

# MZL endpoints & emerging prognostic markers

The main objective of this survey among experts is to draw up a list of potential prognostic markers for PFS in MZL trials. Thereafter, these proposals will serve as a basis to perform the assessment of prognostic value of emerging prognostic markers in MZL by a meta-analysis on aggregated IPD data.

This questionnaire is divided in 4 parts:

- Respondents' characteristics
- Emerging prognostic markers at baseline
- Emerging prognostic markers assessed during follow-up
- Endpoints definitions

Thanks a lot !

Côme Bommier, Jérôme Lambert & Catherine Thieblemont

---

---

**The main objective of this survey among experts is to draw up a list of potential prognostic markers for PFS in MZL trials. Thereafter, these proposals will serve as a basis to perform the assessment of prognostic value of emerging prognostic markers in MZL by a meta-analysis on IPD data.**

**This questionnaire is divided in 4 parts:**

**A- Respondents' characteristics**

**B- Emerging prognostic markers at baseline**

**C- Emerging prognostic markers assessed during follow-up**

**D- Endpoints definitions**

**Thanks a lot !**

**Côme Bommier, Jérôme Lambert & Catherine Thieblemont**

Part A. Q1.

Female

Male

What is your sex ?

Part A. Q2.

What is the year of your birth ?

Part A. Q3.

Clinical hematology (ward)

Biological hematology (lab)

Radiology or Nuclear medicine

Pathology

Biostatistics or Epidemiology

Other

What is your main speciality ?

What is your speciality ?

Part A. Q4.

Have you already participated in a TRIAL involving ONLY MZL patients?

- Yes, as primary investigator
- Yes, as coinvestigator
- Yes, as methodologist
- Yes, as member of the trial management group (responsible for the day-to-day delivery and conduct of the trial)
- Yes, as member of the executive trial steering committee (experienced and independent experts aiming at quality assurance of the trial and patient advocacy)
- Yes, as member of the data monitoring committee (role is to review safety and efficacy data and make recommendations to an executive group)
- No, I have never taken part in such trial

Part A. Q5.

Have you already participated in a TRIAL involving MZL patients, merged with other lymphomas patients (such as FL patients)?

- Yes, as primary investigator
- Yes, as coinvestigator
- Yes, as methodologist
- Yes, as member of the trial management group (responsible for the day-to-day delivery and conduct of the trial)
- Yes, as member of the executive trial steering committee (experienced and independent experts aiming at quality assurance of the trial and patient advocacy)
- Yes, as member of the data monitoring committee (role is to review safety and efficacy data and make recommendations to an executive group)
- No, I have never taken part in such trial

Part A. Q6.

Have you already authored a COHORT including MZL patients ?

- Yes (first author or any co-author)
- No

---



---

**Part B. Emerging prognostic markers at baseline in MZL trial**

**At the time of the questionnaire, prognostic tools are MALT-IPI score (Thieblemont, 2017), HPLL score (Montalban, 2014) and ILL score (Arcaini, 2006).**

**Let suppose you are designing a NEW TRIAL with UNLIMITED possibilities...**

Part B. Q1.

Among markers at BASELINE, what is(are) the EMERGING markers you think worthwhile to be evaluated as prognostic for PFS in MZL ?

You ticked "Other". So among markers at BASELINE, what is the EMERGING markers you think worthwhile to be evaluated as prognostic for PFS in MZL ?

- PET-CT at baseline
- cfDNA at baseline
- Cytogenetics
- Molecular tumor variants by NGS
- Other

---

Part B. Q2.

Among PET-CT measures at baseline, what is(are) the one(those) you think worthwhile to be evaluated as prognostic for PFS in MZL ?

You ticked "Other". So among PET-CT measures AT BASELINE, what is the one you think worthwhile to be evaluated as prognostic for PFS in MZL ?

- Total metabolic tumor volume (TMTV) at baseline
- Deauville score at baseline (Song &al, Sci Reports 2020)
- SUVmax of the main lesion
- Any measurement
- Other
- I think PET-CT at baseline is not relevant as prognostic marker in MZL

---

Part B. Q3.

Among these cytogenetics features at baseline, what is(are) the one(those) you think worthwhile to be evaluated as prognostic for PFS in MZL ?

You ticked "Other". So among cytogenetics features AT BASELINE, what is the one you think worthwhile to be evaluated as prognostic for PFS in MZL ?

- del(17p)
- t(11;18) BIRC3-MALT1
- t(14;18) IGH-MALT1
- t(1;14) BCL10-IGH
- +3
- +18
- 6q23-
- del(7q)
- Any of them
- Other
- I think cytogenetics is not relevant as prognostic marker in MZL

---

Part B. Q4.

Among these molecular variants at baseline, what is(are) the one(those) you think worthwhile to be evaluated as prognostic for PFS in MZL ?

You ticked "Other". So among molecular variants AT BASELINE, what is the one you think worthwhile to be evaluated as prognostic for PFS in MZL ?

- TP53
- NOTCH2
- KLF2
- TNFAIP3
- PTPRD
- KMT2D
- Other
- I think NGS is not relevant as prognostic tool in MZL

---

---



---

**Part C. Emerging prognostic markers assessed during follow-up in MZL trial**

**At the time of the questionnaire, response to treatment in MZL is assessed by CT-scan (Cheson, 2014), blood tests (Matutes, 2008) and/or pathology (Copie-Bergmann, 2003). Let suppose you are designing a NEW TRIAL with UNLIMITED possibilities...**

Part C. Q1.

Among markers assessed DURING FOLLOW-UP, what is(are) the EMERGING marker you think worthwhile to be evaluated as prognostic for PFS in MZL ?

- PET-CT response assessment
- cfDNA during follow-up
- Minimal residual disease (MRD)
- Other

You ticked "Other". So among markers assessed DURING FOLLOW-UP, what is the EMERGING marker you think worthwhile to be evaluated as prognostic for PFS in MZL ?

---

Part C. Q2-1.

Among PET-CT measures during follow-up, what is(are) the one(those) you think worthwhile to be evaluated as prognostic for PFS in MZL ?

- SUVmax
- delta-SUVmax
- Deauville score
- Total metabolic tumor volume (TMTV)
- delta-TMTV
- Any of them
- Other
- I think PET-CT during follow-up is not relevant in MZL

You ticked "Other". So among PET-CT measures DURING FOLLOW-UP, what is the one you think worthwhile to be evaluated as prognostic for PFS in MZL ?

---

Part C. Q2-2.

In a prognostic prospect, at what time from treatment start (in months) do you think it would be relevant to perform PET-CT ?

(Please give a number IN MONTHS (e.g. write M2 if you mean 2 months))

Part C. Q3-1.

Among cfDNA measurements during follow-up, what is the one you think worthwhile to be evaluated as prognostic for PFS in MZL ?

- cfDNA levels
- cfDNA change between baseline and interim assessment
- cfDNA change between baseline and end of treatment
- Other
- Any of them
- I think cfDNA during follow-up is not relevant as prognostic marker in MZL

You ticked "Other". So among cfDNA measurements DURING FOLLOW-UP, what is the one you think worthwhile to be evaluated as prognostic for PFS in MZL ?

---

Part C. Q3-2.

In a prognostic prospect, at what time from treatment start (in months) do you think it would be relevant to measure cfDNA ?

(Please give a number IN MONTHS (e.g. write M2 if you mean 2 months))

Part C. Q4-1.

On which sample would you perform MRD measurement ?

- Blood
- Bone marrow
- I think MRD is not relevant in MZL

Part C. Q4-2.

What technique would you preconize to perform MRD in a MZL trial ?

- Flow cytometry
- PCR

Part C. Q4-3

In a prognostic prospect, at what time from treatment start (in months) do you think it would be relevant to measure MRD ?

\_\_\_\_\_ (Please give a number IN MONTHS (e.g. write M2 if you mean 2 months))

---



---

**Part D. Endpoints definitions**

**As you are still setting up your trial, you're considering to use as clinical endpoints:**

**Progression-free survival, Event-free survival, Time to failure and Time to next treatment.**

Part D. Q1.

Considering Progression-free survival, what would you include in the definition of progression?

- Stable disease after induction (=2 months after treatment start)
- Progressive disease according to Cheson &al., 2014
- Relapse of disease
- Transformation of MZL into a DLBCL
- Add-on of a new therapy
- Grade 3-4 adverse events
- Treatment discontinuation due to adverse events
- Refusal of patient / Patient's consent withdrawal
- Lymphoma-related death
- Death from another origin than lymphoma
- Death of any cause
- Last follow-up

Part D. Q2.

Considering Event-free survival, what would you include in the definition of event?

- Stable disease after induction (=2 months after treatment start)
- Progressive disease according to Cheson &al., 2014
- Relapse of disease
- Transformation of MZL into a DLBCL
- Add-on of a new therapy
- Grade 3-4 adverse events
- Treatment discontinuation due to adverse events
- Refusal of patient / Patient's consent withdrawal
- Lymphoma-related death
- Death from another origin than lymphoma
- Death of any cause
- Last follow-up

Part D. Q3.

Considering Time to failure, what would you include in the definition of failure?

- Stable disease after induction (=2 months after treatment start)
- Progressive disease according to Cheson &al., 2014
- Relapse of disease
- Transformation of MZL into a DLBCL
- Add-on of a new therapy
- Grade 3-4 adverse events
- Treatment discontinuation due to adverse events
- Refusal of patient / Patient's consent withdrawal
- Lymphoma-related death
- Death from another origin than lymphoma
- Death of any cause
- Last follow-up

Part D. Q4.

Considering Time to next treatment, what would you include in the definition of next treatment?

- Stable disease after induction (=2 months after treatment start)
- Progressive disease according to Cheson &al., 2014
- Relapse of disease
- Transformation of MZL into a DLBCL
- Add-on of a new therapy
- Grade 3-4 adverse events
- Treatment discontinuation due to adverse events
- Refusal of patient / Patient's consent withdrawal
- Lymphoma-related death
- Death from another origin than lymphoma
- Death of any cause
- Last follow-up