Worldwide Clinical Trials | Oncology

Optimizing Clinical Development Success in Hematologic Malignancies

Louise Scott, PhD, Senior Director, Therapeutic Strategy Lead, Oncology

Hematologic malignancies account for roughly 1.3 million new cases and 665,000 deaths globally each year, spanning a remarkably diverse group of diseases that include leukemias, lymphomas, and multiple myeloma (Bray et al., 2024).[1] However, blood cancer clinical development is among the most dynamic areas in oncology. Precision medicine, cellular therapies, bispecific antibodies, and sophisticated trial designs have collectively changed patient possibilities. For biotech and emerging biopharma companies developing novel blood cancer therapies, the path from an early-stage program to regulatory approval demands an expert-level understanding of disease biology, complex response assessments, the treatment landscape, and the operational factors that will determine a program's success.

Why is Clinical Development in Hematologic Malignancies Different?

The 5th edition of the WHO Classification of Haematolymphoid Tumours (WHO-HAEM5) recognizes dozens of distinct entities organized around genetic and molecular features, including 12 families of mature B-cell neoplasms and 9 families of mature T- and NK-cell neoplasms (Alaggio et al., 2022).[2] This molecular heterogeneity has serious implications for drug development. A therapy effective in one molecularly defined subtype may have no relevance to another, and disease biology dictates strategy. For example, the treatment approach for TP53-mutated acute myeloid leukemia (AML) differs fundamentally from that for NPM1-mutated disease, just as IGHV-mutated chronic lymphocytic leukemia (CLL) follows a different trajectory than IGHV-unmutated disease (Döhner et al., 2022; Bennett et al., 2023).[3,4]

The growing influence of precision medicine compounds this complexity across the development lifecycle. Sponsors can not design a single trial for "leukemia" or "lymphoma"; they must account for molecular subtyping, risk stratification, and biomarker-defined populations from the earliest planning stages. For sponsors, this diversity means that assay strategy, companion diagnostic planning, and patient identification protocols must be built into program architecture from the outset rather than retrofitted later. As patient populations become increasingly segmented, identifying and accessing eligible patients presents an additional challenge for global development programs. Non-Hodgkin lymphoma alone, the most common hematologic malignancy, is projected to grow to nearly 890,000 annual cases by 2045, and its incidence correlates strongly with regional development indices, meaning global programs face uneven patient distributions (Kuang et al., 2026).[5]

Beyond molecular heterogeneity at diagnosis, hematologic malignancies are defined by their capacity to evolve over time in ways that few solid tumors match. Blood cancers can progress from indolent precursor conditions to aggressive disease states, undergo histologic transformation, acquire new molecular abnormalities through clonal evolution, and develop resistance to therapies that initially produced durable responses. Myelodysplastic syndromes can transform into acute myeloid leukemia; follicular lymphoma can give rise to diffuse large B-cell lymphoma; and chronic myeloid leukemia can accelerate through an advanced phase to blast crisis. These transitions mark disease worsening and can alter the biology a trial was designed to target, reshaping the patient population under study while the study is still underway.

These evolutionary dynamics carry direct consequences for clinical development. Patient populations may shift as diseases transform, complicating eligibility criteria, stratification, and the interpretability of outcomes across a long-running trial. Endpoint strategy must account for the possibility that the disease being measured at follow-up is biologically distinct from the disease that was treated at enrollment, which can affect the validity of response assessments and the durability of survival endpoints. Follow-up requirements may need to extend well beyond the treatment period to capture transformations, relapses, and resistance patterns that emerge months or years later. For sponsors, these dynamics argue for building flexibility into long-term development planning. This includes designing programs that can accommodate evolving disease biology through adaptive eligibility, longitudinal biomarker monitoring, and pre-specified plans for analyzing transformed or resistant subpopulations rather than treating evolution as an unanticipated complication.

What Emerging Modalities Are Reshaping Hematologic Malignancy Research?

The treatment landscape for blood cancers has been reshaped by a wave of novel modalities that have moved from experimental concepts to regulatory mainstays in under a decade.

Cell Therapies

Several autologous chimeric antigen receptor (CAR)-T cell products have now received FDA approval, targeting CD19 in B-cell acute lymphoblastic leukemia (ALL) and large B-cell lymphoma and BCMA in multiple myeloma. The clinical impact is substantial: in the CARTITUDE-1 trial, ciltacabtagene autoleucel produced a 12-month progression-free response rate of 77% and an overall response rate of 89% (Berdeja et al., 2021).[6] In the ZUMA-1 trial, axicabtagene ciloleucel achieved an 82% objective response rate in refractory large B-cell lymphoma (Locke et al., 2021).[7] These results have redefined the treatment ceiling for relapsed and refractory disease — but they also impose demanding operational requirements, including leukapheresis coordination, vein-to-vein time management, specialized toxicity monitoring for cytokine release syndrome and neurotoxicity, and complex chemistry, manufacturing, and controls (CMC) oversight.

Bispecific Antibodies

T-cell-engaging bispecifics have emerged as a major therapeutic class, with six products approved across multiple myeloma and lymphoma indications. Teclistamab, elranatamab, and talquetamab target BCMA or GPRC5D in relapsed myeloma (Baines et al., 2024; FDA Elranatamab (Elrexfio) Approval Letter, 2023),[8,9] while mosunetuzumab, glofitamab, and epcoritamab target CD20 in follicular lymphoma and diffuse large B-cell lymphoma (Budde et al., 2022; FDA Accelerated Approval glofitamab-gxbm, 2023).[10,11] Because bispecifics are off-the-shelf products, they offer operational advantages over CAR-T. However, they raise their own execution challenges, including step-up dosing schedules, inpatient or intensive outpatient monitoring, and managing cumulative toxicity across prolonged treatment.

Antibody-Drug Conjugates

ADCs are also gaining ground in hematologic malignancies. Polatuzumab vedotin combined with R-CHP became a new first-line standard in diffuse large B-cell lymphoma after the POLARIX trial demonstrated a 27% reduction in the risk of progression or death compared with R-CHOP (Yazdy et al., 2024).[12] Loncastuximab tesirine and emerging agents such as zilovertamab vedotin are expanding the ADC toolkit (Cami et al., 2021; Berberabe, 2025).[13,14]

Novel combination strategies that pair these modalities with each other and with established immunotherapies are creating a development environment where sponsors must simultaneously track multiple ongoing trials and make rapid, evidence-based decisions for treatment differentiation.

How Are Sponsors Designing Smarter Hematologic Malignancy Studies?

Endpoint selection in hematologic malignancies is uniquely challenging because no single measure can fully capture treatment effect across the diversity of blood cancers. Unlike many solid tumors, where overall survival and progression-free survival dominate the endpoint landscape, blood cancer trials routinely rely on a combination of clinical, molecular, and survival endpoints, including complete response rates, molecular remissions, measurable residual disease (MRD) status, event-free survival, and overall survival, often within the same study. The appropriate primary endpoint for a given trial depends on the disease, its stage, the mechanism of the therapy under investigation, and the regulatory pathway being pursued, making early alignment between endpoint strategy and disease biology essential.

The growing importance of MRD as both a prognostic marker and a validated intermediate endpoint exemplifies this complexity. MRD negativity can predict long-term outcomes in diseases such as acute lymphoblastic leukemia and multiple myeloma, and regulators have signaled willingness to accept MRD-based endpoints to support accelerated approval. MRD assessment requires sensitive, standardized, and disease-specific assays, and its predictive value varies across disease settings and treatment modalities. Sponsors must therefore align endpoint strategy early, with disease biology, regulatory expectations, and overall study design. This is critical because defaulting to conventional endpoints may not capture the therapeutic benefit most relevant to the population being studied.

These endpoint decisions also have downstream implications for trial execution that extend well beyond statistical planning. The choice of endpoint shapes assessment schedules, determining how frequently patients must be evaluated and what testing must occur at each visit. Molecular and MRD endpoints impose specific laboratory and biomarker testing requirements (e.g., specialized assays, central laboratories, standardized sample handling, and stringent quality controls) that must be operationalized across every participating site. Endpoints that depend on long-term outcomes extend follow-up duration, increasing the operational burden of maintaining patient retention and data quality over time. Protocols must design data collection strategies to capture the right measures at the right intervals without overwhelming sites or compromising patient experience. For sponsors, these considerations mean that endpoint selection is not an isolated statistical decision but one that reverberates through every operational layer of the trial.

The shift toward biomarker-driven development changes blood cancer trial design and execution. Endpoint selection is improving, with MRD emerging as a validated intermediate endpoint. Blinatumomab was the first therapy approved on the basis of an MRD endpoint, after 72-85% of MRD-positive ALL patients achieved complete MRD response (Jen et al., 2019).[15] In April 2024, the FDA's Oncologic Drugs Advisory Committee voted unanimously that MRD-negative complete response is reasonably likely to predict clinical benefit in multiple myeloma, paving the way for its use as a primary endpoint to support accelerated approval (Serani, 2024).[16] A pooled analysis of 11 randomized trials and 4,773 patients validated MRD-negative complete response as an intermediate endpoint across multiple myeloma settings (Shi et al., 2025).[17]

Biomarker integration and patient segmentation are an inherent component of AML development. The 2022 European LeukemiaNet recommendations classify AML into favorable, intermediate, and adverse risk groups based on molecular markers (Döhner et al., 2022).[3] Sponsors must therefore build risk stratification into eligibility criteria and stratification plans from the start.

In addition, master protocols, platform trials, and adaptive designs are increasingly used to accelerate development and maximize signal detection across biomarker-defined subpopulations. The BeatAML master trial prospectively enrolled 395 patients and centrally assigned to genomic subgroups within seven days, treating 224 patients; patients receiving the precision approach had a significantly higher overall survival versus those receiving standard of care (Burd et al., 2020).[18] These designs offer significant scientific

advantages, and require robust data management infrastructure, experienced clinical teams, and careful planning of adaptive decision rules. For emerging biotech sponsors approaching these choices for the first time, the cost of a poorly executed protocol revision is high.

What Are the Best Patient Identification & Enrollment Practices?

Even the most elegantly designed protocol cannot overcome a fundamental enrollment challenge; molecularly defined subpopulations in hematologic malignancies are small. In AML, IDH1 mutations occur in roughly 8% of patients and IDH2 and TP53 each in 12% of patients (Kayser & Levis, 2023).[19] When multiple trials compete for the same molecularly characterized patients across overlapping indications, enrollment becomes a bottleneck.

Best practices begin with site selection grounded in performance, patient access, and disease-specific expertise. Specialized academic centers form the backbone of hematologic malignance research, with the 74 NCI-designated cancer centers seeing a significant proportion of newly diagnosed cancer patients annually (NCI-Designated Cancer Centers, 2026).[20] For molecularly defined diseases, pan-network consortia are vital. The myeloMATCH platform brings together SWOG, Alliance, ECOG-ACRIN, and the Canadian Cancer Trials Group within the NCTN, with the goal of enrolling 5,000 newly diagnosed AML and MDS patients through molecular screening and assignment (SWOG Cancer Research Network, 2026).[21] Working with specialized hematology centers, building referral networks, implementing pre-screening programs that identify eligible patients before a trial opens, and monitoring enrollment in real time are prerequisites for meeting milestone commitments in populations with significant, oftentimes unmet, medical need.

What Can We Learn from Operational Lessons in Complex Blood Cancer Programs?

Complex blood cancer programs raise operational challenges that distinguish them from solid tumor trials. Site activation and startup must be coordinated across specialized centers with the infrastructure to support intensive monitoring, infusion logistics, and complex safety management. Building strong investigator relationships is foundational: experienced hematology-oncology investigators not only drive enrollment but also influence protocol feasibility, eligibility refinement, and the scientific credibility of the program.

Complex treatment modalities such as CAR-T, bispecific antibodies, and novel combinations, are safety intensive requiring robust medical monitoring capabilities and well-defined adverse event management pathways. Cytokine release syndrome, immune effector cell-associated neurotoxicity syndrome, and prolonged cytopenias require real-time data review and oversight. Sponsors need operational partners with experience scaling these programs, maintaining study momentum during challenging enrollment periods, and making evidence-based go/no-go decisions. Data review and oversight considerations extend beyond traditional monitoring to include centralized response assessment, MRD laboratory coordination, and biomarker data integration.

How Should You Plan for Global Development Success?

Global development planning must begin early and build studies with future expansion in mind. Designing eligibility criteria, endpoint strategies, and operational frameworks that can scale from proof-of-concept to registrational studies is far more efficient and cost-effective than redesigning mid-program. Regulatory pathways are supporting this. The FDA's Regenerative Medicine Advanced Therapy (RMAT) designation has accelerated, and become a known expedited pathway for cell and gene therapies including CAR-T products (FDA Cumulative CBER Regenerative Medicine Advanced Therapy, 2025).[22] In Europe, the EMA's PRIME scheme provides early and proactive support for priority medicines, though its acceptance rate of roughly 27% highlights the importance of strong scientific strategy (EMA Human Medicines Annual Report 2024).[23]

Regional differences in standard of care add additional considerations. In frontline multiple myeloma, quadruplet regimens dominate in Germany, the U.K., and France, while triplet regimens are more prevalent in the U.S., Spain, Brazil, and China (Rivolo et al., 2023).[24]

These differences complicate the design of global registrational trials, where control arms must reflect local standard of care. Sponsors must also contend with participation disparities. A review of pivotal myeloma trials found that 100% enrolled patients in high-income countries, while none enrolled patients from low-income countries (Fatoki et al., 2022).[25] Preparing for registrational development means anticipating these regional variations and building a global strategy that can synchronize multi-country submissions without sacrificing speed.

What Are the Important Questions to Ask Before Trial Start?

Site, Operations & Design Strategies:

- Have we selected sites based on high performance, patient access, and disease expertise?
- Have we developed biomarker and patient identification strategies early, with assay and companion diagnostic plans integrated into program architecture?
- Do we fully understand referral pathways and patient flow patterns across the specialized centers we are engaging?
- Are we designing today's study with future registrational development in mind, including endpoints that can support accelerated approval pathways?
- Does our strategy support efficient global expansion, accounting for regional differences in standard of care and regulatory requirements?
- Have we identified and mitigated operational risks before study launch, including manufacturing logistics, safety monitoring, and competitive trial density?

Endpoint Selection Strategies:

- Have we selected endpoints that align with disease biology, treatment setting, and anticipated regulatory pathways?
- Have we accounted for disease evolution, transformation, and treatment resistance in our long-term development strategy?
- How crowded is the competitive trial landscape for our target patient population, and how could it affect enrollment timelines?

Worldwide's Commitment to Hematologic Malignancy Clinical Research

Hematologic malignancies represent one of the most dynamic and complex areas of oncology research, driven by advances in precision medicine CAR-T therapies, bispecific antibodies, ADCs, and novel combination strategies. Success requires deep therapeutic expertise, robust biomarker strategies, specialized site networks, and the operational flexibility to support innovative clinical programs across all stages of development.

Worldwide Clinical Trials brings this combination to every hematology-oncology program it supports. With more than 4,000 professionals operating across 70+ countries, Worldwide delivers therapeutically dedicated oncology expertise, data-driven site and country selection, and a flexible service model that adapts to the needs of development-stage biotechs and emerging biopharma companies alike. From first-in-human studies through global registrational trials, Worldwide is built to support sponsors at every stage of the hematologic malignancy clinical development journey.

The author would like to acknowledge the contribution of Zach Rosinger, PhD, in the preparation of this article.

References

1. Bray F, Laversanne M, Sung H, Ferlay J, Siegel RL, Soerjomataram I, Jemal A. Global Cancer Statistics 2022: GLOBOCAN Estimates of Incidence and Mortality and Patterns of Cancer worldwide. CA: A Cancer Journal for Clinicians. 2024 May/Jun;74(3):229–263. PMID: 38572751. doi: 10.3322/caac.21834. https://doi.org/10.3322/caac.21834

2. Alaggio R, Amador C, Anagnostopoulos I ... Xiao W. The 5th Edition of the World Health Organization Classification of Haematolymphoid Tumours: Lymphoid Neoplasms. Leukemia. 2022 Jul;36(7):1720–1748. PMID: 35732829. PMCID: PMC9214472. doi: 10.1038/s41375-022-01620-2. https://www.nature.com/articles/s41375-022-01620-2

3. Döhner H, Wei AH, Appelbaum FR ... Löwenberg B. Diagnosis and Management of AML in Adults: 2022 Recommendations from an International Expert Panel on Behalf of the ELN. Blood. 2022 Sep 22;140(12):1345–1377. PMID: 35797463. doi: 10.1182/blood.2022016867.

4. Bennett R, Anderson MA, Syemour JF. Unresolved Questions in Selection of Therapies for Treatment-Naïve Chronic Lymphocytic Leukemia. J Hematol Oncol. 2023 Jul 8;16(1):72. PMID: 37422670. PMCID: PMC10329329. doi: 10.1186/s13045-023-01469-7. https://doi.org/10.1186/s13045-023-01469-7

5. Kuang Z, Zheng L, Yan L, Liu R, Zheng X, Ye A, Tu J. The Global Landscape of Non-Hodgkin Lymphoma Incidence and Mortality in 2022 and Predictions for 2045. Arch Med Sci. 2026 May 11;22(3):1312-1325. PMCID: PMC13426179. PMID: 42540595. doi: 10.5114/aoms/218811. https://pmc.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/articles/PMC13426179/

6. Berdeja JG, Madduri D, Usmani SZ ... Jagannath S. Ciltacabtagene Autoleucel, a B-cell Maturation Antigen–Directed Chimeric Antigen Receptor T-Cell Therapy in Patients with Relapsed or Refractory Multiple Myeloma (CARTITUDE-1): A Phase 1b/2 Open-Label Study. Lancet. 2021 Jul 24;398:314–324. PMID: 34175021. doi: 10.1016/S0140-6736(21)00933-8

7. Neelapu SS, Locke FL, Bartlett NL ... Go WY. Axicabtagene Ciloleucel CAR T-Cell Therapy in Refractory Large B-Cell Lymphoma. N Engl J Med. 2017 Dec 28;377(26):2531–2544. PMID: 29226797. PMCID: PMC5882485. doi: 10.1056/NEJMoa1707447. https://doi.org/10.1056/NEJMoa1707447

8. Baines AC, Kanapuru B, Zhao J, Price LS, Zheng N, Konicki R, Manning ML, Gehrke BJ, Theoret MR, Gormley NJ. FDA Approval Summary: Teclistamab. Clin Cancer Res. 2024 Dec 16;30(24):5515-5520. PMID: 39412823. PMCID: PMC11649460. doi: 10.1158/1078-0432.CCR-24-1872. https://doi.org/10.1158/1078-0432.CCR-24-1417

9. U.S. FDA. Elranatamab (Elrexfio) Approval Letter, BLA 761345. FDA.gov Aug 14, 2023. https://www.accessdata.fda.gov/drugsatfda_docs/appletter/2023/761345Orig1s000ltr.pdf

10. Budde LE, Sehn LH, Matasar M ... Bartlett NL. Safety and Efficacy of Mosunetuzumab, a Bispecific Antibody, in Relapsed or Refractory Follicular Lymphoma. Lancet Oncol. 2022 Aug;23(8):1055–1065. PMID: 35803286. doi: 10.1016/S1470-2045(22)00335-7. https://doi.org/10.1016/S1470-2045(22)00335-7

11. U.S. FDA. FDA grants accelerated approval to glofitamab-gxbm for Selected Relapsed or Refractory Large B-Cell Lymphomas. FDA.gov June 15, 2023. https://www.fda.gov/drugs/drug-approvals-and-databases/fda-grants-accelerated-approval-glofitamab-gxbm

12. Yazdy MS, Kasamon YL, Gu W, Rodriguez LR, Jin S, Bhatnagar V, Richardson NC, Theoret MR, Pazdur R, Gormely NJ. FDA Approval Summary: Polatuzumab Vedotin in the First-Line Treatment of Select Large-Cell Lymphomas. Clin Cancer Res. 2024 Dec 16;30(24):5521-5526. PMID: 39404868. PMCID: PMC11649458. doi: 10.1158/1078-0432.CCR-24-1729. https://doi.org/10.1158/1078-0432.CCR-24-1409

13. Cami PF, Ai W, Alderuccio JP, Ardeshna KM, Hamadani M, Hess B ... Carlo-Stella C. Loncastuximab Tesirine in Relapsed or Refractory Diffuse Large B-Cell Lymphoma (LOTIS-2): A Multicentre, Open-Label, Single-Arm, Phase 2 Trial. Lancet Oncol. 2021 Jun;22(6):790-800. PMID: 33989558. doi: 10.1016/S1470-2045(21)00139-X.

14. Berberabe T. Emerging Data Push Antibody-Drug Conjugates Into Earlier Lines of Therapy in DLBCL. Target Ther Onc. 2025 Dec 19;15(1). https://www.targetedonc.com/view/emerging-trials-push-antibody-drug-conjugates-into-earlier-lines-of-therapy-in-dlbcl.

15. Jen EY, Xu Q, Schetter A, Przepiorka D, Shen YL, Roscoe D, Sridhara R, Deisseroth A, Philip R, Farrell AT, Pazdur R. FDA Approval: Blinatumomab for Patients with B-cell Precursor Acute Lymphoblastic Leukemia in Morphologic Remission with Minimal Residual Disease. Clin Cancer Res. 2019 Jan 15;25(2):473-477. PMID: 30254079. doi: 10.1158/1078-0432.CCR-18-2337.

16. Serani S. FDA's ODAC Votes 12 to 0 That MRD Is a Viable End Point in Myeloma Trials. Targeted Oncol. 2024 Apr 12. https://www.targetedonc.com/view/fda-odac-meeting-april-12-mrd-myeloma-trials.

17. Shi Q, Paiva B, Dimier N, Talpes E, Prior TJ, Orfao A, et al. Minimal Residual Disease–Based End Point for Accelerated Assessment of Clinical Trials in Multiple Myeloma: A Pooled Analysis of Individual Patient Data From Multiple Randomized Trials. J Clin Oncol. 2025 Apr 10;43(11):1289-1301. PMID: 39938021. doi: 10.1200/JCO-24-02020. https://doi.org/10.1200/JCO-24-02020

18. Burd A, Levine RL, Ruppert AS, Mims AS, Borate U ... Byrd JC. Precision Medicine Treatment in Acute Myeloid Leukemia Using Prospective Genomic Profiling: Feasibility and Preliminary Efficacy of the Beat AML Master Trial. Nat Med. 2020 Dec;26(12):1852–1858. PMID: 33106665. PMCID: PMC8530434. doi: 10.1038/s41591-020-1089-8.

19. Kayser S, Levis MJ. The Clinical Impact of the Molecular Landscape of Acute Myeloid Leukemia. Haematologica. 2023 Feb 1;108(2):308–320. PMID: 36722402. PMCID: PMC9890016. doi: 10.3324/haematol.2022.280801. https://doi.org/10.3324/haematol.2022.280801

20. National Cancer Institute. NCI-Designated Cancer Centers. 2026. https://www.cancer.gov/research/infrastructure/cancer-centers/find.

21. SWOG Cancer Research Network. myeloMATCH Trials in Myeloid Leukemias Open Across US & Canada. SWOG. Oct 23, 2024. https://www.swog.org/news/2024/10/myelomatch-trials-in-myeloid-leukemias-open-across-us-canada.

22. U.S. FDA. Cumulative CBER Regenerative Medicine Advanced Therapy (RMAT) Designation Requests Received by Fiscal Year. Data as of September 30, 2025. https://www.fda.gov/vaccines-blood-biologics/cellular-gene-therapy-products/regenerative-medicine-advanced-therapy-designation.

23. European Medicines Agency. Human medicines — EMA Annual Report 2024. https://www.ema.europa.eu/assets/en/annual-report/2024/human-medicines/index.html.

24. Rivolo S, Capart P, Benedict A. P857: Comparison of Multiple Myeloma Treatment Patterns in 2022 Across United States, South America, Europe and Asia. Hemasphere. 2023 Aug 8;7(Suppl):e397050f. PMCID: PMC10431049. doi: 10.1097/01.HS9.0000970332.39705.0f.

25. Fatoki J, Koehn K, Kelkar A, Al Hadidi S, Mehra N, Mian H, Landgren O, Kazandjian D, Hoffman J, Sborov DW, Mohyuddin GR. Global Myeloma Trial Participation and Drug Access in the Era of Novel Therapies. JCO Glob Oncol. 2022 Aug:8:e2200119. PMID: 35960904. PMCID: PMC9470137. doi: 10.1200/GO.22.00119.

20261111