

Alma Mater Studiorum Università di Bologna Archivio istituzionale della ricerca

Hematopoietic Stem Cell Transplantation in People With Active Secondary Progressive Multiple Sclerosis

This is the final peer-reviewed author's accepted manuscript (postprint) of the following publication:

Published Version:

Boffa, G., Signori, A., Massacesi, L., Mariottini, A., Sbragia, E., Cottone, S., et al. (2023). Hematopoietic Stem Cell Transplantation in People With Active Secondary Progressive Multiple Sclerosis. NEUROLOGY, 100(11), e1109-e1122 [10.1212/WNL.00000000206750].

Availability:

This version is available at: https://hdl.handle.net/11585/913915 since: 2024-02-24

Published:

DOI: http://doi.org/10.1212/WNL.000000000206750

Terms of use:

Some rights reserved. The terms and conditions for the reuse of this version of the manuscript are specified in the publishing policy. For all terms of use and more information see the publisher's website.

This item was downloaded from IRIS Università di Bologna (https://cris.unibo.it/). When citing, please refer to the published version.

(Article begins on next page)

1	Autologous Hematopoietic Stem Cell Transplantation Reduces Disability Progression In Patients With
2	Secondary Progressive Multiple Sclerosis: Results From The Italian Multiple Sclerosis Register
3	
4	Boffa G ^{*1} MD, Signori A ^{*2} PhD, Massacesi L ³ MD, Mariottini A ³ MD, Cottone S ⁴ MD, Amato MP ⁵ MD,
5	Gasperini C ⁶ MD, Moiola L ⁷ MD, Meletti S ⁸ MD, Brescia Morra V ⁹ MD, Iaffaldano P ¹⁰ MD, Salemi G ¹¹
6	MD, Patti F ¹² MD, Romeo M ⁷ MD, De Luca G ¹³ MD, Lus G ¹⁴ MD, Zaffaroni M ¹⁵ MD, Sola P ¹⁶ MD,
7	Conte A ¹⁷ MD, Pozzilli C ¹⁸ MD, Aguglia U ¹⁹ MD, Granella F ²⁰ MD, Galgani S ²¹ MD, Caniatti LM ²² MD,
8	Lugaresi A ²³ MD, Romano S ²⁴ MD, Saccardi R ²⁵ MD, Angelucci E ²⁶ MD, Mancardi GL ^{1,27} MD, Sormani
9	MP^2 PhD and Inglese M^1 MD, PhD on behalf of the Italian BMT-MS Study Group and the Italian MS
10	Register.
11	
12	* These two authors equally contributed to the work.
13	
14	¹ Department of Neurology, Rehabilitation, Ophthalmology, Genetics, Maternal and Child Health,
15	University of Genoa, San Martino Hospital, Genoa/Italy.
16	² Biostatistics Unit, University of Genoa, Genoa/Italy.
17	³ Department of Neurosciences Drugs and Child Health and Department of Neurology 2, Careggi
18	University Hospital, Florence, Italy
19	⁴ Department of Neurology, Villa Sofia Hospital, Palermo/Italy.
20	⁵ Department NEUROFARBA, Section Neurological Sciences University of Florence IRCCS Fondazione
21	Don Carlo Gnocchi, Florence, Italy
22	⁶ Department of Neurology, Ospedale San Camillo-Forlanini, Roma/Italy.

23 ⁷ Department of Neurology, Vita-Salute San Raffaele University, San Raffaele Scientific Institute,

24 Milan/Italy.

- 25 ⁸ Department of neurology, S.Agostino Estense Hospital, Modena/Italy.
- 26 ⁹ Neurosciences and Reproductive and Odontostomatological Sciences, University "Federico II,"
- 27 Naples, Italy.
- ¹⁰ Department of Basic Medical Sciences, Neurosciences and Sense Organs, University of Bari Aldo
 Moro, Bari/Italy.
- 30 ¹¹ Unit of Neurology, Department of Biomedicine, Neurosciences and Advanced Diagnostics,
- **31** University of Palermo.
- 32 ¹² Department of Medical and Surgical Sciences and Advanced Technologies, AOU Policlinico-San
- **33** Marco, University of Catania, Catania/Italy.
- 34 ¹³ MS Centre, Neurology Unit, SS. Annunziata University Hospital, Chieti/Italy.
- 35 ¹⁴ University of Campania "Luigi Vanvitelli", Department of Advanced Medical and Surgical Sciences,
- 36 2nd Division of Neurology, Naples/Italy.
- 37 ¹⁵ Multiple Sclerosis Center, ASST della Valle Olona, Hospital of Gallarate, Gallarate/Italy.
- 38 ¹⁶ Neurology Unit, Azienda Ospedaliero-Universitaria of Modena, Modena/Italy.
- **39** ¹⁷ IRCCS Neuromed, Department of Human Neurosciences, Sapienza, University of Rome,
- 40 Pozzilli/Italy.
- 41 ¹⁸ Department of Human Neuroscience, Sapienza University, Rome/Italy.
- 42 ¹⁹ Department of Medical and Surgical Sciences, Magna Greacia University of Catanzaro/Italy.
- 43 ²⁰ Department of Neurology, University of Parma/Italy.
- 44 ²¹ Department of Neurosciences, San Camillo-Forlanini Hospital, Rome/Italy.

45	²² Department of Neuroscience and Rehabilitation, Azienda Ospedaliero-Universitaria di Ferrara,
46	Ferrara/Italy.
47	²³ IRCCS Istituto delle Scienze Neurologiche di Bologna, Bologna, Italia/Dipartimento di Scienze
48	Biomediche e Neuromotorie, Università di Bologna, Bologna/Italia.
49	²⁴ Department of Neurosciences, Mental Health and Sensory Organs, Sapienza University of
50	Rome/Italy.
51	²⁵ Department of Cellular Therapies and Transfusion Medicine, Careggi University Hospital,
52	Florence/Italy.
53	²⁶ Ematologia e Centro Trapianti, IRCCS Ospedale Policlinico San Martino, Genova/Italy.
54	²⁷ Istituti Clinici Scientifici Maugeri, Pavia/Italy.
55	
56	
57	
58	Co-investigators for the Italian-BMT Study Group: Repice AM, Barilaro A, Capobianco M, Zimatore
59	GB, Frau J, Scarpini E, Meucci G, Guidetti D, Onofrj M, Gualandi F, Varaldo R, Raiola AM, Innocenti C,
60	Zoli V, Ciceri F, Greco R, Scimè R, De Gobbi M
61	
62	
63	
64	
65	
66	
67	

68 <u>Disclosures</u>

- 69 Boffa G was supported by a research fellowship-FISM Fondazione Italiana Sclerosi Multipla.
- **70** Signori A
- 71 Massacesi L
- 72 Mariottini A
- 73 Cottone S
- 74 Amato MP
- 75 Gasperini C
- 76 Moiola L
- 77 Meletti S
- 78 Brescia Morra V
- 79 Iaffaldano P
- 80 Salemi G
- 81 Patti F
- 82 Romeo M
- 83 De Luca G
- 84 Lus G
- 85 Zaffaroni M
- 86 Sola P
- 87 Conte A
- 88 Pozzilli C
- 89 Aguglia U
- 90 Granella F

91	Galgani S
92	Caniatti LM
93	Lugaresi A
94	Romano S
95	Saccardi R
96	Angelucci E
97	Mancardi GL
98	Sormani MP
99	Inglese M received grants NIH, NMSS, FISM; received fees for consultation from Roche, Genzyme,
100	Merck, Biogen and Novartis.
101	
102	
103	
104	
105	
106	
107	
108	
109	
110	
111	
112	
113	

114 Introduction

Secondary progressive multiple sclerosis (SPMS) is characterized by progressive accrual of 115 116 neurological disability independent of clinical relapses(1). Compartmentalized inflammation within 117 the brain parenchyma(2-4) the leptomeninges(5) and the cerebrospinal fluid(6) represents a key 118 driver of disability worsening in SPMS. Persistent inflammation within the CNS, in terms of clinical 119 relapses or MRI activity, has been repeatedly associated with accelerated disability progression (7,8). 120 Although first randomized controlled clinical trials did not reveal the efficacy of disease-modifying 121 therapies (DMT) for disability progression during SPMS(9,10), a recent randomized clinical trial 122 established some benefits of siponimod(11,12) in reducing the risk of disability worsening compared 123 to placebo. In line with this result, observational studies have suggested that the use of available DMT 124 in SPMS may be therapeutically beneficial(13,14), especially in active SPMS(13). However, the overall 125 risk reduction in disability worsening with available DMT is only modest and it is still unclear whether 126 the effect of treatment persists over time.

127 Ablation of the immune system followed by autologous hematopoietic stem cell transplantation 128 (AHSCT) has been gain increasing evidence as a therapeutic strategy for refractory MS(15–17). AHSCT eradicates autoreactive cell clones and induces sustained self-tolerance by resetting the abnormal 129 130 immune system(18). Although the ideal candidate of AHSCT is a young MS patient with aggressive 131 relapsing-remitting MS, uncontrolled evidence suggests that AHSCT is able to prevent long-term 132 neurological deterioration even in progressive MS(19–21). The drugs used in AHSCT technology cross the blood-brain-barrier and penetrate into the CNS, with the potential to target compartmentalized 133 134 inflammation. Given the absence of satisfactory treatment options for SPMS, in the last two decades 135 AHSCT was used off-label for the treatment of 81 patients with aggressive SPMS in 14 Italian MS 136 centers.

137 The aim of this cohort study was to compare the effect of AHSCT on disability worsening in patients138 with SPMS with that of other DMTs in SPMS patients from the Italian Multiple Sclerosis Register.

139

140 <u>Methods</u>

141 Study Design

142 All patients with SPMS(1), treated with AHSCT at 14 Italian MS Centers from 1997 to 2019 were considered eligible for this study. Patients were treated according to the European Group for Blood 143 144 and Marrow Transplantation (EBMT) guidelines, following the decision of the treating physician and 145 approval of the local Ethics Committee. Although no formal guideline was used for patient selection, 146 patients had aggressive disease course, characterized by the occurrence of relapses, MRI 147 inflammatory activity or accrual of accelerated neurological disability despite active treatment. 148 Detailed information on conditioning regimen and transplant care is reported in the Supplementary 149 Materials.

150 Control patients with SPMS never treated with AHSCT were collected from the Italian MS 151 Register(22). Patients were considered eligible: a) if they had a baseline EDSS recording, b) at least 152 one follow-up visit and c) if a DMT had been started after the diagnosis of SPMS. Untreated patients 153 were included in a sensitivity analysis.

154

155 *Study endpoints*

156 The primary objective was to compare disability worsening as assessed by the EDSS score time course 157 after baseline in patients with SPMS treated with AHSCT versus those treated with other DMT. 158 Secondary endpoints were the cumulative proportion of patients with a 6-months confirmed 159 disability progression (CDP), defined as an increase of 1 point in the EDSS score (0.5 points if the

baseline EDSS score was \geq 5.5), the cumulative proportion of patients with a 6-months confirmed disability improvement (CDI), defined as a decrease of 1 point in the EDSS score (0.5 points if the baseline EDSS score was \geq 5.5) and the prevalence of disability improvement over time, defined as the proportion of patients who are in an improved status as compared to baseline over time.

164

165 Statistical methods

Outcomes were compared between patients treated with AHSCT and patients treated with "other DMT". The "other DMT" group comprises all the patients satisfying the inclusion criteria and starting any DMT during their follow up. Untreated patients were excluded from the analysis and included in a sensitivity analysis. Descriptive results were reported as mean with standard deviation (SD) or median with interquartile range (IQR) or range.

171 We applied two different propensity score (PS) approaches to mitigate the differences of baseline 172 characteristics between the treatment groups. First, we matched individual patients on their 173 propensity to receive AHSCT or one of the other DMT. Patients were matched without replacement 174 with a variable ratio up to 5:1 (other DMT : AHSCT) and using a nearest neighbor matching within a 175 caliper of 0.25 SDs of the PS. Second, we applied an overlap weighting (OW) approach(23). This 176 method has the advantage over the n:1 PS matching method that no patients are excluded from the 177 analysis, without modifying the target population(23). The OW method assigns to each patient a 178 weight proportional to the probability of that patient belonging to the opposite treatment group(23). In our analysis, AHSCT treated patients are therefore weighted by the probability to receive one of 179 the other DMT (1-PS) and patients treated with other DMT are weighted by the probability of 180 181 receiving AHSCT treatment (PS). OW leads to an exact balance on the mean of each baseline covariate included in the PS calculation. 182

For both methods, individual PS were calculated using a multivariable logistics regression model including age at treatment start, gender, EDSS at treatment start, number of previous DMT, ARR in the previous year, disease duration and year of treatment start. Only main effects, without interactions, were included in the regression model. Since MRI data were missing for most of the patients, they were not included in the primary PS calculation. A sensitivity analysis was run by adjusting for a PS including MRI variables. Positivity assumption of PS was checked after its calculation.

190 To assess the degree of unbalance of covariate distribution between the groups, Cohen's
191 standardized mean differences (SMD) were calculated in the original cohort and after matching or
192 weighting. A SMD < 0.10 was considered an acceptable balance.

193 All regression models were run on the matched cohorts or weighted according to PS. A linear mixed 194 model with random intercept and random slope was used to assess the longitudinal EDSS time trend 195 after baseline. A time*treatment group interaction term was included into the model to test 196 differences on EDSS time trend between the two treatment groups. Results were reported as 197 annualized EDSS change with 95% Confidence Intervals (CI). Differences between treatment groups on time to CDP and CDI were assessed by mean of proportional hazard Cox regression models. Results 198 199 were reported as hazard-ratio (HR) with the corresponding 95% CI. Progression-free survival and 200 cumulative probability of improvement were estimated by Kaplan-Meier approach and graphically 201 displayed. The prevalence of CDI was estimated according to the recently reported methodology(24) 202 and compared between groups by bootstrapping the area under the curve (AUC). Stata (v.16; 203 StataCorp) was used for the computation.

204

205 *Sensitivity analyses*

206 The following sensitivity analyses were performed:

i) Inclusion of untreated patients in the "other DMT" group.

ii) Application of marginal structural models (MSM) to account for potential attrition bias
 derived by a different duration of on-treatment follow-up in the matched groups. We
 estimated at each 1-year time point the stabilized weights, from the inverse probability to be
 censored at fixed timepoints conditional on baseline variables. Then we run a weighted Cox
 regression analysis.

iii) Inclusion of magnetic resonance imaging (MRI) activity in the PS calculation. Two analyses
 were performed: one with missing data imputed before the PS calculation using multiple
 imputation approach with a logistic regression model and ten imputations. The second
 analysis used only the subset with complete MRI information.

iv) Comparisons between a) patients treated with AHSCT vs patients treated with Interferon beta
 1-b and b) patients treated with AHSCT vs patients treated with Mitoxantrone using a
 matching without replacement with a variable ratio up to 5:1 (DMT : AHSCT) with the same
 rules previously described. These two treatments were the only two approved in Italy for
 treatment of SPMS.

222

223 Results

Figure 1S reports the flowchart for SPMS patients' selection and inclusion. The SPMS cohort treated
by AHSCT included 81 patients from 14 centers. Two patients did not have follow-up information and
were excluded from the analysis. Data on 8465 SPMS patients were extracted from the Italian
Registry. Of these, 4550 were excluded due to the lack of a baseline EDSS assessments, 851 because
of missing follow up EDSS data and 703 since their DMT start date was during RRMS. A total of 2361

229 patients were included in the analysis; of them 1975 (83.7%) started a DMT ("other DMT" group) while 386 (16.3%) were never treated. **Table 1S** reports the demographic and clinical characteristics 230 231 of the three groups (AHSCT, other DMT, untreated). Patients in the "other DMT" group were older 232 and with a longer disease duration, a lower baseline EDSS and a lower ARR in the previous year as 233 compared to AHSCT patients. DMT used by SPMS patients were mainly Interferons (38%), 234 Azathioprine and Glatiramer acetate (both around 20%). The untreated group was made up of older patients with similar disease duration and EDSS and lower ARR in the previous year as compared with 235 "other DMT" treated subjects. **Table 1** reports the same characteristics for the matched and the OW 236 237 weighted cohorts, showing that both matching and OW weighting consistently reduced the SMD 238 between the two groups. The mean follow-up of the matched cohort was 5.2 years, with a median 239 of 3.6 years (IQR:1.8-7.6 years).

240

241 AHSCT vs "Other DMT" patients

242 Yearly EDSS change

243 Figure 1 reports the estimated slopes of the EDSS change in the two treatment groups: the mean EDSS change over 10 years in the AHSCT cohort was estimated as -0.013 EDSS points per year (95% 244 245 CI:-0.087, 0.061 EDSS points per year) while in the "other DMT" cohort the mean EDSS change was 246 +0.157 EDSS points per year; 95% CI: 0.117, 0.196 EDSS points per year) and the difference was 247 statistically significant (p for time by treatment group interaction<0.001). Similar results were observed by the OW analysis and the estimated slopes of EDSS change are showed in the 248 249 Supplementary Figure 2S. The estimated yearly EDSS change was -0.017 (95% CI: -0.099, 0.065) in 250 the AHSCT cohort and +0.18 (95% CI: 0.15, 0.21) in the "other DMT" cohort (p for time by treatment group interaction < 0.001). 251

252 Time to CDP

The time to CDP was significantly longer in AHSCT patients as compared to the matched "other DMT"
group (HR= 0.50; 95% CI: 0.31, 0.81; p=0.005, Figure 2). After 3 years, the proportion of patients free
from CDP was 58.1% (95% CI:50.3-64.9) in the "other DMT" group and 71.9% (95% CI: 58.5-81.5) in
the AHSCT group; after 5 years it was, 46.3% (95% CI: 37.4, 54.5) in the "other DMT" group and 61.7%
(95% CI: 47.5,73.1) in the AHSCT group.

258 Similar results were observed when the OW procedure was applied to the whole cohort (Figure 3S).
259 EDSS Improvement

260 Figure 3A shows the Kaplan-Meier curves for time to CDI. In the matched cohorts the improvement 261 rate was significantly higher in AHSCT patients as compared with the "other DMT" group (HR = 4.21; 262 95% CI: 2.42-7.33; p<0.001). After 1 year the cumulative proportion of patients who had at least an 263 improvement event was 30.2% (95% CI: 20.6,42.8) in AHSCT patients and 3.4% (95% CI: 1.6, 7.0) in 264 the "other DMT" group; after 3 years it was 38.8% (95% CI: 28.0,51.9) in AHSCT patients and 7.8% (95% CI: 4.2,13.3) in the "other DMT" group . AHSCT patients showed also a higher prevalence of 265 266 improvement (Figure 3B) over time (p < 0.001) as compared with the matched control group. The 267 proportion of patients who reached and maintained an improvement status after 3 years was 34.7% 268 (95% CI: 23.2,46.3) in the AHSCT group, while it was just 4.6% (95% CI: 1.7, 8.6) in the "other DMT" 269 group; after 5 years 18.7% (95% CI: 7.9,29.8) of AHSCT patients are still improved as compared to 270 baseline vs 4.1% (95% CI: 1.3,8.3) of patients treated with other DMTs.

- 271
- 272 Sensitivity analyses
- 273 Inclusion of untreated patients

Untreated patients were added to the cohort of patients treated with other DMT. A total of 72 AHSCT
patients were matched to 228 patients in the control group (26 untreated, 11.4% and 202 treated,

276 88.6%). Characteristics of matched patients are reported in **Table 2S.**

Figure 4S shows the results of the analysis on EDSS change. Results were similar to those reported in

the main analysis: the EDSS increased in the control group (yearly change +0.125; 95% CI: 0.099,0.151

279 EDSS points) while it was substantially stable in the HSCT group (yearly change +0.017 EDSS points;

280 95% CI: -0.032,0.066) with a significant difference between the two groups (p < 0.001). Results on

time to EDSS progression were very close to those reported in the main analysis (Figure 5S).

282 Marginal structural model

283 Results of the analysis run by applying MSM to the matched cohort (69 HSCT vs 217 other DMTs)

confirmed those reported in the main analysis. The time to CPD was significantly longer in HSCT

285 patients as compared to the "other DMT" group (HR= 0.58; 95% CI: 0.35, 0.96; p=0.032).

286 Magnetic resonance (MRI) activity in the propensity score

287 Data on MRI activity were available for 73/79 (92.4%) patients in the AHSCT group and for 812/1975 288 (41.1%) in the "other DMT" group. AHSCT group had a higher frequency (51/73; 70%) of MRI active 289 scans (defined as scans with at least 1 Gadolinium enhancing lesion) than the "other DMT" group 290 (156/812; 19.2%; Table 1S). After multiple imputation of missing values, 79 HSCT patients were 291 matched to 135 patients in the "other DMT" group. The two groups were well balanced (Table 3S). 292 Results on the primary outcome were similar to those reported in the main analysis: the EDSS 293 increased in the control group (yearly change +0.145; 95% CI: 0.115,0.175 EDSS points) while it was 294 substantially stable in the HSCT group (yearly change +0.015 EDSS points; 95% CI: -0.034,0.064) with 295 a significant difference between the two groups (p < 0.001). In the complete cases analysis, 71 HSCT

296	were matched to 100 "other DMT" and similar results were observed (EDSS points yearly change
297	+0.127; 95% CI: 0.091,0.164 in "other DMT" group vs 0.015; 95% CI: -0.038, 0.068 in HSCT; p = 0.001).
298	HSCT vs Interferon beta-1b

A total of 56 HSCT patients were matched with 63 Interferon beta-1b patients (Table 4S). Results
were similar to those reported for the analysis on "other DMTs". In fact we observed an EDSS points
yearly change of +0.126; 95% CI: 0.078,0.174 in Interferon beta group and of 0.047; 95% CI: -0.011,
0.106 in HSCT with a significant difference between the two groups (p=0.040).

303 HSCT vs Mitoxantrone

A total of 74 HSCT patients were matched with 138 Mitoxantrone patients (Table 4S). Also for this
comparison on the primary outcome, results were similar to those reported previously. An EDSS
points yearly change of +0.129; 95% CI: 0.103,0.155 in Mitoxantrone group and of 0.023; 95% CI: 0.025, 0.072 in HSCT with a significant difference between the two groups (p<0.001).

308

309 Discussion

310 To date, no prospective clinical trial has been performed to evaluate the efficacy of AHSCT in SPMS. In this study, we showed that the use of AHSCT for the treatment of SPMS was associated with better 311 312 disability outcomes than other DMT. Despite treatment with active DMT, our SPMS control group 313 exhibited a mean disability accumulation of 0.16 EDSS points per year, with rates of CDP in line with 314 those reported by other independent cohorts(14,25). Conversely, treatment with AHSCT induced an average improvement of EDSS over time (-0.013 EDSS points per year). This result translates into a 315 significant delayed time to first CDP in AHSCT patients compared to matched controls, with a 316 317 percentage of patients without CPD at 5 years of 61.7%.

318 Taken together, our findings confirm and extend the results of previous uncontrolled studies which 319 suggested that AHSCT has the potential to slow down neurological progression in patients with 320 SPMS(19–21,26). AHSCT has demonstrated a striking effect in abolishing clinical relapses and MRI 321 signs of inflammatory activity(19,27–32), which have been associated with worse outcomes during 322 the course of SPMS(7,13). Accordingly, it has been demonstrated that AHSCT is able to reduce CSF 323 markers of ongoing CNS inflammation and axonal damage(33). The profound anti-inflammatory effect of AHSCT has been confirmed by pathological studies of MS lesions of patients with 324 SPMS(34,35), in which a dramatic decrease in T and B cells infiltrates has been described up to 7 325 326 years(35). Although residual demyelination and neurodegeneration have been reported after AHSCT 327 (34,35), it is arguable that the almost complete resolution of compartmentalized inflammation 328 behind the blood-brain barrier obtained with AHSCT has the potential to slow down disability 329 worsening in patients with SPMS, as suggested by the positive results of anti-inflammatory B-cell 330 targeted therapies in progressive MS(36,37). In line with this hypothesis, it has been demonstrated 331 that anti-inflammatory DMT could also reduce axonal damage in patients with SPMS(38-41), 332 potentially preventing disability accumulation.

333

We have previously reported that superimposed relapses(19) and inflammatory activity at baseline MRI(20) are favorable predictors of a better outcome after AHSCT in patients with SPMS. Similar results have been reported in other cohorts of patients with SPMS(13), in which the effect of immunotherapy in reducing disability progression was significant only in patients with active SPMS. Therefore, it is still unknown whether immunotherapy, including AHSCT, can be effective in patients with SPMS without evidence of inflammatory activity. On the other hand, the results of this study

340 support the notion that the presence of inflammation during SPMS represents a treatable target and341 requires adequate treatment.

342

A very intriguing result was that patients who underwent AHSCT were more likely to experience a sustained disability improvement. Our data indicate that 18.7% of SPMS patients maintained an improvement (a lower EDSS than baseline) 5 years after transplant, compared to the 4.1% of patients treated by other DMT. The possibility to improve in disability and maintain improvement is a crucial need for patients with a progressive disease, and it is hardly obtained with standard antiinflammatory drugs.

349

350 Notably, our SPMS control group did not include patients treated with siponimod or rituximab. In the 351 EXPAND study(11), siponimod treatment was associated with a delayed time to CDP than placebo, 352 with CDP rate of 23% over 3 years. Similar results have been published following treatment with 353 rituximab in SPMS(14), with CDP rates of 25% and 50% over 3 and 10 years, respectively. Baseline 354 characteristics of these studies were quite balanced, with evidence of MRI inflammatory activity and relapses in the year before treatment start in about 20% of patients. Although our cohort was 355 356 composed by younger patients with a higher baseline ARR, it is noteworthy that the rate of CDP at 357 10 years was significantly lower in patients treated with AHSCT than in patients treated with 358 rituximab.

359

360 Limitations

361 The main limitation of the present study relies on its observational nature. Since our AHSCT study362 cohort was composed mainly by patients with aggressive, active SPMS and did not represent a

363 standard population of patients with SPMS, we controlled for multiple demographic and clinical 364 variables to mitigate treatment selection bias. The superiority of AHSCT on disability outcomes was 365 confirmed using both the propensity score matching and the overlap weighting (in which no patients 366 are excluded from the analysis, without modifying the target population). As sensitivity analysis, we 367 also included untreated patients with SPMS and confirmed the protective effect of AHSCT on 368 disability worsening and time to CDP. The same results were obtained after the inclusion of measures 369 of MRI activity in the propensity score calculation and from the application of marginal structural 370 models to account for potential attrition bias derived by a different duration of on-treatment follow-371 up in the matched groups. The superiority of AHSCT was also confirmed when considering as a control 372 group patients treated with interferon beta 1b and mitoxantrone, which were the only two DMTs 373 approved for the treatment of SPMS at the time of data collection of this study. Finally, although the EDSS raters were not blinded to the treatment and this could have introduced some bias, the long-374 term follow-up has partially mitigated this measurement bias. 375

376

377 <u>Conclusions</u>

AHSCT induced a marked slowing of disability progression in patients with active SPMS as compared
to other DMT. Prospective randomized clinical trials are needed to confirm the efficacy of AHSCT in
patients with active SPMS.

381

382 <u>Bibliography</u>

383

Lublin FD, Reingold SC, Cohen JA, Cutter GR, Sorensen PS, Thompson AJ, et al. Defining the
 clinical course of multiple sclerosis: The 2013 revisions. Neurology [Internet]. 2014 Jul

386	15;83(3):278–86.	Available	from:

387 http://www.neurology.org/cgi/doi/10.1212/WNL.0000000000000560

Luchetti S, Fransen NL, van Eden CG, Ramaglia V, Mason M, Huitinga I. Progressive multiple
 sclerosis patients show substantial lesion activity that correlates with clinical disease severity
 and sex: a retrospective autopsy cohort analysis. Acta Neuropathol [Internet]. 2018 Apr

391 13;135(4):511–28. Available from: http://link.springer.com/10.1007/s00401-018-1818-y

- Machado-Santos J, Saji E, Tröscher AR, Paunovic M, Liblau R, Gabriely G, et al. The
 compartmentalized inflammatory response in the multiple sclerosis brain is composed of
 tissue-resident CD8+ T lymphocytes and B cells. Brain [Internet]. 2018 Jul 1;141(7):2066–82.
- **395**Available from: https://academic.oup.com/brain/article/141/7/2066/5032773
- Dal-Bianco A, Grabner G, Kronnerwetter C, Weber M, Kornek B, Kasprian G, et al. Long-term
 evolution of multiple sclerosis iron rim lesions in 7 T MRI. Brain [Internet]. 2021 Jan 23;
 Available from: https://academic.oup.com/brain/advance-

399 article/doi/10.1093/brain/awaa436/6114694

- Magliozzi R, Howell O, Vora A, Serafini B, Nicholas R, Puopolo M, et al. Meningeal B-cell follicles
 in secondary progressive multiple sclerosis associate with early onset of disease and severe
 cortical pathology. Brain [Internet]. 2006 Nov 21;130(4):1089–104. Available from:
 https://academic.oup.com/brain/article-lookup/doi/10.1093/brain/awm038
- Magliozzi R, Howell OW, Nicholas R, Cruciani C, Castellaro M, Romualdi C, et al. Inflammatory
 intrathecal profiles and cortical damage in multiple sclerosis. Ann Neurol [Internet]. 2018
 Apr;83(4):739–55. Available from: http://doi.wiley.com/10.1002/ana.25197
- 407 7. Paz Soldan MM, Novotna M, Abou Zeid N, Kale N, Tutuncu M, Crusan DJ, et al. Relapses and
 408 disability accumulation in progressive multiple sclerosis. Neurology [Internet]. 2015 Jan

409		6;84(1):81–8.			Available			from:
410		http://www.no	eurology.org/cgi	/doi/10.1212/	WNL.0000000	000001094		
411	8.	Absinta M, Sa	ti P, Masuzzo F	, Nair G, Seth	i V, Kolb H, e	t al. Associa	ation of Chro	onic Active
412		Multiple Scle	rosis Lesions V	Vith Disability	In Vivo. JAI	MA Neurol	[Internet].	2019 Dec
413		1;76(12):1474			Available			from:
414		https://jamano	etwork.com/jou	rnals/jamaneu	rology/fullarti	cle/2747565	5	
415	9.	Kapoor R, Ho	P-R, Campbell N	, Chang I, Dey	kin A, Forresta	al F, et al. E	ffect of nata	izumab on
416		disease progr	ession in seco	ndary progres	sive multiple	sclerosis	(ASCEND): a	phase 3,
417		randomised,	double-blind, pl	acebo-control	led trial with	an open-la	abel extensi	on. Lancet
418		Neurol	[Internet].	2018	May;17(5):40	5–15.	Available	from:
419		https://linking	hub.elsevier.cor	n/retrieve/pii/	S1474442218	300693		
420	10.	Lublin F, Mille	r DH, Freedman	MS, Cree BAC	, Wolinsky JS,	Weiner H, e	et al. Oral fin	golimod in
421		primary progr	essive multiple	sclerosis (INF	ORMS): a ph	iase 3, rand	domised, do	uble-blind,
422		placebo-contr	olled trial. Lanc	et [Internet].	2016 Mar;387	7(10023):10	75–84. Avail	able from:

423 https://linkinghub.elsevier.com/retrieve/pii/S0140673615013148

424 11. Kappos L, Bar-Or A, Cree BAC, Fox RJ, Giovannoni G, Gold R, et al. Siponimod versus placebo in
425 secondary progressive multiple sclerosis (EXPAND): a double-blind, randomised, phase 3
426 study. Lancet [Internet]. 2018 Mar;391(10127):1263–73. Available from:
427 https://linkinghub.elsevier.com/retrieve/pii/S0140673618304756

428 12. Benedict RHB, Tomic D, Cree BA, Fox R, Giovannoni G, Bar-Or A, et al. Siponimod and Cognition
429 in Secondary Progressive Multiple Sclerosis. Neurology [Internet]. 2021 Jan 19;96(3):e376–86.

- 430 Available from: http://www.neurology.org/lookup/doi/10.1212/WNL.00000000011275
- 431 13. Lizak N, Malpas CB, Sharmin S, Havrdova EK, Horakova D, Izquierdo G, et al. Association of

432 Sustained Immunotherapy With Disability Outcomes in Patients With Active Secondary
433 Progressive Multiple Sclerosis. JAMA Neurol [Internet]. 2020 Nov 1;77(11):1398. Available
434 from: https://jamanetwork.com/journals/jamaneurology/fullarticle/2768700

- 14. Naegelin Y, Naegelin P, von Felten S, Lorscheider J, Sonder J, Uitdehaag BMJ, et al. Association
 of Rituximab Treatment With Disability Progression Among Patients With Secondary
 Progressive Multiple Sclerosis. JAMA Neurol [Internet]. 2019;1–8. Available from:
 http://archneur.jamanetwork.com/article.aspx?doi=10.1001/jamaneurol.2018.4239
- 439 15. Miller AE, Chitnis T, Cohen BA, Costello K, Sicotte NL, Stacom R. Autologous Hematopoietic
 440 Stem Cell Transplant in Multiple Sclerosis. JAMA Neurol [Internet]. 2020 Oct 26; Available
 441 from: https://jamanetwork.com/journals/jamaneurology/fullarticle/2771920
- Cohen JA, Baldassari LE, Atkins HL, Bowen JD, Bredeson C, Carpenter PA, et al. Autologous
 Hematopoietic Cell Transplantation for Treatment-Refractory Relapsing Multiple Sclerosis:
 Position Statement from the American Society for Blood and Marrow Transplantation. Biol
 Blood Marrow Transplant [Internet]. 2019 May;25(5):845–54. Available from:
 https://linkinghub.elsevier.com/retrieve/pii/S1083879119301399
- Sharrack B, Saccardi R, Alexander T, Badoglio M, Burman J, Farge D, et al. Autologous 447 17. 448 haematopoietic stem cell transplantation and other cellular therapy in multiple sclerosis and 449 immune-mediated neurological diseases: updated guidelines and recommendations from the EBMT Autoimmune Diseases Working Party (ADWP) and the Joint Acc. Bone Marrow 450 Transplant Available from: 451 [Internet]. 2020 Feb 26;55(2):283-306. http://www.nature.com/articles/s41409-019-0684-0 452
- 453 18. Muraro PA, Martin R, Mancardi GL, Nicholas R, Sormani MP, Saccardi R. Autologous454 haematopoietic stem cell transplantation for treatment of multiple sclerosis. Nat Rev Neurol.

455 2017;13(7):391–405.

- 456 19. Boffa G, Massacesi L, Inglese M, Mariottini A, Capobianco M, Moiola L, et al. Long-term Clinical
 457 Outcomes of Hematopoietic Stem Cell Transplantation in Multiple Sclerosis. Neurology
 458 [Internet]. 2021 Feb 23;96(8):e1215–26. Available from:
 459 http://www.neurology.org/lookup/doi/10.1212/WNL.00000000011461
- 460 20. Mariottini A, Filippini S, Innocenti C, Forci B, Mechi C, Barilaro A, et al. Impact of autologous
 461 haematopoietic stem cell transplantation on disability and brain atrophy in secondary
 462 progressive multiple sclerosis. Mult Scler J [Internet]. 2020 Feb 3;135245852090239. Available
 463 from: http://journals.sagepub.com/doi/10.1177/1352458520902392
- 464 21. Muraro PA, Pasquini M, Atkins HL, Bowen JD, Farge D, Fassas A, et al. Long-term Outcomes
 465 After Autologous Hematopoietic Stem Cell Transplantation for Multiple Sclerosis. JAMA Neurol
 466 [Internet]. 2017;74(4):459. Available from:

467 http://archneur.jamanetwork.com/article.aspx?doi=10.1001/jamaneurol.2016.5867

- 468 22. Trojano M, Bergamaschi R, Amato MP, Comi G, Ghezzi A, Lepore V, et al. The Italian multiple
 469 sclerosis register. Neurol Sci [Internet]. 2019 Jan 13;40(1):155–65. Available from:
 470 http://link.springer.com/10.1007/s10072-018-3610-0
- 471 23. Thomas LE, Li F, Pencina MJ. Overlap Weighting: A Propensity Score Method That Mimics
 472 Attributes of a Randomized Clinical Trial. JAMA [Internet]. 2020 Jun 16;323(23):2417. Available
 473 from: https://jamanetwork.com/journals/jama/fullarticle/2765748
- 474 24. Signori A, Boffa G, Bovis F, Mariottini A, Repice A, Inglese M, et al. Prevalence of disability
 475 improvement as a potential outcome for multiple sclerosis trials. Mult Scler J [Internet]. 2020
 476 Jun 26;135245852093623. Available from:
- 477 http://journals.sagepub.com/doi/10.1177/1352458520936236

- 478 25. Cree BAC, Gourraud P-A, Oksenberg JR, Bevan C, Crabtree-Hartman E, Gelfand JM, et al. Long479 term evolution of multiple sclerosis disability in the treatment era. Ann Neurol [Internet]. 2016
 480 Oct;80(4):499–510. Available from: http://doi.wiley.com/10.1002/ana.24747
- 481 26. Shevchenko JL, Kuznetsov AN, Ionova TI, Melnichenko VY, Fedorenko DA, Kurbatova KA, et al.
- 482 Long-term outcomes of autologous hematopoietic stem cell transplantation with reduced483 intensity conditioning in multiple sclerosis: physician's and patient's perspectives. Ann
 484 Hematol. 2015;94(7):1149–57.
- 485 27. Atkins HL, Bowman M, Allan D, Anstee G, Arnold DL, Bar-Or A, et al. Immunoablation and
 486 autologous haemopoietic stem-cell transplantation for aggressive multiple sclerosis: a
 487 multicentre single-group phase 2 trial. Lancet [Internet]. 2016;388(10044):576–85. Available
 488 from: http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/S0140-6736(16)30169-6
- 489 28. Burt RK, Balabanov R, Burman J, Sharrack B, Snowden JA, Oliveira MC, et al. Effect of
 490 Nonmyeloablative Hematopoietic Stem Cell Transplantation vs Continued Disease-Modifying
 491 Therapy on Disease Progression in Patients With Relapsing-Remitting Multiple Sclerosis. Jama
- **491** Therapy on Disease Progression in Patients With Relapsing-Remitting Multiple Sclerosis. Jama
- **492** [Internet]. 2019;321(2):165. Available from:

493 http://jama.jamanetwork.com/article.aspx?doi=10.1001/jama.2018.18743

- 494 29. Nash RA, Hutton GJ, Racke MK, Popat U, Devine SM, Steinmiller KC, et al. High-dose
 495 immunosuppressive therapy and autologous HCT for relapsing-remitting MS. Neurology.
 496 2017;88(9):842–52.
- 497 30. Burman J, Iacobaeus E, Svenningsson A, Lycke J, Gunnarsson M, Nilsson P, et al. Autologous
 498 haematopoietic stem cell transplantation for aggressive multiple sclerosis: The Swedish
 499 experience. J Neurol Neurosurg Psychiatry. 2014;85(10):1116–21.
- 500 31. Moore JJ, Massey JC, Ford CD, Khoo ML, Zaunders JJ, Hendrawan K, et al. Prospective phase II

501 clinical trial of autologous haematopoietic stem cell transplant for treatment refractory
502 multiple sclerosis. J Neurol Neurosurg Psychiatry. 2019;90(5):514–21.

- 503 32. Kvistad SAS, Lehmann AK, Trovik LH, Kristoffersen EK, Bø L, Myhr K-M, et al. Safety and efficacy 504 of autologous hematopoietic stem cell transplantation for multiple sclerosis in Norway. Mult 505 Scler [Internet]. 13;135245851989392. Available from: J 2019 Dec 506 http://journals.sagepub.com/doi/10.1177/1352458519893926
- 507 33. Larsson D, Åkerfeldt T, Carlson K, Burman J. Intrathecal immunoglobulins and neurofilament
 508 light after autologous haematopoietic stem cell transplantation for multiple sclerosis. Mult
 509 Scler J. 2019;(Dmd):1–9.
- Metz I, Lucchinetti CF, Openshaw H, Garcia-Merino A, Lassmann H, Freedman MS, et al.
 Autologous haematopoietic stem cell transplantation fails to stop demyelination and
 neurodegeneration in multiple sclerosis. Brain [Internet]. 2007 Apr 2;130(5):1254–62.
 Available from: https://academic.oup.com/brain/article-lookup/doi/10.1093/brain/awl370
- Wundes A, Bowen JD, Kraft GH, Maravilla KR, McLaughlin B, von Geldern G, et al. Brain
 pathology of a patient 7 years after autologous hematopoietic stem cell transplantation for
 multiple sclerosis. J Neurol Sci [Internet]. 2017 Feb;373:339–41. Available from:
 https://linkinghub.elsevier.com/retrieve/pii/S0022510X17300163
- 518 36. Montalban X, Hauser SL, Kappos L, Arnold DL, Bar-Or A, Comi G, et al. Ocrelizumab versus
 519 Placebo in Primary Progressive Multiple Sclerosis. N Engl J Med [Internet]. 2017 Jan
 520 10:276(2):200, 20, Available from: http://www.paim.org/doi/10.1056/NELMoa1606468
- 520
 19;376(3):209–20. Available from: http://www.nejm.org/doi/10.1056/NEJMoa1606468
- 521 37. Hauser SL, Bar-Or A, Cohen JA, Comi G, Correale J, Coyle PK, et al. Ofatumumab versus
 522 Teriflunomide in Multiple Sclerosis. N Engl J Med [Internet]. 2020 Aug 6;383(6):546–57.
- 523 Available from: http://www.nejm.org/doi/10.1056/NEJMoa1917246

- 524 38. Romme Christensen J, Komori M, von Essen MR, Ratzer R, Börnsen L, Bielekova B, et al. CSF inflammatory biomarkers responsive to treatment in progressive multiple sclerosis capture 525 residual inflammation associated with axonal damage. Mult Scler J [Internet]. 2019 Jun 526 527 18;25(7):937-46. Available from: 528 http://journals.sagepub.com/doi/10.1177/1352458518774880 Kapoor R, Smith KE, Allegretta M, Arnold DL, Carroll W, Comabella M, et al. Serum 529 39. neurofilament light as a biomarker in progressive multiple sclerosis. Neurology [Internet]. 2020 530 531 Available from: Sep 8;95(10):436-44. http://www.neurology.org/lookup/doi/10.1212/WNL.000000000010346 532 Axelsson M, Malmeström C, Gunnarsson M, Zetterberg H, Sundström P, Lycke J, et al. 533 40. 534 Immunosuppressive therapy reduces axonal damage in progressive multiple sclerosis. Mult
- 535 Scler J [Internet]. 2014 Jan 23;20(1):43–50. Available from:
 536 http://journals.sagepub.com/doi/10.1177/1352458513490544
- 537 41. Kuhle J, Kropshofer H, Barro C, Meinert R, Häring DA, Leppert D, et al. Siponimod Reduces
 538 Neurofilament Light Chain Blood Levels in Secondary Progressive Multiple Sclerosis Patients
 539 (S8.006). Neurology [Internet]. 2018 Apr 10;90(15 Supplement):S8.006. Available from:
 540 http://n.neurology.org/content/90/15_Supplement/S8.006.abstract



Table 1 – Clinical and demographic characteristics in the matched (left side) and in the overlap weighted (right side) gro

Characteristic		Matched cohort	•		Overlap weighted cohort	:
	AHSCT (n=69)	Treated	SMD AHSCT vs	HSCT (n=79)	Treated (n=1975)	SM
		(n=217)	Treated			Tre
Age, mean (SD);	38.1 (7.7); 37.1	37.8 (7.2); 37.2	0.037	39 (7.8); 37.5	39 (7.8); 38.4 (19-76)	0.0
median (range)	(24-58)	(22-58)		(24-58)		
Sex (M/F), n(%)	24/45	86/131	0.10	28/51	719/1256 (36.4/63.6)	0.0
	(34.8/65.2)	(39.9/60.1)		(35.5/64.5)		
Baseline EDSS,	6.2(0.9); 6.5(6-	6.3 (0.8); 6.5	0.076	6.2 (0.9); 6	6.2 (0.9); 6.5(6-7)	0.0
mean(SD);	7)	(6-7)		(6-6.5)		
median (IQR)						
ARR previous	1.08 (1.12)	0.90 (1.02)	0.17	1.01 (1.07)	1.01 (1.66)	0.0
year						
Disease	13.7 (6.5); 12.1	13.7 (6.1); 12.7	0.01	13.7 (6.8);	13.7 (6.6); 12.9 (9.3-18)	0.0
duration, mean	(10.1-16.5)	(9.3-17.8)		12.1 (10.1-		
(SD); median				17.3)		
(IQR)						
N. of previous	2.4 (1.2); 2 (1-	2.3 (1.4); 2 (1-	0.024	2.2 (1.1); 2	2.2 (1.4); 2 (1-3)	0.0
treatments,	3)	3)		(1-3)		
mean (SD);						
median (IQR)						
Year of	2007.7 (6.4);	2007.6 (5.3);	0.019	2007.7 (6.2);	2007.7 (5.4);	0.0
treatment start,	2007 (2002-	2007 (2004-		2007 (2003-	2008 (2004- 2012)	
	2014)	2012)		2014)		

mean (SD);						
median (IQR)						
Year of SP	2005 (7.9);	2005 (5.8);	0.011	2005 (7.9);	2005 (6.1);	0.0
conversion,	2004 (1999-	2004 (2001-		2004 (1999-	2005 (2001-2010)	
mean (SD);	2013); [n=53]	2009)		2013) [n=57]		
median (IQR)						
Follow-up	6.8 (3.2-11.8);	3.1 (1.7-6.4);	-	5.6 (2.2-	3.9 (1.7-6.4); 0.1-30.9	-
(years); median	0.1-20.1	0.1-18.4		11.1); 0.1-		
(IQR); range				20.1		

Table 1S – Demographic and clinical characteristics of the three treatment groups.

Characteristics	HSCT (n=81)	Treated (n=1975)	Untreated (n=386)	SMD HSCT vs	SN
				Treated	U
Age, mean (SD); median	37.8 (7.8); 36.8 (24-	46.7 (9.6); 46.3 (19-	50.2(11.1); 50 (20-	1.02	1.
(range)	58)	76)	85)		
Sex (M/F), n(%)	28/53 (34.6/65.4)	758/1217	125/261	0.096	0.
		(38.4/61.6)	(32.4/67.6)		
Baseline EDSS, median	6.5 (6-6.5); 4-8.5	5.5 (4.5-6); 0-9	5.5(4-6.5); 0-9	0.86	0.
(IQR); range					
ARR previous year	1.19 (1.27)	0.47 (0.77)	0.29 (0.61)	0.68	0.
Disease duration, mean	13.3 (6.6); 11.8 (8.5-	15.5 (8.7); 14.3 (9.2-	16.6(10.1);	0.29	0.
(SD); median (IQR)	16.3)	20.8)	14.7(9.1-22.9)		
N. of previous treatments,	2 (1-3); 0-6	1 (0-1); 0-6	0 (0-1); 0-4	1.37	1.
median (IQR); range					
Year of treatment start,	2007.6; 2006 (2003-	2007.5; 2008 (2003-	-	0.012	-
mean; median (IQR);	2013); 1997-2019	2012); 1990-2018			
range					
Year of SP conversion,	2005; 2004 (2000-	2004; 2004 (2000-	2002.4; 2003(1997-	0.14	0.
mean; median (IQR);	2013); 1986-2018	2009); 1978-2017	2009); 1977-2018		
range	[n=57]				
Treatments, n(%)*					
Interferon beta (IFN)	-	761 (38.5)	-		
Glatiramer acetate (GA)	-	424 (21.5)	-		
Fingolimod (FTY)	-	299 (15.1)	-		
Natalizumab (NTZ)	-	228 (11.5)	-		
Mitoxantrone (MIT)	-	360 (18.2)	-		
Azathioprine (AZA)	-	431 (21.8)	-		
Other	-	690 (34.9)	-		
N. of treatments received					
during follow-up					
1		1132 (57.3)			
2		555 (28.1)			
3		259 (13.1)			
4		29 (1.5)			1
Time spent in treatment		95.7 (13.4); 100 (1.6-			1
during follow-up (%)		100)			
					-

Table 2S – Demographic and clinical characteristics of matched HSCT and Control group (treated and untreated) patients

Characteristics	HSCT (n=72)	Control (n=228)	SMD
Age, mean (SD)	38.5 (7.7)	39.5 (7.6)	0.12
Sex (M/F), n(%)	26/46 (35.6/64.4)	83/145 (36.4/63.6)	0.016
Baseline EDSS, mean (SD); median (IQR)	6.2 (0.9); 6.5 (6-6.5)	6.2 (0.9); 6 (6-6.5)	0.08
ARR previous year	1.05 (1.04)	0.76 (0.93)	0.29
Disease duration, mean (SD); median (IQR)	13.5 (6.7); 11.8 (10.1-	13.4 (6.2); 12.9 (8.9-	0.022
	16.5)	17.1)	
N. of previous treatments, median (IQR); range	2 (1-3); 0-5	2 (1-3); 0-6	0.19
Year of treatment start, mean; median (IQR)	2007.5; 2007 (2003-	2007.6; 2008 (2004-	0.027
	2014)	2013)	
Year of SP conversion, mean; median (IQR)	2005; 2004 (1999-	2005; 2006 (2001-	0.061
	2013) [n=54]	2011)	

Table 3S – Demographic and clinical characteristics of matched HSCT and other DMTs patients

Characteristics	HSCT (n=79)	Treated (n=135)	SMD
Age, mean (SD)	38.1 (7.7)	38.3 (7.5)	0.032
Sex (M/F), n(%)	27/52 (33.8/66.2)	50/85 (36.9/63.1)	0.066
Baseline EDSS, mean (SD); median (IQR)	6.3 (0.9); 6.5 (6-7)	6.4 (0.9); 6.5 (6-7)	0.18
ARR previous year	1.13 (1.21)	1.06 (1.06)	0.066
Disease duration, mean (SD); median (IQR)	13.4 (6.6); 11.8 (8.5-	13.6 (5.1); 12.9 (8.9-	0.032
	16.5)	17.1)	
N. of previous treatments, median (IQR); range	2 (1-3); 0-5	2 (1-3); 0-6	0.011
Year of treatment start, mean; median (IQR)	2007.6; 2006 (2003-	2008.4; 2008 (2004-	0.15
	2014)	2013)	
Year of SP conversion, mean; median (IQR)	2005; 2004 (2000-	2006; 2005 (2001-	0.12
	2013) [n=57]	2011)	

Table 4S –	Demographic and clir	nical characteristics	of matched HSCT an	d Interferon beta-	1b (left side)	or Mitoxantrone
	Demographic and em				ID (ICIT SIGC)	

Characteristics	HSCT (n=56)	Interferon beta- 1b (n=63)	SMD	HSCT (n=74)	Mitoxar (n=138)
Age, mean (SD)	39.6 (7.6)	39.5 (6.6)	0.016	38.4 (7.6)	38.8 (6.
Sex (M/F), n(%)	23/33 (41/59)	29/34 (46/54)	0.10	27/47 (36.5/63.5)	35/103
Baseline EDSS, mean (SD); median (IQR)	6.2 (0.9); 6.5 (6- 6.5)	6.3 (0.7); 6.5 (6- 7)	0.11	6.3 (0.9); 6.5 (6-7)	6.4 (0.9
ARR previous year	0.76 (0.79)	0.60 (0.73)	0.20	1.05 (1.07)	0.97 (1.
Disease duration, mean (SD); median (IQR)	13.9 (6.9); 12.3 (10.4-17.5)	14.6 (6.9); 14.4 (9.7-18.9)	0.086	13.5 (6.8); 11.9 (8.5-17.3)	13.3 (5. (8.7-16.
N. of previous treatments, median (IQR); range	2 (1-3); 0-4	2 (2-3); 0-5	0.059	2 (1-3); 0-6	2 (2-3);
Year of treatment start, mean; median (IQR)	2007; 2006 (2002-2013)	2005; 2005 (2000- 2007)	0.33	2007; 2006 (2002-2012)	2006; 2 2008)
Year of SP conversion, mean; median (IQR)	2004; 2004 (1998-2010) [n=42]	2000; 2000 (1998-2002)	0.62	2004; 2004 (1999-2011)	2003; 2 2005)