



POST-ASH Issue 3, 2015

**Results of the Phase III CLL11 Study:
Salvage Therapy with Obinutuzumab
and Chlorambucil (Clb) After
Treatment Failure of Clb Alone for
Patients with CLL and Comorbidities**

For more visit ResearchToPractice.com/5MJCASH2015

**Research
To Practice®**

CME INFORMATION

OVERVIEW OF ACTIVITY

Each year, thousands of clinicians, basic scientists and other industry professionals sojourn to major international oncology conferences, like the American Society of Hematology (ASH) annual meeting, to hone their skills, network with colleagues and learn about recent advances altering state-of-the-art management in hematologic oncology. As such, these events have become global stages where exciting science, cutting-edge concepts and practice-changing data emerge on a truly grand scale. This massive outpouring of information has enormous benefits for the hematologic oncology community, but the truth is it also creates a major challenge for practicing oncologists and hematologists.

Although original data are consistently being presented and published, the flood of information unveiled during a major academic conference is unprecedented and leaves in its wake an enormous volume of new knowledge that practicing oncologists must try to sift through, evaluate and consider applying. Unfortunately and quite commonly, time constraints and an inability to access these data sets leave many oncologists struggling to ensure that they're aware of crucial practice-altering findings. This creates an almost insurmountable obstacle for clinicians in community practice because they are not only confronted almost overnight with thousands of new presentations and data sets to consider but they are also severely restricted in their ability to review and interrogate the raw findings.

To bridge the gap between research and patient care, this CME activity will deliver a serial review of the most important emerging data sets on the management of chronic lymphocytic leukemia (CLL) from the latest ASH meeting, including expert perspectives on how these new evidence-based concepts may be applied to routine clinical care. This activity will assist medical oncologists, hematologists, hematology-oncology fellows and other healthcare professionals in the formulation of optimal clinical management strategies and the timely application of new research findings to best-practice patient care.

LEARNING OBJECTIVES

- Develop an understanding of emerging efficacy and side-effect data with novel agents and combination regimens — including next-generation anti-CD20 antibodies and PI3 kinase, BTK and Bcl-2 inhibitors — under evaluation for previously untreated and relapsed/refractory CLL and, where appropriate, facilitate patient access to ongoing trials of these agents.
- Appreciate the recent FDA approvals of novel targeted agents indicated for the treatment of newly diagnosed and relapsed/refractory CLL, and discern how these treatments can be appropriately integrated into clinical practice.
- Compare and contrast the benefits and risks of chemoimmunotherapy with fludarabine/cyclophosphamide/rituximab versus bendamustine/rituximab as first-line therapy for fit patients with CLL.
- Apply recent clinical research findings with the newly FDA-approved combination of obinutuzumab and chlorambucil to the care of patients with previously untreated CLL.
- Recall the activity of salvage therapy with obinutuzumab and chlorambucil after treatment failure of chlorambucil alone in patients with CLL and comorbidities.

ACCREDITATION STATEMENT

Research To Practice is accredited by the Accreditation Council for Continuing Medical Education to provide continuing medical education for physicians.

CREDIT DESIGNATION STATEMENT

Research To Practice designates this enduring material for a maximum of 2 *AMA PRA Category 1 Credits™*. Physicians should claim only the credit commensurate with the extent of their participation in the activity.

HOW TO USE THIS CME ACTIVITY

This CME activity contains slides and edited commentary. To receive credit, the participant should review the slide presentations, read the commentary, complete the Post-test with a score of 75% or better and fill out the Educational Assessment and Credit Form located at ResearchToPractice.com/5MJCASH2015/3/CME.

CONTENT VALIDATION AND DISCLOSURES

Research To Practice (RTP) is committed to providing its participants with high-quality, unbiased and state-of-the-art education. We assess potential conflicts of interest with faculty, planners and managers of CME activities. Real or apparent conflicts of interest are identified and resolved through a conflict of interest resolution process. In addition, all activity content is reviewed by both a member of the RTP scientific staff and an external, independent physician reviewer for fair balance, scientific objectivity of studies referenced and patient care recommendations.

FACULTY — The following faculty (and their spouses/partners) reported real or apparent conflicts of interest, which have been resolved through a conflict of interest resolution process:

Stephen M Ansell, MD, PhD
Professor of Medicine
Division of Hematology
Mayo Clinic
Rochester, Minnesota

Research Funding: Bristol-Myers Squibb Company, Celldex Therapeutics.

Ian W Flinn, MD, PhD
Director of Blood Cancer Research
Sarah Cannon Research Institute

Tennessee Oncology
Nashville, Tennessee

Contracted Research: AstraZeneca Pharmaceuticals LP, Celgene Corporation, Cephalon Inc, Genentech BioOncology, GlaxoSmithKline, Novartis Pharmaceuticals Corporation, Roche Laboratories Inc, Takeda Oncology.

Jonathan W Friedberg, MD, MMSc
Samuel Durand Professor of Medicine
Director, Wilmot Cancer Center
University of Rochester
Rochester, New York

Advisory Committee and Other Uncompensated Activities:
Genentech BioOncology.

Mitchell R Smith, MD, PhD
Director of Lymphoid Malignancies Program at Taussig Cancer
Institute
Cleveland Clinic
Cleveland, Ohio

Consulting Agreements: Celgene Corporation, Spectrum
Pharmaceuticals Inc, Takeda Oncology; Contracted Research:
Abbott Laboratories.

EDITOR — Dr Love is president and CEO of Research To Practice,
which receives funds in the form of educational grants to develop
CME activities from the following commercial interests: AbbVie
Inc, Amgen Inc, Astellas Scientific and Medical Affairs Inc,
AstraZeneca Pharmaceuticals LP, Aveo Pharmaceuticals, Bayer
HealthCare Pharmaceuticals, Biodesix Inc, Boehringer Ingelheim
Pharmaceuticals Inc, Boston Biomedical Pharma Inc, Bristol-
Myers Squibb Company, Celgene Corporation, Clovis Oncology,
Daiichi Sankyo Inc, Dendreon Corporation, Eisai Inc, Exelixis
Inc, Foundation Medicine, Genentech BioOncology, Genomic
Health Inc, Gilead Sciences Inc, Incyte Corporation, Janssen
Biotech Inc, Jazz Pharmaceuticals Inc, Lilly, Medivation Inc,
Merck, Myriad Genetic Laboratories Inc, Novartis Pharmaceuticals
Corporation, Novocure, Onyx Pharmaceuticals, an Amgen
subsidiary, Pharmacyclics Inc, Prometheus Laboratories
Inc, Regeneron Pharmaceuticals, Sanofi, Seattle Genetics,
Sigma-Tau Pharmaceuticals Inc, Sirtex Medical Ltd, Spectrum
Pharmaceuticals Inc, Taiho Oncology Inc, Takeda Oncology, Teva
Oncology, Tokai Pharmaceuticals Inc and VisionGate Inc.

RESEARCH TO PRACTICE STAFF AND EXTERNAL REVIEWERS —
The scientific staff and reviewers for Research To Practice have
no real or apparent conflicts of interest to disclose.

This educational activity contains discussion of published and/
or investigational uses of agents that are not indicated by
the Food and Drug Administration. Research To Practice does
not recommend the use of any agent outside of the labeled
indications. Please refer to the official prescribing information
for each product for discussion of approved indications,
contraindications and warnings. The opinions expressed are those
of the presenters and are not to be construed as those of the
publisher or grantors.

This activity is supported by educational grants from
Bristol-Myers Squibb Company, Celgene Corporation,
Incyte Corporation, Onyx Pharmaceuticals, an Amgen subsidiary,
Seattle Genetics and Takeda Oncology.

Hardware/Software Requirements:

A high-speed Internet connection

A monitor set to 1280 x 1024 pixels or more

Internet Explorer 7 or later, Firefox 3.0 or later, Chrome,
Safari 3.0 or later

Adobe Flash Player 10.2 plug-in or later

Adobe Acrobat Reader

(Optional) Sound card and speakers for audio


Last review date: April 2015

Expiration date: April 2016

To go directly to slides and commentary for this issue, [click here](#).

When the German CLL Study Group — one of the most prolific clinical trial organizations in the world — launched the landmark Phase III CLL10 trial in 2008, few, if any, expected that the central question the study sought to answer would in essence be outdated by the time the results became available. CLL10 focused on a classic oncology research issue — the comparative clinical benefits of 2 chemobiologic regimens (fludarabine/cyclophosphamide/rituximab [FCR] and bendamustine/rituximab [BR]), and although the results as summarized below have important practical clinical implications today, it is increasingly evident that the overall treatment strategy in this disease is undergoing a massive reconfiguration. For that reason, this issue of *5-Minute Journal Club* evaluates not only the seminal CLL10 trial findings but also a sample of 2014 ASH data sets on several new agents, regimens and strategies that have burst onto the scene in the past couple of years and have many investigators thinking that chronic lymphocytic leukemia (CLL) may soon fall into the basic clinical paradigm of chronic myelogenous leukemia (CML) — namely a chronic disease requiring long-term outpatient management that may be associated with prolonged survival.

Here's a summary of what happened in San Francisco related to CLL.



CLL10: FCR versus BR (patients without del[17p])

The updated data from CLL10 continue to support what clinical experience had already strongly suggested, namely that FCR yields clear-cut improvements in disease-related outcomes, including a statistically and clinically significant increase in median progression-free survival (PFS) (55.2 versus 41.7 months) and rates of bone marrow minimal residual disease (MRD) negativity at final restaging (26.6% versus 11.1%). However, with less than 3 years of follow-up, no overall survival benefit has been seen. Just as predictably, the data reveal that FCR produced considerably more toxicity, particularly in older individuals (>65 years) in whom the rate of infection was 47.7% compared to 20.6% with BR. The bottom line is that most investigators believe that both regimens have a role and the risk for toxicity must be carefully considered during patient selection.

Impact of MRD status


The intriguing concept of defining undetectable levels of disease after treatment to better understand potential prognosis has been explored in various forms across many hematologic cancers. In this regard, at ASH we saw a **report from the German group** evaluating pooled data from the CLL8 (FC versus FCR) and CLL10 trials examining the value of peripheral blood MRD-negative status at response evaluation. What was seen was a strong correlation between MRD status and outcome that seemed at least as predictive of PFS as clinical response, and of particular interest, patients considered to have a partial response clinically had a much better prognosis if their bone marrow was MRD-negative (61.7 versus 28.1 months). Discussions are now ongoing about how to integrate MRD status into prospective trial design and potentially clinical decision-making.

Obinutuzumab (Ob)

Since the FDA approval of Ob in combination with chlorambucil — a drug that many had not been regularly using for CLL — there has been constant questioning about whether this novel Type II anti-CD20 antibody could be employed with other chemotherapeutic regimens. Not surprisingly, a number of studies are ongoing that examine this issue, including the Phase III GREEN trial, which is targeting 800 patients with both previously treated and untreated CLL and evaluates Ob alone or with one of several types of chemotherapy. This effort is also interesting in that it examines a modified dosing scheme of 25 mg on day 1 and 975 mg on day 2 in an attempt to address the high rates of infusion-related reactions that have previously been reported with Ob. At ASH we saw **early safety data** from the previously untreated cohort in the study, which showed a 13.3% rate of Grade 3 or higher infusion-related reactions with 2.5% of patients discontinuing treatment due to this side effect. As greater experience is gained with this interesting agent, it has become clear that these infusion reactions occur mainly during the first cycle and may be related to cell death and/or cytokine release. Efficacy findings from this study are not yet available, and until then, clinicians will need to consider whether they want to dust off chlorambucil and give it a go with Ob. Interestingly, during a recent interview for our audio series with investigator Dr Jeffrey

Sharman, I was surprised to learn that he avoids this issue altogether and unabashedly uses Ob alone as up-front therapy in select patients.

Clearly, the German CLL group was busy at ASH as they also treated us to **more from the pivotal CLL11 trial**, which was first presented at ASCO 2013 and paved the way for the approval of Ob. From that and related presentations, we learned, among other things, that Ob/chlorambucil is superior to rituximab/chlorambucil in a number of ways, including rates of MRD negativity in blood (38% versus 3%). Additional data unveiled at ASH evaluated patients in the trial who were initially randomly assigned to chlorambucil alone but upon relapse (generally due to lack of response to chlorambucil) were crossed over to Ob/chlorambucil. Of great interest, 26 of 30 patients (87%) experienced objective responses, further suggesting that Ob itself might have significant and perhaps underappreciated intrinsic anti-CLL activity that is greater than that previously observed with rituximab monotherapy, an important and useful therapeutic tool in follicular lymphoma.



Anti-CD20 maintenance in CLL

Although maintenance rituximab has been commonly used in many patients receiving R-chemotherapy for follicular and mantle-cell lymphoma, our survey and polling data have clearly illustrated that hematologic investigators do not endorse this approach in CLL. However, provocative results from **2 interesting trials** unveiled at ASH have some beginning to reevaluate this stance.

First, the AGMT-CLL8/a trial randomly assigned 263 patients who completed first- or second-line chemotherapy/rituximab to 24 months of rituximab maintenance or observation and demonstrated an approximately 50% reduction in the rate of disease

progression with maintenance. No survival benefit was seen, although crossover in the control group was allowed. The other related and cleverly named Phase III effort (the PROLONG trial) evaluated ofatumumab maintenance after second- or third-line treatment with chemotherapy/anti-CD20, and again there was an approximate 50% reduction in risk of disease progression. Although more data on this important question would be ideal, some investigators feel that these results are enough to compel clinicians to discuss and/or recommend this approach in select patients, at least until the many new options and treatments are sorted out.

Ibrutinib

You can't attend a conference these days without witnessing a new and relevant data set with this blockbuster Bruton tyrosine kinase inhibitor, and ASH was no exception, as we saw results from the Phase II RESONATE™-17 trial focused on 144 patients with del(17p) CLL who experienced disease progression while receiving between 1 and 4 prior lines of therapy. Perhaps not surprisingly, as few of these studies fail to disappoint, most patients had objective responses, and about 80% were progression free at 1 year. These relevant findings are central to the current first-line approval of the drug in this situation. However, it is important to note that although ibrutinib results in similar response rates in this population, these patients have shorter PFS and overall survival.

Interestingly, there is a belief that del(17p) may only be part of the story, and for that reason investigators at MD Anderson evaluated CKT (complex metaphase karyotype by whole genome sequencing defined as 3 or more distinct chromosomal abnormalities) in 100 consecutive cases of CLL treated with ibrutinib. What they found is that CKT is a better predictor of benefit from ibrutinib than del(17p). However, this clearly needs additional confirmation before whole genome sequencing makes its way into trials or clinical practice.


Idelalisib

One of the important features of ibrutinib in CLL is the consistency of response in patients with adverse prognostic factors like 17p deletion, but the drug is not alone in this regard. At ASH we saw a **subset analysis** from the major Phase III trial reported in the *New England Journal* demonstrating that idelalisib/rituximab is a highly effective regimen, including in patients with del(17p), del(11q) and unmutated IGHV. These findings suggest that this regimen may have an important early role in patients with these genetic abnormalities who have previously received or are not candidates for ibrutinib.

Venetoclax (formerly ABT-199)

Despite the new moniker, more data presented at ASH reveal that things remain entirely the same and that this novel Bcl-2 inhibitor/antiapoptotic agent is a very active drug. Most notably, in a **Phase II trial** of 49 patients with relapsed or refractory CLL/small lymphocytic lymphoma, the combination of venetoclax with rituximab demonstrated an impressive 88% objective response rate with 31% complete response (CR) or CR with incomplete blood count recovery, including in 7 of 9 patients with

del(17p). MRD negativity in the bone marrow was recorded in 17 patients. Significantly, 5 dose cohorts were studied, and it appears that a schedule was uncovered that seems to avoid tumor lysis syndrome — a complication reported previously with this agent.



Although it remains to be seen how these novel and encouraging therapies will be optimally mixed, matched and sequenced in CLL, it seems highly likely that the survival of patients will continue to be extended and perhaps soon mirror the normal life expectancies of patients under active treatment for CML. ASH 2014 will be remembered as another important step forward in this rewarding march toward a new standard.

Next on this series, we provide an ASH update on myeloproliferative neoplasms, including more data on the most recently approved treatment in these diseases, the use of ruxolitinib in polycythemia vera.

Neil Love, MD

Research To Practice

Miami, Florida

Research To Practice is accredited by the Accreditation Council for Continuing Medical Education to provide continuing medical education for physicians.

Research To Practice designates this enduring material for a maximum of 2 *AMA PRA Category 1 Credits™*. Physicians should claim only the credit commensurate with the extent of their participation in the activity.

This activity is supported by educational grants from Bristol-Myers Squibb Company, Celgene Corporation, Incyte Corporation, Onyx Pharmaceuticals, an Amgen subsidiary, Seattle Genetics and Takeda Oncology.

Results of the Phase III CLL11 Study: Salvage Therapy with Obinutuzumab and Chlorambucil (Clb) After Treatment Failure of Clb Alone for Patients with CLL and Comorbidities

Presentation discussed in this issue

Goede V et al. **Salvage therapy with obinutuzumab (GA101) plus chlorambucil (Clb) after treatment failure of Clb alone in patients with chronic lymphocytic leukemia (CLL) and comorbidities: Results of the CLL11 study.** *Proc ASH* 2014;[Abstract 3327](#).

Slides from a presentation at ASH 2014 and transcribed comments from a recent interview with Jonathan W Friedberg, MD, MMSc (1/8/15)

Salvage Therapy with Obinutuzumab (GA101) plus Chlorambucil (Clb) After Treatment Failure of Clb Alone in Patients with Chronic Lymphocytic Leukemia (CLL) and Comorbidities: Results of the CLL11 Study

Goede V et al.

Proc ASH 2014;Abstract 3327.

Research
To Practice®


Background

- Chemoimmunotherapy with the glycoengineered Type II anti-CD20 antibody obinutuzumab (O) in combination with chlorambucil (Clb), the O-Clb regimen, was investigated in the CLL11 study (*NEJM* 2014;370(12):1101).
 - O-Clb versus Clb alone demonstrated clinical benefit in patients with previously untreated chronic lymphocytic leukemia (CLL) and comorbidities.
 - Progression-free survival (PFS): 26.7 vs 11.1 months
- **Study objective:** To determine whether O-Clb is an active salvage therapy for patients with refractory CLL after front-line therapy with Clb alone in a subpopulation of patients enrolled on the CLL11 trial.

Goede V et al. *Proc ASH* 2014;Abstract 3327 (Abstract only).

Research
To Practice®

Phase III CLL11: Substudy Design



* Subpopulation of patients enrolled on the Phase III CLL11 trial

- Patients on the study were offered O-Clb as optional salvage therapy.

Goede V et al. *Proc ASH* 2014;Abstract 3327 (Abstract only).

Research
To Practice®

Patient Characteristics

Characteristic	n = 30
Median age	72 years
Median CIRS at study entry	8
Median calculated creatinine clearance	67 mL/min
Del(11q)	12%
Del(17p)	20%
Unmutated IGHV genes	64%

CIRS = cumulative illness rating scale

- All patients on the study were offered O-Clb as optional salvage therapy.
- All patients had a high comorbidity burden at study entry.
- All patients had reduced renal function.

Goede V et al. *Proc ASH* 2014;Abstract 3327 (Abstract only).

Research
To Practice®

Treatment Outcomes

- At crossover to O-Clb therapy:
 - Patients who had not responded to initial treatment with Clb alone: 28 (93%)
 - Patients who initially responded to Clb alone and had achieved partial remission but relapsed early: 2 (7%)
 - The median time from Clb initiation to crossover: 9.7 months
- After crossover to O-Clb therapy:
 - Patients who completed 6 cycles of O-Clb: 29 (97%)
 - Patients who discontinued O-Clb after first infusion of O due to infusion-related reactions (IRRs): 1 (3%)

Goede V et al. *Proc ASH* 2014;Abstract 3327 (Abstract only).

Research
To Practice®

Response to O-Clb

Response, n (%)	n = 30
Overall response	26 (87%)
Complete response	2 (7%)
Incomplete complete response	1 (3%)
Partial response	23 (77%)
Stable disease	2 (7%)
Progressive disease	1 (3%)
Not evaluable due to study discontinuation after IRRs	1 (3%)

- Negativity for minimal residual disease in bone marrow and/or peripheral blood after crossover treatment was achieved in 23% of patients.

Goede V et al. *Proc ASH 2014*;Abstract 3327 (Abstract only).

Research
To Practice®

PFS

Outcome	n = 30
Median PFS* (95% confidence interval)	17.2 months (14.2-22.4)
Median follow-up time	23 months

* From start of crossover treatment

Goede V et al. *Proc ASH 2014*;Abstract 3327 (Abstract only).

Research
To Practice®

Adverse Events (N = 30)

Event	Grade 3 or 4
Neutropenia	33%
IRRs	17%
Infections	13%
Thrombocytopenia	10%
Anemia	7%

Goede V et al. *Proc ASH 2014*;Abstract 3327 (Abstract only).

Research
To Practice®

Author Conclusions

- In addition to the established role of chemoimmunotherapy with O-C1b as front-line treatment of CLL, these results suggest that:
 - The combination could be a safe and active treatment for patients with CLL refractory to prior C1b chemotherapy.

Goede V et al. *Proc ASH 2014*;Abstract 3327 (Abstract only).

Research
To Practice®

Investigator Commentary: Salvage Treatment with O-Clb After Disease Progression on Clb Alone in Patients with CLL and Comorbidities

The background of this study is the randomized Phase III CLL11 trial of Clb/rituximab versus Clb alone versus Clb/O, showing that the combination of O with Clb produced much better results. The magnitude of the benefits observed with O in CLL was surprising.

The current study is like an add-on study with patients who experienced disease progression on initial therapy with Clb alone. These patients belonged to a higher-risk group. They were older, 12% of them had del(11q) and 20% had del(17p). The patients were offered Clb in combination with O. Despite the presence of high-risk disease, the study demonstrated a favorable overall response rate with a median PFS of 17.2 months. This is impressive. The results suggest that O-Clb as an option in the Clb-refractory setting should be a treatment consideration. It demonstrated that the use of O for patients with not-heavily pretreated disease has significant activity.

Interview with Jonathan W Friedberg, MD, MMSc, January 8, 2015

Research
To Practice®