Myelodysplastic Syndromes: What is new in 2020?



Richard M. Stone, MD

Chief of Staff

Director, Translational Research, Leukemia Division, Medical Oncology

Dana-Farber Cancer Institute

Professor of Medicine

Harvard Medical School

Boston, MA

Disclosures- Richard M. Stone, MD

- Consulting relationships past three years:
 - AbbVie*; Actinium, Agios*; Amgen; Argenix (DSMB); Arog*; Astellas; AztraZenaca; Biolinerx, Celgene (includes DSMB and steering committee); Elevate Bio, Fujifilm, Janssen; Juno; Macrogenics; Novartis*; Ono; Orsenix; Pfizer; Roche; Stemline, Sumitomo; Syndax; Syntrix (DSMB only); Syros; Takeda (DSMB), Trovagene
 - * denotes support to my institution for clinical trials on which I was local PI
- Securities, employment, promotional activities, intellectual property, gifts, grants
 - None

Dana-Farber Cancer Institute





Dana/Mayer Building (Office)



Brigham and Women's Hospital



(Clinic)

Myelodysplastic Syndromes: Outline

- Genetics and Prognosis
- Therapy of lower risk disease
 - Lenalidomide in 5q-
 - Erythropoietin (EPO) +/- G-CSF; Lenalidomide +EPO
 - Luspatercept
 - Maybe
 - » Low dose Hypomethylating agent (HMA), Iron chelation
 - Horizon
 - » roxudostat

Therapy of Higher risk disease

- HMA (including now: Oral decitabine/cytidine deaminase inhibitor=ASTX727), alloSCT if possible, remains the standard
 - Maybe
 - » add ventoclax, IDH inhibitor-CSF
 - Horizon
 - » CPI, TP53 refolding, aCD47



Risk Assessment in Myelodysplastic Syndromes

Key Information for MDS Risk Assessment in 2020					
Host Factors					
Age					
Comorbid conditions					
Performance status					
Disease Factors					
Proportion of marrow blasts					
Number and degree of peripheral blood cytopenias					
Cytogenetics / karyotype					
Transfusion burden					
Other marrow features: presence of heavy marrow fibrosis , ring sideroblasts (if low risk/only anemic – to distinguish RA from RARS)					

While not yet routinely part of risk assessment, molecular features will become critical soon.

International Prognostic Scoring System (IPSS) (1997) Risk Stratification

	Score						
Prognostic Variable	0	0.5	1.0	1.5	2.0		
Marrow blasts (%)	< 5%	5%-10%		11%-20%	21%-30%		
Karyotype class*	Good	Intermediate	Poor		-		
# of cytopenias**	0 or 1	2 or 3					

* Karyotype class: Good = normal, -Y, del(5q) alone, del(20q) alone; Poor = chromosome 7 abnormalities or complex; Intermediate = other karyotypes; ** Cytopenias: Hb < 10 g/dL, ANC < 1800/uL, platelets < 100,000/uL

Risk Groups						
Low Int-1 Int-2 High						
IPSS	0	0.5-1.0	1.5-2.0	2.5-3.5		

IPSS-R

Risk group	Points	% patients (n=7,012; AML data on 6,485)	Median survival, years	Median survival for pts under 60 years	Time until 25% of patients develop AML, years
Very low	0-1.5	19%	8.8	Not reached	Not reached
Low	2.0-3.0	38%	5.3	8.8	10.8
Intermed	3.5-4.5	20%	3.0	5.2	3.2
High	5.0-6.0	13%	1.5	2.1	1.4
Very high	>6.0	10%	0.8	0.9	0.7



Based on cytogenetics, marrow blasts, hgb, ANC, plt

Using IPSS-R: 27% of IPSS lower risk "upstaged" 18% of IPSS higher risk "downstaged"

Greenberg P et al Blood 2012 Sep 20;120(12):2454-65.

Recurrent Genetic Mutations in MDS



Haferlach et al., Leukemia (2014) 28, 241-247

"CHIP" Mutation Distribution (increases with age ;12% by age 80)



<u>C</u>lonal <u>H</u>ematopoiesis of <u>I</u>ndeterminate <u>P</u>otential (CHIP)



Impact of Mutations by IPSS Group



Bejar R, et al. N Engl J Med. 2011;364(26):2496-2506.



MDS: New Approaches for Lower Risk-I

- Lenalidomide (10 mg/d x 21d)+Erythropoietin (60k/wk), at 4 weeks higher major erythroid response (26%) than Lenalidomide alone (10%) in non del 5q- (p=0.018); E2905
 - List et al., ASH 2016, abstract 223; Toma A, et al, <u>Leukemia</u> 2016, 30: 897-905.
- Activin trap: luspateracept (Now approved in RARS!) See subsequent slides
 - Fenaux et al., NEJM 2020

MDS: New Approaches for Lower Risk-II

- Reset Oxygen sensing: roxudostat
 - Prevents HIF1α degradation
 - Based on work done by Wm Kaelin DFCI, Semenza, JHU and Ratcliffe, Crick



- Short course hypomethylating agents for lower risk pts
 - 3d decitabine higher ORR (70)% than 3d azacytidine (33%)
 - Jabbour et al., <u>Blood</u>. 2017 130(13):1514-1522
 - Ongoing MDS consortium rand trial of 3 low dose HMA arms
- Splicesome inhibitors in those with U2AF1, SF3B1, SRSF2, ZRSR2 mutations (First study H3B8800- not active (Steensma ASH 2019)

MEDALIST Luspatercept Trial

- Luspatercept is a first-in-class erythroid maturation agent that neutralizes select TGF-β superfamily ligands to inhibit aberrant Smad2/3 signaling and enhance late-stage erythropoiesis in MDS models¹
- In a phase II study in LR, non-del(5q) MDS, luspatercept yielded a high frequency of transfusion-reduction or RBC-TI in patients with MDS-RS (52%) vs. other subtypes (30%)²



1. Suragani RN, et al. *Nat Med*. 2014;20:408.;

2. Platzbecker U, et. A. Lancet Oncol 2017; 18:1338.

MEDALIST Trial

Study Design - A Randomized, Double-Blind, Placebo-Controlled, Phase 3 Study



MEDALIST Trial

Primary Endpoint Achieved: Red Blood Cell – Transfusion Independence) ≥ 8 Weeks



AE: No excess Gr ³/₄ but about Gr 1/2 fatigue, GI, dizzy/HA 20 % w Luspatercept (<10% in placebo); clinical benefit extends to 92 weeks (Fenaux ASH 2019)

Iron Chelation may have a role in heavily transfused lower risk pts 2:1 randomization of defersirox v placebo with primary EP of time to an event (CHF, LFT, AML)



Trend toward OS benefit

All patients*		Log-rank test	Cox model	
	Event/N (%)	Median time (95% CI), days†	P value [‡]	Hazard ratio (95% CI)§
Deferasirox	57/149 (38.3)	1907 (1440, NE)	0.200	0.922 (0.54, 4.29)
Placebo	33/76 (43.4)	1509 (1095, 1804)	0.200	0.032 (0.34, 1.20)

*Both log-rank test and Cox proportional hazards model were stratified by stratification factors; [†]Median time to event and 95% CI generated by Kaplan– Meier estimation; [‡]Exploratory *P* value is one-tailed and based on the stratified log-rank test; [§]Based on a Wald test from the Cox model



Introduction to VEN+HMA in MDS

- 30% of MDS have Intermediate-2/high IPSS risk disease (median OS 0.4-1.2 years)¹
- Azacitidine (Aza) has been the standard of care for higher-risk MDS based on AZA-001 showing median OS of 24.5 mo c/w doctor's choice -9.4 mo²

- CR (17%), PR (12%), HI-E (40%), HI-N (19%), HI-P (33%)

- To date, no doublet has produced superior results in RCT (e.g. + HDAC inhib or len, Sekeres M, et al JCO 2017)
- The BCL-2 inhibitor venetoclax (Ven) combined with Aza induces rapid clinical responses in older patients with AML³
- Tolerability and efficacy of Ven combined with Aza in MDS unknown
- Phase I trial of IPSS Int-2 or high (no t-MDS,CMML, or OL), <20% blasts, results first reported ASH 2019⁴

21

Response Rates (IWG 2006)



Excludes patients of arm C (Aza only); Objective response rate (ORR) includes [complete remission (CR) + marrow complete remission (mCR) + partial remission (PR)]; # of patients with PR=0;

DoR: Duration of response; HI: hematological improvement; HI-E: hematologic improvement in erythroids; HI-N: hematologic improvement in neutrophils; HI-P: hematologic improvement in platelet count; n: patients with favorable outcomes; N: patients eligible for evaluating outcomes Data Cut-off: 21 AUG 2019

Wei A et al, ASH 2019

22

Hematological Improvement



Note: Evaluation of HI-E required baseline hemoglobin <11 g/dL, HI-P platelet counts (unsupported) <100 × 10⁹/L, HI-N neutrophil counts <1.0 × 10⁹/L Overall HI response rate included subjects eligible for HI assessment at baseline and achieving any component of HI-E + HI-P + HI-N

HI: hematological improvement; HI-E: hematologic improvement in erythroids; HI-N: hematologic improvement in neutrophils; HI-P: hematologic improvement in platelet count; n: patients with favorable outcomes; N= patients eligible for evaluating outcomes

*The proportion of patients with Overall HI is less than proportion of patients with HI-P as the eligibility to assess HI is dependent on the baseline cell counts and the number of patients in the groups varied
Data Cut-off: 21 AUG 2019

Wei A et al, ASH 2019

Ven (generally 400 mg/d) With or Without Aza in R/R MDS: ORR



Data cutoff: Aug 30, 2019.

ClinicalTrials.gov. NCT02966782. Zeidan A, et al. ASH 2019. Abstract 565.

Ven With or Without Aza in R/R MDS: PFS



Ven monotherapy: Ven 400 mg or 800 mg; Ven + Aza combination: Ven doses 100, 200, or 400 mg + Aza 75 mg/m²

Zeidan A, et al. ASH 2019. Abstract 565.

Data cutoff: Aug 30, 2019.

ClinicalTrials.gov. NCT02966782. Zeidan A, et al. ASH 2019. Abstract 565.

ORAL HMA in MDS?

1) oral Aza- useful in AML maintenance (Wei A, et al < LBA ASH 2019) and b) ASTX727 (Cedazuridine/Decitabine)

- Current HMA treatment poses significant patient burden due to 5 to 7 days per month of parenteral administration in a clinic setting
- Oral bioavailability of HMAs decitabine and azacitidine is limited due to rapid degradation by CDA in the gut and liver



- Cedazuridine is a novel CDA inhibitor

Garcia-Manero G, et al. ASH 2019. Abstract 846.

ASCERTAIN Trial: Oral ASTX727 (Cedazuridine/Decitabine) vs IV Decitabine, Phase 3 Study in MDS/CMML

ASTX727 is an oral, fixed-dose combination of cedazuridine and decitabine



Major entry criteria

- Candidates for IV decitabine
- ECOG PS 0 to 1
- Life expectancy of \geq 3 months
- Adequate organ function
- 1 prior cycle of HMA is allowed

Primary endpoint

 Total 5-d decitabine AUC equivalence (oral/IV 90% CI between 80% and 125%)

Secondary endpoints

- Efficacy: response rate; TI; duration of response; leukemia-free and OS
- Safety of ASTX727
- Max LINE-1 demethylation

Garcia-Manero G, et al. ASH 2019. Abstract 846.

ASCERTAIN Trial: 5-Day Decitabine AUC Equivalence

Decitabine		ľ	V DEC	Oral	ASTX727	Ratio of Geo LSM	Intrasubject
5-Day AUC ₀₋₂	₄ (h∙ng/mL)	Ν	Geo LSM	Ν	Geo LSM	Oral/IV, % (90% CI)	(% CV)
Primary analysis	Paired*	123	864.9	123	855.7	98.9 (92.7, 105.6)	31.7

*Paired patient population: patients who received both ASTX727 and IV decitabine in the randomized first 2 cycles with adequate PK samples.

- Study met its primary endpoint with high confidence: oral/IV 5-day decitabine AUC ~99% with 90% CI of ~93% to 106%
- All sensitivity and secondary PK AUC analyses confirmed findings from primary analysis
- Demethylation similar to IV decitabine
- AEs similar to 5 d decitabine
- Efficacy data similar to that reported in phase II data: CR-12%, marrow CR-46%

Garcia-Manero G, et al. ASH 2019. Abstract 846.

Enasidenib in Higher-Risk *IDH2*-Mutated MDS: Response Rates

	Total (N = 31)	Arm A (Untreated) Aza + ENA (N = 13)	Arm B (HMA-Failure) ENA (N = 18)
ORR , n (%)	21 (68)	11 (85)	10 (56)
Complete remission	8 (26)	3 (23)	5 (28)
Partial remission	1 (3)	0 (0)	1 (6)
Marrow complete remission	9 (29)	7 (54)	2 (11)
HI only	3 (10)	1 (8)	2 (11)
No response, n (%)	10 (32)	2 (15)	8 (44)
SD	9 (29)	2 (15)	7 (39)
PD	1 (3)	0 (0)	1 (6)

Richard-Carpentier G, et al. ASH 2019. Abstract 678.

12 pts w R/R MDS rx w ivosidenib 500 mg/d: 5 (42%) CR

These materials are provided to you solely as an educational resource for your personal use. Any commercial use or distribution of these materials or any portion thereof is strictly prohibited? NEJM 2019

Allogeneic Transplant in MDS: Approximation of Life Expectancy (Years)



TP53 mutated MDS *Poor prognosis Post-SCT due to early relapse*



Lindsley C, et al. N Engl J Med. 2017;376(6):536-547.

Pevonedistat: NEDD8-A-E inhibitor in MSA

- Pevonedistat is the first small-molecule inhibitor of the NEDD8-activating enzyme (NAE)^{4,5}
 - o In AML, pevonedistat has shown encouraging clinical activity in combination with azacitidine and was well tolerated⁶



AE, adverse event; AML, acute myeloid leukemia; CMML, chronic myelomonocytic leukemia; MDS, myelodysplastic syndromes; NEDD8, neural precursor cell expressed, developmentally downregulated 8.

Sekeres MA, et al. J Clin Oncol 2017;35:2745–53; 2. Garcia-Manero G, et al. Cancer 2017;123:994-1002;
 Prebet T, et al. J Clin Oncol 2014;32:1242–8; 4. Soucy TA, et al. Nature 2009;458:732–6;
 Brownell JE, et al. Mol Cell 2010;37:102–11; 6. Swords RT, et al. Blood 2018;131:1415–24

Study design

NCT02610777: Phase II, randomized, open-label, global, multicenter study [proof of concept]



Study endpoints

- EFS (defined as time to death or transformation to AML in higher-risk MDS/CMML or death in low-blast AML): The study was powered on EFS as the original primary endpoint
- OS: Original secondary endpoint, changed to primary endpoint based on regulatory feedback after enrollment
- ORR: Secondary endpoint

EFS, event-free survival; HMA, hypomethylating agent; IPSS-R, Revised International Prognostic Scoring System; IV, intravenous; ORR, objective response rate; OS: overall survival; SC, subcutaneous; SCT, stem cell transplant.

PRESENTED AT: 2020ASCO #ASCO20 ANNUAL MEETING #ASCO20 Sildes are the property of the author, permission required for reuse. Bildes are the property of the author, permission required for reuse. Bildes are the property of the author, permission required for reuse. Bildes are the property of the author, permission required for reuse. Bildes are the property of the author, permission required for reuse. Bildes are the property of the author, permission required for reuse. Bildes are the property of the author, permission required for reuse. Bildes are the property of the author, permission required for reuse. Bildes are the property of the author, permission required for reuse. Bildes are the property of the author, permission required for reuse. Bildes are the property of the author, permission required for reuse. Bildes are the property of the author, permission required for reuse. Bildes are the property of the author, permission required for reuse. Bildes are the property of the author, permission required for reuse. Bildes are the property of the author, permission required for reuse. Bildes are the property of the author, permission required for reuse. Bildes are the property of the author, permission required for reuse. Bildes are the property of the author, permission required for reuse. Bildes are the property of the author, permission required for reuse. Bildes are the permission reuse are the property of the author, permission required for the permission reuse are the permission reuse are

About 70 pts per arm, about 8, 16 per arm with CMML, low blast AML, respectively

Objective response: Disease subgroups

34.6 months **Pevonedistat** 79.3% ORR (95% CI 11.53-34.60) + azacitidine 56.7% Azacitidine 13.1 months (95% CI 12.02–NE) 51.7% CR 26.7% 0 4 8 12 16 20 24 28 32 36 3.4% Pevonedistat + azacitidine PR Median duration of response (months) 13.3% Azacitidine 24.1% HI 16.7% **Rate of transfusion independence:** 0.0% 20.0% 40.0% 60.0% 80.0% 69.2% (pevonedistat + azacitidine) versus 50.0% (azacitidine) Patients (%)

Higher-risk MDS (response-evaluable patients, n=59)

Low-blast AML and higher-risk CMML

- In low-blast AML, ORR was 52.9% (pevonedistat + azacitidine) versus 60.0% (azacitidine) in response-evaluable patients (n=32)
- In higher-risk CMML, ORR was 77.8% (pevonedistat + azacitidine) versus 75.0% (azacitidine) in response-evaluable patients (n=17)



Well tolerated, no increased F/N in doublet

Ades, L, et al, ASCO, 2020

EFS and OS: Higher-risk MDS



*EFS defined as time to death or transformation to AML in higher-risk MDS/CMML or death in low-blast AML.

presented at: 2020 ANN	20 ASCO NUAL MEETING	#ASCO20 Slides are the property of the author, permission required for reuse.	PRESENTED BY:	Lionel Adès	
----------------------------------	--------------------------------	---	---------------	-------------	--

EFS and OS: Higher-risk CMML



*EFS defined as time to death or transformation to AML in higher-risk MDS/CMML or death in low-blast AML.

PRESENTED AT:	2020 ASCO ANNUAL MEETING	#ASCO20 Slides are the property of the author, permission required for reuse.	PRESENTED BY:	Lionel Adès	12
---------------	-----------------------------	---	---------------	-------------	----

Targeting TP53 Mutations in MDS/AML via APR-246



A. Fersht et al. (2010) Prot. Sci; Q. Zhang et al. (2018) Cell Death Disease; H. Furukawa et al. (2018) Cancer Sci.

Sallman D, et al, ASH 2019

Response to Treatment in Evaluable Patients (n=45) APR-246+AZA



These materials are provided to you solely as an educational resource for your personal use. Any commercial use or distribution of these materials or any portion thereof is strictly prohibited.

Overall Survival (ITT): APR-246+aza



44% cleared TP53 to <5% VAF

These materials are provided to you solely as an educational resource for your personal use. Any commercial use or distribution of these materials or any possibility of the second sole of the second sole

Pivotal Phase 3 MDS Trial in TP53-Mutant MDS

• Randomized study of frontline azacitidine ± APR-246 in *TP53*-mutant MDS



- Intermediate-/high-/very high-risk TP53mutant MDS
- Primary endpoint: CR rate
- Secondary endpoints: ORR, DoR, PFS, LFS, OS, transplant rate

- Status
 - Enrollment commenced in January 2019
 - Currently targeting full enrollment in first quarter 2020
 - Fast Track Designation for MDS: granted by FDA in April 2019
 - Orphan Drug Designations for MDS: granted by FDA in April 2019 and EMA in July 2019

ClinicalTrials.gov. NCT03745716.

CD47

 Major macrophage immune checkpoint and "do not eat me" signal in myeloid malignancies including MDS and AML



- CD47 is a "do not eat me" signal on cancers that enables macrophage immune evasion
- Increased CD47 expression predicts worse prognosis in patients with AML

Veillette, A, et al. *J Clin Oncol.* 37:1012-1014; Chao MP, et al. *Curr Opin Immunol.* 2012;24:225-32; Majeti R, et al. *Cell.* 2009 Jul 23;138(2):286-99.; Sallman D, et al. ASH 2019. Abstract 569.

Magrolimab + AZA Induces High Response Rates in MDS and AML

Best Overall Response	1L MDS N=33	1L AML N=25
ORR	30 (91%)	16 (64%)
CR	14 (42%)	10 (40%)
CRi	NA	4 (16%)
PR	1 (3%)	1 (4%)
MLFS/marrow CR	8 (24%) 4 with marrow CR + HI	1 (4%)
Hematologic improvement (HI)	7 (21%)	NA
SD	3 (9%)	8 (32%)
PD	0	1 (4%)

Response assessments per 2006 IWG MDS criteria and 2017 AML ELN criteria. Patients with at least 1 posttreatment response assessment are shown; all other patients are on therapy and are too early for first response assessment, except for 2 MDS patients not evaluable (withdrawal of consent) and 3 AML patients (1 AE, 2 early withdrawal).



Four patients not shown due to missing values; <5% blasts imputed as 2.5%. *Baseline bone marrow blasts ≤5%.

- Magrolimab + AZA induces a 91% ORR (42% CR) in MDS and 64% ORR (56% CR/CRi) in AML
- Responses deepened over time with a 56% 6-month CR rate in MDS patients (assessed in all patients 6 months after initial treatment)
- Median time to response is 1.9 months, more rapid than AZA alone
- Magrolimab + AZA efficacy compares favorably to AZA monotherapy (CR rate 6-17%^{1,2})

1. Azacitidine USPI. 2. Fenaux P, et al. Lancet Oncol. 2009;10(3):223-232.

PRESENTED AT:

2020ASCO ANNUAL MEETING #ASCO20 Sildes are the property of the author, permission required for reuse. PRESENTED BY: DAVID A. SALLMAN, MD

Note: on target anemia mitigated by priming

Sallman D, et al, ASH 2020

Magrolimab + AZA Eliminates Disease in AML and MDS Patients With *TP53* Mutation

Efficacy in TP53-Mutant Patients

Best Overall Response	AML <i>TP53</i> Mutant (N=12)	MDS <i>TP53</i> Mutant (N=4)
ORR	9 (75%)	3 (75%)
CR	5 (42%)	2 (50%)
CRi/marrow CR	4 (33%)	1 (25%)
Complete cytogenetic response *	4/8 (50%)	3/3 (100%)
MRD negative of responders	4/9 (44%)	0
Median duration of response (months)	Not reached (0.03+ – 15.1+)	Not reached (0.03+ – 5.2+)
Survival probability at 6 months	91%	100%
Median follow-up (range) (months)	8.8 (1.9 – 16.9)	7 (4.2 – 12.2)

TP53-Mutant AML Patients



*Responding patients with abnormal cytogenetics at baseline.

- Magrolimab + AZA has a high response rate with deep responses in TP53-mutant AML and MDS patients
- The estimated 6-month survival is 91% and 100% in AML and MDS patients, respectively
- Median duration and survival has not been reached, which compares favorably to current therapies
 - Venetoclax + AZA in AML: ORR 47%, DOR 5.6 mo, OS 7.2 mo¹

1. DiNardo CD, et al. Blood. 2019;133(1):7-17.

PRESENTED AT: 2020ASCO

Slides are the property of the author permission reauired for reuse.

PRESENTED BY: DAVID A. SALLMAN, MD

9/16 pts cleared TP53 VAF to less than 5%

Sallman D, et al, ASH 2020

Proposed Treatment Algorithm for Patients With MDS: 2020



Acknowledgements

- Clinical Team at DFCI:
 - Dan DeAngelo, Martha Wadleigh, David Steensma, Jackie Garcia, Goyo Abel, Eric Winer, Marlise Luskin
 - Ilene Galinsky, NP
 - Andrian Penicaud, PA, Kat Edmonds, NP, Sarah Cahill, PA, Mary Girard, PA, Elizabeth Herrity, DNP
 - BMT Team: Alyea, Antin, Armand, Cutler, Ho, Koreth, Romee, Nikiforow, Soiffer
 - DFHCC Team: Avigan, Rosenblatt, Amrein, Fathi, Brunner, Hobbs, Graubert
- Scientific Team at Dana-Farber/Harvard Cancer Center
 - Ben Ebert; Andy Lane, Coleman Lindsley, Jim Griffin, Tony Letai, David Weinstock, David Frank, Kim Stegmeir, Donna Neuberg, Tom Look, S Armstrong, T Graubert
- Worldwide Collaborators
 - Alliance: R Larson, G Marcucci, W Blum, G Uy, G Roboz, S Mandrekar
 - Worldwide: C Schiffer, T Fischer, H Dohner, K Dohner, C Thiede, R Schlenk, and others
- Slides
 - G Garcia-Manero, D Steensma, D Sallman,

The End

Questions or need help? Email: rstone@partners.org Phone: 617-632-2214 Administrative Assistant: 617-632-2168 New Patients: 617-632-6028 Page: 617-632-3352 #42194