



**University of
Zurich**^{UZH}

**Zurich Open Repository and
Archive**

University of Zurich
University Library
Strickhofstrasse 39
CH-8057 Zurich
www.zora.uzh.ch

Year: 2017

Interim results from the CATNON trial (EORTC study 26053-22054) of treatment with concurrent and adjuvant temozolomide for 1p/19q non-co-deleted anaplastic glioma: a phase 3, randomised, open-label intergroup study

van den Bent, Martin J ; Baumert, Brigitta ; Erridge, Sara C ; et al ; Stupp, Roger

DOI: [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0140-6736\(17\)31442-3](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0140-6736(17)31442-3)

Posted at the Zurich Open Repository and Archive, University of Zurich

ZORA URL: <https://doi.org/10.5167/uzh-141071>

Journal Article

Accepted Version

Originally published at:

van den Bent, Martin J; Baumert, Brigitta; Erridge, Sara C; et al; Stupp, Roger (2017). Interim results from the CATNON trial (EORTC study 26053-22054) of treatment with concurrent and adjuvant temozolomide for 1p/19q non-co-deleted anaplastic glioma: a phase 3, randomised, open-label intergroup study. *Lancet*, 390(10103):1645-1653.

DOI: [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0140-6736\(17\)31442-3](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0140-6736(17)31442-3)

1
2
3 CONCURRENT AND ADJUVANT TEMOZOLOMIDE FOR 1P/19Q NON-CO-DELETED ANAPLASTIC GLIOMA: INTERIM
4 RESULTS OF THE RANDOMIZED INTERGROUP CATNON TRIAL (EORTC STUDY 26053-22054).

5
6 Running title: Interim analysis of the CATNON trial, a report of the EORTC Brain Tumor Group

7
8 List of authors and affiliations: see next page

9
10 Corresponding author:
11 M.J. van den Bent
12 Brain Tumor Center at Erasmus MC Cancer Institute
13 Groene Hilledijk 301
14 3075 EA Rotterdam
15 The Netherlands

16 [e-mail m.vandenbent@erasmusmc.nl](mailto:m.vandenbent@erasmusmc.nl)
17 tel +31 10 7041415
18 fax +31 10 7041031

19
20 In part presented at the ASCO 2016 meeting, June 2016 Chicago, Ill USA

21
22
23
24 Abstract: 300 words

25 Research in context: 223 words

26 Text incl acknowledgements 3200 words

27 References: 30

Formatiert: Italienisch (Italien)

28 **Authors**

Prof Martin J van den Bent, MD	the Brain Tumor Center at Erasmus MC Cancer Institute
Brigitta Baumert, MD	Dept. Radiation-Oncology (MAASTRO), Maastricht University Medical Center (MUMC) and GROW (School for Oncology), Maastricht, Netherlands; Dept. of Radiation-Oncology, University of Munster, Germany & Paracelsus Clinic, Osnabrück,
Sarah C Erridge, MD	Edinburgh Centre for Neuro-Oncology, Western General Hospital, University of Edinburgh, Edingburgh, UK
Prof Michael A Vogelbaum., MD	Department of Neurosurgery, Cleveland Clinic Lerner College of Medicine of Case Western Reserve University, Rose Ella Burkhardt Brain Tumor and NeuroOncology Center; Cleveland Clinic, Cleveland, OH USA
Prof Anna K Nowak, MD	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. School of Medicine and Pharmacology, University of Western Australia, 35 Stirling Highway Crawley WA 6009 Australia; 2. CoOperative Group for NeuroOncology, University of Sydney, Camperdown NSW Australia; 3. Department of Medical Oncology, Sir Charles Gairdner Hospital, Hospital Avenue, Nedlands WA 6009 Australia.
Prof Marc Sanson, MD	Sorbonne Universités UPMC Univ Paris 06, Inserm, CNRS, APHP, Institut du cerveau et de la moelle (ICM)- Hôpital Pitié-salpêtrière, Boulevard de l'hôpital, F-75013, Paris, France
Alba Ariela Brandes, MD	Medical Oncology Department, AUSL-IRCCS Scienze Neurologiche, Bologna Italy
Paul M Clement, PhD	Department of Oncology, KU Leuven and Department of General Medical Oncology, UZ Leuven, Leuven Cancer Institute
Prof Jean Francois Baurain, MD	Medical Oncology Department, King Albert II Cancer Institute, Cliniques universitaires Saint-Luc, Université Catholique de Louvain, Bruxelles, Belgium
Prof Warren P Mason, MD	Princess Margaret Cancer Centre, University of Toronto, Toronto, Canada
Helen Wheeler, MD	Northern Sydney Cancer Centre, St Leonards, NSW 2065 Australia: University of Sydney
Prof Olivier L Chinot, MD	Aix-Marseille University, AP-HM, Neuro-Oncology division, Marseille, France
Sanjeev Gill, MD	Dept Medical Oncology, Alfred Hospital, Melbourne, Australia
Matthew Griffin, FRCR	Department of Clinical Oncology, Nottingham University Hospitals NHS Trust, Nottingham, UK
Prof David G Brachman, MD	Department of Radiation Oncology, Barrow Neurological Institute, Phoenix AZ USA
Walter Taal , MD	the Brain Tumor Center at Erasmus MC Cancer Institute
Roberta Rudà, MD	Department of Neuro-Oncology, City of Health and Science Hospital and University of Turin, Italy
Prof Michael Weller, MD	Department of Neurology and Brain Tumor Center, University Hospital and University of Zurich, Zurich, Switzerland
Catherine McBain, MD	Department of Clinical Oncology, The Christie NHS FT, Manchester, UK
Jaap Reijneveld, MD	Brain Tumor Center Amsterdam & Department of Neurology, VU University Medical Center Department of Neurology, Academic Medical Center, Amsterdam
Roelien H Enting, MD	Department of Neurology, UMCG, University of Groningen, Groningen, the Netherlands
Carmen Ares	Department of Radiation Oncology, University Hospital of Geneva, Geneva, Switzerland
Thierry Lesimple, MD	Department of Clinical Oncology, Comprehensive Cancer Center Eugène Marquis, Rennes, France
Susan Clenton, MSc	Weston Park Hospital, Sheffield, UK
Anja Gijtenbeek, MD	Department of Neurology, Radboud University Medical Centre, Nijmegen, The Netherlands
Sarah Pascoe, MD	Department of Clinical Oncology, PLYMOUTH HOSPITALS NHS TRUST

Formatiert: Französisch (Frankreich)

Formatiert: Französisch (Frankreich)

Formatiert: Französisch (Frankreich)

Formatiert: Französisch (Frankreich)

Prof Ulrich Herrlinger, MD	Division of Clinical Neurooncology, Department of Neurology, University of Bonn Medical Center
Prof Peter Hau, MD	Wilhelm Sander-NeuroOncology Unit and Department of Neurology, University Hospital Regensburg, Regensburg, Germany
Frederic Dhermain, MD	Radiotherapy Department, Gustave Roussy University Hospital. 114 rue E. Vaillant 94 Formatiert: Französisch (Frankreich) Villejuif, Cedex, France
Irene van Heuvel	Neuro-oncology Unit, Brain Tumor Center at Erasmus MC Cancer Institute Rotterdam, the Netherlands
Prof Roger Stupp, MD	Department of Medical Oncology, University Hospital and University of Zurich, Zurich, Switzerland
Ken Aldape, MD	Princess Margaret Cancer Centre, University of Toronto
Prof Robert B Jenkins, MD	Department of Laboratory Medicine and Pathology, Mayo Clinic, Rochester MN, USA
Hendrikus Jan Dubbink, PhD	Dept Pathology, Erasmus MC Cancer Institute, Rotterdam, the Netherlands
Winand N.M. Dinjens, PhD	Dept Pathology, Erasmus MC Cancer Institute, Rotterdam, the Netherlands
Prof Pieter Wesseling, MD	Department of Pathology, Radboud University Medical Center, Nijmegen, The Netherlands, Department of Pathology, VU University Medical Center, Amsterdam, The Netherlands.
Sarah Nuyens	EORTC HQ, Brussels, Belgium
Vassilis Golfopoulos, MD	EORTC HQ, Brussels, Belgium
Thierry Gorlia, PhD	EORTC HQ, Brussels, Belgium
Prof Wolfgang Wick, MD	Neurologische Klinik und Nationales Zentrum für Tumorerkrankungen Universitätsklinik Heidelberg, Germany
Prof Johan M Kros, MD	Dept Pathology, Erasmus MC Cancer Institute, Rotterdam, the Netherlands

29

30

31 Research in context

32 Evidence before this study

33 At the time of study initiation, past studies on PCV chemotherapy given after radiotherapy had failed
34 to produce survival benefit in anaplastic oligodendrogliomas which was assumed to be a
35 chemotherapy responsive disease. These studies also showed that 1p19q non-co-deleted tumors
36 have a much worse prognosis compared to 1p/19q co-deleted tumors. At the same time, combined
37 chemo-irradiation with temozolomide was shown to improve outcome in glioblastoma, which was
38 considered a relatively chemo-therapy resistant disease. In this latter study, MGMT gene promoter
39 methylation was found to be predictive of benefit to temozolomide; it remained unclear if both
40 temozolomide given concurrent with and after ('adjuvant') radiotherapy were required to improve
41 patient outcome.

42 Added value of this study

43 In a preplanned interim analysis this study shows that 12 cycles of adjuvant temozolomide given
44 after radiotherapy improve overall and progression free survival in non-1p/19q-codeleted anaplastic
45 glioma.

46 Implications of all the available evidence

47 Standard of post-care for non-1p/19q1 codeleted anaplastic glioma should now be surgery followed
48 by radiotherapy and 12 cycles of standard day 1-5 every 4 weeks temozolomide. Ongoing molecular
49 research within this trial will show whether IDH mutational status and MGMT promoter methylation
50 can be used to identify the patients benefitting from temozolomide chemotherapy. Further follow-up
51 of the CATNON trial is necessary to understand if temozolomide given concurrently with
52 radiotherapy also improves survival.

53

54

55 **Abstract Background, Methods, Findings, Interpretation, and Funding**

56 **Background**

57 The role of temozolomide chemotherapy in newly-diagnosed anaplastic glioma without 1p/19q co-
58 deletion ('non-co-deleted') is unclear. The CATNON trial investigated the addition of a) concurrent
59 and b) adjuvant temozolomide chemotherapy to 59.4 Gy of radiotherapy in adult patients with non-
60 codeleted anaplastic glioma .

61 **Methods**

62 In an open label study with a 2x2 factorial design patients with newly diagnosed non-co-deleted
63 anaplastic glioma were randomized using minimization technique to either radiotherapy alone,
64 radiotherapy followed by 12 cycles of adjuvant temozolomide 150-200 mg/m² day 1-5 4-weekly,
65 radiotherapy given concurrent with daily temozolomide 75 mg/m², or radiotherapy with both
66 concurrent and adjuvant temozolomide. Patients were stratified for prognostic factors including
67 centrally assessed O-6-methylguanine-DNA methyltransferase gene promoter methylation status.
68 The primary endpoint was overall survival (OS) adjusted for stratification factors. The study design
69 required 748 patients, with a planned interim analysis once 41% (219) of the required events had
70 occurred and which required a p-value < 0.0084 to reject the null hypothesis. (NCT00626990, EORTC
71 26053-22054).

72 **Findings**

73 745 patients were included in the interim analysis. The hazard ratio for OS for use of adjuvant
74 temozolomide was 0.65 (99.145 % confidence interval: 0.45, 0.93) prompting the Independent Data
75 Monitoring Committee to recommend early release of the data on adjuvant treatment. OS at 5 years
76 was 55.9% with and 44.1% without adjuvant temozolomide.. Toxicity was mainly hematological and
77 reversible.

78 **Interpretation**

79 This is the first study to show a survival benefit of temozolomide chemotherapy after radiotherapy in
80 newly diagnosed non-co-deleted anaplastic glioma. Further follow-up is required for analysis of the
81 role of concurrent temozolomide and of molecular factors, in particular *isocitrate dehydrogenase*
82 gene mutations.

83 **Funding**

84 Schering Plough/MSD supported this trial with an unrestricted grant and provided temozolomide; the
85 trial was further supported by grants from the EORTC Cancer Research Fund, NRG Oncology
86 Operations, NRG Oncology SDMC, and Cancer Australia.

87

88

89 Introduction

90 The pivotal EORTC trial combining temozolomide with radiotherapy in glioblastoma was the first to
91 show a statistically significant and clinically meaningful benefit from adding chemotherapy to
92 radiotherapy in glioma.¹ That study also identified O6-ethylguaninemethyltransferase (MGMT) gene
93 promoter methylation as a biomarker for increased activity of temozolomide.² Concurrently, two
94 trials in anaplastic oligodendroglioma investigating adjuvant chemotherapy with procarbazine, CCNU
95 and vincristine (PCV) with radiotherapy failed to show a survival benefit at the time of their first
96 analysis.^{3;4} However, these trials showed a major prognostic effect of the deletion of both the short
97 arm of chromosome 1 (1p) and the long arm of chromosome 19 (19q), now known as 1p/19q co-
98 deletion ('co-deleted') and associated previously with increased sensitivity to chemotherapy.⁵ Since
99 tumors without 1p/19q co-deletion are generally less chemo-responsive, we asked whether
100 combined chemo-radiotherapy with temozolomide would improve outcomes in non-co-deleted
101 anaplastic gliomas, and also whether it was the concomitant (given during radiotherapy), or the
102 adjuvant (given after conclusion of radiotherapy) temozolomide treatment which determined any
103 survival benefit. These questions induced a trial which in a 2 x 2 factorial design randomized patients
104 with non-co-deleted anaplastic glioma to four study arms: radiotherapy with or without concurrent
105 temozolomide, and with or without adjuvant temozolomide. Shortly after the end of accrual a
106 planned interim analysis was conducted. This analysis resulted in the recommendation by the
107 Independent Data Monitoring Committee (IDMC) to immediately release the data on the addition of
108 adjuvant temozolomide to radiotherapy. We now report on the outcome of adjuvant treatment
109 based on the data and events the IDMC reviewed.

110

111 Methods

112 The CATNON intergroup trial was conducted in Australia (Cooperative trials Group for Neuro-
113 Oncology, COGNO), North America (NRG Oncology, Canadian Clinical Trials Group (CCTG) and Europe

114 (European Organization for Research and Treatment of Cancer (EORTC), Medical Research Council
115 (MRC), NeuroOnkologische Arbeitsgemeinschaft der Deutschen Krebsgesellschaft (NOA)).

116 Study design and participants

117 The trial was a phase III, randomized, open-label, 2 x 2 factorial study involving patients with newly
118 diagnosed anaplastic glioma without 1p/19q co-deletion. Previous surgery for low grade glioma was
119 allowed, provided histological confirmation of an anaplastic tumor was obtained at progression.
120 Patients were 18 years or older, with a WHO performance status 0-2, adequate hematological, renal
121 and liver function, and on a stable or decreasing dose of corticosteroids. Treatment with other
122 experimental agents was not allowed. Patients were required to start radiotherapy within 7 weeks of
123 surgery and within 8 days of randomization. All patients gave written informed consent according to
124 local, national and international guidelines. After stratification for institution, performance status (0
125 vs >0), age (≤ 50 vs > 50 years of age), 1p loss (yes vs no), the presence of oligodendroglial elements at
126 microscopy (yes vs no) and MGMT promoter methylation status (methylated vs unmethylated vs
127 indeterminate) patients were electronically randomized through the EORTC web-based ORTA system
128 (<http://www.eortc.org/investigators/>).

129 Tumor evaluation

130 At patient registration, tumor material was submitted for pathology review, 1p/19q status
131 determination, and assessment of MGMT promoter methylation status. Pathology review and central
132 1p/19q determination were performed separately for North American and European/Australian
133 patients. After central review of their local 1p/19q testing procedure, dedicated and experienced
134 European centers were allowed to enroll patients based on the local histological and molecular
135 diagnosis. For patients from centers requiring central pathology review, confirmation of the diagnosis
136 of anaplastic glioma was required. For Europe and Australia, 1p/19q status was assessed using
137 microsatellite analysis; in North America 1p/19q diagnostics were done with fluorescent in situ
138 hybridization (FISH).^{6,7} MGMT promoter methylation was performed by two central laboratories

139 using quantitative PCR as previously described.⁸ If MGMT determination was not available in time to
140 meet radiotherapy timelines, patients were randomized with an 'indeterminate' MGMT methylation
141 status.

142 Treatment

143 Patients were 1:1:1:1 randomized using the minimization technique to radiotherapy alone,
144 radiotherapy combined with temozolomide, radiotherapy followed by temozolomide, or
145 radiotherapy combined with and followed by temozolomide. Radiotherapy consisted of 59.4 Gy in 33
146 fractions of 1.8 Gy. Whenever possible, target volume definition was based on co-registered pre- or
147 (ideally) post-operative magnetic resonance imaging (MRI). From 2011 onwards, centers were
148 allowed to use IMRT after additional quality assurance. The radiotherapy gross tumor volume (GTV)
149 volume was the entire region of high signal intensity on T2 weighted MRI images or FLAIR sequences,
150 the regions of enhancement, and the tumor resection cavity. A 1.5 to 2.0cm margin (edited for
151 anatomical barriers) was added to the GTV for microscopic spread, and then 0.5-0.7cm for daily set-
152 up variability. Planning could be either by 3D-conformal radiotherapy or IMRT and the plan had to
153 conform to the ICRU 50/62 criteria for target volume coverage, dose normalization and
154 homogeneity.^{9;10} Temozolomide was given daily during radiotherapy (including on non-
155 radiotherapy weekend days) at a dose of 75 mg/m² for a maximum of 7 weeks. Adjuvant
156 temozolomide started four weeks after completion of radiotherapy, for a maximum of 12 planned
157 cycles. Temozolomide was given on days 1-5 every four weeks at a dose of 150 mg/m² during the
158 first cycle with dose escalation to 200 mg/m² for subsequent cycles if no or only minimal toxicity was
159 observed during the first cycle. Dose modifications were made as described elsewhere.¹ Treatment
160 at progression was left to the discretion of the treating physicians, but temozolomide was suggested
161 in patients randomized to radiotherapy only. During concomitant chemo-radiotherapy, pneumocystis
162 jirovecii prophylaxis was mandatory.

163 Assessments

164

165 Patients were reviewed weekly during radiotherapy, four-weekly during adjuvant temozolomide
166 treatment and every three months after the completion of all therapy. Radiological assessment
167 used MRI scans at baseline, four weeks after the end of radiotherapy and thereafter every three
168 months until progression. Following progression, patients were followed up for survival. Progression
169 was assessed using Macdonald's criteria, incorporating steroid dose and with a description of the
170 possibility of pseudoprogression.¹¹ For non-enhancing tumors, progression was defined as a 25%
171 increase in tumor area defined as the product of the two largest perpendicular diameters. Toxicities
172 were scored using the National Cancer Institute Common Toxicity Criteria for Adverse Events (NCI
173 CTCAE) version 3.0. For health-related quality of life (HRQoL) analysis, the EORTC QLQ-C30 and BN20
174 questionnaires were used at baseline and all visits corresponding to MRI imaging.¹² Cognition was
175 assessed at the same time points using the MiniMental State Examination, and in dedicated centers
176 with a more comprehensive test battery which was performed annually after the start of
177 radiotherapy.^{13;14} HRQoL and Cognitive assessments will be reported separately.

178 Statistics

179 The study used a 2 by 2 factorial design with overall survival (OS) adjusted by the stratification factors
180 as the primary endpoint. The study intended to answer two questions:

181 QI: whether OS would be improved by concurrent temozolomide chemotherapy (comparing all
182 patients receiving radiotherapy alone or radiotherapy followed by adjuvant temozolomide to all
183 those receiving either radiotherapy and concurrent temozolomide or radiotherapy and concurrent
184 followed by adjuvant temozolomide)

185 QII: whether OS would be improved by adjuvant temozolomide chemotherapy (comparing all
186 patients receiving radiotherapy alone and radiotherapy with concurrent temozolomide to all those
187 receiving radiotherapy followed by adjuvant temozolomide or radiotherapy and concurrent followed
188 by adjuvant temozolomide)

189 Survival was calculated from the date of randomization to the date of death from any cause.
190 Secondary endpoints included univariate OS, PFS adjusted for stratification factors, landmark OS and
191 PFS analyses, HRQoL outcomes, toxicity, and cognition. PFS was defined as the time from
192 randomization to the date of first progression or death, whichever came first. For all time to event
193 analyses, patients still alive and not having met the endpoint at the last follow-up visit were
194 censored. The Kaplan Meier technique was used for the univariate estimates of OS and PFS. For the
195 primary analysis of OS and PFS, the Cox proportional hazards model was fit with a question indicator
196 variable (one for each question, QI and QII). Assuming a median survival of 24 months in patients
197 receiving radiotherapy only and a risk reduction of 0.775 for both concurrent temozolomide and
198 adjuvant temozolomide (two-sided logrank test), at an overall significance level of 5% and a power of
199 83%, 523 events were needed and 748 patients were to be recruited. One interim analysis for
200 efficacy was planned when 41% of the required events (n=219) had been observed. For this analysis,
201 only the rejection of null hypothesis of no efficacy was considered for both questions; the nominal
202 significance level for rejecting H0 was taken as 0.0084. To compensate for this interim look, 11
203 additional events were needed for the final analysis (534 instead of 523).

204 Primary analysis was on the intention-to-treat population defined as all randomized patients in the
205 arm they were allocated to by randomization. Relative dose intensity (RDI) was calculated as the
206 administered dose per time as delivered divided by the planned dose per planned time of delivery. In
207 2011, the study was amended to include a prospective analysis of the efficacy results in relation to
208 tumor IDH status and to allow iMRT after additional quality control for treatment delivery.

209 Support and study analysis

210 Schering Plough/Merck supported the study by an unrestricted grant and by the provision of
211 temozolomide but had no role in the data collection, analysis, interpretation, writing of the
212 manuscript or the decisions to submit . The study protocol was prepared by EORTC, the study
213 database was developed, housed and analyzed by EORTC. TG, MvdB, BB and MW had access to all

214 data. All authors have reviewed and approved of the manuscript. No writing assistance was provided.
215 AN, TG, BB and MvdB had the responsibility for the submission of the manuscript.

216

217 Results

218 Between December 4, 2007 and September 19, 2015 1407 patients were screened and 748 were
219 randomized. The required number of events for the interim analysis was observed in May 2015. This
220 report is based on all data up to May 31, 2015 (clinical cut-off date for the interim analysis), with a
221 first database lock on August 31, 2015 for the report to the IDMC, and a second lock for the study
222 report on May 12 2016. At the time of the clinical cut-off date, 1400 patients had been registered
223 and 745 randomized by 137 institutions in 12 countries (Figure 1). No significant imbalances in
224 baseline characteristics were observed between the four treatment arms (Table 1). MGMT
225 methylation status was available for 275 of 745 (37%) patients at randomization and for 550 of 745
226 (74%) patients at the time of the interim analysis.

227 Treatment

228 All patients were treated according to the arm to which they were randomized. All except sixteen
229 patients completed radiotherapy. Thirty patients did not start adjuvant treatment (figure 1), 21 of
230 the 188 patients randomized to radiotherapy with concurrent temozolomide and 9 of the 185
231 patients to radiotherapy alone. RDI of concurrent temozolomide was more than 90% in 89% (312
232 349) of patients with sufficient treatment information available. The RDI in patients who completed
233 adjuvant temozolomide was 92%; in 12% (31/262) of patients the RDI was below 70%. Sixty-four
234 percent (167/262) of patients who completed adjuvant temozolomide had at least one cycle delayed:
235 28% (74) for hematological toxicity, 6% (16) for non-hematological toxicity, 3% (8) for both and 47%
236 (123) for non-drug related reasons.

237 Toxicity

238 Treatment was generally well tolerated. The most frequent related toxicity was hematological
239 (supplemental table 1), with 8-12% of patients in the temozolomide-containing arms experiencing
240 grade 3 or 4 toxicities, most frequently thrombocytopenia (7–9%). Supplemental table 1 summarizes
241 the most frequent non-hematological grade 3 and 4 toxicities, excluding neurological events. Apart
242 from constitutional and gastrointestinal toxicities, most toxicities were judged unrelated. Grade 3 or
243 4 increase in transaminases occurred in 1% of temozolomide treated patients (5:547).

244 Efficacy outcomes

245 With a median follow-up of 27 months, 344 patients (46%) had progressed and 221 patients (30%)
246 had died: 129 in the arms without adjuvant temozolomide and 92 in the adjuvant temozolomide
247 arms. The HR [99.145 CI] for the primary endpoint of OS adjusted for stratification factors for the
248 arms containing adjuvant temozolomide was 0.65 [0.45, 0.93] (Table 2). Figure 2a shows the
249 univariate OS analysis (HR 0.67, 95% CI 0.51, 0.88). If the methylation status of tumors that became
250 known after randomization are also considered, the HR [99.145 CI] for adjuvant temozolomide was
251 0.651 [0.454, 0.934]. Age (under 50 or 50 years and older) was also a highly significant risk factor for
252 survival (HR 4.0, [2.8, 5.7]). In univariate analysis, PFS was also superior in patients receiving
253 adjuvant temozolomide (Figure 2b, HR 0.62, 95% CI 0.50, 0.76]). Table 3 shows additional median
254 and 5 year PFS and OS analyses.

255 Treatment at progression

256 In the non-adjuvant arms, 200 patients progressed, compared with 144 in the adjuvant arms. Details
257 for treatment given at progression were available for 195 and 143 patents respectively
258 (supplemental table 2). Of these 338 patients, 303 received some additional treatment, mostly
259 chemotherapy. Any chemotherapy was given to 143 (73%) in the non-adjuvant and 89 (62%) in the
260 adjuvant arm, with temozolomide or PCV chemotherapy respectively being given to 82 (42.1%) and
261 19 (9.7%) in the non-adjuvant arms, and 31 (21.7%) and 20 (14.0%) in the adjuvant arms.
262 Bevacizumab was administered to 44 patients (22.6%) in the non-adjuvant arms and 38 (26.6%) in

263 the adjuvant arms. (Radio)surgery was used in 18 (9%) of the non-adjuvant arm patients and 9 (6%)
264 of the adjuvant arm patients.

265 Discussion

266 This planned interim analysis of the CATNON trial showed a statistically significant and clinically
267 meaningful benefit of adjuvant temozolomide on OS and PFS in non-co-deleted anaplastic glioma,
268 mandating immediate release of the results. With adjuvant temozolomide, median PFS increased
269 from 19 to 42.8 months and five-year OS increased from 44% to 56% . The present data do not imply
270 that concurrent temozolomide does not have a beneficial effect; they only indicate that the interim
271 analysis for this comparison did not cross the predefined boundaries. Of note, with 30% of patients
272 having died and 46% having progressed, follow-up is still immature and further follow-up is ongoing.
273 Nevertheless, the HR observed in the interim analysis is striking, and passing the very strict statistical
274 boundaries of the preplanned analysis.. With longer follow-up the survival curves diverge more ,
275 suggesting that with time the OS improvement is likely to increase. More follow-up is needed for
276 both the answer to the concurrent question and for a more detailed OS analysis.

277 This trial on a molecularly defined subgroup of anaplastic glioma is noteworthy for several reasons.
278 By allowing only patients without co-deletion of 1p/19q, this is the first trial on glioma which used
279 molecular criteria for eligibility. This approach was induced by the worse outcome of 1p/19q non-co-
280 deleted tumors in the PCV trials on anaplastic oligodendroglioma.^{3;4} It is also the first trial in WHO
281 grade II or III glioma with a radiotherapy only group that investigated the addition of temozolomide,
282 rather than PCV, to radiotherapy.¹⁵⁻¹⁷ The toxicity profiles of PCV and single agent nitrosoureas are
283 less favorable than that of temozolomide.^{18;19}As a consequence, temozolomide has almost
284 completely replaced PCV in clinical use. However, until now there has been no evidence supporting
285 the activity temozolomide in the adjuvant setting in diffuse grade II or III glioma; the pivotal
286 temozolomide trial investigated glioblastoma which represents at the molecular level an entirely
287 different disease with as a rule no IDH mutations.¹ Although CATNON recruited patients with a less

288 chemotherapy sensitive subset of anaplastic glioma compared to 1p/19q co-deleted glioma,
289 temozolomide is clearly beneficial. Thirdly, prolonged follow-up was required to show an OS benefit
290 in trials of adjuvant PCV in low grade glioma and anaplastic oligodendroglioma, with all three trials
291 showing separation of survival curves only four to six years after randomization.¹⁵⁻¹⁷ Each of these
292 trials was initially reported as negative for OS, before the impact of early adjuvant PCV on OS was
293 demonstrated with longer follow-up. Strikingly, in the CATNON trial there is an early separation of
294 the OS curves which was sufficiently large to be detected in the interim analysis

295 By recruiting only patients without co-deletion of 1p/19q, this trial aimed at a molecularly defined
296 subgroup of glioma patients ; since then further molecular research has resulted in new basic insight
297 in glioma. In 2008, key mutations were first identified in IDH1 and IDH2 genes, occurring in 70-80%
298 of all grade II and III diffuse glioma. These mutations are associated with improved outcomes and are
299 now the cornerstone of the WHO 2016 classification of glioma.²⁰⁻²⁴ In 2011 the study protocol was
300 therefore amended to incorporate analyses of IDH mutation status; these molecular analyses of their
301 predictive value for temozolomide efficacy are pending. In view of today's emphasis on IDH
302 mutations and the large metabolic differences between IDHmt and IDHwt tumors, future trials in
303 grade II and III glioma should consider only either IDHmt or IDHwt tumors.

304 The results of MGMT testing were not available for 60% of patients at the time of randomization, due
305 to timelines issues with samples requiring both 1p/19q testing and MGMT testing in a limited
306 timeframe. However, when considering the MGMT tests that became available post-randomization
307 the study arms remained well balanced for MGMT promoter methylation. We also note that the
308 percentage of successfully tested tumors showing MGMT methylation (42%) is lower than
309 anticipated, being within the range expected in glioblastoma. This may be explained by the use in
310 this trial of a PCR technique which was optimized for glioblastoma.^{8;25} To overcome both this
311 technical issue and the still modest rate of successful MGMT determination, MGMT promoter
312 methylation status testing will be repeated using a genome wide methylation platform.^{26;27} Both
313 the presence of IDH mutations and MGMT promoter methylation have been proposed as predictive

314 factors for benefit to chemotherapy. 28 The results of this study that will have enrolled both patients
315 with IDH mutant and with IDH wild type gliomas with an anticipated difference in prognosis and
316 sensitivity to outcome will help to decide on this question.

317 The interim analysis of the CATNON trial has shown a similar risk reduction (HR 0.65) in non-co-
318 deleted anaplastic glioma treated with adjuvant temozolomide to that from adjuvant PCV in the low
319 grade glioma trial, with an overall HR of 0.59, and HR 0.73 for the subset of astrocytoma (less likely
320 1p/19q co-deleted).¹⁷ Since the distinction between WHO grade II and III diffuse glioma is subjective
321 and gradual and these tumors have similar molecular abnormalities, it seems reasonable to consider
322 adjuvant temozolomide for patients with grade II non-co-deleted diffuse glioma. Furthermore, four
323 trials now show clear clinical benefits from adding chemotherapy to radiotherapy, whereas two trials
324 in grade II and III glioma failed to show improved outcome with initial chemotherapy alone compared
325 to initial radiotherapy alone.^{15-17;29;30} With the currently available data, it seems prudent to
326 extrapolate that treatment with chemotherapy alone will deliver worse OS results compared to initial
327 treatment with radiotherapy and adjuvant chemotherapy. Another issue relates to the use of 12
328 cycles adjuvant treatment in this trial, whereas for glioblastoma 6 cycles of adjuvant temozolomide
329 are advised. This duration of 12 cycles was chosen as half of the patients randomized to the adjuvant
330 arm would not receive concurrent TMZ, and we specifically wanted sufficient TMZ exposure in the
331 patients treated with TMZ in adjuvant setting alone. Lastly, the role of concurrent temozolomide
332 remains to be clarified, at present no evidence based guidance can be given on this part of the
333 treatment. While concurrent chemo-irradiation with temozolomide improves outcome in
334 glioblastoma, outcome data on the individual parts of combined treatment (concurrent and
335 adjuvant) in glioblastoma are lacking.¹ Also, as opposed to the 12 months of adjuvant treatment in
336 the CATNON trial, the pivotal glioblastoma trial used only 6 months adjuvant treatment. Of note, the
337 use of concurrent temozolomide with radiation therapy may increase late neurotoxicity, which will
338 especially be relevant in favorable prognosis patients.

339 To conclude, the preplanned interim analysis of the CATNON trial shows that 12 cycles of adjuvant
340 temozolomide given after radiotherapy significantly improves OS in 1p/19q non-co-deleted
341 anaplastic glioma and should now constitute standard care. Further follow-up and tissue studies are
342 required to establish the efficacy of concurrent temozolomide chemotherapy and the impact of the
343 molecular signature on outcome.

344

345 Acknowledgements

346 Study support for EORTC by the EORTC Cancer Research Fund; for NRG by NRG grants U10CA180868
347 (NRG Oncology Operations) and U10CA180822 (NRG Oncology SDMC), and for Australia by Cancer
348 Australia (Project Grants 1026842 and 1078655)

349 Contributions

350 The study was designed by MVDB, BB, SCE, MAV, AAB, PC, WM, MW, RS, KA, HJD, WNMD, TG, WW.
351 The data were analyzed and the manuscripts was prepared by MVDB, BB, SE, AAB, AKN, WT, MW,
352 HJD, WNMD, PW, VG, TG, WW, JMK. All authors provided administrative support and contributed
353 to the data collection, and approval of the final version of the manuscript.

354 Disclosures authors

355 Dr. van den Bent reports grants from MSD, during the conduct of the study; personal fees from Novartis,
356 personal fees from BMS, personal fees from Roche, grants and personal fees from Abbvie, personal fees from
357 Actelion, personal fees from Blue Earth Diagnostics, personal fees from Cavion, personal fees from MSD,
358 personal fees from Merck Ag, outside the submitted work;

359 Dr. Baumert reports personal fees, non-financial support and other from Noxxon, personal fees and non-
360 financial support from Roche/Genentech, outside the submitted work;

361 Dr. Vogelbaum reports other from Infuseon Therapeutics, Inc, personal fees from NeuralStem, Inc,
362 personal fees from Tocagen, personal fees from Medicenna, outside the submitted work;

363 Dr. Nowak reports grants from Astra Zeneca Australia, personal fees from Bayer pharmaceuticals, personal fees
364 from Roche pharmaceuticals, personal fees from Sellas Life Sciences, personal fees from Aduro pharma,
365 personal fees from Astra Zeneca, personal fees from Boehringer Ingelheim, outside the submitted work;

366 Dr. Clement reports grants from MSD, outside the submitted work;

367 Dr. Mason reports personal fees from Merck and Co., during the conduct of the study; .

368 Dr. Olivier Chinot reports grants, personal fees and non-financial support from ROCHE, personal fees from
369 IPSEN, personal fees from SERVIER, personal fees from CELDEX, personal fees from IMMATICS, personal fees
370 from BMS, outside the submitted work;

371 Dr. Weller reports grants from MSD, personal fees from MSD, outside the submitted work;

372 Dr. McBain reports personal fees from Bristol Meyers Squibb, personal fees from Bristol Meyers Squibb, other
373 from Bristol Meyers Squibb, outside the submitted work; .

374 Dr. Reijneveld reports non-financial support from Roche Nederland BV, outside the submitted work;

375 Dr. Lesimple reports personal fees and non-financial support from Roche, personal fees and non-financial
376 support from BMS, personal fees and non-financial support from MSD, personal fees and non-financial support
377 from Novartis, outside the submitted work;

378 Dr. Ulrich Herrlinger reports grants and personal fees from Roche, personal fees from Medac, personal fees
379 from Bristol-Myer-Squibbs, personal fees from Novocure, personal fees from Mundipharma, personal fees from
380 Noxxon, outside the submitted work;

381 Dr. Hau reports personal fees from Roche, personal fees from Novocure, non-financial support from Medac,
382 outside the submitted work;

383 Dr. Stupp reports other from Celgene, other from Ipsen, other from MSD-Merck, other from Novartis, other
384 from Novocure, other from Roche, outside the submitted work; and Spouse employee of Celgene

385 Dr. Aldape reports personal fees from Merck, personal fees from Cavion, outside the submitted work

386 Dr. Wick reports grants and personal fees from Roche, grants from Pfizer, grants from Boehringer Ingelheim,
387 grants from Apogenix, personal fees from Celldex, personal fees from BMS, outside the submitted work;

388

389

390

391 Table 1. Patient characteristics at the time of randomization, including the stratification factors (bolded).

	Treatment arm				Total (N=745) N (%)
	RT (N=187) N (%)	TMZ/RT (N=185) N (%)	RT->TMZ (N=185) N (%)	TMZ/RT->TMZ (N=188) N (%)	
	Age (years)				
Median	42.2	43.2	39.9	42.8	42.2
Range	19.0 - 81.2	20.1 - 77.1	20.0 - 82.3	18.3 - 80.1	18.3 - 82.3
≤50 years	132 (71)	124 (67)	129 (70)	129 (69)	514 (69)
>50 years	55 (29)	61 (33)	56 (30)	59 (31)	231 (31)
Presence of oligodendroglial elements (Yes vs No)					
No oligo	144 (77)	141 (76)	143 (77)	144 (77)	572 (77)
Oligo	43 (23)	44 (24)	42 (23)	44 (23)	173 (23)
WHO Performance Status (>0 vs 0)					
PS 0	110 (59)	109 (59)	108 (58)	112 (60)	439 (59)
PS >0	77 (41)	76 (41)	77 (42)	76 (40)	306 (41)
Presence of 1p LOH (Yes vs No)					
1p no loss	173 (93)	173 (94)	171 (92)	175 (93)	692 (93)
1p loss	14 (8)	12 (7)	14 (8)	13 (7)	53 (7)
Pre-randomization MGMT (Methylated vs Unmethylated vs Undetermined/invalid)					
Methylated	29 (16)	27 (14.6)	29 (16)	29 (15)	114 (15)
Unmethylated	40 (21)	40 (21.6)	40 (22)	41 (22)	161 (22)
Undetermined/invalid	118 (63)	118 (63.8)	116 (63)	118 (63)	470 (63)
Post-randomization MGMT (Methylated vs Unmethylated vs Undetermined/invalid)					
Methylated	60 (32)	53 (29)	66 (36)	54 (29)	233 (31)
Unmethylated	80 (43)	76 (41)	76 (41)	85 (45)	317 (43)
Undetermined/invalid	47 (25)	56 (30)	43 (23)	49 (26)	195 (26)

	Treatment arm				
	RT	TMZ/RT	RT->TMZ	TMZ/RT->TMZ	Total
	(N=187)	(N=185)	(N=185)	(N=188)	(N=745)
	N (%)	N (%)	N (%)	N (%)	N (%)
Sex					
male	107 (57)	116 (63)	102 (55)	102 (54)	427 (57)
female	74 (40)	65 (35)	79 (43)	79 (42)	297 (40)
Missing	6 (3)	4 (2)	4 (2)	7 (4)	21 (3)
Mini Mental State Evaluation					
Median	29	30	30	29	29
<27	25 (13)	21 (11)	21 (11)	24 (13)	91 (12)
≥27	138 (74)	150 (81)	145 (78)	146 (78)	579 (78)
Missing	24 (13)	14 (8)	19 (10)	18 (10)	75 (10)
On corticosteroids at study entry					
no	131 (70)	128 (69)	128 (69)	122 (65)	509 (68)
yes	49 (26)	54 (29)	52 (28)	58 (31)	213 (29)
Missing/unknown	7 (4)	3 (2)	5 (3)	8 (4)	23 (3)
Prior surgery for low grade tumor					
no	158 (85)	161 (87)	160 (87)	154 (82)	633 (85)
yes	23 (12)	20 (11)	21 (11)	27 (14)	91 (12)
Missing	6 (3)	4 (2)	4 (2.2)	7 (4)	21 (3)
Type of surgery					
biopsy	33 (18)	41 (22)	35 (19)	40 (21)	149 (20)
partial removal	100 (54)	86 (47)	89 (48)	72 (38)	347 (47)
total removal	48 (26)	54 (29)	57 (31)	69 (37)	228 (31)

393 Table 2. Cox model of the primary endpoint, with the effect of adjuvant temozolomide adjusted by
394 the stratification factors (and MGMT status at randomization).

395

Parameter	Pr > ChiSq	Hazard Ratio (HR)	99.145% HR Confidence Limits
Adjuvant Temozolomide	0.0014	0.65	0.450, 0.926
Age (>50 vs ≤50)	<.0001	4.04	2.784, 5.867
WHO Performance Status (>0 vs 0)	0.0273	1.36	0.943, 1.960
Presence of 1p LOH (Yes vs No)	0.0572	1.56	0.844, 2.877
Presence of oligodendroglial elements (Yes vs No)	0.2230	1.20	0.812, 1.762
MGMT (Methylated vs Unmethylated)	0.0031	0.49	0.259, 0.925
MGMT (Undetermined/invalid vs Unmethylated)	0.1606	0.81	0.538, 1.207

396

397

398 77 3. Median (months) and 5-year OS and PFS (percentage) with 95% CI

399

Adjuvant TMZ	Progression Free survival			Overall Survival		
	Events	Median (months)	% at 5-years	Events	Median (months)	% alive at 5-years
No	200	19.0 (14.4, 24.6)	24.3 (17.7, 31.6)	129	41.10 (36.6, 60.7)	44.1 (36.3, 51.6)
Yes	144	42.8 (28.6, 60.6)	43.1 (35.0, 50.9)	92	Not reached	55.9 (47.2, 63.8)

400

401

402 Figure 1: CONSORT diagram at the time of interim analysis

403

404 Figure 2 a, b. Overall survival (a) and Progression Free Survival (b) in patients treated with or without
405 adjuvant temozolomide chemotherapy

406

407

408

Reference List

409

- 410 (1) Stupp R, Mason WP, van den Bent MJ, Weller M, Fisher B, Taphoorn MJ et al. Radiotherapy
411 plus concomitant and adjuvant temozolomide for glioblastoma. *N Engl J Med* 2005;352:987-
412 96.
- 413 (2) Hegi ME, Diserens A-C, Gorlia T, Hamou M-F, de Tribolet N, Weller M et al. MGMT gene
414 silencing and benefit from temozolomide in glioblastoma. *N Engl J Med* 2005;352:997-1003.
- 415 (3) van den Bent MJ, Carpentier AF, Brandes AA, Sanson M, Taphoorn MJB, Bernsen HJJA et al.
416 Adjuvant PCV improves progression free survival but not overall survival in newly diagnosed
417 anaplastic oligodendrogliomas and oligoastrocytomas: a randomized EORTC phase III trial. *J*
418 *Clin Oncol* 2006;24:2715-22.
- 419 (4) Cairncross JG, Berkey B, Shaw E, Jenkins RB, Scheithauer BW, Brachman D et al. Phase III trial
420 of chemotherapy plus radiotherapy (RT) versus RT alone for pure and mixed anaplastic
421 oligodendroglioma (RTOG 9402): an intergroup trial by the RTOG, NCCTG, SWOG, NCI CTG
422 and ECOG. *J Clin Oncol* 2006;24:2707-14.
- 423 (5) Cairncross JG, Ueki K, Zlatescu MC, Lisle DK, Finkelstein DM, Hammond RR et al. Specific
424 genetic predictors of chemotherapeutic response and survival in patients with anaplastic
425 oligodendrogliomas. *J Natl Canc Inst* 1998;90:1473-9.
- 426 (6) Jenkins RB, Curran W, Scott CB, Cairncross G. Pilot evaluation of 1p and 19q deletions in
427 anaplastic oligodendrogliomas collected by a national cooperative cancer treatment group.
428 *Am J Clin Oncol* 2001 October;24(5):506-8.
- 429 (7) Dubbink HJ, Atmodimedjo PN, van MR, Krol NM, Riegman PH, Kros JM et al. Diagnostic
430 Detection of Allelic Losses and Imbalances by Next-Generation Sequencing: 1p/19q Co-
431 Deletion Analysis of Gliomas. *J Mol Diagn* 2016 September;18(5):775-86.
- 432 (8) Vlassenbroeck I, Califice S, Diserens AC, Migliavacca E, Straub J, Di S, I et al. Validation of real-
433 time methylation-specific PCR to determine O6-methylguanine-DNA methyltransferase gene
434 promoter methylation in glioma. *J Mol Diagn* 2008 July;10(4):332-7.
- 435 (9) ICRU (1993). International Commission on Radiation Units and Measurements. ICRU report
436 50. Prescribing, Recording and Reporting Photon Beam Therapy. Bethesda, MD: 1993.
- 437 (10) International Commission on Radiation Units and Measurements. ICRU Report 62.
438 Prescribing, recording, and reporting photon beam therapy (Supplement to ICRU Report 50).
439 Bethesda, MD: ICRU, 1999.
- 440 (11) Macdonald DR, Cascino TL, Schold SC, Cairncross JG. Response criteria for phase II studies of
441 supratentorial malignant glioma. *J Clin Oncol* 1990;8:1277-80.
- 442 (12) Taphoorn MJ, van den Bent MJ, Mauer ME, Coens C, Delattre JY, Brandes AA et al. Health-
443 related quality of life in patients treated for anaplastic oligodendroglioma with adjuvant
444 chemotherapy: results of a European Organisation for Research and Treatment of Cancer
445 randomized clinical trial. *J Clin Oncol* 2007 December 20;25(36):5723-30.

- 446 (13) Folstein MF, Folstein SE, McHugh PR. "Mini-mental state". A practical method for grading the
447 cognitive state of patients for the clinician. *J Psychiatr Res* 1975 November;12(3):189-98.
- 448 (14) van den Bent MJ, Wefel JS, Schiff D, Taphoorn MJ, Jaeckle K, Junck L et al. Response
449 assessment in neuro-oncology (a report of the RANO group): assessment of outcome in trials
450 of diffuse low-grade gliomas. *Lancet Oncol* 2011 June;12(6):583-93.
- 451 (15) van den Bent MJ, Brandes AA, Taphoorn MJ, Kros JM, Kouwenhoven MC, Delattre JY et al.
452 Adjuvant Procarbazine, Lomustine, and Vincristine Chemotherapy in Newly Diagnosed
453 Anaplastic Oligodendroglioma: Long-Term Follow-Up of EORTC Brain Tumor Group Study
454 26951. *J Clin Oncol* 2013;31:344-50.
- 455 (16) Cairncross G, Wang M, Shaw E, Jenkins R, Brachman D, Buckner J et al. Phase III trial of
456 chemoradiotherapy for anaplastic oligodendroglioma: long-term results of RTOG 9402. *J Clin*
457 *Oncol* 2013 January 20;31(3):337-43.
- 458 (17) Buckner JC, Shaw EG, Pugh SL, Chakravarti A, Gilbert MR, Barger GR et al. Radiation plus
459 Procarbazine, CCNU, and Vincristine in Low-Grade Glioma. *N Engl J Med* 2016 April
460 6;374(14):1344-55.
- 461 (18) Chang S, Zhang P, Cairncross JG, Gilbert MR, Bahary JP, Dolinskas CA et al. Phase III
462 randomized study of radiation and temozolomide versus radiation and nitrosourea therapy
463 for anaplastic astrocytoma: results of NRG Oncology RTOG 9813. *Neuro Oncol* 2016
464 December 18.
- 465 (19) Wick W, Hartmann C, Engel C, Stoffels M, Felsberg J, Stockhammer F et al. NOA-04
466 Randomized Phase III Trial of Sequential Radiochemotherapy of Anaplastic Glioma With
467 Procarbazine, Lomustine, and Vincristine or Temozolomide. *J Clin Oncol* 2009 November
468 9;27:5874-80.
- 469 (20) Parsons DW, Jones S, Zhang X, Lin JC, Leary RJ, Angenendt P et al. An integrated genomic
470 analysis of human glioblastoma multiforme. *Science* 2008 September 26;321(5897):1807-12.
- 471 (21) van den Bent MJ, Dubbink HJ, Marie Y, Brandes AA, Taphoorn MJ, Wesseling P et al. IDH1 and
472 IDH2 mutations are prognostic but not predictive for outcome in anaplastic oligodendroglial
473 tumors: a report of the European Organization for Research and Treatment of Cancer Brain
474 Tumor Group. *Clin Cancer Res* 2010 March 1;16(5):1597-604.
- 475 (22) Sanson M, Marie Y, Paris S, Idbaih A, Laffaire J, Ducray F et al. Isocitrate dehydrogenase 1
476 codon 132 mutation is an important prognostic biomarker in gliomas. *J Clin Oncol* 2009
477 September 1;27(25):4150-4.
- 478 (23) Wiestler B, Capper D, Sill M, Jones DT, Hovestadt V, Sturm D et al. Integrated DNA
479 methylation and copy-number profiling identify three clinically and biologically relevant
480 groups of anaplastic glioma. *Acta Neuropathol* 2014 October;128(4):561-71.
- 481 (24) Louis DN, Ohgaki H, Wiestler OD, Cavenee WK, Ellison DW, Figarella-Branger D et al. WHO
482 classification of tumours of the central nervous system. revised 4th edition ed. Lyon; 2016.
- 483 (25) Bady P, Delorenzi M, Hegi ME. Sensitivity Analysis of the MGMT-STP27 Model and Impact of
484 Genetic and Epigenetic Context to Predict the MGMT Methylation Status in Gliomas and
485 Other Tumors. *J Mol Diagn* 2016 February 27.

- 486 (26) Bady P, Sciuscio D, Diserens AC, Bloch J, van den Bent MJ, Marosi C et al. MGMT methylation
487 analysis of glioblastoma on the Infinium methylation BeadChip identifies two distinct CpG
488 regions associated with gene silencing and outcome, yielding a prediction model for
489 comparisons across datasets, tumor grades, and CIMP-status. *Acta Neuropathol* 2012
490 October;124(4):547-60.
- 491 (27) van den Bent MJ, Erdem-Eraslan L, Idbaih A, de RJ, Eilers PH, Spliet WG et al. MGMT-STP27
492 methylation status as predictive marker for response to PCV in anaplastic
493 Oligodendrogliomas and Oligoastrocytomas. A report from EORTC study 26951. *Clin Cancer
494 Res* 2013 October 1;19(19):5513-22.
- 495 (28) Cairncross JG, Wang M, Jenkins RB, Shaw EG, Giannini C, Brachman DG et al. Benefit From
496 Procarbazine, Lomustine, and Vincristine in Oligodendroglial Tumors Is Associated With
497 Mutation of IDH. *J Clin Oncol* 2014 March 10;32(8):783-90.
- 498 (29) Wick W, Roth P, Hartmann C, Hau P, Nakamura M, Stockhammer F et al. Long-term analysis
499 of the NOA-04 randomized phase III trial of sequential radiochemotherapy of anaplastic
500 glioma with PCV or temozolomide. *Neuro Oncol* 2016 July 1.
- 501 (30) Baumert BG, Hegi ME, van den Bent MJ, von DA, Gorlia T, Hoang-Xuan K et al. Temozolomide
502 chemotherapy versus radiotherapy in high-risk low-grade glioma (EORTC 22033-26033): a
503 randomised, open-label, phase 3 intergroup study. *Lancet Oncol* 2016 September 26.
504
505