot  
317 both be estimated. In such cases, we specify a functional form that generates pairs of  
318 parameters that fit the single on-treatment data point (**Supplemental File 1**). This  
319 function defines a set of parameter pairs all of which fit the patient data points. In  
320 principle, this set is wide-ranging, although biologically realistic bounds can be placed  
321 on  $\delta$  and  $r$ , particularly using historical data from independent cohorts. The predictions  
322 arising from the possible pairs of  $\delta$  and  $r$  can vary greatly. Thus, constraining the set of  
323 plausible pairs is of high value for predicting the future course of the patient’s disease.

324

### 325 **Model Calibration using Historical Data**

326 A key aspect of the ETB process is the use of retrospective cohort data to constrain the  
327 predictions generated for the specific ETB patient. As such, we evaluated a  
328 retrospective cohort of patients with recurrent and/or metastatic HNSCC (**Tables 1 and**  
329 **2**). For these 26 retrospective patients, we applied the ETB analysis approach to their  
330 available historical data. Imaging scans were retrieved and remeasured to both  
331 generate volumetric measures of each lesion and look for non-target lesions that may  
332 not have been considered during typical RECIST follow-up analysis at the time of their  
333 care. These data were then modeled using the above procedures to find parameter  
334 ranges for each patient that matched their data. Specifically, ranges of growth rates for

335 lesions ( $\gamma$ ), their response to any applied therapies ( $\delta$ ), and their rate of becoming  
336 resistant to such therapies ( $r$ ) were determined. These ranges give a starting point for  
337 predicting the outcomes of the ETB patient, putting expected bounds on their growth  
338 rate and response to treatments, wherever the ETB patient's data itself does not offer a  
339 fit. In our exemplar patient that we describe below, we used the retrospective cohort of  
340 patients receiving combination cetuximab and nivolumab to predict the widest range of  
341 response to these agents expected in the ETB patient. The patient's own lesion  
342 dynamics then further refines the predictions within that retrospective range of  
343 possibilities.

344

#### 345 **Evaluation of Primary Endpoint of the Pilot Study**

346 In 15 patients enrolled to date, 11 patients (73%) met the primary endpoint (**Table 3**). In  
347 cases where the end point was not met, the reasons are: 1) the patient was deceased  
348 before the date of the first ETB presentation, 2) insufficient historical data/analysis at the  
349 time of ETB to predict response to additional therapy options, 3) the patient was taken  
350 off the study at physician's discretion before the ETB presentation, and 4) the patient did  
351 not have measurable lesions delaying the presentation at ETB. In the 11 cases with  
352 recommendations, subsequent systematic chart reviews were conducted to determine if  
353 the treating physician altered the patient's treatment plan based on the evolutionary  
354 therapies recommended by the ETB. The physician and patient followed the  
355 recommendation of the model in all 11 cases. All patients were longitudinally followed  
356 on the protocol for continued chart review to evaluate, after sufficient follow up, whether



357 the patient had an improved outcome compared to the *a priori* prognosis for similar  
358 patients under standard of care.

359  
360 The ETB has developed a framework to evaluate novel therapeutic strategies for  
361 individual patients, including tools for temporal visualization of the treatment and  
362 responses throughout the patient's cancer journey, and application of the GDRS model  
363 to volumetric and other biomarker data. These tools are critical in facilitating treatment  
364 decisions for each individual patient in an efficient and consistent manner. Due to the  
365 often-sparse nature of clinical data, and need to constantly refine treatment decisions,  
366 we developed the following decision support workflow for fitting, prediction, and analysis  
367 using the ETB framework (**Figure 2A**).

368  
369 **Evaluation of HNSCC based on the ETB recommendation**

370 To determine the initial feasibility of the ETB based approach, we focused on the  
371 evaluation of HNSCC because of the immediate availability of the retrospective cohort  
372 through a recently completed clinical trial. Parallel efforts for each enrolled patient in  
373 other disease sites to develop a similar model is ongoing and will be reported  
374 separately. For HNSCC, we enrolled a man in his 60's with an initial diagnosis of  
375 HNSCC (subject ID: ETB-003) with base of tongue primary site and cervical lymph node  
376 metastasis based on imaging studies. The patient pursued non-standard of care  
377 alternative therapy and had local disease progression (**Supplemental Table 1**). The  
378 repeat biopsy of cervical lymph node at the time of disease progression was p16-  
379 positive squamous cell carcinoma. The patient started palliative chemotherapy with

380 cisplatin, 5-fluorouracil, and cetuximab. Unfortunately, the regimen was discontinued  
381 because of toxicity after one cycle. Pembrolizumab was started, and chemotherapy was  
382 added due to disease progression on the pembrolizumab monotherapy. Again, the  
383 treatment was discontinued due to toxicities. The patient completed the concurrent  
384 carboplatin, paclitaxel, and radiation for durable locoregional control. The patient  
385 developed disease progression locally and distantly with lung metastasis and was  
386 treated with cetuximab and nivolumab.

387  
388 For this patient with metastatic relapse, we analyzed the potential outcomes that might  
389 arise with the application of first-strike second-strike therapy, also known as extinction  
390 therapy (**Figure 2B and Figure 2C**). Upon relapse, the patient was put on the  
391 combination of cetuximab and nivolumab (the first strike), which we label F1 here. The  
392 goal of our analysis was to determine when the patient might fail this combination and  
393 therefore intervene at the appropriate time with a second strike. In this case, there were  
394 two chemotherapy options available as second strikes: carboplatin plus paclitaxel (S1)  
395 and cisplatin plus 5-fluorouracil (S2). Ideally, the first strike will be applied until efficacy  
396 wanes and the nadir of tumor burden is near, at which point the switch to the second  
397 strike would occur. In our analysis of this patient, we used retrospective cohort data, the  
398 patient's previous imaging data, and the temporal follow-up data to determine 1) when  
399 the nadir of F1 may occur, and 2) which of the second strikes to switch to.

400

401 **Initial analysis and model fits**

402 **Figure 2B** shows the initial analysis of the patient that was produced after enrollment.  
403 The dynamics of their lesions pre-ETB are shown to the left of the solid vertical line,  
404 which represents the time at which the patient was first analyzed by the ETB. Some of  
405 the early historical data was not available since the patient was treated at another  
406 institution prior to being seen at Moffitt Cancer Center. Volumetric measurements for all  
407 available scans were performed retrospectively for each detectable lesion and are  
408 shown as dots on the plot. The horizontal time axis is scaled relative to the first  
409 available scan.

410  
411 The patient was administered several different therapies to address the primary  
412 disease: combination regimens of chemotherapies, targeted therapy, immunotherapy,  
413 and radiotherapy, with the latter causing regression of the primary disease around day  
414 760. A follow-up scan on day 878 showed no evidence of disease; however, on day  
415 1026 there was evidence of lung and lymph node metastases. These were measured  
416 volumetrically. Knowing their positions in the lungs, the previous scan with no evidence  
417 of disease (NED) at day 878 was reexamined to see if very small lesions were indeed  
418 detectable, but they remained NED. Therefore, we consider that these lesions are  
419 smaller than the detection threshold of the instrument, and they are marked with 'x'  
420 markers on **Figure 2B**. Shortly before enrolling on the ETB, the patient began their first-  
421 strike therapy (F1) for the metastatic disease.

422

423 In accordance with the methods, we fit the model to the available data. The growth rate  
424 ranges were primarily fit from the metastatic disease dynamics, since there were two  
425 measurements prior to starting therapy F1, and an additional upper limit from the NED  
426 scan on day 878. Using these ranges of growth rate, we fit efficacy and resistance  
427 parameters for the dynamics of the primary disease (of which a representative fit for the  
428 largest primary lesion is shown in **Figure 2B** in dark blue). A confounding factor is that  
429 the drugs were primarily given in combination, and furthermore the imaging data is  
430 sparse compared to the multiple changes of agents. However, some constraints on the  
431 drug behaviors can be gained from these fits.

432  
433 We also leveraged our retrospective data for the first-strike therapy from patients having  
434 received the same F1 combination of cetuximab and nivolumab, from the clinical trial  
435 described above. By fitting to the dynamics of the patients in that cohort, we determined  
436 ranges of efficacy for F1 (**Table 2**). Application of this range to the current patient (using  
437 the intrinsic range of growth rates and resistance rates found from their own lesion  
438 dynamics) produced the predictive cone shown in light blue (the widest cone). Naturally,  
439 since some retrospective patients progressed rapidly and others had significant  
440 responses, the cone encompasses a wide range of possible responses for the current  
441 patient. Taking the average retrospective behavior and applying it to the current patient  
442 produces the darker shaded region.

443  
444 At this stage of the analysis and patient decision-making process, we are primarily  
445 interested in knowing when the efficacy of F1 will be significantly diminished, and

446 therefore the nadir of tumor volume will be approached. This will be the time to switch to  
447 a second strike. The time-to-nadir (TTN) for the retrospective cohort parameter ranges  
448 applied broadly to this patient ranges from 0 months (i.e., the efficacy of F1 is low  
449 enough that the lesions are already growing through it) to 7.3 months. To refine the  
450 patient-specific prediction of the nadir, we leverage model fits derived from the earlier  
451 lesion dynamics, and restrict the fits generated by the retrospective cohort parameter  
452 ranges to those that match the current patient's fits. After this constraint, the model  
453 predicts that the current patient is likely to do significantly better than the average  
454 response of the retrospective cohort. The likely TTN range is now between 4.2 months  
455 and 6.9 months. Since the next scan is anticipated to be within two months of starting  
456 the therapy, the model strongly suggests that switching therapies should wait until  
457 follow-up imaging is obtained.

458

### 459 **First follow-up analysis**

460 Upon imaging and performing volumetric measurements of the lesions, we reanalyze  
461 the patient dynamics. **Figure 2C** shows the results after the first follow-up scan for the  
462 patient at day 1119. The largest lesion has declined significantly under the first strike,  
463 F1. This decline was in line with the “Patient fit” prediction cone of **Figure 2B**,  
464 suggesting that the growth rates and treatment dynamics determined from earlier  
465 timepoints remained consistent for this lesion over time. The updated prediction cone  
466 for F1 is narrower after follow-up analysis using the additional data point. The TTN now  
467 ranges from 1.5 to 3.5 months (from the time of follow-up, not the start of F1). The  
468 model again suggests that the first strike is most likely to remain efficacious until the

469 next imaging cycle, with only a small fraction of simulations suggesting that the nadir will  
470 be reached prior to that time.

471  
472 At the same time, we examine what the effect of switching to a second strike would be  
473 at this time, since we do not want to wait until the nadir is reached to switch. In the  
474 insets of **Figure 2C**, we show the predicted range of effect for switching from the F1 to  
475 either second-strike S1 (inset A) or S2 (inset B). In both cases, the range of efficacy for  
476 the strike is determined by both retrospective cohort responses and the current patient's  
477 response, since they were previously administered these agents during primary tumor  
478 treatment. S1 was administered at the end of the primary disease treatment, and  
479 therefore the estimates are better than for S2, which was only administered in  
480 combination with other agents, and therefore has confounding factors in the primary fits.  
481 However, in both cases, the model suggests that compared to staying with the first  
482 strike, the second strikes appear to bring no advantage at this time. Therefore, since the  
483 model predicts that there is likely some efficacy remaining in F1 and that both S1 and  
484 S2 currently provide little comparative advantage, the decision is to continue the therapy  
485 until the next imaging time point.

486  
487 **Second follow-up analysis**

488 For any patient in follow-up, the ETB process repeats with each new scan. Volumetric  
489 measures for the next follow-up scan were attained and the updated analysis is shown  
490 in **Figure 2D**. The tumor has continued to shrink, albeit at a slower rate than during the  
491 initial phase. Reanalyzing the data with the model leads to updated predictions for the

492 TTN, which now ranges from 0 to 1.7 months (from the reanalysis time point). This  
493 suggests that the efficacy of F1 is approaching its end. The insets in the figure show the  
494 predicted efficacy of the two second-strike options, and as opposed to **Figure 2C**, both  
495 now are likely to have a better effect on tumor burden than continuing with F1.

496

### 497 **Decision support in the ETB**

498 The ETB is a non-interventional trial, and therefore the decisions of when to switch  
499 therapies and what to switch to remain in the hands of the oncologist and the patient.  
500 Here, the model analysis and predictions used in the ETB workflow aim to give insight  
501 into the temporal dynamics of the patient's specific disease, which can aid in making the  
502 above decisions. In the exemplar case above, the model initially suggested continuing  
503 the first strike, and similarly continuing after the first follow-up imaging point, after which  
504 the model began to suggest that a second-strike option should be applied soon. For this  
505 patient, an additional treatment option, radiotherapy, arose at the time, and was chosen  
506 as a second strike. The insight gained regarding the efficacy and expected nadir of the  
507 first strike was valuable in making the subsequent treatment decisions for the patient.

508

### 509 **DISCUSSION**

510 Here we report the first results of the ETB feasibility study, having built a system to  
511 capture available clinical tumor dynamics over time and in response to available  
512 therapies, to incorporate the remaining conventional therapeutic options, and created a  
513 forum and methodology for disciplines with an evolutionary understanding of cancer to  
514 discuss ideas and implement them for patients. We also highlight a specific patient to

515 provide more detail of the process of building a model and using it to guide timing and  
516 selection of available therapies in a novel and dynamic manner. We leveraged the  
517 existing framework of clinical tumor boards, the well-established best practice care  
518 delivery model in oncology, in combination with quantitative analysis<sup>7,15</sup>. ETB uniquely  
519 includes non-clinical disciplines and integrates eco-evolutionary concepts to generate  
520 novel treatment strategies and assesses the results of this platform over time.

521  
522 To date we have primarily analyzed patients with HNSCC while additional investigations  
523 into adolescent and young adult sarcomas, prostate, breast, and lung cancers are  
524 ongoing. Successfully expanding to additional disease sites depends on many factors.  
525 A key aspect is having the option to change therapies in real time during follow-up. In  
526 addition, availability of retrospective cohorts to inform model development is critical to  
527 their utility. **Figure 3** shows how we envision the current incarnation of the ETB in  
528 facilitating the integration of evolutionary therapies into standard practice. Early on, the  
529 ETB serves as a test bed for developing models, understanding the evolutionary  
530 dynamics of the disease, and creating potential clinical trials. In later stages, pilot trials  
531 will be served by a robust framework using highly calibrated mathematical model(s)  
532 developed for that trial. If successful, we envision developing disease-specific software  
533 modules that will assist the oncologist in decision support during standard of care,  
534 particularly in practice environments without access to multidisciplinary tumor board.  
535 This long-term vision delivers the insights gained from mathematical modeling of  
536 evolutionary dynamics into the hands of any interested oncologist for personalized  
537 decision support.



538

539 The ETB invites consideration of evolutionarily enlightened therapy approaches. Our  
540 primary focus here has been using multi-strike therapy to effect maximal tumor  
541 reduction, ideally extinction, while minimizing the effect of tumor resistance to any given  
542 agent. Evolutionary theory suggests that it is best to switch therapies either just before  
543 or at the nadir of the tumor volume under the current therapy (as opposed to waiting for  
544 progression to occur and be observed on imaging) because the nadir is believed to  
545 represent the point that the tumor population has effectively evolved resistance to the  
546 first-strike therapy. A key tool in this approach is predictive modeling, which can  
547 estimate time-to-progression before it occurs. In the best case, multi-strike therapy can  
548 effect a cure, but even in the absence of such, the approach has the potential to deliver  
549 deeper remission, both in terms of tumor volume and PFS.

550

551 There are several other eco-evolutionary concepts that are already in application or in  
552 development. One of the more developed is adaptive therapy, which typically exploits  
553 the evolutionary costs of resistance such as synthesis, maintenance, and operation of  
554 the molecular machinery needed to survive treatment. The benefits of resistance  
555 exceed costs during therapy. This has best been demonstrated thus far clinically in  
556 prostate cancer<sup>16</sup> but also in preclinical models of breast cancer<sup>17</sup>. Adaptive therapy is  
557 predicted to be most effective when there is a competitively dominant sensitive  
558 population of cancer cells, typically present in clinical situations that have high response  
559 rate but a low cure rate. It also requires a treatment strategy that reliably induces a  
560 response. With continuous therapy or metronomic therapies that do not consider the

561 patient's tumor dynamics, competitively subordinate resistant cancer cells come to  
562 predominate as they experience competitive release from the absence of the drug-  
563 sensitive cancer cells<sup>18-20</sup>. By removing therapy while there is still a high frequency and  
564 density of sensitive cells, these sensitive cells effectively compete with and therefore  
565 suppress the resistant cancer cells. Adaptive therapy is an important and active area of  
566 evolutionary therapy research<sup>16,17,19,21-32</sup> that can encompass multiple drugs<sup>31,32</sup> and has  
567 already been considered for some ETB patients.

568  
569 We plan to initiate several clinical trials to better examine the ETB approach with  
570 respect to accuracy, predictability, and outcomes. However, much work remains to be  
571 done. First, the models will be improved with more real-world data, and thus increased  
572 analysis of additional retrospective cohorts in each disease will serve to better constrain  
573 the operating parameter ranges we apply in our models. Second, compared to imaging,  
574 collecting additional biomarkers such as cfDNA has the potential to provide faster  
575 turnaround, more frequent and even potentially more accurate information on tumor  
576 dynamics, particularly in minimal residual disease states. Third, streamlining the  
577 process of clinical annotation, literature searches, biomarker collection, analysis, and  
578 prediction will be necessary to apply this labor-intensive workflow on a wider scale,  
579 though having performed the process for a given diagnosis provides efficiencies for  
580 future ETB patients. To this end, we are developing a framework that automates much  
581 of the process from start to finish, allowing the ETB team to focus on key discussion  
582 points regarding the model predictions and patient assumptions that drive the next  
583 decision point. Ultimately, we hope to continue to improve the therapeutic paradigm of

584 clinical oncology application based on the insight gained from ETB. We anticipate the  
585 tools generated will inform both sequences and strategies of multi-strike therapy across  
586 a number of cancers and directly facilitate the likelihood of cancer extinction.

587 **REFERENCES**

588

589 1 Siegel, R. L., Miller, K. D., Fuchs, H. E. & Jemal, A. Cancer statistics, 2022. *CA Cancer J*  
590 *Clin* **72**, 7-33 (2022). [https://doi.org:10.3322/caac.21708](https://doi.org/10.3322/caac.21708)

591 2 Stankova, K., Brown, J. S., Dalton, W. S. & Gatenby, R. A. Optimizing Cancer Treatment  
592 Using Game Theory: A Review. *JAMA Oncol* **5**, 96-103 (2019).  
593 [https://doi.org:10.1001/jamaoncol.2018.3395](https://doi.org/10.1001/jamaoncol.2018.3395)

594 3 Gatenby, R. A. & Brown, J. Mutations, evolution and the central role of a self-defined  
595 fitness function in the initiation and progression of cancer. *Biochim Biophys Acta* **1867**,  
596 162-166 (2017). [https://doi.org:10.1016/j.bbcan.2017.03.005](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.bbcan.2017.03.005)

597 4 Gravenmier, C. A., Siddique, M. & Gatenby, R. A. Adaptation to Stochastic Temporal  
598 Variations in Intratumoral Blood Flow: The Warburg Effect as a Bet Hedging Strategy.  
599 *Bull Math Biol* **80**, 954-970 (2018). [https://doi.org:10.1007/s11538-017-0261-x](https://doi.org/10.1007/s11538-017-0261-x)

600 5 Gatenby, R. A., Zhang, J. & Brown, J. S. First Strike-Second Strike Strategies in  
601 Metastatic Cancer: Lessons from the Evolutionary Dynamics of Extinction. *Cancer Res*  
602 (2019). [https://doi.org:10.1158/0008-5472.CAN-19-0807](https://doi.org/10.1158/0008-5472.CAN-19-0807)

603 6 Gatenby, R. A., Artzy-Randrup, Y., Epstein, T., Reed, D. R. & Brown, J. S. Eradicating  
604 metastatic cancer and the eco-evolutionary dynamics of Anthropocene extinctions.  
605 *Cancer Res* (2019). [https://doi.org:10.1158/0008-5472.CAN-19-1941](https://doi.org/10.1158/0008-5472.CAN-19-1941)

606 7 Kim, E., Rebecca, V. W., Smalley, K. S. & Anderson, A. R. Phase i trials in melanoma: A  
607 framework to translate preclinical findings to the clinic. *Eur J Cancer* **67**, 213-222 (2016).  
608 [https://doi.org:10.1016/j.ejca.2016.07.024](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ejca.2016.07.024)

- 609 8 Chung, C. H. *et al.* Concurrent Cetuximab and Nivolumab as a Second-Line or beyond  
610 Treatment of Patients with Recurrent and/or Metastatic Head and Neck Squamous Cell  
611 Carcinoma: Results of Phase I/II Study. *Cancers* **13** (2021).  
612 <https://doi.org/10.3390/cancers13051180>
- 613 9 Chung, C. H. *et al.* Phase II multi-institutional clinical trial result of concurrent cetuximab  
614 and nivolumab in recurrent and/or metastatic head and neck squamous cell carcinoma.  
615 *Clin Cancer Res* (2022). <https://doi.org/10.1158/1078-0432.CCR-21-3849>
- 616 10 Brady, R. & Enderling, H. Mathematical Models of Cancer: When to Predict Novel  
617 Therapies, and When Not to. *Bull Math Biol* **81**, 3722-3731 (2019).  
618 <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11538-019-00640-x>
- 619 11 Claret, L. *et al.* Model-based prediction of phase III overall survival in colorectal cancer  
620 on the basis of phase II tumor dynamics. *J Clin Oncol* **27**, 4103-4108 (2009).  
621 <https://doi.org/10.1200/JCO.2008.21.0807>
- 622 12 Claret, L. *et al.* Evaluation of tumor-size response metrics to predict overall survival in  
623 Western and Chinese patients with first-line metastatic colorectal cancer. *J Clin Oncol*  
624 **31**, 2110-2114 (2013). <https://doi.org/10.1200/JCO.2012.45.0973>
- 625 13 Glazar, D. J. *et al.* Tumor Volume Dynamics as an Early Biomarker for Patient-Specific  
626 Evolution of Resistance and Progression in Recurrent High-Grade Glioma. *J Clin Med* **9**  
627 (2020). <https://doi.org/10.3390/jcm9072019>
- 628 14 Glazar, D. J. *et al.* Early response dynamics predict treatment failure in patients with  
629 recurrent and/or metastatic head and neck squamous cell carcinoma treated with  
630 cetuximab and nivolumab. *Oral Oncol* **127**, 105787 (2022).  
631 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.oraloncology.2022.105787>

- 632 15 Pasetto, S., Gatenby, R. A. & Enderling, H. Bayesian Framework to Augment Tumor  
633 Board Decision Making. *JCO Clin Cancer Inform* **5**, 508-517 (2021).  
634 [https://doi.org:10.1200/CCI.20.00085](https://doi.org/10.1200/CCI.20.00085)
- 635 16 Zhang, J., Cunningham, J. J., Brown, J. S. & Gatenby, R. A. Integrating evolutionary  
636 dynamics into treatment of metastatic castrate-resistant prostate cancer. *Nat Commun* **8**,  
637 1816 (2017). [https://doi.org:10.1038/s41467-017-01968-5](https://doi.org/10.1038/s41467-017-01968-5)
- 638 17 Enriquez-Navas, P. M. *et al.* Exploiting evolutionary principles to prolong tumor control in  
639 preclinical models of breast cancer. *Sci Transl Med* **8**, 327ra324 (2016).  
640 [https://doi.org:10.1126/scitranslmed.aad7842](https://doi.org/10.1126/scitranslmed.aad7842)
- 641 18 Gillies, R. J., Flowers, C. I., Drukteinis, J. S. & Gatenby, R. A. A unifying theory of  
642 carcinogenesis, and why targeted therapy doesn't work. *Eur J Radiol* **81 Suppl 1**, S48-  
643 50 (2012). [https://doi.org:10.1016/S0720-048X\(12\)70018-9](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0720-048X(12)70018-9)
- 644 19 Gatenby, R. A., Silva, A. S., Gillies, R. J. & Frieden, B. R. Adaptive therapy. *Cancer Res*  
645 **69**, 4894-4903 (2009). [https://doi.org:10.1158/0008-5472.CAN-08-3658](https://doi.org/10.1158/0008-5472.CAN-08-3658)
- 646 20 Gatenby, R. A., Brown, J. & Vincent, T. Lessons from applied ecology: cancer control  
647 using an evolutionary double bind. *Cancer Res* **69**, 7499-7502 (2009).  
648 [https://doi.org:10.1158/0008-5472.CAN-09-1354](https://doi.org/10.1158/0008-5472.CAN-09-1354)
- 649 21 Brady-Nicholls, R. *et al.* Prostate-specific antigen dynamics predict individual responses  
650 to intermittent androgen deprivation. *Nat Commun* **11**, 1750 (2020).  
651 [https://doi.org:10.1038/s41467-020-15424-4](https://doi.org/10.1038/s41467-020-15424-4)

- 652 22 Brady-Nicholls, R. *et al.* Predicting patient-specific response to adaptive therapy in  
653 metastatic castration-resistant prostate cancer using prostate-specific antigen dynamics.  
654 *Neoplasia* **23**, 851-858 (2021). <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.neo.2021.06.013>
- 655 23 Cunningham, J. *et al.* Optimal control to reach eco-evolutionary stability in metastatic  
656 castrate-resistant prostate cancer. *PLoS One* **15**, e0243386 (2020).  
657 <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0243386>
- 658 24 Gallaher, J. A., Enriquez-Navas, P. M., Luddy, K. A., Gatenby, R. A. & Anderson, A. R.  
659 A. Spatial Heterogeneity and Evolutionary Dynamics Modulate Time to Recurrence in  
660 Continuous and Adaptive Cancer Therapies. *Cancer Res* **78**, 2127-2139 (2018).  
661 <https://doi.org/10.1158/0008-5472.CAN-17-2649>
- 662 25 Kim, E., Brown, J. S., Eroglu, Z. & Anderson, A. R. A. Understanding the potential  
663 benefits of adaptive therapy for metastatic melanoma. *bioRxiv*, 2020.2010.2016.343269  
664 (2020). <https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.10.16.343269>
- 665 26 Kim, E., Brown, J. S., Eroglu, Z. & Anderson, A. R. A. Adaptive Therapy for Metastatic  
666 Melanoma: Predictions from Patient Calibrated Mathematical Models. *Cancers (Basel)*  
667 **13** (2021). <https://doi.org/10.3390/cancers13040823>
- 668 27 Mason, N. T. *et al.* Budget Impact of Adaptive Abiraterone Therapy for Castration-  
669 Resistant Prostate Cancer. *Am Health Drug Benefits* **14**, 15-20 (2021).
- 670 28 Strobl, M. A. R. *et al.* Spatial structure impacts adaptive therapy by shaping intra-tumoral  
671 competition. *bioRxiv*, 2020.2011.2003.365163 (2021).  
672 <https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.11.03.365163>

- 673 29 Strobl, M. A. R. *et al.* Turnover Modulates the Need for a Cost of Resistance in Adaptive  
674 Therapy. *Cancer Res* **81**, 1135-1147 (2021). [https://doi.org:10.1158/0008-5472.CAN-20-](https://doi.org/10.1158/0008-5472.CAN-20-0806)  
675 [0806](https://doi.org/10.1158/0008-5472.CAN-20-0806)
- 676 30 West, J., Ma, Y. & Newton, P. K. Capitalizing on competition: An evolutionary model of  
677 competitive release in metastatic castration resistant prostate cancer treatment. *J Theor*  
678 *Biol* **455**, 249-260 (2018). [https://doi.org:10.1016/j.jtbi.2018.07.028](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jtbi.2018.07.028)
- 679 31 West, J. *et al.* Towards Multidrug Adaptive Therapy. *Cancer Res* **80**, 1578-1589 (2020).  
680 [https://doi.org:10.1158/0008-5472.CAN-19-2669](https://doi.org/10.1158/0008-5472.CAN-19-2669)
- 681 32 West, J. B. *et al.* Multidrug Cancer Therapy in Metastatic Castrate-Resistant Prostate  
682 Cancer: An Evolution-Based Strategy. *Clin Cancer Res* (2019).  
683 [https://doi.org:10.1158/1078-0432.CCR-19-0006](https://doi.org/10.1158/1078-0432.CCR-19-0006)
- 684



**Table 1. Patient characteristics**

Variables		ETB N=15	HNSCC Retrospective Cohort N=26
<b>Age</b>	Median	59	64
<b>Gender</b>	Male	12 (80%)	23 (88%)
	Female	3 (20%)	3 (12%)
<b>Race</b>	White	13 (87%)	25 (96%)
	Black	1 (7%)	0
	Other	1 (7%)	1 (4%)
<b>ECOG PS</b>	0	8 (53%)	7 (27%)
	1	6 (40%)	19 (73%)
	2	1 (7%)	0
<b>Smoking History</b>	Yes	6 (40%)	17 (65%)
	No	9	9
<b>Disease Site</b>	HNSCC	6 (40%)	26 (100%)
	Sarcoma	7 (47%)	0
	Lung	1 (7%)	0
	Prostate	1 (7%)	0
<b>Prior line of therapy for R/M cancers</b>	0	0 (0%)	6 (23%)
	1	6 (40%)	13 (50%)
	2	6 (40%)	5 (19%)
	3	0 (0%)	2 (8%)
	4	3 (20%)	0 (0%)

ETB: evolutionary tumor board

HNSCC: head and neck squamous cell carcinoma

ECOG PS: Eastern Cooperative Oncology Group Performance Status

R/M: recurrent and/or metastatic

**Table 2. Retrospective head and neck squamous cell carcinoma cohort characteristics (N=26)**

Variables	Mean	Min/Max Range
<b>Number of lesions per patient</b>	2.61	1 to 5
<b>Number of scans per lesion</b>	4.16	2 to 13
<b>Parameter fits for <math>\gamma</math> (per day)</b>	0.027	0.008 to 0.061
<b>Parameter fits for <math>\delta / \gamma</math> for cetuximab + nivolumab</b>	2.2	1.1 to 3.7
<b>Parameter fits for <math>r</math> (per day) for cetuximab + nivolumab</b>	0.0076	0.002 to 0.013

**Table 3. Evolutionary Tumor Board (ETB) Recommendations**

ETB ID	Clinical Presentation at ETB	ETB Recommendation	Implemented by physician
ETB-001	Metastatic Ewing sarcoma with prolonged stable disease and unresectable disease burden	Three strike strategy: Short course doxorubicin. Radiation therapy to lung metastasis (whole lung vs stereotactic depending on response) with a systemic therapy backbone (tyrosine kinase inhibitor or vincristine) and then return to vincristine and irinotecan cycled with a tyrosine kinase inhibitor (regorafenib).	doxorubicin + dexrazoxane + cyclophosphamide
ETB-002	Metastatic alveolar rhabdomyosarcoma entering second complete response	Radiation therapy to the forearm lesion, chemotherapy, anti-angiogenesis inhibitor (rotating 90-day cycles)	pazopanib + radiation therapy
ETB-003	Metastatic HPV positive poorly differentiated carcinoma of base of tongue who presented while on nivolumab + cetuximab clinical trial	Maintain combination of nivolumab + cetuximab treatment for at least 90 days from initiation, but not greater than 120 days based on the model. Then switch to a second strike with an available chemotherapy with nivolumab. Nivolumab will be continued as maintenance. Maintain second strike for 90-120 days and then consider switching the chemotherapy again based on the current estimated tumor proliferation rate.	continued nivolumab + cetuximab
ETB-004	Metastatic HPV positive base of tongue squamous cell carcinoma presented with progressive disease on the second line palliative systemic therapy	Discontinue current therapy and initiate concurrent cisplatin or carboplatin + paclitaxel with radiation as a second strike to achieve durable locoregional control. Possibility of radiating the sternal metastasis for palliation will be assessed by the radiation oncology team. As soon as the patient recovers from the radiation induced toxicities, resume an appropriate systemic therapy again to control the lung metastasis.	cisplatin + radiation therapy
ETB-005	Widespread metastatic bone and lung osteosarcoma in first 6 months of MAP	No: Recommendation N/A due to death of the patient after enrolling to the study but before the ETB presentation.	N/A
ETB-006	p16-positive right tonsil squamous cell carcinoma progressed on the first line of palliative systemic therapy	Discontinue the first line carboplatin + paclitaxel. Switch to cisplatin + 5-fluorouracil + pembrolizumab as a second strike. Continue pembrolizumab as maintenance. Introduce second strike of a dose-reduced cisplatin + 5-fluorouracil because the patient had problems with neutropenia given the prior regimen. Alternately, cisplatin + 5-fluorouracil can be given as a full dose by adding a growth factor to prevent prolonged neutropenia.	cisplatin + 5-fluorouracil + pembrolizumab

<b>ETB-007</b>	Gleason 8 Prostate cancer with widespread bone metastases	Begin an adaptive therapy using enzalutamide + relugolix. Use 50% PSA decline as threshold for stopping therapy and increase of PSA to resume. Follow patient closely to calibrate modeling and potentially alter the recommendation of start-stop algorithm	enzalutamide + relugolix
<b>ETB-008</b>	Osteosarcoma with metastases in lung with good response	No: Recommendation N/A due to insufficient historical data/analysis at the time of ETB to predict response to additional therapy options.	N/A
<b>ETB-009</b>	Widely metastatic embryonal rhabdomyosarcoma with LN, bone and lung metastases newly diagnosed	If the first strike results in disease progression or stable disease, then change to doxorubicin-based therapy. If partial response after the first evaluation, continue vincristine + Adriamycin + cyclophosphamide (VAC) and determine intensify or de-intensify the regimen. Second strike: vincristine + irinotecan after complete response between 12-42 weeks of VAC.	VAC → vincristine + irinotecan
<b>ETB010</b>	Metastatic HPV positive base of tongue squamous cell carcinoma	Await the next follow-up scan to refine the model predictions and decide when to switch to next line of therapy.	pembrolizumab
<b>ETB-011</b>	Metastatic oropharynx (posterior pharyngeal wall) squamous cell carcinoma	Switch to cetuximab + pembrolizumab instead of administering the final cycle of cisplatin + 5-fluorouracil + pembrolizumab based on evidence of progression. Expect cetuximab to provide 2 to 7 months of efficacy. Nadir of efficacy expected in 1 to 4 months, so close attention to upcoming scans should be given to anticipate the next switch of therapy.	cetuximab + pembrolizumab
<b>ETB-012</b>	Adenocarcinoma with metastasis to liver	No: Recommendation N/A due to the patient taken off the study at physician's discretion before the ETB presentation.	N/A
<b>ETB-013</b>	Synchronous floor of mouth (cT1N0M0) and left base of tongue (cT2N0M0) squamous cell carcinoma, both p16 negative.	Next scan will be critical for predicting nadir of response. Scan delayed by insurance, so results pending for now. Consider starting the palliative radiation therapy sooner after getting the next scan.	palliative radiation therapy
<b>ETB-014</b>	Recurrent esthesioneuroblastoma	No: Recommendation N/A due to the lack of measurable lesions and delay in patient presentation.	N/A
<b>ETB-015</b>	Bone metastatic Ewing sarcoma with initial response to chemotherapy	Continue vincristine + doxorubicin + cyclophosphamide /ifosfamide + etoposide (VDC/IE). Patient is in the 2nd strike window.	continue VDC/IE

Figure 1A.






Figure 1B.



**Figure 1C.**



**Figure 1. A:** Schematic diagram of the Evolutionary Tumor Board clinical workflow. **B:** An example of tumor volumetric data visualization in context of the clinical data. **C:** An

example of tumor volumetric data visualization based on a mathematical model using a system of ordinary differential equations in context of the treatment data.

**Figure 2A.**




Figure 2B.








Figure 2C.




**Figure 2D.**



**Figure 2. A:** Overview of the ETB mathematical modeling using the tumor Growth, tumor Dearth, evolution of drug Resistance, and drug re-Sensitization (GDRS) model and decision support workflow. **B:** The initial analysis of the patient. The bottom section of the figure shows the treatments received over time. The top section of plot shows the volumes of each lesion (different colors for each lesion) on a  $\log_{10}$  scale, over time, with clinical data from imaging represented by dots, and model fits represented by lines. Here, the model fit for the largest primary lesion is plotted (purple), as well as for the largest lung metastasis (teal). The 'x' markers represent scans with no detectable volume for that lesion (below the detection threshold for the instrument, represented by the dashed line).

The vertical solid line represents the time when the first ETB for the patient occurred, and the vertical dashed line indicated the next expected date of imaging. The model is used to create a cone of outcomes (shaded areas). The wide cone represents the range of outcomes seen in retrospective patients; the inner shaded cones represent the average retrospective patient, and the patient-specific predictions for the current patient.

**C:** First follow-up analysis by the ETB (solid vertical line). This occurs shortly after the patient has received their first imaging scan on the current therapy. The new prediction cone is significantly narrowed, given the additional data point. Inset A shows the prediction cone for immediately switching therapy to carboplatin and paclitaxel (purple cone), and inset B shows the predictions if the patient were immediately switched to cisplatin and 5-FU. **D:** Second follow-up analysis by the ETB (solid vertical line). This occurs shortly after the patient's second scan on current therapy. As in **Figure 2C**, the prediction cones for the two options for second strikes are shown in the insets.



**Figure 3.** Three phases of the ETB. The development phase (red) is where models and evolutionary therapy approaches are developed for each specific disease setting based on available biomarkers. Retrospective cohorts are curated and analyzed. The second phase (blue) brings the ETB approach to disease-specific clinical trials, using a Phase ‘i’ virtual trial approach for patient decision support. Models and biomarker collection are refined, and patient cohorts are expanded. In phase three (green), validated approaches are deployed for broad clinical use, via custom software developed for the specific disease. This system can be self-improving with each patient that is seen via the approach, contributing valuable data and outcomes to the retrospective cohort for a given disease.