Background An investigational use only immunohistochemical (IHC) clinical trial assay was used to prospectively identify NY-ESO-1-positive patients for eligibility in two phase I/II pilot clinical trials. NY-ESO-1 T-cell receptor (TCR) T-cell therapy was investigated in NY-ESO-1 expressing HLA-A*02:01, 05, or 06 positive patients with either metastatic or locally advanced synovial sarcoma (SS) (NCT01343043), or advanced myxoid round cell liposarcoma (MRCLS) (NCT02992743). Post-hoc analyses on both studies investigated the relationship of NY-ESO-1 expression levels in patients with response and no response as per RECIST1.1 (investigator assessed) to NY-ESO-1 TCR T-cell therapy.

Methods NY-ESO-1 expression was determined by total tumor percent staining at stain intensities 0, 1+, 2+, 3+ (TP-score) as assessed by a board-certified pathologist. Eligible SS patients were enrolled into study cohorts with differing cut-off criteria for NY-ESO-1 expression levels (table 1). MRCLS patients were enrolled into study cohorts using a single cut-off for NY-ESO-1 expression levels (≥2+, TP ≥30%). SS and MRCLS eligible patients received different dose lymphodepleting regimens (LDR) of fludarabine and cyclophosphamide depending on trial and cohort (table 1). For the present NY-ESO-1 expression analysis, the distribution of the NY-ESO-1 TP-score is displayed as boxplots allowing simultaneous visual comparisons of the range of expression across response, indication, and LDR. In addition, an exploratory cut-off of ≥50% was used to evaluate responses. All analyses are exploratory and descriptive.

Results All MRCLS patients and most SS patients expressed NY-ESO-1 as predominately moderate/strong (2+/3+) in ≥50% tumor cells. A pooled ORR assessment at ≥50% threshold was 33%. Responders and non-responders were observed across a range of NY-ESO-1 TP-scores in SS from ≥1% to 100% and in MRCLS ≥50% to 100% (figure 1). Of the six patients with threshold ≤30%; there were two SS responders expressing TP-score at 30% and one at 10% (figure 1, table 1).

Conclusions NY-ESO-1 expression as a biomarker of patient selection is a relevant approach for use with NY-ESO-1 TCR T-cell therapy. Observed range of response may be supportive of a cut-off in SS of less than 50% TP-score given that three patient responders had low to moderate (<50% TP-score) NY-ESO-1 expression, and that MRCLS cut-off was set at ≥30%. Further exploration of TP-score is underway in a current phase II trial of NY-ESO-1 TCR T-cell therapy (NCT03967223).
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Abstract 600 Figure 1 NY-ESO-1 TP-score across SS and MRCLS treated patient cohorts and TP-score cut-offs (≥1%, ≥30%, ≥50%) MRCLS, myoid round cell liposarcoma; NR, non-responders; R, responders; SS, synovial sarcoma
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Abstract 600 Table 1  Summary of NY-ESO-1 scoring algorithms and Lymphodepletion regimens by cohort

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Study</th>
<th>Cohort (number of patients)</th>
<th>R and NR (number of patients)</th>
<th>Scoring algorithm for NY-ESO-1 expression</th>
<th>Drug</th>
<th>Dose</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MRCLS 1 (n=10)</td>
<td>R (n=5) NR (n=5)</td>
<td>IHC intensity score 2+, TP ≥50%</td>
<td>Fludarabine</td>
<td>96 mg/m² (30 mg/m² x 3 days)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MRCLS 2 (n=10)</td>
<td>R (n=4) NR (n=6)</td>
<td>IHC intensity score 2+, TP ≥50%</td>
<td>Fludarabine</td>
<td>120 mg/m² (30 mg/m² x 4 days)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SS 1 (n=9)</td>
<td>R (n=4) NR (n=5)</td>
<td>IHC intensity score 2+, TP ≥50%</td>
<td>Fludarabine</td>
<td>120 mg/m² (30 mg/m² x 4 days)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SS 2 (n=11)</td>
<td>R (n=4) NR (n=7)</td>
<td>IHC intensity score 2+, TP ≥50%</td>
<td>Fludarabine</td>
<td>120 mg/m² (30 mg/m² x 4 days)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SS 4 (n=10)</td>
<td>R (n=4) NR (n=6)</td>
<td>IHC intensity score 2+, TP ≥50%</td>
<td>Fludarabine</td>
<td>90 mg/m² (30 mg/m² x 3 days)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
