IMPERIAL

#175P: Lenvatinib versus sorafenib as second-line treatment post-atezolizumab plus bevacizumab for hepatocellular carcinoma: the LEVIATHAN Study. P. Lombardi^{1,2,#}, H. Yang^{3,#}, G.F. Manfredi^{1,4}, C. Celsa^{1,5}, B. Stefanini^{1,6}, T.U. Marron⁷, M. Pinter⁸, F. Piscaglia^{6,9}, C.Y. Lin^{10,11}, W.F. Hsu¹²,

1. Department of Surgery & Cancer, Imperial College London, Hammersmith Hospital, Du Cane Road, London, UK; 2. Phase 1 Unit, Fondazione Policlinico Università del Piemonte Orientale, Novara, Italy; 5. Section of Gastroenterology, Department of Translational Medicine, CHA Bundang Medical Center, CHA Università del Piemonte Orientale, Novara, Italy; 5. Section of Gastroenterology, Department of Translational Medicine, Università del Piemonte Orientale, Novara, Italy; 5. Section of Gastroenterology, Department of Translational Medical Center, CHA Università del Piemonte Orientale, Novara, Italy; 5. Section of Gastroenterology, Department of Translational Medicine, Università del Piemonte Orientale, Novara, Italy; 5. Section of Gastroenterology, Department of Translational Medicine, Università del Piemonte Orientale, Novara, Italy; 5. Section of Gastroenterology, Department of Translational Medicine, Università del Piemonte Orientale, Novara, Italy; 5. Section of Gastroenterology, Department of Translational Medicine, Università del Piemonte Orientale, Novara, Italy; 5. Section of Gastroenterology, Department of Translational Medicine, Università del Piemonte Orientale, Novara, Italy; 5. Section of Gastroenterology, Department of Translational Medicine, Università del Piemonte Orientale, Novara, Italy; 5. Section of Gastroenterology, Department of Translational Medicine, Università del Piemonte Orientale, Novara, Italy; 5. Section of Gastroenterology, Department of Translational Medicine, Università del Piemonte Orientale, Novara, Italy; 5. Section of Gastroenterology, Department of Translational Medicine, Università del Piemonte Orientale, Novara, Italy; 5. Section of Gastroenterology, Department of Translational Medicine, Università del Piemonte Orientale, Novara, Italy; 5. Section of Gastroenterology, Department of Translational Medicine, Università del Piemonte Orientale, Novara, Italy; 5. Section of Gastroenterology, Department of Italy; 5. Section of Gastroenterology, Department of Italy; 5. Section of Gastro Health Promotion, Mother and Child Care, Internal Medicine and Medical Specialties, PROMISE, University of Palermo, Italy; 6. Department of Medicine, Division of Internal Medicine, Division of Gastroenterology, Department of Medical University of Vienna, Austria; 9. Division of Internal Medicine, Division of Internal Medicine, Hepatobiliary and Hepatobiliary and Hepatobiliary and Hepatobiliary and Hepatobiliary and Surgical Sciences, University of Vienna, Vienna, Austria; 9. Division of Internal Medicine, Hepatobiliary and Hepatobiliary and Surgical Sciences, University of Vienna, Vienna, Austria; 9. Division of Internal Medicine, Hepatobiliary and Hepatobiliary and Hepatobiliary and Hepatobiliary and S Immunoallergic Diseases, IRCCS Azienda Ospedaliero-Universitaria di Bologna, Italy; 10. Department of Gastroenterology and Hepatology, Chang Gung University, Taoyuan, Taiwan; 11. College of Medicine, Center, Taoyuan, Taiwan; 12. Department of Translational Hospital, Linkou Medical University, Taoyuan, Taiwan; 12. Department of Translational Nedicine, Center for Digestive Medicine, Center for Digestive Medicine, Chang Gung University, Taoyuan, Taiwan; 12. Department of Translational Hospital, Linkou Medical Center, Taoyuan, Taiwan; 13. University of Verona, Department of Translational Hospital, Taichung, Taiwan; 13. University, Taoyuan, Taiwan; 13. University of Verona, Department of Translational Hospital, Taichung, Taiwan; 14. Department of Taichung, Taiwan; 14. Department o Research and New Technologies in Medicine and Surgery, University of Pisa, Pisa, Italy; 15. Unit of Pneumology, Kindai University Faculty of Medical Center Mainz, I. Dept. of Internal Medicine, Mainz, I. Dept. of Internal Medicine, Mainz, Germany; 17. University Faculty of Medical Center Mainz, I. Dept. of Internal Medicine, Mainz, I. Dept. of Internal Medicine, Mainz, Germany; 18. Department of Gastroenterology and Hepatology, Kindai University Faculty of Medicine, Mainz, I. Dept. of Internal Medicine, Mainz, Germany; 18. Department of Gastroenterology and Bone Marrow Transplantation with Section of Pneumology, University Faculty of Medical Center Mainz, I. Dept. of Internal Medicine, Mainz, I. Dept. of Internal Medicine, Mainz, I. Dept. of Internal Medical Center Mainz, I. Dept. of Internal Medicine, Mainz, I. Dept. of Internal Medical Center Mainz, I. Dept. of Internal Medical Center Mainz, I. Dept. of Internal Medical Center Mainz, I. Dept. of Internal Medicine, Mainz, I. Dept. of Internal Medicine, Mainz, I. Dept. of Internal Medical Center Mainz, I. Dept. of Internal Medicine, Mainz, I. Dept. of Internal Medical Center Mainz, I. Dept. of Internal Medical Center Mainz, I. Dept. of Internal Medicine, Mainz, I. Dept. of Internal Medical Center Mainz Osaka-Sayama, Japan; 19. Department of Biomedical Sciences, Humanitas University, Via Rita Levi Montalcini 4, 20072 Pieve Emanuele, Milan, Italy; 20. Medical Oncology and Hematology Unit, Humanitas Cancer Center, IRCCS Humanitas Research Hospital, Via A. Manzoni 56, 20089 Rozzano, Milan, Italy; 21. Division of Internal Medicine, AOU Maggiore della Carità, Novara, Italy; 22. Division of Oncology, Department of Translational Medicine, University of Piemonte Orientale, Novara, Italy.

Introduction

Atezolizumab plus bevacizumab (A+B) is a standard of care first-line (1L) systemic therapy for unresectable hepatocellular carcinoma (uHCC). Uncertainty remains regarding optimal sequencing post A+B.

Methods

LEVIATHAN is a multicentre, prospective registry examining efficacy and survival outcomes of patients with HCC post A+B. From 1210 patients treated with 1L A+B between May 2018 and August 2024, 230 who progressed on A+B and received either lenvatinib (n=125, 54.3%) or sorafenib (n=105, 45.7%) as secondline (2L) treatment were included. Propensity score matching (PSM) was performed to mitigate selection bias, with matching based on independent predictors of overall survival (OS) and response characteristics to investigated treatment.

Table 1. Patient characteristics

| Variable | Lenvatinib | | Sorafenib | р | |
|---|---------------------------|---------------|---------------|--------|--|
| | | 125 | 105 | | |
| Center (%) | eastern | 97 (77.6) | 67 (63.8) | 0.031 | |
| | western | 28 (22.4) | 38 (36.2) | | |
| Age (mean (SD)) | | 61.48 (11.10) | 61.58 (10.51) | 0.948 | |
| Sex (%) | Female | 22 (17.6) | 21 (20.2) | 0.741 | |
| | Male | 103 (82.4) | 83 (79.8) | | |
| ECOG diagnosis (%) | 0 | 69 (55.2) | 33 (31.4) | <0.001 | |
| | 1 | 56 (44.8) | 72 (68.6) | | |
| HCC Etiology (%) | Non viral | 36 (28.8) | 37 (35.2) | 0.367 | |
| 0, 1, 7 | Viral | 89 (71.2) | 68 (64.8) | | |
| Cirrhosis (%) | No | 23 (18.5) | 33 (31.4) | 0.075 | |
| | Unknown | 2 (1.6) | 1 (1.0) | | |
| | Yes | 99 (79.8) | 71 (67.6) | | |
| Ascites (%) | No | 109 (87.2) | 79 (75.2) | 0.029 | |
| | Previous and now resolved | 1 (0.8) | 0 (0.0) | | |
| | Yes | 15 (12.0) | 26 (24.8) | | |
| BCLC (%) | Stage A | 9 (7.2) | 7 (6.7) | 0.005 | |
| | Stage B | 35 (28.0) | 15 (14.3) | | |
| | Stage C | 56 (44.8) | 71 (67.6) | | |
| | Unknown | 25 (20.0) | 12 (11.4) | | |
| Neoplastic PVT (%) | No | 100 (80.0) | 76 (73.1) | 0.280 | |
| | Yes | 25 (20.0) | 28 (26.9) | | |
| Extrahepatic spread (%) | No | 60 (48.0) | 47 (44.8) | 0.721 | |
| (/0) | Yes | 65 (52.0) | 58 (55.2) | | |
| AFP level (%) | <400 ng/mL | 78 (62.9) | 66 (64.1) | 0.964 | |
| (- / | >=400 ng/mL | 46 (37.1) | 37 (35.9) | | |
| NLR grade (%) | high | 46 (38.3) | 39 (40.2) | 0.888 | |
| 0 () | low | 74 (61.7) | 58 (59.8) | | |
| ALBI grade (%) | grade 1 | 92 (73.6) | 49 (47.6) | <0.001 | |
| 0 () | grade 2 | 32 (25.6) | 54 (52.4) | | |
| | grade 3 | 1 (0.8) | 0 (0.0) | | |
| Type of resistance to immunotherapy (%) | Unknown | 1 (0.8) | 0 (0.0) | 0.016 | |
| | Primary resistance | 60 (49.2) | 66 (68.0) | | |
| | Secondary resistance | 61 (50.0) | 31 (32.0) | | |

Results





predictors of improved OS (Table 2).



Disease control rate with lenvatinib Figure 4 compared to sorafenib in primary resistance patient to A+B.

A. Dalbeni¹³, G. Masi^{14,15}, M. Schönlein¹⁶, P.R. Galle¹⁷, M. Kudo¹⁸, L. Rimassa^{19,20}, M. Pirisi^{4,21}, H. J. Chon^{3,#}, D. J. Pinato^{1,22#}.

In the overall 2L study population, lenvatinib exposure was associated with longer median progression-free survival (PFS) (5.5 versus 2.6 months, HR 0.41, p<0.001) and OS (11.9 versus 7.4 months, HR 0.67, p=0.018) compared to sorafenib (Fig. 1A-B). When considering OS from the time of A+B initiation, the A+B-lenvatinib sequence achieved a median OS of 22.4 months versus 14.3 months for A+B-sorafenib (HR 0.54, p<0.001) (Fig. 1C).

Multivariate analysis identified 2L treatment with lenvatinib, AFP ≤400 ng/ml, NLR <3, and absence of portal vein thrombosis as independent Figure 3 - Sankey diagram of the illustrates patient flow from first line A+B to second line (A) lenvatinib or (B) sorafenib.
 Table 2. Univariate and multivariate Cox regression analyses

| | | L | Univariate analysis | | | Multivariate analysis | | |
|------------------------|----------------------------|------|---------------------|---------|------|-----------------------|--------------|--|
| Variable | Level | HR | , Cl | P_value | HR | CI | , P value | |
| II line treatment | Sorafenib vs lenvatinib | 1.92 | 1.36-2.70 | <0.001 | 2.12 | 1.47- 3.06 | <0.001 | |
| Sex | Male vs Female | 0.61 | 0.40-0.93 | 0.02 | 0.89 | 0.57- 1.40 | 0.06 | |
| ECOG | 1 vs 0 | 1.37 | 0.96-1.96 | 0.08 | | | | |
| Age | (median) | 1.03 | 0.74-1.46 | 0.8 | | | | |
| Etiology | Viral vs Non Viral | 1.30 | 0.88-1.93 | 0.2 | | | | |
| Cirrhosis | Yes vs No | 0.77 | 0.53-1.13 | 0.2 | | | | |
| Ascites | Yes vs No | 1.25 | 0.82-1.91 | 0.3 | | | | |
| Number of nodules | Single vs Multiple | 0.82 | 0.50-1.34 | 0.4 | | | | |
| Neoplastic PVT | Yes vs No | 1.69 | 1.14-2.50 | 0.008 | 1.64 | 1.10- 2.46 | 0.01 | |
| Extrahepatic spread | Yes vs No | 1.15 | 0.82-1.62 | 0.4 | | | | |
| AFP grade | >=400 vs < 400 | 1.83 | 1.30-2.59 | <0.001 | 2.04 | 1.42- 2.92 | <0.001 | |
| NLR grade | NLR low vs high | 0.60 | 0.42-0.85 | 0.004 | 0.59 | 0.41- 0.85 | 0.004 | |
| ALBI grade | 2-3 vs 1 | 1.41 | 0.99-2.03 | 0.054 | | | | |

IESMO GASTROINTESTINAI CANCERS

Annual Congress

Figure 1 - (A). Kaplan-Meier curves for PFS; (B). Kaplan-Meier curves for OS; (C). Kaplan-Meier curves for OS in patients treated with the sequence of A+Blenvatinib A+Bor sorafenib.

Conclusions

The LEVIATHAN study suggests lenvatinib to be associated with improved outcomes compared to sorafenib as 2L treatment after A+B discontinuation in uHCC, including patients with refractory disease. Although observational in nature, these findings highlight the importance of optimized sequencing strategies in uHCC.

References

Finn RS, Qin S, Ikeda M et al. Atezolizumab plus Bevacizumab in Unresectable Hepatocellular Carcinoma. N Engl J Med 2020; 382 (20): 1894-1905;

Wu M, Fulgenzi CAM, D'Alessio A, Cortellini A, Celsa C, Manfredi GF, et al. Second-line treatment patterns and outcomes in advanced HCC after progression on atezolizumab/bevacizumab. JHEP Rep. 2025;7(2):101232. Martirena A, Lombardi P, Pinato DJ, Rimassa L, Lamarca A. Systemic management of advanced HCC, 10.1016/j.esmogo.2025.100139, ESMO Gastrointestinal Oncology. 2025;7.