Check for updates





Blood 142 (2023) 2142-2143

The 65th ASH Annual Meeting Abstracts

POSTER ABSTRACTS

705.CELLULAR IMMUNOTHERAPIES: LATE PHASE AND COMMERCIALLY AVAILABLE THERAPIES

Development and Validation of a Clinical Prediction Model for the Efficacy of CD19 CAR T-Cell Therapy in DLBCL

Bin Xue, MD¹, Xiu Luo², Yifan Liu², Lili Zhou², Shiguang Ye, MD², Shaoguang Li, MD³, Ping Li², Aibin Liang, MD PhD²

¹Department of Hematology, Tongji Hospital of Tongji University, Shanghai, China

²Department of Hematology, Tongji Hospital of Tongji University, Shanghai, China

³Univ. of Massachusetts Medical School, Worcester, MA

Currently, Autologous CD19 chimeric antigen receptor T-cell therapy (CART) has become the most important treatment modality for relapsed or refractory diffuse large B-cell lymphoma (r/r DLBCL) beyond conventional multi-line treatments. However, it is worth noting that over 60% of CD19 CAR-T recipients will eventually experience relapse. A substantial amount of clinical research has been conducted to explore the reasons for the ineffectiveness or relapse of CAR-T therapy. Based on a comprehensive analysis of clinical data, we selected various combinations of predictive factors and used the TRIPOD guidelines to construct a logistic regression model for predicting the efficacy of CD19 CAR-T therapy.

This study was conducted as a retrospective cohort study, including patients with confirmed diagnosis of DLBCL who underwent CD19 CAR-T therapy and met the following criteria: (1) aged 18 years or older but not exceeding 80 years; (2) voluntarily participated in the study and signed an informed consent form. The exclusion criteria for this study were: (1) addition of other chemotherapy drugs or targeted drugs within 90 days before assessing the best response after infusion, except for those who achieved complete response (CR) or progressive disease (PD); (2) death caused by non-tumor progression factors within 90 days after infusion.

After the inclusion and exclusion criteria, a total of 54 patients with DLBCL undergoing CD19 CART at Shanghai Tongii Hospital of Tongji University ultimately participated in this study from January 1, 2019, to April 31, 2023. The derivation cohort consisted of 45 patients enrolled in clinical trials (NCT02537977, NCT03154775, CTR20201986, CTR20200561). The median age of the patients in the derivation cohort was 60 years (IQR: 50-67 years). Out of the 45 participants, 25 (55.6%) were male, and 29 (64.4%) had the non-germinal center B-cell (non-GCB) subtype, 1 had grade 3-4 Cytokine Release Syndrome (CRS). The validation cohort consisted of 9 patients involved in real-world studies. The median age of the patients in the validation cohort was 55 years (IQR: 52.5-69 years). Out of the 9 participants, 5 (55.6%) were male, and 6 (66.7%) had the non-GCB subtype, 2 had grade 3-4 CRS. The demographic and clinical characteristics of the derivation cohort were similar to those of the validation cohort. Based on the best CD19 CART response at 90 days, we divided the derivation cohort into two groups, CR and non-CR. Then, we selected a series of candidate predictive factors from baseline data such as clinical features, genetic features, and laboratory features before CART (Table 1). The results of univariate and multivariate logistic regression analysis were used to select specific factors (Gender, ECOG, TP53) as model prediction indicators based on p-values (p<0.05). There was no significant correlation between these factors (p>0.1). A score nomogram (Model1) was plotted using the regression coefficients of each predictive factor as weights (Fig.1 A), C-index (Model1) =0.872 (Fig.1 C). To facilitate better clinical use, we also constructed a risk nomogram (Model2) to assess the degree of risk (Fig.1 D). Model2 considers three factors: Male, ECOG≥2, TP53 altered. If a person has not any of these risk factors, they are categorized as low risk. If there is one risk factor present, they are deemed to be at moderate risk, whereas having two or more risk factors classifies them as high risk. C-index (Model2) =0.845 (Fig.1 F). Finally, the model's clinical efficacy was validated using real-world CART-treated patients, and the C-index was calculated as Model1=0.875 (Fig.1 G), Model2=0.7 (Fig.1 H), confirming the clinical impact of the model.

In conclusion, this study has successfully developed an easily implementable clinical prediction model. For the first time, we have used CART clinical studies as the derivation cohort and real-world results as the validation cohort. Our scoring system provides clinicians with accurate and objective efficacy information, helping them identify the appropriate population for CAR-T therapy in DLBCL.

Disclosures No relevant conflicts of interest to declare.

POSTER ABSTRACTS

Session 705

Jender 25:6 Male 25:5 Grantle 20:0 Age at enrollment 20:0 600y 21:1 600y 21:1 600y 21:1 600y 21:1 600y 21:1 600y 21:1 70:0 24:1 70:0 20:0 70:0 20:0 70:0 20:0 70:0 20:0 70:0 20:0 70:0 20:0 70:0 20:0 70:0 20:0 70:0 20:0 70:0 20:0 70:0 20:0 70:0 20:0 70:0 20:0 70:0 20:0 70:0 20:0 70:0 20:0 70:0 21:1 71:1 21:0 70:0 21:0 70:0 21:0 70:0 21:0	II N=45(%) CR N=16(*) (5(55.6) 5(31.3) 00(44.4) 11(88.8) 11(46.7) 6(37.5) 4(53.3) 10(62.5) 6(35.6) 8(50) 9(96.4.4) 8(50) 7(37.8) 9(37.5) 8(62.2) 10(62.5) 3(8.7) 2(12.5) 11(91.1) 14(87.5) 27(60) 13(81.3) 18(40) 3(18.8) 6(35.6) 6(37.5) 9(62.4) 10(62.5) 2(71.1) 14(87.5) 3(27.1) 14(62.5) 3(27.1) 14(67.5) 3(27.1) 14(67.5) 3(27.1) 14(67.5) 3(27.1) 14(67.5) 3(27.1) 14(67.5) 3(27.1) 14(67.5) 3(27.1) 14(67.5) 3(27.1) 14(67.5)	20(69.0) 9(31.0) 15(51.7) 14(483) 8(27.6) 21(72.4) 11(37.9) 18(62.1) 1(3.4) 28(96.6) 2(6.9) 27(93.1) 14(48.3) 15(51.7) 10(34.5) 19(65.5)) P 0.015 0.36 0.133 0.977 0.244 0.527 0.031 0.840 0.840	Pum Danter nu DOG 4 T190 4 Tata Pum Pan Pum Mont2 Rat			dan ta da ana ana ana ana ana ana ana ana ana	shability	The second secon		to the second se	00437 pm 01 12
lale 25 emale 20 ge at enrollment 21 80y 21 90y 24 80y 21 90y 24 80y 21 90y 24 90y 28 90y 24 91y 44 91y 44 91y 91y 91y 91y 91y 91y 91y 91y 91y 91y 91y 91y 91y	11(68.8) 11(68.7) 6(37.5) 14(53.3) 10(62.5) 6(35.6) 8(50) 13(64.4) 8(50) 7(37.8) 6(35.6) 8(62.2) 10(62.5) 3(6.7) 2(12.5) 2(33.3) 14(87.5) 4(8.9) 2(12.5) 11(91.1) 14(87.5) 27(60) 13(81.3) 8(40) 3(18.8) 6(35.6) 6(35.6) 9(36.4.4) 10(62.5) 12(71.1) 14(87.5)	9(31.0) 15(51.7) 14(483) 8(27.6) 21(72.4) 11(37.9) 18(62.1) 1(3.4) 28(96.6) 2(6.9) 27(93.1) 14(48.3) 15(51.7) 10(34.5) 10(34.5) 10(65.5)	0.36 0.133 0.977 0.244 0.527 0.031	1953 Tau Pans Pars Pars	<u></u>		in the second se	shability			0.4 0.8 1 - Specificity	and the second
emale 20) ge at enrollment	11(68.8) 11(68.7) 6(37.5) 14(53.3) 10(62.5) 6(35.6) 8(50) 13(64.4) 8(50) 7(37.8) 6(35.6) 8(62.2) 10(62.5) 3(6.7) 2(12.5) 2(33.3) 14(87.5) 4(8.9) 2(12.5) 11(91.1) 14(87.5) 27(60) 13(81.3) 8(40) 3(18.8) 6(35.6) 6(35.6) 9(36.4.4) 10(62.5) 12(71.1) 14(87.5)	9(31.0) 15(51.7) 14(483) 8(27.6) 21(72.4) 11(37.9) 18(62.1) 1(3.4) 28(96.6) 2(6.9) 27(93.1) 14(48.3) 15(51.7) 10(34.5) 10(34.5) 10(65.5)	0.133 0.977 0.244 0.527 0.031 0.840	1953 Tau Pans Pars Pars	<u></u>		ženor is ne is teor	shability			0.4 0.8 1 - Specificity	and the second second second
as at enrollment 60y 211 60y 214 ans classification 100 ICB 160 IGB 160 Ouble expression 280 ouble oble stression 280 ouble hit 280 tage at enrollment 420 II 441 COG at enrollment 122 1 282 2 18 2 18 2 19 2 18 2 18 2 18 2 18 2 18 2 18 2 18 2 19 2 19 4 20 10 21 2 10 2 10 2 10 2 10 2 10 2 10	11(46,7) 6(37,5) 14(53,3) 10(62,5) 6(35,6) 8(50) 9(64,4) 8(50) 7(37,8) 6(37,5) 8(62,2) 10(62,5) 2(12,5) 10(62,5) 3(6,7) 2(12,5) 14(67,5) 14(67,5) 27(60) 13(81,3) 18(40) 3(18,8) 6(35,6) 6(37,5) 9(96,4,4) 10(62,5) 12(71,1) 14(67,5)	15(51.7) 14(483) 8(27.6) 21(72.4) 11(37.9) 18(62.1) 1(3.4) 28(96.6) 2(6.9) 27(93.1) 14(48.3) 15(51.7) 10(34.5) 19(65.5)	0.133 0.977 0.244 0.527 0.031 0.840	1953 Tau Pans Pars Pars	<u></u>	E	2	shability			0.4 0.8 1 - Specificity	and the second second second
Soly 21 Soly 24 Soly 24 CB 161 GCB 29 ss 171 ss 171 ss 173 sage at enrollment 421 LI 44 SOG St enrollment 122 1 23 1 24 1 24 1 24 1 24 1 24 1 24 2 16 4 24 2 16 4 23 2 16 4 23 2 16 4 23 3 3 4 23 5 3 4 3 5 3 4 3 5 3 4 3 5<	14(53.3) 10(62.5) 6(35.6) 8(50) 19(64.4) 8(50) 7(37.8) 6(37.5) 18(62.2) 10(62.5) 3(6.7) 2(12.5) 12(93.3) 14(87.5) 4(8.9) 2(12.5) 11(91.1) 14(87.5) 27(60) 13(81.3) 18(40) 3(18.8) 6(35.6) 6(37.5) 19(64.4) 10(62.5) 12(71.1) 14(87.5)	14(483) 8(27.6) 21(72.4) 11(37.9) 18(62.1) 1(3.4) 28(96.6) 2(6.9) 27(93.1) 14(48.3) 15(51.7) 10(34.5) 19(65.5)	0.133 0.977 0.244 0.527 0.031 0.840	1953 Tau Pans Pars Pars	<u></u>		2	shability			0.4 0.8 1 - Specificity	and the second
Soy 24i ans classification CB CB 16i -GCB 29i ouble expression 29i ouble hit 29i os 17i o 28i ouble hit 30i cage at enrollment 41i LV 41i COG at enrollment 20i 1 20i 2 16i 4 20j 5 core 22i 5 corn 32i 5 corn 32	14(53.3) 10(62.5) 6(35.6) 8(50) 19(64.4) 8(50) 7(37.8) 6(37.5) 18(62.2) 10(62.5) 3(6.7) 2(12.5) 12(93.3) 14(87.5) 4(8.9) 2(12.5) 11(91.1) 14(87.5) 27(60) 13(81.3) 18(40) 3(18.8) 6(35.6) 6(37.5) 19(64.4) 10(62.5) 12(71.1) 14(87.5)	14(483) 8(27.6) 21(72.4) 11(37.9) 18(62.1) 1(3.4) 28(96.6) 2(6.9) 27(93.1) 14(48.3) 15(51.7) 10(34.5) 19(65.5)	0.977 0.244 0.527 0.031 0.840	1953 Tau Pans Pars Pars	<u></u>		in the second se	shability			0.4 0.8 1 - Specificity	and the second second second
ans classification CB 164 (GCB 264 (GCB 294 ouble expression ss 177 o 284 ouble hit ss 33 o 422 tage at enrollment II 4 LiV 414 COG at enrollment 1 22 1 3 core 2 4 160 1 4 20 1 3 core 2 5 cm 323 5 cm 323 5 cm 323	6(35.6) 8(50) 9(9(4.4) 8(50) 7(37.8) 6(37.5) 8(62.2) 10(62.5) 3(8.7) 2(12.5) 12(93.3) 14(87.5) 4(8.9) 2(12.5) 11(91.1) 14(87.5) 27(60) 13(81.3) 18(40) 3(18.8) 6(35.6) 6(37.5) 9:9(64.4) 10(62.5) 12(71.1) 14(87.5)	8(27.6) 21(72.4) 11(37.9) 18(62.1) 1(3.4) 28(96.6) 27(93.1) 14(48.3) 15(51.7) 10(34.5) 19(65.5)	0.977 0.244 0.527 0.031 0.840	1953 Tau Pans Pars Pars	<u></u>		in the second se	shability			0.4 0.8 1 - Specificity	and the second second second
CB 160 GCB 299 ouble expression es 177 o 280 rs 30 o 422 es 30 o 422 rs 30 o 422 rs 30 o 422 rs 30 rs 30	9964.4) 8(50) 7(37.8) 6(37.5) 8(52.2) 10(62.5) 3(6.7) 2(12.5) 12(93.3) 14(87.5) 4(8.9) 2(12.5) 11(91.1) 14(87.5) 27(60) 13(81.3) 18(40) 3(18.8) 6(35.6) 6(37.5) 9(64.4) 10(62.5) 12(71.1) 14(87.5)	21(72.4) 11(37.9) 18(62.1) 1(3.4) 28(66.6) 27(93.1) 14(48.3) 15(51.7) 10(34.5) 19(65.5)	0.977 0.244 0.527 0.031 0.840	tau Pana Ros D Pana Monte Pan	<u></u>	E E	inner is inner inner inner	shability			0.4 0.8 1 - Specificity	and the second
GCB 29 ouble expression 3 os. 17 o 28 ouble hit 3 o 42 tage at enrollment 41 L1V 41 L50F at mollment 21 2 16 4 29 12 16 4 29 5 cm 32	9964.4) 8(50) 7(37.8) 6(37.5) 8(52.2) 10(62.5) 3(6.7) 2(12.5) 12(93.3) 14(87.5) 4(8.9) 2(12.5) 11(91.1) 14(87.5) 27(60) 13(81.3) 18(40) 3(18.8) 6(35.6) 6(37.5) 9(64.4) 10(62.5) 12(71.1) 14(87.5)	21(72.4) 11(37.9) 18(62.1) 1(3.4) 28(66.6) 27(93.1) 14(48.3) 15(51.7) 10(34.5) 19(65.5)	0.244 0.527 0.031 0.840	tau Pana Ros D Pana Monte Pan	<u></u>	E Norman a	in in Presser	shability			0.4 0.8 1 - Specificity	and the second
suble expression es 17,7 log 28 bouble hit 28 suble hit 42 tage at enrollment 42 LiV 41 COG at enrollment 12 2 12 Pl score 20 44 20 uiky disease 32 5 cm 33 xtra-ndoual disease 33	7(37.8) 6(37.5) 8(82.2) 10(82.5) 10(82.2) 10(82.5) 2(93.3) 2(12.5) 14(87.5) 2(12.5) 11(91.1) 14(87.5) 27(60) 13(81.3) 18(40) 3(18.8) 6(35.6) 6(37.5) 9(964.4) 10(62.5) 12(71.1) 14(87.5)	11(37.9) 18(62.1) 1(3.4) 28(96.6) 2(6.9) 27(93.1) 14(48.3) 15(51.7) 10(34.5) 19(65.5)	0.244 0.527 0.031 0.840	nas D Pores Moder Ins	<u></u>	E S S S S S S S S S S S S S S S S S S S	in ne in near the nea	shability			0.4 0.8 1 - Specificity	and the second second second
ouble expression es 177 o 230 ouble hit 230 ouble hit 420 tage at enrollment II 44 I-I√ 410 COG at enrollment 21 2 2 12 2 3 20 2 5	7(37.8) 6(37.5) 8(82.2) 10(82.5) 10(82.2) 10(82.5) 2(93.3) 2(12.5) 14(87.5) 2(12.5) 11(91.1) 14(87.5) 27(60) 13(81.3) 18(40) 3(18.8) 6(35.6) 6(37.5) 9(964.4) 10(62.5) 12(71.1) 14(87.5)	11(37.9) 18(62.1) 1(3.4) 28(96.6) 2(6.9) 27(93.1) 14(48.3) 15(51.7) 10(34.5) 19(65.5)	0.244 0.527 0.031 0.840	nas D Pores Moder Ins	<u></u>	E S	in is nation to be	shability			0.4 0.8 1 - Specificity	and the second second second
es 17/ o 280 es 280 o 422 es 33 o 422 Hit 44 LaV 441 LaV 441 L	88(62.2) 10(62.5) 3(6.7) 2(12.5) 12(93.3) 14(87.5) 4(8.9) 2(12.5) 11(91.1) 14(87.5) 27(60) 13(81.3) 18(40) 3(18.8) 6(35.6) 6(37.5) 9(64.4) 10(62.5) 12(71.1) 14(87.5)	18(62.1) 1(3.4) 28(96.6) 27(93.1) 14(48.3) 15(51.7) 10(34.5) 19(65.5)	0.244 0.527 0.031 0.840	nas D Pores Moder Ins	<u></u>	E Support	in ta Anna ta Nationa ta Nationa National National	shability			0.4 0.8 1 - Specificity	and the second second second
lo 28) ouble hit es 33, io 42; tage at enrollment II 4 II 4 II 4 II 4 II 2 COG at enrollment -1 27 12 16 Pl score -2 16 4 29 ulty disease 5 cm 323 5 cm 323	88(62.2) 10(62.5) 3(6.7) 2(12.5) 12(93.3) 14(87.5) 4(8.9) 2(12.5) 11(91.1) 14(87.5) 27(60) 13(81.3) 18(40) 3(18.8) 6(35.6) 6(37.5) 9(64.4) 10(62.5) 12(71.1) 14(87.5)	18(62.1) 1(3.4) 28(96.6) 27(93.1) 14(48.3) 15(51.7) 10(34.5) 19(65.5)	0.527	Pura Mote2 Risk	<u></u>	E normania	in in Producer Pro	shability			0.4 0.8 1 - Specificity	and the second
ouble hit 3 es 3 tage at enrollment 42 til 4 LV 41 COG at enrollment 2 1 22 Pl score 2 -2 16 -3 20 Uky disease 20 5 cm 32 5 cm 32 5 cm 32 5 cm 33 xtra-ndoual disease 33	3(6,7) 2(12.5) 12(93.3) 14(8.7,5) 4(8.9) 2(12.5) 11(91.1) 14(87.5) 27(60) 13(81.3) 18(40) 3(18.8) 6(35.6) 6(37.5) 9(964.4) 10(62.5) 12(71.1) 14(87.5)	1(3.4) 28(96.6) 27(93.1) 14(48.3) 15(51.7) 10(34.5) 19(65.5)	0.527	Pura Mote2 Risk	<u></u>	E Numerour start	nin in Producto Pr	shability			0.4 0.8 1 - Specificity	and the second
es 3) o 422 (o 422) II 44 II 44 I-1-V 41 ICOG at enrollment -1 22 2 16 2 2 18 core -2 16 4 29 5 cm 322 5 cm 322 5 cm 323	2(293.3) 14(87.5) 4(8.9) 2(12.5) 11(91.1) 14(87.5) 27(60) 13(81.3) 18(40) 3(18.8) 6(35.6) 6(37.5) 9(96.4.4) 10(62.5) 12(71.1) 14(87.5)	28(96.6) 2(6.9) 27(93.1) 14(48.3) 15(51.7) 10(34.5) 19(65.5)	0.527	Pura Mote2 Risk	<u></u>	E S S S S S S S S S S S S S S S S S S S	anina, bet Predicted The Mode	shability			1 - Specificity	/
o 422 tage at enrollment II 4 IV 411 COG at enrollment 1 22 18 score -2 16 4 291 uiky disease 5 cm 322 5 cm 332 5 cm 33	2(293.3) 14(87.5) 4(8.9) 2(12.5) 11(91.1) 14(87.5) 27(60) 13(81.3) 18(40) 3(18.8) 6(35.6) 6(37.5) 9(96.4.4) 10(62.5) 12(71.1) 14(87.5)	28(96.6) 2(6.9) 27(93.1) 14(48.3) 15(51.7) 10(34.5) 19(65.5)	0.031	Pura Mote2 Risk		E Statement work		a	F	2	Model2 ROC	/
tage at enrollment 4 II 4 I-Iv 4 COG at enrollment 2 1 22 2 16 Pl score 2 -2 16 -4 20 uiky disease 32 5 cm 32 5 cm 32 5 cm 32	4(8.9) 2(12.5) 11(91.1) 14(87.5) 27(60) 13(81.3) 18(40) 3(18.8) 6(35.6) 6(37.5) 9(64.4) 10(62.5) 12(71.1) 14(87.5)	2(6.9) 27(93.1) 14(48.3) 15(51.7) 10(34.5) 19(65.5)	0.031	Points		Anna Primary Mark	/			2	_	/
II 44 I-I√ 41 I-I√ 21 2 2 12 2 2 12 2 2 12 4 20 4 29 5 cm 322 5 cm 322 5 cm 324 5 cm 324	i1(91.1) 14(87.5) 27(60) 13(81.3) 18(40) 3(18.8) 6(35.6) 6(37.5) i9(64.4) 10(62.5) i2(71.1) 14(87.5)	27(93.1) 14(48.3) 15(51.7) 10(34.5) 19(65.5)	0.031	Poins Model? Risk		Annual Permanan A	/	/	Avenue	z - z		/
-IV 411 COG at enrollment 1 27 2 1 score 2 16 4 299 ulky disease 5 cm 322 5 cm 332 5 cm 33	i1(91.1) 14(87.5) 27(60) 13(81.3) 18(40) 3(18.8) 6(35.6) 6(37.5) i9(64.4) 10(62.5) i2(71.1) 14(87.5)	27(93.1) 14(48.3) 15(51.7) 10(34.5) 19(65.5)	0.840	Model? Real and		Annand Research	/		Aurona	z	/	
LIV 411 COG at enrollment 2 -1 27 14 20 15 5 4 294 uiky disease 322 5 5 5 133 xtra-nodual disease 324	i1(91.1) 14(87.5) 27(60) 13(81.3) 18(40) 3(18.8) 6(35.6) 6(37.5) i9(64.4) 10(62.5) i2(71.1) 14(87.5)	27(93.1) 14(48.3) 15(51.7) 10(34.5) 19(65.5)	0.840	Model2 Flok		Amount of the second second	/		Benthely	1	/	
COG at enrollment 21 -1 21 2 16 4 20 ulky disease 21 5 cm 32 5 cm 32 5 cm 33 xtra-nodual disease 33	27(60) 13(81.3) 18(40) 3(18.8) 6(35.6) 6(37.5) 9(64.4) 10(62.5) 12(71.1) 14(87.5)	14(48.3) 15(51.7) 10(34.5) 19(65.5)	0.840	Model2 Plank		to the second second	/		August			
-1 27 2 18 2 2 18 4 score -2 16 4 29 5 4 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5	18(40) 3(18.8) 6(35.6) 6(37.5) 19(64.4) 10(62.5) 12(71.1) 14(87.5)	15(51.7) 10(34.5) 19(65.5)	0.840	Node2 flak		Numerou aver	/		formers,	z- /		
2 18 Pl score -2 16(-2 26(-2 27) -2 16(-2	18(40) 3(18.8) 6(35.6) 6(37.5) 19(64.4) 10(62.5) 12(71.1) 14(87.5)	15(51.7) 10(34.5) 19(65.5)		Nodec Plan	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	1	/	/	(instant)			
11 score 16 2 16 24 29 ulky disease 32 5 cm 32 5 cm 13 xtra-nodual disease 32	6(35.6) 6(37.5) 19(64.4) 10(62.5) 12(71.1) 14(87.5)	10(34.5) 19(65.5)		Tool Points			/		1	. /		
2 16(4 29) ulky disease 5 cm 32(5 cm 13) xtra-nodual disease	10(62.5) (2(71.1) 14(87.5)	19(65.5)		Total Points		a .				- /		
-4 29i ulky disease 5 cm 32i 5 cm 13i xtra-nodual disease	10(62.5) (2(71.1) 14(87.5)	19(65.5)	0.072	Total Points	10 00 00 at 10 00 00 00 00 00	2.				a 1		
ulky disease 5 cm 32 5 cm 13/ xtra-nodual disease	12(71.1) 14(87.5)		0.072	Total Points								
5 cm 32 5 cm 13 ktra-nodual disease			0.072									
5 cm 13 xtra-nodual disease		10100								21/		
5 cm 13 xtra-nodual disease		18(62.1)				2. /				1/		
xtra-nodual disease		11(37.9)						- Dan G	constant .	s. 1	- A4	IC-0.845 (95% C)
	ofenio) e(reio)		0.977	Fish -		¥	ú ú			00 02		0.8
	7(37.8) 6(37.5)	11(37.9)	0.017		ជ បំ មំ សំ មំ បំ បំ	8+ 1000 cm	ettion, tool Predicted	Probability	140.837 6448		1 - Specificity	
S				G								
	8(62.2) 10(62.5)	18(62.1)		G	Model1 ROC	н	Model	ROC				
rior lines of therapy			<0.001	2 -		7 2			/			
-3 17	7(37.8) 12(75)	5(17.2)			/			/				
lines 28	8(62.2) 4(25)	24(82.8)						//				
P53			0.003	0	/			///				
/T 26	6(57.8) 14(87.5)	12(41.4)					/	/ /				
Itered 19	9(42.2) 2(12.5)	17(58.6)		5 -	/	3-	/					
AR-T costimulatory domain			1	1 /		1	/					
	16(100)	29(100)		1		1	/ /					
				31		31						
	0(0) 0(0)	0(0)	0.107									
rior ASCT			0.427	2		2						
	6(13.3) 3(18.8)	3(10.3)				1 2						
o 39	9(86.7) 13(81.3)	26(89.7)										
rior CART			1	2-2-		9 2 2		- AUC-07 (8% C) 0.46	6.0.94)			
es 1(1(2.2) 0(0)	1(3.4)		0.0	02 04 08 68 10	0 60	0.2 0.4	6.8 0.8	5.0			
o 44	4(97.8) 16(100)	28(96.6)		Figure 1 Devel	opment and validation of the predi	iction model	3 - 84	wolkely				
	2.3(21.9) 110.8(19.6		0.053		r predicting CART response based		vation cohort were	shown, Model1(A)	and Model2	(D). Model1 c	predicted the poor	CART
	4.3(2.0) 4.371(1.8		0.867	response prob	abilities between 0.2-0.9 for total in	ntegrals betw	een 20-140. Mode	12 predicted the poo	or CART re	sponse probal	bilities between 0.	1-0.9 for
				integrals betwe	en 0-100.							
	7.4(72.1) 164.0(62.4		0.66		curve based on the Hosmer-Lemi							
	3.20,26.59) 4.99(2.46,8.			Brier Score=0. R2=0.356.	127, Cox-Snell R2=0.528, Nagelke	erke R2=0.3	94. (E) Calibration	curve of the Model2	. Brier Scol	re=0.135, Cox	<-snell R2=0.488,	Nagelke
DH ,median(IQR) 243(1	(188,348) 207(180,26	8) 268(218,360)	0.058		perating characteristic curve (ROC) and area -	nder the curve /Al	C) were used to as	spec the di	scrimination a	and predictive value	in of the
erritin ,median(IQR) 247(9	(97.6,669) 214(45.5,29	3) 433.8(114.3,795)	0.07		diction model. The grading of the o							

Figure 1

https://doi.org/10.1182/blood-2023-184885