Mantle cell lymphoma patients in first relapse: we pretty much know what to do
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Treatment of relapsed mantle cell lymphoma (MCL) patients is challenging. Disease behavior has typically been described to be largely heterogeneous [1]. The MANTLE-FIRST study, the first patient-level analysis of outcomes of relapsed-refractory (r/r) MCL after rituximab and cytarabine containing induction therapy, has clearly divided patients’ outcome depending on time to first relapse (early- versus late-POD) [2, 3]. While the latter experienced good expectations in terms of survival irrespective of the second line treatment, early-POD patients had significantly better outcome when treated with ibrutinib. This study, together with several independent observations [4, 5], has established ibrutinib as the new standard second line therapy in early-POD patients.

For late-POD patients the impact of treatment choice still needs to be clarified. In our study [2] bendamustine-based regimen (rituximab-bendamustine, R-B, and rituximab-bendamustine plus cytarabine, R-BAC) conferred similar survival rates to ibrutinib in this subgroup. We consider R-B, R-BAC or VR-CAP (bortezomib, rituximab, cyclophosphamide, doxorubicin, and prednisone) as reasonable time limited-treatment choice for patients with prior chemo-sensitive disease. However, given the expected response duration to BTKi in second line setting [5] and the generally favorable BTKi side effect profile relative to chemo-immunotherapy (CIT), unless major contraindications, we consider ibrutinib as standard second line therapy at any age.

The predictive significance of early-POD following less intensive frontline treatment, such as bendamustine-based induction regimen, is not well established. A recent

Figure 1: Proposal for approaching Mantle Cell Lymphoma (MCL) at first relapse. Allo-SCT: allogeneic stem cell transplant; Ara-C: cytarabine; ASCT: autologous stem cell transplant; BCL2i: BCL2-inhibitors (i.e., venetoclax); BsAb: monoclonal bispecific antibodies (i.e. mosunetuzumab, glofitamab, REGN1979); BTKi: Bruton tyrosine kinase inhibitors (i.e., ibrutinib, acalabrutinib, or zanubrutinib); CAR-T cells: chimeric antigen receptor T-cells; Pirtobrutinib: LOXO-305; POD: progression of disease; R-B: rituximab and bendamustine; R-BAC: rituximab and bendamustine plus cytarabine; VR-CAP: bortezomib plus rituximab, cyclophosphamide, doxorubicin, and prednisone. *Anthracycline containing induction (R-CHOP/VR-CAP) plus maintenance behave like late-POD younger patients.
work has shown shorter duration of first remission to be associated with inferior survival after both intensive and less intensive frontline therapy in a large retrospective cohort [6]. The BCL2-i venetoclax has been used off-label in this setting and could be a reasonable treatment option in the future.

Based on data showing that the efficacy of ibrutinib is greater when used early in treatment sequence [5], chemotherapy-sparing approaches such as BTKi plus anti-CD20 plus-minus venetoclax in treatment naïve MCL patients are under evaluation in clinical trials.

Early-POD younger patients (i.e., < 65) represent a high-risk population (10–20% of new diagnosed patients with MCL, overall) where allogeneic stem cell transplant (allo-SCT) appears as a valid option. Whenever achieving at least a good partial response or preferably a complete response (chemo-sensitive relapse), these patients have experienced good long-term outcome after allo-SCT [7]. Chimeric antigen receptor T-cells (CAR-T) may instead represent a unique opportunity for those patients that fail to achieve a substantial response after second line treatment [7, 8].

Unfortunately, despite the considerable clinical response to BTKi, resistance inevitably emerges [9]. When patients relapse on BTKi, disease is often aggressive and resistant to subsequent therapies. In this setting, CAR-T or clinical trials represent the mainstay for the future. A judicious evaluation of patients’ fitness and age is mandatory for subsequent treatment choice. CAR-T have held impressive short-term results in patients with MCL, and an update of the follow up is eagerly awaited [8].

In retrospective studies [9], R-BAC and venetoclax demonstrated a high response rate in the post-BTKi setting and were sometimes effective bridge to allo-SCT [10]. We have sufficient reasons (mutuated from chronic lymphocytic leukemia) to believe that patients that withhold BTKi due to intolerance (and not progression) might be a more favorable population. Among others, the non-covalent highly selective LOXO-305, which delivers CIT and BTKi - taking into account driver gene mutations, the B-cell receptor (BCR) pathway status of activation, and genetic and epigenetic determinants responsible for tumor cell evasion from BCR dependence - is the object of the ongoing FIL MANTLE-FIRST BIO study (https://clinicaltrials.gov/ number, NCT04882475).

Our proposal for a treatment algorithm with a perspective view on MCL management is depicted in Figure 1. We pretty much know what to do, but there is a clear need to identify biological subgroups associated with different clinical course. This is a critical next step to improve therapy allocation of patients who are r/r after cytarabine containing induction regimens and to guide the selection and optimal timing of new treatments with innovative approaches, including CAR-T, obtaining successful and durable responses.
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