# Long-Term Efficacy and Safety of Zanubrutinib in Patients With Relapsed/Refractory (R/R) Marginal Zone Lymphoma (MZL): Final Analysis of the MAGNOLIA (BGB-3111-214) Trial

#### Stephen Opat,<sup>1</sup> Alessandra Tedeschi,<sup>2</sup> Bei Hu,<sup>3</sup> Kim M. Linton,<sup>4</sup> Pamela McKay,<sup>5</sup> Sophie Leitch,<sup>6</sup> Jie Jin,<sup>7</sup> Mingyuan Sun,<sup>8</sup> Magdalena Sobieraj-Teague,<sup>9</sup> Pier Luigi Zinzani,<sup>10</sup> Peter Browett,<sup>11</sup> Catherine Thieblemont,<sup>12</sup> Anna Marina Liberati,<sup>13</sup> Emmanuel Bachy,<sup>14</sup> Federica Cavallo,<sup>15</sup> Régis Costello,<sup>16</sup> Sunil Iyengar,<sup>17</sup> Roberto Marasca,<sup>18</sup> Heidi Mociková,<sup>19</sup> Jin Seok Kim,<sup>20</sup> Dipti Talaulikar,<sup>21</sup> Zhiyu Liang,<sup>22</sup> Jianfeng Xu,<sup>22</sup> Chris Tankersley,<sup>22</sup> Richard Delarue,<sup>22</sup> Melannie Co,<sup>22</sup> Judith Trotman<sup>23</sup>

oli 12 and e a 12 Eve at a conte of Belogna, Italy; <sup>14</sup> Hematology Belogna, Italy; <sup>14</sup> Hematology Department, Lyon-Sud Hospital, University of Bologna, Italy; <sup>14</sup> Hematology Department, Lyon, France; <sup>15</sup> Division Academy of Medical Centre, Bedford Park, SA, Australia; <sup>10</sup> Institute of Hematology Department, Lyon-Sud Hospital, University of Lyon, Italy; <sup>14</sup> Hematology Department, Lyon-Sud Hospital, University of Bologna, Italy; <sup>14</sup> Hematology Department, Lyon-Sud Hospital, University of Lyon, Italy; <sup>14</sup> Hematology Department, Lyon-Sud Hospital, University of Bologna, Italy; <sup>14</sup> Hematology Benatic Contre, Bedford Park, SA, Australia; <sup>10</sup> Institute of Hematology Department, Lyon-Sud Hospital, University of Bologna, Italy; <sup>14</sup> Hematology Benatic Contre, Bedford Park, SA, Australia; <sup>10</sup> Institute of Hematology Benatic Contre, Bedford Park, SA, Australia; <sup>10</sup> Institute of Hematology Benatic Contre, Bedford Park, SA, Australia; <sup>10</sup> Institute of Hematology Benatic Contre, Bedford Park, SA, Australia; <sup>10</sup> Institute of Hematology Benatic Contre, Bedford Park, SA, Australia; <sup>10</sup> Institute of Hematology Benatic Contre, Bedford Park, SA, Australia; <sup>10</sup> Institute of Hematology Benatic Contre, Bedford Park, SA, Australia; <sup>10</sup> Institute of Hematology Benatic Contre, Bedford Park, SA, Australia; <sup>10</sup> Institute of Hematology Benatic Contre, Bedford Park, SA, Australia; <sup>10</sup> Institute of Hematology Benatic Contre, Bedford Park, SA, Australia; <sup>10</sup> Institute of Hematology Benatic Contre, Bedford Park, SA, Australia; <sup>10</sup> Institute of Hematology Benatic Contre, Bedford Park, SA, Australia; <sup>10</sup> Institute of Hematology Benatic Contre, Bedford Park, SA, Australia; <sup>10</sup> Institute of Hematology Benatic Contre, Bedford Park, SA, Australia; <sup>10</sup> Institute of Hematology Benatic Contre, Bedford Park, SA, Australia; <sup>10</sup> Institute of Hematology Benatic Contre, Bedford Park, SA, Australia; <sup>10</sup> Institute of Hematology Benatic Contre, Bedford Park, SA, Australia; <sup>10</sup> Institute of Hematology Benatic Contre, Benatic Contre, Benatic Contre, Be 18 Emetology, Department of Molecular Biotechnologies and Health Sciences, University of Torino, Italy; 18 University of Modena, Italy; 19 Department, Conception University of Modena, Italy; 19 Department, Conception University of Modena e Reggio Emilia, Modena, Italy; 19 Department of Clinical Hematology, University of Modena, Italy; 19 Department, Conception University, Prague, and Cellular Therapy Department, Conception University of Modena e Reggio Emilia, Modena, Italy; 19 Department of Clinical Hematology, University of Modena, Italy; 18 University, Prague, and Institute of Cancer Research, Sutton, UK; 18 University, Prague, and Italy; 18 University, Prague, and Italy; 19 Department, Conception University, Prague, and Italy; 19 Department, Conception University, Prague, and Italy; 19 Department of Clinical Hematology, University, Prague, and Italy; 19 Department of Clinical Hematology, University, Prague, and Italy; 19 Department, Conception Unitersity, Prague, and Italy; 19 Department, Concepti, Ital Czech Republic; <sup>20</sup>Division of Hematology, Department of Internal Medicine, Yonsei University, Canberra, ACT, Australia; <sup>22</sup>BeiGene (Beijing) Co, Ltd, Beijing, China, BeiGene USA, Inc, San Mateo, CA, USA; <sup>23</sup>Concord Repatriation General Hospital, University of Sydney, Concord, NSW, Australia

### INTRODUCTION

- Advanced-stage MZL is generally incurable<sup>1</sup>
- B-cell receptor (BCR) signaling is a critical pathway in MZL pathogenesis<sup>2</sup>
- Bruton tyrosine kinase (BTK) plays a key role in BCR signaling<sup>2</sup> BTK inhibition has antitumor activity in various B-cell
- malignancies<sup>2,3</sup> • Zanubrutinib (BGB-3111) is a potent and highly specific next-
- generation BTK inhibitor Designed to maximize BTK occupancy and minimize off-target inhibition of tyrosine kinase expressed in hepatocellular carcinoma (TEC)- and epidermal growth factor receptor (EGFR)–family kinases<sup>3-5</sup>
- Can be coadministered with strong/moderate cytochrome P450 3A (CYP3A) inhibitors at a reduced dose, proton pump inhibitors, acid-reducing agents, and antithrombotic agents<sup>6,7</sup>
- Recently approved for the treatment of patients with R/R MZL based on the primary analysis results of the MAGNOLIA study (BGB-3111-214; NCT03846427)<sup>7</sup>
- Here we present the final analysis of MAGNOLIA at a median follow-up of 28 months

### METHODS

- MAGNOLIA was a phase 2, multicenter, open-label, single-arm study (Figure 1)
- Eligible patients were  $\geq$ 18 years old, had R/R MZL, had received ≥1 CD20-directed regimen, and had an Eastern Cooperative Oncology Group performance status (ECOG PS) of 0, 1, or 2
- Patients with prior treatment with a BTK inhibitor were excluded
- All patients received zanubrutinib monotherapy 160 mg twice daily (BID)
- Response to treatment was measured based on the Lugano classification for non-Hodgkin lymphoma (NHL)<sup>8</sup>
- Positron emission tomography (PET)-based criteria for patients with independent review committee (IRC)-confirmed fluorodeoxyglucose (FDG)-avid disease
- Computed tomography (CT)–based criteria for non–FDG-avid patients
- Additional sensitivity analysis in all evaluable patients using CT-based criteria

**Primary endpoint:** 

DOR, safety

- Adverse events (AEs) were assessed and graded per the National Cancer Institute Common Terminology Criteria for Adverse Events v4.03
- The data cutoff date was May 4, 2022

#### Figure 1. Study Design



### RESULTS

- Median follow-up was 28 months
- progressive disease (PD)

#### Figure 2. Patient Disposition



Data cutoff date: May 4, 2022.

LTE, long-term extension.

Two patients were excluded owing to lack of central confirmation of MZL. <sup>b</sup>BGB-3111-LTE1 is a BeiGene-sponsored, global, open-label, extension study (NCT04170283). <sup>c</sup> Five patients discontinued treatment owing to AEs (2 patients with fatal COVID-19 pneumonia; 1 patient with pyrexia later attributed to disease proc ression; 1 patient with fatal myocardial infarction and preexisting cardiovascular disease; 1 patient who died from septic encephalopathy after bladder surgery [in CR at the time of death]). <sup>d</sup> Four patients discontinued per investigator decision (3 patients required prohibited medications; 1 patient due to lack of clinical benefit).

### Table 1. Baseline Demographics and Disease History

Characteristics	Total (N=68)		
Age, median (range), years	70 (37-95)		
≥65 years, n (%)	41 (60)		
≥75 years, n (%)	19 (28)		
Male, n (%)	36 (53)		
ECOG PS 0 or 1, n (%) <sup>a</sup>	63 (93)		
MZL subtypes, n (%)			
Extranodal	26 (38)		
Nodal	26 (38)		
Splenic	12 (18)		
Unknown	4 (6)		
Disease status, n (%)			
Relapsed	44 (65)		
Refractory	22 (32)		
Stage III/IV, n (%)	59 (87)		
FDG avid (by IRC), n (%)	61 (90)		
Extranodal site involvement, n (%)	53 (78)		
Bone marrow infiltration, n (%)	29 (43)		
Prior lines of systemic therapy, median (range) <sup>b</sup>	2 (1-6)		
Immunochemotherapy, n (%)	61 (90) <sup>b</sup>		
Rituximab monotherapy, n (%)	7 (10)		
<sup>a</sup> Overall, 43% of patients had ECOG PS of 1 or 2. <sup>b</sup> Rituximab-based chemotherapy in most patients (n=60 [88%]).			

- 76% (**Table 2**)
- approximately 3 months

## • A total of 68 participants were enrolled in the study (**Figure 2**)

• At the cutoff date, 34 patients were still receiving zanubrutinib • The most common reason for treatment discontinuation was

 After a median follow-up of 28 months, overall response rate (ORR) by IRC was 68%; ORR by principal investigator (INV) was

 26% of patients had a complete response (CR) by IRC, and 29% had a CR by INV; the median time to response was

Table 2. Best Overall Response by IRC and INV Assessment			
	(N=66)ª		
	IRC INV		INV
Efficacy	PET and/or CT (primary endpoint) <sup>b</sup>	CT only (sensitivity analysis) <sup>f</sup>	PET and/or CT
ORR, n (%)	45 (68)	44 (67)	50 (76)
[95% CI]	[55.6-79.1]	[54.0-77.8]	[63.6-85.5]
<i>P</i> value	<.0001°		
Best response, n (%)			
CR	17 (26)	16 (24)	19 (29)
PR	28 (42)	28 (42)	31 (47)
SD	14 (21) <sup>d,e</sup>	16 (24)	10 (15)
PD	6 (9)	5 (8)	5 (8)
Discontinued study prior to first assessment, n (%)	1 (1)	1 (1)	1 (1)
Time to response , median (range), months	2.8 (1.7-11.1)	3.0 (1.8-22.2)	2.8 (1.7-16.6)

<sup>a</sup> Two patients were excluded from the efficacy population owing to lack of central confirmation of MZL. <sup>b</sup> Patients with IRC-confirmed FDG-avid disease were assessed by PET-based criteria; non–FDG-avid patients were assessed by CT-based Lugano criteria. °P value for the primary endpoint was computed with the binomial exact test against the null hypothesis of ORR=30% with an alternative of ORR >30%. <sup>d</sup> Five patients (7.6%) with SD are remaining on study treatment (after 12-18 cycles). <sup>e</sup> Included 1 patient with FDG-avid disease who missed the PET scan at cycle 3 and was assessed as non-PD: CT showed stable disease at cycle 3. <sup>f</sup>Additional sensitivity analysis using CT-based Lugano criteria in all 66 evaluable patients regardless of PET status at baseline.

• The ORR was high in all MZL subtypes, with the highest ORR seen in patients with nodal MZL (76%) and the highest CR in patients with extranodal MZL (40%)

#### Figure 3. Best Overall Response by IRC and MZL Subtypes



<sup>a</sup> One patient (extranodal MZL) who withdrew consent prior to the first disease assessment is not shown in the figure

#### • All key patient subgroups had a response, as evaluated by IRC (Figure 4)

#### Figure 4. Subgroup Analysis of ORR by IRC

All patients       45/66       Image group       68.2 (55.6-79.1)         Age group	Subgroup	Patients/response		ORR (95% CI), %ª
Age group         <65 years	All patients	45/66	⊢	68.2 (55.6-79.1)
-65 years       15/26         265 years       30/40         275 years       28/48         275 years       17/18         MALT       16/25         NMZL       19/25         SMZL       8/12         Unknown       2/4         Disease stage       66.7 (34.9-90.1)         II       3/5         III       5/7         No       26/37         Prior tractment       72.0 (65.4-82.1)         Refactory       14/21         Prior treatment       75.0 (60.4-86.4)         23       9/18          50.0 (26.0-74.0)         Prior treatment       72.7 (49.8-89.3)         RcHop       9/17	Age group			
265 years       30/40         <75 years	<65 years	15/26	<b>⊢</b>	57.7 (36.9-76.7)
<75 years	≥65 years	30/40	<b>⊢</b>	75.0 (58.8-87.3)
275 years       17/18       94.4 (72.7-99.9)         MZL subtype       MALT       16/25         MALT       19/25       64.0 (42.5-82.0)         SMZL       8/12       66.7 (34.9-90.6)         Unknown       2/4       66.7 (34.9-90.1)         Disease stage       66.7 (34.9-90.1)         I       2/4       60.0 (14.7-94.7)         III       3/5       70.0 (56.4-92.1)         No       26/37       70.0 (55.4-82.1)         Disease status       70.0 (55.4-82.1)         Refractory       14/21       65.5 (45.7-82.1)         Prior lines of systemic therapy       70.3 (53.0-84.1)         23       9/18       75.0 (60.4-86.4)         Prior reatment       72.1 (56.3-84.7)         RCVP       20/25       75.0 (60.4-86.4)         CVP       20/25       72.7 (49.8-93.3)         R-lenaidomide       1/2       50.0 (26.0-74.0)         Prior reatment       72.7 (74.9.8-93.3)       50.0 (13.99.7)         RL maidomide       1/2       50.0 (13.99.7)         RL maidomide       1/2       50.0 (13.99.7)         RL maidomide       1/2       50.0 (13.99.3)         R-chorambucil       2/5       50.0 (13.99.3)	<75 years	28/48	<b>⊢</b>	58.3 (43.2-72.4)
M2L subtype	≥75 years	17/18	► <b>− − − 1</b>	94.4 (72.7-99.9)
MALT       16/25         NMZL       19/25         SMZL       8/12         Unknown       2/4         I       2/4         I       3/5         II       3/5         III       5/7         III       5/7         V       3/50         Bone marrow involvement       70.0 (54.99.0.6)         Yes       19/29         No       26/37         Prior lines of systemic therapy       66.7 (43.0-90.1)         <3	MZL subtype			
NMZL       19/25         SMZL       8/12         Unknown       2/4         Disease stage       50.0 (6.8-93.2)         I       2/4         I       3/5         III       3/5         IV       35/50         Bone marrow involvement       70.0 (55.482.1)         Yes       19/29         No       26/37         Disease status       65.5 (45.7-82.1)         Relapsed       31/43         Refractory       14/21         Prior treatment       72.1 (56.3-84.7)         RCVP       20/25         RCVP       20/25         R-lenalidomide       1/2         R-lenalidomide <t< td=""><td>MALT</td><td>16/25</td><td><b>⊢</b></td><td>64.0 (42.5-82.0)</td></t<>	MALT	16/25	<b>⊢</b>	64.0 (42.5-82.0)
SMZL       8/12       66.7 (34.9-90.1)         Unknown       2/4       50.0 (6.8-93.2)         Disease stage       50.0 (6.8-93.2)         I       3/5         II       3/5         III       5/7         IV       35/50         Bone marrow involvement       71.4 (29.0-96.3)         Yes       19/29         No       26/37         Disease status       65.5 (45.7-82.1)         Relapsed       31/43         Refractory       14/21         Prior lines of systemic therapy       75.0 (60.4-86.4)         ≥3       36/48         ≥3       36/48         ≥3       9/18         Prior treatment       75.0 (60.4-86.4)         RCVP       20/25         RCHOP       9/17         BR       16/22         R-lenalidomide       1/2         Rituximab monotherapy       7/7         CHOP       2/3         R-lenalidomide       1/2         R-lenalidomide       1/2         R-lenalidomide       1/2         R-chlorambucil       2/5	NMZL	19/25	↓ <b>↓</b> ↓	76.0 (54.9-90.6)
Unknown         2/4           Disease stage	SMZL	8/12	↓↓	66.7 (34.9-90.1)
Disease stage         50.0 (6.8-93.2)           I         3/5           II         3/5           III         3/5           IV         35/50           Bone marrow involvement         71.4 (29.0-96.3)           Yes         19/29           No         26/37           Disease status         65.5 (45.7-82.1)           Relapsed         31/43           Refractory         14/21           Prior lines of systemic therapy         66.7 (43.0-85.4)           <3	Unknown	2/4	↓	50.0 (6.8-93.2)
I       2/4       →       50.0 (6.8-93.2)         II       3/5       60.0 (14.7-94.7)         III       5/7       71.4 (29.0-96.3)         IV       35/50       →         Bone marrow involvement       71.4 (29.0-96.3)         Yes       19/29         No       26/37         Disease status       65.5 (45.7-82.1)         Relapsed       31/43         Refractory       14/21         Prior lines of systemic therapy       66.7 (43.0-85.4)         <3	Disease stage			· · /
II       3/5       60.0 (14.7-94.7)         III       5/7       71.4 (29.0-96.3)         IV       35/50       70.0 (55.4-82.1)         Bone marrow involvement         Yes       19/29         No       26/37         Disease status         Relapsed       31/43         Refractory       14/21         Prior lines of systemic therapy       66.7 (43.0-85.4)         <3	1	2/4	I I I I I I I I I I I I I I I I I I I	50.0 (6.8-93.2)
III       5/7       71.4 (29.0-96.3)         IV       35/50       70.0 (55.4-82.1)         Bone marrow involvement       65.5 (45.7-82.1)         Yes       19/29       70.3 (53.0-84.1)         Disease status       70.3 (53.0-84.1)         Relapsed       31/43         Refractory       14/21         Prior lines of systemic therapy       66.7 (43.0-85.4)         >3       36/48         >3       9/18         Prior treatment       75.0 (60.4-86.4)         RCVP       20/25         RCHOP       9/17         BR       16/22         R-lenalidomide       1/2         Rituximab monotherapy       7/7         CHOP       2/3         R-chlorambucil       2/5	П	3/5	<b>⊢</b>	60.0 (14.7-94.7)
IV       35/50       IV       70.0 (55.4-82.1)         Bone marrow involvement       70.0 (55.4-82.1)       70.0 (55.4-82.1)         Yes       19/29       65.5 (45.7-82.1)       70.3 (53.0-84.1)         Disease status       72.1 (56.3-84.7)       66.7 (43.0-85.4)         Prior lines of systemic therapy       75.0 (60.4-86.4)       50.0 (26.0-74.0)         Prior treatment       80.0 (59.3-93.2)       50.0 (26.0-74.0)         Prior treatment       80.0 (59.3-93.2)       52.9 (27.8-77.0)         BR       16/22       72.7 (49.8-89.3)       50.0 (1.3-98.7)         Rituximab monotherapy       7/7       100.0 (59.0-100.0)       50.0 (1.3-98.7)         Rituximab monotherapy       7/7       100.0 (59.0-100.0)       66.7 (9.4-99.2)         R-chlorambucil       2/5       40.0 (5.3-85.3)       40.0 (5.3-85.3)	III	5/7	↓	71.4 (29.0-96.3)
Bone marrow involvement            Yes         19/29           No         26/37           Disease status         70.3 (53.0-84.1)           Relapsed         31/43           Refractory         14/21           Prior lines of systemic therapy         72.1 (56.3-84.7)           <3	IV	35/50	<b>⊢</b>	70.0 (55.4-82.1)
Yes       19/29         No       26/37         Disease status       70.3 (53.0-84.1)         Relapsed       31/43         Refractory       14/21         Prior lines of systemic therapy       66.7 (43.0-85.4)         >3       36/48         ≥3       9/18         Prior treatment       75.0 (60.4-86.4)         RCVP       20/25         RCHOP       9/17         BR       16/22         R-lenalidomide       1/2         Rituximab monotherapy       7/7         CHOP       2/3         R-chlorambucil       2/5	Bone marrow involvement			
No       26/37       ✓       70.3 (53.0-84.1)         Disease status       ✓       72.1 (56.3-84.7)       66.7 (43.0-85.4)         Refractory       14/21       ✓       ✓       75.0 (60.4-86.4)         ≥3       9/18       ✓       ✓       75.0 (60.4-86.4)         Prior treatment       ✓       80.0 (59.3-93.2)       80.0 (59.3-93.2)         RCHOP       9/17       52.9 (27.8-77.0)       80.0 (59.3-93.2)         RCHOP       9/17       52.9 (27.8-77.0)       52.9 (27.8-77.0)         BR       16/22       ✓       72.7 (49.8-89.3)         R-lenalidomide       1/2       ✓       50.0 (1.3-98.7)         Rituximab monotherapy       7/7       100.0 (59.0-100.0)       66.7 (9.4-99.2)         R-chlorambucil       2/5       ✓       ✓       40.0 (5.3-85.3)	Yes	19/29	<b>⊢ − − − − − − − − − −</b>	65.5 (45.7-82.1)
Disease status       72.1 (56.3-84.7)         Relapsed $31/43$ Refractory $14/21$ Prior lines of systemic therapy $66.7$ ( $43.0-85.4$ ) $< 3$ $36/48$ $\geq 3$ $9/18$ Prior treatment       75.0 ( $60.4-86.4$ )         RCVP $20/25$ RCHOP $9/17$ BR $16/22$ R-lenalidomide $1/2$ Rituximab monotherapy $7/7$ CHOP $2/3$ R-chlorambucil $2/5$	No	26/37	<b>⊢</b>	70.3 (53.0-84.1)
Relapsed       31/43       72.1 (56.3-84.7)         Refractory       14/21       66.7 (43.0-85.4)         Prior lines of systemic therapy       36/48       75.0 (60.4-86.4)         ≥3       9/18       9/18       50.0 (26.0-74.0)         Prior treatment       80.0 (59.3-93.2)       80.0 (59.3-93.2)         RCHOP       9/17       52.9 (27.8-77.0)         BR       16/22       72.7 (49.8-89.3)         R-lenalidomide       1/2       50.0 (1.3-98.7)         Rituximab monotherapy       7/7       100.0 (59.0-100.0)         CHOP       2/3       40.0 (5.3-85.3)	Disease status			
Refractory       14/21       66.7 (43.0-85.4)         Prior lines of systemic therapy       36/48       75.0 (60.4-86.4)         ≥3       9/18       50.0 (26.0-74.0)         Prior treatment       80.0 (59.3-93.2)         RCHOP       9/17       52.9 (27.8-77.0)         BR       16/22       72.7 (49.8-89.3)         R-lenalidomide       1/2       50.0 (1.3-98.7)         Rituximab monotherapy       7/7       100.0 (59.0-100.0)         CHOP       2/3       40.0 (5.3-85.3)	Relapsed	31/43	<b>⊢</b>	72.1 (56.3-84.7)
Prior lines of systemic therapy         36/48         75.0 (60.4-86.4)           ≥3         9/18         50.0 (26.0-74.0)           Prior treatment         80.0 (59.3-93.2)           RCVP         20/25           RCHOP         9/17           BR         16/22           R-lenalidomide         1/2           Rituximab monotherapy         7/7           CHOP         2/3           R-chlorambucil         2/5	Refractory	14/21	•	66.7 (43.0-85.4)
<3	Prior lines of systemic thera	ру		
≥3       9/18       Image: style="text-align: center;">50.0 (26.0-74.0)         Prior treatment       RCVP       20/25       80.0 (59.3-93.2)         RCHOP       9/17       52.9 (27.8-77.0)         BR       16/22       72.7 (49.8-89.3)         R-lenalidomide       1/2       50.0 (1.3-98.7)         Rituximab monotherapy       7/7       100.0 (59.0-100.0)         CHOP       2/3       Image: style="text-align: center;">66.7 (9.4-99.2)         R-chlorambucil       2/5       Image: style="text-align: center;">1       40.0 (5.3-85.3)	<3	36/48	│	75.0 (60.4-86.4)
Prior treatment         80.0 (59.3-93.2)           RCHOP         9/17           BR         16/22           R-lenalidomide         1/2           Rituximab monotherapy         7/7           CHOP         2/3           R-chlorambucil         2/5	≥3	9/18	<b>├</b> ──── <b>┤</b>	50.0 (26.0-74.0)
RCVP       20/25       80.0 (59.3-93.2)         RCHOP       9/17       52.9 (27.8-77.0)         BR       16/22       72.7 (49.8-89.3)         R-lenalidomide       1/2       50.0 (1.3-98.7)         Rituximab monotherapy       7/7       66.7 (9.4-99.2)         R-chlorambucil       2/5       40.0 (5.3-85.3)	Prior treatment			
RCHOP       9/17       52.9 (27.8-77.0)         BR       16/22       72.7 (49.8-89.3)         R-lenalidomide       1/2       50.0 (1.3-98.7)         Rituximab monotherapy       7/7       100.0 (59.0-100.0)         CHOP       2/3       66.7 (9.4-99.2)         R-chlorambucil       2/5       40.0 (5.3-85.3)	RCVP	20/25	<b>⊢</b>	80.0 (59.3-93.2)
BR     16/22       R-lenalidomide     1/2       Rituximab monotherapy     7/7       CHOP     2/3       R-chlorambucil     2/5	RCHOP	9/17	│	52.9 (27.8-77.0)
R-lenalidomide       1/2         Rituximab monotherapy       7/7         CHOP       2/3         R-chlorambucil       2/5	BR	16/22		72.7 (49.8-89.3)
Rituximab monotherapy         7/7         Image: monotherapy         100.0 (59.0-100.0)           CHOP         2/3         Image: monotherapy         66.7 (9.4-99.2)           R-chlorambucil         2/5         Image: monotherapy         40.0 (5.3-85.3)	R-lenalidomide	1/2	<b>⊢</b>	50.0 (1.3-98.7)
CHOP         2/3         66.7 (9.4-99.2)           R-chlorambucil         2/5         40.0 (5.3-85.3)	Rituximab monotherapy	7/7	► ► ► ► ► ► ► ► ► ► ► ► ► ► ► ► ► ► ►	100.0 (59.0-100.0)
R-chlorambucil 2/5 40.0 (5.3-85.3)	CHOP	2/3		66.7 (9.4-99.2)
	R-chlorambucil	2/5	<b>↓</b>	40.0 (5.3-85.3)

BR, bendamustine plus rituximab: CHOP, cyclophosphamide, hydroxydaunorubicin hydrochloride, vincristine sulfate, and prednisone; MALT, mucosa-associated lymphoid tissue; NMZL, nodal MZL; R, rituximab; RCHOP, rituximab, cyclophosphamide, hydroxydaunorubicin hydrochloride, vincristine sulfate, and prednisone; RCVP, rituximab, cyclophosphamide, vincristine sulfate, and prednisone; SMZL, splenic MZL. Two-sided Clopper-Pearson test; 95% Cls for ORR.

25

50

75

100



• At a follow-up of 24 months, progression-free survival (PFS)

was 86% (**Figure 5C**)

rate by IRC was 71% (Figure 5A), duration of response (DOR)

rate by IRC was 73% (Figure 5B), and overall survival (OS) rate

- All patients experienced ≥1 treatment-emergent adverse event (TEAE) (**Figure 6A**)
- 49% of patients experienced TEAEs of grade 3 or higher
- Cardiac TEAEs were rare, with hypertension occurring in 4%, atrial fibrillation/flutter in 3%, and ventricular extrasystole in 1.5% of patients; the rate of cardiac TEAEs was comparable to that in a pooled safety analysis of zanubrutinib and lower than that reported for ibrutinib (**Table 3**)
- The most common TEAEs ( $\geq$ 18%) included contusion, diarrhea, and constipation (Figure 6B)

C Cofote C

EAEs in all patients, n (%)	N=	-68	
21 TEAE	68	(100)	
Grade ≥3	33	(49)	
Serious	30	(44)	
Leading to death	5	( <b>7</b> ) <sup>a</sup>	
Leading to dose interruption	25 (37) <sup>b</sup>		
Leading to study drug discontinuation	5 (7)°		
Leading to dose reduction		C	
TEAEs of clinical interest, n (%)	All grade	Grade ≥3	
Infections	38 (56)	15 (22) <sup>d</sup>	
Hemorrhage	28 (41)	1 (1.5) <sup>e</sup>	
Cardiac			
Hypertension	3 (4) <sup>f</sup>	2 (3)	
Atrial fibrillation/flutter	2 (3) <sup>g</sup>	1 (1.5)	
	<b>1 /1 E</b> )h	0	
Ventricular extrasystole	I (I.S)"	0	



URII, upper respiratory tract infection.
<sup>a</sup> Five patients died owing to AEs: COVID-19 pneumonia (n=2); myocardial infarcti
acute myeloid leukemia in a patient with prior exposure to an alkylating agent (n
and ileal conduit in a patient with recurrent bladder cancer (in CR at the time of c
COVID-19 pneumonia (n=4), neutropenia (n=3), diarrhea (n=2), lower respiratory t
and tonsillitis (n=2). °Five patients discontinued owing to AEs: COVID-19 pneumo
myocardial infarction (n=1); and septic encephalopathy (n=1). <sup>d</sup> Fatal infection: COV
in a patient who also received anticoagulant for pulmonary embolism; the patien
<sup>f</sup> Two patients had new-onset hypertension; none led to treatment reduction or d
atrial fibrillation (21 days after end of treatment owing to disease progression). Pa
zanubrutinib. <sup>h</sup> Ventricular extrasystole in an 83-year-old patient with no known c
day, and did not lead to treatment modification or discontinuation. <sup>i</sup> Includes base
(with history of skin cancer); papillary thyroid carcinoma (with preexisting thyroid
history of bladder cancer); and acute myeloid leukemia (with prior chemotherapy
count decreased. <sup>k</sup> Includes thrombocytopenia and platelet count decreased.

#### **Table 3. Cardiac TEAEs of Clinical Interest**

	MAGNOLIA	Pooled analysis B-cell malignanciesª	
Cardiovascular disorders	Zanubrutinib (n=68)	Zanubrutinib (n=1550)	Ibrutinib (n=422)
Treatment duration, median, months	24	26.64	19.96
Any cardiovascular medical history, n (%)			
Atrial fibrillation/flutter	8 (11.7)	101 (6.5)	26 (6.2)
Ventricular arrhythmia <sup>b</sup>	0	14 (0.9)	1 (0.2)
Hypertension <sup>c</sup>	21 (30.9)	669 (43.2)	206 (48.8)
Any cardiovascular AE, n (%)			
	2 (3)	60 (3.9)	60 (14.2)
Atrial fibrillation/flutter		EAIR: 0.13 vs 0.82 person-month ( <i>P</i> <.0001)	
Ventricular arrhythmia (grade ≥2) <sup>♭</sup>	1 (1.5)	11 (0.7)	6 (1.4)
Hypertension <sup>c</sup>	3 (4)	225 (14.5)	85 (20.1)

EAIR, exposure-adjusted incident rate; MedDRA, Medical Dictionary for Regulatory Activities; SMQ, standardized MedDRA guery. <sup>a</sup> Pooled analyses of 10 clinical studies of zanubrutinib.<sup>9 b</sup> Including ventricular tachyarrhythmia (SMQ narrow) and ventricular arrhythmias and cardiac arrest (High Level Term MedDRA v24.0). <sup>c</sup>Including hypertension (SMQ narrow).

on in a patient with preexisting cardiovascular disease (n=1); n=1); and septic encephalopathy following radical cystectomy leath [n=1]). <sup>b</sup> Most common AEs leading to dose interruption: ract infection (n=2), pneumonia (n=2), pyrexia (n=2), syncope (n=2 nia (n=2); pyrexia later attributed to disease progression (n=1); /ID-19 pneumonia (n=2). ° Gastrointestinal hemorrhage (day 862 t continued zanubrutinib with no recurrent bleeding episode. scontinuation. <sup>9</sup> Atrial fibrillation in a patient with preexisting itient with atrial flutter recovered spontaneously and continue ardiac history; it was nonserious, transient, resolved on the same al cell and squamous cell carcinoma and basal cell carcinoma nodule); recurrent bladder cancer and prostate cancer (with with alkylating agent). <sup>j</sup>Includes neutropenia and neutrophil

### CONCLUSIONS

- At a median study follow-up of 28 months, zanubrutinib showed high response rates and durable disease control in R/R MZL
- There were responses in all MZL subtypes and in difficult-to-treat subgroups
- Zanubrutinib was generally well tolerated
- Hypertension and atrial fibrillation/flutter were uncommon, comparable to those in the zanubrutinib pooled safety analyses, and lower than reported with ibrutinib
- No new safety signals were observed
- These data support the use of zanubrutinib as treatment for patients with R/R MZL

#### REFERENCES

- 1. Cheah CY, et al. *Haematologica*. 2022;107(1):35-43.
- 2. Pal Singh S, et al. Mol Cancer. 2018;17(1):57
- 3. Opat S, et al. Clin Cancer Res. 2021;27(23):6323-6332. 4. Guo Y, et al. J Med Chem. 2019;62(17):7923-7940.
- 5. Rhodes JM, Mato AR. Drug Des Devel Ther. 2021;15:919-926.
- 6. Ou YC, et al. Br J Clin Pharmacol. 2021;87(7):2926-2936.
- 7. Brukinsa (zanubrutinib). Package insert. BeiGene USA, Inc; 2023.
- 8. Cheson BC, et al. J Clin Oncol. 2014;32(27):3059-3067. 9. Tam CS, et al. Presented at: 2022 Lymphoma, Leukemia, and Myeloma Congress. October 18-22, 2022. Abstract 1324736.

#### DISCLOSURES

SO: Employee of Monash Health; Consultant for AbbVie, AstraZeneca, Janssen, and Roche; research funding from AbbVie, AstraZeneca, BeiGene, Gilead, Janssen, Pharmacyclics, Roche, Sandoz, and Takeda; honoraria from AbbVie, AstraZeneca, Celgene, CSL Behring, Gilead, Janssen, Merck, Roche, and Takeda; member of board of directors or advisory committee for AbbVie, AstraZeneca, Celgene, CSL Behring, Gilead, Janssen, Merck, Roche, and Takeda. AT: Consultant for BeiGene, AstraZeneca, AbbVie, and Janssen; honoraria from BeiGene, AstraZeneca, AbbVie, and Janssen; speakers bureau fo BeiGene, AstraZeneca, AbbVie, and Janssen; received travel funds from BeiGene, AstraZeneca, AbbVie, and Janssen. BH: Research funding from BeiGene, BMS/Celgene, and Roche; member of the board of directors or advisory committee for ADC Therapeutics, BeiGene, and Morphosys. KML: Consultant for Celgene, Gilead/Kite, BeiGene, Genmab, and Roche; speakers bureau for Genmab; member of the board of directors or advisory committee for Genmab. PM: Honoraria from Roche, BeiGene, Recordati Rare Disease, Gilead/Kite, BMS/Celgene, Takeda, AstraZeneca, AbbVie, Epizyme, and Incyte; speakers bureau for Janssen, Incyte, Roche, and Kite; travel funds from Takeda. **PLZ:** Consultant for Eusapharma, MSD, and Novartis; speakers bureau for Celltrion, Gilead, Janssen-Cilag, BMS, Servier, MSD, TG Therapeutics Takeda, Roche, Eusapharma, Kyowa Kirin, Novartis, Incyte, and BeiGene; member of the advisory board of Secura Bio, Celltrion, Gilead, Janssen-Cilag, BMS, Servier, Sandoz, MSD, TG Therapeutics, Takeda, Roche, Eusapharma, Kyowa Kirin, Novartis, ADC Therapeutics, Incyte, and BeiGene. PB: Honoraria from AbbVie; member of the board of directors or advisory committee of MSD and Janssen. CTh: Consultant for Roche, AbbVie, GenMab, Gilead/Kite, Takeda, Novartis, Incyte, Celgene, and BMS; research funding from Roche; travel funds from Novartis, Gilead, and BMS. EB: Honoraria from Gilead Sciences, Janssen Roche, AbbVie, Novartis, and BMS; consultant for Roche, MAbQi, MedXCell, and BMS; travel funds from Roche and Gilead Sciences. FC: Consultant for Roche and AstraZeneca; speakers bureau for Servier; travel funds from Takeda, AstraZeneca, and Roche. JT: Research funding from BMS, Roche, Janssen, BeiGene, Cellectar, and PCYC. ZL, JX, CTa, RD, MC: Employees of and may own stock in BeiGene, Inc. JJ, SL, MS, MS-T, AML, RC, SI, RM, HM, JSK, DT: Nothing to disclose

#### CORRESPONDENCE

Stephen Opat Monash Health and Monash University Clayton, VIC, Australia stephen.opat@monashhealth.org

#### ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The authors thank the patients and their families, investigators, co-investigators, and the study teams at each of the participating centers. This study was sponsored by BeiGene Co, Ltd. Medical writing support was provided by Nicole Lopez, PhD, of Articulate Science, LLC, and supported by BeiGene.



Copies of this presentation obtained through Quick Response (QR) code are for personal use only and may not be reproduced without permission from EHA and the authors of this presentation