

in

The Future of Cancer

Matthew Lunning D.O. Associate Professor OPTUM Leadership Forum 5/15/19

A National Cancer Institute Designated Cancer Center



FRED & PAMELA BUFFETT CANCER CENTER

Disclosures

Research Support	Amgen; BMS; Celgene; Curis; Juno; Janssen; Pharmacyclics; TG Therapeutics
Consultancy	AbbVie/Pharmacyclics; Bayer; Cardinal Health; Celgene/Juno; Dava; Janssen; Gilead/Kite; Novartis; Portola; Seattle Genetics; Spectrum; TG Therapeutics; Vanium; Verastem
Employment	NONE
Major Stock Holder	NONE
Speaker Bureau	NONE



Objectives

- 1. Discuss the safety, efficacy, and role of chimeric antigen receptor (CAR) T-cell therapy in cancer treatment
- 2. Outline guideline recommendations for patient selection, administration of treatment, and monitoring and management of toxicities with regard to CAR T-cell therapy
- 3. Discuss current and future strategies for applying CAR T-cell therapy and managing treatment-related complications





- 1. Current clinical trials involving chimeric antigen therapy (CAR) T-cell therapy various hematologic malignancies target the following antigens except:
 - A. CD19
 - B. CD20
 - C. CD22
 - D. CD28



- 2. Prior to the delivery of cyclophosphamide and fludarabine based lymphodepleting chemotherapy a change in this may necessitate a dose reduction:
 - A. Creatinine clearance
 - B. ECOG performance status
 - C. Absolute neutrophil count (ANC)
 - D. Hemoglobin



- 3. In monitoring for cytokine release syndrome (CRS) these factors are taken into consideration except:
 - A. Temperature
 - B. Oxygen saturation
 - C. Blood pressure
 - D. Pain score



- 4. In the treatment of neurotoxicity related to CAR-T therapy when may it appropriate to consider the use of tocilizumab?
 - A. At onset of fever
 - B. When there established concurrent CRS
 - C. At the onset of grade 1 neurotoxicity
 - D. At the resolution of grade 1 neurotoxicity



Axi-cel is commonly delivered in the outpatient setting?

- A. True
- B. False



Cancer is Smart

Low Immunogenicity	Tumor Treated as Self Antigen	Antigenic Modulation	Tumor-Induced Immune Suppression	Tumor-Induced Privileged Site
No peptide:MHC ligand; No adhesion molecules; No co-stimulatory molecules	Tumor antigens taken up and presented by APCs in absence of co-stimulation tolerize T cells	Antibody against tumor cell-surface antigens can induce endocytosis and degradation of the antigen. Immune selection of antigen-loss variants	Factors (eg, TGF-β) secreted by tumor cells inhibit T cells directly. Induction of regulatory cells by tumors	Factors secreted by tumor cells create a physical barrier to the immune system
LFA-1 TCR			T _{reg} + TGF-β, IL-10	A COLOR OF C



Immunobiology (7th edition). 2008. Garland Science

Glioblastoma





Julka JK et al. J Clin Res 2013

Metastatic Pancreatic Cancer





Conroy T et al. NEJM, 2011.

1st Relapsed Acute Lymphoblastic Leukemia



Fielding A, et al. Blood. 2007

Relapsed or Refractory Diffuse Large B-cell Lymphoma





Crump M. et al. Blood 2017

Risk of Disease Equals Potential Reward





Can we Get Smarter?

Target the Tumor

- Chemotherapy and AutoHCT
- Monoclonal Antibodies
 - o Rituximab and Herceptin
- Antibody-Drug Conjugates
 - o Brentuximab
- Tumor Checkpoint Blockade – PD-L1



Target the Host

- Vaccination
 - o Gardasil (anti-HPV16&18)
 - Sipuleucel-T (anti-PSA)
- Immune Modulators
 - Lenalidomide
- Immune Checkpoint Blockade
 - PD1, CTLA4



Target Both Tumor & Host

- Allogeneic HCT
- Bispecific Antibodies
 - o Blinatumomab
- CAR T Therapy



Shifting Gears: What is a CAR T-cell?





Courtesy of Susan Blumel



Chen DS, Mellman I. Immunity. 2013;39:1-10

T-cells Secrete Cytokines





Franciszkiewicz K, et al. Cancer Res. 2012;72:6325-6332

T-cell Immunology



AICD= Activation induced cell death



Daniyan et al. Journal of Leukocyte Biology 2016

Building Blocks to CAR-T

T lymphocyte CD4+→MHC class 2 CD8+→MHC class 1



AICD= Activation induced cell death



Daniyan et al. Journal of Leukocyte Biology 2016

Evolution of CAR-T





Geyer et al. Cytotherapy 2016

Evolution of CAR-T





Geyer et al. Cytotherapy 2016

The Target and Why





Giraldo WAS. Rheumatol Clin. 2012;8(4):201-207.

Manufacturing CAR T-cells





Courtesy of Susan Blumel

Many Hands





Many Days





Roberts et al. Leukemia & Lymphoma 2017

Patient level Popcorn





Provider level WMD





Current Role of CAR-T in Cancer





Courtesy of Susan Blumel

A Short List

Academic Group	Company (Drug)	Co-Stimulatory Domain	Vector Delivery	Indications
UPenn	Novartis (Tisagenlecleucel) (CTL019)	4-1BB	Lentiviral	ALL CLL, DLBCL, FL
Fred Hutchinson	Juno (JCAR017)	4-1BB	Lentiviral	ALL, CLL, various B-cell malignancies
NCI (NIH)	Kite, A Gilead Company (Axicabtagene Ciloleucel) (KTE-C19)	CD28	Retroviral	DLBCL ALL, MCL
MDACC	Ziopharm/Intrexon	$\text{CD28} \rightarrow \text{4-1BB}$	Transposon/transposase	B-cell malignancies
Institute Pasteur	Cellectis/Pfizer (UCART19)	4-1BB	Lentiviral	ALL, CLL, AML, MM
Baylor	Bellicum (BPX-401)	MyDBB + CD40	Retroviral	Various
Dartmouth	Cardio3	DAP-10	Retroviral	AML, MDS, MM



CAR-T Working Group

WMD





WMD





CAR T-cell in Rel/Ref DLBCL

CAR-T Product	Viral Vector	Costimulatory
Axi-Cel (KiTE/Gilead)	Gamma-retrovirus	CD28
Tisagenlecleucel (Novartis)	Lentivirus	41BB
Liso-Cel (JUNO/Celgene)	Lentivirus	41BB



Efficacy of Axi-Cel ZUMA-1

	N=1	01
Median Follow Up (Months)	27.1	
	ORR	CR
Best Overall Response Rate(ORR; %)	83%	58%
Refractory > /+ 2 lines		53%
Relapse within 12 months post Auto txp		72%
Double expressers (MYC, BCL2, and BCL6)		68%
Duration of response (DOR; Months)	11.8 (4.2 to NE)	
Median Progression Free Survival (PFS; Months)	5.9 (95% Cl 3.3 to 15)	



Neelapu et al. Lancet Oncol 2019

Duration of Response post Axi-cel





Neelapu et al. Lancet Oncol 2019

Overall Survival of Axi-Cel





Neelapu et al. Lancet Oncol 2019
Efficacy Of Tisagenlecleucel (Juliet)

	N=93	3
Median Follow Up (Months)	14.0)
	ORR	CR
Best ORR (%)	52%	40%
12 months post response (%)		
Relapse free survival Relapse free in CR	65% 79%	



Shuster S et al. NEJM 2019

Duration of Remission Of Tisagenlecleucel



Months since First Response



Shuster S et al. NEJM 2019

Overall Survival of Tisagenlecleucel



Months since Infusion



Shuster et al. NEJM 2019

Liso-cel (Not FDA approved)

- Late stage clinical trial (TRANSCEND)
- How is Liso-cel different?
 - Individually formulated CD4 and CD8 suspensions through lentiviral transduction
 - Low ALC requirement
 - Flat dosing
 - 1:1 ratio of CD4:CD8
 - 41BB costimulatory



TRANSCEND: CORE

- DLBCL-NOS
- Transformed FL
- High grade B-cell lymphoma (DH/TH)
- ECOG 0-1
- No ALC minimum



TRANSCEND Cohort/Dose

Core group

- DLBCL-NOS
- Transformed FL
- High grade B-cell lymphoma (DH/TH)
- ECOG 0-1
- No ALC minimum

Dosing Levels

5 X 10⁷ cells single dose (DL1S)
5 X 10⁷ cells double dose (DL1D)
1 X 10⁸ cells single dose (DL2S)



Abramson J et al. EHA 2018

TRANSCEND Pivotal Cohort

FOCUS ON:

Core + DL2S Outcomes, unknown results of accrued <u>PIVOTAL</u> cohort



Abramson J et al. EHA 2018

Liso-Cel Efficacy (Transcend)

Core & DLS2	N=37
Best ORR	80%
Best CR	55%
ORR @ 6 months	50%
CR @ 6 months	50%



Abramson J et al. EHA 2018

Axi-cel Post Approval Gloves On Vs Gloves Off







Excluded From ZUMA-1



Platelets < 75	37 (13)
Active DVT/PE	27 (9)
Prior CD19 or CAR T cell therapy	24 (8)
GFR < 60	22 (8)
History of CNS lymphoma	22 (8)
Symptomatic pleural effusion	11 (4)
LVEF < 50%	10 (4)
Prior allogeneic SCT	7 (2)



Nastoupil L et al. ASH 2018

Let's Box

On

		N (%)	N (%)
Median follow up, months		3.9	15.4
Day 30 ORR, N (%)	220	191 (80)	N/A
Day 30 CR, N (%)	250	113 (47)	N/A
Best ORR at Day 90, N (%)	7 /0a	201 (81)	89 (82)
Best CR at Day 90, N (%)	240-	142 (57)	63 (58)



Nastoupil L. et al ASH 2018

Too Sick To Fight?

<u>Variables</u>	<u>CR @ 3 month N (%)</u>	<u>p value</u>
Age <60 vs. <u>></u> 60	37 (51) vs. 52 (64)	0.11
DLBCL vs. PMBCL vs. TFL	59 (58) vs. 4 (40) vs. 26 (63)	0.41
COO GCB vs. ABC	50 (62) vs. 30 (53)	0.29
DHL/THL vs. Not	19 (59) vs. 65 (57)	0.77
IPI 0-2 vs. 3-5	45 (58) vs. 43 (58)	0.96
Bridging therapy Yes vs. No	40 (53) vs. 49 (64)	0.17
Tocilizumab Yes vs. No	51 (58) vs. 38 (59)	0.86
Steroids Yes vs. No	49 (58) vs. 40 (61)	0.71
ICU Admission Yes vs. No	26 (52) vs. 63 (61)	0.28



Fittest Fighters?

<u>Variables</u>	<u>CR @ 3 month N (%)</u>	<u>p value</u>
Female vs. male	39 (72) vs. 50 (51)	0.009
ECOG 0-1 vs. ≥ 2	82 (62) vs. 7 (35)	0.024
Relapsed vs. primary refractory/refractory	27 (79) vs. 24 (47)/38 (56)	0.011
Non-bulky vs. bulky (≥ 10cm)	76 (62) vs. 13 (42)	0.040
Met eligibility for ZUMA-1 vs. not	62 (65) vs. 27 (47)	0.037



Nastoupil L. et al ASH 2018

Should We Keep Fighting?







Progression Free Survival 1.0 Median PFS time: 6.18 months 0.8 95% CI: 4.57 ~ NA months Probability 0.6 0.4 0.2 0.0 п 3 6 9 12 Time (months) # at risk 242 124 39 7 1



Nastoupil L et al ASH 2018; Neelapu et a. Lancet Oncol 2019

Who Should Get CAR-T





Courtesy of Susan Blumel

The Right Disease





Who Can Weather the Fall Out

Baseline Tests

- 1. Transthoracic echocardiogram
- 2. Pulse oximetry
- 3. CBC, CMP, and DIC panel
- 4. Lactate dehydrogenase (LDH)
- 5. Pre-CART disease burden assessment



Selection of a Specific CAR-T





Courtesy of Susan Blumel

Finding a CAR T Site ASBMT→ASTCT





Within the CAR T Site

Case Manager Process and Checklist:

- Binder specific to each product and diagnosis
- Overall Checklist
- Details of each stage of process with screen shots:
 - Eligibility/Consult
 - Evaluation
 - Insurance
 - Collection
 - Enrollment, Ordering, & PO process
 - Chemotherapy
 - Infusion
 - Discharge
 - Long-Term Follow-up



Patient Tracker

Date of First Contact	Pla Va	ce on aitlist	Patien	t Name	Ref	erred By	Patient Resid	City of ence	Sho Disea Histo	ort ase ory	MR Number	Investigat or	Case Manager or Research Coordir or	Date of Consult	
1/4/2018		1	Test F	atient	Joh	n Doe	Anywhe	re, USA	DLB	C	123456	Bierman	Tawny	1/4/2018	
IRB 736 JCAR0 Junc Transo	i-15 i17 end	IRB 611- JCAR0 Celger Platfor	-17 17 ne T	жж–18 JCAR017 Celgene ransfori	, " •	Dnly if co meet	-17 Axi- Kite a-9 mmercial does not spec	Ste Insu No	udy ance tes		I	I	Blue = I Green = Yellow = Gold = ⁻	Demogra - Study - Insura Treatme	ap Inf nc
Commerc ial Kite Yescarta	Comme ial Novarti Kymri;	rc Date o is (HSC	of Referral CT form)	Payor S	ource	Date P Determi on Receiv	re nati Date - Aj	Pre Auth proved	Date Sine Case Agreeme Approve	gle int ed	Insuranc e Comment s v				
Yes		1/2:	2/2018	BCE	35	N/A	зг	7/2018	3/1/201	8	Pre- Certification denied: not med neces, peer to peer by Dr. Bierman				
Date Enrolled Yescarta Kite ID	& PO	& Invoice	Aphere Date	sis Che Sta Da	mo art te	Admissio n Date	Infusion Date	Com	nents T		Toxicities	•			
	1		3/22/20	18 4/13/2	2018 4	4/17/2018	4/18/2018		•			_	N FRE	D & PAMEL	LA

phic Information formation e Information Plan Dates



Before the CAR T

- Risk Evaluation and Mitigation Strategy (REMS) training
- CAR T education...education....education
- Tocilizumab supply process and documentation
- Policies for each product (includes Foundation for the Accreditation of Cellular Therapy (FACT) requirements)
 - Includes Wallet Card process and tocilizumab process
- Patient Consents for each product
- Treatment Plans for each product and diagnosis
- Pharmacy iVents
 - Patient specific notes used by pharmacists to communicate information
 - Dose and location of rescue agents
 - Other pertinent patient and product information
 - Crosses inpatient and outpatient care areas
 - Visible to all pharmacists viewing the EMR
- Formal Patient/Caregiver Education
 - Handouts, web-based, 1:1
 - Documentation via Template with teaching points
- On-Call/Triage
 - CAR T trained staff
 - Who to call and when to call
- IT



Select a CAR-T





Bridging Therapy

- Insurance
- Need to bridge?
 - Yes or No
- If Yes
 - Prior treatments (R-CHOP; ICE)
- Cell of origin (Hans)
 - GCB—Bendamustine or Gemcitabine
 - Non-GCB—Ibrutinib or Lenalidomide
- Late bridging
 - Steroids
 - Low dose oral Cytoxan, etoposide, prednisone
 - BOOM-BOOM (XRT)



Lymphodepletion

- Cy/Flu vs Benda vs None
 - Known the dose
 - Know when not to use (Tisagenlecleucel)
- Renal
 - Know the CrCl and how you will handle the fludarabine dosing
- Timing
 - Know the current EGOC & volume of disease
 - Know the product is ready
 - Know you have beds



WMD



CRS = Cytokine Release Syndrome; ICANS = Immune effector cell-associated neurotoxicity syndrome

"Old" CRS Grading

Grading System	Grade 1	Grade 2	Grade 3	Grade 4
CTCAE version 4.03 [11]	Mild reaction; infusion interruption not indi- cated; intervention not indicated	Therapy or infusion interrup- tion indicated but responds promptly to symptomatic treatment (antihistamines, NSAIDs, narcotics, i.v. fluids); prophylactic medications indi- cated for ≤24 h	Prolonged (eg. not rapidly respon- sive to symptomatic medication and/or brief interruption of infu- sion); recurrence of symptoms fol- lowing initial improvement; hospitalization indicated for clini- cal sequelae (eg, renal impairment, pulmonary infiltrate)	Life-threatening consequen- ces; pressor or ventilatory support indicated
CTCAE version 5.0 [13]	Fever, with or without constitutional symptoms	Hypotension responding to fluids. Hypoxia responding to <40% FiO ₂	Hypotension managed with one pressor. Hypoxia requiring ≥40% FiO ₂	Life-threatening consequen- ces; urgent intervention needed
Lee criteria [14]	symptoms are not me- threatening and require symptomatic treatment only (fever, nausea, fatigue, headache, myal- gias, malaise)	respond to moderate intervention:	aggressive intervention:	Life-tirreatening symptoms.
		• Oxygen requirement <40% FiO ₂ OR	• Oxygen requirement ≥40% FiO ₂ OR	Requirement for ventilator support OR
		Hypotension responsive to i. v. fluids or low dose of one vasopressor OR	 Hypotension requiring high-dose or multiple vasopressors OR 	• Grade 4 organ toxicity (excluding transaminitis)
		 Grade 2 organ toxicity* 	 Grade 3 organ toxicity* or grade 4 transaminitis 	
Penn criteria [17]	Mild reaction: Treated with supportive care, such as antipyretics, antiemetics	Moderate reaction: Some signs of organ dysfunction (grade 2 creatinine or grade 3 LFTs) related to CRS and not attrib- utable to any other condition.	More severe reaction: Hospitaliza- tion required for management of symptoms related to organ dys- function, including grade 4 LFTs or grade 3 creatinine, related to CRS and not attributable to any other	Life-threatening complica- tions such as hypotension requiring high-dose vasopressors
		Hospitalization for manage- ment of CRS-related symp-	condition Hypotension treated with multiple fluid boluses or low-dose	Hypoxia requiring mechani cal ventilation
		toms, including neutropenic fever and need for i.v. thera- pies (not including fluid resus- citation for hypotension)	vasopressors	
			Coagulopathy requiring fresh fro- zen plasma, cryoprecipitate, or fibrinogen concentrate Hypoxia requiring supplemental oxygen (nasal cannula oxygen, high-flow oxygen, CPAP, or BiPAP)	
MSKCC criteria [16]	Mild symptoms requir- ing observation or sup- portive care only (eg, antipyretics, antiemet- ics, pain medication)	Hypotension requiring any vasopressors <24 h	Hypotension requiring any vaso- pressors \geq 24 h	Life-threatening symptoms
		Hypoxia or dyspnea requiring supplemental oxygen <40%	Hypoxia or dyspnea requiring sup- plemental oxygen ≥40%	Hypotension refractory to high dose vasopressors Hypoxia or dyspnea requir- ing mechanical ventilation
CARTOX criteria [12]	Temperature ≥38°C	Hypotension responds to IV fluids or low-dose vasopressor	Hypotension needing high-dose or multiple vasopressors	Life-threatening hypotension
	Grade 1 organ toxicity†	Hypoxia requiring FiO ₂ <40% Grade 2 organ toxicity [†]	Hypoxia requiring FiO ₂ ≥40% Grade 3 organ toxicity [†] or grade 4 transaminitis	Needing ventilator support Grade 4 organ toxicity [†] except grade 4 transaminiti



"Old Neurotoxicity Grading

Grading System	Adverse Event Term/	Neurotoxicity Domain	Grade 1	Grade 2	Grade 3
Grade 4 CTCAE v5.0 [13],*		Encephalopathy	Mild symptoms	Moderate symptoms; limiting	Severe symptoms; limiting
Life-threatening consequences; urgent intervention indicated					
	Seizure	Brief partial seizure and no loss of	Brief generalized seizure	New-onset seizures (partial or generalized); multiple seizures despite medical intervention	Life-threatening consequences
	Dysphasia	Awareness of recep- tive or expressive characteristics; not impairing ability to communicate	Moderate receptive or expressive characteristics; impairing ability to communicate spontaneously	Severe receptive or expressive characteristics; impairing ability to read, write, communicate intelligibly	
	Tremor	Mild symptoms	Moderate symptoms; limiting instrumental ADL	Severe symptoms; limiting self- care ADL	
	Headache	Mild pain	Moderate pain; limiting instrumen- tal ADL	Severe pain; limiting self-care ADL	
	Confusion	Mild disorientation	Moderate disorientation; limiting instrumental ADL	Severe disorientation; limiting self-care ADL	Life-threatening consequen- ces; urgent intervention indicated
Life-threatening consequences; coma; urgent inter- vention indicated	Depressed level of	consciousness	Decreased level of alertness	Sedation; slow response to stim- uli; limiting instrumental ADL	Difficult to arouse
	Cerebral edema			New onset; worsening from baseline	Life-threatening consequen- ces; urgent intervention indicated
CARTOX criteria [12]	Neurologic Assessment Score (CAR- TOX-10)	7-9 (mild impairment)	3-6 (moderate impairment)	0-2 (severe impairment)	Patient in critical condition, and/or obtunded and cannot perform assessment of tasks
	Elevated ICP	N/A	N/A	Stage 1-2 papilledema [†] or CSF opening pressure <20 mmHg	Stage 3-5 papilledema [†] , or CSF opening pressure ≥20 mmHg. or cerebral edema
	Seizures or motor weakness	N/A	N/A	Partial seizure or nonconvulsive seizures on EEG with response to benzodiazepine	Generalized seizures or con- vulsive or nonconvulsive status epilepticus, or new motor weakness

Toxicity of Axi-Cel

	CRS	NT
All Grades	93%	64%
Grade ≥ 3	11%	32%
Median Time to onset (range) in days	2 (1-12)	5 (1-17)
Median Time to Resolution	8 days	17 days
Tocilizumab Usage	43%	
Dexamethasone Usage	27%	



Neelapu et al. NEJM 2018; Neelapu Lancet Oncol 2019; NT=CTAE 4.03

Toxicity of Tisagenlecleucel

	CRS*	NT
All Grades	58%	21%
Grade ≥ 3	22%	12%
Median Time to onset (range) in days	3	6
Median Time to Resolution	7	14
Tocilizumab Usage	14%	
Dexamethasone Usage	10%	



Shuster NEJM 2019 *CRS =UPENN criteria; NT=CTAE 4.03

Toxicity of Liso-Cel

Core & DL2S or Full	CRS	NT
All Grades	30%	24%
Grade ≥ 3	0%	8%
Median Time to onset (range) in days	5	10
Median Time to Resolution	NR	NR
Tocilizumab Usage (FULL)	17%	
Dexamethasone Usage	21%	



Abramson et al. EHA 2018; CRS per Lee etal; NT=CTAE 4.03; NR=Not reported

New CRS Grading

CRS Parameter	Grade 1	Grade 2	Grade 3	Grade 4
Fever* With	Temperature ≥38°C	Temperature ≥38°C	Temperature ≥38°C	Temperature \geq 38°C
Hypotension	None	Not requiring vasopressors	Requiring a vasopressor with or without vasopressin	Requiring multiple vasopressors (excluding vasopressin)
And/or† Hypoxia	None	Requiring low-flow nasal cannula [‡] or blow-by	Requiring high-flow nasal cannula [‡] , facemask, nonrebreather mask, or Venturi mask	Requiring positive pressure (eg, CPAP, BiPAP, intubation and mechanical ventilation)



Lee et al. BBMT 2018

New ICANS Grading

Neurotoxicity Domain	Grade 1	Grade 2	Grade 3	Grade 4
ICE score*	7-9	3-6	0-2	0 (patient is unarousable and unable to perform ICE)
Depressed level of consciousness [†]	Awakens spontaneously	Awakens to voice	Awakens only to tactile stimulus	Patient is unarousable or requires vigorous or repetitive tactile stimuli to arouse. Stupor or coma
Seizure	N/A	N/A	Any clinical seizure focal or general- ized that resolves rapidly or nonconvulsive seizures on EEG that resolve with intervention	Life-threatening prolonged seizure (>5 min); or Repetitive clinical or electrical seizures without return to baseline in between
Motor findings [‡]	N/A	N/A	N/A	Deep focal motor weakness such as hemiparesis or paraparesis
Elevated ICP/cerebral edema	N/A	N/A	Focal/local edema on neuroimaging [§]	Diffuse cerebral edema on neuroimaging; Decer- ebrate or decorticate posturing; or Cranial nerve VI palsy; or Papilledema; or Cushing's triad



Lee et al. BBMT 2018

Post CAR-T





Courtesy of Susan Blumel

Post CAR-T

Inpt CAR-T

- Mini Mental Status Exam or ICE
- CBC/CMP/DIC panel
- Ferritin
- CRP

Outpt CAR-T

Prophylaxis (Acyclovir, Levofloxacin, Fluconazole) Caregiver (24 hour) No driving for 2 months (research opportunity)



Management of Toxicity






Management of CRS



Management of CRS





Management of ICANS





Management of ICANS







Late Infectious Toxicities

Patient	SAE Start Time Post Axi-cel Infusion (months)	Grade	SAE
1	8.7	3	Lung infection
2	16.7	3	Recurrent viral upper respiratory infection
	18.6	3	Rotavirus infection
3 ^b	12.5	3	Pneumonia
4	7.2	4	Sepsis
	7.2	3	Left lower lobe pneumonia
	7.2	3	Atrial fibrillation with rapid ventricular response
5	9.1	3	Lung infection
	9.2	3	Febrile neutropenia
6	7.1	3	Influenza B infection
7	7.9	3	Infection other - pneumonia
8	6.7	1	Muscle weakness right side
	6.7	2	Slurred speech
9 °	9.3	3	Heart failure
10	14.4	3	Community acquired pneumonia

B-cell aplasia with hypogammaglobulinemia: Use of IVIG



The Double Dip





Future Strategies for CAR-T





Courtesy of Susan Blumel

CAR-T in 1st Relapse



No significant differences in PFS and OS were observed according to

- sAA-IPI
- Relapse <12 months
- Primary refractory disease vs relapse ≥12 months

CANCER CENTER

• Type of salvage therapy

Sauter et al. Blood 2016

Too Sick to CAR-T





Prediction of Toxicities





Locke et al. ASH 2017 Abs#1547

Access, Referrals and other drugs DLBCL







FRED & PAMELA BUFFETT CANCER CENTER

A National Cancer Institute Designated Cancer Center

BuffettCancerCenter.com Omaha, Nebraska



