haematologica
Journal of the Ferrata Storti Foundation

Connecting asciminib tolerability to long-term treatment persistence. Comment on: "Favorable tolerability of asciminib *versus* ATP-competitive tyrosine kinase inhibitors in the ASC4FIRST study of newly diagnosed patients with chronic-phase chronic myeloid leukemia"

by Chan Zhang

Received: July 15, 2026.
Accepted: July 16, 2026.

Citation: Chan Zhang. Connecting asciminib tolerability to long-term treatment persistence. Comment on: "Favorable tolerability of asciminib versus ATP-competitive tyrosine kinase inhibitors in the ASC4FIRST study of newly diagnosed patients with chronic-phase chronic myeloid leukemia". Haematologica. 2026 July 23. doi: 10.3324/haematol.2026.301608 [Epub ahead of print]

Connecting asciminib tolerability to long-term treatment persistence. Comment on: "Favorable tolerability of asciminib versus ATP-competitive tyrosine kinase inhibitors in the ASC4FIRST study of newly diagnosed patients with chronic-phase chronic myeloid leukemia"

Chan Zhang[1*]

[1] Dalian Women and Children's Medical Group Dalian, China

*** Corresponding authors:**

Chan Zhang, Dalian Women and Children's Medical Group Dalian, China, E-mail: 19955210850163.com

Authors' contributions

All authors contributed equally to the conception and drafting of the manuscript and approved the submitted version.

Disclosure

The authors declare no conflict of interest.

Issa GC and colleagues address an important question in hematology: Favorable tolerability of asciminib versus ATP-competitive tyrosine kinase inhibitors in the ASC4FIRST study of newly diagnosed patients with chronic-phase chronic myeloid leukemia. [1] The article is valuable because it tackles a clinically recognizable problem and provides a useful basis for discussion. The key issue, however, is whether tolerability differences in ASC4FIRST can be interpreted independently of treatment selection, monitoring intensity, and discontinuation rules. This distinction matters because readers may otherwise move too quickly from an interesting observation to a clinical or methodological conclusion that the present evidence does not fully establish. We therefore believe the article should be read not only for its main result, but also for the assumptions that determine how far that result can travel.

The first issue is that A tolerability advantage is clinically meaningful only if adverse-event ascertainment, dose modification, and discontinuation thresholds are comparable across treatment groups. The second is that newly diagnosed chronic-phase chronic myeloid leukemia is a long-horizon disease, so early tolerability should be connected to adherence, molecular response durability, and treatment-free remission goals. [2], [3] These concerns do not diminish the contribution of the study, but they define the conditions under which the findings can be applied. A strong letter should make this boundary visible, because the most important risk for readers is not that the result is uninteresting, but that its practical meaning is broader than the data can support. In this sense, the central question is not whether the work is useful; it is what exact decision, hypothesis, or future study the work can legitimately support.

This distinction has practical consequences for interpretation. If the study is read as definitive, readers may focus on the headline conclusion and overlook design features that shape the estimate, such as patient selection, timing of measurement, endpoint definition, missing data, operator behavior, or treatment pathway after enrollment. If it is read as a carefully bounded contribution, however, the same findings become more useful because they identify where the evidence is strong and where replication or refinement is still required. That framing is especially important for studies likely to influence clinical language before they change clinical practice.

A third issue is that patient-reported outcomes and time-to-discontinuation analyses would make the tolerability signal easier to translate into first-line treatment choice. [4], [5] The next study should therefore be designed around a small number of prespecified questions: which subgroup is most likely to benefit from the proposed interpretation, which outcome should be considered decisive, and what level of follow-up, technical quality, or data completeness would make the conclusion reproducible. Answering these questions would help move the field from an interesting report to a usable clinical or methodological standard. Such a design would also make negative or neutral findings more informative, because it would show whether the original signal fails generally or only under specific biological, technical, or operational conditions.

The findings should also be discussed with attention to negative and neutral results. A focused letter is most useful when it protects readers from a one-directional interpretation of promising data. If the reported strategy performs well only under selected conditions, that

limitation should be visible early. If the observed effect is clinically attractive but operationally difficult, implementation barriers should be treated as part of the evidence rather than as a secondary concern. This is not a conservative posture for its own sake. It is a way to keep promising results actionable without turning them into recommendations before the necessary comparative or external evidence exists.

We would therefore encourage future work to report the elements that determine transportability. For clinical studies, these include baseline risk, co-interventions, follow-up intensity, competing events, safety, and patient-centered outcomes. For biomarker, registry, artificial-intelligence, or methodological studies, they include calibration, missingness, data provenance, annotation quality, temporal drift, and external validation. Making these elements explicit would allow readers to distinguish a robust finding from a finding that is promising but context-dependent.

In summary, Favorable tolerability of asciminib versus ATP-competitive tyrosine kinase inhibitors in the ASC4FIRST study of newly diagnosed patients with chronic-phase chronic myeloid leukemia is a meaningful contribution to the literature. [1] Asciminib may offer a favorable safety profile, but the practical question is how tolerability changes long-term treatment persistence and sequencing. Its greatest value lies in opening a practical discussion about how the reported evidence should be used, verified, and communicated. Clearer boundaries can strengthen, rather than weaken, the impact of a well-conducted study, because they show readers exactly what should change now and what still requires confirmation.

Reference

[1] Issa GC, Larson RA, Hughes TP, et al. Favorable tolerability of asciminib versus ATP-competitive tyrosine kinase inhibitors in the ASC4FIRST study of newly diagnosed patients with chronic-phase chronic myeloid leukemia. Haematologica. 2026 July 2. doi: 10.3324/haematol.2025.300145. [Epub ahead of print]

[2] Hochhaus A, Wang J, Kim DW, et al. Asciminib in newly diagnosed chronic myeloid leukemia. N Engl J Med. 2024;391(10):885-898.

[3] Rea D, Mauro MJ, Boquimpani C, et al. A phase 3, open-label, randomized study of asciminib, a STAMP inhibitor, vs bosutinib in CML after 2 or more prior TKIs. Blood. 2021;138(21):2031-2041.

[4] Bower H, Bjorkholm M, Dickman PW, Hoglund M, Lambert PC, Andersson TM. Life expectancy of patients with chronic myeloid leukemia approaches the life expectancy of the general population. J Clin Oncol. 2016;34(24):2851-2857.

[5] Noens L, Hensen M, Kucmin-Bemelmans I, Lofgren C, Gilloteau I, Vrijens B. Measurement of adherence to BCR-ABL inhibitor therapy in chronic myeloid leukemia: current situation and future challenges. Haematologica. 2014;99(3):437-447.