QuANTUM-First: Efficacy by Age in Newly Diagnosed Patients With FMS-Like Tyrosine Kinase **3-Internal Tandem Duplication–Positive Acute Myeloid Leukemia**

BACKGROUND

- The phase 3 QuANTUM-First study (NCT02668653) demonstrated that the addition of the oral, highly potent, second-generation, and selective type 2 FMS-like tyrosine kinase 3 (FLT3) inhibitor quizartinib to standard induction and consolidation chemotherapy and/or allogeneic hematopoietic cell (allo-HCT), followed by continuation monotherapy with quizartinib or placebo for up to 36 cycles, resulted in a clinically meaningful and statistically significant improvement in overall survival (OS) versus standard therapy (placebo group) in patients 18-75 years of age with newly diagnosed *FLT3*-internal tandem duplication (ITD)–positive acute myeloid leukemia (AML)¹
- Quizartinib treatment reduced the relative risk of death by 22.4% versus placebo (hazard ratio [HR], 0.776; 95% confidence interval (CI)
- 0.615-0.979; *P*=0.0324)¹ In a post hoc subgroup analysis of OS by age group (<60 years vs ≥60 years), the HR for OS was 0.684 (95% CI, 0.493-0.949) in patients <60 years</p> of age and 0.911 (95% CI, 0.658-1.263) in patients ≥60 years of age¹
- Quizartinib has recently been approved in the United States (US),^{2,3} European Union (EU),^{4,5} and Japan⁶ in combination with chemotherapy across induction, consolidation, and as maintenance monotherapy (but not after transplantation in the US) for the treatment of adult patients with newly diagnosed FLT3-ITD-positive AML

OBJECTIVES

• To further evaluate the impact of age (<60 years vs ≥60 years) on the efficacy of quizartinib in patients with newly diagnosed FLT3-ITD-positive AML, b analyzing rates and duration of complete remission (CR), cumulative incidence of relapse (CIR), relapse-free survival (RFS), rates of allo-HCT in the first CR (CR1), and impact of allo-HCT in CR1 on OS and event-free survival (EFS)

METHODS

- A detailed description of the QuANTUM-First study has been previously published¹
- Eligible adult patients (18-75 years of age) with newly diagnosed FLT3-ITD-positive AML were randomized 1:1 to receive standard induction chemotherapy with either guizartinib (40 mg/day) or placebo and stratified by region (EU, North America, or Asia/Australia/South America), age (<60 years vs ≥ 60 years), and white blood cell (WBC; $< 40 \times 10^9$ /L vs $\geq 40 \times 10^9$ /L) count at diagnosis¹
- Patients who achieved CR or CR with incomplete hematologic recovery received ≤ 4 cycles of standard consolidation chemotherapy (cytarabine 3 g/m²/ dose for patients <60 years of age and 1.5 g/m²/dose for patients \geq 60 years of age) plus quizartinib (40 mg/day) or placebo and/or allo-HCT, followed by 36 cycles (≈3 years) of continuation monotherapy with quizartinib (30-60 mg/day) or placebo¹
- OS and EFS were calculated in the intent-to-treat population, consisting of all randomized patients
- Duration of CR, CIR, and RFS were calculated in patients who achieved CR at the end of induction, per independent review committee
- The rates of CR were reported along with the 2-sided 95% CIs estimated according to the Clopper-Pearson method
- CIR was calculated from randomization; a competing risk analysis, with death from any cause as a competing risk, was used to compute the curves for CIR • The medians of duration of CR, RFS, OS, and EFS were calculated using the Kaplan-Meier method, the 2-sided 95% CIs using the method of Brookmeyer–Crowley, and the HRs with the 95% CI using unstratified Cox regression
- *P* values were not adjusted for multiplicity
- All the analyses presented are post hoc analyses
- Analysis of the frequency and severity of adverse events (AE) were conducted on the safety analysis set (defined as all patients who received ≥1 dose of study drug). Grading and management of AEs was as per investigator

RESULTS

Patient and Baseline Characteristics by Age Group

- In QuANTUM-First, 539 patients were randomized to receive either guizartinib (n=268) or placebo (n=271)¹
- Of 539 randomized patients in QuANTUM-First, 323 (59.9%) were <60 years of age (quizartinib, n=161; placebo, n=162) and 216 (40.1%) were ≥60 years of age (quizartinib, n=107; placebo, n=109; **Table 1**)
- More patients ≥ 60 years of age had an Eastern Cooperative Oncology Group performance status of 1-2 (72.2%) than patients <60 years of age (61.0%; Table 1)
- More patients ≥ 60 years of age had NPM1 mutations (61.1%) than patients <60 years of age (46.4%; **Table 1**)
- More patients ≥60 years of age had a lower count of WBCs at diagnosis (55.6%) than patients aged <60 years (47.1%; **Table 1**)

Table 1. Baseline Characteristics by Age Group (ITT Analysis Set)

	<60 yea	rs of age	≥60 years of age			
Patient characteristics	Quizartinib (n=161)	Placebo (n=162)	Quizartinib (n=107)	Placebo (n=109)		
Age						
Median (range), years	48 (23-59)	49 (20-59)	66 (60-75)	66 (60-75)		
ECOG PS, n (%)						
0	57 (35.4)	68 (42.0)	30 (28.0)	30 (27.5)		
1	75 (46.6)	73 (45.1)	59 (55.1)	63 (57.8)		
2	29 (18.0)	20 (12.3)	18 (16.8)	16 (14.7)		
1-2	104 (64.6)	93 (57.4)	77 (72.0)	79 (72.5)		
Missing	0	1 (0.6)	0	0		
Cytogenetic risk status, n (%)						
Favorable	11 (6.8)	14 (8.6)	3 (2.8)	5 (4.6)		
Intermediate	115 (71.4)	114 (70.4)	82 (76.6)	79 (72.5)		
Unfavorable	12 (7.5)	17 (10.5)	7 (6.5)	10 (9.2)		
Unknown	23 (14.3)	16 (9.9)	15 (14.0)	15 (13.8)		
Mutated <i>NPM1</i> , n (%)	76 (47.2)	74 (45.7)	66 (61.7)	66 (60.6)		
Mutated <i>CEBPA</i> , n (%)	21 (13.0)	12 (7.4)	7 (6.5)	12 (11.0)		
AML with myelodysplasia-related changes	11 (6.8)	7 (4.3)	12 (11.2)	9 (8.3)		
AML type, n (%)						
De novo AML	150 (93.2)	154 (95.1)	93 (86.9)	101 (92.7)		
Secondary AML	11 (6.8)	8 (4.9)	14 (13.1)	8 (7.3)		
<i>FLT3</i> -ITD/total <i>FLT3</i> , n (%)						
≥3% to ≤25%	53 (32.9)	60 (37.0)	41 (38.3)	38 (34.9)		
>25% to ≤50%	87 (54.0)	81 (50.0)	56 (52.3)	57 (52.3)		
>50%	21 (13.0)	21 (13.0)	9 (8.4)	14 (12.8)		
>25%	108 (67.1)	102 (63.0)	65 (60.7)	71 (65.1)		
Unknown	0	0	1 (0.9)	0		
WBC count at diagnosis of AML, n (%)						
<40×10 ⁹ /L	75 (46.6)	77 (47.5)	60 (56.1)	60 (55.0)		
≥40×10 ⁹ /L	86 (53.4)	85 (52.5)	47 (43.9)	49 (45.0)		
AML, acute myeloid leukemia; CEBPA=CCAAT enhancer-binding protein alpha	; ECOG PS, Eastern Cooperative Oncolog	gy Group performance status; <i>FLT</i> 3	- B-ITD, FMS-like tyrosine kinase 3–i	nternal tandem duplication;		

ITT, intent-to-treat: NPM1=nucleophosmin 1: WBC, white blood cell.

Karima Imadalou,¹¹ Abderrahmane Laadem,¹¹ Pau Montesinos¹²

¹Duke Cancer Institute, Durham, NC, USA; ²Institute of Hematology and Blood Transfusion, Warsaw, Poland; ³Augusta University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia, PA, USA; ⁵Sylvester Cancer Center, University of Miami Health System, Miami, FL, USA; ⁶Saint Louis Hospital, Tianjin, China; ⁹Division of Hematologic Malignancies, Johns Hopkins University, Baltimore, MD, USA; ⁶Saint Louis Hospital, Tianjin, China; ⁹Division of Hematologic Malignancies, Johns Hopkins University, Baltimore, MD, USA; ⁶Saint Louis Hospital, Tianjin, China; ⁹Division of Hematologic Malignancies, Johns Hopkins University, Baltimore, MD, USA; ⁶Saint Louis Hospital, Tianjin, China; ⁹Division of Hematologic Malignancies, Johns Hopkins University, Baltimore, MD, USA; ⁶Saint Louis Hospital, Tianjin, China; ⁹Division of Hematologic Malignancies, Johns Hopkins University, Baltimore, MD, USA; ⁶Saint Louis Hospital, Tianjin, China; ⁹Division of Hematologic Malignancies, Johns Hopkins University, Baltimore, MD, USA; ⁶Saint Louis Hospital, Tianjin, China; ⁹Division of Hematologic Malignancies, Johns Hopkins University, Baltimore, MD, USA; ⁶Saint Louis Hospital, Tianjin, China; ⁹Division of Hematologic Malignancies, Johns Hopkins University, Baltimore, MD, USA; ⁶Saint Louis Hospital, Tianjin, China; ⁹Division of Hematologic Malignancies, Johns Hopkins University, Baltimore, MD, USA; ⁶Saint Louis Hospital, Tianjin, China; ⁹Division of Hematologic Malignancies, Johns Hopkins University, Baltimore, MD, USA; ⁹Division of Hematologic Malignancies, Johns Hopkins University, Baltimore, MD, USA; ⁹Division of Hematologic Malignancies, Johns Hopkins, Songer, Song ¹⁰National Center of Tumor Diseases Trial Center, Germany; ¹¹Daiichi Sankyo, Inc., Basking Ridge, NJ, USA; ¹²La Fe University and Polytechnic Hospital, Valencia, Spain

Drug Exposure by Age Group

Drug exposure was similar for quizartinib versus placebo in patients <60 years of age and in patients ≥60 years of age (Table 2)

Table 2. Drug Exposure by Age Group (Safety Analysis Set)

		arall	By age group				
	(N=	539)	<60 y	/ears	≥60 years		
Parameter	Quizartinib	Placebo	Quizartinib	Placebo	Quizartinib	Placebo	
	(n=265)	(n=268)	(n=159)	(n=160)	(n=106)	(n=108)	
Median (range) number of cycles	3	3	3	3	3	3	
	(1-42)	(1-41)	(1-42)	(1-41)	(1-40)	(1-41)	
Median (range) duration on adjusted therapy, weeks ^a	6.00	6.00	6.00	5.93	6.00	6.00	
	(0.1-170.1)	(0.3-155.9)	(0.1-161.7)	(0.6-155.6)	(0.1-170.1)	(0.3-155.9)	
Median (range) dose intensity, mg/day ^ь	40.00	40.00	40.00	40.00	38.12	40.00	
	(11.74-58.70)	(16.43-59.17)	(11.74-58.70)	(16.43-58.74)	(20.00-57.91)	(20.00-59.17)	

^aAdjusted treatment duration (days) = sum of treatment duration (days) minus the planned off-drug days across the 3 treatment phases. ^bDose intensity = cumulative dose / adjusted treatment duration in days.

Rates of CR by Age Group

- There were 297 patients who achieved CR at the end of induction (<60 years of age, n=180; \geq 60 years of age, n=117; **Table 3**)
- Rates of CR in patients who achieved CR at the end of induction were similar for quizartinib versus placebo in patients <60 years of age (55.9% vs 55.6%) and in patients ≥ 60 years of age (53.3% vs 55.0%; **Table 3**)

Table 3. Rates of CR per IRC at the End of Induction and Duration of CR, by Age Group (ITT Analysis Set)

		By age group											
Overall (N=539)		<60 years		≥60 years			Overall (N=539)		By age <60 years		e group ≥60 years		
Parameter	Quizartinib (n=268)	Placebo (n=271)	Quizartinib (n=161)	Placebo (n=162)	Quizartinib (n=107)	Placebo (n=109)	Parameter	Quizartinib (n=268)	Placebo (n=271)	Quizartinib (n=161)	Placebo (n=162)	Quizartinib (n=107)	Placebo (n=109)
CR, n (%) [95% Cl]ª	147 (54.9) [48.7-60.9]	150 (55.4) [49.2-61.4]	90 (55.9) [47.9-63.7]	90 (55.6) [47.6-63.4]	57 (53.3) [43.4-63.0]	60 (55.0) [45.2-64.6]	Allo-HCT in CR1, n (%) [95% Cl]ª	84 (31.3) [25.8-37.3]	73 (26.9) [21.7-32.6]	64 (39.8) [32.1-47.8]	52 (32.1) [25.0-39.9]	20 (18.7) [11.8-27.4]	21 (19.3) [12.3-27.9]
Median CR duration, ^b months, (n) ^c [95% CI] ^d	38.6 (147) [21.9-NE]	12.4 (150) [8.8-22.7]	NR (90) [NE-NE]	16.5 (90) [9.4-NE]	15.9 (57) [11.1-26.0]	9.0 (60) [5.4-21.6]	Includes protocol-specified and nonprotocol-specified allo-HCT. Some transplantation; CI, confidence interval; CR1, first complete remission	e patients had both protocol-s ; ITT, intent-to-treat.	specified and nonprotoco	I-specified allo-HCT. ^a Base	d on the Clopper-Pearsor	n method. Allo-HCT, alloge	neic hematopoietic cell

Based on the Clopper-Pearson method. Duration of CR defined as the time from the first documented CR, until documented relapse or death from any cause, whichever occurred first. Duration of CR was not censored at the time of allo-HCT. Number of patients who achieved CR by IRC at the end of induction. Based on unstratified Cox regression analysis. allo-HCT, allogeneic hematopoietic cell transplantation: CI. confidence interval: CR. complete remission: IRC, independent review committee: ITT, intent-to-treat: NE, not estimable: NR, not reached

Duration of CR by Age Group

- Median duration of CR was longer with guizartinib versus placebo in patients <60 years of age (not reached vs 16.5 months), with an HR of 0.432 (95% CI 0.267-0.699: **Table 3**)
- Median duration of CR was numerically longer with guizartinib versus placebo in patients ≥ 60 years of age (15.9 months vs 9.0 months), with an HR of 0.918 (95% CI, 0.591-1.424; **Table 3**)

Analysis of CIR by Age Group

- The analysis of CIR in patients who achieved CR at the end of induction showed a lower proportion of patients in the quizartinib arm having relapse at 12 and 24 months versus those in the placebo arm in both age groups (Figure 1)
- In patients <60 years of age, CIR at 24 months was 22.6% in the quizartinib arm versus 37.8% in the placebo arm (**Figure 1A**)
- In patients ≥60 years of age, CIR at 24 months was 43.9% in the quizartinib arm versus 51.0% in the placebo arm (**Figure 1B**)

Figure 1. CIR for Patients Who Achieved CR per IRC at the End of Induction by Age Group



CI, confidence interval; CIR, cumulative incidence of relapse; CR, complete remission; IRC, independent review committee

Analysis of RFS by Age Group

- The analysis of RFS in patients <60 years of age who achieved CR at the end of induction showed that the median RFS with guizartinib was longer versus placebo, with HR of 0.425 (95% CI, 0.263-0.687; Figure 2A)
- In patients ≥60 years of age, the median RFS was numerically longer with quizartinib versus placebo, with a HR of 0.912 (95% CI, 0.587-1.415; Figure 2B)
- Rates of Allo-HCT in CR1 by Age Group
- Overall, 157 patients underwent allo-HCTs in CR1 (<60 years of age, n=116; \geq 60 years of age, n=41; **Table 4**)
- In patients <60 years of age, rates of allo-HCT in CR1 were numerically higher with quizartinib versus placebo (39.8% vs 32.1%)
- In patients ≥60 years of age, rates of allo-HCT in CR1 were similar in the 2 treatment arms (18.7% vs 19.3%)

Harry P. Erba,¹ Elżbieta Patkowska,² Jorge Cortes,³ Alexander E. Perl,⁴ Mikkael A. Sekeres,⁵ Hervé Dombret,⁶ Sergio Amadori,⁷ Jianxiang Wang,⁸ Mark J. Levis,⁹ Richard F. Schlenk,¹⁰ Li Liu,¹¹ Yasser Mostafa Kamel,¹¹





^aRFS defined as the time from randomization until documented relapse or death from any cause, whichever occurred first, CI, confidence interval; CR, complete remission; HR, hazard ratio; IRC, independent review committee NE. not estimable: NR. not reached: RFS. relapse-free survival

Table 4 Rates of Allo-HCT in CR1 by Age Group (ITT Analysis Set)

OS by Allo-HCT in CR1 and by Age Group

- Among patients <60 years of age, guizartinib provided a remarkable survival benefit, regardless of whether they received allo-HCT in CR1 or not, with HRs
- of 0.470 and 0.315, respectively (Figure 3A and Figure 3B) • Among patients ≥60 years of age, the HRs were 0.919 in those who underwent allo-HCT in CR1, and 0.821 in those who did not undergo allo-HCT in CR1 (Figure 3C and Figure 3D)

Figure 3. Impact of Allo-HCT in CR1 on OS^a by Age Group





AML-202



Copies of materials obtained through the QR code or /bit.ly link are for personal use only and may not be reproduced without written permission of the authors.

Analysis of EFS by Age Group

- EFS was similar between treatment arms by age group when 42 days from the last induction cycle was used to define induction treatment failure (ITF; Table 5) • In a sensitivity EFS analysis, in which 56 days from the last induction cycle was used to define ITF:
- The median EFS was longer with quizartinib versus placebo in patients <60 years of age, with a HR of 0.732 (95% CI, 0.559-0.959; Table 5) - The median EFS was numerically longer with quizartinib versus placebo in patients ≥ 60 years of age, with a HR of 0.965 (95% CI, 0.719-1.294; Table 5)

Table 5. Analyses of EFS^a by Age Group (ITT Analysis Set)

	<60 years	≥60 years of age			
Parameter	Quizartinib (n=161)	Placebo (n=162)	Quizartinib (n=107)	Placebo (n=109)	
Primary analysis ^b					
Median (95% CI) EFS, months	0.0 (0.0-7.6)	0.5 (0.0-5.1)	0.1 (0.0-1.9)	1.0 (0.0-3.8)	
HR (95% CI)	0.859 (0.6	62-1.115)	1.023 (0.766-1.368)		
Sensitivity analysis ^c					
Median (95% CI) EFS, months	9.0 (0.2-19.8)	4.2 (0.0-5.9)	3.2 (0.3-6.8)	2.9 (0.0-6.0)	
HR (95% CI)	0.732 (0.5	59-0.959)	0.965 (0.719-1.294)		

EFS was defined as the time from randomization to lack of complete remission based on independent review committee assessment, relapse, or death from any cause, whichever occurred first, bITF definition; not achieving complete remission by day 42 from the start of the last induction cycle. ITF definition: not achieving complete remission by the end of induction, up to day 56 from the start of the last induction cycle. CI, confidence interval EFS, event-free survival: HR, hazard ratio: ITF, induction treatment failure: ITT, intent-to-treat

Safety by Age Group

- Rates of grade 3/4 pancytopenia and grade 3/4 myelosuppression were low in the quizartinib arm in patients <60 years of age (1.9% and 1.3%,
- respectively) as well as in patients ≥60 years of age (2.8% and 1.9%, respectively), although higher versus the placebo arm across age groups (**Table 6**) • Among patients with CR, the median time to recovery of either neutropenia or thrombocytopenia was numerically longer in the quizartinib group versus the placebo group across age groups (**Table 6**)
- Early deaths within 30 days and 60 days of the first dose were numerically higher in patients ≥ 60 years of age in the guizartinib arm versus the placebo
- arm (8.5% vs 5.6% and 12.3% vs 6.5%, respectively; **Table 6**)
- Five patients (3 in the quizartinib arm and 2 in the placebo arm) died before receiving treatment • Infections in patients ≥ 60 years of age were the main cause of more early deaths (within 30 and 60 days)

Table 6. Summary of Myelosuppression (Safety Analysis Set) and Early Deaths (Safety Analysis Set and ITT Analysis Set)

	Overall Safety population (N=533)		By age group					
			<60	years	≥60 years			
Parameter	Quizartinib (n=265)	Placebo (n=268)	Quizartinib (n=159)	Placebo (n=160)	Quizartinib (n=106)	Placebo (n=108)		
Grade 3 or 4 pancytopenia, n (%) ^a	6 (2.3)	1 (0.4)	3 (1.9)	1 (0.6)	3 (2.8)	0		
Grade 3 or 4 myelosuppression, n (%) ^a	4 (1.5)	0	2 (1.3)	0	2 (1.9)	0		
Time to hematologic recovery from C1D1 in CR patients with onset of neutropenia or thrombocytopenia during induction, days								
Median (IQR) time to recovery of neutropenia (absolute neutrophil count ≥1000 cells/mm ³)	36 (29-44)	29 (27-38)	37 (29-47)	29.5 (26-39)	34 (29-42)	29 (28-37)		
Median (IQR) time to recovery of thrombocytopenia (platelet count ≥100,000 cells/mm ³)	31 (28-40)	29 (26-34)	31 (28-39)	28 (26-34)	31 (28-40)	29 (27-34.5)		
Rates of early death, n (%) ^b								
Deaths within 30 days of first dose	15 (5.7)	9 (3.4)	6 (3.8)	3 (1.9)	9 (8.5)	6 (5.6)		
Deaths within 60 days of first dose	20 (7.5)	13 (4.9)	13 (4.9) 7 (4.4)		13 (12.3)	7 (6.5)		
	ITT population (N=539)		<60 years		≥60 years			
Parameter	Quizartinib (n=268)	Placebo (n=271)	Quizartinib (n=161)	Placebo (n=162)	Quizartinib (n=107)	Placebo (n=109)		
Rates of early death, n (%) ^c								
Deaths within 30 days of first dose	18 (6.7)	11 (4.1)	8 (5.0)	4 (2.5)	10 (9.3)	7 (6.4)		
Deaths within 60 days of first dose	23 (8.6)	15 (5.5)	9 (5.6)	7 (4.3)	14 (13.1)	8 (7.3)		

The safety-analysis population includes all patients who received ≥1 dose of quizartinib or placebo. Three patients in each group were not treated and were not included in the safety analysis population. If a patient had >1 event, that patient was counted only once. aTreatment-emergent adverse events regardless of causality. bDuring induction, 20 patients died in the quizartinib group, and 13 patients died in the placebo group. cIncludes 5 patients (3 in the quizartinib arm and 2 in the placebo arm) who died before receiving treatment. C, cycle; CR, complete remission; D, day; IQR, interquartile range; ITT, intent-to-treat.

CONCLUSIONS

- These post hoc analyses of efficacy by age of the QuANTUM-First study showed that guizartinib provides more clinical benefit versus placebo in patients <60 years of age, as demonstrated by
- Longer duration of CF
- Lower CIR and longer RFS in patients who achieved CR during induction
- Longer EFS, with 56 days from the start of the last induction cycle used to define ITF
- In patients ≥ 60 years of age, the benefit provided by guizartinib based on duration of response, RFS, and EFS was less pronounced than in patients
- <60 years of age
- Overall, quizartinib achieves compelling efficacy among FLT3 inhibitors

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

We would like to thank the patients, their families, and caregivers for their participation in the QuANTUM-First study. We would further like to thank the QuANTUM-First steering committee members, the investigators, the study staff, and independent review committee and data monitoring committee members for their important contributions. This study is sponsored by Daiichi Sankyo, Inc. Data first presented at the European Hematology Association (EHA) 2024 Hybrid Congress; Madrid, Spain; June 13-16, 2024. Medical writing support was provided by Mohamed Abdelmegeed, MD, PhD, CMPP, and Francesca Balordi, PhD, CMPP, of The Lockwood Group (Stamford, CT, USA), in accordance with Good Publication Practice (GPP 2022) guidelines, with funding by Daiichi Sankyo, Inc.

REFERENCES

- L. Erba HP. et al. *Lancet*. 2023:401(10388):1571-1583.
- 2. VANFLYTA[®] first FLT3 inhibitor approved in the U.S. specifically for patients with newly diagnosed *FLT3*-ITD positive AML. Press release. July 20, 2023. Accessed April 3, 2024. https://www.daiichisankyo.com/files/news/pressrelease/pdf/202307/20230720_E.pdf.
- VANFLYTA® (quizartinib). Prescribing information. Daiichi Sankyo, Inc.; July 2023. Accessed April 5, 2024. https://daiichisankyo.us/prescribing-information-portlet/
- getPIContent?productName=Vanflyta&inline=true.
- 4. VANFLYTA[®] approved in the EU as the first FLT3 inhibitor specifically for patients with newly diagnosed *FLT3*-ITD positive AML. Press release. November 9, 2023. Accessed April 5. 2024. https://www.daiichisankyo.com/files/news/pressrelease/pdf/202311/20231109 E.pdf.
- . VANFLYTA® (guizartinib). Summary of product characteristics. Daiichi Sankyo, Inc.; November 2023. Accessed April 5, 2024. https://www.ema.europa.eu/en/documents/productinformation/vanflyta-epar-product-information en.pdf.
- VANFLYTA[®] first FLT3 inhibitor approved in Japan for patients with newly diagnosed FLT3-ITD positive AML. Press release. May 25, 2023. Accessed April 5, 2024. https://www. daiichisankyo.com/files/news/pressrelease/pdf/202305/20230525 E.pdf.