

MultiSCRIPT-Cycle 1- A Pragmatic trial embedded within the Swiss Multiple Sclerosis Cohort (SMSC) on neurofilament light chain monitoring to inform personalized treatment decisions in Multiple Sclerosis: a study protocol for a randomized clinical trial

Perrine Janiaud¹, Chiara Zecca^{2,3}, Anke Salmen⁴, Pascal Benkert⁵, Sabine Schädelin⁵, Annette Orleth^{1,6}, Lilian Demuth^{1,6}, Aleksandra Maleska Maceski^{1,7}, Cristina Granziera^{1,6,8}, Johanna Oechtering^{1,6}, David Leppert¹, Tobias Derfuss^{1,6}, Lutz Achtnichts⁹, Oliver Findling⁹, Patrick Roth¹⁰, Patrice Lalive¹¹, Marjolaine Uginet¹¹, Stefanie Müller¹², Caroline Pot¹³, Robert Hoepner¹⁴, Giulio Disanto², Claudio Gobbi², Leila Rooshenas¹⁵, Matthias Schwenkglens^{16,17}, Mark J Lambiris^{16,17}, Ludwig Kappos¹, Jens Kuhle^{1,5,6,7*}, Özgür Yaldizli^{1,5,6,8*}, Lars G Hemkens^{1,5*}

*Shared last authors

¹Research Center for Clinical Neuroimmunology and Neuroscience Basel (RC2NB), University Hospital Basel, University of Basel, Basel, Switzerland

² Neurology clinic Lugano, MS center, Neurocenter of Southern Switzerland, Lugano, Switzerland

³ Faculty of Biomedical Sciences, Università della Svizzera Italiana (USI), Lugano, Switzerland

⁴Department of Neurology, Ruhr-University Bochum, St. Josef-Hospital, Bochum, Germany

⁵Department of Clinical Research, University Hospital Basel, University of Basel, Basel, Switzerland,

⁶Neurologic Clinic and Policlinic, MS Centre, University Hospital Basel, Basel, Switzerland,

⁷Department of Neurology, University Hospital Basel, University of Basel, Basel, Switzerland,

⁸Translational Imaging in Neurology Basel, Department of Medicine and Biomedical Engineering, University Hospital Basel, University of Basel, Basel, Switzerland,

⁹Department of Neurology, Cantonal Hospital Aarau, Aarau, Switzerland,

¹⁰Department of Neurology, University Hospital Zurich and University of Zurich, Zurich, Switzerland,

¹¹Division of Neurology, Department of Clinical Neurosciences, Faculty of Medicine, Geneva University Hospitals, Geneva, Switzerland,

¹²Department of Neurology, Cantonal Hospital St. Gallen, St. Gallen, Switzerland,

¹³Service of Neurology, Department of Clinical Neurosciences, Lausanne University Hospital (CHUV) and University of Lausanne, Lausanne, Switzerland,

¹⁴Department of Neurology, Bern University Hospital and University of Bern, Bern, Switzerland,

¹⁵Bristol Population Health Science Institute, University of Bristol, Bristol, UK,

¹⁶Health Economics Facility, Department of Public Health, University of Basel, Basel, Switzerland

¹⁷Institute of Pharmaceutical Medicine (FCPM), University of Basel, Basel, Switzerland.

NOTE: This preprint reports new research that has not been certified by peer review and should not be used to guide clinical practice.

Corresponding author:

Lars G. Hemkens, MD, MPH, Research Center for Clinical Neuroimmunology and Neuroscience Basel (RC2NB), University Hospital Basel and University of Basel, Spitalstrasse 2, CH-4031 Basel, Switzerland, Phone: +41 61 265 3100, email: lars.hemkens@usb.ch

Abstract

Background: Treatment decisions for persons with relapsing-remitting multiple sclerosis (RRMS) rely on clinical and radiological disease activity, the benefit-harm profile of drug therapy, and preferences of patients and physicians. However, there is limited evidence to support evidence-based personalized decision-making on how to adapt disease modifying therapies treatments targeting no evidence of disease activity, while achieving better patient-relevant outcomes, fewer adverse events and improved care. Serum neurofilament light chain (sNfL) is a sensitive measure of disease activity that captures and prognosticates disease worsening in RRMS. sNfL might therefore be instrumental for a patient-tailored treatment adaptation. We aim to assess whether 6-monthly sNfL monitoring in addition to usual care improves patient-relevant outcomes compared to usual care alone.

Methods: Pragmatic multicenter, 1:1 randomized, platform trial embedded in the Swiss MS Cohort (SMSC). All patients with RRMS in the SMSC for ≥ 1 year are eligible. We plan to include 915 patients with RRMS, randomly allocated to two groups with different care strategies, one of them new (group A), one of them usual care (group B). In group A, 6-monthly monitoring of sNfL will together with information on relapses, disability and magnetic resonance imaging (MRI) inform personalized treatment decisions (e.g., escalation or de-escalation) supported by pre-specified algorithms. In group B, patients will receive usual care with their usual 6- or 12-monthly visits. Two primary outcomes will be used: 1) evidence of disease activity (EDA3: occurrence of relapses, disability worsening, or MRI activity) and 2) quality of life (MQoL-54) using 24-month follow-up. The new treatment strategy with sNfL will be considered superior to usual care if either more patients have no EDA3, or their health-related quality of life increases. Data collection will be embedded within the SMSC using established trial-level quality procedures.

Discussion: MultiSCRIPT aims to be a platform where research and care are optimally combined to generate evidence to inform personalized decision-making in usual care. This approach aims to foster better personalized treatment and care strategies, at low cost and with rapid translation to clinical practice. **Trial registration:** NCT06095271

Introduction

Multiple sclerosis (MS) is an inflammatory, demyelinating and neurodegenerative disease of the central nervous system, typically affecting persons in early adulthood, and is a leading cause of non-traumatic disability in young adults (1). MS presents heterogeneous courses of the disease, the most common form being relapsing-remitting MS (RRMS), with high variability in symptoms and treatment responses. There are currently over 20 disease modifying therapies (DMTs) that have been approved but all have diverse benefits, harms and burdens (2). High efficacy DMTs such as for example natalizumab (3), alemtuzumab (4) and ocrelizumab (5) which are given as infusions, ranging from every 4 weeks to yearly, lead to an almost complete suppression of acute disease activity. However, such DMTs inevitably inhibit the natural immune response putting patients at risk for harm due to, for example viral or bacterial infections (6).

As more potent DMTs are being developed (7) one should also explore the optimization of currently available DMTs (8). Personalized treatment strategies for persons with MS are urgently needed (8,9) to treat patients as little as possible but as much as necessary and at the right time (10). Practically, this means ensuring no evidence of disease activity, while achieving better patient-relevant outcomes such as, for example, improved quality of life, fewer adverse events, and improved care. Such an approach requires detailed information on disease activity and treatment response. Currently, in usual care this includes information on relapses, new/enlarging T2 weighted (w) MRI lesions or T1w contrast enhancing lesions, and confirmed disability worsening. MRIs are time and resources consuming, and occurrence of disease worsening despite stable standard MRI features is well documented (11). There is an urgent need for a body fluid biomarker (9) allowing for reliable and rapid detection of disease activity leading to prompt treatment escalation or as important additional surveillance to ensure disease stability during treatment de-escalation.

Serum neurofilament light chain (sNfL) has emerged as a promising fluid biomarker reflecting neuro-axonal damage in MS and correlating with disease activity and severity (12–15). Recent advancements in immunoassay technology allow for sensitive detection of subtle sNfL level increases in serum samples (16). sNfL levels are associated with future MS disease activity, disability worsening, MRI activity, and treatment response (17–22). When added to clinical

assessments (i.e., relapses and disability worsening assessment) and conventional MRI, sNfL increases sensitivity in detecting disease activity and worsening in disability score (14). However, while sNfL shows potential for personalized treatment decisions, its routine use in clinical care is not widespread or recommended in major clinical guidelines. To best of our knowledge, there are currently no planned or ongoing randomized controlled trials assessing the clinical usefulness of sNfL in MS therapy monitoring in clinical practice.

Objectives

The primary objective of this trial is to assess whether a treatment strategy including sNfL monitoring improves patient-relevant outcomes and care of patients with RRMS by either increasing the proportion of patients with no evidence of disease activity or by improving patients' health-related quality of life. We assume that introducing a 6-monthly monitoring of sNfL within SMSC usual care will inform more personalized treatment decisions and result in either:

- 1) Better quality of life for patients with MS through biomarker (i.e., sNfL) guided de-escalation by reducing treatment burden and risk for side effects associated with highly effective DMT, or
- 2) Lower disease activity by early and/or more sensitive biomarker-guided escalation of DMT.

Secondary objectives include assessing if a treatment strategy including 6-monthly monitoring is associated with a decrease in the proportion of patients with relapses, disability worsening (assessed using Expanded Disability Status Scale (EDSS) scores) and/or MRI activity (i.e., new/enlarging T2 weighted (w) lesions or T1w contrast enhancing lesions). We also aim to assess if specific patient subgroups benefit from 6-monthly sNfL monitoring, i.e., patients at higher risk in comparison to patients at lower risk for future disease activity. We further aim to evaluate the economic implications of monitoring sNfL in terms of direct and indirect RRMS-related costs, quality-adjusted life-time, and incremental cost-effectiveness.

Methods

MultiSCRIPT-Cycle 1 is a pragmatic multicenter, 1:1 randomized, trial embedded in the SMSC to compare a new treatment strategy including sNfL monitoring in addition to SMSC usual care compared with SMSC usual care alone. Patients are randomized in a 1:1 ratio to two groups with these different treatment strategies, one of them new (group A) and one of them usual care (group B).

MultiSCRIPT-Cycle 1 is a pragmatic trial that aims to provide evidence closely reflecting what happens in routine care (PRagmatic Explanatory Continuum Indicator Summary (PRECIS-2) (23) available in Appendix 1). It is patient-centered, and clearly focused on real-world decision making. It is embedded in the existing SMSC data structure and is based on routinely collected data from well-established and field-tested processes with central quality controls.

Trial Setting

MultiSCRIPT-Cycle 1 is fully embedded in the Swiss MS Cohort (SMSC), leveraging the existing research infrastructure and processes. The SMSC (NCT02433028 – BASEC ID: PB_2016-01171) is a prospective multicenter cohort study performed across eight Swiss academic medical centers (the University Hospitals of Basel, Berne, Geneva, Lausanne and Zurich, and the Cantonal Hospitals of Aarau, Lugano and St. Gallen).

Usual care within the SMSC consists of 6 or 12-monthly clinical visits, including routine assessment of relapses and disability status (measured using the Expanded Disability Status Scale; EDSS), a blood draw (mandatory within SMSC usual care) and may include MRI at the discretion of the treating physician and patient's preferences (facultative but it is routine for persons with MS to get yearly MRI to assess new/enlarging T2w lesions and/or T1w contrast enhancing lesions on cranial and/or spinal MRIs) (24). MRI protocols are standardized and aligned across centers. The centers scan the patients by default always at the same scanner with the same scanning parameters (e.g. head position in the scanner) to ensure maximum of comparability between the scans.

The SMSC 6 or 12-monthly schedule is at the discretion of the physician and patient's preferences, and may vary over time. The SMSC collates routinely collected data (i.e., data not

collected for the purpose of research) into a standardized and unique database and all blood samples collected as part of the SMSC usual care are biobanked.

Eligibility criteria

We include all patients who have been diagnosed with RRMS according to the most recent McDonald criteria (2017) (25) for at least a year and have already consented to take part in the SMSC. Patients who are included (or planned to be included) in another DMT trial are excluded as they are (or will) most likely not follow the SMSC usual care.

The eligibility criterion that participants must have been diagnosed with RRMS for at least a year is used because it frequently takes up to a minimum of a year of treatment before a DMT adaptation may be considered. We are explicitly not excluding pregnant women from MultiSCRIPT-Cycle 1, or patients with specific conditions or concomitant diseases. We are aiming to generate evidence for all patients, including vulnerable populations, for which the tested intervention may be used in real-world care settings.

Patients who are not participating in MultiSCRIPT Cycle 1 but are in the SMSC will serve as external control subjects.

Primary Outcomes

The two independent primary outcomes are (1) EDA3 (evidence of disease activity) and (2) quality of life using the Multiple Sclerosis Quality of Life (MSQoL)-54 instrument. Both primary outcomes will be assessed using 24 months follow-up data (i.e., 24 months since randomization).

EDA3 is defined as the occurrence of a relapse as defined in the McDonald criteria (25), confirmed disability worsening defined as an EDSS increase of ≥ 1.5 steps if baseline EDSS was 0, ≥ 1.0 step if baseline EDSS 1.0 to 5.5 and 0.5 steps if baseline EDSS >5.5 (11), or new/enlarging T2w lesions compared to the last MRI or T1w contrast enhancing lesions based on local MRI readings. EDA3 has better predictive value of disease worsening compared to taking its components individually (26) and NEDA3 is regarded as the most adequate indicator of treatment response (27).

The MSQoL-54 Instrument is an extension of the well-established Short Form-36 (SF-36) specifically for MS patients. It is a validated instrument with an adequate test-retest reliability, construct validity and internal consistency (28,29). MSQoL-54 is a structured self-reported questionnaire including 54 items generating 12 subscales with two summary scores, the physical health composite summary and the mental health composite summary (28). For the primary outcome, we will use the sum of both composite summaries as a total score (30).

Secondary outcomes

The secondary outcomes include assessments of EDA3 and MSQoL-54 at 12 months. The individual components of EDA3 will also be assessed separately including relapses, disability worsening measured by EDSS, and new/enlarging T2w lesions and T1w contrast enhancing lesions based on local MRI reading and on centralized MRI readings. Similarly, the individual summary scores of MSQoL-54 will also be assessed separately. The amount of immunosuppressive/ immunomodulatory drug treatment (or DMTs) will be monitored. Quality of life will be further assessed using EQ-5D-5 and SF-36. All secondary outcomes will be assessed using 12- and 24-month follow-up data (i.e., 12 and 24 months since randomization). For the health economical evaluation, we will assess health-related quality of life measured with the EQ-5D-5L, quality-adjusted life years, professional activity status and change, indirect costs, and direct medical costs based on healthcare utilization (e.g., hospitalizations). To better understand treatment pathways and clinical decision making, we will collect information on treatment changes (e.g., how many patients were escalated or de-escalated) and the reason for treatment change.

Harm outcomes

Any serious adverse events related to the key intervention in the new strategy (i.e., blood draw for sNfL measurement) will be monitored and collected until the end of the study conduct at 42 months of follow-up.

In addition, the following harm indicators will be assessed during the safety interim analysis: mortality, harms related to immunosuppression (e.g., relevant infections), occurrence of relapses and/or disability worsening in patients previously stable.

All follow-up data on SAEs and indicators of harms available at the database closure will be used for the safety analysis.

New care strategy (group A)

At randomization, patients are allocated to a new treatment strategy (group A) with 6-monthly sNfL monitoring in addition to SMSC usual care or SMSC usual care alone (group B).

Patients allocated to the new treatment strategy have 6-monthly sNfL monitoring including 6-monthly blood draws and communication of sNfL values to treating physicians in addition to their usual care within the SMSC.

The monitoring of sNfL requires a 6-monthly blood draw. In practice, for the duration of the trial, patients allocated to group A who came to the SMSC every 12 months are asked to now come in-between their yearly visits (i.e., at 6-month) for an additional blood draw to monitor sNfL. For patients allocated to group A who came to the SMSC every 6 months anyway, the blood draw is always performed as part of the SMSC usual care, and no additional blood for the purpose of the trial will be taken. One serum aliquot per blood draw is used to measure sNfL centrally at the Clinical Neuroimmunology Laboratory, Department of Biomedicine in Basel, Switzerland. Two sNfL assays are used: single molecule array (Simoa, Quanterix, USA) and Cobas (Roche, CH) technologies. Percentiles and z scores normalized sNfL values (14) are reported to the clinicians within 14 days from blood sampling.

The SMSC treating physicians receive 6-monthly sNfL values for all patients allocated to the intervention arm and at a maximum 10 days after the patient's visit. If and how the physician and patient acts upon the sNfL value is beyond the scope of this trial. To facilitate the implementation of sNfL in treatment decision-making, we have established treatment decision algorithms that integrated sNfL in addition to usual care assessments for the most common clinical scenarios (Appendix 2). Those algorithms were decided upon by consensus among experts in the field and patient consultant using a modified Delphi approach (31,32).

Usual care comparator (group B)

Patients allocated to the usual care comparator (group B) continue with their usual care in the SMSC, including their usual 6 to 12 monthly visits.

Patients who do not consent to be randomly allocated and participate in the MultiSCRIPT-Cycle 1 trial will continue their SMSC usual care and will not be exposed to any influence of the study. This group of patients will allow to explore the external validity of the randomized trial results using only the SMSC routinely collected data (for example by exploring differences of characteristics of patients in MultiSCRIPT-Cycle 1 and the other cohort patients), but will not be used to determine intervention effects (33).

Participant timeline

The recruitment period will last 2 years and the trial conduct until the primary analysis will last 3 years, but participants will be followed until the end of the close-out phase for an additional 6 months (Figure 1). The expected duration of participants' follow-up will range from 1.5 year to 3.5 years depending on their timepoint of recruitment. Table 1 illustrated study assessment timeline for individual participants.

Sample size

We plan to recruit all eligible patients from the SMSC and aim to recruit 915 patients. This estimation was based on number of eligible persons with RRMS in the SMSC across all 8 centres and assuming an 80% acceptance rate. We further estimate that the primary analysis will include 824 patients with 24-month follow-up data available. This was based on the assumption that we will recruit 90% of our target sample size the first year of recruitment.

Based on the data of the SMSC (date of last analysis: 15 October 2021), we assume 52% patients under usual care without sNfL biomarker monitoring will have an EDA3 during 24-month follow-up. We assume a relative risk reduction of 25% of EDA3 with sNfL biomarker monitoring compared to usual care to be a minimal important difference (MID). A sample size of 824 patients would have 93% power to detect the MID.

We are not aware of an established MID for MSQoL-54. We assume a difference of 0.2 (Hedges g) as a MID for the MSQoL-54, considering current guidelines for health-technology assessment and reimbursement decisions on quality of life assessments (34). Using a systematic search for trials using quality of life outcomes, we identified two recent trials (SUNBEAM (35) and RADIANCE (36)) using the MSQoL-54 instrument in a population that had a higher disease

activity compared to the SMSC population. We used a conservative approach assuming a SD=20 based on the pooled standard deviation at baseline in the SUNBEAM (35) and RADIANCE (36) trials, an intra-patient correlation (baseline and 24m follow-up) of 0.8 and a correlation of the composite scores of 0.5 ($r=0.66$ reported by Vickrey et al (28)), which shows that a sample size of 824 patients in MultiSCRIPT-Cycle 1 would have > 95% power to detect the MID of 0.2 or a difference in 4 points on the MSQoL-54 total score. The power for 3 points would be 91% in the primary analysis. Given the pragmatic approach of MultiSCRIPT-Cycle 1 with a probably more heterogeneous study population than the more explanatory SUNBEAM and RADIANCE patient populations, a larger variability of quality of life may be plausible. A recently published survey in MS patients from the Netherlands, France, the United Kingdom, Spain, Germany and Italy, however, reported SD for the composites of 17.2 (physical) and 21.5 (mental) (29). However, even in a scenario with a 25% larger variability (SD of 25), the statistical power for detecting a difference of 4 points would be large with a sample size of 824 (94%). The power calculations have been adjusted for multiple testing of the two primary outcomes.

Recruitment and informed consent

We aim to recruit 915 participants which as of January 2024 represent 61% of the eligible SMSC participants with RRMS ($n=1503$). Participants are recruited by their SMSC physician during their usual care visit to the SMSC.

Making use of the existing SMSC database, eligible patients are identified ahead of their SMSC visit. Depending on the study site, the information sheet and consent form for the trial may be sent ahead of the patient's visit. On the day of their SMSC visit, patients are invited to take part in MultiSCRIPT Cycle 1 by their SMSC treating physician. If they accept to sign the informed consent, patients are then randomized and their allocated group is directly communicated to them because patients allocated to the new treatment strategy need to know if they have to come back in 6 months.

We adopted proactive mitigation measures to address recruitment risks (37), including: (a) a dedicated 'diagnosis' of factors supporting and hindering recruitment informed by QuinteT Recruitment Intervention (QRI) methods, with a view to sharing good practice and training

materials on how to recruit patients informed by QRI (38–40); (b) a recruitment log to record reasons for declining participation, informed by the SEAR process (41); (c) a quarterly newsletter will be submitted to all recruiting centers, reporting the progress and expected recruitment in all centers; and (d) online conferences (one per quarter in the first year of recruitment) and annual investigator meetings will be used to evaluate processes and share experiences.

Assignment of treatment strategies

Allocation

Participants are randomized in a 1:1 ratio to the trial groups stratified by study site. The randomization will be implemented in a centralized manner using the SMSC web-based electronic data capture implemented by RodanoTech, an electronic data capture (EDC) and data management services provider for the SMSC. Allocation concealment is ensured by the centralized and instant web-based randomization.

Blinding procedures

MultiSCRIPT-Cycle 1 is a pragmatic trial that aims to provide evidence closely reflecting what happens in usual care. Therefore, being aware of the treatment and having a real-world assessment of treatment outcomes are part of the evaluated intervention within this pragmatic trial framework.

Data collection and management

Assessment and collection of outcomes

Most data related to outcome measures are routine collected within the SMSC and at a minimum on a yearly basis. For MultiSCRIPT-Cycle 1, the primary outcomes will be assessed at 24-months follow-up and secondary outcomes at 12- and 24-months follow-up. The additional data collected for the purpose of MultiSCRIPT are the sNfL measurements, and MRI related data based on radiological reports from the local centers.

Retention and adherence

MultiSCRIPT-Cycle 1 uses a pragmatic approach, and therefore no specific steps are taken to maximize adherence for the purpose of the trial as this would create an artificial setting and deviate from usual care. Patients are followed within the SMSC and the SMSC usual care mimics routine care for patients with MS.

Treatment changes will be recorded but no mitigation action will be taken to enforce implementation of the treatment decision algorithms. It remains the treating physician and the patient's choice to implement a treatment change based on sNFL as it would occur in usual care.

Statistical methods

Statistical analysis for primary and secondary outcomes

Superiority of a treatment strategy will be assumed when there is an improvement in at least one of the two primary outcomes, i.e., the strategy either reduces the risk of EDA3 *or* increases quality of life. Since there are two primary outcomes the significance level will be 2.5%.

Primary Analyses

The primary analyses for the two primary outcomes will be conducted when 90% of the total number of participants (i.e. n= 824) have been recruited, randomized, and have at least 24 months follow-up data (expected to occur after 3 years of trial conduct). The primary analysis will follow the intention to treat (ITT).

To test the between-group difference 24 months after randomization regarding the proportion of patients experiencing at least one EDA3 event, the Pearson's χ^2 -test will be applied. Odds ratio and 95% confidence intervals will be reported. To test the between-group difference in the MSQoL-54 scores 24 months after randomization, a linear regression model will be used. The model will be adjusted on the following covariate: baseline MSQoL-54 score. The score differences and 95% confidence intervals will be reported. To adjust for multiple testing of the two primary outcomes, the Bonferroni correction will be applied and the threshold for rejecting null hypotheses will be set at $\alpha = 2.5\%$.

Secondary Analyses

The analysis of the primary outcomes will be repeated with 12-month follow-up data using all patients who were randomized and thus have a minimum of 12-month follow-up. In addition, each component of the EDA3 primary outcome (i.e., proportions of patients with at least one relapse, EDSS worsening, new/enlarging T2w lesion or T1w contrast enhancing lesion, and proportions of patients with at least two criteria of EDA3) and of the MSQoL-54 score (i.e., physical health composite summary and the mental health composite summary) will be assessed using Pearson's χ^2 -test and linear regression models, respectively. Secondary outcomes will also be assessed at 24-month follow-up.

The amount of immunosuppressive drug treatment will be summarized using the defined daily dose as defined by the World Health Organization (WHO) (42) i.e., the assumed average maintenance dose per day for a drug used for its main indication in adults.

Interim Harm analyses

An interim analysis will be conducted when 90% of the total number of participants (i.e. n= 824) have been recruited, randomized, and have at least 12 months follow-up data (expected to occur after 2 years of trial conduct). The rationale being that indicators of harms are collected at a minimum on a yearly basis (as some participants only come once a year to the SMSC) we therefore need a minimum of one year follow-up data. Using 12-month follow-up data, the interim analyses will focus of reviewing any SAEs related to blood draw and indicator of harms including mortality, harms related to immunosuppression (e.g., relevant infections) and any event related to occurrence of relapses and/or disability worsening in patients previously stable. The analysis will be conducted and reviewed in a blinded fashion by the Data Safety Monitoring Board (DSMB) made of study-independent experts, including a statistician and experts in trial methodology, ethics and/or care management in MS.

The DSMB will request unblinding of the data if any of the aforementioned outcomes exhibit statistically significant differences when comparing the two trial groups. We will consider that the causal pathway between the key intervention (i.e., monitoring and providing the sNfL information) and indicators of harms is complex and difficult to assess because sNfL is only one

parameter among many that is considered in shared decision-making about treatment adaptation in usual care.

Interim analyses will be considered indicative and will not lead to an automatic early stopping of the trial. In case of major safety concerns, based on their expertise and review of the literature, the DSMB may recommend an early termination of the trial. Of note, “efficacy” will not be assessed in the interim analysis.

Harm analysis

Incidence rates of SAEs and multiple occurrences of SAEs within individual patients will be reported separately and summarized and compared between treatment arms using the Pearson’s χ^2 -tests. Harm outcomes will be assessed until the end of the assessment cycle (i.e., up to 42-month follow-up).

Additional analyses:

Subgroup effects on the primary outcomes will be analyzed by interaction tests. To this end, EDA3 will be assessed in a logistic regression model and MSQoL-54 in a linear regression model. All subgroup analyses will be pre-specified in the final statistical analyses plan (SAP) which will be published before unblinding the data.

The key subgroups of interest are patients with low or high baseline risk of further EDA (secondary objective; section 5). In addition, we plan to analyze the following subgroups: age (<40 years vs. >40 years); Sex (male or female); Treatment-naive or previously treated for multiple sclerosis (with any DMT at any time before study enrolment); Number of relapses in the year before the study (≤ 1 relapse or > 1 relapse); Number of relapses in the 2 years before the study (≤ 1 , 2, or > 2 relapses); Baseline disability (EDSS score 0–3.5 or > 3.5); Number of contrast enhancing lesions at baseline (0 or ≥ 1); Number of T2w lesions (<3; 3 to 9; > 9); and T2w lesion volume ($\leq 3300 \mu\text{L}$ or $> 3300 \mu\text{L}$).

We will consider the criteria as determined by the ICEMAN tool when interpreting subgroup effects and reporting the results (43).

In addition, to better understand the causal pathway that leads to the outcomes, we will also explore the outcomes in patients who have been treated as expected according to the treatment

guidelines (e.g., patients with a relatively clear indication to escalation and subsequently escalated). In the same direction, we will explore the treatment decision (categorical: no (major) change, escalation or de-escalation) as a mediator in the causal pathway from the intervention to the outcomes, as we do not expect the intervention to have a direct causal effect on the outcomes, but an indirect effect through this mediator (complete mediation). For this, we will record each treatment changes. We will also explore the impact of lack of blinding using the centralized reading of MRI compared with local MRI reports.

Since such analyses rely on complex assumptions, are based on non-randomized comparisons, and are prone to time-dependent confounding bias, we will carefully prespecify such additional analyses consider them entirely as exploratory (44).

Finally, health economic analyses will be detailed in a specific health economic analysis plan that will be finalized before the primary analysis starts.

Handling of missing data and drop-outs

Patients are already participating in the SMSC which include at a minimum yearly visit with an assessment of their EDA3 status (i.e., EDSS, relapses and MRI data are routinely collected), thus the occurrence of missing data should be minimal for the EDA3 primary outcome. MSQoL-54 is also part of the SMSC usual care and in addition to careful planning and conduct of the trial should also minimize the occurrence of missing data on the MSQoL-54 primary outcome. To test the robustness of our results to missing data, various imputation methods will be implemented, and a detailed description of imputation methods will be provided in the SAP. In the unlikely event that missing data exceeds 40%, we will only report the complete cases analysis (45) and we will interpret it only exploratory.

Dissemination plans

Statistical code will be made available on GitHub while the patient-level data set will be made available upon request to the primary investigator. Results will be published in an open-access peer-reviewed medical journal.

Discussion

MS is the most frequent non-traumatic cause of disability in young adults and MS patients have a lower health related quality of life compared with the general population but also compared with other chronic diseases (46,47). An estimated 15,000 persons are living with MS in Switzerland (48) of whom >1800 are included in the SMSC with a median follow-up of 6.3 years, as of January 2024. Patient care in the SMSC reflects the usual care of MS patients nationwide.

Within the SMSC, almost half of the patients with RRMS receive DMTs known for their high efficacy but with uncertainties on the long-term exposure to these treatments. A significant number (over 200) of patients in the SMSC also remain untreated and potentially at risk of disease activity. Improvement of patients' quality of life by providing patients and physicians with information that may reduce the uncertainty and enable a biomarker guided de-escalation when applicable would be highly relevant and a significant step towards a more personalized approach to MS treatment and care management. This may reduce the treatment burden and the risk for potential severe side effects associated with highly effective DMT. On the other hand, there may be a better basis for informed decision-making and better informed, earlier and/or more sensitive biomarker-guided escalation that may lead to fewer patients with evidence of disease activity. Better and adequate monitoring of treatment response would also reduce the costs generated by over- or under treating patients. Moreover, a continuous sNfL monitoring may improve patients' quality of life by providing an additional sense of security in a disease which is largely unpredictable.

The pragmatic attitude of MultiSCRIPT being fully embedded in the SMSC usual care with minimal disruption to patient care, leveraging routinely collected data and aiming to generate evidence to inform decisions lays the foundation for creating a learning healthcare system. A learning system whereby accumulating data will enable the continuous generation of new hypotheses on how treatment and care strategies can be further personalized to treat patients as little as possible but as much as necessary at the right time, i.e., ensuring no evidence of disease activity (with more sensitive biomarkers such as for example sNfL), while achieving

better patient-relevant outcomes, and improved care by better informing shared decision-making.

Trial status

The first patient has been included on 5 February 2024. At the submission of this manuscript on 22 March 2024, 105 patients have been included and randomized and recruitment is ongoing.

Declarations

Acknowledgments

We would like to thank all study coordinators and nurses involved in the SMSC as well as persons with MS participating in the SMSC. We would also like to thank the patient consultants who provided feedback on the protocol proposal.

Authors contributions

Authors contributions according to the CRedIT author statement:

1. Conceptualization: PJ, LK, JK, LGH, ÖY
2. Data Curation: ./.
3. Formal Analysis: PJ, PB, SS, LGH
4. Funding Acquisition: CZ, AS, JK, LGH, ÖY
5. Investigation (trial-ongoing): CZ, AO, LD, AM, CG, JO, TD, LA, OF, PR, PL, SM, CP, RH, GD, CG, JK, ÖY
6. Methodology: PJ, SS, LR, MS, MJL, LGH
7. Project Administration: PJ
8. Resources: ./.
9. Software: ./.
10. Supervision: JK, LGH, ÖY
11. Validation: ./.
12. Visualization: ./.
13. Writing – Original Draft: PJ, LGH
14. Writing – Review & Editing: all authors

Funding:

This project is supported by the Swiss National Science Foundation as part of the Investigator Initiated Clinical Trial program (33IC30_205806/1). The funder had no role in the design of this

study and will not have any role during its execution, analyses, interpretation of the data, or decision to submit results.

Ethics approval and consent to participate:

The Ethikkommission Nordwest- und Zentralschweiz (EKNZ) reviewed and approved the protocol (BASEC 2023-01578). Written, informed consent to participate will be obtained from all participants.

Consent for Publication – Not applicable

Competing Interest

PJ, PB, SS, AO, LD, AM, DL, GD, LR declares no conflict of interest; OF, MU, MJL, MS declared none; Ente Ospedaliero Cantonale, employer of CZ, received grants and/or compensation for Zecca's lecturer and consultant activities and/or grants from Abbvie, Ammirall, Biogen Idec, Bristol Meyer Squibb, Genzyme, Lilly, Lundbeck, Merck, Mylan, Novartis, Pfizer, Teva Pharma, Roche, Sanofi; AS received speaker honoraria for activities with Bristol Myers Squibb, CSL Behring, Novartis, and Roche, and research support by the Baasch Medicus Foundation, the Medical Faculty of the University of Bern and the Swiss MS Society, all not related to this work; The University Hospital Basel (USB) and the Research Center for Clinical neuroimmunology and Neuroscience (RC2NB), as the employers of CG, have received the following fees which were used exclusively for (research support from Siemens, GeNeuro, Genzyme-Sanofi, Biogen, Roche. They also have received advisory board and consultancy fees from Actelion, Genzyme-Sanofi, Novartis, GeNeuro, Merck, Biogen and Roche; as well as speaker fees from Genzyme-Sanofi, Novartis, GeNeuro, Merck, biogen and Roche; JO received research support by the Swiss MS Society and served on advisory boards for Roche and Merck; TD has served on scientific advisory boards, steering committees, and data safety monitoring boards for Alexion, Actelion, Biogen, Celgene, Genzyme, GeNeuro, Merck, Mitsubishi Pharma, Novartis, Roche, Octapharma, and MedDay; has received travel and/or speaker honoraria from Biogen, Genzyme, Merck, Novartis, Roche, and Merck-Serono; has received research support from Alexion, Biogen, Novartis, Roche, the Swiss MS Society, the European Union and the Swiss National Foundation. LA served on scientific advisory boards for Celgene, Novartis Pharmaceuticals, Merck, Biogen,

Sanofi Genzyme, Roche, and Bayer; received funding for travel and/or speaker honoraria from Celgene, Biogen, Sanofi Genzyme, Novartis, Merck Serono, Roche, Teva, and the Swiss MS Society; and research support from Biogen, Sanofi, Genzyme, and Novartis; PR has received honoraria for lectures or advisory board participation from Alexion, Bristol-Myers Squibb, Boehringer Ingelheim, Debiopharm, Merck Sharp and Dohme, Laminar, Midatech Pharma, Novocure, QED, Roche, and Sanofi and research support from Merck Sharp and Dohme and Novocure; PR reports that the Geneva University Hospital received honoraria for speaking from Biogen, Merck, Roche; consulting fees from Biogen, Merck, Novartis, Roche; research grants from Biogen, Merck, Novartis; SM received honoraria for travel, honoraria for lectures/consulting and/or grants for studies from Almirall, Alexion, Bayer, Biogen, Bristol-Myers Squibb SA/Celgene, Genzyme, Merck-Serono, Teva, Novartis and Roche; CP reports that the Lausanne University Hospital received speaker honoraria, travel grants and consulting services for her activities with Novartis, Roche, Biogen, Merck, Sanofi-Aventis none related to this work; RH received speaker/advisor honorary from Merck, Novartis, Roche, Biogen, Alexion, Sanofi, Janssen, Bristol-Myers Squibb, Teva/Mepha and Almirall. He received research support within the last 5 years from Roche, Merck, Sanofi, Biogen, Chiesi, and Bristol-Myers Squibb. He also received research grants from the Swiss MS Society, the SITEM Insel Support Fund and is a member of the Advisory Board of the Swiss and International MS Society. He also serves as deputy editor in chief for Journal of Central Nervous System disease. All conflicts are not related to this work; Ente Ospedaliero Cantonale, employer of CG, received grants and/or compensation for Gobbi's lecturer and consultant activities and/or grants from Almirall, Biogen Idec, Bristol Meyer Squibb, Genzyme, Lilly, Lundbeck, Merck, Mylan, Novartis, Teva Pharma, Roche, Sanofi. Faculty of Biomedical Sciences, Università della Svizzera Italiana (USI), Lugano, Switzerland; LK has received no personal compensation. His institutions (University Hospital Basel/Stiftung Neuroimmunology and Neuroscience Basel) have received and used exclusively for research support payments for steering committee and advisory board participation, consultancy services, and participation in educational activities from: Actelion, Bayer, BMS, df-mp Molnia & Pohlmann, Celgene, Eli Lilly, EMD Serono, Genentech, Glaxo Smith Kline, Janssen, Japan Tobacco, Merck, MH Consulting, Minoryx, Novartis, F. Hoffmann-La Roche Ltd, Senda

Biosciences Inc., Sanofi, Santhera, Shionogi BV, TG Therapeutics, and Wellmera, and license fees for Neurostatus-UHB products; grants from Novartis, Innosuisse, and Roche; OY received grants from ECTRIMS/MAGNIMS, University of Basel, Pro Patient Stiftung, University of Basel, Free Academy Basel, Swiss Multiple Sclerosis Society, Swiss National Science Foundation and advisory board/lecture and consultancy fees from Roche, Sanofi Genzyme, Allmirall, Biogen and Novartis; RC2NB is supported by Foundation Clinical Neuroimmunology and Neuroscience Basel. RC2NB has a contract with Roche for a steering committee participation of LGH.

References


1. Koch-Henriksen N, Sørensen PS. The changing demographic pattern of multiple sclerosis epidemiology. *Lancet Neurol*. 2010 May;9(5):520–32.
2. Jakimovski D, Bittner S, Zivadinov R, Morrow SA, Benedict RH, Zipp F, et al. Multiple sclerosis. *Lancet*. 2024 Jan 13;403(10422):183–202.
3. Polman CH, O'Connor PW, Havrdova E, Hutchinson M, Kappos L, Miller DH, et al. A randomized, placebo-controlled trial of natalizumab for relapsing multiple sclerosis. *N Engl J Med*. 2006 Mar 2;354(9):899–910.
4. Cohen JA, Coles AJ, Arnold DL, Confavreux C, Fox EJ, Hartung HP, et al. Alemtuzumab versus interferon beta 1a as first-line treatment for patients with relapsing-remitting multiple sclerosis: a randomised controlled phase 3 trial. *Lancet*. 2012 Nov 24;380(9856):1819–28.
5. Hauser SL, Bar-Or A, Comi G, Giovannoni G, Hartung HP, Hemmer B, et al. Ocrelizumab versus Interferon Beta-1a in Relapsing Multiple Sclerosis. *N Engl J Med*. 2017 Jan 19;376(3):221–34.
6. Giovannoni G. Disease-modifying treatments for early and advanced multiple sclerosis: a new treatment paradigm. *Curr Opin Neurol*. 2018 Jun;31(3):233–43.
7. Amin M, Hersh CM. Updates and advances in multiple sclerosis neurotherapeutics. *Neurodegener Dis Manag*. 2023 Feb;13(1):47–70.
8. Kalincik T, Manouchehrinia A, Sobisek L, Jokubaitis V, Spelman T, Horakova D, et al. Towards personalized therapy for multiple sclerosis: prediction of individual treatment response. *Brain*. 2017 Sep 1;140(9):2426–43.
9. Rotstein D, Montalban X. Reaching an evidence-based prognosis for personalized treatment of multiple sclerosis. *Nat Rev Neurol*. 2019 May;15(5):287–300.
10. Cutter GR, Liu Y. Personalized medicine. *Neurol Clin Pract*. 2012 Dec;2(4):343–51.
11. Kappos L, Wolinsky JS, Giovannoni G, Arnold DL, Wang Q, Bernasconi C, et al. Contribution of Relapse-Independent Progression vs Relapse-Associated Worsening to Overall Confirmed Disability Accumulation in Typical Relapsing Multiple Sclerosis in a Pooled Analysis of 2 Randomized Clinical Trials. *JAMA Neurol*. 2020 Sep 1;77(9):1132–40.

12. Abdelhak A, Benkert P, Schaedelin S, Boscardin WJ, Cordano C, Oechtering J, et al. Neurofilament Light Chain Elevation and Disability Progression in Multiple Sclerosis. *JAMA Neurol.* 2023 Dec 1;80(12):1317–25.
13. Kuhle J, Kropshofer H, Haering DA, Kundu U, Meinert R, Barro C, et al. Blood neurofilament light chain as a biomarker of MS disease activity and treatment response. *Neurology.* 2019 Mar 5;92(10):e1007–15.
14. Benkert P, Meier S, Schaedelin S, Manouchehrinia A, Yaldizli Ö, Maceski A, et al. Serum neurofilament light chain for individual prognostication of disease activity in people with multiple sclerosis: a retrospective modelling and validation study. *Lancet Neurol.* 2022 Mar;21(3):246–57.
15. Bar-Or A, Thanei GA, Harp C, Bernasconi C, Bonati U, Cross AH, et al. Blood neurofilament light levels predict non-relapsing progression following anti-CD20 therapy in relapsing and primary progressive multiple sclerosis: findings from the ocrelizumab randomised, double-blind phase 3 clinical trials. *EBioMedicine.* 2023 Jul;93:104662.
16. Kuhle J, Barro C, Andreasson U, Derfuss T, Lindberg R, Sandelius Å, et al. Comparison of three analytical platforms for quantification of the neurofilament light chain in blood samples: ELISA, electrochemiluminescence immunoassay and Simoa. *Clin Chem Lab Med.* 2016 Oct 1;54(10):1655–61.
17. Kapoor R, Smith KE, Allegretta M, Arnold DL, Carroll W, Comabella M, et al. Serum neurofilament light as a biomarker in progressive multiple sclerosis. *Neurology.* 2020 Sep 8;95(10):436–44.
18. Barro C, Benkert P, Disanto G, Tsagkas C, Amann M, Naegelin Y, et al. Serum neurofilament as a predictor of disease worsening and brain and spinal cord atrophy in multiple sclerosis. *Brain.* 2018 Aug 1;141(8):2382–91.
19. Disanto G, Barro C, Benkert P, Naegelin Y, Schädelin S, Giardiello A, et al. Serum Neurofilament light: A biomarker of neuronal damage in multiple sclerosis. *Ann Neurol.* 2017 Jun;81(6):857–70.
20. Bittner S, Steffen F, Uphaus T, Muthuraman M, Fleischer V, Salmen A, et al. Clinical implications of serum neurofilament in newly diagnosed MS patients: A longitudinal multicentre cohort study. *EBioMedicine.* 2020 Jun;56:102807.
21. Thebault S, Abdoli M, Fereshtehnejad SM, Tessier D, Tabard-Cossa V, Freedman MS. Serum neurofilament light chain predicts long term clinical outcomes in multiple sclerosis. *Sci Rep.* 2020 Jun 25;10(1):10381.
22. Uphaus T, Steffen F, Muthuraman M, Ripfel N, Fleischer V, Groppa S, et al. NfL predicts relapse-free progression in a longitudinal multiple sclerosis cohort study: Serum NfL predicts relapse-free progression. *EBioMedicine.* 2021 Sep 24;72:103590.
23. Loudon K, Treweek S, Sullivan F, Donnan P, Thorpe KE, Zwarenstein M. The PRECIS-2 tool: designing trials that are fit for purpose. *BMJ.* 2015 May 8;350:h2147.
24. Disanto G, Benkert P, Lorscheider J, Mueller S, Vehoff J, Zecca C, et al. The Swiss Multiple Sclerosis Cohort-Study (SMSC): A Prospective Swiss Wide Investigation of Key Phases in Disease Evolution and New Treatment Options. *PLOS ONE.* 2016 Mar 31;11(3):e0152347.
25. Thompson AJ, Banwell BL, Barkhof F, Carroll WM, Coetzee T, Comi G, et al. Diagnosis of multiple sclerosis: 2017 revisions of the McDonald criteria. *The Lancet Neurology.* 2018 Feb 1;17(2):162–73.

26. Rotstein DL, Healy BC, Malik MT, Chitnis T, Weiner HL. Evaluation of no evidence of disease activity in a 7-year longitudinal multiple sclerosis cohort. *JAMA Neurol.* 2015 Feb;72(2):152–8.
27. Zhang Y, Salter A, Wallström E, Cutter G, Stüve O. Evolution of clinical trials in multiple sclerosis. *Ther Adv Neurol Disord.* 2019 Feb 21;12:1756286419826547.
28. Vickrey BG, Hays RD, Harooni R, Myers LW, Ellison GW. A health-related quality of life measure for multiple sclerosis. *Qual Life Res.* 1995 Jun;4(3):187–206.
29. Visser LA, Louapre C, Uyl-de Groot CA, Redekop WK. Health-related quality of life of multiple sclerosis patients: a European multi-country study. *Archives of Public Health.* 2021 Mar 20;79(1):39.
30. Giordano A, Testa S, Bassi M, Cilia S, Bertolotto A, Quartuccio ME, et al. Viability of a MSQOL-54 general health-related quality of life score using bifactor model. *Health Qual Life Outcomes.* 2021 Sep 25;19(1):224.
31. Diamond IR, Grant RC, Feldman BM, Pencharz PB, Ling SC, Moore AM, et al. Defining consensus: a systematic review recommends methodologic criteria for reporting of Delphi studies. *J Clin Epidemiol.* 2014 Apr;67(4):401–9.
32. McMillan SS, King M, Tully MP. How to use the nominal group and Delphi techniques. *Int J Clin Pharm.* 2016 Jun;38(3):655–62.
33. Mc Cord KA, Al-Shahi Salman R, Treweek S, Gardner H, Strech D, Whiteley W, et al. Routinely collected data for randomized trials: promises, barriers, and implications. *Trials.* 2018 Jan 11;19(1):29.
34. IQWiG. General Methods (Version 6.0) [Internet]. 2020 [cited 2021 Oct 9]. Available from: https://www.iqwig.de/methoden/general-methods_version-6-0.pdf
35. Comi G, Kappos L, Selmaj KW, Bar-Or A, Arnold DL, Steinman L, et al. Safety and efficacy of ozanimod versus interferon beta-1a in relapsing multiple sclerosis (SUNBEAM): a multicentre, randomised, minimum 12-month, phase 3 trial. *The Lancet Neurology.* 2019 Nov 1;18(11):1009–20.
36. Cohen JA, Comi G, Selmaj KW, Bar-Or A, Arnold DL, Steinman L, et al. Safety and efficacy of ozanimod versus interferon beta-1a in relapsing multiple sclerosis (RADIANCE): a multicentre, randomised, 24-month, phase 3 trial. *The Lancet Neurology.* 2019 Nov 1;18(11):1021–33.
37. Kasenda B, von Elm E, You J, Blümle A, Tomonaga Y, Saccilotto R, et al. Prevalence, characteristics, and publication of discontinued randomized trials. *JAMA.* 2014 Mar 12;311(10):1045–51.
38. Donovan JL, Rooshenas L, Jepson M, Elliott D, Wade J, Avery K, et al. Optimising recruitment and informed consent in randomised controlled trials: the development and implementation of the Quintet Recruitment Intervention (QRI). *Trials.* 2016 Jun 8;17(1):283.
39. Donovan JL, Jepson M, Rooshenas L, Paramasivan S, Mills N, Elliott D, et al. Development of a new adapted QuinteT Recruitment Intervention (QRI-Two) for rapid application to RCTs underway with enrolment shortfalls—to identify previously hidden barriers and improve recruitment. *Trials.* 2022 Apr 4;23(1):258.

40. Rooshenas L, Scott LJ, Blazeby JM, Rogers CA, Tilling KM, Husbands S, et al. The QuinteT Recruitment Intervention supported five randomized trials to recruit to target: a mixed-methods evaluation. *J Clin Epidemiol*. 2019 Feb;106:108–20.
41. Wilson C, Rooshenas L, Paramasivan S, Elliott D, Jepson M, Strong S, et al. Development of a framework to improve the process of recruitment to randomised controlled trials (RCTs): the SEAR (Screened, Eligible, Approached, Randomised) framework. *Trials*. 2018 Jan 19;19(1):50.
42. World Health Organization. Defined Daily Dose (DDD) [Internet]. [cited 2021 Oct 10]. Available from: <https://www.who.int/tools/atc-ddd-toolkit/about-ddd>
43. Schandelmaier S, Briel M, Varadhan R, Schmid CH, Devasenapathy N, Hayward RA, et al. Development of the Instrument to assess the Credibility of Effect Modification Analyses (ICEMAN) in randomized controlled trials and meta-analyses. *CMAJ*. 2020 Aug 10;192(32):E901–6.
44. Ewald H, Speich B, Ladanie A, Bucher HC, Ioannidis JP, Hemkens LG. Marginal structural models and other analyses allow multiple estimates of treatment effects in randomized clinical trials: meta-epidemiological analysis. *J Clin Epidemiol*. 2018;107(Mar):12–26.
45. Jakobsen JC, Gluud C, Wetterslev J, Winkel P. When and how should multiple imputation be used for handling missing data in randomised clinical trials - a practical guide with flowcharts. *BMC Med Res Methodol*. 2017 Dec 6;17(1):162.
46. Hermann BP, Vickrey B, Hays RD, Cramer J, Devinsky O, Meador K, et al. A comparison of health-related quality of life in patients with epilepsy, diabetes and multiple sclerosis. *Epilepsy Research*. 1996 Oct 1;25(2):113–8.
47. Rudick RA, Miller D, Clough JD, Gragg LA, Farmer RG. Quality of Life in Multiple Sclerosis: Comparison With Inflammatory Bowel Disease and Rheumatoid Arthritis. *Archives of Neurology*. 1992 Dec 1;49(12):1237–42.
48. Kaufmann M, Puhan MA, Kuhle J, Yaldizli Ö, Magnusson T, Kamm CP, et al. A Framework for Estimating the Burden of Chronic Diseases: Design and Application in the Context of Multiple Sclerosis. *Front Neurol*. 2019;10:953.

Figure 1: MultiSCRIPT Cycle 1 timeline



*Timelines may be adapted depending on recruitment rates

Table 1: Study assessment timeline

	Pre-allocation	Allocation	Post-allocation follow-up visits				Post-allocation Close-Out		
Visit	-	V1	V2	V3	V6	V7	V8	V9	V10
Time	M0 (-14d)	M0	M6 (±45d)	M12 (±45d)	M18 (±45d)	M 24 (±45d)	M30 (±45d)	M36 (±45d)	M42 (±45d)
Recruitment									
Eligibility screening	X								
Informed consent		X							
Randomization		X							
Baseline characteristics*	X	X							
Intervention		X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
Primary outcomes									
MSQoL-54*		X				X			
EDA3*		X				X			
Secondary outcomes									
MSQoL-54*		X		X		X			
EDA3*		X		X		X			
Relapses*		X		X		X			
EDSS*		X		X		X			
Lesions*		X		X		X			
Amount of DMT*†				X		X			
SAE		X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
Indicators of harm*		X	(X)	X	(X)	X	(X)	X	(X)
- Relapses		x	(x)	x	(x)	x	(x)	x	(x)
- EDSS		x	(x)	x	(x)	x	(x)	x	(x)
- Opportunistic infections		x	(x)	x	(x)	x	(x)	x	(x)
Other outcomes									
EQ-5D-5L*		X		X		X			
Other PROs:									
- Professional activity*		X		X		X			
- Healthcare utilization - Hospitalization*		X		X		X			

* Routinely collected data within the SMSC; (X) only when it coincides with a SMSC visit

† Defined as the daily dose following WHO recommendations

Appendix 1: PRECIS-2 assessment

PRECIS-2 scoring results are (pragmatic attitudes are reflected by a maximum of 5 points, while explanatory characteristics by lower scores) - Eligibility 5 (broad eligibility criteria with only one exclusion criterion); Recruitment 5 (patients will be recruited during their usual care yearly visit); Setting 5 (embedded in the SMSC usual care and 7 centers from the cohort will be recruiting); Organization 5 (make use of the already existing SMSC organization in place); Flexibility – delivery 5 (treatment guidelines pre-specified but as any guidelines, it will be the physicians and patients’ decision to follow them); Flexibility – Adherence 5 (no mitigation measures will be taken to increase the use of diagnostic information); Follow-up 5 (number of visits and routine assessment increased in intervention group, but part of the biomarker monitoring intervention; no change in control group); Primary Outcome 5 (decision-relevant and patient reported outcome); Primary analysis 5 (intention to treat).

Appendix 2: Treatment decision algorithms

The following treatment decision algorithms are intended to serve as treatment decision aids for the clinical application of serum neurofilament light chain values within MultiSCRIPT-Cycle 1 to guide escalation and de-escalation of disease modifying therapies (DMTs) in patient with relapse-remitting multiple sclerosis (RRMS). They represent a minimal set of treatment decision algorithms that experts have reach a certain level of agreement on.

The proposed treatment decision algorithms are not meant to cover all unique cases that physicians might encounter in the clinics. We acknowledge that treatment modifications related to pregnancies, treatment intolerances, comorbidities and other causes may not be captured here. The proposed algorithms are not binding and do not intend to supplant patients' and physicians' preferences. Physician at their discretion may pursue any additional clinical and/or clinical assessment as per usual care to inform the decision.

The treatment decision algorithms rely on the following definitions:

Usual care arm: Consider escalation, if there is evidence of disease activity (clinically or MRI-activity)

NEDA: no evidence of disease activity

NEDA2: no relapse, no EDSS worsening

NEDA3: no relapse, no EDSS worsening, no MRI activity

EDSS worsening: defined as an increase of ≥ 1.5 points from an EDSS of 0, ≥ 1.0 point from an EDSS of 1.0-5.0 or ≥ 0.5 point from an EDSS ≥ 5.5

MRI activity: Any unequivocal new or enlarging T2w lesion (**after adequate re-baselining**) or contrast enhancement on T1w images on brain or spinal cord MRI according to the consensus between local neuroradiologist and treating neurologist.

Evidence of disease activity based on sNfL is defined using sNfL > 90th percentile (Benkert et al. *Lancet Neurology* 2022) and **once other potential causes of high sNfL have been excluded** (e.g. trauma, stroke, relevant sports-related head injury, at least medium severe renal failure (GFR < 60 mL/min/1.73 m²), suboptimally treated diabetes mellitus or any other concomitant disease that may lead to relevant neuroaxonal damage)

DMT CLASSIFICATION	Delphi results
Low efficacy: glatiramer acetate – interferon beta – teriflunomide	97% Strong consensus
Medium efficacy: fumarates – S1P modulators – cladribine	83% Broad consensus
High efficacy: alemtuzumab – anti B cell therapy – natalizumab	100% Full agreement

ESCALATION TREATMENT DECISION ALGORITHMS	Delphi results
TREATMENT INITIATION FROM UNTREATED	
If your patient is currently untreated and has high sNfL (>90th percentile) jointly consider with your patient to <u>initiate DMT</u> if your patient has....	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ NEDA2 plus MRI activity with at least 2 new/enlarging T2w lesions or contrast enhancing T1w lesions 	97% Strong consensus
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ NEDA2 plus MRI activity with at least 1 new/enlarging T2w lesion or contrast enhancing T1w lesion 	93% Strong consensus
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ NEDA 3 	80% Broad consensus
ESCALATION FROM LOW DMT	
If your patient is currently receiving a low efficacy DMT for at least 9 months and has high sNfL (>90th percentile) jointly consider with your patient to <u>escalate to medium or high efficacy DMT</u> if your patient has.....	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ NEDA2 plus MRI activity with at least 2 unequivocal new/enlarging T2w lesions or contrast enhancing T1w lesions 	97% Strong consensus
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ NEDA2 plus MRI activity with at least 1 unequivocal new/enlarging T2w lesion or contrast enhancing T1w lesion 	97% Strong consensus
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ NEDA3 	67% Moderate consensus
ESCALATION FROM MEDIUM DMT	
If your patient is currently receiving a medium efficacy DMT for at least 9 months and has high sNfL (>90th percentile) jointly consider with your patient to <u>escalate to high efficacy DMT</u> if your patient has...	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ NEDA2 plus MRI activity with at least 2 unequivocal new/enlarging T2w lesions or contrast enhancing T1w lesions 	100% Full agreement
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ NEDA2 plus MRI activity with at least 1 unequivocal new/enlarging T2w lesion or contrast enhancing T1w lesion 	93% Broad consensus
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ NEDA3 	67% Moderate consensus

HORIZONTAL SWITCH TREATMENT DECISION ALGORITHMS	Delphi results
HORIZONTAL SWITCH FROM NATALIZUMAB	
If your patient is currently receiving natalizumab and has high sNfL (>90thpercentile) jointly consider with your patient to <u>switch to a different mode of action high efficacy DMT</u> if your patient has...	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ at least 9 months natalizumab plus NEDA2 plus MRI activity with at least 2 unequivocal new/enlarging T2w lesions or contrast enhancing T1w lesions 	97% Strong consensus
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ at least 9 months natalizumab plus NEDA2 plus MRI activity with at least 1 unequivocal new/enlarging T2w lesion or contrast enhancing T1w lesion 	84% Broad consensus
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ at least 12 months natalizumab plus NEDA3 	54% Moderate consensus
HORIZONTAL SWITCH FROM ANTI-B CELL THERAPY	
If your patient is currently receiving anti-B cell therapy and has high sNfL (>90thpercentile) jointly consider with your patient to <u>switch to a different mode of action high efficacy DMT</u> if your patient....	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ at least 9 months anti-B cell therapy plus NEDA2 plus MRI activity with at least 2 unequivocal new/enlarging T2w lesions or contrast enhancing T1w lesions 	93% Broad consensus
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ at least 9 months anti-B cell therapy plus MRI activity plus confirmed EDSS worsening or relapse 	93% Broad consensus
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ at least 12 months anti-B cell therapy plus NEDA2 plus MRI activity with at least 1 unequivocal new/enlarging T2w lesion or contrast enhancing T1w lesion 	92% Broad consensus
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ at least 12 months anti-B cell plus no MRI activity but relapse 	83% Broad consensus
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ at least 12 months anti-B cell plus no MRI activity but confirmed EDSS worsening 	71% Moderate consensus
HORIZONTAL SWITCH FROM CLADRIBINE	
If your patient is received the second cycle cladribine and has high sNfL (>90thpercentile) jointly consider with your patient to <u>switch to a different mode of action or regimen strategy of DMT</u> if your patient has....	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ at least 6 months after the second cycle plus NEDA2 plus MRI activity with at least 2 unequivocal new/enlarging T2w lesions or contrast enhancing T1w lesions 	97% Strong consensus
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ at least 12 months after the second cycle plus NEDA3 	83% Broad consensus
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ at least 6 months after the second cycle plus NEDA2 plus MRI activity with at least 1 unequivocal new/enlarging T2w lesion or contrast enhancing T1w lesion 	81% Broad consensus

DE-ESCALATION TREATMENT DECISION ALGORITHMS	Delphi results
DE-ESCALATION FROM ANTI-B CELL THERAPY	
<p>If your patient is currently receiving anti-B cell therapy for at least 2 years, has NEDA3 for the past 2 years and has normal sNfL (< 80th percentile) jointly consider with your patient to perform 6-monthly cMRI and 6-monthly sNfL measurement and de-escalate by extending treatment interval up to 12 months (Ocrevus, Rituximab) or 8 weeks (Kesimpta)</p>	<p>74% Moderate consensus</p>
DE-ESCALATION FROM FUMARATES	
<p>If your patient is >60 years old, currently receiving fumarates for at least 5 years, has NEDA3 for the past 5 years, pre-treatment activity was low (e.g., less than 1 relapse per year) and has normal sNfL (<80th percentile) jointly consider with your patient to perform 6-monthly cMRI and 6-monthly sNfL measurement and stopping fumarates</p>	<p>74% Moderate consensus</p>
DE-ESCALATION FROM LOW EFFICACY DMT	
<p>If the patient wishes to stop treatment and is >60 years old, currently receiving low efficacy DMT for at least 5 years, has NEDA3 for the past 5 years and has normal sNfL (< 80th percentile) jointly consider with your patient to perform 6-monthly cMRI and 6-monthly sNfL measurement and stopping DMT treatment</p>	<p>87% Broad consensus</p>