Ph3 results of the ULTIMATEI&II global studies: Ublituximab v. teriflunomide in RMS

Lawrence Steinman, MD¹; Edward Fox, MD, PhD²; Hans-Peter Hartung, MD³⁻⁶; Enrique Alvarez, MD, PhD⁷; Peiging Qian, MD⁸; Sibyl Wray, MD⁹; Derrick Robertson, MD¹⁰; DeRen Huang, MD, PhD¹¹; Krzysztof Selmaj, MD, PhD^{12, 13}; Daniel Wynn, MD¹⁴; Douglas Arnold, MD¹⁷, Michael S. Weiss¹⁵, Jenna A. Bosco¹⁵, Sean A. Power¹⁵, Koby Mok, PhD¹⁵; Bruce Cree, MD, PhD, MAS¹⁶

1Stanford University, Stanford, CA, USA 2Central Texas Neurology Consultants, Round Rock, TX, USA 3Heinrich Heine University, Dusseldorf, Germany, 4Brain and Mind Centre, University of Sydney, Australia, 5Department of Neurology, Medical University of Vienna, Vienna Austria 6Department of Neurology, Palacky University, Olomouc, Czech Republic 7University of Colorado, Aurora, CO, USA 8Swedish Medical Center, Seattle, WA, USA 9Hope Neurology, Knoxville, TN, USA 10University of South Florida, Tampa, FL, USA 11Center for Multiple Sclerosis, Mount Carrnel Health System, Westerville, OH, USA, 12Center of Neurology, Lodz, Poland, 13University of Warmia & Mazury, Olsztyn, Poland 14Consultants in Neurology, Northbrook, IL, USA 15TG Therapeutics, New York, NY, USA 16UCSF Weill Institute for Neurosciences, University of California San Francisco, CA, USA17Brain Imaging Center at the Montreal Neurological Institute, Montreal, Canad

INTRODUCTION

Background and Objectives

- Ublituximab is a novel monoclonal antibody that targets a unique epitope of CD20 (Figure 1) and is glycoengineered for enhanced antibody-dependent cellular cytotoxicity
- Ublituximab is administered in lower doses with shorter infusion times than other currently available anti-CD20 therapies

<u>Primary Objective</u>

To evaluate the efficacy and safety of ublituximab compared with teriflunomide in patients with relapsing multiple sclerosis

Primary Endpoint (by individual study):

ARR at 96 wks (number of confirmed MS relapses in a year)

Pre-specified Pooled Analysis:

Time to CDP for at least 12 weeks Time to CDP for at least 24 weeks Time to CDI for at least 12 weeks Time to CDI for at least 24 weeks

Patient Disposition & Analysis Population

Figure 3. Patient Disposition and Analysis Population

Patients screened	ULTIMA N = 67	TE I 3	ULTIM N = 6	ATE II 560
Patients randomized	flunomide N = 275	Iblituximab N = 274	Teriflunomide N = 273	Ublituximab N = 272
Discontinued Treatment Adverse event	→ 23 (8.4) 1 (0.4)	→ 34 (12.4) • 17 (6.2)	→ 34 (12.5)	→ 18 (6.6)
 Withdrawal of consent 	15 (5.5)	• 6 (2.2)	• 23 (8.4)	• 6 (2.2)
 Investigator decision 	2 (0.7)	4 (1.5)	2 (0.7)	2 (0.7)
 Pregnancy 	• •	2 (0.7)	1 (0.4)	4 (1.5)
 Lost to follow-up 	2 (0.7)	2 (0.7)	2 (0.7)	• •
 Lack of efficacy 	2 (0.7)	2 (0.7)	2 (0.7)	• •
 Others* 	1 (0.4)	1 (0.4)	3 (1.1)	3 (1.1)
Completed Treatment 252 (91.6) 240 (87.6) 239 (87.5) 254 (93.4)				

Data represented as n (%). *Others include: alternative treatment and COVID-19.

MRI: T1 and T2 Lesions





dependent cytotoxicity; D: day; MS: multiple sclerosis; wk: week. a Initial infusion time over 4 hours; b Initial infusion time over 2.5 hours ; *after initial

Demographics and Disease Characteristics

Study Design



*After completing Week 96, patients entered into a 20-week safety follow-up and were eligible to enroll into an open-label extension

Weeks

RESULTS

Primary Endpoint

ULTIMATE I (N = 545) ULTIMATE II (N = 544) Characteristi Mean ± standard deviation of 37.0 ± 9.63 34.5 ± 8.76 178 (65.4) Age, year 36.2 ± 8.2 36.2 ± 8.96 166 (61.3) 176 (64.7) Sex, Female, n (%) 179 (65.3) Race, % 266 (97.1) 264 (97.4) 268 (98.5) 269 (98.9) Caucasiar African America 6 (2.2) 3 (1.1) 2 (0.7) Type of MS, n (%) Relapsing Remitt 270 (98.5) 264 (97.4) 267 (98.2) 268 (98.5) 7 (2.6) Secondary Progressiv 5 (1.8) 4 (1.5) 4 (1.5) Duration of MS since first 6.81 ± 5.89 7.52 ± 6.48 7.39 ± 6.26 7.31 ± 6.52 symptoms, years Previously untreated*, n (%) 162 (59.1) 162 (59.8) 155 (57.0) 138 (50.7) Number of relapses in last 12 1.4 ± 0.67 1.3 ± 0.65 1.2 ± 0.65 1.3 ± 0.65 Number of relapses in last 2.0 ± 1.11 1.8 ± 0.96 1.8 ± 0.92 1.8 ± 0.94 EDSS at screening 2.89 ± 1.17 2.96 ± 1.21 2.96 ± 1.20 2.80 ± 1.31 T2 lesion volume, cm 14.9 ± 15.8 15.9 ± 16.0 15.7 ± 17.5 14.7 ± 13.5 64.0 ± 41.23 Number of T2 lesi 60.4 ± 37.01 64.1 ± 38.59 65.3 ± 41.23 Patients free of Gd+T1 156 (57.4) 153 (56.7) 131 (48.2) 135 (50.0) lesions, n (%) Number of Gd+ T1 lesions at 1.6 ± 3.67 2.6 ± 5.77 2.3 ± 5.47 2.5 ± 5.47

Figure 4. Annualized Relapse Rate (ARR)



least one baseline and post-baseline efficacy assessment. Based on negative binomial model (GEE) for the relapse count per subject with logarithmic link function, treatment, region, and baseline EDSS strata as covariates and log (years of treatment) as offset. Cl: confidence interval

Disability



Table 1. Baseline Demographics and Disease Characteristics

Modified Intent-to-Treat population: All patients in the ITT population who received at least one dose of study drug and had at least on baseline and post-baseline efficacy assessment. *Untreated with disease-modifying therapy in 5 years prior to study entry. DMT: disease-modifying therapy; EDSS: expanded disability status scale; Gd+: gadolinium-enhancing; MS: multiple sclerosis.

The modified Inte



el (GEE) with loga ne EDSS strata, baseline number of lesions (o/>=1) and an offset based on the log-transformed number of post-baseline MRI scans. MRI assessed by Independent Revie

No Evidence of Disease Activity (NEDA)

Figure 7. NEDA

2.5.



The modified Intention-to-Treat (mITT) population consists of all subjects in the ITT population who received at least one dose of study medication and had at least one baseline and post-baseline efficacy assessment. Logistic regression model with covariates treatment, region, baseline EDSS strata and log transformed baseline MRI counts (T1 unenhancing, T2, Gd enhancing).

Immunoglobulins





increase

Safety

Table 2a: Most Common Adverse Events

Most common AEs, n (%) ≥5% in any treatment group	Teriflunomide N=548	
Any AE	486 (88.7)	483 (88.6)
IRR	67 (12.2)	260 (47.7)
Headache	138 (25.2)	165 (30.3)
Nasopharyngitis	96 (17.5)	97 (17.8)
Lymphopenia	5 (0.9)	51 (9.4)
Back pain	53 (9.7)	48 (8.8)
Respiratory tract infection viral	31 (5.7)	41 (7.5)
Respiratory tract infection	38 (6.9)	40 (7.3)
Upper respiratory tract infection	33 (6.0)	39 (7.2)
Diarrhea	53 (9.7)	36 (6.6)
Lymphocyte count decreased	9 (1.6)	34 (6.2)
Abdominal pain	17 (3.1)	32 (5.9)
Pharyngitis	11 (2.0)	31 (5.7)
Pyrexia	23 (4.2)	30 (5.5)
Insomnia	16 (2.9)	28 (5.1)
Nausea	26 (4.7)	28 (5.1)
Hypertension	35 (6.4)	19 (3.5)
Alopecia	84 (15.3)	18 (3.3)

12.0%

Three total malignancies were reported 2 ublituximab (endometrial, uterine) versus 1 teriflunomide (tongue) Three total deaths occurred Ublituximab: pneumonia, encephalitis (post-measles), salpingitis 1 death was deemed possibly related to treatment (pneumonia) No cases of progressive multifocal leukoencephalopathy (PML)

Table 2b. Serious Adverse Events

	Teriflunomide	Ublituximab
SAEs, n (%)	N = 548	N = 545
Any serious AEs	34 (6.2)	52 (9.5)
Most common SAEs by SOC ≥1% in any treatment group		
Infections and infestations	14 (2.6)	22 (4.0)
Nervous system disorders	7 (1.3)	5 (0.9)
AE: serious adverse event; SOC: system organ class		

CONCLUSIONS

- In the Phase III ULTIMATE I & II studies ublituximab met its primary endpoint of ARR and reduced MRI parameters compared with teriflunomide
- A very low rate of disability progression was observed with ublituximab, with >94% of patients showing no 12week CDP, and >96% of patients showing no 24-week CDP, although neither was statistically different from teriflunomide
- In a pre-specified pooled tertiary analysis, ublituximab increased the proportion of patients with 12-week CDI and 24-week CDI
- A significantly higher percentage of patients treated with ublituximab achieved NEDA compared with teriflunomide
- Ublituximab exhibited a favorable safety and tolerability profile with no unexpected safety signals
- These data are being prepared for marketing authorization application submissions in the US and EU

In ULTIMATE I & ULTIMATE II, ublituximab, a one-hour infusion, demonstrated robust efficacy and a favorable safety profile that benefited RMS patients

Acknowledgements: We thank the patients and their families for participating in the ULTIMATE I and II studies.

Presented at the 29th Annual Meeting of the European Charcot Foundation, 14-18 November 2021