

between these two anti-CD38 mAbs, therapeutic choice should be based on factors other than efficacy. Protocol Registration: CRD420250618823.

<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.htct.2025.104822>

ID - 821

DARATUMUMAB + BORTEZOMIB, LENALIDOMIDE, AND DEXAMETHASONE (DVRD) VS VRD IN TRANSPLANT-INELIGIBLE (TIE)/TRANSPLANT-DEFERRED (TD) NEWLY DIAGNOSED MULTIPLE MYELOMA (NDMM): PHASE 3 CEPHEUS TRIAL CYTOGENETIC SUBGROUP ANALYSIS

NJ Bahlis^a, SZ Usmani^b, T Facon^c, S Zweegman^d, C Venner^e, M Braunstein^f, L Pour^g, J Marti^h, A Maiolinoⁱ, V Hungria^j

^a Arnie Charbonneau Cancer Research Institute, University of Calgary, Calgary, Canada

^b Department of Medicine, Memorial Sloan Kettering Cancer Center, New York, United States

^c University of Lille, CHU Lille, Lille, France

^d Amsterdam University Medical Center, Vrije Universiteit Amsterdam, Amsterdam, Netherlands

^e Cross Cancer Institute, University of Alberta, Edmonton, Canada

^f Perlmutter Cancer Center, NYU Langone Health, New York, United States

^g University Hospital Brno, Brno, Czech Republic

^h Hospital Universitario Mútua de Terrassa, Terrassa, Spain

ⁱ Instituto Americas de Ensino, Pesquisa e Inovação, Rio de Janeiro, Brazil

^j Clínica Médica São Germano, São Paulo, Brazil

Introduction: In CEPHEUS, DVRd significantly improved overall MRD negativity (MRD neg + $\geq$ CR) and sustained MRD neg rates and PFS in patients (pts) with TIE/TD NDMM. In this post hoc analysis, we report outcomes in cytogenetic risk subgroups. **Objectives:** To gain additional insight into those patients who had long-term clinical benefit $\geq$ 5 years after a single ciltacel infusion, we conducted a post hoc analysis. We report OS, $\geq$ 5-year progression-free outcomes, associated biomarkers, and safety from CARTITUDE-1, with 61.3-month median follow-up. **Material and methods:** Pts with TIE/TD NDMM were randomized 1:1 to DVRd or VRd. High-risk (HiR) cytogenetic abnormalities (HRCAs) were assessed by FISH. HiR was $\geq$ 1 of: del(17p); t(4;14); t(14;16). Revised HiR (R-HiR) was $\geq$ 1 of above or gain (3 copies) or amp(1q) ($\geq$ 4 copies). Standard risk (SR) was 0 HRCAs; revised SR (R-SR) was 0 revised HRCAs. Additional risk groups included: gain or amp(1q) + other HRCAs; 1 and $\geq$ 2 revised HRCAs. We assessed overall MRD neg rate, sustained MRD neg, $\geq$ CR rate, and PFS. We reported all MRD neg rates at 10-5 unless noted. **Results:** Of 395 randomized pts (DVRd, n = 197; VRd, n = 198), 298 had SR (DVRd, n = 149; VRd, n = 149) and 52 HiR (DVRd, n = 25; VRd, n = 27). 184 pts had R-SR (DVRd, n = 94; VRd, n = 90) and 167 R-

HiR (DVRd, n = 83; VRd, n = 84). At median 58.7-month (mo) follow-up, overall MRD neg rate was higher with DVRd vs VRd in SR (64% vs 38%; $P < 0.0001$) and R-SR pts (68% vs 38%; $P < 0.0001$). Rates by treatment (tx) arm in HiR (48% vs 56%; $P = 0.7816$) and R-HiR pts (55% vs 45%; $P = 0.2169$) were comparable. DVRd improved $\geq$ 1-year (y) sustained MRD neg rate vs VRd in SR (51% vs 26%; $P < 0.0001$) and R-SR pts (54% vs 24%; $P < 0.0001$). Sustained MRD neg rates by tx arm were comparable in HiR (40% vs 37%; $P = 1.0000$) and R-HiR pts (43% vs 30%; $P = 0.0782$). PFS was improved with DVRd vs VRd in SR (HR = 0.61 [95% CI, 0.41–0.91]; $P = 0.01$) and R-SR (HR = 0.54 [95% CI, 0.32–0.91]; $P = 0.01$) pts and was comparable by tx arm in HiR (HR = 0.88 [95% CI, 0.48–1.84]; $P = 0.73$); and R-HiR HR = 0.73 [95% CI, 0.46–1.15]; $P = 0.17$; pts $\geq$ 1, including in MRD neg pts (R-SR: (HR = 0.63 [95% CI, 0.26–1.52]; $P = 0.30$); R-HiR: HR = 0.71 [95% CI, 0.32–1.58]; $P = 0.39$. Gain(1q)+otherHRCAs HR = 0.80 [95% CI, 0.45–1.42]; $P = 0.044$; Amp(1q)+other HRCAs HR = 0.97 [95% CI, 0.38–2.47]; $P = 0.95$. 1 revised HRCA HR = 0.63 [95% CI, 0.37–1.09]; $P = 0.09$; $\geq$ 2 revised HRCA (HR = 1.01 [95% CI, 0.42–2.44]; $P = 0.98$) Remaining outcomes, including rates of $\geq$ CR, $\geq$ 2-y sustained MRD neg, and overall and $\geq$ 1-y sustained MRD neg at 10-6, were improved with DVRd in SR and R-SR pts and comparable by tx arm in HiR and R-HiR pts. **Discussão e conclusão:** In CEPHEUS, DVRd consistently improved the key response outcomes of MRD neg and PFS in (R-)SR pts. In HiR pts, MRD and PFS outcomes trended lower in both tx arms vs those in SR pts. Here, DVRd mostly improved PFS outcomes vs VRd; however, pt numbers were small, with the study underpowered for HiR pts. These data support use of DVRd for TIE/TD NDMM regardless of cytogenetic risk status. **Funding:** This study was funded by Johnson & Johnson. Medical writing support was provided by Maggie Hartman, PharmD, of Eloquent Scientific Solutions, and funded by Johnson & Johnson.

<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.htct.2025.104823>

ID - 765

DARATUMUMAB PLUS BORTEZOMIB, LENALIDOMIDE, AND DEXAMETHASONE (DVRD) IN PATIENTS WITH NEWLY DIAGNOSED MULTIPLE MYELOMA (NDMM): SUBGROUP ANALYSIS OF TRANSPLANT-INELIGIBLE (TIE) PATIENTS IN THE PHASE 3 CEPHEUS STUDY

T Facon^a, S Zweegman^b, V Hungria^c, NJ Bahlis^d, CP Venner^e, M Braunstein^f, L Pour^g, J Marti^h, A Maiolinoⁱ, SZ Usmani^j

^a University of Lille, CHU Lille, Lille, France

^b Amsterdam University Medical Center, Vrije Universiteit Amsterdam, Amsterdam, Netherlands

^c Clínica Médica São Germano, São Paulo, Brazil

^d Arnie Charbonneau Cancer Research Institute, University of Calgary, Calgary, Canada

^e Cross Cancer Institute, University of Alberta, Edmonton, Canada