# Prognostic and Predictive Value of IPSS-R in Assessing Overall Survival (OS) in a Phase III Study of Rigosertib in Second-line Higher-risk (HR) MDS Patients

Lewis R. Silverman, MD<sup>1</sup>, Pierre Fenaux, MD<sup>2</sup>, Aref Al-Kali, MD<sup>3</sup>, Maria R. Baer, MD<sup>5</sup>, Gail Roboz, MD<sup>6</sup>, Gianluca Gaidano, MD<sup>7</sup>, Bart Scott, MD<sup>8</sup>, Peter Greenberg, MD<sup>9</sup>, Uwe Platzbecker, MD<sup>10</sup>, David P. Steensma, MD<sup>11</sup>, Karl-Anton Kreuzer, MD<sup>13</sup>, Lucy Godley, MD<sup>14</sup>, Robert Collins, Jr, MD<sup>15</sup>, Ehab Atallah, MD<sup>16</sup>, Nozar Azarnia, PhD<sup>17</sup>, Guillermo Garcia-Manero, MD<sup>18</sup> <sup>1</sup>Division of Hematology/Oncology, Tisch Cancer Institute, Icahn School of Medicine at Mount Sinai, New York, NY; <sup>2</sup>Hospital St Louis, Paris, France; <sup>3</sup>Mayo Clinic, Cleveland Clinic, Cleveland, OH; <sup>6</sup>Weill Cornell Medical College, New York, NY; <sup>7</sup>Amedeo Avogadro University of Eastern Piedmont, Novara, Italy; <sup>8</sup>Fred Hutchinson Cancer Research Center, Seattle, WA; <sup>9</sup>Stanford, CA; <sup>10</sup>Universitätsklinikum Dresden, Germany; <sup>11</sup>Dana-Farber Cancer Institute, Boston, MA; <sup>12</sup>Universitätsklinikum Köln, Köln, Germany; <sup>13</sup>University of Chicago Medical Center, Chicago, IL; <sup>14</sup>Univ of Texas, Southwestern Medical Center at Dallas, TX; <sup>15</sup>Froedtert Hospital and Medical Center, Houston, TX

# INTRODUCTION

**ONTIME** was a randomized (2:1) study of rigosertib vs best supportive care (BSC) in 299 pts with HR-MDS who had relapsed after, failed to respond to, or progressed during hypomethylating agents (HMAs). This study showed a trend favoring RIG in the overall **ITT** analysis and a significant effect of RIG in the subgroup of pts with very high risk (VHR) per the revised International Prognostic Scoring System (IPSS-R). METHODS

We examined the utility of the IPSS-R and correlation between baseline disease characteristics and OS in 93 rigosertib and 41 BSC pts with IPSS-R VHR.

## RESULTS

This first clinical study using IPSS-R in second-line HR-MDS pts showed a effect (p<0.01) of rigosertib on median OS vs BSC not only in the overall group of pts with IPSS-R VHR, but also in several subgroups defined by baseline disease characteristics (see table).

CONCLUSION

**IPSS-R** is a useful prognostic tool for second-line MDS pts. After HMA failure, MDS pts with IPSS-R VHR and certain subgroups identified by baseline disease characteristics showed an OS advantage when treated with rigosertib compared to BSC. Such characteristics should be considered in the design of future second-line studies in MDS patients with IPSS-R VHR.

## Median (mon

### Characteristic

All patients wi

**Primary HMA** 

FAB classifica

**ECOG** perform

**Bone marrow** 

Hemoglobin <

Platelet count

**Neutrophil cou** 

### FAB classifica

\* Failed to respond to or progressed during HMA treatment (Prébet T, Gore SD, Esterni B, et al. Outcome of high-risk myelodysplastic syndrome after azacitidine treatment failure. J Clin Oncol 2011; 29:3322-27.) FAB, French/American/British classification system; RAEB-t, refractory anemia with excess blasts in transition; ECOG, Eastern Cooperative Oncology Group; CMML, chronic myelomonocytic leukemia

nths) OS by Baseline Disease Characteristics in Patients with IPSS-R VHR						
	Rigosertib		BSC		Log-rank	Hazard ratio (Rigosertib / BSC)
C	Ν	OS	N	OS	p-value	(95% CI)
ith IPSS-R VHR	93	7.6	41	3.2	0.0050	0.56 (0.37-0.84)
failure*	55	8.1	21	2.6	0.0055	0.48 (0.28-0.81)
ation of RAEB-t	23	5.8	9	3.4	0.0031	0.26 (0.10-0.68)
mance status 0 or	79	8.9	30	3.6	0.0006	0.44 (0.28-0.71)
v blast 20-30%	24	5.9	9	3.4	0.0020	0.25 (0.10-0.64)
< 9 g/dL	63	6.9	21	2.3	< 0.0001	0.30 (0.17-0.54)
t ≥ 40 ×10 <sup>9</sup> /L	37	10.1	13	4.4	0.0009	0.27 (0.12-0.62)
ount ≥ 0.8 × 10 <sup>9</sup> /L	24	8.5	12	2.7	0.0038	0.29 (0.12-0.70)
ation of CMML	1	9.2	5	4.7	< 0.0001	