of treatment between both groups (9.8% vs 15.8% p= 0.231). No patient died as a result of an adverse event to the treatment.

Table: 42P

Characteristics	<65 years (41)	>65 years (19)	
Comorbidities:	7.3%	26.3%	
Hypertension	2.4%	10.5%	
Diabetes	14.6%	21.0%	
Hypercholesterolemia	2.4%	0%	
Ischemic event	0%	5.26%	
Heart failure			
Smoking habit	14.6%	1%	
Current	29.3%	36.8%	
Former			
Stage at diagnosis	I-II: 14.6% III-IV: 86.4%	I-II: 15.8 III-IV: 84.4%	
Toxicity (any)	43.9%	63.2%	p=0.165
Grade >G3	14.6%	5.3%	P=0.293
Toxicity	33%	50%	
Gastrointestinal	22.2%	25%	
Cardiological	33.4%	21%	
Hematological	5.5%	4%	
Others:			
Median treatment duration (months)	11.5	7	
Discontinuation:	9.8%	21.0%	P= 0.231
Delays:	9.8%	15.8%	P=0.498
Subsequent treatment	68.2%	71.4%	P=0.333

Conclusions: Patients >65 years treated with iPARPs did not experience higher rates of adverse events or treatment interruptions/discontinuations. iPARPs should be a valid treatment option for ovarian cancer in this increasingly frequent subgroup of patients.

Legal entity responsible for the study: The authors.

Funding: Has not received any funding.

Disclosure: All authors have declared no conflicts of interest.

https://doi.org/10.1016/j.annonc.2022.04.060

43P Malignant bowel obstruction in advanced ovarian cancer: A retrospective analysis of patients supported with parenteral nutrition

R.K.K. Wight[1], A.D. Murphy[2], J. Bower[3], R.D. Morgan[1], L. Flanagan[1], S. Maycock[1], S. Lal[4], A. Teubner[4], A. Abraham[4], C. Mitchell[1], J. Hasan[1], G. Jayson[1], A.R. Clamp[1], Z. Salih[1]

[1]Medical Oncology Dept., The Christie NHS Foundation Trust, Manchester, UK; [2]Medical Oncology, Nepean Cancer Care Centre, Kingswood, NSW, Australia; [3]Nutrition and Dietetics, The Christie NHS Foundation Trust, Manchester, UK; [4]Gastroenterology, Salford Royal, Salford, UK

Background: Malignant bowel obstruction (MBO) is common in advanced ovarian cancer (AOC). Treatment options are limited as majority of cases present with widespread, multilevel peritoneal dissemination and platinum-resistant disease. The benefit of Parenteral Nutrition (PN) in MBO is debated, given the limited overall survival (OS) of this patient group. Aim: to identify which clinical features correlate with improved survival in AOC and MBO, to support clinical decision-making.

Methods: Retrospective review of patients admitted with MBO between April 2019 and October 2021 to a single tertiary cancer centre. Those with AOC established on PN with the aim to discharge home on PN were included. Univariate analysis for survival after commencing PN was performed using log-rank test.

Results: 103 patients with MBO were identified with 33 patients excluded (PN not initiated, 15; PN withdrawn: covid service constraint, 5, acute medical event, 13). 70 patients were successfully established on PN and 49 discharged on PN; 16 patients clinically deteriorated; 5 returned to enteral diet. Median OS of patients that did not receive PN was 19 days, PN stopped due to general deterioration 39 days and 100 days (range 18-807) for those established on PN ($p<0.0001$). Clinical features associated with improved OS: no prior systemic therapy ($p=0.0067$), platinum sensitivity ($p=0.043$), ECOG performance status (PS) 1 vs 2-3 ($p=0.004$), falling modified Glasgow Prognostic Score (mGPS) during admission ($p=0.0027$). In the treatment naïve group, chemotherapy resolved MBO in 6/9 cases. In the pre-treated group, 60% of patients received subsequent chemotherapy (median duration 8 weeks), with early cessation due to toxicity and no clinical benefit. Only 1 patient achieved resolution of MBO on chemotherapy.

Conclusions: PN may improve survival of patients with AOC in MBO. ECOG PS, platinum sensitivity and mGPS trend may be useful to select patients for PN. In those presenting with MBO at AOC diagnosis, PN can enable safe delivery of chemotherapy, which usually will resolve MBO. In pre-treated patients, PN is a life-long commitment and chemotherapy is largely ineffective in resolving MBO. Further research should focus on quality of life in patients receiving PN.

Legal entity responsible for the study: The authors.

Funding: Has not received any funding.

Disclosure: All authors have declared no conflicts of interest.

https://doi.org/10.1016/j.annonc.2022.04.061

44TiP ENGOT-ov65/KEYNOTE-B96: Phase III, randomized, double-blind study of pembrolizumab vs placebo + paclitaxel with optional bevacizumab for platinum-resistant recurrent ovarian cancer

N. Colombo[1], R.L. Coleman[2], X. Wu[3], F. Kose[4], R. Wenham[5], A. Sebastianelli[6], K. Hasegawa[7], E. Zsiros[8], T. De La Motte Rouge[9], M. Bidzinski[10], I. McNeish[11], J. Sehouli[12], J. Korach[13], P.R. Debruyne[14], J-W. Kim[15], A.C. De Melo[16], X. Peng[17], A.M. Bogusz[18], K. Yamada[18], B.J. Monk[19]

[1]Department of Medicine and Surgery, University of Milan-Bicocca and European Institute of Oncology (IEO) IRCCS, Milan, Italy; [2]Gynecologic Oncology, Texas Oncology-The Woodlands, The Woodlands, TX, USA; [3]Department of Gynecologic Oncology, Fudan University Shanghai Cancer Center, Shanghai, China; [4]School of Medicine, Department of Medical Oncology, Baskent University, Adana, Turkey; [5]Department of Gynecologic Oncology, Moffitt Cancer Centerolia Campus, Tampa, FL, USA; [6]Gynecology Oncology, CHU de Québec-Université Laval, Quebec City, QC, Canada; [7]Department of Gynecologic Oncology, Saitama Medical University International Medical Center, Hidaka, Japan; [8]Department of Gynecologic Oncology and Department of Immunology, Roswell Park Comprehensive Cancer Center, Buffalo, NY, USA; [9]Department of Medical Oncology, Centre Eugène-Marquis, Rennes, France; [10]National Institute of Oncology Maria Sklodowska-Curie, Warsaw, Poland, Faculty of Medical Sciences and Health Sciences Kazimierz Pulaski University of Technology and Humanities, Radom, Poland; [11]Ovarian Cancer Action Research Centre, Department of Surgery and Cancer, Imperial College London, London, UK; [12]Department of Gynecology, Charité Universitätsmedizin Berlin, Berlin, Germany; [13]Gynecologic Oncology Department, Sheba Medical Center, Tel Aviv University, Tel Aviv, Israel; [14]Department of Medical Oncology, Kortrijk Cancer Centre, AZ Groeninge, Kortrijk, Belgium, Medical Technology Research Institute (MTRI), School of Life Sciences, Anglia Ruskin University, Cambridge, UK; [15]Department of Obstetrics and Gynecology, Seoul National University Hospital, Seoul, Republic of Korea; [16]Clinical Research and Technological Development Division, Instituto Nacional de Câncer, Brazilian National Cancer Institute, Rio de Janeiro, Brazil; [17]Biostatistics and Research Decision Sciences, Merck, Kenilworth, NJ, USA; [18]Global Clinical Development, Merck, Kenilworth, NJ, USA; [19]Division of Gynecologic Oncology, University of Arizona College of Medicine, Creighton University School of Medicine, Phoenix, AZ, USA

Background: There is an urgent need for new treatments for platinum-resistant recurrent ovarian cancer (PROC). Addition of bevacizumab (bev) to non-platinum-based chemotherapy (chemo) significantly improved PFS in patients (pts) with PROC but did not show a clear OS benefit. Thus far, the combination of paclitaxel + bev has shown the most promise in PROC, although the proportion of pts eligible for bev is limited by treatment-related toxicities. Combination of the anti-PD-1 antibody pembrolizumab (pembro) with weekly paclitaxel showed antitumor activity and manageable toxicity in pts with PROC in a single-arm, phase II study. ENGOT-ov65/KEYNOTE-B96 (NCT05116189) compares the efficacy and safety of pembro + standard of care chemo (weekly paclitaxel) ± bev vs placebo (pbo) + weekly paclitaxel ± bev in pts with PROC.

Trial design: In this randomized, pbo-controlled, double-blind, phase III study, eligible pts are aged ≥18 y with histologically confirmed epithelial ovarian, fallopian tube, or primary peritoneal carcinoma with 1-2 prior lines of systemic therapy, including ≥1 prior platinum-based therapy with ≥4 cycles in first line. Pts must have platinum-resistant disease (radiographic evidence of PD ≤6 mo after last platinum-based therapy dose), be eligible for paclitaxel (± bev per investigator discretion), have ECOG PS ≤1, radiographically evaluable disease per RECIST v1.1, and have a tumor sample for central evaluation of PD-L1 status. ~616 pts will be randomized 1:1 to pembro 400 mg IV or pbo Q6W for up to 18 cycles (~2 y) + paclitaxel 80 mg/m^2 on days 1, 8, and 15 of each Q3W cycle (± bev 10 mg/kg Q2W per investigator discretion) until PD or unacceptable toxicity. Randomization is stratified by planned bev use (yes vs no), region (US vs Europe vs rest of world), and PD-L1 status (combined positive score [CPS] <1 vs CPS 1-<10 vs CPS ≥10). Primary endpoint is PFS per RECIST v1.1 by investigator review in pts with tumor PD-L1 CPS ≥1 and in all pts. Secondary endpoints are OS in pts with tumor PD-L1 CPS ≥1 and in all pts, PFS per RECIST v1.1 by blinded independent central review in pts with tumor PD-L1 CPS ≥1 and in all pts, safety, and pt-reported outcomes. Enrollment is ongoing.

Clinical trial identification: NCT05116189.

Legal entity responsible for the study: Merck Sharp & Dohme Corp., a subsidiary of Merck & Co., Inc., Kenilworth, NJ, USA.

Funding: Merck Sharp & Dohme Corp., a subsidiary of Merck & Co., Inc., Kenilworth, NJ, USA.

Disclosure: N. Colombo: Financial Interests, Personal, Full or part-time Employment, Employment of Immediate Family Member: Sarepta Therapeutics; Financial Interests, Personal, Advisory Role: Roche/Genentech, AstraZeneca, Clovis Oncology, Pfizer, MSD Oncology, Tesaro, GlaxoSmithKline,