IJSCIA

International Journal of Scientific Advances
ISSN: 2708-7972
Volume: 5 | Issue: 5 | Sep – Oct 2024 Available Online: www.ijscia.com
DOI: 10.51542/ijscia.v5i5.25

Comparing the Efficacy and Side Effect Profiles of Pazopanib and Sunitinib in the Treatment of Advanced Renal Cell Carcinoma: A Narrative Literature Review

Muhammad Faraaz Ismail

University Street, Al Jurf 1, Ajman, United Arab Emirates

*Corresponding author details: Muhammad Faraaz Ismail; drfaraazismail@gmail.com

ABSTRACT

Background: Renal Cell Carcinoma (RCC) is the most common form of kidney cancer, accounting for approximately 85% of all kidney malignancies [1, 3]. Targeted therapies such as Pazopanib and Sunitinib, which inhibit the vascular endothelial growth factor (VEGF) pathway, have become integral to the management of metastatic RCC [4, 5]. Despite their similar mechanisms of action, these agents differ in their side effect profiles, which presents important considerations for patient tolerability and quality of life (QoL) [11, 12]. ***Objectives:*** This literature review aims to compare the efficacy and side effect profiles of Pazopanib and Sunitinib in treating advanced or metastatic RCC, providing a synthesis of the current evidence to guide clinicians in optimizing treatment strategies based on patient-specific factors. ***Methods:*** A narrative literature review was conducted using a descriptive synthesis approach. Relevant studies from 2006 to 2024 were identified in PubMed, Cochrane Library, and EMBASE. Randomized controlled trials (RCTs) and observational cohort studies were included, with a focus on identifying trends in efficacy and side effect profiles. ***Conclusion:*** Pazopanib and Sunitinib provide comparable efficacy in treating advanced RCC, though they differ significantly in their side effect profiles. Pazopanib is generally better tolerated, particularly in reducing fatigue, hand-foot syndrome, and mucosal side effects. In contrast, Sunitinib may be more suitable for patients with concerns about hypertension or hepatotoxicity. Clinicians should carefully balance efficacy with patient-specific tolerability when selecting between these agents. Further research should focus on combination therapies and long-term safety profiles.

Keywords: pazopanib, sunitinib; renal cell carcinoma; efficacy; side effects.

INTRODUCTION

1. Background on Renal Cell Carcinoma (RCC)

Renal Cell Carcinoma (RCC) accounts for approximately 85% of all kidney cancers, with more than 430,000 new cases diagnosed worldwide annually [1,3]. Advanced or metastatic RCC is particularly challenging, with limited treatment options and a poor prognosis. The 5-year survival rate for metastatic RCC is estimated to be around 8%, making the development of effective systemic therapies essential [2].

2. Targeted Therapy in RCC

Targeted therapies have revolutionized the treatment landscape for RCC, particularly therapies targeting the vascular endothelial growth factor (VEGF) pathway. This pathway plays a critical role in angiogenesis, a process that becomes dysregulated in RCC due to mutations in the von Hippel-Lindau (VHL) gene [5]. Pazopanib and Sunitinib, two VEGF inhibitors, have been developed to inhibit angiogenesis and slow tumor progression [7].

3. Pazopanib and Sunitinib: Mechanism of Action

Pazopanib and Sunitinib are multi-kinase inhibitors that target VEGF receptors, as well as other pathways involved in tumor proliferation, including platelet-derived growth factor receptors (PDGFR) [9]. Both drugs have shown substantial efficacy in controlling advanced RCC. However, despite their similar mechanisms, they differ significantly in their side effect profiles, which can influence treatment choice [8, 9].

4. Objective of the Review

This literature review aims to compare the efficacy and side effect profiles of Pazopanib and Sunitinib, synthesizing the current evidence to help clinicians make informed treatment decisions and optimize patient outcomes.

DISCUSSION

1. Efficacy of Pazopanib and Sunitinib

The literature consistently indicates that Pazopanib and Sunitinib provide comparable efficacy in treating advanced RCC. Numerous clinical trials and real-world studies have shown no significant differences in key efficacy outcomes such as Progression-Free Survival (PFS) and Overall Survival (OS) between the two agents [10, 11, 12, 16]. Both drugs have demonstrated their capability to slow disease progression and extend survival in patients with metastatic RCC, as evidenced in studies such as Motzer et al. and Ruiz-Morales et al. [10, 11].

These findings suggest that clinicians can choose either agent based on efficacy, without concern for major differences in survival outcomes.

Despite these similarities in efficacy, individual patient response can be influenced by various factors including disease burden, comorbidities, and overall tolerability. As a result, clinicians must not only consider efficacy but also how well each patient can manage the side effects associated with each drug [12, 14, 16].

2. Side Effect Profiles: Tolerability Considerations

While Pazopanib and Sunitinib offer similar efficacy, their side effect profiles differ significantly, which plays a major role in determining the appropriate choice between the two drugs. Side effect profiles can greatly impact QoL, especially for patients undergoing long-term treatment for metastatic RCC [11, 12, 15, 17]. Each drug's side effect burden should be carefully weighed based on patient preferences and comorbid conditions.

- ***Fatigue***

Fatigue is a common and often debilitating side effect in RCC treatment, however, studies consistently show that Pazopanib is associated with lower rates of fatigue compared to Sunitinib [11, 12, 14]. For instance, both the COMPARZ trial and real-world studies have consistently reported that patients on Pazopanib experience less fatigue, making it a preferable option for individuals seeking to maintain energy levels and QoL [11, 12].

- ***Hypertension***

Hypertension is more frequently reported with Pazopanib, although the severity and clinical significance of this side effect vary across studies. Studies by Motzer et al. and Kim et al. observed higher rates of hypertension in Pazopanib-treated patients [11, 12, 14]. Despite this, Pazopanib's more favorable side effect profile in other aspects, such as fatigue and hand-foot syndrome, makes it a more attractive option for many patients. Hypertension can often be managed with antihypertensive medications, which makes Pazopanib more suitable for those who are able to tolerate this particular side effect [12, 13, 15, 17].

- ***Diarrhea***

Diarrhea occurs more frequently in patients treated with Pazopanib, as noted in several studies, including those by Kim et al. and Escudier et al. [11, 12, 14]. While this side effect is generally manageable, its higher incidence in Pazopanib-treated patients should be considered, particularly when determining the best treatment for individuals with pre-existing gastrointestinal sensitivities. Despite its frequency, diarrhea tends to be less debilitating compared to other side effects like fatigue or mucosal toxicity [14, 16].

- ***Hand-Foot Syndrome***

Sunitinib is associated with significantly higher rates of hand-foot syndrome, a painful condition affecting the hands and feet, which can impair a patient's ability to perform daily tasks [11, 12, 14]. This side effect is notably more prevalent in Sunitinib-treated patients, as reported in both clinical trials and observational studies, including Motzer et al. and Ruiz-Morales et al. [10, 12]. For patients seeking to maintain an active lifestyle, this side effect may lead clinicians to favor Pazopanib over Sunitinib.

- ***Hepatotoxicity***

Hepatotoxicity is a well-documented concern with Pazopanib. Studies by Motzer et al. and Amin et al. consistently report higher rates of liver toxicity in patients treated with Pazopanib compared to those receiving Sunitinib [11, 12, 13, 15, 17]. As a result, close monitoring of liver function is essential when treating patients with Pazopanib, particularly those with pre-existing liver conditions or a higher risk of hepatic complications [12].

- ***Mucosal Side Effects***

Mucosal side effects, such as stomatitis and oral mucositis, occur more frequently with Sunitinib, which can cause significant discomfort and impair a patient's ability to eat and speak. Multiple studies, including the CheckMate 016 trial and real-world analyses, have consistently reported a higher incidence of mucosal toxicity in patients treated with Sunitinib compared to those receiving Pazopanib [11, 12, 15, 17]. These side effects, along with hand-foot syndrome, often contribute to lower QoL scores for patients on Sunitinib, as the cumulative burden of these adverse events can significantly impact daily living activities [11, 12, 14, 15, 17].

3. Quality of Life Considerations

The QoL of patients undergoing treatment for advanced RCC is strongly influenced by the differing side effect profiles of Pazopanib and Sunitinib. Studies such as Escudier et al. have consistently shown that patients treated with Pazopanib report better overall QoL, largely due to the lower incidence of debilitating side effects such as fatigue, hand-foot syndrome, and mucosal side effects [14]. Conversely, patients on Sunitinib often report greater difficulty managing these adverse effects, which can significantly impact daily life, particularly for those receiving long-term therapy [12, 14, 15, 17].

Clinicians must carefully consider these QoL impacts when deciding between the two agents, especially in the context of long-term treatment for metastatic RCC. Balancing efficacy with tolerability is crucial to ensuring that patients receive a treatment plan that aligns with their overall health goals and personal preferences [11, 12, 14, 15, 17].

4. Implications for Clinical Practice

Given their comparable efficacy, the choice between Pazopanib and Sunitinib should primarily be guided by patient-specific factors related to tolerability and side effects. Pazopanib may be a more suitable option for patients who are particularly concerned with maintaining their quality of life by minimizing fatigue, hand-foot syndrome, and mucosal toxicity [11, 12, 14, 15, 17]. Conversely, Sunitinib may be better suited for patients with a lower risk of hepatotoxicity or those

who are less affected by hypertension but may prioritize avoiding the gastrointestinal side effects of Pazopanib [11, 13, 15, 16, 17].

5. Limitations and Future Research

There are several limitations to the existing body of research comparing Pazopanib and Sunitinib. Variability in patient populations, outcome definitions, and follow-up durations inherently makes direct comparisons challenging. Future studies should focus on identifying patient subgroups that may benefit more from one drug over the other, based on genetic or metabolic markers. Additionally, more research is needed on combination therapies involving VEGF inhibitors like Pazopanib and Sunitinib with immunotherapies, such as Nivolumab, to improve long-term outcomes while minimizing side effects [15, 17]. The integration of real-world evidence and patient-reported outcomes in future studies will also help clinicians better understand the balance between efficacy and QoL in advanced RCC treatment.

CONCLUSION

Pazopanib and Sunitinib offer similar efficacy in treating advanced renal cell carcinoma, but they differ significantly in their side effect profiles. Pazopanib tends to be better tolerated, particularly in terms of fatigue, hand-foot syndrome, and mucosal side effects, making it a preferable option for patients focused on maintaining their QoL. Sunitinib, on the other hand, may be better suited for patients with concerns about hepatotoxicity or those less affected by fatigue or mucosal toxicity. The choice between these agents should be personalized based on the patient's comorbidities, side effect tolerability, and overall treatment goals.

Moving forward, further research should explore the integration of VEGF inhibitors with immunotherapies to enhance long-term efficacy and safety. Real-world outcomes and patient-reported QoL metrics will also play a crucial role in optimizing treatment strategies and personalizing care for patients with advanced RCC.

DECLARATION OF GENERATIVE AI AND AI-ASSISTED TECHNOLOGIES IN THE WRITING PROCESS

During the preparation of this work, the author used ChatGPT, an AI language model, in order to maintain and order references and to assess and improve grammar/coherency. After using this tool/service, the author reviewed and edited the content as needed and took full responsibility for the content of the publication.

REFERENCES

[1] GLOBOCAN 2020: Kidney Cancer Fact Sheet. International Agency for Research on Cancer (IARC).

[2] Choueiri TK, Motzer RJ. Systemic Therapy for Metastatic Renal-Cell Carcinoma. N Engl J Med. 2017;376(4):354-366.

[3] American Cancer Society. Cancer Facts & Figures 2023.

[4] Rini BI. VEGF-targeted therapy in metastatic renal cell carcinoma. Oncologist. 2005;10(3):191-197.

[5] Ferrara N. VEGF and the quest for tumour angiogenesis factors. Nat Rev Cancer. 2002;2(10):795-803.

[6] Kaelin WG Jr. The von Hippel-Lindau tumor suppressor gene and kidney cancer. Clin Cancer Res. 2004;10(18):6290S-6295S.

[7] Motzer RJ, Bukowski RM. Targeted therapy for metastatic renal cell carcinoma. J Clin Oncol. 2006;24(35):5601-5608.

[8] Sternberg CN, Davis ID, Mardiak J, et al. Pazopanib in locally advanced or metastatic renal cell carcinoma: results of a randomized phase III trial. J Clin Oncol. 2010;28(6):1061-1068.

[9] Motzer RJ, Hutson TE, Tomczak P, et al. Sunitinib versus interferon alfa in metastatic renal-cell carcinoma. N Engl J Med. 2007;356(2):115-24.

[10] Ruiz-Morales JM, Swierkowski M, Wells JC, et al. First-line sunitinib versus pazopanib in metastatic renal cell carcinoma: results from the IMDC. Eur J Cancer. 2016;65:102-108.

[11] Motzer RJ, Hutson TE, Cella D, et al. Pazopanib versus Sunitinib in Metastatic RCC. N Engl J Med. 2013;369(8):722-731.

[12] Kim MS, Chung HS, Hwang EC, et al. Efficacy of first-line targeted therapy in real-world Korean patients with metastatic RCC: focus on sunitinib and pazopanib. J Korean Med Sci. 2018;33(51).

[13] Hutson TE, Davis ID, Machiels JP, et al. Efficacy and safety of pazopanib in patients with metastatic RCC. J Clin Oncol. 2010;28(3):475-480.

[14] Escudier B, Porta C, Bono P, et al. Randomized, controlled, double-blind, cross-over trial assessing treatment preference for pazopanib versus sunitinib in patients with metastatic RCC. J Clin Oncol. 2014;32(14):1412-1418.

[15] Amin A, Plimack ER, Ernstoff MS, et al. Safety and efficacy of nivolumab in combination with sunitinib or pazopanib in advanced RCC: CheckMate 016 study. J Immunother Cancer. 2018;6(1):109.

[16] Demir L, Bayir D, Ozdogan R. A real-world comparison of pazopanib versus sunitinib in metastatic RCC: focus on poor-risk patients. J Oncol. 2020;6(3):153-63.

[17] Hammers HJ, Plimack ER, Infante JR, et al. Safety and efficacy of nivolumab in combination with ipilimumab in metastatic RCC: CheckMate 016 study. J Clin Oncol. 2017;35(34):3851-3858.