

La selezione del paziente CAR-T e l'importanza della rete.

B Bruno

Disease	CAR T therapy Approved	Date of Approval	Target	Costimulatory Domain	Pivotal Trial
Large B cell Lymphoma	Axicabtagene ciloleucel (Axi-cel) Tisagenlecleucel (Tisa-cel) Lisocabtagene maraleucel (Liso-cel)	Oct 2017 May 2018 Feb 2021	CD19 CD19 CD19	CD28-CD3zeta 41BB-CD3zeta 41BB-CD3zeta	ZUMA-1 ^{1,2} JULIET ³ TRANSCEND ⁴
Mantle Cell Lymphoma	Brexucabtagene autoleucel (Brexu-cel)	July 2020	CD19	CD28-CD3zeta	ZUMA-2 ⁵
Follicular Lymphoma	Axicabtagene ciloleucel (Axi-cel) Tisagenlecleucel (Tisa-cel)	Mar 2021 May 2022	CD19 CD19	CD28-CD3zeta 41BB-CD3zeta	ZUMA-5 ⁶ ELARA ¹¹
Multiple Myeloma	<mark>Idecabtagene vicleucel (Ide-cel)</mark> Ciltacabtagene autoleucel (Cilta-cel)	Mar 2021 Feb 2022	<mark>BCMA</mark> BCMA	41BB-CD3zeta 41BB-CD3zeta	<mark>KarMMa⁷ CARTITUDE-1¹⁰</mark>
Pediatric ALL	Tisagenlecleucel (Tisa-cel)	Aug 2017	CD19	41BB-CD3zeta	ELIANA ⁸
Adult ALL	Brexucabtagene autoleucel (Brexu-cel)	Oct 2021	CD19	CD28-CD3zeta	ZUMA-3 ⁹

[1] Neelapu et al. NEJM 2017 [2]Locke et al. Lancet Oncol 2019 [3] Schuster et al. NEJM 2019 [4] Abramson et al. Lancet 2020 [5] Wang et al. NEJM 2020
[6] Jacobson et al. ASH 2020 [7] Munshi et al NEJM 2021 [8] Maude et al NEJM 2018
[9] Shah et al Lancet 2021 [10] Berdeja et al Lancet 2021 [11] Fowler et al Nat Med 2022

EMA Approvals

Disease	CAR T therapy Approved	Date of Approval	Target	Co-Stimulatory Domain	Pivotal Trial
Large B cell	Axicabtagene ciloleucel (Axi-cel)	Aug 2018	CD19	CD28-CD3zeta	ZUMA-1 ^{1,2}
Lymphoma	Tisagenlecleucel (Tisa-cel)	Aug 2018	CD19	41BB-CD3zeta	JULIET ³
Pediatric ALL	Tisagenlecleucel (Tisa-cel)	Aug 2018	CD19	41BB-CD3zeta	ELIANA ⁵
Follicular	Axicabtagene ciloleucel (Axi-cel)	Jun 2022	CD19	CD28-CD3zeta	ZUMA-5 ⁴
Lymphoma	Tisagenlecleucel (Tisa-cel)	May 2022	CD19	41BB-CD3zeta	ELARA ⁶

Patient Assessment for CAR T Therapy: Factors Considered in Initial Studies

• Each institution can develop their own specific guidelines based on experience within framework of FDA label

Factors to consider when selecting patients for CAR T therapy:

- 1. Age
- 2. Organ function
- 3. ECOG PS
- 4. Underlying neurological disorders, including seizures
- 5. Active infections
- 6. CNS disease
- 7. Concomitant medications/comorbidities, prior allo-HSCT

Practice Changes Based on Post-Marketing Data

Post-marketing data has shown a shift toward a more inclusive approach in the following areas:

- 1. Biologic age/frailty/ECOG PS rather than chronologic age
- 2. More latitude in organ function, especially in GFR
- 3. Patients with aggressive disease requiring bridging therapy are now considered eligible
- 4. Patients with active CNS disease have been treated in case reports
- 5. Prior and currently controlled hepatitis and HIV are no longer absolute contraindications
- 6. Patients post-allogeneic stem cell transplant, without active GvHD, have been treated with CARs
- 7. Availability of previously collected autologous cells should be explored for pts with poor marrow function

Efficacy in real-world studies (22000)

	LBCL	ALL	MM
ORR	55%-82%	NA	32%-83%
CR	32%-64%	86% (95% CI 80.6-89.7)	34%-35%
12-month PFS	32%-45%	NA	NA
12-month OS	54%-64%	NA	56%

They surveyed 1 CAR-T expert (director of MM and/or CAR-T program) each from 20 centers (selected for adequate geographic representation of the highest-volume MM CAR-T therapy centers across the US



The first section assessed current use and prioritization of ethical principles for slot allocation, and the second section addressed organization and the process of patient selection.

The median year of the earliest CAR-T infusion (SOC/trial) was 2017 (range, 2010 to 2019).

In 2021, 13/17 centers treated more than 50 patients with MM (SOC/trial) (All centers reported no major decrease in CAR-T practice volume in the previous year despite the COVID-19 pandemic)

A median of 1 ide-cel slot was allocated per month per center,

and 15 centers were allocated 2 slots per month (range, 0 to 4/month/center).

However, the median number of patients per center on the waitlist since ide-cel approval was 20 per month (range, 5 to 100).

patients remained on the waitlist for a median of 6 months prior to leukapheresis (range, 2 to 8).

results reported across 14 centers showed that **approximately 25% of patients received a leuka**pheresis slot for commercial CAR-T therapy, 25% enrolled on another non-CAR-T clinical trial, 25% enrolled on a CAR-T clinical trials, and approximately 25% died or enrolled in hospice

Criterium	Numbers of Centers
availability of alternative therapy options	14
patients more likely to successfully undergo leukapheresis	13
receive CAR-T therapy after leukaphe- resis	13
time spent on the waitlist among their prioritization criteria	12
high disease burden	11

Criterion	Numbers of Centers
more likely to achieve clinical response	5
higher HCT-CI	5
social value (young patient with family)	3
using a lottery system	1
selecting 1 patient per CAR-T clinician on a rotating basis	1



The simple ethical principles of CAR-T slot allocation that embody the core values. The bar graph shows prioritization of the core ethical values used in patient selection for CAR-T therapy from highest to lowest as a percentage of total survey respondents.

Core Ethical Value	Numbers of Centers
Maximizing the total benefit	10
treating people equally	7
giving priority to the worst off	6
promoting social value	2

Principles for allocation of scarce medical interventions

	Principles included	Advantages	Objections
UNOS points systems for organ allocation in the USA	First-come, first-served; sickest-first; prognosis	Can combine all possible principles; flexible	Includes least justifiable principles: first-come, first-served and sickest-first; low priority given to prognosis; vulnerable to bias and manipulation, such as being listed on multiple transplantation lists and misrepresentation of health status; allows multiple organ transplants, thus saving fewer lives
QALY allocation	Prognosis; excludes save the most lives	Maximises future benefits; considers quality of life; used in many existing, quantitatively sophisticated frameworks	Outcome measure disadvantages disabled people; incorrect conception of equality by focusing on equality of QALYs rather than equality of persons; does not incorporate many relevant principles
DALY allocation	Prognosis; instrumental value; excludes save the most lives	Maximises future benefits; includes instrumental value, saving people whose productivity is key to a flourishing society	Outcome measure disadvantages disabled people; age considered as modifying value of individual life-years, rather than from standpoint of distributive justice; definition of instrumental value is too focused on economic worth, and could justify bias towards heads of household and other "traditional" social positions; does not incorporate many relevant principles
Complete lives system	Youngest-first; prognosis; save the most lives; lottery; instrumental value, but only in public health emergency	Matches intuition that death of adolescents is worse than that of infants or elderly; everyone has an interest in living through all life stages; incorporates the largest number of relevant principles; resistant to corruption	Reduced chances for persons who have lived many years; life-years are not a relevant health care outcome; unable to deal with international differences in life expectancy; need lexical priority rather than balancing; complete lives system is not appropriate for general distribution of health care resources

UNOS=United Network for Organ Sharing. QALY=quality-adjusted life-years. DALY=disability-adjusted life-years.

Table 2: Four multiprinciple systems

cilta-cel was approved shortly after completion of the initial survey

in October 2022 centers were asked how many slots per month they had received for ciltacel and how patients were selected for ciltacel over ide-cel.

(15/17 responded) The median number of monthly cilta-cel slots was 2 (range, 1 to 4).

All centers identified physician and patient preference as the most common factor influencing the decision to prescribe one product over the other.

Five centers reported that longer manufacturing times for cilta-cel also influenced their decision regarding which product to prescribe according to the clinical scenario, but no center reported the use of formal criteria for patient allocation to each product.

"This makes it even harder when I have patients dying off our list that we couldn't get this therapy to in time."

"Some patients are delaying or refusing other treatment options including good clinical trials because of the focus on wanting CAR-T therapy and concern that they may become ineligible for future CAR-T treatment."

"Commercial CAR-T has become the last resort."

"... very difficult to justify who gets the 'golden ticket' and who does not This is affecting our mental health for the those of us taking care of these patients."



www.nature.com/bmt

CORRESPONDENCE

Check for updates

Clinical outcome of patients with relapsed refractory multiple myeloma listed for BCMA directed commercial CAR-T therapy

© The Author(s), under exclusive licence to Springer Nature Limited 2022

Al Hadidi S. et al. / Bone Marrow Transplant. 2022





Locations of CAR T Centers



Alabama

UAB Medicine Arizona

 Banner Gateway Medical Center BMDACC SCTCT program
 Banner University Medical Center/HCTT Program
 Honor Health Cancer Transplant Institute
 Mavo Clinic Arizona

Arkansas

 University of Arkansas for Medical Sciences

 California
 Cedars-Sinai
 City of Hope
 Stanford Health Care
 UC Davis Health
 UC San Diego Health
 UCLA Health
 UCLSF Helen Diller Family Comprehensive
 Cancer Center

Colorado

 Colorado Blood Cancer Institute in partnership with Sarah Cannon Cancer Institute at Presbyterian/St. Luke's Medical Center
 UC Health University of Colorado Cancer Center

USC Norris Comprehensive Cancer Center

Connecticut

Smilow Cancer Hospital/Yale
 Cancer Center

Delaware

 ChristianaCare Helen F. Graham Cancer Center and Research Institute

Florida

AdventHealth Cancer Institute
 Mayo Clinic Florida
 Memorial Hospital West
 Moffit Cancer Center

Sylvester Comprehensive Cancer Center

UF Health Georgia

Augusta University Health
 Northside Hospital Cancer Institute
 Winship Cancer Institute of
 Emory University

Cancer Center

Illinois

· Advocate Health Care

America® Chicago

· Loyola Medicine

UI Health

Indiana

lowa

Kansas

Kentucky

Maryland

· Cancer Treatment Centers of

Northwestern Medicine Robert H. Lurie

· Franciscan Health Cancer Center - Indiana

Bone & Marrow Transplant Program

The University of Kansas Cancer Center

Comprehensive Cancer Center of

· Rush University System for Health

· University of Chicago Medicine

Northwestern University

Indiana University Health

· Ascension Via Christi

Norton Cancer Institute

Cancer Center

· University of Kentucky Markey

The Sidney Kimmel Comprehensive

University of Maryland Marlene and

Stewart Greenebaum Comprehensive

Cancer Center at Johns Hopkins Hospital

· University of Iowa Health Care

Massachusetts
 Beth Israel Deaconess Medical Center
 Dana-Farber/Brigham and Women's
 Cancer Center
 Massachusetts General Hospital
 Cancer Center
 UMass Memorial Medical Center

Michigan

Barbara Ann Karmanos Cancer Institute
 Henry Ford Cancer Institute
 Spectrum Health
 University of Michigan Comprehensive
 Cancer Center

Minnesota

Mayo Clinic
 M Health/University of Minnesota

Missouri

Siteman Cancer Center
 SSM Health Saint Louis University Hospital

Nebraska

Nebraska Medicine
 New Hampshire

Dartmouth Hitchcock Medical Center
New Jersey
 Hackensack University Medical Center John Theurer Cancer Center
 Rutgers Cancer Institute of New Jersey/
Robert Wood Johnson University Hospital
New York
 Memorial Sloan Kettering Cancer Center

Memorial Sloan Kettering Cancer Center
 Montefiore Medical Center
 NewYork-Presbyterian/Columbia University
 Medical Center
 NewYork-Presbyterian/Weill Cornell
 Medical Center
 North Shore University Hospital
 Perimutter Cancer Center
 Roswell Park Comprehensive
 Cancer Center
 The Tisch Cancer Institute at Mount Sinai
 UB Medicine Wilmot Cancer Institute

North Carolina

Atrium Health Wake Forest Baptist
 Duke Cancer Institute
 Levine Cancer Institute
 Novant Health Presbyterian Medical Center
 UNC Cancer Care

Westchester Medical Center

Ohio

Cleveland Clinic Cancer Center
 The Jewish Hospital Blood Cancer Center
 The Ohio State University Comprehensive
 Cancer Center
 UC Health University of Cincinnati
 Medical Center

University Hospitals of Cleveland Oklahoma

OU Medicine
 Oregon
 Oregon Health and Science University

Hospital

Pennsylvania Allegheny Health Network Cancer Institute Fox Chase - Temple University Hospital Bone Marrow Transplant Program Penn Medicine Abramson Cancer Center Penn State Cancer Institute Sidney Kimmel Cancer Center -Jefferson Health UPMC Hillman Cancer Center

South Carolina

MUSC Health
 South Dakota
 Avera Mckennan Transplant Institute

Tennessee

Baptist Memorial Hospital
 Center for Blood Cancer at Tri-Star
 Centennial Hospital
 Methodist Healthcare
 Tennessee Valley Healthcare System
 Veteran Affairs
 Vanderbilt University Medical Center
Texas
 Baylor University Medical Center/Texas
 Oncology - Baylor Charles A. Sammons
 Cancer Center
 Houston Methodist
 Medical City

 St. David's Healthcare
 The University of Texas MD Anderson Cancer Center
 Texas Transplant Institute, Methodist Hospital
 UT Southwestern Simmons Comprehensive Cancer Center

Utah

 Huntsman Cancer Institute at the University of Utah
 Intermountain LDS Hospital

Virginia

University of Virginia
 VCU Massey Cancer Center
Washington
 Seattle Cancer Care Alliance

Swedish Health Services
 Washington, DC
 MedStar Georgetown University Hospital

West Virginia

WVU Medicine Cancer Institute
Wisconsin

maconsin

Advocate Aurora
 Froedtert & The Medical College of
Wisconsin Cancer Network
 University of Wisconsin Hospital and
Clinics - Carbone Cancer Center

Ideas for Optimized Program Growth

- 1. Create commercial and research workflows to enhance capacity for CAR T support
 - a. Leverage existing resources and communication pathways
 - Balance other institutional programs (for example, BMT or disease-specific practices)
 - Shared personnel resources may include clinicians
 - Physical plant resources may include apheresis center, cell processing lab, infusion beds
- 2. Recognize when new cell therapies and indications require new stakeholder engagement (for example, solid tumor oncologists and surgeons)
- 3. Develop and advance a coherent clinical and research portfolio to optimize patient enrollment and focus on clinical strengths
- 4. Allow for collaborative projects between sponsors and institutional researchers

Patient selection for CAR T or BiTE therapy in multiple myeloma: Which treatment for each patient?



Kegyes D, et al. J Hematol Oncol. 2022

Patient selection for CAR T or BiTE therapy in multiple myeloma: Which treatment for each patient?

	Car	BiTE
Advantages	Strong and rapid anti-tumor effects	Off-the-shelf available
	Efficient in different subgroups	Good anti-tumor control
	Autologous or allogeneic products	Dosing can be stopped in case of adverse effects
Disadvantages	Delay in production	Continuous treatment
	Side effects	Costs + +
	costs + + +	

Kegyes D, et al. J Hematol Oncol. 2022

Interazioni tra diverse professionalità



Progettualità della Rete

- Attivazione commissioni e gruppi multidisciplinari

- Razionalizzazione delle risorse

- Raccolta di informazioni epidemiologiche e flussi

Conclusions



ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

vour attention. Division of Hematology, Department of Molecular Biotechnology and He **University of Torino Clinical trial and multiple myeloma Unit** Azienda Ospedaliero-Universitaria Città della S Italy

Dr. Sara Bringhen Prof.ssa France

Prof

....a D'Agostino Dr. Francesca Bonello Dr. Luca Bertamini Dr. Giuseppe Bertuglia Dr. Lorenzo Cani Dr. Andrea Casson Prof. Benedetto Bruno

Laboratory Staff Transplant Unit Nurses Data Managing Staff **Statisticians**

European Myeloma Network (EMN) Prof. Mario Boccadoro



UNIVERSITÀ **DI TORINO**

