



## Ibrutinib for Relapsed / Refractory CLL: A UK and Ireland Analysis of Outcomes in 315 patients

by Collaborative Groups: UK CLL Forum

Haematologica 2016 [Epub ahead of print]

*Citation: Collaborative Groups: UK CLL Forum . Ibrutinib for Relapsed / Refractory CLL: A UK and Ireland Analysis of Outcomes in 315 patients.*

*Haematologica. 2016; 101:xxx*

*doi:10.3324/haematol.2016.147900*

### *Publisher's Disclaimer.*

*E-publishing ahead of print is increasingly important for the rapid dissemination of science. Haematologica is, therefore, E-publishing PDF files of an early version of manuscripts that have completed a regular peer review and have been accepted for publication. E-publishing of this PDF file has been approved by the authors. After having E-published Ahead of Print, manuscripts will then undergo technical and English editing, typesetting, proof correction and be presented for the authors' final approval; the final version of the manuscript will then appear in print on a regular issue of the journal. All legal disclaimers that apply to the journal also pertain to this production process.*

# **Ibrutinib for Relapsed / Refractory CLL: A UK and Ireland Analysis of Outcomes in 315 patients**

*UK CLL Forum*

## **Abstract**

In 2014, ibrutinib was made available for relapsed/refractory chronic lymphocytic leukaemia (CLL) patients. The UK CLL Forum collected data from UK/Ireland patients with a minimum of 1 year follow-up with pre-planned primary endpoints; the number of patients still on therapy at 1 year (Discontinuation Free Survival; DFS) and 1 year overall survival (OS). With a median 16 months follow-up, data on 315 patients demonstrated 1 year DFS of 73.7% and 1 year OS of 83.8%. Patients with better pre-treatment performance status (PS 0/1 vs 2+) had superior DFS (77.5% vs 61.3%; $p<0.0001$ ) and OS (86.3% vs 76.0%; $p=0.0001$ ). In univariable analysis OS and DFS were not associated with number of prior lines of therapy or 17p deletion. However, multivariable analysis identified an interaction between prior lines of therapy, age and 17p deletion suggesting that older patients with 17p deletion did worse when treated with ibrutinib beyond 2<sup>nd</sup> line. Overall, 55.6% of patients had no first year dose reductions or treatment breaks >14 days and had OS of 89.7%, while 26% of patients had dose reductions and 13% had temporary treatment breaks >14 days. We could not demonstrate a detrimental effect of dose reductions alone (1 year OS: 91.7%), but patients who had first year treatment breaks > 14 days, particularly permanent cessation of ibrutinib had both reduced 1 year OS (68.5%) and also a statistically significant excess mortality rate beyond one year.

Although outcomes appear inferior to the RESONATE trial (1 year OS;90%: PFS;84%), this may partly reflect the inclusion of PS 2+ patients and that 17.5% of patients permanently discontinued ibrutinib due to an event other than disease progression.

Address for correspondence: Dr G Follows, Cambridge University Hospitals NHS Foundation Trust, Department of Haematology, Box 234, Cambridge CB2 0QQ.

Email: [george.follows@addenbrookes.nhs.uk](mailto:george.follows@addenbrookes.nhs.uk)

The UK CLL Forum would like to thank and specifically acknowledge Amy Kirkwood, Statistician, University College London, who has co-ordinated and run the statistical analysis for this project, and the CLL Chapter of the Lymphoma Forum of Ireland for their collaboration with this project.

## Introduction

The RESONATE trial established the efficacy and tolerability of ibrutinib in relapsed / refractory CLL and led to licensing of ibrutinib for this indication in the US and Europe.<sup>1,2</sup> In 2014, a named patient scheme (NPS) made ibrutinib available for relapsed / refractory CLL patients in the UK and Ireland who broadly matched RESONATE trial entry criteria. Following scheme closure, the UK CLL Forum initiated a service evaluation of data from patients who commenced treatment on the scheme in 2014 with a minimum 1 year follow-up. Accepting the limitations of retrospective data analysis, the UK CLL Forum executive committee pre-planned the two most objective primary endpoints for the evaluation: 1. Percentage of patients alive and still taking ibrutinib at 1 year (Discontinuation Free Survival; DFS) and 2. Percentage 1 year overall survival (OS). As data collection was >12 months after all patients commenced ibrutinib, the 1 year DFS and OS are therefore absolute values that cannot change with further follow-up. The broad proposal with this service evaluation was to assess how the primary endpoints were influenced by basic patient demographics and performance status, aspects of CLL biology and treatment-related variables.

## Methods

All clinicians entering patients into the CLL ibrutinib NPS were asked whether they wished to contribute anonymised data to the UK CLL Forum ibrutinib service evaluation. To meet entry criteria for the evaluation, patients had to have relapsed / refractory CLL having received prior immuno-chemotherapy, and had at least 1 day of ibrutinib treatment in the NPS, commencing treatment in 2014. Twelve months after scheme closure, participating clinicians were sent a questionnaire requesting 25 data points per patient roughly grouped into 9 categories as set out in supplementary table 1.

Clinicians were given a further opportunity to update their data in March 2016. Clinicians were asked to report any clinically significant AE possibly related to ibrutinib and provide a best response to therapy. Inevitably, there are limitations in accuracy of adverse event (AE) reporting and response assessments in retrospective analysis, particularly as there is very variable use of CT scanning and bone marrow assessments in non-trial practice. Defining accurate complete and partial remission rates was therefore not possible. Patients were grouped as 'responder' if clinicians graded the response to therapy as partial remission (PR) (including PR + lymphocytosis) or better or 'non-responder' for stable disease or worse. Kaplan-Meier survival analyses, Cox regression and the log-rank test were used for time-to-event analyses and the assumption of proportional hazards was checked using Schoenfeld residuals. Where this assumption did not hold 16 month rates are presented. Data were analysed using Stata version 14.1.

## Results

### Demographics, disease and patient characteristics

Patient data were returned on 315 patients who met entry criteria from 62 hospitals from across the UK (England, Scotland, Wales, N Ireland) and the Republic of Ireland. Contributing hospitals, patient numbers contributed and responsible clinicians are detailed in supplementary table 2. Median age of patients on first day of treatment was 69 (range: 42-93) with 69% male. Median prior lines of therapy was 2 (range: 1-14), with 48% of patients having received 3 or more prior lines. Specific data on types of prior therapy were not collected. FISH data were provided for 263 /315 patients (83.5%). All 263 patients had FISH for 17p deletion, but testing for other loci was variable between centres. Testing for mutation of TP53 was limited to a small number of academic centres and the number of patients tested for this mutation is not known, although 3 patients were reported with a TP53 mutation. In total, 90 patients were identified with a 17p deletion (90/263; 34.2%); Clinician assessed ECOG performance status was 0/1 in 240 (76.2%) patients (0=78, 1=162) and 2/3 in 74 (23.5%) patients (2=62, 3=12). One patient was PS 4.

### Discontinuation-free and overall survival data

From the entire cohort, 73.7% (232/315) of patients were still on therapy at 1 year with absolute one year survival of 83.8% (264/315) (Figure 1A and 1B). At the median follow-up of 16 months, OS was 77.4% (95% CI: 71.9 – 81.9). The primary endpoints of 1 year DFS and OS were then analysed by demographic, disease specific and treatment-related criteria. The hazard ratios for this data with 95% confidence limits are presented in table 1. Patients with a better performance status pre-treatment had better outcomes, with poorer performance status patients having more than double the risk of discontinuation and / or death: 1 year DFS for PS 0/1 was 77.5% and for PS 2+ was 61.3%;  $p < 0.0001$  and OS rates were 86.3% and 76.0% respectively;  $p = 0.0001$  (Figure 1C and 1D).

Younger patients (median age of 69 or below) fared better in terms of both DFS (1 year rates: 80.7% and 68.2%;  $p = 0.024$ ) and OS (86.7% and 81.2%;  $p = 0.10$ , Figure 2A) although this did not reach significance for OS. When age was analysed as a continuous variable the detrimental consequences for each additional 10 years was statistically significant for both DFS and OS (DFS HR=1.43 (1.14 – 1.80),  $p = 0.01$ ; OS HR=1.51 (1.15 – 1.98),  $p = 0.0025$ ). Male and female patients had no difference in DFS and OS. Although 1 year DFS and OS appeared inferior for 17p- patients compared with 17p wild-type, this was not statistically significant (DFS: 71.1% vs 77.5%;  $p = 0.74$ , OS: 84.4% vs 86.7%; log-rank  $p = 0.86$ , Figure 2B). It is noteworthy that patients with no FISH data available had a worse DFS and OS. There is no clear explanation for this observation. When the effect of prior therapies was analysed, no differences could be demonstrated for either DFS or OS for patients treated with 1 prior, 2 prior or 3+ prior lines of therapy (OS: 83.5% 1 line, 82.9% 2 lines and 84.3% 3+ lines;  $p = 0.997$ ,

Figure 2C). Furthermore, there was no suggestion of any separation of the DFS or OS Kaplan-Meier survival curves beyond one year. No data were available on types of prior therapy. Response assessments were available for 311 patients, with 266/311 (85.5%) classified as 'responder' by their clinician and 45/311 (14.5%) classified as 'non-responder'. Responding patients had a markedly superior 1 year DFS and OS compared with non-responding patients (OS: 90.2% vs 46.7%,  $p < 0.0001$ , Figure 2D).

All five pre-treatment variables from table 1 were included in a multivariable model. When fitted, it became apparent that there were significant interactions for DFS between age and number of prior lines and 17p and number of prior lines (supplementary table 3). If patients had received 1 line of prior therapy, then the older group patients had similar DFS and OS outcomes to younger patients. However, for patients with 2 prior lines of therapy, age was significantly associated with inferior DFS (a more than 4-fold increase in risk) and showed the same trend with OS (a 2-fold increase,  $p = 0.17$ ). For patients receiving 3 or more prior lines the same trend was seen but the effect size was much smaller and did not reach statistical significance (71% increase in risk of discontinuation or death ( $p = 0.26$ ) and a 76% increase in the risk of death,  $p = 0.13$ ). The Kaplan Meier OS plots for younger and older patients separated by prior lines of therapy are shown in figure 3A and figure 3B respectively, while the corresponding DFS curves are shown in supplementary figure 1A and 1B. 17p deletion showed a very similar pattern; if patients had received only 1 prior line of therapy, there was no evidence that 17p deletion had a detrimental effect but with 2 prior lines the risk of discontinuation or death was 4 times higher ( $p = 0.006$ ) and risk of death was more than double ( $p = 0.13$ ). For 3+ prior lines there was a non-significant increase of 71% in the risk of discontinuation or death ( $p = 0.12$ ) and 82% in the risk of death ( $p = 0.13$ ). It is not clear why the effect was less marked in 3+ prior lines compared with 2 prior lines and there remains a possibility that there are unknown confounding factors. The Kaplan Meier OS plots for 17p wild type and 17p deleted patients separated by prior lines of therapy are shown in figure 3C and figure 3D respectively, while the corresponding DFS curves are shown in supplementary figure 1C and 1D

The association of prior lines with DFS and OS is complicated by the two interactions described above. Given the small numbers of events in the subsets of patients it is hard to draw firm conclusions though it appears clear that for patients who are older and have 17p deletion, the risk of death or discontinuation increases dramatically with more lines of prior therapy (at least a 4 fold increase, HRs range from 4.34 to 17.04). The same more than 2-fold increase in the risk for both DFS and OS for PS 2+ patients was seen in the multivariable analysis as in the univariable. There was no evidence of an association (or any interactions) with sex in the multivariable model. As there was missing data for a small group of patients this variable has not been included in the model presented in supplementary table 3.

A number of clinicians included individual case histories describing marked quality of life (QoL) improvements in their patients and 85.2% of patients (248/291) were reported to have an improved QoL with ibrutinib therapy. Clinical suspicion of Richter's transformation was reported in 9.2% of the whole patient cohort (29/315). Of these 29 patients, the transformation was biopsy-confirmed in 18 patients, i.e. 5.7% of all

patients, with 13 were biopsy proven in the first year. Of the 29 patients clinically suspected of Richter's transformation, 22 (76%) had died by data collection.

#### Treatment discontinuation and dose reduction

Survival was poor for the 83 patients who stopped ibrutinib permanently within the first year. Of these patients, 11 died on therapy (median 153 days from first dose (range: 46-363)), and of the remaining 72 patients, 40 died before 1 year and 8 died within the period of data collection. Median survival for these 72 patients was 95 days after stopping ibrutinib and 319 days from first dose. Of the 83 patients who permanently stopped ibrutinib in the first year, 28 were broadly due to disease (refractory disease, progressive disease or Richter's transformation) and 55 due to other causes (summarised in table 2). Clinicians were asked if the drug was stopped permanently due to an ibrutinib-related adverse event. With 56/83, the local clinician classified the main reason for stopping was due to an ibrutinib-related adverse event, while with 27/83 the local clinician did not classify the reason for stopping as adverse event-related. There was a striking difference in 1 year OS between these 2 groups. Of the patients who stopped for a 'clinician-defined' adverse event, 29 / 56 (51.8%) died before 1 year, but the patients who stopped drug for reasons other than an adverse event, mortality was much higher, with 22/27 (81.5%) dying before 1 year.

Thirty four patients had treatment breaks of 14 days or less. Temporary treatment breaks between 15 days and 6 months (median = 28 days) were reported in 41 patients. The five commonest primary reasons given for these longer treatment breaks were: Infection (12 cases), haemorrhage / bruising (9 cases), cytopenias (4 cases), lower gastro-intestinal (GI) toxicity (3 cases), skin rash / dermatological (3 cases). Dose reductions were relatively common, with 26% of patients (82/315) being reduced to 280mg (42 patients) or 140mg (40 patients) lasting from 1 week to permanent dose reduction (median = 6 months). 32 of these 82 patients also had additional treatment breaks ranging from 15 days to permanent discontinuation. Primary reasons given for dose reductions are given in table 3.

Overall, clinicians reported clinically significant adverse events (AEs) in 56.5% of patients, although a number of these events did not require either dose reduction or treatment breaks. The overall profile of AEs was similar to published series and included atrial fibrillation (AF) in 5.1%.

We wanted to analyse whether any alterations in therapy potentially compromised outcomes. To assess whether dose reductions / treatment breaks could impact on outcome, we defined a reference group of patients (group A) who had minimal alterations to therapy, defined as having received standard dose ibrutinib with no dose reductions and total treatment breaks no greater than 14 days in the first year. Group B were patients with any dose reductions but no treatment breaks greater than 14 days. Group C included any patient where ibrutinib was withheld for greater than 14 days, either temporarily or permanently. Group C therefore

also include patients with dose reductions and treatment breaks greater than 14 days. Kaplan-meier DFS and OS curves for the 3 groups are presented in Figure 4.

The total number of group A patients was 175 which included 136 patients who continued on ibrutinib unchanged for the whole year, and 21 patients who had up to 14 days off therapy. PS 0/1 patients were over-represented in group A with 141 PS 0/1 patients (80.6%) compared with 38 (79.2%) in group B and 61 (66.3%) in group C (Chi square  $p=0.03$ ). There were 18 deaths in group A before 1 year, 8 patients dying on therapy and 10 patients dying within 14 days of stopping therapy. Of the 18 deaths in group A, major adverse events associated with the final illness were infection (6), progressive CLL (4), Richter's transformation (2), cardiac (1), haemorrhage (1) general debility (1) not given (3). Group A DFS and OS were both 89.7% The total number of group B patients was 48, with 18 patients with dose reductions for less than or equal to 6 months (lowest dose 140mg in 11 and 280mg in 7) and 30 patients with dose reductions >6 months (lowest dose 140mg in 16 and 280mg in 15). There were 4 deaths before 1 year in group B, 2 patients dying on therapy and 2 within 14 days of stopping. Major adverse events associated with the final illness were infection (1), Upper GI toxicity (1) and not given (2). All 4 deaths occurred in patients who were dose reduced to 140mg. Group B DFS and OS were 89.6% and 91.7% respectively. There were 92 patients in group C, which included 58 patients with treatment breaks but no dose reductions and 34 patients who had breaks in therapy and dose reductions. From group C, 32/92 patients were still on ibrutinib at 1 year with 29 patients having died before 1 year. Of the 92 group C patients, 42 were identified by their clinician as having temporary treatment breaks > 14 days in the first year. Of these 42 patients, 8 died before 1 year. Group C DFS and OS were 34.8% and 68.5% respectively.

Assessing the consequences of dose modifications in a retrospective analysis is inevitably challenging owing to multiple confounding factors, primarily that the most ill patients inevitably 'self-select' themselves to be more likely dose reduced / stopped early. In an attempt to control for this, we carried out a post 1 year analysis of patients from group A, B and C, only analysing patients who were alive in the specific group at 1 year. To be included in this post 1 year analysis, group A had to be patients alive on ibrutinib at the 1 year point with no modifications or breaks >14 days in the first year, group B had to be alive on ibrutinib at 1 year having had (or having on-going) dose reductions but no breaks >14 days. With this prospective analysis from 1 year, we could also split group C into group C1 who were patients who had had temporary breaks >14 days in the first year, but were alive and taking ibrutinib at 1 year, and C2, who were patients who had stopped ibrutinib permanently before 1 year, but were alive at 1 year. The split of these patient groups are shown in a flow chart (supplementary figure 2). Patient numbers were: A=157, B=44, C1=32 and C2=31. The hazard ratios for DFS and OS beyond 1 year are shown in table 4 and the Kaplan-meier plots for DFS and OS beyond 1 year are shown in figure 5.

Patients who have had dose reductions in the first year (group B), rather than treatment breaks (groups C1 and C2) appear to have very similar outcomes to patients who have been treated with no dose reductions (group A), within the constraints of the limited follow-up of this study. However, patients who have had temporary

treatment breaks (>14 days) within the first year (group C1) appear to have an almost 4-fold increase in the risk of stopping ibrutinib beyond one year. The same trend is seen for the risk of death post 1 year ( $p < 0.0001$ ) though the assumption of proportional hazards does not hold for this comparison ( $p = 0.015$ ) so the hazard ratios are not valid; at the median follow-up of 16 months the OS rates in groups A and B are very similar (96.5% and 100%) but these drop to 85.4% in group C1 and just 68.1% in group C2. These combined results suggest that post 1 year survival does not appear to be compromised by dose reductions in ibrutinib, but does appear to be compromised by both temporary and permanent breaks in ibrutinib therapy.

By analysing the patients alive at one year, we were also able to see whether number of prior lines of therapy or pre-treatment performance status had any correlation with first year dose reductions and treatment breaks. We could not demonstrate any statistically significant association between the number of prior lines of therapy and either dose reductions or treatment breaks. However, there did appear to be a correlation between poorer performance status and higher frequency of treatment breaks. Of the 207 PS 0/1 patients alive at one year, they were split between groups A to C2 as follows: 62.8% (A); 17.4% (B); 10.1% (C1); 9.7% (C2). The 58 PS2+ patients alive at one year were split: 48.3% (A); 13.8% (B); 19% (C1); 19% (C2), indicating that less than half of the poor performance status patients had no treatment modifications by one year, and twice as many had temporary and permanent treatment breaks in the first year compared to PS 0-1 ( $p = 0.033$ ).

## Discussion

The RESONATE trial established ibrutinib as an effective therapy for relapsed / refractory CLL,<sup>1</sup> and ibrutinib is now a recommended therapy in this setting in European and US clinical guidelines.<sup>3,4,5</sup> There is considerable interest in real-world experience with this drug outside clinical trials and this UK/Ireland evaluation represents the largest multi-centre dataset of ibrutinib patients treated off-trial with a median follow-up of 16 months for surviving patients. Patients in this analysis were treated in 62 centres ranging from small district general hospitals to large university teaching centres. The 1 year overall survival for the cohort was strikingly better than patients treated in historical relapsed / refractory CLL trials,<sup>6,7</sup> however, the patients in this evaluation appeared to fare less well than patients treated in the RESONATE trial. The patients in this study were similar in terms of age, number of prior therapies and 17p deletion status to the patients recruited into the RESONATE trial which has now been presented with 16 months median follow-up with a 12-month progression free survival (PFS) of 84% and overall survival of 90%.<sup>2</sup> Although our UK / Ireland dataset does not have a progression free survival, the one year absolute survival was inferior to the RESONATE 1 year PFS. Although DFS and PFS are only surrogates, it does appear that the real-world rate of ibrutinib discontinuation rate and death rate appear higher than patients treated within the RESONATE trial. This real-world observation is not limited to the UK / Ireland data. The single-centre Mayo clinic data included 124 R/R CLL patients with a median follow-up of 6.4 months and has been presented as an abstract.<sup>9</sup> The estimated proportion of patients continuing ibrutinib at 6 months was 84% (95% CI: 77-92%) and at 12 months was 70% (95% CI: 59-83%), both



figures being similar to the UK / Ireland data. Furthermore, the multi-centre Swedish experience presented data on 95 CLL patients treated for a median 10.2 months, with a 10 month PFS of 77% and OS 83%.<sup>8</sup>

There are a number of potential reasons why the rates of ibrutinib discontinuation and survival are likely to be worse in a real-world setting than a clinical trial. Patients treated outside of a clinical trial are more likely to have poorer performance status and more co-morbidities. Nearly a quarter of the UK / Ireland patients had a pre-treatment performance status that would have excluded them from the RESONATE trial and 45% of the Swedish patients had pre-treatment criteria that would have excluded them from RESONATE. If only PS 0/1 patients from the UK data are considered, then DFS of 77.5% and OS 86.3% are closer to the figures from the RESONATE trial. Our data are the first to confirm that a poorer pre-treatment performance status (2+) is significantly associated with reduced discontinuation free and overall survival (16.2% and 9.3% lower at 1 year respectively). We have also shown that of the patients who were alive at 1 year the PS 2+ group were significantly more likely to have had treatment breaks during the first year of therapy. Interestingly, there appears to be on-going divergence of survival curves beyond 1 year for good and poor performance status patients, suggesting on-going consequences for patients who are less well when therapy commences.

Patients treated within a clinical trial have more stringent rules for dose modifications / dose interruptions that are likely to translate into higher levels of drug compliance. Dose reductions / breaks were reported in 4% in the RESONATE trial and 10% in the Ohio State series<sup>10</sup>, whereas 26% of the UK / Ireland cohort had a dose reduction of ibrutinib (with or without treatment breaks) and 19% of patients had treatment breaks (temporary and permanent) with no dose reductions. It is difficult to compare the relative frequency of dose modifications with the clinical trial data exactly, as treatment breaks in particular can be classified in different ways. However, it seems clear that the extent of dose modification was much higher in this UK / Ireland series than in the published trials. The reasons given for dose reductions and treatment breaks predominantly fit within the expected adverse event profile of relapsed / refractory CLL patients treated with ibrutinib, with infection, cytopenias, bleeding issues, gastrointestinal toxicity being recurring reasons cited for both temporary and permanent dose reductions and therapy breaks. It is not clear why the rates of modifications were so high in our series, although the inclusion of poorer performance status patients was a likely contributing factor, and there was variation in practice between centres. We could not, however, demonstrate clear differences in outcomes between centres grouped by size / number treated / university status etc (data not shown). It seems unlikely that these dose modifications would have been permitted within the context of a clinical trial, and although a direct causal link between dose modifications and inferior outcomes cannot be made from our data, it does appear from our data that treatment breaks in particular are associated with inferior outcomes both at 1 year, and beyond one year for patients alive and re-started on ibrutinib by 1 year. In contrast, we could not identify any statistically significant inferiority for DFS and OS up to and beyond 1 year for patients who were only dose reduced but had minimal treatment breaks. Our data therefore suggest that continuous therapy with ibrutinib (excepting minimal breaks) throughout the first year is required for optimal outcomes, but raises the question as to whether 420mg is required to gain maximal benefit from the drug.

Therefore, if clinicians feel the need to dose modify therapy due to an adverse event, potentially dose reduction may be preferable to treatment cessation. Of course, there are major limitations to our retrospective dataset particularly including the limited follow-up, and whether or not dose reductions compromise longer term outcomes will only be answered by prospective clinical trials which are currently recruiting.

With regards to permanent discontinuation of ibrutinib, it is clear that the drug was stopped in far fewer patients due to an adverse event in the RESONATE and Ohio State trials (4% and 12% with 9.4 months and 3 years follow-up respectively) than in real-world datasets. Despite shorter follow-up in the Swedish and Mayo Clinic data sets, 10.5% and 12.1% of patients respectively in these real-world series stopped ibrutinib for an adverse event other than progressive disease, although both these figures are smaller than 17.5% observed in the UK / Ireland series. Together these results suggest that higher rates of ibrutinib discontinuation are to be expected when patients are treated off trial. When the reasons for permanent discontinuation of ibrutinib are compared between real-world data sets, there are some similarities. In the UK / Ireland, Swedish and Mayo clinic series, infection is the commonest single reason other than Richter's transformation / progressive CLL and infection is also the dominant cause of death, other than Richter's transformation / progressive CLL in the UK / Ireland and Swedish series. After stopping ibrutinib within the first year of treatment, a notable feature of our dataset is the short overall survival. If patients who died while still taking the drug are excluded from the analysis, the median survival was 95 days which appears shorter than reported in other series<sup>9</sup>. The reasons for this are not clear, but the lack of access to alternative non-chemotherapy treatments in the UK / Ireland post ibrutinib discontinuation could be a contributing factor.

Although our data suggested a slightly inferior 1 year DFS for 17p deleted patients (71.1% vs 77.7%), this was not statistically significant and OS at 1 year was similar (84.4% vs 86.7%). This contrasts with published data, where, with longer follow-up, patients with TP53 disruption have worse PFS and OS.<sup>10</sup> Potentially this separation may be seen with our data with longer follow-up. Our data contrasts markedly with the Swedish data where Kaplan-Meier plots of PFS and OS show very early divergence for patients with 17p deletion. The reasons for these differences are not clear. We also looked at the effect of prior lines of therapy on 1 year outcomes. With the updated abstract presentation of RESONATE at 16 months median follow-up, there is a suggestion that patients treated with 1 prior line of therapy compared with 2+ prior lines of therapy had a statistically meaningful PFS advantage at 12 months (94% vs 82%). Although it would be reasonable to expect a more heavily pre-treated group of patients to be enriched for poorer prognostic features such as poorer PS and higher levels of 17p deletion, with univariable analysis we could not see any outcome differences for more or less heavily pre-treated patients. With our data, DFS and OS were highly similar for patients treated with 1, 2 or 3+ lines of prior lines therapy with no suggestion of divergence of survival curves beyond one year, although these curves could potentially separate with longer follow-up. However, when pre-treatment variables of age, sex, PS, 17p status and prior lines of therapy were subject to multivariable analysis, significant interactions were uncovered. PS remains statistically significant, but it also appears that older patients and

those with 17p deletion have inferior DFS and OS when treated beyond first relapse. These results are biologically plausible. It is highly likely that a 17p- patient treated with ibrutinib beyond 2<sup>nd</sup> line would have had a subclone of 17p- CLL cells when treated with earlier lines of chemotherapy. Potentially, these earlier lines of treatment could contribute to more genomic complexity and worse outcomes when treated with ibrutinib beyond and including 3<sup>rd</sup> line therapy, although this remains speculation at this stage.

As response assessments in routine practice do not include bone marrow biopsy and CT scan assessments, it was not possible to verify accurately remission status in this evaluation. We therefore grouped all patients who achieved at least a partial remission (or PR + lymphocytosis) together as responding patients. Overall, the response rate of 85% in this study was identical to the investigator-assessed response rate in the RESONATE trial. As expected, patients who were classified by their clinician as responding to therapy demonstrated a markedly superior DFS and OS compared with non-responding patients. Although we could not demonstrate any clear differences in the incidence of dose reductions / temporary treatment breaks between patients classified as responder or non-responder (data not shown), the DFS and OS rates for responding patients who had no dose reductions and no treatment break >14 days were excellent, with 95% (152/160) of patients in this group being alive and continuing on treatment at 1 year.

In conclusion, with this presentation of the largest non-trial multi-centre dataset of ibrutinib-treated relapsed / refractory CLL patients, we confirm that ibrutinib is a highly effective, generally well tolerated drug in this population, although our data and other real-world datasets suggest overall outcomes in routine clinical practice are inferior to those observed in the pivotal clinical trials. While it seems likely that some of the inferiority reflects the treatment of poorer PS patients in the non-trial setting, it also remains possible that the unexpectedly high incidence of treatment breaks in the UK / Ireland practice could have been contributory. The lack of access to other CLL therapies in the UK / Ireland could also have contributed to the short overall survival observed following ibrutinib cessation.

## References

1. Byrd JC, Brown JR, O'Brien S, et al. Ibrutinib versus ofatumumab in previously treated chronic lymphoid leukemia. *N Engl J Med*. 2014;371(3):213-223.
2. Brown JR, Hillmen P, O'Brien S, et al. Updated efficacy including genetic and clinical subgroup analysis and overall safety in the phase 3 RESONATE trial of ibrutinib versus ofatumumab in previously treated chronic lymphocytic leukemia/small lymphocytic lymphoma. *Blood*. 2014; 124(21): 3331-3331.
3. Dutch/Belgium HOVON CLL working group. Dutch guidelines for the diagnosis and treatment of chronic lymphocytic leukaemia. *Neth J Med*. 2016; 74(2):68-74.
4. Follows G, Bloor A, Dearden C, et al. Interim statement from the BCSH CLL Guidelines Panel [http://www.bcsghguidelines.com/documents/Interim\\_statement\\_CLL\\_guidelines\\_version6.pdf](http://www.bcsghguidelines.com/documents/Interim_statement_CLL_guidelines_version6.pdf)
5. Zelenetz AD, Gordon LI, Wierda WG, Abramson, et al. Chronic lymphocytic leukemia/small lymphocytic lymphoma, version 1.2015. *J Natl Compr Canc Netw*. 2015;13(3):326-362.

6. Keating MJ, Flinn I, Jain V, et al. Therapeutic role of alemtuzumab (Campath-1H) in patients who have failed fludarabine: results of a large international study. *Blood*. 2002;99(10):3554-3561.
7. Fischer K, Cramer P, Busch R, et al. Bendamustine combined with rituximab in patients with relapsed and/or refractory chronic lymphocytic leukemia: a multicenter phase II trial of the German Chronic Lymphocytic Leukemia Study Group. *J Clin Oncol*. 2011;29(26):3559-3566.
8. Winqvist M, Asklid A, Andersson P, et al. Real-world results of ibrutinib in patients with relapsed or refractory Chronic Lymphocytic Leukemia: Data from 95 consecutive patients treated in a compassionate use program. *Haematologica*. 2016 May 19. [Epub ahead of print]
9. Parikh SA, Chaffee KR, Call TG, et al. Ibrutinib Therapy for Chronic Lymphocytic Leukemia (CLL): An Analysis of a Large Cohort of Patients Treated in Routine Clinical Practice. *Blood*. 2015;126(23):2935-2935.
10. Byrd JC, Furman RR, Coutre SE, et al. Three-year follow-up of treatment-naive and previously treated patients with CLL and SLL receiving single-agent ibrutinib. *Blood*. 2015;125(16):2497-2506.

## Tables

Variable	DFS Events/N	HR(95% CI)	p-value	OS Events/N	HR(95% CI)	p-value
<b>Age</b>						
≤median (69 years)	39/150	1.00	0.024	27/150	1.00	0.10
>median	55/148	1.60 (1.06 – 2.42)		40/148	1.50 (0.92 – 2.43)	
<b>TP53</b>						
No 17p deletion	50/173	1.00	0.74*	34/173	1.00	0.86*
17p deletion	30/90	1.08 (0.68 – 1.71)		19/90	1.05 (0.60 – 1.84)	
Missing	22/52	1.56 (0.94 – 2.57)		18/52	1.95 (1.10 – 3.45)	
<b>Prior therapies</b>						
1	25/85	1.00	0.71	19/85	1.00	0.997
2	26/76	1.25 (0.72 – 2.18)		17/76	0.97 (0.51 – 1.87)	
3+	47/146	1.09 (0.67 – 1.77)		34/146	0.98 (0.56 – 1.73)	
<b>Performance status</b>						
0-1	64/240	1.00	<0.0001	42/240	1.00	0.0001
2+**	38/74	2.30 (1.54 – 3.44)		29/75	2.47 (1.54 – 3.96)	
<b>Sex</b>						
Female	26/93	1.00	0.63	19/93	1.00	0.65
Male	66/203	1.12 (0.71 – 1.76)		49/203	1.13 (0.67 – 1.92)	

**Table 1.** Univariable analysis of pre-treatment parameters for DFS and OS. \*Compares patients with 17p results only \*\*One patient was PS 4

Dominant reasons given for stopping ibrutinib before 1 year	Number of patients
Infection	15
Progressive or refractory disease	14
Richter's transformation	14 (biopsy proven in 12)
Haemorrhage / bleeding-related / anticoagulation-related	9
General debility	6
2 <sup>nd</sup> cancer	6
Lower / upper GI toxicity	2 / 1
Cytopenias	2
Cardiac issues	2
Dermatological	1
Neuropathy	1
Reason for stopping ibrutinib not provided	10 (including 3 patients who died on therapy)

**Table 2.** Dominant reason given for permanently stopping ibrutinib in 83 patients who stopped the drug within the first year of treatment.

Dominant reasons given for dose reducing ibrutinib	Number of patients
Lower / upper GI toxicity	15 / 2
Cytopenias	14
Infection	14
Physician decision due to general debility	10
Abnormal liver function tests	6
Atrial fibrillation / coagulation issues	6
Haemorrhage / bruising	5
Arthralgias / musculo-skeletal	4
Mouth ulcers	2
Dermatological	1
Cardiac failure	1
Deterioration of Parkinson's disease	1
Not specified	1

**Table 3.** Dominant reason given for ibrutinib dose reductions in 82 patients who dose reduced within the first year of treatment.

	DFS			OS*		
	Events/ N	HR(95% CI)	p-value	Events/ N	HR(95% CI)	p-value
<b>Treatment group</b>						
A	11/157	1.00	0.045	5/157	1.00	<0.0001
B	4/44	1.58 (0.49 – 5.06)		2/44	1.38 (0.27 – 7.12)	
C1	5/32	3.76 (1.24 – 11.39)		5/32	5.76 (1.65 – 20.08)	
C2	-	-		8/31	9.30 (3.04 – 28.45)	

**Table 4.** Hazard ratios with 95% confidence intervals for OS and DFS for the 4 separate treatment compliance groups. For this analysis, the origin time for DFS and OS was taken as the 1 year time point. \*Fails the proportional hazards assumption – HR can only be interpreted as an average over time.

## Figure Legends


**Figure 1.** Kaplan-meier plots of (A) DFS and (B) OS for the whole cohort of 315 patients. Patient outcomes as per pre-ibrutinib performance status showing (C) DFS and (D) OS

**Figure 2.** Kaplan-meier plots of (A) OS of patients older than median age and median age or younger, (B) OS with or without 17p deletion (\*p-value for the comparison of patients with and without 17p deletion) (C) OS of patients by number of prior lines of therapy and (D) OS of patients classified by local clinician as ‘responder’ or ‘non-responder’ to ibrutinib therapy


**Figure 3.** Kaplan-meier plots of OS for (A) patients equal to or younger than the median age and (B) patients older than the median age and (C) patients without 17p deletion and (D) patients with 17p deletion stratified by the number of prior lines of therapy

**Figure 4.** Kaplan-meier plots of DFS (A) and OS (B) of patients divided into group A, B or C as per definition in the text


**Figure 5.** Kaplan-meir plots of DFS (A) and OS (B) for groups A, B, C1 and C2 showing survival beyond one year



Number at risk  
 315      272      232      59      0




Number at risk  
 315      289      262      70      0



Number at risk


PS 0-1	240	216	186	47	0
PS 2+	75	56	46	12	0



Number at risk


PS 0-1	240	227	206	56	0
PS 2+	75	62	56	14	0






Number at risk

	0	6	12	18	24
Younger	150	141	130	35	0
Older	148	134	121	30	0




Number at risk

	0	6	12	18	24
No 17p deletion	173	159	150	35	0
17p deletion	90	84	74	26	0
No FISH data	52	46	38	9	0







Number at risk


	0	6	12	18	24
1	85	81	69	15	0
2	76	68	63	16	0
3+	146	133	123	33	0



Number at risk


	0	6	12	18	24
No response	45	29	20	7	0
Response	266	257	239	63	0






Number at risk

	0	6	12	18	24
Group A	175	162	157	45	0
Group B	48	47	43	10	0
Group C	92	63	32	4	0




Number at risk

	0	6	12	18	24
Group A	175	162	157	46	0
Group B	48	47	43	11	0
Group C	92	80	62	13	0



Number at risk


	0	2	4	6	8	10	12
Group A	157	123	76	45	23	12	0
Group B	44	37	22	10	6	1	0
Group C1	32	26	12	4	2	0	0




Number at risk

	0	2	4	6	8	10	12
Group A	157	126	76	46	23	12	0
Group B	44	38	23	11	7	1	0
Group C1	32	27	12	4	2	0	0
Group C2	31	19	14	9	3	3	0

## Supplementary Figures



**Supplementary Figure 1:** Kaplan-meier plots of DFS for (A) patients equal to or younger than the median age and (B) patients older than the median age and (C) patients without 17p deletion and (D) patients with 17p deletion stratified by the number of prior lines of therapy



**Supplementary Figure 2.** Flow chart detailing the patient numbers in groups A through C2 up to 1 year and beyond to 16 months median follow-up

## **Supplementary Tables**

Question theme	Specific Questions
<b>Demographics</b>	Hospital / Sex / age or DoB / number in this series
<b>Patient characteristics</b>	Number of prior lines / performance status pre-ibrutinib
<b>CLL Characteristics</b>	Known FISH profile
<b>Ibrutinib dates</b>	Start date for ibrutinib / Still on ibrutinib at one year? / Stop date for ibrutinib Is your patient still on ibrutinib at most recent review?
<b>Ibrutinib dosing</b>	Any dose reductions or stopping in first year? Reasons for dose reductions / stopping Maximal duration of ibrutinib withdrawal Maximal dose reduction Was ibrutinib stopped permanently because of an adverse event (AE)?
<b>Adverse events</b>	Any clinically significant AE possibly related to ibrutinib
<b>Response assessments</b>	Best clinical response Overall, did / does your patient feel their QoL was / is better since ibrutinib therapy?
<b>Transformation</b>	Any clinical suspicion for Richter's transformation? Any biopsy evidence of Richter's transformation?
<b>On-going assessments</b>	Date of most recent review / confirmation of status / Date of death

**Supplementary Table 1.** Ibrutinib service evaluation questionnaire

Hospital	Number of patients contributed	Clinician (s)
Southampton	22	F Forconi, AS Duncombe
Cambridge	20	GA Follows, I Ringshausen
Oxford	20	A Schuh, TA Eyre
Royal Marsden	19	S Iyengar, C Dearden
Nottingham	14	CP Fox, H Knight
James Paget, Gt Yarmouth	12	S Sadullah
UCLH, London	11	K Cwynarski, B von Barsewisch
Truro RCHT	10	R Noble, J Blundell
Edinburgh	10	F Scott
Norwich	10	KM Bowles
Leicester	9	DBJ Kennedy, S Wagner, MJS Dyer, C Balotis
Leeds	9	P Hillmen, T Munir
Birmingham Heartlands	8	S Paneesha
Taunton	7	M Ewings
Christie, Manchester	7	A Bloor
Newcastle	7	J Wallis
Dublin SJH	6	E Vandenberghe
Colchester	6	M Hamblin, G Campbell
KCH, London	6	PEM Patton, S Devereux
Wexham Park	6	N Bienz
Derriford, Plymouth	6	C Hutchinson, S Rule, D Tucker
Ipswich	5	A Hodson, I Whalley
Barts, London	5	SG Agrawal, J Gribbon
Worthing	5	S Narat
The London Clinic	4	J Gribbon, R Marcus
West Wales	4	P Cumber
GSTT, London	4	PEM Patten
Altnagelvin	4	F McNichol
University Hospital, Birmingham	3	H Parry, G Pratt, P Moss
Southend	3	M Badat, P Cervi
Sheffield RHS	3	N Morley
Beaumont, Dublin	3	P Thornton
Cardiff	3	C Fegan
RFH	3	E Kumar
West Sussex SRH	3	S Janes, S Narat
RHCH	3	J Arnold
Cork	3	S Glavey
Sandwell and BMH	2	RJA Murrin
Russell Hall	1	J Neilson
Basildon	2	P Jasani



<b>Ayr</b>	2	P Micallef-Eyraud
<b>North Tyneside</b>	2	C Williams, J Allen
<b>Princess Royal University Hosp</b>	2	C De Lord, S Bowcock
<b>Forth Valley</b>	2	R Boulton-Jones
<b>Doncaster</b>	2	S Kaul, S Sorour
<b>Wolverhampton</b>	2	A Jacob
<b>Drogheda</b>	1	S Glavey
<b>Worcester</b>	1	E Maughan
<b>Basingstoke</b>	1	AE Milne
<b>Mater, Dublin</b>	1	S Glavey
<b>Kent and Canterbury</b>	1	C Pocock
<b>West Suffolk Hospital</b>	1	M Karanth
<b>Limerick</b>	1	S Glavey
<b>North Bristol</b>	1	AJ Whiteway
<b>Nevill Hall</b>	1	N Parry-Jones
<b>Beatson, Glasgow</b>	1	N Leach
<b>Sunderland</b>	1	S Marshall
<b>Withybush Hospital, Wales</b>	1	S Kundu
<b>Hexham</b>	1	C Williams, J Allen
<b>East Surrey/Crawley</b>	1	P Kaczmarek
<b>Lewisham</b>	1	S Updyke, N Mir

**Supplementary Table 2.** Contributing Hospitals with Lead Clinicians and patient numbers

				HR(95% CI)	P-value
<b>Discontinuation Free Survival</b>					
<b>Older age</b>					
1 prior line				0.75 (0.30 – 1.86)	0.53
2 prior lines				4.50 (1.90 – 10.63)	0.001
3+ prior lines				1.71 (0.60 – 2.64)	0.26
<b>17p</b>					
1 prior line				0.48 (0.15 – 1.54)	0.22
2 prior lines				4.00 (1.48 – 10.84)	0.006
3+ prior lines				1.71 (0.88 – 3.33)	0.12
<b>Prior lines</b>					
2 prior lines	Younger age	No 17p		0.34 (0.10 – 1.13)	0.08
2 prior lines	Younger age	17p		2.84 (0.72 – 11.24)	0.14
2 prior lines	Older age	No 17p		2.03 (0.78 – 5.32)	0.15
2 prior lines	Older age	17p		17.04 (4.16 – 69.79)	<0.001
3+ prior lines	Younger age	No 17p		0.64 (0.24 – 1.72)	0.38
3+ prior lines	Younger age	17p		2.29 (0.67 – 7.75)	0.19
3+ prior lines	Older age	No 17p		1.21 (0.50 – 2.91)	0.67
3+ prior lines	Older age	17p		4.34 (1.27 – 14.83)	0.019
<b>PS 2+</b>				2.40 (1.51 – 3.82)	<0.0001
<b>Overall survival</b>					
<b>Older age</b>					
1 prior line				0.68 (0.25 – 1.90)	0.47
2 prior lines				2.00 (0.74 – 5.41)	0.17
3+ prior lines				1.76 (0.85 – 3.64)	0.13
<b>17p</b>					
1 prior line				0.48 (0.13 – 1.81)	0.28
2 prior lines				2.69 (0.75 – 9.72)	0.13
3+ prior lines				1.82 (0.84 – 3.92)	0.13
<b>Prior lines</b>					
2 prior lines	Younger age	No 17p		0.40 (0.10 – 1.49)	0.17
2 prior lines	Younger age	17p		2.22 (0.43 – 11.31)	0.34
2 prior lines	Older age	No 17p		1.15 (0.36 – 3.68)	0.81
2 prior lines	Older age	17p		6.47 (1.17 – 35.81)	0.033
3+ prior lines	Younger age	No 17p		0.45 (0.14 – 1.43)	0.18
3+ prior lines	Younger age	17p		1.71 (0.41 – 7.23)	0.46
3+ prior lines	Older age	No 17p		1.16 (0.43 – 3.14)	0.77
3+ prior lines	Older age	17p		4.39 (1.10 – 17.49)	0.036
<b>PS 2+</b>				2.58 (1.52 – 4.38)	<0.001

**Supplementary Table 3.** All HRs taken from a model which included Age, 17p, prior lines, PS and interaction terms for age and prior lines and 17p and prior lines. 17p was included with 3 categories; no 17p deletion, 17p deletion and unknown. Unknown had been omitted from the table as we are unable to draw any conclusions from this group.