

Durable clinical benefit with BCMA-directed therapy, belantamab mafodotin plus pomalidomide and dexamethasone in relapsed/refractory multiple myeloma: DREAMM-8 long-term responder analysis

Meletios A. Dimopoulos,^{1,2} Meral Bektaş,³ Sosana Delimpasi,⁴ Vladimir Vorobyev,⁵ Hang Quach,⁶ Ivan Špička,⁷ Jakub Radocha,⁸ Paweł Robak,⁹ Kihyun Kim,¹⁰ Syed Zafar,¹¹ Ainslee Moore,¹² Kristin Morris,¹³ Margaret Polinkovsky,¹⁴ Kelly Brock,¹⁴ Joanna Grams,¹⁵ Elisabet E. Manasanch,^{14,a} Maria-Victoria Mateos,¹⁶ Suzanne Trudel¹⁷

^a Institution where work was conducted.
¹ Department of Clinical Therapeutics, School of Medicine, National and Kapodistrian University of Athens, Athens, Greece; ² Department of Medicine, Korea University, Seoul, Republic of Korea; ³ Department of Hematology, Ankara Liv Hospital, Istinye University, Ankara, Turkey; ⁴ General Hospital Evangelismos, Athens, Greece; ⁵ Leningrad Regional Clinical Hospital, Saint Petersburg, Russian Federation; ⁶ University of Melbourne, St Vincent's Hospital Melbourne, Melbourne, VIC, Australia; ⁷ First Faculty of Medicine, Charles University and General Hospital, Prague, Czech Republic; ⁸ 4th Department of Internal Medicine – Hematology, University Hospital Hradec Králové, Charles University, Faculty of Medicine in Hradec Králové, Hradec Králové, Czech Republic; ⁹ Medical University of Łódź, Łódź, Poland; ¹⁰ Sungkyunkwan University, Samsung Medical Center, Seoul, Republic of Korea; ¹¹ Florida Cancer Specialists and Research Institute, Fort Myers, FL, USA; ¹² GSK, Stevenage, UK; ¹³ GSK, Durham, NC, USA; ¹⁴ GSK, Collegeville, PA, USA; ¹⁵ GSK, Warsaw, Poland; ¹⁶ Hematology Department, University Hospital of Salamanca/IBSAL/Cancer Research Center-IBMCC (USAL-CSIC), Salamanca, Spain; ¹⁷ Department of Medical Oncology and Hematology, Princess Margaret Cancer Centre, Toronto, ON, Canada

Background

- Targeting BCMA has transformed the RRMM treatment landscape, delivering unprecedented survival benefits over standard-of-care triplets^{1,2}
- Belamaf is an antibody-drug conjugate representing a unique BCMA-targeting modality that is accessible across all sites of care
- Belamaf, in combination with Pd, significantly improved PFS vs Pvd in the DREAMM-8 phase 3 trial (HR, 0.52; 95% CI, 0.37-0.73; *P*<0.001)³
- This post hoc analysis was conducted to investigate the characteristics of and outcomes in patients who achieved sustained clinical benefit with BPd and are considered LTRs

Conclusions

Almost 40% of patients treated with BPd achieved LTR status, representing a 2.5-fold higher rate than with Pvd

Higher LTR rates were also seen with BPd in patients with high-risk cytogenetics

BPd-treated LTRs had deeper responses compared with Pvd-treated LTRs

BPd-treated LTRs demonstrated a trend toward prolonged PFS and PFS2

The safety profile in LTRs (PFS ≥30 months) was generally consistent with previous reports in the overall safety population³

Methods

DREAMM-8 study design³

RRMM with ≥1 prior LOT, including lenalidomide

1:1 randomization

BPd

Belamaf 2.5 mg/kg IV (cycle 1), then 1.9 mg/kg IV Q4W from cycle 2 onward

pomalidomide 4 mg orally on days 1-21 (28-day cycles) + dexamethasone 40 mg^a orally on days 1, 8, 15, and 22

Pvd

Bortezomib 1.3 mg/m² SC on days 1, 4, 8, and 11 of cycles 1-8, then days 1 and 8 (21-day cycles) + pomalidomide 4 mg orally on days 1-14 (21-day cycles) + dexamethasone 20 mg^a orally on the day of and day after bortezomib

End-of-treatment visit

Treatment until disease progression, death, unacceptable toxicity, withdrawal of consent, or end of study

Primary endpoint: PFS (IRC assessed per IMWG)

Key secondary endpoints: OS, MRD negativity, DOR

Other secondary endpoints: ORR, CRR, ≥ VGPR, TTBR, TTP, PFS2,^b AEs, ocular findings, HRQOL, PROs

^a Patients aged >75 years with comorbidities or intolerance of the 40-mg dose in arm A or 20-mg dose in arm B could have dose level reduced to half per investigator discretion. ^b PFS2 was defined as time from randomization to disease progression after initiation of new antineoplastic therapy or death from any cause, whichever was earliest.

- This post hoc analysis evaluated baseline characteristics and clinical outcomes in LTRs, defined as patients who had PFS ≥30 months
- All patients who have remained on study have been on study for >30 months
 - Data cutoff: July 7, 2025; median follow-up, 36 months in both arms

Post hoc analysis in LTRs and non-LTRs

BPd

LTRs: patients who had PFS ≥30 months

Non-LTRs: patients who had PFS <30 months

Pvd

LTRs: patients who had PFS ≥30 months

Non-LTRs: patients who had PFS <30 months

Baseline characteristics and clinical outcomes

Results

The proportion of LTRs was higher with BPd, including patients with high-risk cytogenetics

LTRs and Non-LTRs in the BPd and Pvd Arms

Proportion of LTRs in Patients With High- and Standard-Risk Cytogenetics^a

^a High-risk cytogenetics was defined as the presence of ≥1 of the following: t(4;14), t(14;16), or del(17p13). Standard-risk cytogenetics was defined as negative results for all high-risk abnormalities: t(4;14), t(14;16), and del(17p13). Cytogenetic data were missing or nonevaluable in 12 BPd- and 3 Pvd-treated LTRs and 19 BPd- and 22 Pvd-treated non-LTRs.

- Of the 302 patients in DREAMM-8, 81 were LTRs

BPd-treated LTRs had deeper responses vs Pvd-treated LTRs

Treatment Responses in LTRs

BPd (n=59)

ORR: 97%^a (95% CI, 88.3%-99.6%)

sCR: 46 (n=27)

CR: 31 (n=18)

VGPR: 14 (n=8)

PR: 7 (n=4)

Pvd (n=22)

ORR: 100% (95% CI, 84.6%-100.0%)

sCR: 36 (n=5)

CR: 23 (n=5)

VGPR: 32 (n=7)

PR: 9 (n=2)

≥ CR: 76% (95% CI, 63.4%-86.4%)

≥ CR: 59% (95% CI, 36.4%-79.3%)

MRD Negativity (10⁻⁵) in LTRs With ≥ CR or ≥ VGPR^{b,c}

BPd

73% (33/45)

Pvd

54% (7/13)

BPd

66% (35/53)

Pvd

40% (8/20)

Overall MRD Negativity (10⁻⁵) in LTRs^d

BPd

56% (33/59)

Pvd

32% (7/22)

BPd

59% (35/59)

Pvd

36% (8/22)

BPd

39% (23/59)

Pvd

18% (4/22)

^a ORR was not 100% because 1 patient had minimal response, and 1 patient had stable disease. ^b MRD-negativity rate is defined as the percentage of patients who are MRD negative by next-generation sequencing at a sensitivity of 10⁻⁵ as assessed by an independent reviewer. ^c MRD-negativity rate calculated based on LTRs with ≥ CR or ≥ VGPR. ^d MRD-negativity rate calculated based on LTRs.

Treatment arms were generally balanced at baseline with a higher proportion of LTRs in earlier therapy lines

	LTRs BPd (n=59)	Pvd (n=22)
Female/male sex, n (%)	25 (42) / 34 (58)	12 (55) / 10 (45)
Age, median (range), years	65.0 (44-79)	69.5 (42-79)
ISS at screening, n (%)		
I	39 (66)	15 (68)
II	15 (25)	6 (27)
III	5 (8)	1 (5)
Line of therapy completed at screening, n (%)		
1	39 (66)	15 (68)
2	14 (24)	4 (18)
≥3	6 (10)	3 (14)

- The safety profile in LTRs was generally consistent with previous reports in the overall DREAMM-8 safety population³
- In BPd vs Pvd LTRs, exposure-adjusted rates per 100 patient-years of neutropenia^a (23.4 vs 21.1), infections^b (27.4 vs 27.6), and pneumonia (9.6 vs 9.2) were similar, as were exposure-adjusted rates of grade 3/4 events (30 vs 25)
- Grade ≥3 exposure-adjusted rates per 100-patient years of infections^b (17.8 vs 6.6) and pneumonia (8.1 vs 3.9) were higher for BPd vs Pvd LTRs

^a Neutropenia includes preferred terms febrile neutropenia, neutropenia, and neutrophil count decreased. ^b System organ class event.

BPd-treated LTRs demonstrated prolonged PFS that continued following first subsequent antineoplastic therapy

PFS

48 Months

84% (95% CI, 69%-92%)

76% (95% CI, 46%-91%)

PFS2

48 Months

82% (95% CI, 55%-94%)

80% (95% CI, 48%-93%)

PFS and PFS2 follow-up in the DREAMM-8 study is ongoing

Almost 40% of patients treated with BPd had prolonged remission as long-term responders (PFS ≥30 months), and >80% of these patients maintained PFS at 4 years

Digital poster

QR code

SCAN ME

