Daratumumab (Darzalex®) in combination with cyclophosphamide, bortezomib and dexamethasone for the treatment of newly diagnosed systemic light chain (AL) amyloidosis

General information					
Drug description [1]	Indication [2]				
Daratumumab is a human immunoglobulin Gk (IgGk)	Daratumumab is indicated in combination with cyclophosphamide, bortezomib and dexamethasone for the treatment of adult patients with newly				
monoclonal antibody targeting CD ₃ 8.	diagnosed AL amyloidosis.				

Current treatment [3]

- First-line treatment is recommended with combination chemotherapy regimens similar to those used in myeloma but typically using dexamethasone.
- Proteasome inhibitor (PI)-based regimens are a preferred choice due to better response rates and outcomes in phase II studies and a bortezomib-alkylator-steroid combination is preferred where a rapid response is desirable (cardiac involvement, renal impairment, severe hypoalbuminaemia, fluid retention).
- Sortezomib is preferably given subcutaneously to reduce toxicity but may be given intravenously in patients with severe fluid overload where there is a concern about the adequacy of absorption.
- Thalidomide in combination with cyclophosphamide and dexamethasone is effective in the treatment of AL amyloidosis. Thalidomide should be used with caution in patients with cardiac stage III disease and those with grade III-IV neuropathy. In patients with grade III-IV neuropathy, strong consideration must be given to avoiding neurotoxic drugs (thalidomide and bortezomib).
- High dose melphalan (HDM) and autologous stem cell transplantation (ASCT) (HDM-ASCT) is the preferred first-line treatment for selected patients up to 65–70 years of age with estimated glomerular filtration rate >50 ml/min, low cardiac biomarkers, low-level plasma cell infiltration in the bone marrow at the time of transplant and lacking the contraindications mentioned in the next point.
- * HDM-ASCT is not generally recommended as first-line therapy for patients with any of the following: Cardiac amyloidosis with N-terminal pro-brain natriuretic peptide >590 pmol/l and/or troponin-T > 0.06 ng/ml, severe autonomic neuropathy, significant gastrointestinal bleeding due to amyloid, advanced renal failure, age over 70 years, symptomatic recurrent amyloid-related pleural effusions or poor Eastern Cooperative Oncology Group performance status (>2).

Regulatory status

EMA [2]

Approval status for this indication: On 20 May 2021, the CHMP adopted a positive opinion recommending changes to the terms of the marketing authorisation for Darzalex®.

The CHMP extended the existing indication for Darzalex® 1,800 mg solution for injection (active substance: daratumumab; excipients: recombinant human hyaluronidase rHuPH20, L-histidine, L-histidine hydrochloride monohydrate, L-methionine, polysorbate 20, sorbitol, water for injections) as follows:

 Darzalex® is indicated in combination with cyclophosphamide, bortezomib and dexamethasone for the treatment of adult patients with newly diagnosed AL amyloidosis.

Other indications: Darzalex® is indicated:

- in combination with lenalidomide and dexamethasone or with bortezomib, melphalan and prednisone for the treatment of adult patients with newly diagnosed multiple myeloma (MM) who are ineligible for autologous stem cell transplant.
- in combination with bortezomib, thalidomide and dexamethasone for the treatment of adult patients with newly diagnosed MM who are eligible for autologous stem cell transplant.
- in combination with lenalidomide and dexamethasone, or bortezomib and dexamethasone, for the treatment of adult patients with MM who have received at least one prior therapy.
- in combination with pomalidomide and dexamethasone for the treatment of adult patients with MM who have received one prior therapy containing a PI and lenalidomide and were lenalidomiderefractory, or who have received at least two prior therapies that included lenalidomide and a PI and have demonstrated disease progression on or after the last therapy.
- as monotherapy for the treatment of adult patients with relapsed and refractory MM, whose prior therapy included a PI and an immunomodulatory agent and who have demonstrated disease progression on the last therapy.

FDA [4, 5]

Approval status for this indication: On 15 January 2021, the FDA granted accelerated approval to daratumumab plus hyaluronidase (Darzalex Faspro®) in combination with bortezomib, cyclophosphamide and dexamethasone for newly diagnosed AL amyloidosis.

✓ This indication is approved under accelerated approval based on the response rate.

Continued approval for this indication may be contingent upon verification and description of clinical benefit in a confirmatory trial(s).

Other indications: Darzalex Faspro® is indicated for the treatment of adult patients with:

- MM combination with bortezomib, melphalan and prednisone in newly diagnosed patients who are ineligible for autologous stem cell transplant.
- MM in combination with lenalidomide and dexamethasone in newly diagnosed patients who are ineligible for autologous stem cell transplant and in patients with relapsed or refractory MM who have received at least one prior therapy.
- MM in combination with bortezomib, thalidomide, and dexamethasone in newly diagnosed patients who are eligible for autologous stem cell transplant.
- MM in combination with bortezomib and dexamethasone in patients who have received at least one prior therapy.
- MM in combination with pomalidomide and dexamethasone in patients who have received at least one prior line of therapy including lenalidomide and a proteasome inhibitor.
- MM as monotherapy, in patients who have received at least three prior lines of therapy including a PI and an immunomodulatory agent or who are double-refractory to a PI and an immunomodulatory agent.



- ✓ Orphan status
- ✓ Medicine under additional monitoring
- ✓ Accelerated assessment¹

Darzalex Faspro® is not indicated and is not recommended for the treatment of patients with AL amyloidosis who have NYHA Class IIIB or Class IV cardiac disease or Mayo Stage IIIB outside of controlled clinical trials.

Costs

1 vial Darzalex® solution for injection 1,800 mg/15ml= € 6,288.00 (ex-factory price) [6]

Warnings and precautions (Darzalex Faspro®) [4]

- Hypersensitivity and Other Administration Reactions:
 - Permanently discontinue Darzalex Faspro® for life-threatening reactions.
- Cardiac Toxicity in Patients with AL Amyloidosis:
 - Monitor patients with cardiac involvement more frequently for cardiac adverse reactions and administer supportive care as appropriate.
- Neutropenia:
 - Monitor complete blood cell counts periodically during treatment. Monitor patients with neutropenia for signs of infection. Consider withholding Darzalex Faspro® to allow recovery of neutrophils.
- * Thrombocytopenia:
 - Monitor complete blood cell counts periodically during treatment. Consider withholding Darzalex Faspro® to allow recovery of platelets.
- Embryo-Foetal Toxicity:
 - Can cause foetal harm. Advise pregnant women of the potential risk to a foetus and advise females of reproductive potential to use effective contraception.
- Interference with cross-matching and red blood cell antibody screening:
 - Type and screen patients prior to starting treatment. Inform blood banks that a patient has received Darzalex Faspro®.

Pre-/Post-medication [7]

- Darzalex® solution for subcutaneous injection can cause severe and/or serious IRRs, including anaphylactic reactions.
- Patients should be pre-medicated with antihistamines, antipyretics, and corticosteroids as well as monitored and counselled regarding IRRs, especially during and following the first and second injections.
- If an anaphylactic reaction or life-threatening (Grade 4) reactions occur, appropriate emergency care should be initiated immediately. Darzalex® therapy should be discontinued immediately and permanently.
- To reduce the risk of delayed IRRs, oral corticosteroids should be administered to all patients following Darzalex® injection.
- Patients with a history of the chronic obstructive pulmonary disease may require additional post-injection medicinal products to manage respiratory complications. The use of post-injection medicinal products (e.g. short- and long-acting bronchodilators and inhaled corticosteroids) should be considered for patients with chronic obstructive pulmonary disease.

Study characteristics [1, 4, 7, 8]										
Trial name	Trial name n Intervention (I) Comparator (C)		PE	Characteristics	Biomarker	Funding	Publication(s)			
ANDROMEDA, Study AMY3001 NCT03201965	388	dexamethasone + cyclophosphamide + bortezomib + Darzalex Faspro® 1,800 mg/30,000 units administered subcutaneously once weekly from weeks 1 to 8, once every 2 weeks from	dexamethasone + cyclophosphamide + bortezomib	Overall complete hematologic response rate (HemCR) based on International Amyloidosis Consensus Criteria guidelines	randomised, open-label, active-controlled, multicentre, phase 3 study with a safety run-in phase	-	Janssen Research & Development, LLC	[1] (safety run-in results)		

¹ This medicine had an accelerated assessment, meaning that it is a medicine of major interest for public health, so its timeframe for review was 150 evaluation days rather than 210.



weeks g to 24, and once every 4, weeks starting with week 25, guild idinase progression or unacceptable toxicity of a maximum of 2 years Efficacy (I.vs. C) Max 881 vs. 18.1%, estimated Odds Ratio 5.13, p-value <0.0001 Year 95									
starting with week ze, until disease progression or unacceptable toxicity or a maximum of 2 years Efficacy (I vs. C) In=18B vs. C (aga)		weeks 9 to 24 and							
week 25 until disease progression or unacceptable toxicity or a maximum of 2 years Efficacy (I vs. C) Efficacy (I vs. C) Imas By vs. C(25) Serious AEs: n-82/153 (43,01%) vs. n-68/158 (36,17%) Other (not funding serious) AEs: n-128/158 (36,17%) Other (not funding serious) AE		once every 4 weeks							
progression or unacceptable toxicity or a maximum of 2 years Efficacy (I.vs. C) Inn. 1887 vs. C. Lag3 Serious AEs: n=83/193 (x ₃ 0.1%) vs. n=68/188 (36.1.7%) Other (not including serious) AEs: n=182/193 (y ₃ 0.3%) vs. n=83/188 (96.2.8%) Obage interruptions (defined as dose delays or skipped doses) due to an adverse reaction occurred in 36% in 1. HemCR: \$3.3\% vs. 31.3\% estimated Odds Ratio \$1.3 p. value <0.0001		starting with							
progression or unacceptable toxicity or a maximum of 2 years Efficacy (I.vs. C) Inn. 1887 vs. C. Lag3 Serious AEs: n=83/193 (x ₃ 0.1%) vs. n=68/188 (36.1.7%) Other (not including serious) AEs: n=182/193 (y ₃ 0.3%) vs. n=83/188 (96.2.8%) Obage interruptions (defined as dose delays or skipped doses) due to an adverse reaction occurred in 36% in 1. HemCR: \$3.3\% vs. 31.3\% estimated Odds Ratio \$1.3 p. value <0.0001		week 25 until disease							
Efficacy (Ivs. C) Safety I(n=18) vs. C (193) Serious AEs: n=3193(9 (3,01%) vs. n=68/188 (36.17%) Other (not including serious) AEs: n=182/183 (96.28%) Dosage interruptions (defined as dose delays or skipped doses) due to an adverse reaction occurred in 36% in 1. Cardiac Adverse Eractions: Very good partial response (P(R): 13,36 vs. 27,5% Hematologic VGPR): -25,18 vs. 49,31% Partial response (P(R): 13,36 vs. 27,5% Hematologic VGPR or better: 197 days (ange: 9 to 39,6) vs. 59, days (range: 16 to 34%) Major organ deterioration PFS, HR with 35% C1 o. 58 (0.37, 0.92), p=0.0211 Median time to HemCR: 30 days (range: 5 to 33,6) vs. 25 days (range: 8 to 39,6) vs. 12 days (range: 10 to 38,6) vs. 12 days									
Efficacy (I vs. C) Efficacy (I vs. C) Efficacy (I vs. C) Safety Inn:188) vs. C(sqs) Serious AEs: n=83/193 (43 o1%) vs. n=68/188 (36.17%) Other (not including serious) AEs: n=182/193 (44.90%) vs. n=381/188 (96.28%) Other (not including serious) AEs: n=182/193 (44.90%) vs. n=381/188 (96.28%) Other (not including serious) AEs: n=182/193 (44.90%) vs. n=381/188 (96.28%) Other (not including serious) AEs: n=182/193 (44.90%) vs. n=381/188 (96.28%) Other (not including serious) AEs: n=182/193 (44.90%) vs. n=381/188 (96.28%) Other (not including serious) AEs: n=182/193 (44.90%) vs. n=381/188 (96.28%) Other (not including serious) AEs: n=182/193 (44.90%) vs. n=381/188 (96.28%) Other (not including serious) AEs: n=182/193 (44.90%) vs. n=381/188 (96.28%) Other (not including serious) AEs: n=182/193 (44.90%) vs. n=68/188 (36.17%) Other (not including serious) AEs: n=182/193 (43.01%) vs. n=68/188 (36.17%) Other (not including serious) AEs: n=182/193 (43.01%) vs. n=68/188 (36.17%) Other (not including serious) AEs: n=182/193 (43.01%) vs. n=68/188 (36.17%) Other (not including serious) AEs: n=182/193 (43.01%) vs. n=68/188 (36.17%) Other (not including serious) AEs: n=182/193 (43.01%) vs. n=68/188 (36.17%) Other (not including serious) AEs: n=182/193 (43.01%) vs. n=68/188 (36.17%) Other (not including serious) AEs: n=182/193 (43.01%) vs. n=68/188 (36.17%) Other (not including serious) AEs: n=182/193 (43.01%) vs. n=68/188 (36.17%) Other (not including serious) AEs: n=182/193 (43.01%) vs. n=68/188 (36.17%) Other (not including serious) AEs: n=182/193 (43.01%) vs. n=68/188 (36.17%) Other (not including serious) AEs: n=182/193 (43.01%) vs. n=68/188 (36.17%) Other (not including serious) AEs: n=182/193 (43.01%) vs. n=68/188 (36.17%) Other (not including serious) AEs: n=182/193 (43.01%) vs. n=68/188 (36.17%) Other (not including serious) AEs: n=182/193 (43.01%) vs. n=68/188 (36.17%) Other (not including serious) AEs: n=182/193 (43.01%) vs. n=68/188 (36.17%) Other (not including serious) AEs: n=182/193 (43.01%) vs. n=68/188 (43.01									
### Carriage February Februar									
Efficacy (i.vs. C) In=aBl vs. C (asa) Safety									
HemCR: 53.3% vs. 18.1%, estimated Odds Ratio 5.13, p-value <0.0001 Senous AEs: n=83/133 (43.01%) vs. n=68/188 (56.77%) Other (not including serious) AEs: n=182/133 (94.30%) vs. n=182/188 (96.28%) Dosage interruptions (defined as dose delays or skipped doses) due to an adverse reaction occurred in 196% in I. Very good partial response (VGPR): -25.1% vs. 31.1% Senous AEs: n=182/133 (43.01%) vs. n=68/188 (96.28%) Dosage interruptions (defined as dose delays or skipped doses) due to an adverse reaction occurred in 196% in I. Very good partial response (VGPR): -25.1% vs. 31.1% Senous AEs (PR): -33.3% vs. 27.5% Senous Cardiac Adverse Reactions: **Among patients in I, 72% of patients had baseline cardiac involvement with Mayo Cardiac Stage I (39%), Stage II (4,66%) and Stage III (51%). **Beat and I and 28% of patients with 5 fage III (11) Senous cardiac disorders occurred in 196% of patients (8%) of patients with Mayo Cardiac Stage I and I and 28% of patients with 5 fage III (11) Senous cardiac disorders in 2-2% of patients included cardiac failure (8%), cardiac arrest (4%) and arrhythmia (4%) Senous cardiac disorders in 2-2% of patients with Mayo Cardiac Stage I and I and 19% of patients with Stage III (11) Senous cardiac disorders in 2-2% of patients with Mayo Cardiac Stage I and I and 19% of patients with Stage III (11) Senous cardiac disorders in 2-2% of patients with Mayo Cardiac Stage I and I and 19% of patients with Stage III (11) Senous cardiac disorders in 2-2% of patients with Mayo Cardiac Stage I and I and 19% of patients with Stage III in 1 Senous cardiac disorders in 2-2% of patients with Mayo Cardiac Stage I and I and 19% of patients with Stage III in 1 Senous cardiac disorders in 2-2% of patients with Mayo Cardiac Stage I and I and 19% of patients with Stage III in 1 Senous cardiac disorders in 2-2% of patients with Mayo Cardiac Stage I and I and 19% of patients with Stage III in 1 Senous cardiac disorders in 2-2% of patients with Stage III in 1 Senous cardiac d		,			Safety				
Serious AEs: n=83/193 (A, 0.1%) (s. n=68/188 (56.17%) Other (not including serious) AEs: n=182/193 (A, 3.04%) vs. n=68/188 (56.17%) Obosage interruptions (defined as dose delays or skipped doses) due to an adverse reaction occurred in 165% in 1. HemCR: 53.3% vs. 18.1%, estimated Odds Ratio 5.13, p-value < 0.0001 Very good partial response (VGPR): -25.1% vs. 31.1% Very good partial response (VGPR): -25.1% vs. 31.1% Very good partial response (VGPR): -25.1% vs. 31.1% Hematologic VGPR or better (HemCR + VGPR): 78.5% vs. 49.2% Hematologic VGPR or better (HemCR + VGPR): 78.5% vs. 49.2% Median time to HemCR: 5g days (range: 8 to 299) vs. 5g days (range: 8 to 340) Median time to VGPR or better: 17 days (range: 5 to 336) vs. 25 days (range: 8 to 271) Median duration of HemCR had not been reached in either arm. The median follow-up for the study is 11.4 months. OS data were not mature. A total of 56 deaths were observed: n=27 (13.8%) vs. n=29 (15%). **Safety run-in results, n=28 Grade 3/4, TEAES (>a patient): n=20 (71.4%) TEAEs considered related to study treatment: n=26 (93%), TEAEs in 12 (75%) patients TEAEs considered related to to study treatment: n=26 (93%), TEAEs in 12 (75%). ### TEAEs considered related to to study treatment: n=26 (93%), TEAEs in 12 (75%). ### TEAEs considered related to to study treatment: n=26 (93%), TEAEs in 12 (75%). ### TEAEs considered related to to study treatment: n=26 (93%), TEAEs in 12 (75%). ### TEAEs considered related to to daratumumab: n=21 (75%). ### TEAEs considered related to to daratumumab: n=21 (75%). ### TEAEs considered related to to daratumumab: n=21 (75%). ### TEAEs considered related to to daratumumab: n=21 (75%). ### TEAEs considered related to to daratumumab: n=21 (75%). ### TEAEs considered related to to daratumumab: n=26 (93%), TEAEs in 12 (75%). ### TEAEs considered related to daratumumab: n=26 (93%), TEAEs in 12 (75%). ### TEAEs considered related to daratumumab: n=26 (93%), TEAEs in 12 (75%). ### TEAEs considered related to daratumumab: n=26 (I (n=188	,				
themCR: 53.3% vs. 18.1%, estimated Odds Ratio 5.13, p-value <0.0001 Very good partial response (VGPR): -25.1% vs. 31.1% Partial response (VGPR): -25.1% vs. 31.9% Very good partial response (VGPR): -25.1% vs. 31.9% Abequate deterioration PFS, HR with 95% C1: 0.58 (0.37, 0.92), p=0.0211 Median time to HemCR: 53 days (range: 8t to 293) vs. 52 days (range: 8t to 340) Median time to VGPR or better: 27 days (range: 5t to 350) vs. 25 days (range: 8t to 340) Median time to VGPR or better: 27 days (range: 5t to 350) vs. 25 days (range: 8t to 271) Median duration of HemCR had not been reached in either arm. The median follow-up for the study is 11.4 months. OS data were not mature. A total of 56 deaths were observed: n=27 (13.8%) vs. n=29 (15%). Safety run-in results, n=28 Grade 3/4 TEAEs (>1 patient): n=20 (71.4%) TEAEs considered related to study treatment: n=26 (93%); TEAEs in 21 (75%) patients The ESMO-MCBS is not applicable since no scorable endpoint had been reached at the time of analysis. ESMO-MCBS version 1.1 Risk end baseline cardiac involvement with Mayo Cardiac Stage I and II and 28% of patients with Stage III) in I. Fatal cardiac disorders occurred in 16% of patients (8% of patients with Mayo Cardiac Stage I and II and 28% of patients with Stage III) in I. Fatal cardiac disorders occurred in 26% of patients with Mayo Cardiac Stage I and II and 28% of patients with Stage III) in I. Fatal cardiac disorders occurred in 26% of patients with Mayo Cardiac Stage I and II and 28% of patients with Stage III) in I. Fatal cardiac disorders occurred in 26% of patients with Mayo Cardiac Stage I and II and 28% of patients with Stage III) in I. Fatal cardiac disorders occurred in 26% of patients with Mayo Cardiac Stage I and II and 28% of patients with Stage III). Fatal cardiac disorders occurred in 26% of patients with Stage III in I. Fatal cardiac disorders occurred in						n=68/188 (56 17%)			
Dosage interruptions (defined as dose delays or skipped doses) due to an adverse reaction occurred in 36% in 1. Cardiac Adverse Reactions: Very good partial response (VGPR): -25_19k vs. 31_19k Safety vs. 27_59k							199 (26 2994)		
Cardiac Adverse Reactions:					_		_		
HemCR: 53.3% vs. 18.1%, estimated Odds Ratio 5.13, p-value <0.0001 Very good partial response (VCPR): -25.3% vs. 31.1% Partial response (PR): 13.3% vs. 27.5% Hematologic VGPR or better: (HemCR + VGPR): 78.5% vs. 49.2% Major organ deterioration PFS, HR with 95% Cl. 0.58 (0.37, 0.92), p=0.0211 Median time to HemCR: 59 days (range: 8 to 299) vs. 59 days (range: 8 to 290) vs. 59 days (range: 8 to 290) vs. 59 days (range: 8 to 37.1) Median duration of HemCR had not been reached in either arm. The median follow-up for the study is 11.4 months. OS data were not mature. A total of 56 deaths were observed: n=27 (13.8%) vs. n=29 (15%). Safety run-in results, n=28 Grade 3/4 TEAEs (>1 patient): n=20 (71.4%) TEAES considered related to study treatment: n=26 (93%); TEAEs in 21 (75%) patients TEAES considered related to daratumumab: n=21 (75%). Risk of bias (study level) [5] Adequate generation of randomisation sequence unclear unclear unclear in No, open-label unclear in No, open-label unclear in yes of patients with Stage III) (saper). Cardiac Adverse Reactions: Among patients in 1, 72% of patients in 1, 72% of patients with Made Stage III (15.5%). Serious cardiac disorders occurred in 16% of patients with Mayo Cardiac Stage I and a 28% of patients with Stage III). Serious cardiac disorders in >2% of patients with Mayo Cardiac Adverse Reactions: Serious cardiac disorders in >2% of patients with Mayo Cardiac Adverse Reactions (4.9%) and arrhythmia (4.9%). Serious cardiac disorders in >2% of patients with Mayo Cardiac Adverse Reactions (4.9%) and arrhythmia (4.9%). Serious cardiac disorders in >2% of patients with Mayo Cardiac Adverse Reactions (4.9%). Serious cardiac disorders in >2% of patients with Mayo Cardiac Adverse Reactions (5.9% of patients with Mayo Cardiac Adverse Reactions (5.9% of patients with Mayo Cardiac Adverse Reactions (5.9% of patients with Stage III). Serious cardiac disorders in >2% of patients with Stage III). Safety run-in results. Safety run-in results. Safety run-in results					•	se delays or skipped doses) di	Je to an adverse reaction		
Among patient response (VGPR): -25.1% vs. 31.1% Partial response (PR): 3-3.3% vs. 27,5% Hematologic VGPR or better (HemCR + VGPR): 78.5% vs. 49.2% Major organ deterioration PFS, HR with 95% Cl: 0.58 (0.37, 0.92), p=0.0211 Median time to HemCR: 59 days (range: 8 to 299) vs. 59 days (range: 15 to 340) Median time to VGPR or better: 17 days (range: 5 to 349) vs. 25 days (range: 8 to 171) Median duration of HemCR had not been reached in either arm. The median follow-up for the study is 11.4 months. OS data were not mature. A total of 56 deaths were observed: n=27 (13.8%) vs. n=29 (15%). Safety run-in results, n=28 Grade 3/4 TEAEs (>1 patient): n=20 (71.4%) TEAEs considered related to daratumumab: n=21 (75%), liR: n=1 (4%) ESMO-MCBS version 1.1 The ESMO-MCBS is not applicable since no scorable endpoint had been reached at the time of analysis. Risk of bias (study level) [3] Adequate generation of randomisation sequence unclear unclear No, open-label unclear				occurred	in 36% in I.				
Partial response (PGR): -25.1% vs. 31.1% Partial response (PR): 3-23% vs27.5% Hematologic VGPR or better (HemCR + VGPR): 78.5% vs. 49.2% Major organ deterioration PFS, HR with 95% CI: 0.58 (0.37), 0.92), p=0.0211 Median time to HemCR: 59 days (range: 8 to 299) vs. 59 days (range: 15 to 340) Median time to VGPR or better: 17 days (range: 5 to 349) vs. 25 days (range: 8 to 171) Median duration of HemCR had not been reached in either arm. The median follow-up for the study is 11.4 months. OS data were not mature. A total of 56 deaths were observed: n=27 (13.8%) vs. n=29 (15%). Safety run-in results, n=28 Grade 3/4 TEAEs (>1 patient): n=20 (71.4%) TEAEs considered related to daratumumab: n=21 (75%), iRR: n=1 (49%) ESMO-MCBS version 1.1 The ESMO-MCBS is not applicable since no scorable endpoint had been reached at the time of analysis. Risk of bias (study level) [9] Adequate generation of randomisation sequence unclear	HemCR: 53.3% vs. 18.1%,	estimated Odds Ratio 5.13, p-value <0.0001		Cardiac A	Cardiac Adverse Reactions				
Partial response (PR): 3:,3% vs. 27.5% Hematologic VGPR or better (HemCR + VGPR): 78.5% vs. 49.2% Major organ deterioration PFS, HR with 95% Cl: 0.58 (0.37, 0.92), p=0.0211 Median time to HemCR: 59 days (range: 8 to 299) vs. 59 days (range: 16 to 340) Median duration of HemCR had not been reached in either arm. The median follow-up for the study is 11.4 months. OS data were not mature. A total of 56 deaths were observed: n=27 (13.8%) vs. n=29 (15%). Safety run-in results, n=28 Grade 3/4, TEAEs (-1) patient): n=20 (71.4%) TEAEs considered related to daratumumab: n=21 (75%), patients TEAEs considered related to daratumumab: n=21 (75%) patients TEAEs considered related to daratumumab: n=21 (75%), patients	Very good partial respons	se (VGPR): -25.1% vs. 31.1%				natients had baseline cardiac	involvement with Mayo		
Hematologic VGPR or better (HemCR + VGPR): 78.5% vs. 49.2% Major organ deterioration PFS, HR with 95% Cl. 0.58 (0.37, 0.92), p=0.0211 Median time to HemCR: 59 days (range: 8 to 299) vs. 59 days (range: 8 to 171) Median duration of HemCR had not been reached in either arm. The median follow-up for the study is 11.4 months. OS data were not mature. A total of 56 deaths were observed: n=27 (13.8%) vs. n=29 (15%). Safety run-in results, n=28 Grade 3/4 TEAEs (>1 patient): n=20 (71.4%) TEAEs considered related to study treatment: n=26 (93%); TEAEs in 21 (75%) patients The ESMO-MCBS is not applicable since no scorable endpoint had been reached at the time of analysis. Risk of bias (study level) [9] Adequate generation of another and concealment unclear unclear unclear unclear unclear in a concealment unclear unclear in the study is 10.4% on patients (8% of patients with Mayo Cardiac Stage I and II and 28% of patients with Stage III). Serious cardiac disorders occurred in 16% of patients (8%), cardiac arrest (4%) and arrhythmia (4%). Serious cardiac disorders occurred in 16% of patients with Mayo Cardiac Stage I and II and 28% of patients with Mayo Cardiac disorders occurred in 10% of patients (9%), cardiac arrest (4%) and arrhythmia (4%). Fatal cardiac disorders occurred in 10% of patients (5% of patients with Mayo Cardiac disorders occurred in 10% of patients (10%), cardiac arrest (4%) and arrhythmia (4%). Fatal cardiac disorders occurred in 10% of patients (5% of patients with Mayo Cardiac disorders occurred in 10% of patients with Mayo Cardiac disorders occurred in 10% of patients (10%), and cardiac failure (10%). Fatal cardiac disorders occurred in 10% of patients with Mayo Cardiac disorders occurred in 10% of patients with Mayo Cardiac disorders occurred in 10% of patients with Mayo Cardiac disorders occurred in 10% of patients with Mayo Cardiac disorders occurred in 10% of patients with Mayo Cardiac disorders occurred in 10% of patients with Mayo Cardiac disorders occurred in 10% of patients wit					31	•	or ement men may e		
Major organ deterioration PFS, HR with 95% Cl: 0.58 (0.37, 0.92), p=0.0211 Median time to HemCR: 59 days (range: 8 to 239) vs. 59 days (range: 16 to 340) Median time to VGPR or better: 17 days (range: 5 to 336) vs. 25 days (range: 8 to 171) Median duration of HemCR had not been reached in either arm. The median follow-up for the study is 11.4 months. OS data were not mature. A total of 56 deaths were observed: n=27 (13.8%) vs. n=29 (15%). Safety run-in results, n=28 Grade 3/4 TEAEs (>1 patient): n=20 (71.4%) TEAEs considered related to study treatment: n=26 (93%); TEAEs in 21 (75%) patients TEAES considered related to daratumumab: n=21 (75%). Risk of bias (study level) [9] Adequate generation of randomisation sequence unclear No, open-label No, open-label No, open-label Adequate generation of randomisation sequence unclear Yags (range: 8 to 239) vs. 59 days (range: 16 to 340) Serious cardiac disorders occurred in 10% of patients with Mayo Cardiac arrest (4%) and arrhythmia (4%). Fatal cardiac disorders occurred in 10% of patients with Stage III) in 1. Fatal cardiac disorders occurred in 10% of patients with Mayo Cardiac Stage I and II and 19% of patients with Stage III) in 1. Fatal cardiac disorders occurred in 10% of patients with Mayo Cardiac Stage I and II and 19% of patients with Stage III) in 1. Fatal cardiac disorders occurred in 10% of patients with Mayo Cardiac Stage I and II and 19% of patients with Stage III) in 1. Fatal cardiac disorders occurred in 10% of patients with Mayo Cardiac disorders occurred in 10% of patients with Stage III) in 1. Fatal cardiac disorders occurred in 10% of patients with Stage III) in 1. Fatal cardiac disorders occurred in 10% of patients with Stage III) in 1. Fatal cardiac disorders occurred in 10% of patients with Stage III) in 1. Fatal cardiac disorders occurred in 10% of patients with Stage III) in 1. Fatal cardiac disorders occurred in 10% of patients with Stage III) in 1. Fatal cardiac disorders occurred in 10% of patients with Stage III	-				5 5		of patients with Mayo Cardias		
Median time to HemCR: 59 days (range: 8 to 299) vs. 59 days (range: 16 to 340) Median duration of HemCR had not been reached in either arm. Median duration of HemCR had not been reached in either arm. OS data were not mature. A total of 56 deaths were observed: n=27 (13.8%) vs. n=29 (15%). A total of 56 deaths were observed: n=27 (13.8%) vs. n=29 (15%). Safety run-in results, n=28 Grade 3/4 TEAEs (>1 patient): n=20 (71.4%) TEAEs considered related to study treatment: n=26 (93%); TEAEs in 21 (75%) patients TEAEs considered related to daratumumab: n=21 (75%) patients The ESMO-MCBS version 1.1 Risk of bias (study level) [9] Adequate generation of randomisation sequence unclear Unclear No, open-label No, open-label No, open-label OSEIOUS Cardiac disorders in >2% of patients included cardiac failure (8%), cardiac arrest (4,%) and arrhythmia (4,%). Fatal cardiac disorders that occurred in no% of patients with Mayo Cardiac arrest (4,%) and arrhythmia (4,%). Fatal cardiac disorders that occurred in no% of patients with Mayo Cardiac disorders that occurred in more than one patient in l included cardiac disorders that occurred in more than one patient in l included cardiac disorders that occurred in more than one patient in l included cardiac disorders that occurred in more than one patient in l included cardiac disorders that occurred in more than one patient in l included cardiac disorders that occurred in more than one patient in l included cardiac disorders that occurred in more than one patient in l included cardiac disorders that occurred in more than one patient in l included cardiac disorders that occurred in now than occur	_	. , , ,					for patients with Mayo Cardiac		
Median time to VGPR or better: 17 days (range: 5 to 336) vs. 25 days (range: 8 to 171) Median duration of HemCR had not been reached in either arm. The median follow-up for the study is 11.4 months. OS data were not mature. A total of 56 deaths were observed: n=27 (13.8%) vs. n=29 (15%). Safety run-in results, n=28 Grade 3/4 TEAEs (>1 patient): n=20 (71.4%) TEAEs considered related to daratumumab: n=21 (75%) patients TEAEs considered related to daratumumab: n=21 (75%) patients TEAEs considered related to daratumumab: n=21 (75%). Risk of bias (study level) [5] Adequate generation of randomisation sequence unclear unclear unclear unclear nuclear nuclear very many of the study is a page of the s)		· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·				
Median duration of HemCR had not been reached in either arm. The median follow-up for the study is 11.4 months. • Fatal cardiac disorders occurred in 10% of patients (5% of patients with Mayo Cardiac Stage I and II and 19% of patients with Stage III) in I. OS data were not mature. • Fatal cardiac disorders occurred in now of patients with Stage III) in I. A total of 56 deaths were observed: n=27 (13.8%) vs. n=29 (15%). • Fatal cardiac disorders occurred in now of patients with Mayo Cardiac Stage I and II and 19% of patients with Stage III) in I. • Fatal cardiac disorders occurred in 10% of patients with Mayo Cardiac Stage I and II and 19% of patients with Stage III) in I. • Fatal cardiac disorders occurred in 10% of patients with Mayo Cardiac Stage I and II and 19% of patients with Mayo Cardiac Stage I and II and 19% of patients with Stage III) in I. • Fatal cardiac disorders occurred in 10% of patients with Mayo Cardiac Stage I and II and 19% of patients with Stage III) in I. • Fatal cardiac disorders occurred in 10% of patients with Mayo Cardiac Stage I and II and 19% of patients with Mayo Cardiac failure stage. • Fatal cardiac disorders occurred in now to stage I and II and 19% of patients with Mayo Cardiac failure stage. • Fatal cardiac disorders that occurred in more than one patient in I included cardiac arrest (4%), sudden death (3%), and cardiac failure (3%). • Fatal cardiac disorders that occurred in more than one patient in I included cardiac arrest (4%), sudden death (3%), and cardiac failure (3%). • Fatal cardiac disorders hat occurr	_	, , , , , , , ,	·		'				
Stage I and II and 19% of patients with Stage III) in I. OS data were not mature. A total of 56 deaths were observed: n=27 (13.8%) vs. n=29 (15%). Safety run-in results, n=28 Grade 3/4 TEAEs (>1 patient): n=20 (71.4%) TEAEs considered related to study treatment: n=26 (93%), TEAEs in 21 (75%) patients TEAEs considered related to daratumumab: n=21 (75%). IRR: n=1 (4%) Adequate generation of randomisation sequence unclear Adequate allocation concealment Blinding reporting unlikely unclear² yes3 high		. , , .	: 8 to 171)		, , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , ,				
OS data were not mature. A total of 56 deaths were observed: n=27 (13.8%) vs. n=29 (15%). Safety run-in results, n=28 Grade 3/4 TEAEs (>1 patient): n=20 (71.4%) TEAEs considered related to study treatment: n=26 (93%); TEAEs in 21 (75%) patients TEAEs considered related to daratumumab: n=21 (75%). IRR: n=1 (4%) ESMO-MCBS version 1.1 The ESMO-MCBS is not applicable since no scorable endpoint had been reached at the time of analysis. Risk of bias (study level) [9] Adequate generation of randomisation sequence unclear unclear unclear No, open-label unclear² yes³ high	Median duration of Hemo	CR had not been reached in either arm.			,				
A total of 56 deaths were observed: n=27 (13.8%) vs. n=29 (15%). A total of 56 deaths were observed: n=27 (13.8%) vs. n=29 (15%). Safety run-in results, n=28 Grade 3/4 TEAEs (>1 patient): n=20 (71.4%) TEAEs considered related to study treatment: n=26 (93%); TEAEs in 21 (75%) patients TEAEs considered related to daratumumab: n=21 (75%). IRR: n=1 (4%) Risk of bias (study level) [9] Adequate generation of randomisation sequence Adequate allocation concealment on reporting unlikely unclear unclear No, open-label unclear² yes³ high	The median follow-up for t	the study is 11.4 months.		:	Stage I and II and 19% of patients with Stage III) in I.				
Safety run-in results, n=28 Grade 3/4 TEAEs (>1 patient): n=20 (71.4%) TEAEs considered related to study treatment: n=26 (93%); TEAEs in 21 (75%) patients TEAEs considered related to daratumumab: n=21 (75%). IRR: n=1 (4%) ESMO-MCBS version 1.1 The ESMO-MCBS is not applicable since no scorable endpoint had been reached at the time of analysis. Risk of bias (study level) [9] Adequate generation of randomisation sequence Adequate allocation concealment unclear No, open-label unclear² Yes³ high	OS data were not mature.			•					
Safety run-in results, n=28 Grade 3/4 TEAEs (>1 patient): n=20 (71.4%) TEAEs considered related to study treatment: n=26 (93%); TEAEs in 21 (75%) patients TEAEs considered related to daratumumab: n=21 (75%). IRR: n=1 (4%) ESMO-MCBS version 1.1 The ESMO-MCBS is not applicable since no scorable endpoint had been reached at the time of analysis. Risk of bias (study level) [9] Adequate generation of randomisation sequence unclear No, open-label unclear yes3 high	A total of 56 deaths were of	observed: n=27 (13.8%) vs. n=29 (15%).			arrest (4%), sudden death (3%), and cardiac failure (3%).				
Grade 3/4 TEAEs (>1 patient): n=20 (71.4%) TEAEs considered related to study treatment: n=26 (93%); TEAEs in 21 (75%) patients TEAEs considered related to daratumumab: n=21 (75%). IRR: n=1 (4%) ESMO-MCBS version 1.1 The ESMO-MCBS is not applicable since no scorable endpoint had been reached at the time of analysis. Risk of bias (study level) [9] Adequate generation of randomisation sequence unclear No, open-label unclear² Yes³ high	J	, , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , ,					,		
Grade 3/4 TEAEs (>1 patient): n=20 (71.4%) TEAEs considered related to study treatment: n=26 (93%); TEAEs in 21 (75%) patients TEAEs considered related to daratumumab: n=21 (75%). IRR: n=1 (4%) ESMO-MCBS version 1.1 The ESMO-MCBS is not applicable since no scorable endpoint had been reached at the time of analysis. Risk of bias (study level) [9] Adequate generation of randomisation sequence Adequate allocation concealment Unclear No, open-label No, open-label Difference of Grade 3/4 TEAEs (>1 patient): n=20 (71.4%) TEAEs considered related to study treatment: n=26 (93%); TEAEs in 21 (75%) patients TEAEs considered related to study treatment: n=26 (93%); TEAEs in 21 (75%) patients TEAEs considered related to study treatment: n=26 (93%); TEAEs in 21 (75%) patients TEAEs considered related to study treatment: n=26 (93%); TEAEs in 21 (75%) patients TEAEs considered related to study treatment: n=26 (93%); TEAEs in 21 (75%) patients TEAEs considered related to study treatment: n=26 (93%); TEAEs in 21 (75%) patients TEAEs considered related to study treatment: n=26 (93%); TEAEs in 21 (75%) patients TEAEs considered related to study treatment: n=26 (93%); TEAEs in 21 (75%) patients TEAEs considered related to study treatment: n=26 (93%); TEAEs in 21 (75%) patients TEAEs considered related to study treatment: n=26 (93%); TEAEs in 21 (75%) patients TEAEs considered related to study treatment: n=26 (93%); TEAEs in 21 (75%) patients TEAEs considered related to study treatment: n=26 (93%); TEAEs in 21 (75%) patients TEAEs considered related to daratumumab: n=21 (75%). IRR: n=1 (4%) The ESMO-MCBS is not applicable since no scorable endpoint had been reached at the time of analysis. The ESMO-MCBS is not applicable since no scorable endpoint had been reached at the time of analysis. The ESMO-MCBS is not applicable since no scorable endpoint had been reached at the time of analysis. The ESMO-MCBS is not applicable since no scorable endpoint had been reached at the time of analysis. The ESMO-MCBS is				Safety r	Safety run-in results, n=28				
TEAEs considered related to study treatment: n=26 (93%); TEAEs in 21 (75%) patients TEAEs considered related to daratumumab: n=21 (75%). IRR: n=1 (4%) ESMO-MCBS version 1.1 The ESMO-MCBS is not applicable since no scorable endpoint had been reached at the time of analysis. Risk of bias (study level) [9] Adequate generation of randomisation sequence unclear unclear No, open-label unclear yes3 high					· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·				
TEAEs considered related to daratumumab: n=21 (75%). IRR: n=1 (4%) ESMO-MCBS version 1.1 The ESMO-MCBS is not applicable since no scorable endpoint had been reached at the time of analysis. Risk of bias (study level) [9] Adequate generation of randomisation sequence reporting unlikely unclear No, open-label unclear² yes3 high									
IRR: n=1 (4%) ESMO-MCBS version 1.1					, ,				
ESMO-MCBS version 1.1 The ESMO-MCBS is not applicable since no scorable endpoint had been reached at the time of analysis. Risk of bias (study level) [9] Adequate generation of randomisation sequence unclear No, open-label unclear² yes³ high					1 =				
The ESMO-MCBS is not applicable since no scorable endpoint had been reached at the time of analysis. Risk of bias (study level) [9] Adequate generation of randomisation sequence unclear No, open-label unclear² yes³ high									
Risk of bias (study level) [9] Adequate generation of randomisation sequence unclear No, open-label unclear Other aspects which increase the risk of bias Risk of bias reporting unlikely yes³ high									
Adequate generation of randomisation sequence Unclear Adequate allocation concealment Blinding Selective outcome reporting unlikely Unclear Other aspects which increase the risk of bias Risk of bias No, open-label Unclear ² yes ³ high									
unclear unclear No, open-label unclear² Versage the risk of bias reporting unlikely versage the risk of bias vers	Adequate generation of Selective outcome								
unclear unclear No, open-label unclear² yes³ high		Adequate allocation concealment	Blinding		Other aspects which incr	rease the risk of bias	Risk of bias		
					,	yes ³	high		
First published: 06/2021			, , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , ,				First published: 06/2021		

² ANDROMEDA trial is ongoing until 08/2024;



³ Industry-funded; the investigators and sponsor devised the study design and analysis. The sponsor conducted the final data analysis and verified data accuracy.

Abbreviations: AE=adverse event, AJ=adjustment, AL amyloidosis=systemic light chain amyloidosis, ASCT=autologous stem cell transplantation, C=comparator, CHMP=Committee for Medicinal Products for Human Use, CI=confidence interval, EMA=European Medicines Agency, ESMO-MCBS= European Society of Medical Oncology – Magnitude of Clinical Benefit Scale, FDA=Food and Drug Administration, FM=final magnitude of clinical benefit grade, HDM=high dose melphalan, HemCR=Hematologic complete response, HR=hazard ratio, I=intervention, Int.=intention, IRR=infusion-related reaction, MG=median gain, MM=multiple myeloma, n=number of patients, OS=overall survival, PE=primary endpoint, PFS=progression-free survival, PI=proteasome inhibitor, PM=preliminary grade, PR=partial response, QoL=quality of life, SAE=serious adverse event, ST=standard treatment, TEAE=treatment-emergent adverse event, VGPR=very good partial response

References:

- 1. Palladini G, Kastritis E, Maurer M, et al. Daratumumab plus CyBorD for patients with newly diagnosed AL amyloidosis: safety run-in results of ANDROMEDA. Blood 2020;136(1):71-80. [Available from: https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC7332897/].
- 2. European Medicines Agency (EMA). Medicines. Darzalex. [Available from: https://www.ema.europa.eu/en/medicines/human/summaries-opinion/darzalex-2].
- 3. National Institute for Health and Research (NIHR). Daratumumab in addition to cyclophosphamide, bortezomib and dexamethasone for newly diagnosed systemic amyloid light-chain amyloidosis. [Available from: http://www.io.nihr.ac.uk/wp-content/uploads/2020/02/21696-Daratumumab-CyBorD-for-Amyloidosis-V1.0-JAN2020-NON-CONF.pdf].
- 4. U.S. Food and Drug Administration (FDA). Darzalex Faspro. Label Information. [Available from: https://www.accessdata.fda.gov/drugsatfda_docs/label/2021/761145s007lbl.pdf].
- 5. U.S. Food and Drug Administration (FDA). FDA grants accelerated approval to Darzalex Faspro for newly diagnosed light chain amyloidosis. [Available from: https://www.fda.gov/drugs/resources-information-approved-drugs/fda-grants-accelerated-approval-darzalex-faspro-newly-diagnosed-light-chain-amyloidosis].
- 6. Österreichischer Apotheker-Verlag. Warenverzeichnis Online. [Available from: https://warenverzeichnis.apoverlag.at/].
- 7. European Medicines Agency (EMA). Darzalex: EPAR Product Information. [Available from: https://www.ema.europa.eu/en/documents/product-information/darzalex-epar-product-information en.pdf].
- 8. U.S. National Library of Medicine, ClinicalTrials.gov. A Study to Evaluate the Efficacy and Safety of Daratumumab in Combination With Cyclophosphamide, Bortezomib and Dexamethasone (CyBorD) Compared to CyBorD Alone in Newly Diagnosed Systemic Amyloid Lightchain (AL) Amyloidosis. [Available from: https://clinicaltrials.gov/ct2/show/study/NCT03201965].
- 9. European Network for Health Technology Assessment (EUnetHTA). LEVELS OF EVIDENCE. Internal validity of randomised controlled trials. Adapted version (2015). [Available from: https://www.eunethta.eu/wp-content/uploads/2018/01/Internal-validity-of-randomised-controlled-trials.pdf].

