# Four-Year Update of Phase 2 **ELARA Trial: Clinical Outcomes** of Tisagenlecleucel in Patients With High-Risk Relapsed/ **Refractory Follicular Lymphoma**

**<u>Catherine Thieblemont</u>**, MD<sup>1</sup>; Martin Dreyling, MD<sup>2</sup>; Michael J. Dickinson, MBBS, D Med Sci, FRACP, FRCPA<sup>3</sup>; Joaquin Martinez-Lopez, MD, PhD<sup>4</sup>; Arne Kolstad, MD, PhD<sup>5</sup>; Jason Butler, MBBS<sup>6</sup>; Monalisa Ghosh, MD<sup>7</sup>; Leslie L. Popplewell, MD, FACP, MPH<sup>8</sup>; Julio C. Chavez, MD<sup>9</sup>; Emmanuel Bachy, MD, PhD<sup>10</sup>; Koji Kato, MD, PhD<sup>11</sup>; Hideo Harigae, MD, PhD<sup>12</sup>; Marie José Kersten, MD, PhD<sup>13</sup>; Charalambos Andreadis, MD, MS<sup>14</sup>; Peter A. Riedell, MD<sup>15</sup>; P. Joy Ho, MBBS, FRACP, FRCPA<sup>16</sup>; Jose Antonio Pérez Simon, MD, PhD<sup>17</sup>; Andy Chen, MD, PhD<sup>18</sup>; Loretta J. Nastoupil, MD<sup>19</sup>; Bastian von Tresckow, MD<sup>20, 21</sup>; Andrés José María Ferreri, MD<sup>22</sup>; Takanori Teshima, MD, PhD<sup>23</sup>; Piers E.M. Patten, MBChB, FRCP, FRCPath, PhD<sup>24</sup>; Joseph P. McGuirk, DO<sup>25</sup>; Fritz Offner, MD, PhD<sup>26</sup>; Andreas Viardot, MD, PhD<sup>27</sup>; Pier Luigi Zinzani, MD, PhD<sup>28, 29</sup>; Ram Malladi, MD, PhD<sup>30</sup>; Aiesha Zia, MSc<sup>31</sup>; Rakesh Awasthi, PhD<sup>32</sup>; Davide Germano, PhD<sup>33</sup>; Roberto Javier Ramos, MD<sup>32</sup>; Pei Hsu, MD<sup>31</sup>; Stephen J. Schuster, MD<sup>34</sup>; Nathan H. Fowler, MD<sup>35</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Service d'hémato-oncologie, Hôpital Saint-Louis, Paris, France; <sup>2</sup>Department of Medicine III, Ludwig-Maximilians-University Hospital, Munich, Germany; <sup>3</sup>Sir Peter MacCallum Department of Oncology, The University of Melbourne, Melbourne, VIC, Australia; <sup>4</sup>Hospital Universitario 12 de Octubre, CIBER-ONC CB16/12/00369, CNIO, Madrid, Spain; <sup>5</sup>Oslo University Hospital, Oslo, Norway; <sup>6</sup>Royal Brisbane Hospital, Herston, QLD, Australia; <sup>7</sup>Division of Hematology/Oncology, University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, MI; <sup>8</sup>Department of Hematology and Hematopoietic Cell Transplantation, City of Hope, Atlanta, GA; <sup>9</sup>Department of Malignant Hematology, Moffitt Cancer Center, Tampa, FL; <sup>10</sup>Clinical Hematology, Hospices Civils de Lyon and Claude Bernard Lyon 1 University, Lyon, France; <sup>11</sup>Department of Hematology, Oncology, and Cardiovascular Medicine, Kyushu University Hospital, Fukuoka, Japan; <sup>12</sup>Department of Hematology, Tohoku University Graduate School of Medicine, Sendai, Japan; <sup>13</sup>Cancer Center Amsterdam, Amsterdam University Medical Centers, University of Amsterdam, Amsterdam, Netherlands; <sup>14</sup>Helen Diller Family Comprehensive Cancer Center, University of California San Francisco, San Francisco, CA; <sup>15</sup>David and Etta Jonas Center for Cellular Therapy, University of Chicago, Chicago, IL; <sup>16</sup>Royal Prince Alfred Hospital & University of Sydney, Sydney, NSW, Australia; <sup>17</sup>Department of Hematology, University Hospital Virgen del Rocio-IBIS, Universidad de Sevilla, Sevilla, Spain; <sup>18</sup>Oregon Health and Science University, Portland, OR; <sup>19</sup>The University of Texas MD Anderson Cancer Center, Houston, TX; <sup>20</sup>Department I of Internal Medicine, Medical Faculty and University Hospital Cologne, University of Cologne, Cologne, Germany; <sup>21</sup>Department of Hematology and Stem Cell Transplantation, West German Cancer Center (WTZ), University Hospital Essen, University of Duisburg-Essen, Essen, Germany; <sup>22</sup>Unit of Lymphoid Malignancies, Department of Onco-Haematology, IRCCS San Raffaele Scientific Institute, Milano, Italy; <sup>23</sup>Department of Hematology, Hokkaido University, Sapporo, Japan; <sup>24</sup>King's College London, London, United Kingdom; <sup>25</sup>University of Kansas Medical Center, Westwood, KS; <sup>26</sup>Universitair Ziekenhuis Ghent, Ghent, Belgium; <sup>27</sup>Department of Internal Medicine III, University Hospital of Ulm, Ulm, Germany; <sup>28</sup>Universitaria di Bologna, Istituto Di Ematologia, Bologna, Italy; <sup>29</sup>Institute of Hematology "Seràgnoli," University of Bologna, Bologna, Italy; <sup>30</sup>Hospitals NHS Foundation Trust, Cambridge University, Cambridge, United Kingdom; <sup>31</sup>Novartis Pharma AG, Basel, Switzerland; <sup>32</sup>Novartis Pharmaceuticals, East Hanover, NJ; <sup>33</sup>Autolus Therapeutics, Basel, Switzerland; <sup>34</sup>Abramson Cancer Center, University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia, PA; <sup>35</sup>BostonGene, Waltham, MA

## **KEY FINDINGS & CONCLUSIONS**

- Updated long-term follow-up from the ELARA trial continues to demonstrate robust durable responses >4 years post infusion, alongside a favorable safety profile
- Subgroup analyses suggest that most baseline high-risk disease characteristics (double-refractory disease, bulky disease, POD24, and high FLIPI) are not associated with inferior CRR, 48-month PFS, or 48-month OS
- Although lower CRR, 48-month PFS, and 48-month OS rates were reported for patients with high tumor burden, it is important to remember high-risk subgroup analyses were exploratory and some subgroups (ie, high tumor burden) had very limited patient numbers
- High frequencies of MRD-negative status were achieved among MRDevaluable patients, showing that tisagenlecleucel therapy can achieve deep response in treated patients



Scan to obtain Poster

https://tinyurl.com/ThieblemontPS2150 Copies of this poster obtained through Quick Response (QR) code are for personal use only and may not be reproduced without permission of the authors.

This study is sponsored by Novartis Pharma AG. Poster presented at the 30<sup>th</sup> European Hematology Association (EHA) Annual Congress; June 12-15, 2025; Milan, Italy.

•	Irea
	con
	- P
	– P
	fr
	li
	р
•	Chir
	acc
	dise
•	Tisa
	app
•	Her

# RESULTS

- Key patient subgroups at high risk among efficacy-evaluable patients (N = 94):
- Disease refractory to ≥2 prior regimens: 72%
- Bulky disease (>7 cm or at least 3 lesions >3 cm): 66% - POD24 from first anti-CD20 monoclonal antibody (mAb)-containing therapy: 65%
- High Follicular Lymphoma International Prognostic Index (FLIPI; ≥3): 61%
- High tumor burden (total metabolic tumor volume >510 mL<sup>9</sup>): 21%

## Table 1. Disease History and Baseline Patient Characteristics

Median age 18 to <65 ≥65 years ECOG PS ≥ Stage at stud Bone marrow Bulky diseas FLIPI high a Median no. POD24<sup>b</sup> Refractory of Refractory Double refra Refractory Prior autolo

## Safety

CD, cluster of differentia

PI3K, phosphatidylinosi <sup>a</sup>Bulky disease defined

<sup>b</sup>POD24 from first anti-CD20 mAb-containing therapy or rituximab monotherapy.

anticancer therapy

- Rates of infections (including grade 3) increased over time

## Table 2. AEs of Special Interest by Timing After Tisagenlecleucel Infusion

Preferred te Patients with Patients wit Cytokine rel Cytopenias Neutroper Neutrophi Anemia Thromboo Platelet co

> White blood Leukopeni Febrile neu Lymphocy

Lymphope Hypogamm Patients with

AE. adverse event

neurologica

References

## INTRODUCTION

atment strategies for patients with relapsed/refractory follicular lymphoma (r/r FL) require deration of prior therapies and patient-related factors<sup>1</sup>

atients with r/r FL typically have worsening treatment outcomes with increasing lines of therapy<sup>2</sup> tients with high-risk disease characteristics (eg, progression of disease within 2 years of ntline systemic therapy [POD24]) have an increased chance of suboptimal response to laterne therapies such as R-CHOP (rituximab plus cyclophosphamide, doxorubicin, vincristine, ednisone)<sup>3,</sup>

eric antigen receptor (CAR)-T cell therapy has demonstrated durable responses with otable safety profile in the treatment of patients with r/r FL, including those with high-risk se characteristics1,5-7

genlecleucel is an autologous cluster of differentiation (CD)-directed CAR-T cell therapy oved for the treatment of patients with r/r FL who have received ≥2 lines of prior therapy<sup>8</sup> we report the 4-year follow-up of efficacy, safety, and pharmacokinetics findings with a focus on patients with high-risk disease characteristics

## **Baseline Characteristics**

• As of March 27, 2024, 97 patients were infused; 94 patients were evaluable for efficacy with a median followup of 53 months (range: 46-62)

- The last patient in the ELARA trial was infused May 22, 2020

- Baseline and primary disease characteristics of the infused set can be found in Table 1
- Median age was 57 years (range: 29-73), with 25% of infused patients ≥65 years of age Median number of prior therapies was 4 (range: 2-13)
- Thirty-six percent of patients received a prior autologous hematopoietic cell transplant (HCT)
- Seventy-eight percent of patients were refractory to the last line of therapy

	Infused set (N = 97), n (%)
(range), years years	57.0 (29-73) 73 (75) 24 (25)
1 prior to infusion	42 (43)
dy entry III-IV	83 (86)
v involvement	37 (38)
e <sup>a</sup>	63 (65)
t study entry (≥3)	58 (60)
of prior therapies (range)	4 (2-13)
	61 (63)
isease to last line of therapy	76 (78)
o ≥2 regimens	69 (71)
ctory: anti-CD20 mAb + alkylating agent	66 (68)
PI3K inhibitors	14 (14)
ious HCT	35 (36)

• No new safety signals were reported since the last data cut. Adverse events (AEs) of special interest can be found summarized by timing post infusion in **Table 2** 

- Among the 47 patients who experienced cytokine release syndrome (CRS), all first events occurred within 8 weeks after infusion. Two patients experienced a second late onset CRS event; one in the context of a new

- Most cytopenias had their onset in the first-year post infusion

			Infused set (N	l = 97), n (%)				
	Within 8 week	ks of infusion	>8 weeks to infus	1 year post sion	>1 year post infusion			
rm	All grades	Grade ≥3	All grades	Grade ≥3	All grades	Grade ≥3		
at least one AE	88 (90.7)	68 (70.1)	70 (72.9)	42 (43.8)	38 (45.2)	24 (28.6)		
at least one infection <sup>a</sup>	20 (20.6)	6 (6.2)	37 (38.5)	12 (12.5)	31 (36.9)	16 (19.0)		
ase syndrome	47 (48.5)	0	1 (1.0)	0	1 (1.2)	1 (1.2)		
ia count decreased	33 (34.0) 15 (15.5) 23 (23 7)	32 (33.0) 15 (15.5) 13 (13 4)	21 (21.9) 7 (7.3) 7 (7.3)	18 (18.8) 7 (7.3) 5 (5.2)	5 (6.0) 2 (2.4) 4 (4.8)	5 (6.0) 1 (1.2) 3 (3.6)		
/topenia unt decreased	15 (15.5) 7 (7.2)	9 (9.3) 4 (4.1)	8 (8.3) 4 (4.2)	5 (5.2) 2 (2.1)	3 (3.6) 0	2 (2.4) 0		
d cell count decreased a utropenia	18 (18.6) 7 (7.2) 10 (10.3)	13 (13.4) 7 (7.2) 10 (10.3)	12 (12.5) 3 (3.1) 2 (2.1)	7 (7.3) 3 (3.1) 2 (2.1)	2 (2.4) 1 (1.2) 2 (2.4)	0 0 2 (2.4)		
e count decreased nia	10 (10.3) 6 (6.2)	8 (8.2) 6 (6.2)	2 (2.1) 4 (4.2)	0 4 (4.2)	0 1 (1.2)	0 1 (1.2)		
globulinemia at least one serious AE	9 (9.3) 10 (10.3)	0 1 (1.0)	7 (7.3) 2 (2.1)	1 (1.0) 2 (2.1)	2 (2.4) 2 (2.4)	0 1 (1.2)		

Grade ≥3 infections reported within 8 weeks of infusion included bacteremia, Campylobacter infection, Escherichia sepsis, human herpesvirus 6 encephalitis, neutropenic sepsis, pseudomonal sepsis, and staphylococcal sepsis. Grade >3 infections reported >8 weeks to 1 year post infusion included pneumonia, COVID-19, lower respiratory tract infection, tooth infection, coronavirus pneumonia, diverticulitis, pneumonia influenza, progressive multifocal leukoencephalopathy, pseudomonal bacteremia, and sepsis. Grade ≥3 infections reported >1 year post infusion included COVID-19, pneumonia, sinusitis, COVID-19 pneumonia, encephalitis, infection, pneumonia respiratory syncytial viral, rhinovirus infection, sepsis, skin infection, and varicella zoster virus infection.

1. Fowler NH et al. Target Oncol. 2024;19(4):495-510. 2. Link BK et al. Br J Haematol. 2019;184(4):660-663. 3. Casulo C et al. J Clin Oncol 2015;33(23):2516-2522. **4.** Sortais C et al. Ann Hematol. 2020;99(7):1595-1604. **5.** Jacobson CA et al. Lancet Oncol. 2022;23(1):91-103. 6. Fowler NH et al. Nat Med. 2022;28(2):325-332. 7. Dreyling M et al. Blood. 2024;143(17):1713-1725. 8. Kymriah. Prescribing information. Novartis Pharmaceuticals Corp. 9. Delfau-Larue MH et al. Blood Adv. 2018;2(7):807-816

# **METHO**

Study de ELARA stu

### Figure 1. E Screer cryopr



• Second primary malignancies (defined as any new cancer occurring post infusion regardless of tisagenlecleucel relationship) were reported in 6 patients (6.2%) and included basal cell carcinoma (N = 2), squamous cell carcinoma (N = 2), acute myeloid leukemia (N = 1), bladder transitional cell carcinoma (N = 1), Bowen's disease (N = 1), malignant melanoma (N = 1), metastatic squamous cell carcinoma (N = 1), and myelodysplastic syndrome (N = 1) • As of data cutoff, 19 patients have died during the study: 8 due to progressive disease, 10 due to AEs (1 patient each;

acute myeloid leukemia, bladder transitional cell carcinoma, cardiac arrest, CRS, encephalitis, gastrointestinal

## Efficacy

## Figure 2. Complete Response Rate by Subgroups

			CRR, n/N (%)	[95% CI]
All patients	All patients (N = 94)		65/94 (69.1)	[58.8-78.3]
Age	<65 years (N = 70) ≥65 years (N = 24)	- <b></b>	46/70 (65.7) 19/24 (79.2)	[53.4-76.7] [57.8-92.9]
Sex	Female (N = 30) Male (N = 64)	<b>_</b>	22/30 (73.3) 43/64 (67.2)	[54.1-87.7] [54.3-78.4]
Race	Asian (N = 11) White (N = 79)		9/11 (81.8) 54/79 (68.4)	[8.2-97.7] [56.9-78.4]
Ethnicity	Not Hispanic or Latino (N = 87)		60/87 (69.0)	[58.1-78.5]
FLIPI at study entry	Low/Intermediate (N = 37) High (N = 57)		29/37 (78.4) 36/57 (63.2)	[61.8-90.2] [49.3-75.6]
Histological grade	1-2 (N = 85) 3A (N = 9)		59/85 (69.4) 6/9 (66.7)	[58.5-79.0] [29.9-92.5]
Number of prior lines	≤2 lines (N = 24) 3-4 lines (N = 43) >4 lines (N = 27)		14/24 (58.3) 35/43 (81.4) 16/27 (59.3)	[36.6-77.9] [66.6-91.6] [38.8-77.6]
PI3K inhibitor use	Pre-treated (N = 19) Naive (N = 75)	<b>_</b>	15/19 (78.9) 50/75 (66.7)	[54.4-93.9] [54.8-77.1]
Prior HSCT therapy	Yes (N = 35) Relapsed ≤12 months (N = 14) Relapsed >12 months (N = 21) No (N = 59)		22/35 (62.9) 10/14 (71.4) 12/21 (57.1) 43/59 (72.9)	[44.9-78.5] [41.9-91.6] [34.0-78.2] [59.7-83.6]
Disease status to last line	Refractory (N = 74) Relapsed (N = 17)	- <b></b>	52/74 (70.3) 11/17 (64.7)	[58.5-80.3] [38.3-85.8]
POD24	Yes (N = 61) No (N = 33)	<b></b>	37/61 (60.7) 28/33 (84.8)	[47.3-72.9] [68.1-94.9]
Bulky disease at baseline	Yes (N = 62) No (N = 32)	<b></b>	41/62 (66.1) 24/32 (75.0)	[53.0-77.7] [56.6-88.5]
Bridging therapy	Yes (N = 44) No (N = 50)		29/44 (65.9) 36/50 (72.0)	[50.1-79.5] [57.5-83.8]
LDH at study entry	≤ULN (N = 53) >ULN (N = 41)		39/53 (73.6) 26/41 (63.4)	[59.7-84.7] [46.9-77.9]
Prior R2 use	Pre-treated (N = 16) Naive (N = 78)		12/16 (75.0) 53/78 (67.9)	[47.6-92.7] [56.4-78.1]
US sites	Yes (N = 26) No (N = 68)		17/26 (65.4) 48/68 (70.6)	[44.3-82.8] [58.3-81.0]
Double refractory	Yes (N = 65) No (N = 29)		44/65 (67.7) 21/29 (72.4)	[54.9-78.8] [52.8-87.3]
MTV at baseline	High tumor burden (N = 20) Low tumor burden (N = 72)		8/20 (40.0) 55/72 (76.4)	[19.1-63.9] [64.9-85.6]

(Figure 3)

DDS				•
sign				•
udy design, including	eligibility criteria and key	end points, can be found in <b>Figure 1</b>		•
LARA Study Design				
ning, apheresis, and reservation (N = 122)	Enrollment (N = 98)	——— Optional bridging chemotherapy <sup>a</sup> — ——— Tisagenlecleucel manufacturing —	Re-staging, lymphodepletion	Ti in
Key eligibility criteria		Stud	y treatment	
<ul> <li>≥18 years of age</li> <li>FL grade 1, 2, or 3A</li> <li>Relapsed/refractory disea</li> <li>No evidence of histologic</li> <li>No prior anti-CD19 therage</li> </ul>	ase <sup>d</sup> al transformation/FL3B by or allogeneic HCT	Tisag 0.6-6	enlecleucel dose range (single IV infusio ×10 <sup>8</sup> CAR-positive viable T cells	n) was

hemorrhage, infection, metastatic squamous cell carcinoma, pneumonia, and sepsis), and 1 from euthanasia

Disease was reassessed prior to infusion for all patients requiring bridging therapy. <sup>b</sup>Infusion was conducted on an in- or outpatient basis at investigator discretion. <sup>c</sup>Every 3 months until month 12, and every 6 months until end of study. <sup>d</sup>Refractory to ≥2nd line of

• Subgroup analyses suggest that most baseline high-risk disease characteristics (double-refractory disease, bulky disease, POD24, and high FLIPI) were not associated with inferior overall or complete response following tisagenlecleucel infusion in patients with r/r FL (**Figure 2**)

**Response rate**, %

CRR, complete response rate; FLIPI, Follicular Lymphoma International Prognostic Index; HSCT, hematopoietic stem cell transplant; LDH, lactate dehydrogenase; MTV, metabolic tumor volume; PI3K, phosphatidylinositol-3-kinase; POD24, progression of disease within 2 years of frontline systemic therapy; R2, lenalidomide + rituximab; ULN, upper limit of normal.

• The estimated 48-month progression-free survival (PFS) was 50.2% as assessed by independent review committee (IRC)

- Patients who had a best overall response of complete response had a 48-month probability of PFS of 66.1% - Among patient subgroups at high risk, 48-month PFS by IRC was 45.5% (POD24), 45.5% (high FLIPI), 45.2% (bulky disease), 52.8% (double-refractory), and 23.2% (high tumor burden)

## Acknowledgements

The authors sincerely thank the patients, their families, and the principal investigators and support staff

All analyses in this presentation were conducted by Novartis Pharmaceuticals Corporation.

Medical writing support was provided by Jay Shah, PhD, of Novartis Healthcare Pvt Ltd and was funded by Novartis Pharmaceuticals Corporation. Previously presented at the 2024 ASH Annual Meeting and Exposition; December 9-13, 2024; San Diego, CA, and Virtual. Poster: 3034.

Fig

Fig

Catherine Thieblemont: Current Employment and Ended employment in the past 24 months: University of Paris; Consultancy and Honoraria: Kite/Gilead, Takeda, BMS/Celgene, AbbVie, BeiGene, Janssen, Novartis, Regeneron; Honoraria: Bayer, Roche, Cellectis, ADC Therapeutics, AstraZeneca, Incyte, Sanofi, Amgen; Research Funding: Kite/Gilead, AbbVie, Roche.

Bridging therapy was allowed and was followed by disease re-evaluation before tisagenlecleucel infusion Cellular kinetics were determined by measurement of transgene levels by quantitative polymerase chain

Minimal residual disease (MRD) levels were determined via clonoSEQ<sup>®</sup> next-generation sequencing assay performed at Adaptive Biotechnologies (Seattle, WA, USA)

		(14 - 5	· <b>-</b> )									ulan i	OIIOW	-up.						
ion <sup>b</sup> (N = 97)										53	mon	ths (	range	: 46-6	62)					
									Lo	ong-te	erm s	afety	and	effica	acy fo	ollow	-up <sup>c</sup>			
							E	nd p	oints			-			-		-			
							Ρ	rimar	y: CR	R by I	RC									
							<b>S</b> O	<b>econo</b> S, sat	d <b>ary:</b> ( fety, ce	ORR, ellular	DOR, kinetio	PFS, cs								
all response rate; OS, ove mic therapy (including an	erall survival; PF n anti-CD20 antil	S, progre body and	ession-fr alkylatir	ee surviv ng agent	/al. ) or relaps	sed within	n 6 month	ns after ≥	2nd line c	of therapy	or after a	an autolog	gous HSC	Г.						
e 3. Progres	sion-Fr	ee S	urvi	val																
100		<del>0 @ E</del>	<b>à</b>	<b>`</b> []	~~															
80 - Censoring	times			Jage 1		~ <u>`</u>		~_		— <u>p</u>		_								
PR (N = 16)	- N - 04)	→	L		-~~_	~ <u>`</u>						٦.				<del></del>				
Number of	events (n)	_0						~		-0		~~~		- <b>@</b>		0 0				<b>)</b>
40 - PR: 12																				
Kaplan-Me	eier medians			ł																
PR: 5.9 mon	ths; 95% CI: N	E-INE 7-6.2																		>
		1/2 CI. 18 T O	3	6	9	12	15	18	21	24	27	30	33	36	39	42	45	48	51	
J					-	-	-	-		T	ime, I	mont	hs				. =		- •	
of patients still a	at risk										47	4 -		4.0	0.5	~ 1	00	4.4	1	
of patients still a	at risk	65 16	65 13	62 4	60 2	55 2	53 1	51 1	49 1	47 1	47 1	45 1	43 1	40 1	35 1	34 1	33 1	14	1	
r of patients still a nts ete response; NE, not es dian overall s cacy-evaluat mong patien	at risk <sup>stimable; PR, pa</sup> survival ble patie	65 16 94 Irtial resp (OS) nts oups	65 13 80 onse. ) was	62 4 67 s no	fon 2 62 t read	55 2 57 ched 48-n	53 1 54 as a	51 1 52 asses	49 1 50 ssed	47 1 48 by II RC v	47 48 RC (I	45 1 46 Figu	43 1 44 r <b>e 4</b> ); % (PC	40 1 41 48-n 0D24	), 73	34 1 35 n OS .2%	was	<sup>14</sup> 15 <b>79</b> .	3% i PI),	n
r of patients still a nts ete response; NE, not es dian overall s cacy-evaluat mong patien 3.0% (bulky	at risk stimable; PR, pa survival ble patie nt subgr disease Surviva	65 16 94 Intial resp (OS) nts oups e), 83	65 13 80 onse. ) was s at h 3.7%	62 4 67 s no nigh	60 2 62 t read risk, puble-	55 2 57 ched 48-n •refra	53 1 54 as a nonth	51 52 asses n OS y), a	49 50 ssed 5 by I nd 6	47 1 48 by II RC v 5.5%	47 1 48 RC (I vas 8 5 (hig	45 1 46 Figu 80.8% h tur	43 1 44 r <b>e 4</b> ); % (PC nor b	40 1 41 48-n 0D24 urder	35 1 36 nonth ), 73 n)	34 1 35 1 OS	was	<sup>14</sup> <sup>15</sup> 5 79.	3% i PI),	n
r of patients still a nts ete response; NE, not es dian overall s cacy-evaluat Among patien 3.0% (bulky <b>4. Overall</b>	at risk stimable; PR, pa survival ble patie nt subgro disease <b>Surviva</b>	65 94 Intial resp (OS) nts oups e), 83	65 13 80 onse. ) was s at h 3.7%	62 4 67 s no nigh	60 2 62 t read risk, puble-	55 2 57 ched 48-n •refra	53 1 54 as a nonth	51 52 asses n OS y), a	49 50 ssed 6 by I nd 6	47 1 48 by II RC v 5.5%	47 1 48 RC (I was 8 5 (hig	45 1 46 Figu 80.8% h tur	43 1 44 r <b>e 4</b> ); % (PC	40 1 41 48-n 0D24 urder	), 73	34 1 35 n OS	was	<sup>14</sup> <sup>1</sup> 5 79.	1 2 3% i PI),	n
r of patients still a nts ete response; NE, not es dian overall s cacy-evaluat Mong patien 3.0% (bulky	at risk stimable; PR, pa survival ble patie nt subgro disease <b>Surviva</b>	65 16 94 Intial resp (OS) nts oups e), 83	65 13 80 onse. ) was s at h 3.7%	62 4 67 s no nigh	fon 2 62 t read risk, puble-	55 2 57 ched 48-n •refra	53 1 54 as a nonth actor	51 52 asses n OS y), a	49 50 ssed 5 by I nd 6	47 1 48 by II RC v 5.5%	47 1 48 RC (I vas 8 5 (hig	45 1 46 Figu 30.8% h tur	43 1 44 re 4); % (PC nor b	40 1 41 48-n 0D24 urder	35 1 36 nonth ), 73 n)	34 1 35 n OS .2%	thigh	<sup>14</sup> 15 <b>79</b> .	1 2 3% i PI),	n
r of patients still a ints lete response; NE, not es dian overall s cacy-evaluat Among patien '3.0% (bulky e <b>4. Overall</b> 100 80 $\begin{bmatrix} Censoring CR (N = 65) $	at risk stimable; PR, pa survival ble patie nt subgr disease <b>Surviva</b> O times	65 16 94 Intial resp (OS) nts oups e), 83	65 13 80 onse. ) was s at h 3.7%	62 4 67 s no nigh	fon 2 62 t read risk, puble-	55 2 57 ched 48-n •refra	53 1 54 as a nonth actor	51 1 52 asses n OS y), a	49 1 50 ssed 6 by I nd 6	47 1 48 by II RC v 5.5%	47 1 48 RC (I was 8 5 (hig	45 1 46 Figu 30.8% h tur	43 1 44 re 4); % (PC nor b	40 1 41 48-n 0D24 urder	35 1 36 nonth ), 73 n)	34 1 35 n OS .2%	(high	79. The FLI	1 2 3% i PI),	n
r of patients still a ents lete response; NE, not es dian overall s cacy-evaluat Among patien 3.0% (bulky <b>e 4. Overall</b> 100 80 Censoring CR (N = 65 PR (N = 16) 00 All patients Number of	at risk stimable; PR, pa survival ole patie nt subgro disease <b>Surviva</b> <i>—</i> ©⊖ times ) (N = 94) events (n)	65 16 94 Intial resp (OS) nts oups e), 83 I □ ◇ 0	65 13 80 onse. ) was s at h 3.7%	62 4 67 s no nigh	60 2 62 t read risk, puble-	55 2 57 ched 48-n •refra	53 1 54 as a nonth actor	51 1 52 asses n OS y), a	49 1 50 ssed 5 by I nd 6	47 1 48 by II RC v 5.5%	47 1 48 RC (I was 8 5 (hig	45 1 46 Figu 30.8% h tur	43 1 44 re 4); % (PC nor b	40 1 41 48-n 0D24 urder	35 1 36 nonth ), 73 n)	34 1 35 n OS .2%	33 1 34 was (high	14 1 15 5 79. h FLI	1 2 3% i PI),	n
r of patients still a ents lete response; NE, not es dian overall s cacy-evaluat Among patien 73.0% (bulky e 4. Overall s 100 80 - Censoring CR (N = 65 PR (N = 16) All patients Number of CR: 7 40 - PR: 5	at risk stimable; PR, pa survival ole patie nt subgro disease Surviva Ole patie disease surviva ole patie nt subgro disease	65 16 94 Intial resp (OS) nts oups e), 83	65 13 80 onse. ) was s at h 3.7%	62 4 67 s no nigh	60 2 62 t read risk, puble-	55 2 57 ched 48-n •refra	53 1 54 as a nonth actor	51 1 52 asses n OS y), a	49 1 50 ssed 6 by I nd 6	47 1 48 by II RC v 5.5%	47 1 48 RC (I was 8 5 (hig	45 1 46 Figu 30.8% h tur	43 1 44 re 4); % (PC nor b	40 1 41 48-n 0D24 urder	35 1 36 nonth ), 73 n)	34 1 35 n OS .2%	33 1 34 was (high	14 1 15 79. TFLI	1 2 3% i PI),	n
r of patients still a ents lete response; NE, not es dian overall s cacy-evaluat Among patien 73.0% (bulky e 4. Overall $100^{-1}$ 80 - Censoring CR (N = 65 PR (N = 16) All patients Number of CR: 7 PR: 5 All patients: Kaplan-Me	at risk stimable; PR, pa survival ble patie nt subgr disease Surviva Outimes (N = 94) events (n)	65 16 94 Intial resp (OS) nts oups ≥), 83	65 13 80 onse. ) was s at h 3.7%	62 4 67 s no high	for 2 62 t read risk, puble-	55 2 57 ched 48-n •refra	53 1 54 as a nonth actor	51 1 52 asses n OS y), a	49 1 50 ssed 6 by I nd 6	47 1 48 by II RC v 5.5%	47 1 48 RC (I vas 8 5 (hig	45 1 46 Figu 30.8% h tur	43 1 44 re 4); % (PC nor b	40 1 41 48-n 0D24 urder	35 1 36 nonth ), 73 n)	34 1 35 n OS .2%	33 1 34 was (high	14 1 15 5 79. 1 FLI	1 2 3% i PI),	n
r of patients still a ents lete response; NE, not est dian overall s cacy-evaluat Among patien 3.0% (bulky <b>e 4. Overall</b> 100 80 - Censoring CR (N = 65 PR (N = 16) 60 - All patients Number of CR: 7 PR: 5 All patients: Number of CR: NE mo PR: NE mo	at risk stimable; PR, pa survival ole patie nt subgro disease Surviva Gisease (N = 94) events (n) : 18 ier medians nths; 95% CI: 1 nths; 95% CI: 1	65 16 94 Intial resp (OS) nts oups e), 83 I	65 13 80 onse. ) was s at h 3.7%	62 4 67 s no nigh	60 2 62 t read risk, puble-	55 2 57 ched 48-n •refra	53 1 54 as a nonth actor	51 1 52 asses n OS y), a	49 1 50 ssed 5 by I nd 6	47 1 48 by II RC v 5.5%	47 1 48 RC (I was 8 6 (hig	45 1 46 Figu 30.8% h tur	43 1 44 re 4); % (PC nor b	40 1 41 48-n 0D24 urder	35 1 36 nonth ), 73 n)	34 1 35 n OS .2%	33 1 34 (high	14 1 15 5 79. h FLI	1 2 3% i PI),	n
r of patients still a ints lete response; NE, not es dian overall s cacy-evaluat Among patien 3.0% (bulky <b>4. Overall</b> $100^{-1}$ 80 - Censoring CR (N = 65 PR (N = 16) 60 - All patients Number of CR: 7 40 - PR: 5 All patients: Kaplan-Me CR: NE mo PR: NE mo All patients: (0 - All patients)	at risk stimable; PR, pa survival ple patie nt subgre disease Surviva Gisease (N = 94) events (n) (N = 94) events (n) 18 ier medians nths; 95% CI: I nths; 95% CI: I NE months; 9	65 16 94 Intial resp (OS) nts oups e), 83 I 	65 13 80 onse. ) was s at h 3.7%	62 4 67 s no nigh o (do	for for for for for for for for for for	55 2 57 ched 48-n •refra	53 1 54 as a nonth actor	51 1 52 asse: n OS y), a	49 1 50 ssed 5 by I nd 6	47 1 48 by II RC v 5.5%	47 1 48 RC (I was 8 6 (hig	45 1 46 Figu 30.8% h tur	43 1 44 <b>re 4</b> ); % (PC nor b	40 1 41 48-n 0D24 urder	35 1 36 nonth ), 73 n)	34 1 35 n OS .2%	i 34 was (high	14 1 15 5 79. 1 FLI	1 2 3% i PI), ●	n
r of patients still a ints lete response; NE, not es dian overall s cacy-evaluat Among patien 3.0% (bulky <b>4. Overall</b> 100 80 <b>Censoring</b> CR (N = 65 PR (N = 16) 60 All patients <b>Number of</b> CR: 7 40 PR: 5 All patients: <b>Kaplan-Me</b> CR: NE mo PR: NE mol All patients: <b>Kaplan-Me</b> CR: NE mol	at risk stimable; PR, pa survival ple patie nt subgra disease Surviva O times (N = 94) events (n) (N = 94) events (n) 18 ier medians nths; 95% CI: I nths; 95% CI: I	65 16 94 Intial resp (OS) nts oups e), 83 I 	65 13 80 onse. ) wa: 5 at h 3.7%	62 4 67 s no high b (do	for treat risk, puble-	55 2 57 ched 48-n •refra	53 $1$ $54$ as a nonthactor	51 1 52 asses n OS y), a	49 1 50 ssed 5 by I nd 6 	47 1 48 by II RC v 5.5%	47 1 48 RC (I vas 8 5 (hig	45 1 46 Figu 30.8% h tur	43 1 44 <b>re 4</b> ); % (PC nor b	40 1 41 48-n 0D24 urder	35 1 36 nonth ), 73 n)	34 1 35 n OS .2%	33 1 34 was (high	14 1 15 579. FLI	1 2 3% i PI),	n 6
r of patients still a nts ete response; NE, not es dian overall s cacy-evaluat Among patien 3.0% (bulky <b>e 4. Overall</b> 100 80 Censoring CR (N = 65) PR (N = 16) All patients <b>Number of</b> CR: 7 PR: 5 All patients: <b>Xaplan-Me</b> CR: NE mong $PR: NE mongAll patients:CR: NE mongR: NE mongOCR: NE mongCR: NE mongOCR: NE mongOCR: NE mongOCR: NE mongOCR: NE mongCR: NE mongCR: NE mongCR: NE mongCR: NE mongCR: NE mongCR: NE mongOCR: NE mongCR: $	at risk stimable; PR, pa survival ple patie nt subgra disease Surviva G times (N = 94) events (n) (N = 94) events (n) 18 ier medians nths; 95% CI: I nths; 95% CI: I NE months; 95% CI: I CI ME months; 95% CI: I CI ME months; 95% CI ME months; 95	65 16 94 Intial resp (OS) nts oups e), 83 I □ ◇ 0 I □ ◇ 0 I NE-NE 18.1-NE 15% Cl: 6 5% 65	65 13 80 onse. ) Wa: 5 at l 3.7%	62 4 67 s no nigh 5 (do	60 2 62 t read risk, puble-	55 2 57 ched 48-n •refra	53 1 54 as a nonth actor	51 1 52 asses n OS y), a	49 1 50 ssed 5 by I nd 6 1 27 27 Tir 57	47 1 48 by II RC v 5.5%	47 1 48 RC (I was 8 6 (hig	45 1 46 Figu 30.8% h tur	43 1 44 re 4); % (PC nor b 39 4: 52 5	40 1 41 48-n 0D24 urder urder	35 1 36 nonth ), 73 n)	34 1 35 n OS .2%	33 1 34 was (high	14 1 15 579. ↑ FLI	1 2 3% i PI),	n
r of patients still a nts ete response; NE, not es dian overall s cacy-evaluat Among patien 3.0% (bulky <b>4. Overall</b> 100 80 <b>Censoring</b> CR (N = 65 PR (N = 16) 60 All patients <b>Number of</b> CR: 7 PR: 5 All patients: <b>Xaplan-Me</b> CR: NE mo PR: NE mo All patients: <b>Xaplan-Me</b> CR: NE mo	at risk stimable; PR, pa survival ole patie nt subgra disease Surviva O times (N = 94) events (n) (N = 94) events (n) 18 ier medians nths; 95% CI: 1 nths; 95% CI: 2 NE months; 9 0 3 at risk 65 65 16 15 94 92	65 16 94 Intial resp (OS) nts oups e), 83 I I I I I I I I I I I I I I I I I I I	65 13 80 onse. ) wa: 5 at h 3.7%	62 4 67 s no nigh 5 (do	60 2 62 t read risk, puble- 2 15 2 15 2 11 78	55 2 57 ched 48-n •refra	53 1 54 as a nonth actor	51 1 52 asses n OS y), a	49 1 50 ssed 5 by I nd 6 nd 6	47 1 48 by II RC v 5.5%	47 1 48 RC (I vas 8 5 (hig	45 1 46 Figu 30.8% h tur 30.8% h tur	43 1 44 re 4); % (PC nor b 	40 1 41 48-n 0D24 urder urder 2 45 1 50 5 59	35 1 36 nonth ), 73 n)	34 1 35 n OS .2%	33 1 34 was (high €	14 1 15 57 57 4 0 5	1 2 3% i PI), 60 0 1	n

Kaplan-Meier medians 20 T CR: NE months: 95% CI: NE-NE PR: 10.0 months; 95% CI: 6.0-29.6 All patients: NE months: 95% CI: 53.3-NE 0 3 6 9 12 15 18 21 24 27 30 33 36 39 42 45 48 51 54 57 60 Time, months Number of patients still at risk 

 65
 65
 62
 59
 56
 53
 50
 50
 49
 48
 47
 47
 46
 45
 44
 36
 24
 15
 2

 16
 15
 13
 6
 4
 4
 3
 2
 2
 1
 1
 1
 1
 1
 1
 1
 1
 1
 1
 0
 0

 94 91 83 72 67 64 61 57 56 54 52 51 51 49 48 46 37 25 16 2 0 All patients

CR, complete response; NE, not estimable; PR, partial response.

MRD data were available for 31 of 94 patients (33.0%)

- 90.3% of evaluable patients (28/31) achieved MRD negativity at any time point (**Table 3**)

- 63.6% of patients with MRD-negative status at month 6 (7/11) are ongoing without relapse
- All 5 patients with MRD-positive status at month 6 relapsed

### Table 3. MRD-Negative Rate by Timing After Tisagenlecleucel Infusion

	MRD-negative (N = 31 <sup>a</sup> ), % (n/N)
ay 28	82.0 (22/27)
onth 3	75.0 (12/16)
onth 6	69.0 (11/16)
onth 12	76.0 (13/17)
ny time	90.0 (28/31)
minimal residual disease.	

• CAR transgene persistence was observed for up to 1680 days; median Tlast (time to last measurable concentration) was 210 days (range: 13-1680)

### Disclosures

<sup>a</sup>Patients evaluated for MRD response