

Abstract EP134/#1505 Table 1

	Korean expanded access program dMMR/MSI-H EC N=17
Median follow-up, months	3.75
Tumor response	
ORR, % (n/N)	60 (6/10)
Complete response, % (n/N)	20 (2/10)
Partial response, % (n/N)	40 (4/10)
Stable disease, % (n/N)	10 (1/10)
Adverse events	
TEAE, n (%)	6 (35.3)
Grade $\geq$ 3 TEAE, n (%)	2 (11.8)
TRAE, n (%)	1 (5.9)
Grade $\geq$ 3 TRAE, n (%)	0
SAE, n (%)	1 (5.9)
TRAE leading to discontinuation, n (%)	0

ORR, objective response rate; SAE, serious adverse event; TEAE, treatment-emergent adverse event; TRAE, treatment-related adverse event.

71 years). With a median follow-up of 3.75 months, 10 patients were available for evaluation of tumor response. Of these, 6 had confirmed complete or partial responses; objective response rate was 60.0%. Treatment-related adverse events (TRAEs) were experienced by 5.9% (1/17) of patients, with no grade  $\geq$ 3 TRAEs. No patients discontinued because of TRAEs.

**Conclusion/Implications** Initial results from the Korean EAP of dostarlimab monotherapy treatment for patients with recurrent or advanced dMMR/MSI-H EC demonstrated encouraging antitumor activity with no new safety signals, further supporting dostarlimab use in Korean patients. Results were consistent with the GARNET clinical trial (NCT02715284) of dostarlimab monotherapy. Additional follow-up is ongoing.

**Introduction** Objective: This study aimed to determine whether the number of resected pelvic lymph nodes (PLNs) affects the prognosis of endometrial cancer patients at post-operative risk of recurrence.

**Methods** JGOG2043 was a trial to assess the efficacy of three different chemotherapeutic regimens as adjuvant therapy in endometrial cancer patients with post-operative recurrent risk. Two hundred fifty patients who underwent pelvic lymphadenectomy alone in JGOG2043 were analyzed retrospectively. The number of resected and positive nodes and other clinicopathologic risk factors for survival were retrieved.

**Results** There were 167 patients in the group with 20 or more PLNs removed, while 83 patients had less than 20 PLNs removed. There was no significant difference in patients' backgrounds between the two groups, and the rate of lymph node metastasis was not significantly different (28.1% vs. 24.1%,  $P=0.49$ ). There was a trend toward fewer pelvic recurrences in the group with 20 or more PLNs removed (3.5% vs. 9.6%,  $P=0.0502$ ). Although Kaplan-Meier analysis showed no significant difference in survival rates between 20 or more and less than 20 groups (5-year OS: 90.3% vs. 84.3%,  $P=0.20$ ), multivariate analysis revealed that the number of resected nodes is one of the independent risk factors (HR, 0.49; 95%CI, 0.24–0.99;  $P=0.048$ ), as well as surgical stage, high-risk histology, and advanced age for overall survival.

**Conclusion/Implications** Resection of 20 or more nodes in the pelvic region was associated with improved pelvic control and better survival outcomes in endometrial cancer patients who underwent pelvic lymphadenectomy alone at risk of recurrence treated with adjuvant chemotherapy.

EP135/#104

**THE PROGNOSTIC SIGNIFICANCE OF THE NUMBER OF RESECTED PELVIC NODES IN ENDOMETRIAL CANCER: JAPANESE GYNECOLOGIC ONCOLOGY GROUP STUDY JGOG2043 POST HOC ANALYSIS**

<sup>1</sup>Yosuke Konno\*, <sup>2</sup>Hidemichi Watari, <sup>3</sup>Michinori Mayama, <sup>4</sup>Hiroko Matsumiya, <sup>5</sup>Wataru Yamagami, <sup>6</sup>Jiro Suzuki, <sup>7</sup>Nobuyuki Susumu, <sup>8</sup>Kenichi Harano, <sup>9</sup>Kei Nakagawa, <sup>10</sup>Toru Nakanishi, <sup>11</sup>Kosuke Yoshihara, <sup>12</sup>Hiroyuki Nomura, <sup>13</sup>Yoshihito Yokoyama, <sup>14</sup>Kazuhiro Takehara, <sup>6</sup>Aikou Okamoto. <sup>1</sup>Hokkaido University Hospital, Department of Gynecology, Sapporo, Japan; <sup>2</sup>Hokkaido University school of medicine, Department of Obstetrics and Gynecology, Sapporo, Japan; <sup>3</sup>University of Pennsylvania, School of Veterinary Medicine, Biomedical Science, Philadelphia, USA; <sup>4</sup>Hokkaido University Hospital, Gynecology, Sapporo, Japan; <sup>5</sup>Keio University School of Medicine, Department of Gynecologic Oncology, Tokyo, Japan; <sup>6</sup>The Jikei University, Department of Obstetrics and Gynecology, Tokyo, Japan; <sup>7</sup>International University of Health and Welfare, Department of Obstetrics and Gynecology, Narita, Japan; <sup>8</sup>National Cancer Center Hospital East, Department of Medical Oncology, Kashiwa, Japan; <sup>9</sup>Osaka University, Department of Obstetrics and Gynecology, Suita, Japan; <sup>10</sup>Tohoku medical and pharmaceutical University, Department of Obstetrics and Gynecology, Sendai, Japan; <sup>11</sup>Niigata University Graduate School of Medical and Dental Sciences, Department of Obstetrics and Gynecology, Niigata, Japan; <sup>12</sup>Fujita Health University, Department of Obstetrics and Gynecology, Toyoake, Japan; <sup>13</sup>Hirosaki University, Department of Obstetrics and Gynecology, Hirosaki, Japan; <sup>14</sup>Shikoku Cancer Center, Department of Gynecology, Matsuyama, Japan

10.1136/ijgc-2023-IGCS.231