### 1 Efficacy of Melflufen in Patients with Relapsed/Refractory Multiple Myeloma and 2 Mutated or Deleted TP53

Klara Acs,<sup>1\*</sup> Juho J. Miettinen,<sup>2\*</sup> Philipp Sergeev,<sup>2\*</sup> Tobias Heckel,<sup>3</sup> Yumei Diao,<sup>1</sup> Kristina Witt-3 Mulder,<sup>1</sup> Marcus Thureson,<sup>1</sup> Thorsten Bischler,<sup>3</sup> Maiju-Emilia Huppunen,<sup>2</sup> Jakob Obermüller,<sup>1</sup> 4 Umair Munawar,<sup>4</sup> Ana Slipicevic,<sup>11</sup> Ralf C. Bargou,<sup>4</sup> Fredrik Lehmann,<sup>111</sup> Stefan Svensson 5 6 Gelius,<sup>1</sup> Stefan Norin,<sup>1</sup> Fredrik Schjesvold,<sup>5</sup> Pieter Sonneveld,<sup>6</sup> Thorsten Stühmer<sup>4</sup> and 7 Caroline A. Heckman<sup>2†</sup>

8

9 <sup>1</sup>Oncopeptides AB, Stockholm, Sweden; <sup>2</sup>Institute for Molecular Medicine Finland, Helsinki Institute of Life Science, iCAN Digital Precision Cancer Medicine Flagship, University of 10 Helsinki, Helsinki, Finland; <sup>3</sup>Core Unit Systems Medicine, University of Würzburg, Würzburg, 11 Germany; <sup>4</sup>Comprehensive Cancer Center Mainfranken, Würzburg, Germany; <sup>5</sup>Oslo 12 Myeloma Center, Department of Hematology, Hospital, 13 Oslo University Oslo. Norway; <sup>6</sup>Department of Hematology, Erasmus MC Cancer Institute, Rotterdam, The 14 15 Netherlands

- 16
- \*– K.A., J.J.M and P.S. contributed equally to this study. 17
- 18 <sup>1</sup> – Recent address, One-carbon Therapeutics AB, Stockholm, Sweden.
- <sup>ii</sup> Recent address, Industrifonden, Stockholm, Sweden. 19
- 20 <sup>†</sup> – Corresponding author.

NOTE: This preprint reports new research that has not been certified by peer review and should not be used to guide clinical practice.

### 21 ABSTRACT

### 22 Background

Patients with relapsed/refractory multiple myeloma (RRMM) and high-risk genetic abnormalities such as del(17p) and *TP53* mutation have poor response to standard therapies and shorter survival compared to patients without these aberrations. Here, we investigated the activity and mechanism of action of peptide-drug conjugate melphalan flufenamide (melflufen) in *TP53* wild type (*TP53*wt) and mutant (*TP53*mut) myeloma models and assessed the efficacy of melflufen in patients with del(17p) and/or *TP53* mutation.

## 29 Methods

30 We evaluated melflufen activity ex vivo in 24 myeloma bone marrow (BM) samples 31 and explored indicators of response from single cell RNA sequencing (scRNAseq) profiles. 32 The efficacy of melflufen vs. control treatments was further investigated in TP53<sup>/-</sup> and parental 33 TP53wt myeloma cell lines. DNA damage, apoptosis kinetics, mitochondrial function, plus 34 transcriptomic and metabolic data were analyzed to understand the mechanisms responsible 35 for melflufen activity in the absence of p53. Patient outcome data from the OCEAN phase III 36 clinical trial (NCT03151811), which investigated the clinical activity of melflufen in RRMM, 37 were statistically analyzed to assess the impact of del(17p) and TP53 mutation on clinical 38 response.

### 39 Results

40 BM plasma cell (PC) response to melflufen was independent of TP53 mutation status, with melflufen active in del(17p), TP53mut, and TP53wt samples. Differential analysis of 41 42 scRNAseq data demonstrated that melflufen sensitive PCs had lower expression of p53 target 43 genes and higher expression of genes associated with DNA damage repair and cell cycle checkpoints. Analysis of *TP53<sup>/-</sup>* and *TP53*wt cell lines showed superior efficacy of melflufen 44 45 in comparison to melphalan or cyclophosphamide. In the presence and absence of functional p53, melflufen robustly induced apoptosis, DNA damage, and mitochondrial dysfunction. In 46 TP53<sup>/-</sup> cells, melflufen treatment led to distinct changes in expression of genes associated 47

48	with cell cycle checkpoint and apoptosis, which were not observed with melphalan treatment.
49	Notably, post-hoc analysis of the OCEAN trial del(17p) patient population demonstrated
50	favorable progression free survival in the del(17p) subgroup treated with melflufen plus
51	dexamethasone compared to the pomalidomide plus dexamethasone arm.
52	Conclusions
53	Our insights into the molecular mechanisms of melflufen activity in TP53mut myeloma
54	support its clinical efficacy and application in the del(17p) and TP53mut patient population.
55	
56	Trial registration
57	NCT03151811, registration 2017-05-09.
58	
59	Keywords:
60	Melflufen, clinical efficacy, TP53 mutation, del(17p), PFS, in vitro efficacy, SoC

61 alkylators

### 62 BACKGROUND

63 The number of targeted therapies developed in the last decades has enormously increased the treatment possibilities for patients with multiple myeloma (MM) and has 64 prolonged life expectancies.<sup>1-4</sup> However, after initial response to early line therapies, patients 65 66 suffer from multiple relapses and eventually develop resistance as the disease progresses. In current clinical practice, therapy regimens that include proteasome inhibitors (PIs), 67 68 immunomodulatory drugs (IMIDs), monoclonal antibodies (mAbs), and dexamethasone (Dex) are commonly used as early line treatments.<sup>5</sup> The development of resistance to these 69 70 therapies has resulted in a patient population with heavily pre-treated relapsed/refractory MM 71 (RRMM). As the disease progresses, patients develop enhanced clonal heterogeneity, with 72 their tumor genome often accumulating more mutations and structural changes. Patients 73 belonging to this population have benefited only modestly from the approval of novel targeted 74 drugs and have very limited treatment options.<sup>6-9</sup>

75 The loss of parts of the short arm of chromosome 17 (del(17p)) in myeloma is one of 76 the most important prognostic factors for patient response. The TP53 gene is located at 77 chromosome 17p13.1 and encodes the p53 tumor suppressor protein, which is important for maintaining genome integrity and initiation of apoptosis.<sup>10</sup> Patients with del(17p) are assigned 78 79 high-risk status according to the International Myeloma Working Group (IMWG) and based on 80 several studies.<sup>11-13</sup> In case a deletion of the chromosome 17 small arm is associated with 81 TP53 mutation on the remaining allele, the patients are grouped into the so-called "double-hit" population with very poor survival.<sup>14</sup> The reason for the worse outcome is that no functional 82 p53 protein remains in the tumor cells of these patients. However, del(17p) alone also confers 83 84 poor outcome compared with patients without this deletion, and del(17p) cytogenetics is considered as a prognostic indicator for poor outcome.<sup>14-21</sup> 85

Melphalan flufenamide (melflufen) is a novel peptide-drug conjugate recently approved 86 by the European Medical Agency (EMA) for the treatment of RRMM.<sup>22</sup> The lipophilicity of 87 melflufen facilitates rapid cellular uptake and the antineoplastic activity of the drug depends 88

on high expression of aminopeptidases in the malignant myeloma cells.<sup>23</sup> After hydrolysis by
aminopeptidases, a robust increase of the alkylating metabolites occurs inside the tumor cells
leading to induction of apoptosis with remarkably fast kinetics.<sup>22-27</sup>

92 In the OCEAN trial, a randomized, head-to-head, open-label, phase III clinical study, 93 melflufen combined with dexamethasone (mfldex) or pomalidomide plus dexamethasone 94 (pomdex) was studied in patients who had received 2-4 lines of previous treatments, were 95 refractory to lenalidomide and their last treatment, and had not previously received 96 pomalidomide treatment. The primary endpoint was progression free survival (PFS), and key 97 secondary endpoints included overall survival (OS) and overall response rate (ORR). Results 98 from the trial showed that patients on the melflufen arm had superior PFS compared to the pomalidomide arm patients.<sup>28,29</sup> In a post-hoc analysis, patients on the melflufen arm that 99 100 either had no prior ASCT or progressed >36 months after a prior ASCT had a better PFS and 101 OS than patients progressing <36 months after an ASCT.<sup>30</sup>

102 The robust cellular efficacy of melflufen led us to compare the mechanism of action in 103 different myeloma models with or without a mutated *TP53* genetic background, including bone 104 marrow (BM) CD138+ plasma cells (PCs) from RRMM patients positive for del(17p)/*TP53* 105 mutation, isogenic myeloma cell lines with double-mutated *TP53*, and patients with the same 106 background enrolled in the OCEAN trial.

107

### 108 MATERIALS AND METHODS

## 109 **Compounds and stock solutions**

Melflufen (Oncopeptides AB) was freshly prepared in DMSO before application.
Melphalan (cat. no. M2011, Sigma-Aldrich) stock solution was prepared in acidified ethanol.
Cyclophosphamide (N,N-bis(2-chloroethyl)-4-hydroperoxy-2-oxo-1,3,25-oxazaphosphinan-2amine,TRC Canada) was freshly prepared in DMSO.

114

### 115 *Ex vivo* drug sensitivity testing of myeloma bone marrow samples

116 Viably cryopreserved BM mononuclear cell (BM-MNC) samples (n=24) from 23 patients with MM were obtained from the Finnish Hematology Registry and Biobank (Table 1). 117 118 The samples were collected after informed consent using approved protocols and in 119 accordance with the Declaration of Helsinki. The study was approved by an ethical committee 120 of the Helsinki University Hospital (Ethical Committee Statement 303/13/03/01/201, latest amendment 7 dated 15 June 2016; latest HUS study permit HUS/395/2018 dated 13 February 121 122 2018; Permit numbers 239/13/03/00/2010, 303/13/03/01/2011). For ex vivo drug sensitivity 123 testing, BM-MNCs were thawed, resuspended in conditioned medium from the HS-5 human 124 BM stromal cell line, and seeded on 96-well plates. Resuspended drugs were added to the 125 wells and cells incubated at 37°C for 72h. Labeled antibodies specific for CD138 and CD38 126 (BD Biosciences) were used to detect plasma cells, while Annexin V and 7AAD (BD 127 Biosciences) were used to detect apoptotic and dead cells, respectively. The cells were 128 analyzed on the iQue PLUS flow cytometer (Sartorius). Additional details are included in the 129 Supplementary Materials and Methods.

130

### 131 Single-cell gene expression analysis

132 For single cell RNA sequence (scRNAseq) analysis, the above-mentioned 24 BM-133 MNCs were sorted based on CD138+ expression and libraries prepared with 10x Genomics 134 reagents and sequenced on the Illumina NovaSeq 6000 instrument. The samples were 135 grouped based on ex vivo drug sensitivity to melflufen and melphalan. Cell clusters were 136 identified based on gene expression patterns and differential gene expression (DGE) and gene set enrichment analysis (GSEA) performed on the plasma cell clusters of the highly 137 138 sensitive and low sensitive samples for both drugs (see Supplementary Materials and Methods for details). Data link NCBI GEO (http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/geo) accession 139 number GSE263201. 140

141

### 142 Cell lines, cell culture, and cytotoxicity

The AMO-1 cell line was obtained from DSMZ (Braunschweig, Germany). Generation
and characterization of *TP53* deficient AMO-1 clones is described in Munawar et al., 2019.<sup>31</sup>
Cell viability was determined after 72h incubation using the CellTiter-Glo® 2.0 assay
(Promega) or AlamarBlue<sup>™</sup> reagent (Invitrogen) according to the manufacturers' protocols.

147

## 148 DNA damage signaling and cell apoptosis analyses

AMO-1 *TP53*wt and AMO-1 *TP53*<sup>-/-</sup> cells were treated with melflufen, melphalan or cyclophosphamide at the indicated concentrations and time points. H2AX phosphorylation at Ser139(γ-H2AX) for DNA damage signal was analyzed using flow cytometry. For apoptosis analysis cells were stained for Annexin V APC and PI (Invitrogen). All samples were analyzed with the FACSCanto II flow cytometer (BD Biosciences). Data were analyzed using FlowJo software (BD Biosciences).

155

### 156 JC-1 mitochondria membrane potential assay

AMO-1 *TP53*wt and AMO-1 *TP53<sup>+/-</sup>* cells were treated with melflufen, melphalan or cyclophosphamide at the indicated concentrations and time points. The JC-1 mitochondrial membrane potential assay was performed according to the manufacturer's protocol (MitoProbe<sup>™</sup> JC-1 Assay Kit for Flow Cytometry (M34152), Molecular Probes).

161

### 162 RNA preparation and RNA sequence analysis

AMO1 *TP53*wt cells or the *TP53<sup>-/-</sup>* knock out clonal subline AMO-1 *TP53<sup>-/-</sup>* were treated with melphalan or melflufen at different concentrations and timepoints. RNA was isolated according to the RNeasy Plus protocol, quantified with Nanodrop (Thermo Scientific), and quality assessed with the Agilent 2100 Bioanalyzer. DNA libraries were prepared using the TruSeq Stranded mRNA Library Preparation Kit (Illumina) and sequencing performed on the NextSeq-500 platform (Illumina). Sequences were mapped to the human genome (GRCh38.p14) with STAR aligner and gene level based read counts generated with RefSeq.

Differential gene expression (DGE) analysis was performed using DESeq2 with log-fold change shrinkage using beta Prior. Cluster profiler was used for gene set enrichment analysis (GSEA) and for KEGG pathway analysis. R was applied to generate heatmaps. Data link NCBI GEO (http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/geo) accession number GSE254959.

174

### 175 Statistical analyses of the OCEAN trial data

176 Primary analysis of tumor response and progression-dependent endpoints of patients 177 enrolled in the OCEAN trial (NCT03151811) were based on response assessments by an 178 Independent Review Committee. All tumor response and progression-dependent endpoints 179 were assessed using the IMWG Uniform Response Criteria (IMWG-URC). PFS was defined 180 as time (months) from date of randomization to either confirmed disease progression or death 181 due to any cause. ORR was defined as the proportion of patients for whom the best overall 182 confirmed response was stringent complete response (sCR), complete response (CR), very 183 good partial response (VGPR), or partial response (PR). Posthoc analyses were performed to examine associations between PFS and chromosome 17 deletion status and/or TP53 gene 184 mutation status. Furthermore, another post-hoc analysis was carried out to study the patient 185 186 responder status in the chromosome 17 deletion population.

187

### 188 Assessment of del(17p) status

The del(17p) status had been determined from bone marrow at baseline level (entry) of the clinical study by interphase Fluorescence In-Situ Hybridization (iFISH) in accordance with Good Clinical Practice (GCP). No cutoff applied, all patients with del(17p) cytogenetics had been included into the analyses. The presence of del(17p) in plasma cells varied between 8-90%. The del(17p) status of the patient samples used for the *ex vivo* drug sensitivity testing was determined using iFISH as previously described.<sup>32</sup>

195

### 196 Assessment of *TP53* mutation status

197 TP53 mutation status of OCEAN trial patients was determined by next generation 198 sequencing (NGS) using Almac Genomic Services. Briefly, DNA was extracted from BM 199 derived CD138+ cells and processed using Illumina TruSeg Custom Amplicon Kit Dx. A 200 custom TP53 oligo panel detecting pan-cancer single nucleotide polymorphisms was applied 201 and the samples sequenced on the Illumina MiSeq instrument. All detected single nucleotide 202 variants classified. The TP53 mutation status of the patient samples used for the ex vivo drug 203 sensitivity testing was determined using exome sequencing of DNA from CD138+ cells as previously described.<sup>32</sup> 204

- 205
- 206

Detailed materials and methods are provided in the supplementary information.

207

### 208 RESULTS

### 209 Melflufen targets MM plasma cells *ex vivo* regardless of *TP53* mutation status

210 To assess the efficacy of melflufen in high-risk myeloma ex vivo, we conducted flow 211 cytometry-based drug sensitivity testing of 24 myeloma BM-MNC samples obtained from 23 patients with various clinical and molecular backgrounds (Figure 1A). The cohort included 212 213 samples from newly diagnosed and relapsed patients. After treatment of the BM-MNCs with 214 melflufen or control drugs for 72h, the viability of the CD138+CD38+ cells was assessed by 215 Annexin V and 7AAD staining. All samples showed reduced viability after exposure to 216 melflufen, but sensitivity varied between samples from extremely sensitive to less sensitive, 217 which was reflective of the heterogeneity of the patients (Figure 1B). For subsequent analyses, 218 the samples were divided into different melflufen sensitivity groups based on the melflufen 219 DSS values of the samples: high (HS, DSS>40; n=8), intermediate (IS, 40<DSS<31; n=8), 220 and low (LS, DSS>31; n=8). Confirming our earlier observations, a significant indicator of 221 melflufen sensitivity was disease stage as all but one of the HS samples were from RRMM 222 patients.<sup>26</sup> A gain of chromosome 1q (+1q) and loss of chromosome 13 (-13/-13q) were the 223 most frequent abnormalities observed in 22/24 samples individually or in combination.

224 Statistical analysis showed tendencies of samples with +1g to have higher sensitivity to 225 melflufen, and the opposite trend for samples with -13/-13q although significance was not obtained due to the limited sample number. In addition, 4 of the 8 LS samples and only 1 of 226 227 the 8 HS samples had t(4;14), while 3 of the HS, 1 of the IS and 2 of the LS samples were 228 positive for del(17p). TP53 mutation status was available for 14 of the 24 tested samples. Of the 5 HS samples with TP53 sequence data, 3 were mutation positive, while TP53 mutations 229 230 were not detected in any of the 5 LS samples with sequence information. These results 231 suggested that melflufen was highly active despite the presence of TP53 mutation or del(17p). 232 At the same time, comparison of the ex vivo drug sensitivity of samples to melflufen, 233 melphalan, and cyclophosphamide clearly showed the superior potency of melflufen in 234 TP53wt, del17p, and del17p + TP53mut patient samples (Figure 1C). For instance, the 235 sensitivity to melflufen was significantly higher in the TP53wt (melflufen: n = 8, melphalan: n 236 = 8, cyclophosphamide: n = 2) and del(17p) + *TP53*mut groups (melflufen: n = 4, melphalan: 237 n = 4, cyclophosphamide: n = 2). Although the threshold for statistical significance was not 238 achieved in the del(17p) cohort (n = 2 for all drugs), the trend was similar.

To investigate molecular differences between groups with different sensitivity to melflufen, we analyzed the transcriptomic profiles of the plasma cell populations, obtained by scRNA sequencing, and conducted differential gene expression (DGE) and gene set enrichment (GSEA) analyses. GSEA of genes detected in HS and LS samples showed a decrease in p53 downstream pathways and targets in the HS group, and, at the same time, higher enrichment of pathways associated with DDR genes *BRCA1, ATM*, and *CHEK2* (Figure 1D).

246

### 247 Loss of *TP53* compromises multiple pathways

To better understand the mechanisms responsible for the superior activity of melflufen compared to other standard of care alkylators observed from the *ex vivo* drug sensitivity testing analysis, we used the myeloma cell line AMO-1 with intact WT *TP53* or with deletion of both

251 alleles (TP53<sup>/-</sup>). To validate the functional significance of these cell line models and their 252 relevance with the patient samples, we investigated transcriptomic alterations caused by mutation of TP53 by comparing baseline gene expression of TP53<sup>/-</sup> vs. TP53wt patient 253 254 samples and cell lines. This analysis yielded 1485 differentially expressed genes in patient 255 samples (Supplementary Table S1) and 5357 of those in cell lines (Supplementary Table S2). 256 In both comparisons, there were 252 similarly deregulated genes, such as IL6R, JUN, DUSP5, AREG, and FOS (Supplementary Table S3). Subsequently, gene set enrichment analysis 257 258 (GSEA), when applied to these cohorts of genes, gave us multiple gene sets, associated with 259 TP53 and cell cycle progression, as well as pathways, associated with signaling and DNA 260 damage (Supplementary Figure S1). These results confirmed a similar impact of TP53 261 dysfunction in the patient samples and cell line models and illustrated the exploitability of TP53 262 loss for treatment purposes by a drug such as melflufen.

263

### 264 Melflufen is cytotoxic and induces early apoptosis in cells without functional p53

265 Earlier studies had demonstrated that deletion of one or both alleles of TP53 in AMO-266 1 cells by CRISPR/Cas9 resulted in significant loss of sensitivity to melphalan or doxorubicin .<sup>31,33</sup> In support of the earlier report,<sup>33</sup> double mutant *TP53<sup>/-</sup>* AMO-1 cells displayed profound 267 268 loss of sensitivity to melphalan with EC50 values close to 20µM (Figure 2A, B, Supplementary 269 Table S4). However, melflufen was highly active towards both TP53wt and TP53<sup>/-</sup> AMO-1 270 cells and compared to melphalan exhibited 30-fold more inhibition of cell viability with EC50 271 0.6µM. Importantly, melflufen-induced apoptosis as measured by Annexin V was similar in 272 TP53wt and TP53<sup>-/-</sup> cells (Figure 2B).

Earlier studies have shown that melflufen has more efficient kinetics compared to melphalan,<sup>34,35</sup> we therefore investigated the induction of apoptosis in *TP53*wt and *TP53*<sup>-/-</sup> cells after treatment with melflufen or melphalan. Even at 2h, induction of apoptosis was apparent in both *TP53*wt and *TP53*<sup>-/-</sup> cells after melflufen but not melphalan treatment (Figure 2C). At 4h, early induction of apoptosis was as prominent in the mutant *TP53*<sup>-/-</sup> AMO-1 cells as in

278 *TP53*wt cells. In contrast to melflufen, melphalan and cyclophosphamide failed to induce early 279 apoptosis (Figure 2D), although the apoptotic signal increased later and at higher IC50 values 280 ( $55\mu$ M and  $15\mu$ M, respectively) compared to melflufen (IC50 1 $\mu$ M) (Figure 2D). Overall, these 281 results demonstrate that melflufen treatment resulted in complete inhibition of viability and 282 induction of apoptosis at sub- to low micromolar concentrations, and indicate that, in contrast 283 to melphalan, melflufen remains active despite compromised p53 function.

284

# 285 Melflufen induces DNA damage and mitochondrial membrane disruption in *TP53* 286 deficient cells

As the main cellular target for alkylating agents is genomic DNA, we aimed to gain 287 insight into the kinetics of DNA damage induction for cells harboring TP53wt or TP53<sup>/-</sup> cells. 288 289 Cells were treated with either melflufen, melphalan or cyclophosphamide and induction of 290 early DNA damage was measured by phosphorylation of H2AX (yH2AX (ser139)). Melflufen 291 treatment induced yH2AX signal after 30 min in the TP53wt cells in a concentration dependent 292 manner, while in the TP53<sup>/-</sup> mutant cells maximal DNA damage induction occurred already at the lowest concentration. TP53<sup>-/-</sup> cells exhibited a higher baseline level of vH2AX which is in 293 294 line with loss of p53 protein function in the feed-back loops for DNA replication and repair 295 protein functions.<sup>10</sup> Exposure to melphalan resulted in little induction of early DNA damage in 296  $TP53^{-1}$  cells while in TP53wt cells DNA damage induction was apparent only at a 10-fold higher concentration compared to melflufen. Similarly, there was little change in yH2AX levels 297 in TP53<sup>/-</sup> cells treated with cyclophosphamide, and the yH2AX signal induction by 298 299 cyclophosphamide in the TP53wt cells appeared later in comparison to the other drugs (Figure 300 3A).

We further investigated whether other cellular targets such as mitochondria<sup>27</sup> are affected by melflufen with similar efficacy in the *TP53*wt and *TP53<sup>/-</sup>* cells. Mitochondrial functionality by membrane integrity measurements of the AMO-1 isogenic cell lines showed that melflufen induced a drop of membrane potential in the *TP53*wt cells within 2 hours after

treatment, and the effect on mitochondria function was even more pronounced in the mutant  $TP53^{\prime-}$  cells (Figure 3B). In contrast, melphalan and cyclophosphamide had no measurable effect on mitochondrial function in  $TP53^{\prime-}$  cells at the 4h treatment timepoint. Altogether, these data demonstrate that the activity of melflufen compared to other alkylators is associated with more efficient induction of cellular DNA damage and mitochondrial membrane disruption, and that melflufen can induce these processes with or without functional p53.

311

## 312 Gene expression analysis reveals differences in *TP53*wt vs. *TP53*<sup>*l*</sup> cells after treatment

### 313 with melflufen and melphalan

314 To understand if the rapid kinetics of melflufen intracellular accumulation and DNA 315 damage induction uniquely influenced gene expression patterns compared to melphalan, RNA 316 was collected from AMO-1 TP53wt and TP53<sup>/-</sup> cells after 2h exposure to the IC90 317 concentrations of melflufen or melphalan (Supplementary Table S4) and sequenced. Gene 318 expression analysis showed distinct differences in the p53 pathway between melflufen and 319 melphalan treatment of the TP53<sup>/-</sup> AMO-1 cells that were not apparent in TP53wt cells (Figure 320 4A). For example, melflufen treatment of the  $TP53^{-1}$  cells resulted in significant upregulation of genes including the cyclin dependent kinase inhibitor 1A (CDKN1A), cyclin G2 (CCNG2), 321 322 and DNA damage inducible alpha, beta, and gamma genes (GADD45A, B and G), as well as 323 upregulation of the apoptosis inducing *PMAIP1* (NOXA) gene. At the same time melflufen 324 treatment caused significant downregulation in apoptosis inhibition and stress response genes including the well-known BCL2 and BCL2L1 genes. The primary target of alkylators is genomic 325 DNA and treatment results in the upregulation of DNA damage repair (DDR) signaling as a 326 cellular response to genomic stress. Importantly, the p53 protein is a key factor in the 327 maintenance of DNA repair protein homeostasis<sup>10</sup>, and base excision repair (BER) and 328 nucleotide excision repair (NER) are the main DNA repair pathways activated upon alkylator 329 induced DNA damage.<sup>36</sup> We therefore investigated genes belonging to these pathways and 330 331 analyzed their expression levels (Figure 4B and Supplementary Figure S2). In the DNA

332 replication pathway analysis, these genes tended to be upregulated in TP53<sup>-/-</sup> cells after melflufen treatment. Besides well-known replication guarding genes such as RPA1, 333 334 POLD1.3.4 and POLE2.3, the upregulation of a cluster of genes that includes several micro-335 chromosome maintenance genes (MCM7, MCM3, MCM5) was also observed. Importantly, 336 BER associated genes such as PARP1, PARP2, RCF4 and XRCC1, and NER pathway genes including the hallmark ERCC genes (ERCC1,2,5) and RAD23A were upregulated in TP53/-337 338 cells after melflufen but not melphalan treatment. The differential gene expression patterns between melflufen and melphalan treated *TP53<sup>/-</sup>* cells were also apparent after 12h incubation 339 340 with drug (Supplementary Figure S2). In contrast, there was little difference in the gene 341 expression patterns induced by melflufen and melphalan in TP53wt cells at 2 or 12h. The distinct gene expression patterns induced by melflufen in the TP53<sup>/-</sup> cells compared to 342 343 melphalan suggest a clear mechanistic difference between the two alkylators.

344

### 345 **Patient PFS, OS and response in the del(17p) population**

346 To confirm our preclinical observations and determine if melflufen is active in patients 347 with dysfunctional TP53, we conducted a post-hoc analysis of the OCEAN head-to-head open 348 label clinical trial where the primary endpoint was PFS in the mfldex vs. pomdex treatment 349 arms. Earlier, the PFS of 6.8 months in the mfldex group was shown to be significantly better than the PFS of 4.9 months in the pomdex group (stratified log-rank p value: p=0.03; HR 0.792 350 351 [95% CI: 0.640, 0.981]).<sup>28</sup> In the post-hoc analysis for patient responder status in the chromosome 17 deletion population study, 70 patients characterized with del(17p) were 352 included in this analysis from the total enrolled 495 patients in the OCEAN trial. Notably, the 353 354 del(17p) patient population size from the OCEAN trial is in line with the published and commonly detected del(17p) cytogenetics rate where del(17p) is detected in ~10-15% from 355 total MM trial populations.<sup>18,37,38</sup> 356

357 For PFS analysis of the del(17p) subpopulation, the patient distribution was as follows; 358 in the mfldex arm 33 patients had del(17p) chromosomal aberration and 213 had no del(17p)

359 while in the pomdex arm 37 patients were del(17p) mutant and 212 patients had no deletion (Supplementary Table S5). In the del(17p) subpopulation there was a trend towards improved 360 PFS in the mfldex group with 7.1 months vs. 2.9 months in the pomdex group (HR 0.45 [95% 361 CI: 0.26, 0.79], p=0.006) (Figure 5A). These data suggest that melflufen treatment is efficient 362 363 in this high-risk subpopulation and can substantially prolong patient PFS. OS in the del(17p) subpopulation indicated a favourable OS in the pomdex arm versus mfldex arm, with 11.5 364 365 months in the mfldex arm and 15.9 months in the pomdex arm (HR 1.31 [95% CI: 0.76, 2.26], 366 p=0.33) (Figure 5B). The different PFS and OS outcomes between the treatment groups 367 (mfldex arm vs. pomdex arm) might be explained based on post-hoc subgroup analyses which 368 indicated that OS outcomes may have been driven primarily by patients who had received 369 previously high-dose melphalan followed by an autologous haematopoietic stem-cell 370 transplantation (ASCT).<sup>28</sup> These earlier post-hoc analyses determined that melflufen plus 371 dexamethasone should be indicated for RRMM, but exclude patients with a prior ASCT, whose time to progression is less than 3 years from transplantation.<sup>39</sup> 372

373 Based on analysis of response to treatment in the del(17p) subgroup, the ORR results 374 are as follows; the mfldex arm had 33.3% ORR (11 responders from 33 patients) vs. pomdex 375 which had an ORR of 10.8% (4 responders from 37 patients) (33.3% vs 10.8%, p=0.028) 376 (Figure 5C). The observed ORR data in the del(17p) population showed that the mfldex 377 treatment arm had a significantly higher number of responders compared to the pomdex treatment arm and suggest that melflufen treatment can induce responses in this high-risk 378 379 population. In addition, the ORR to melflufen treatment in the del(17p) population was 380 comparable to the ORR in the general patient population of the OCEAN trial, which included 381 heavily pre-treated R/R MM patients. In the OCEAN study, the ORR for mfldex was 33% (95% 382 CI, 27-39) vs. an ORR of 27% (95% CI, 22-33) for pomdex.

The del(17p) aberration often co-occurs with other high-risk cytogenetic abnormalities, which may also impact patient response to treatment and outcome. The distribution of these other high-risk changes within the del(17p) population and the outcome of these del(17p)

subgroups are shown in Supplementary Table S6. The most common co-occurring high-risk cytogenetic abnormality with del(17p) was gain of 1q (+1q), which appeared to negatively impact response to both mlfdex and pomdex in the del(17p) population; however, statistical analysis of these further subdivided cytogenetic groups would have been underpowered.

390

## 391 Melfufen shows favorable clinical efficacy in del(17p) and/or *TP53* mutation patients

### 392 from the OCEAN trial

393 To better understand mfldex clinical efficacy in the population with dysfunctional TP53, 394 which included a mixed population of patients comprised of del(17p) and non-del(17p) 395 patients, we performed a NGS exploratory study to determine TP53 gene mutation status for 396 both mfldex and pomdex treatment arms. For both arms, most sequenced patient samples 397 contained silent single nucleotide polymorphism alterations to TP53 and thus retained p53 398 function. From the mfldex arm, 15 samples that were sequenced had del(17p) and/or 399 contained a pathogenic mutation to TP53, while in the pomdex arms 18 patients were 400 identified with del(17p) and/or pathogenic/loss-of-function mutation to TP53. Analyzing PFS 401 in the sequenced population, the patient distribution was as follows; in the mfldex arm, 62 patients had no functional alteration to TP53, and 15 patients had either del(17p) and/or TP53 402 403 pathogenic mutation. In the pomdex arm, 50 patients had no functional TP53 impairment, and 404 18 patients displayed del(17p) and/or TP53 pathogenic mutation (Supplementary Table S7). The PFS analysis showed superiority of mfldex treatment vs. pomdex (Figure 6A). In the 405 406 impaired TP53 group (del(17p) and/or TP53mut) the PFS in the mfldex group was 6.7 months 407 vs. 4.7 months in the pomdex group (HR 0.57 [95% CI: 0.25, 1.29], p=0.2). These data indicate 408 that in the OCEAN trial, mfldex treatment resulted in a better PFS in the TP53 gene mutated 409 patient population.

Additionally, OS analysis for the *TP53* sequenced subpopulation indicated not significant but prolonged OS in the mfldex arm *vs.* pomdex arm (Figure 6B) with 22.8 months *vs.* 19.9 months, respectively (HR 1.54 [95% CI: 0.69, 3.47], p=0.30).

Based on analysis of response to treatment in the *TP53* gene sequenced patient population, the ORR results are as follows; the mfldex arm had 33.3% ORR *vs.* pomdex which had an ORR of 11.1% (Figure 6C). The observed ORR data in the *TP53* gene sequenced population showed that the mfldex treatment arm had a higher number of responders compared to the pomdex treatment arm. Only 3 patients were double hit patient with del(17p) and *TP53* mutation. Their distribution was the following, 1 patient with partial response (PR) in the mfldex arm and 2 patients with no respond (stable disease (SD)) in the pomdex arm.

Notably, both post-hoc analyses (del(17p) population or the del(17p) and/or *TP53* mutation sequenced population) included the melflufen treatment target (>36 months post ASCT) and non-target populations (<36 months post ASCT).<sup>38</sup> Inclusion of both populations resulted in a less favorable outcome for the mfldex arm. However further dividing the del(17p) or the del(17p) and/or *TP53* sequenced populations would result in very small patient groups with very limited statistical power.

426

### 427 **DISCUSSION**

428 In myeloma, the sequential appearance of small mutations and larger chromosomal 429 structural changes are acquired with treatment course and ultimately result in progressive 430 disease driven by drug resistant clones. The deletion of chromosome 17p13 and mutation to TP53 are the most deleterious aberrations described in myeloma and predict poor outcome 431 and limited responses to most available therapies. Analysis of late line RRMM patients treated 432 with lenalidomide and dexamethasone showed that del(17p) patients had low response rate 433 and significantly shorter survival compared to patients without the deletion, indicating an 434 unmet clinical need for this subpopulation of patients.<sup>40</sup> 435

Our earlier preclinical investigations of melflufen activity in myeloma indicated that plasma cells from relapsed/refractory patients were more sensitive than those from newly diagnosed patients.<sup>26</sup> We confirmed those observations in this study but also demonstrated that melflufen is active in patient-derived plasma cells with del(17p) and/or mutated *TP53*.

440 Although this cohort was too small to demonstrate statistical significance across all 441 subpopulations, we found that melflufen was clearly more effective than standard of care 442 alkylators melphalan and cyclophosphamide when tested against patient plasma cells with WT TP53, del(17p), or del(17p) plus mutated TP53. Although we lacked TP53 mutation status 443 444 for all the tested samples, comparative gene expression analysis showed decreased 445 enrichment of gene sets associated with p53 downstream pathways and targets in samples 446 highly sensitive to melflufen. These results indicated that melflufen retains its activity despite 447 compromised p53 function.

448 Using isogenic myeloma cell lines with intact TP53 or loss of both alleles, we were able 449 to confirm our results from the patient samples and demonstrate that melflufen is highly 450 effective in the presence or absence of functional p53. Although melflufen should have a 451 similar mechanism of action as melphalan, our results showed that melflufen treatment 452 resulted in rapid and robust induction of apoptosis in both TP53wt and TP53<sup>-/-</sup> cells compared to melphalan, which especially had reduced effect on TP53<sup>/-</sup> cells. In addition, melflufen 453 454 rapidly induced DNA damage and disrupted mitochondrial function. These results further 455 strengthened the applicability of melflufen as an alkylating drug in the RRMM population as 456 several studies indicate increased mitochondria number and function with myeloma disease progression.41-43 457

Although the fast kinetics of melflufen may be in part due to its lipophilic profile,<sup>22,24</sup> melflufen treatment was associated with unique differences in the gene expression profiles of treated cells. Notably, melflufen treatment of  $TP53^{/-}$  cells resulted in increased expression of genes associated with DNA replication and DNA repair and downregulation of cell cycle checkpoint and anti-apoptosis genes (e.g., *CHEK1, PTEN, BCL2, BCL2L1*). These changes were not observed in melphalan treated  $TP53^{/-}$  cells indicating distinct mechanistic differences between these drugs.

465 Our preclinical data were supportive of post-hoc analyses of the OCEAN trial. The 466 original analyses of the OCEAN study cohort showed that RRMM patients treated with the

467 combination mfldex had a longer PFS compared to patients that received pomdex (6.8 months vs. 4.9 months).<sup>28</sup> In this follow-up study, a similar difference in PFS for the two treatment 468 469 arms was reflected in high-risk patients with del(17p) cytogenetics, where PFS of the mfldex 470 group was superior to the pomdex group. The del(17p) patients treated with mfldex also had 471 a greater ORR (33%) compared to patients that received pomdex (ORR 10.8%). Furthermore, 472 the PFS for the del(17p) and/or TP53 gene mutated subgroup in the mfldex arm was 6.74 473 months compared to 4.67 months for the pomdex arm. Although OS analyses showed 474 prolonged survival of patients with TP53 mutation who received mfldex compared to pomdex, 475 the results were not statistically significant. In addition, OS was better for patients with del(17p) 476 who had received pomdex compared to those receiving mfldex, but this also lacked 477 significance. These analyses included all patients who had received high dose melphalan prior 478 to ASCT, although the indication of the melflufen plus dexamethasone combination is for 479 patients who progress >36 months after ASCT. Thus, inclusion of non-indicated patients who 480 progressed <36 months after receiving high dose melphalan and ASCT could have affected 481 the results. However, dividing the patients into even smaller subgroups would not have been 482 statistically meaningful. Nevertheless, these results demonstrated that melflufen had superior 483 efficacy in the del(17p) and TP53 mutant patient population.

Although our preclinical studies did not include a comparison between melflufen and pomalidomide, we could demonstrate that melflufen had superior activity compared to that of the standard of care alkylators melphalan and cyclophosphamide, even without functional p53. In addition, the analyses of the OCEAN trial patient cohort have demonstrated better efficacy of the mfldex combination in heavily pretreated patients including those with del(17p) and *TP53* mutation. Future studies could investigate the impact of other genetic abnormalities or lines of treatment on response to melflufen.

491

### 492 CONCLUSION

Our findings underline melflufen's unique mechanism of action in which intracellular accumulation of the alkylating payload efficiently causes cytotoxic effects by rapid induction of DNA damage and mitochondrial dysfunction independent of *TP53* gene status and protein function. These results together with the post-hoc analysis of the OCEAN trial data demonstrate that melflufen is particularly effective in high-risk myeloma with del(17p) and/or *TP53* mutation.

499

### 500 **DECLARATIONS**

### 501 Ethics approval and consent to participate

502 Bone marrow (BM) aspirates were collected from multiple myeloma (MM) patients after 503 informed consent using protocols approved by the ethical committee of Helsinki University 504 Hospital (Ethical Committee Statement 303/13/03/01/201, latest amendment 7 dated 15 June 505 2016; latest HUS study permit HUS/395/2018 dated 13 February 2018; Permit numbers 506 239/13/03/00/2010, 303/13/03/01/2011) and in accordance with the Declaration of Helsinki.

507

### 508 **Consent for publication**

509 Not applicable.

510

### 511 Availability of data and materials

512 Bulk RNAseq data from AMO1 *TP53*wt cells and the *TP53<sup>-/-</sup>* knock out clonal subline 513 AMO-1 TP53<sup>-/-</sup> is available at the NCBI GEO (http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/geo) accession 514 number GSE254959. Single cell RNA sequencing data from multiple myeloma patient 515 samples is available at the NCBI GEO (http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/geo) accession number 516 GSE263201. All other data are available upon request from the corresponding author.

517

### 518 Competing interests

519 K.A., Y.D., K.W.M., J.O., S.S.G. are employees of and receives stock or stock options 520 from Oncopeptides. S.N. is an employee of, has participated on a data safety monitoring board 521 or advisory board for, and receives stock or stock options from Oncopeptides. M.T. is a 522 consultant of and receives stock or stock options from Oncopeptides. A.S., F.L., are former 523 employees of and receive stock or stock options from Oncopeptides. F.S. has received grants 524 or contracts from Celgene, GlaxoSmithKline, Janssen, Oncopeptides, Targovax, and Sanofi; 525 payment or honoraria for lectures or speakers' bureau participation from AbbVie, Amgen, 526 Bristol Myers Squibb, Daiichi Sankyo, GlaxoSmithKline, Janssen, Novartis, Oncopeptides, 527 Pfizer, Sanofi, SkyliteDX, and Takeda; serving on a data safety monitoring or advisory board 528 for AbbVie, Celgene, GlaxoSmithKline, Janssen, Oncopeptides, Sanofi, and Takeda; and 529 stock or stock options from Nordic Nanovector. P.So. has received grants or contracts from 530 Amgen, Celgene, Janssen, Takeda, and SkylineDx. C.A.H. has received research funding 531 from Oncopeptides related to this work, and from IMI2 projects HARMONY and HARMONY 532 PLUS, WntResearch, Orion, Kronos Bio, Novartis, Celgene, Zentalis Pharmaceuticals for 533 unrelated work, plus honoraria or personal fees from Amgen and Autolus. The remaining 534 authors declare no competing financial interests. The following authors have no conflicts of 535 interest: J.J.M., P.Se., T.H., T.B., M.E.H., U.M., R.C.B., T.S.

536

### 537 Funding

The work done in this manuscript has been funded by Oncopeptides. C.A.H. and F.S. 538 have received funding from Oncopeptides to support the study. **P.Se.**: Funding from University 539 540 of Helsinki Doctoral programme of Biomedicine, Instrumentariumin Tiedesäätiö.

541

### **Authors' contributions** 542

- 543 Conceptualization – K.A., J.J.M., T.S., S.N., C.A.H.
- Data Curation K.A., P.Se., J.J.M., T.S., T.B., T.H., J.O., M.T. 544
- 545 Formal Analysis – K.A., P.Se., J.J.M., T.H., T.B., T.S., J.O., M.T.

- 546 Funding Acquisition S.N., T.S., C.A.H.
- 547 Investigation K.A., P.Se., J.J.M., M.-E.H., U.M., T.B., T.H.
- 548 Methodology K.A., P.Se., J.J.M., Y.D., K.W.-M., M.T., J.O., U.M.
- 549 Project administration K.A., C.A.H.
- 550 Resources K.A., C.A.H., T.S.
- 551 Software P.Se., T.B., J.O., M.T.
- 552 Supervision K.A., C.A.H.
- 553 Validation K.A., C.A.H., T.S., S.N.
- 554 Visualization K.A., P.Se., J.J.M., T.B.
- 555 Writing (Original Draft Preparation) K.A., P.Se., J.J.M., C.A.H.
- 556 All authors participated in paper reviewing and editing.
- 557

### 558 Authors' information

- 559 Klara Acs<sup>\*1</sup>
- 560 Oncopeptides AB, Stockholm, Sweden
- 561 klara.acs@oncopeptides.com
- 562
- 563 Juho J. Miettinen<sup>12</sup>
- Institute for Molecular Medicine Finland-FIMM, HiLIFE–Helsinki Institute of Life Science,
   iCAN Digital Precision Cancer Medicine Flagship, University of Helsinki, Helsinki, Finland
- 566 juho.miettinen@helsinki.fi
- 567
- 568 Philipp Sergeev<sup>2</sup>
- 569 Institute for Molecular Medicine Finland-FIMM, HiLIFE–Helsinki Institute of Life Science,
- iCAN Digital Precision Cancer Medicine Flagship, University of Helsinki, Helsinki, Finland
   philipp.sergeev@helsinki.fi
- 572
- 573 Tobias Heckel<sup>3</sup>
- 574 Core Unit Systems Medicine, University of Wuerzburg, Wuerzburg, Germany
- 575 <u>heckel.t@web.de</u>
- 576
- 577 Yumei Diao<sup>1</sup>
- 578 Oncopeptides AB, Stockholm, Sweden
- 579 yumei.diao@oncopeptides.com
- 580
- 581 Kristina Witt-Mulder
- 582 Oncopeptides AB, Stockholm, Sweden
- 583 <u>kristina.witt-mulder@oncopeptides.com</u>
- 584
- 585 Marcus Thureson<sup>1</sup>

586 587	Oncopeptides AB, Stockholm, Sweden marcus.thureson@oncopeptides.com
588	The veter Dischlam
589	
590 591 502	thorsten.bischler@uni-wuerzburg.de
592 593	Maiju-Emilia Huppunen <sup>2</sup>
594	Institute for Molecular Medicine Finland-FIMM, HiLIFE–Helsinki Institute of Life Science.
595	iCAN Digital Precision Cancer Medicine Flagship, University of Helsinki, Helsinki, Finland
596	maiju.huppunen@hotmail.com
597	
598	Jakob Obermuller <sup>1</sup>
599	Uncopeptides AB, Stockholm, Sweden
600 601	Jakob.obermulier@oncopeptides.com
602	Umair Munawar₄
603	Comprehensive Cancer Center Mainfranken, Wuerzburg, Germany
604	Munawar U@ukw.de
605	
606	Ana Slipicevic <sup>11</sup>
607	Oncopeptides AB, Stockholm, Sweden
608	ana.slipicevic@one-carbon.com
609	
610	Ralf C. Bargou₄
611	Comprehensive Cancer Center Mainfranken, Wuerzburg, Germany
612	<u>bargou r@ukw.de</u>
613	
614	Fredrik Lehmann <sup>11</sup>
615	Oncopeptides AB, Stockholm, Sweden
616	fredrik.lehmann@otpharma.se
617	
618	Stetan Svensson Gellus
619 620	Oncopeptides AB, Stockholm, Sweden
620 621	steran.svensson.genus@oncopeptides.com
622	Stefan Norin
623	Oncopentides AB Stockholm Sweden
624	stefan.norin@oncopeptides.com
625	
626	Fredrik Schjesvold₅
627	Oslo Myeloma Center, Department of Hematology, Oslo University Hospital, Oslo, Norway
628	fredrikschjesvold@gmail.com
629	
630	
631	Department of Hematology, Erasmus MC Cancer Institute, Rotterdam, The Netherlands
632 Caa	p.sonneveld@erasmusmc.nl
C27	Thereton Stühmer
034 625	Comprehensive Cancer Center Mainfranken, Wuerzhurg, Cermenu
033 636	Stuehmer T@ukw.de
637	
638	Caroline A. Heckman <sup>2</sup>
-	

- 639 Institute for Molecular Medicine Finland-FIMM, HiLIFE–Helsinki Institute of Life Science,
- 640 iCAN Digital Precision Cancer Medicine Flagship, University of Helsinki, Helsinki, Finland
- caroline.heckman@helsinki.fi 641

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.12.02.24318289; this version posted December 2, 2024. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in

perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

### REFERENCES 644

655 656

657

666 667

668

669

670 671

672

673

674

675

676 677

678

679

680 681

682 683

684

685

686 687

688

- 645 1. Rajkumar SV. Multiple myeloma: 2020 update on diagnosis, risk-stratification and 646 management. Am J Hematol. 2020;95(5):548-67.
- 647 2. Goldschmidt H, Ashcroft J, Szabo Z, Garderet L. Navigating the treatment landscape 648 in multiple myeloma: which combinations to use and when? Ann Hematol. 649 2019;98(1):1-18.
- 650 3. Manier S, Ingegnere T, Escure G, et al. Current state and next-generation CAR-T cells in multiple myeloma. Blood Rev. 2022:54:100929. 651
- 652 4. Attal M, Harousseau JL, Stoppa AM, et al. A prospective, randomized trial of 653 autologous bone marrow transplantation and chemotherapy in multiple myeloma. 654 Intergroupe Français du Myélome. N Engl J Med. 1996;335(2):91-7.
  - 5. Dimopoulos MA, Moreau P, Terpos E, et al. Multiple myeloma: EHA-ESMO Clinical Practice Guidelines for diagnosis, treatment and follow-up(dagger). Ann Oncol. 2021;32(3):309-22.
- 6. Sonneveld P, Avet-Loiseau H, Lonial S, et al. Treatment of multiple myeloma with 658 659 high-risk cytogenetics: a consensus of the International Myeloma Working Group. 660 Blood. 2016;127(24):2955-62.
- 7. Manier S, Salem KZ, Park J, Landau DA, Getz G, Ghobrial IM. Genomic complexity 661 662 of multiple myeloma and its clinical implications. Nat Rev Clin Oncol. 663 2017;14(2):100-13.
- 8. Corre J, Cleynen A, Robiou du Pont S, et al. Multiple myeloma clonal evolution in 664 homogeneously treated patients. Leukemia. 2018;32(12):2636-47. 665
  - 9. Moreau P, Kumar SK, San Miguel J, et al. Treatment of relapsed and refractory multiple myeloma: recommendations from the International Myeloma Working Group. Lancet Oncol. 2021;22(3):e105-e118.
  - 10. Ho T, Tan BX, Lane D. How the other half lives: what p53 does when it is not being a transcription factor. Int J Mol Sci. 2019;21(1).
  - 11. Palumbo A, Avet-Loiseau H, Oliva S, et al. Revised International Staging System for Multiple Myeloma: A Report from International Myeloma Working Group. J Clin Oncol. 2015;33(26):2863-9.
  - 12. Avet-Loiseau H, Attal M, Moreau P, et al. Genetic abnormalities and survival in multiple myeloma: the experience of the Intergroupe Francophone du Myélome. Blood. 2007;109(8):3489-95.
  - 13. Hebraud B, Magrangeas F, Cleynen A, et al. Role of additional chromosomal changes in the prognostic value of t(4;14) and del(17p) in multiple myeloma: the IFM experience. Blood. 2015;125(13):2095-100.
  - 14. Thakurta A, Ortiz M, Blecua P, et al. High subclonal fraction of 17p deletion is associated with poor prognosis in multiple myeloma. Blood. 2019;133(11):1217-21.
  - 15. Corre J, Perrot A, Caillot D, et al. del(17p) without TP53 mutation confers a poor prognosis in intensively treated newly diagnosed patients with multiple myeloma. Blood. 2021;137(9):1192-5.
  - 16. Jovanović KK, Escure G, Demonchy J, et al. Deregulation and targeting of TP53 pathway in multiple myeloma. Front Oncol. 2018;8:665.
    - 17. Robiou du Pont S, Cleynen A, Fontan C, et al. Genomics of multiple myeloma. J Clin Oncol. 2017;35(9):963-7.
- 18. Corre J, Avet-Loiseau H. Risk-based therapeutic strategies. Cancer J. 689 690 2019;25(1):54-8.
- 19. Drach J, Ackermann J, Fritz E, et al. Presence of a p53 gene deletion in patients with 692 multiple myeloma predicts for short survival after conventional-dose chemotherapy. 693 Blood. 1998;92(3):802–9.
- 694 20. Flynt E, Bisht K, Sridharan V, Ortiz M, Towfic F, Thakurta A. Prognosis, biology, and 695 targeting of TP53 dysregulation in multiple myeloma. Cells. 2020;9(2).

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.12.02.24318289; this version posted December 2, 2024. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.

- 496 21. Walker BA, Mavrommatis K, Wardell CP, et al. A high-risk, double-hit, group of newly diagnosed myeloma identified by genomic analysis. Leukemia. 2019;33(1):159–70.
- 698 22. Wickström M, Nygren P, Larsson R, et al. Melflufen—a peptidase-potentiated
  699 alkylating agent in clinical trials. Oncotarget. 2017;8(39):66641–55.
- Wickström M, Viktorsson K, Lundholm L, et al. The alkylating prodrug J1 can be
   activated by aminopeptidase N, leading to a possible target-directed release of
   melphalan. Biochem Pharmacol. 2010;79(9):1281–90.
- 24. Gullbo J, Wickström M, Tullberg M, et al. Activity of hydrolytic enzymes in tumour
   cells is a determinant for anti-tumour efficacy of the melphalan-containing prodrug
   J1. J Drug Target. 2003;11(6):355–63.

706

707

708

709 710

711

712

713

718

719

720

721 722

723

724

725

726

727

728

729 730

731

732

733

734

735

736 737

738 739

740

- 25. Lindberg J, Nilvebrant J, Nygren P, Lehmann F. Progress and future directions with peptide-drug conjugates for targeted cancer therapy. Molecules. 2021;26(19).
  - 26. Miettinen JJ, Kumari R, Traustadottir GA, et al. Aminopeptidase expression in multiple myeloma associates with disease progression and sensitivity to Melflufen. Cancers (Basel). 2021;13(7).
- 27. Westermark U, Diao Y, Fasth KJ, et al. A rapid intracellular enrichment of alkylating payload is essential for melphalan flufenamide potency and mechanism of action. Biochem Biophys Res Commun. 2023;656:122–30.
- 28. Schjesvold FH, Dimopoulos MA, Delimpasi S, et al. Melflufen or pomalidomide plus dexamethasone for patients with multiple myeloma refractory to lenalidomide (OCEAN): a randomised, head-to-head, open-label, phase 3 study. Lancet Haematol. 2022;9(2): e98-e110.
  - 29. Schjesvold F, Robak P, Pour L, Aschan J, Sonneveld P. OCEAN: a randomized phase III study of melflufen + dexamethasone to treat relapsed refractory multiple myeloma. Future Oncol. 2020;16(11):631–41.
  - 30. Sonneveld P, Richardson PG, Ludwig H, et al. Benefit versus risk assessment of Melflufen and dexamethasone in relapsed/refractory multiple myeloma: analyses from longer follow-up of the OCEAN and HORIZON studies. Clin Lymphoma Myeloma Leuk. 2023;23(9):687–96.
  - Munawar U, Roth M, Barrio S, et al. Assessment of TP53 lesions for p53 system functionality and drug resistance in multiple myeloma using an isogenic cell line model. Sci Rep. 2019;9(1):18062.
  - Majumder MM, Silvennoinen R, Anttila P, et al. Identification of precision treatment strategies for relapsed/refractory multiple myeloma by functional drug sensitivity testing. Oncotarget 2017;8:56338-56350.
  - Stühmer T, Chatterjee M, Hildebrandt M, et al. Nongenotoxic activation of the p53 pathway as a therapeutic strategy for multiple myeloma. Blood. 2005;106(10):3609–17.
  - 34. Chauhan D, Ray A, Viktorsson K, et al. In vitro and in vivo antitumor activity of a novel alkylating agent, melphalan-flufenamide, against multiple myeloma cells. Clin Cancer Res. 2013;19(11):3019–31.
  - 35. Ray A, Ravillah D, Das DS, et al. A novel alkylating agent Melflufen induces irreversible DNA damage and cytotoxicity in multiple myeloma cells. Br J Haematol. 2016;174(3):397–409.
    - 36. Kondo N, Takahashi A, Ono K, Ohnishi T. DNA damage induced by alkylating agents and repair pathways. J Nucleic Acids. 2010;2010:543531.
- 37. Liu J, Yang H, Liang X, et al. Meta-analysis of the efficacy of treatments for newly
  diagnosed and relapsed/refractory multiple myeloma with del(17p). Oncotarget.
  2017;8(37):62435–44.
- 38. Lakshman A, Painuly U, Rajkumar SV, et al. Impact of acquired del(17p) in multiple
  myeloma. Blood Adv. 2019;3(13):1930–8.
- 747 39. Pepaxti Summary of Product Characteristics.
   748 <u>https://ec.europa.eu/health/documents/community-</u>
   749 register/2024/20240301161964/anx\_161964\_en.pdf. Accessed 20 November 2024.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.12.02.24318289; this version posted December 2, 2024. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.

- 750 40. Reece D, Song KW, Fu T, et al. Influence of cytogenetics in patients with relapsed or refractory multiple myeloma treated with lenalidomide plus dexamethasone: adverse 751 752 effect of deletion 17p13. Blood. 2009;114(3):522-5. 753 41. Wallace DC. Mitochondria and cancer. Nat Rev Cancer. 2012;12(10):685-98. 42. Porporato PE, Filigheddu N, Pedro JMB, Kroemer G, Galluzzi L. Mitochondrial 754 755 metabolism and cancer. Cell Res. 2018;28(3):265-80. 756 43. Guerra F, Arbini AA, Moro L. Mitochondria and cancer chemoresistance. Biochim 757 Biophys Acta Bioenerg. 2017;1858(8):686-99. 758 759 760 **FIGURE LEGENDS** 761 762 Figure 1. Melflufen ex vivo drug sensitivity testing results from the 24 myeloma bone 763 marrow samples. A) Patient sample characteristics. B) Melflufen dose response curves for 764 the 24 MM patient samples. Samples having both del(17p) and TP53 mutation (black), having 765 only del(17p) (red), having only TP53 mutation (blue), other (grey). C) Drug sensitivity scores 766 of samples with different molecular background for three alkylators – melflufen, melphalan, and cyclophosphamide. P-values are indicated above the brackets, with the corresponding 767 comparison. \* -p<0.05, \*\*\* -p<0.001. **C**) Bar plot representing normalized enrichment scores 768 769 for selected gene sets derived from the most differentially expressed genes in the plasma cell 770 populations between the melflufen high sensitive (HS) and low sensitive (LS) groups.
- 771

772 Figure 2. Cytotoxicity and apoptosis detection in the AMO-1 TP53 isogenic cell lines. A, B) Melflufen and melphalan cytotoxicity dose effect curves in parental AMO-1 cells 773 774 (TP53wt) and in its bi-allelic-double mutant TP53 gene harbouring clonal cell line (TP53<sup>/-</sup>) 775 using either the alamarBlue metabolic activity assay (A) or the apoptosis measurement 776 Annexin V/propidium iodide staining (B). The curves represent three independent 777 experiments, error bars reflect standard deviations. C) Melflufen, melphalan or 778 cyclophosphamide induced early apoptosis in AMO-1 TP53wt and AMO-1 TP53<sup>-/-</sup> isogenic cell 779 lines. Cells were treated with the indicated drug concentrations and time points, melflufen 780 (red), melphalan (green), or cyclophosphamide (blue). Early apoptosis was detected with 781 Annexin V and PI staining using flow cytometry (Annexin V positive, PI negative). D) Both

early and late apoptosis were measured in AMO-1 *TP53*wt and AMO-1 *TP53<sup>/-</sup>* isogenic cell
lines after 24h treatment with the indicated drugs and drug concentrations (late apoptotic cells:
Annexin V positive, PI positive).

785

786 Figure 3. DNA damage and mitochondrial membrane potential detection in AMO-1 TP53wt and TP53 knock out cells. A) Melflufen, melphalan or cyclophosphamide induced 787 DNA damage in AMO-1 TP53wt and AMO-1 TP53<sup>/-</sup> isogenic cell lines. Early DNA damage 788 789 was detected as yH2AX signal by flow cytometry after the indicated treatment concentrations 790 and time points. yH2AX: phosphorylated histone protein 2AX. B) Melflufen, melphalan or 791 cyclophosphamide treatment induced mitochondrial disfunction in AMO-1 TP53 isogenic cell 792 line. Melflufen, melphalan or cyclophosphamide treatment were applied in the indicated 793 concentrations, and after 1, 2, 3 and 4h time points mitochondrial function of the treated cells 794 was measured using JC-1 mitochondrial membrane potential assay. PI: propidium iodide.

795

Figure 4. Gene expression analysis in *TP53* wild type versus *TP53* mutant genetic background AMO-1 cells. A, B) Heatmaps of gene expression of p53 signalling (A) and the Base Excision Repair (BER) DNA repair pathway (B) genes after 2h treatment of *TP53* wt or *TP53<sup>-/-</sup> cells* with 2.5  $\mu$ M melflufen versus 20  $\mu$ M melphalan, respectively.

800

Figure 5. Progression-free survival, overall survival, and overall response rate in del(17p) patient population from the OCEAN trial. A) Kaplan-Meier progression-free survival curve, B) overall survival curve, and C) overall response rate for the investigator assessed all-treated del(17p) population. Analysis set of 70 del(17p) patients and 425 patients not harbouring del(17p). MflDex: melflufen + dexamethasone; PomDex: pomalidomide + dexamethasone; VGPR: very good partial response; PR: partial response; MR: minimal response; SD: stable disease; PD: progressive disease; NE: not evaluable

808

809 Figure 6. Progression-free survival, overall survival and overall response rate in 810 del(17p) and/or TP53 gene mutated patient population from the OCEAN trial. A) Kaplan-811 Meier progression-free survival curve, **B**) overall survival curve, and **C**) overall response rate 812 for all del(17p) and/or TP53 gene sequenced population. Analysis set of 33 del(17p) and/or 813 TP53 gene mutated patients and 112 patients not harbouring del(17p) or TP53 gene mutation. 814 MfIDex: melflufen + dexamethasone; PomDex: pomalidomide + dexamethasone; CR: 815 complete response; VGPR: very good partial response; PR: partial response; MR: minimal response; SD: stable disease; PD: progressive disease; NE: not evaluable 816



### Figure 2



# Figure 3



-	
ıme i	n i

В	TP53-/-				TP53wt				_
	0.92	0.93	1.02	0.97	0.85	0.91	0.84	0.75	1 µM
Cyclophosphamide Melphalan Melflufen	0.92	1.02	0.82	1.10	0.85	0.82	0.87	0.88	5 µM
	0.93	0.69	0.73	0.70	0.88	0.78	0.84	0.83	10 µM
	0.90	0.67	0.69	0.65	0.97	0.82	0.76	0.73	15 µM
	1.22	1.20	0.98	0.91	1.06	1.03	0.84	0.88	1 µM
	1.17	1.45	0.82	0.89	1.16	1.18	0.92	1.24	5 μΜ
	1.20	1.44	0.76	0.85	1.03	1.08	0.87	0.96	10 µM
	1.15	1.31	0.79	1.16	1.04	0.99	1.00	0.81	15 µM
	1.02	0.90	1.12	1.44	0.90	0.97	0.90	0.81	1 µM
	1.04	0.89	1.10	1.35	0.95	0.95	0.88	0.81	5 µM
	1.00	1.00	1.12	1.44	0.85	0.97	0.86	0.85	10 µM
•	0.88	0.95	1.39	1.27	0.78	0.99	0.83	0.73	15 µM
	1	2 Tin	3 ne (h)	4	1	2 Tim	3 e (h)	4	•

(ratio 590/529 normalized to DMSO) 1.4 1.2 1

Mitochondrial membrane potential

0.8

Figure 4 A





-3 -2 -1 0 1 2 3 vst-transformed counts (z-scores)





В







Figure 6 medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.12.02.24318289; this vers preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, wh Α perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND



0 0 0 0

В

PomDex - TP53 wild type 50

33



