Why PARP inhibitors are changing the mCRPC treatment algorithm

Written by The Life Science Feed Editorial Team · Published 7 August 2026 · Edited by Mara Voss

> Prostate cancer management has seen significant advancements, but challenges remain, especially for patients with metastatic disease. Traditional androgen deprivation therapy (ADT) and chemotherapy offer benefits, but resistance often develops, necessitating new therapeutic approaches. PARP inhibitors represent a targeted strategy, leveraging specific genetic vulnerabilities within the tumor.

KEY TAKEAWAYS

- The Pivot: PARP inhibitors offer a targeted treatment option for metastatic castration-resistant prostate cancer (mCRPC) in patients with homologous recombination repair (HRR) gene mutations.
- The Data: These agents have demonstrated efficacy in delaying disease progression and improving patient outcomes in genetically selected populations.
- The Action: Clinicians should consider germline and somatic testing for HRR gene mutations in patients with mCRPC to identify those who may benefit from PARP inhibitor therapy.

Metastatic castration-resistant prostate cancer (mCRPC) remains a formidable clinical challenge, with patients often progressing despite multiple lines of systemic therapy. The disease is heterogeneous, and identifying specific molecular vulnerabilities has become a key strategy for improving outcomes. For a subset of these patients, particularly those with defects in DNA repair pathways, PARP inhibitors offer a targeted therapeutic avenue.

Poly (ADP-ribose) polymerase (PARP) enzymes are critical for repairing single-strand DNA breaks. When these enzymes are inhibited, single-strand breaks accumulate and convert into more severe double-strand breaks during DNA replication. In cells that already have deficiencies in homologous recombination repair (HRR), such as those with mutations in BRCA1, BRCA2, or ATM, PARP inhibition leads to synthetic lethality, effectively killing the cancer cells while sparing healthy cells. This mechanism underpins the utility of PARP inhibitors in cancers with specific genetic profiles.

Identifying the Right Patients

The efficacy of PARP inhibitors in prostate cancer is not universal; it is largely confined to patients whose tumors harbor specific genetic alterations. These are primarily mutations in genes involved in the homologous recombination repair (HRR) pathway. The most frequently implicated genes include BRCA1, BRCA2, and ATM, though other genes like CHEK2, PALB2, and RAD51C can also play a role. Identifying these mutations is paramount for patient selection.

Genetic testing, both germline and somatic, is essential to determine a patient's HRR mutation status. Germline testing identifies inherited mutations that may predispose individuals to cancer and can inform family risk. Somatic testing,

typically performed on tumor tissue or circulating tumor DNA (ctDNA), identifies mutations acquired by the tumor itself. The presence of these mutations dictates whether a patient is a candidate for PARP inhibitor therapy. Without this genetic information, the drugs are largely ineffective, making broad application inappropriate.

Clinical Role in Metastatic Castration-Resistant Prostate Cancer

For patients with mCRPC and documented HRR gene mutations, PARP inhibitors have demonstrated a clear benefit. These agents are typically used in later lines of therapy, after progression on standard androgen receptor pathway inhibitors (ARPIs) like enzalutamide or abiraterone. The goal is to delay disease progression, improve symptom control, and potentially extend survival in a population with limited options.

PARP inhibitors have shown activity as monotherapy in this setting. They have also been investigated in combination with ARPIs, with some data suggesting enhanced efficacy in specific subgroups. The decision to use a PARP inhibitor, either alone or in combination, depends on the patient's prior treatments, their specific HRR mutation profile, and overall clinical status. The Oxford Handbook of Oncology provides a concise reference for navigating these complex treatment pathways.

Safety and Tolerability Considerations

Like all systemic therapies, PARP inhibitors come with a distinct safety profile that clinicians must manage. Common adverse events include fatigue, nausea, anemia, and thrombocytopenia. These are generally manageable with dose modifications, supportive care, or temporary interruptions in treatment. Less common but more serious adverse events can include myelodysplastic syndrome (MDS) or acute myeloid leukemia (AML), though these are rare and typically occur after prolonged exposure or in patients with a history of prior cytotoxic chemotherapy.

Careful monitoring of complete blood counts is necessary throughout treatment to detect and manage hematologic toxicities promptly. Patients should be counselled on potential side effects and encouraged to report any new or worsening symptoms. The balance between efficacy and tolerability is a critical aspect of patient management, requiring ongoing assessment and communication.

Where the Evidence Stands

While PARP inhibitors have established a role in mCRPC with HRR mutations, several questions persist. The optimal sequencing of these agents relative to other therapies, such as chemotherapy or novel hormonal agents, is still an area of active investigation. Furthermore, the precise predictive value of different HRR mutations varies, with BRCA2 mutations generally conferring the strongest sensitivity to PARP inhibition. The role of PARP inhibitors in earlier disease stages, such as metastatic hormone-sensitive prostate cancer, is also being explored.

But the field is moving towards more precise patient stratification. The development of robust companion diagnostics to accurately identify HRR mutations is crucial for maximizing the benefit of these therapies and avoiding unnecessary exposure in patients unlikely to respond. The long-term safety profile, particularly regarding secondary malignancies, also warrants continued surveillance as more patients receive these treatments.

> **CLINICAL IMPLICATIONS**
>
> The integration of PARP inhibitors into prostate cancer management marks a significant step towards precision oncology. For clinicians, this means a fundamental shift in how mCRPC patients are evaluated. Genetic testing

for HRR mutations is no longer an academic exercise; it is a prerequisite for identifying a substantial subset of patients who stand to benefit from these targeted agents.

But the complexity of HRR mutations, and the varying degrees of sensitivity they confer, demands a nuanced approach. A positive BRCA2 mutation is a clear signal, but the implications of other HRR gene alterations can be less straightforward. This necessitates a deeper understanding of molecular pathology and a willingness to consult with genetic counsellors or molecular tumor boards.

For the pharmaceutical industry, the success of PARP inhibitors in prostate cancer reinforces the value of targeted drug development. It also highlights the importance of companion diagnostics, as the market for these drugs is intrinsically linked to accurate patient selection. This model, while effective, places a greater burden on healthcare systems to implement widespread and accessible genetic testing.

Patients, meanwhile, gain a new treatment option, but also face the added layer of genetic testing and the potential for complex discussions about inherited risk. The promise of personalized medicine is real, but it comes with increased demands on patient education and shared decision-making. The future of prostate cancer therapy will undoubtedly involve further stratification based on molecular profiles, making comprehensive genomic testing an indispensable part of routine care.

EDITORIAL & AI STANDARDS

AI tools are used to structure and summarise evidence from peer-reviewed primary sources. Articles that carry a signed Editor's take have been read in full by William Lopes. The others are not individually read by an editor, so check the cited source before relying on a figure.

REFERENCES

1. 1. Chakrabarti D, Albertsen P, Adkins A, et al. The contemporary management of prostate cancer. CA Cancer J Clin. 2025;75(6):552-586. doi:10.3322/caac.70020
2. 2. Horvat N, Gusmao M, Coelho FMA, et al. Uncommon Prostate Malignant Neoplasms. Top Magn Reson Imaging. 2020;29(1):31-45. doi:10.1097/RMR.0000000000000230
3. 3. Wei JT, Barocas D, Carlsson S, et al. Early Detection of Prostate Cancer: AUA/SUO Guideline Part I: Prostate Cancer Screening. J Urol. 2023;210(1):46-53. doi:10.1097/JU.0000000000003491
4. 4. Grobholz R. Neuroendocrine differentiation in prostate neoplasms. Pathologie (Heidelb). 2025;46(Suppl 1):26-34. doi:10.1007/s00292-025-01449-3
5. 5. Wei JT, Barocas D, Carlsson S, et al. Early Detection of Prostate Cancer: AUA/SUO Guideline Part II: Considerations for a Prostate Biopsy. J Urol. 2023;210(1):54-63. doi:10.1097/JU.0000000000003492
6. 6. Eastham JA, Auffenberg GB, Barocas DA, et al. Clinically Localized Prostate Cancer: AUA/ASTRO Guideline, Part I: Introduction, Risk Assessment, Staging, and Risk-Based Management. J Urol. 2022;208(1):10-18. doi:10.1097/JU.0000000000002757

LICENCE & RIGHTS

© 2026 The Life Science Feed. All rights reserved. This content is produced for medical education purposes. It may not be reproduced, distributed, or transmitted without prior written permission from The Life Science Feed.

MEDICAL DISCLAIMER

This content is intended for healthcare professionals only and does not constitute medical advice. Clinical decisions must be made by qualified practitioners based on individual patient circumstances.

FOLLOW THE LIFE SCIENCE FEED

Instagram @lifesciencefeed **LinkedIn** linkedin.com/company/thelifesciencefeed

thelifesciencefeed.com