

Table 3. Pivotal studies for treatment-naïve CLL.

| Study                                    | Population <sup>a</sup>                                 | Design   | PFS benefit for experimental arm?   | OS benefit for experimental arm?  |
|--|---|--|---|---|
| Alliance A041202 (phase 3) <sup>40</sup> | Fit, older patients (>65 years), del(17p) allowed       | BR vs Ibru vs IR                                       | YES, IR superior<br>2-year PFS rate: 74% (BR) vs 87% (I) vs 88% (IR)                                | NO<br>2-year OS rate: 95% (BR) vs 90% (I) vs 94% (IR)                         |
| CLL5 (phase 3) <sup>66</sup>             | Treatment-naïve, ≥65, Binet stage C, ECOG 0–2           | F vs Clb   | NO<br>19 months for F vs 18 months for Clb  | NO<br>46 months for F vs 64 months for Clb                                    |
| CLL8 (phase 3) <sup>29</sup>             | Treatment-naïve, physically fit, age 30–80, CD20+       | FC vs FC+R   | YES, FC+R superior<br>3-year PFS rate: 65% (FCR) vs 45% (FC)  | NO<br>not reached for FCR vs 86.0 months for FC                               |
| CLL10 (phase 3) <sup>76</sup>            | Treatment-naïve, physically fit, age 30–80, no del(17p) | FCR vs BR  | YES, FCR superior<br>PFS 41.7 months BR and 55.2 months   | NO  |
| CLL12 (phase 3) <sup>20</sup>            | Treatment-naïve, Binet stage A, ECOG 0–2                | Observational: no treatment<br>Treatment: I vs placebo | YES<br>3-year PFS rate: 80.9% (Ibru) vs 28.5%   | -   |
| CLL13 (GAIA) (phase 3) <sup>57</sup>     | Fit, no TP53 aberrations                                | CIT: FCR or BR<br>V combinations: VR vs VO vs VO+I     | YES, VO+I most superior<br>3-year PFS rate: 90.5% (VO+I) vs 87.7% (VO) vs 80.8% (VR) vs 75.5% (CIT) | NO<br>3-year OS rate: 95.3% (VO+I) vs 96.3% (VO) vs 96.5% (VR) vs 95.0% (CIT) |
| CLL14 (phase 3) <sup>47</sup>            | Unfit (CIRS >6 or CrCl <70)                             | VO vs Clb-O  | YES, VO superior<br>3-year PFS rate: 82% (VO) vs 50% (Clb-O)  | NO<br>24-month OS rate 92% (VO) vs 93% (Clb-O)                                |
| CAPTIVATE (phase 2) <sup>55</sup>        | Treatment-naïve, ≥70 years                              | I+V  | YES<br>24-month PFS rate 95%  | YES<br>24-months OS rate 98%  |
| E1912 (phase 3) <sup>39,59</sup>         | Fit, no del(17p)  | FCR vs I+R   | YES, IR superior<br>3-year PFS rate: 73% (FCR) vs 89% (IR)  | YES<br>3-year OS rate: 92% (FCR) vs 99% (IR)                                  |
| GAGE <sup>77</sup>                       | Treatment-naïve CLL                                     | O 1000 mg vs 2000 mg                                   | YES, but not superior   | -   |
| ELEVATE-TN (phase 3) <sup>38,41</sup>    | Unfit (CIRS >6 or CrCl <70)                             | A vs A+O vs Clb-O                                      | YES. A+O superior<br>Estimated 24-month PFS rate: 93% (A+O) vs 87% (A) vs 47% (Clb-O)               | YES<br>Estimated 24-month OS rate: 95% (A+O) vs 95% (A) vs 92% (Clb-O)        |

Table 3. Pivotal studies for treatment-naïve CLL. (Cont'd)

| Study                                     | Population <sup>a</sup>   | Design                | PFS benefit for experimental arm?   | OS benefit for experimental arm?                           |
|---|---|-----------------------|---|--|
| FLAIR (phase 3) <sup>58</sup>             | Treatment-naïve, fit to receive FCR, age 18–75, WHO performance status ≤2, and treatment required from iwCLL criteria | I+V vs I vs FCR       | YES. I+V superior to FCR. Estimated 3-year PFS rate: 97.2% (I+V) vs 76.8% (FCR)                 | YES<br>3-year OS rate: 98.0% (I+V) vs 93.0% (FCR)          |
| GLOW (phase 3) <sup>48</sup>              | ≥65 years OR CIRS >6  | I+V vs Clb-O          | YES, I+V superior<br>Estimated 30-month PFS rate 80.5% (I+V) vs 35.8% (Clb-O)                   | NO   |
| HDMP+R <sup>78</sup>                      | Treatment-naïve   | HDMP+R                | YES<br>PFS 30.5 months  | YES<br>3-years OS rate 96%                                 |
| iLLUMINATE (phase 3) <sup>61</sup>        | Unfit (CIRS>6 or CrCl<70) or TP53 del/mut   | I+V vs Clb-O          | YES<br>Estimated 30-month PFS rate 79% (I+V) vs 31% (Clb-O)                                     | NO<br>Estimated 30-month OS rate: 86% (I+V) vs 85% (Clb-O) |
| RESONATE-2 (phase 3) <sup>60</sup>        | ≥65 without del(17p)  | I vs Clb              | YES<br>5-year PFS rate: 70% (I) vs 12% (Clb)  | YES<br>5-year OS rate: 83% (I) vs 68% (Clb)                |
| Rituximab (phase 2) <sup>65</sup>         | Treatment-naïve   | R                     | YES<br>1- and 2-year PFS rates were 62% and 49%, respectively                                   | YES  |
| RO5072759 [GA101] (phase 3) <sup>64</sup> | Treatment-naïve, CIRS >6  | Clb-O vs Clb vs Clb-R | YES, Clb superior<br>Median PFS 26.7 months (Clb-O) vs 11.1 months (Clb) vs 16.3 months (Clb-R) | YES<br>OS rate 9% (Clb-O) vs 20% (Clb) vs 15% (Clb-R)      |
| SEQUOIA (phase 3) <sup>42</sup>           | Untreated, ≥65 years, ECOG 0–2  | Z vs BR               | Median PFS not reached in either arm. Z showed longer PFS.                                      | NO<br>Estimated 24-month OS rate 94.3% (Z) vs 94.6% (BR)   |

<sup>a</sup> Fit patients are defined as those aged <65 years with a CIRS score <6 and CrCl ≥70 mL/min

A: acalabrutinib; B: bendamustine; Clb: chlorambucil; CLL: chronic lymphocytic leukaemia; CIT: chemoimmunotherapy; CrCl: creatine clearance; CIRS: Cumulative Illness Rating Scale; C: cyclophosphamide; ECOG: Eastern Cooperative Oncology Group; F: fludarabine; HDMP: high-dose methylprednisolone; FCR: fludarabine + cyclophosphamide + rituximab; I: ibrutinib; iwCLL: International Workshop on CLL; PFS: progression-free survival; O: obinutuzumab; OS: overall survival; R: rituximab; V: venetoclax; WHO: World Health Organization; Z: zanubrutinib