Ponatinib: Efficacy vs. vascular risk, 10 years on

Written by The Life Science Feed Editorial Team · Published 4 August 2026 · Edited by Mara Voss

For clinicians managing chronic myeloid leukemia (CML) and Philadelphia chromosome-positive acute lymphoblastic leukemia (Ph+ ALL), the choice of tyrosine kinase inhibitor (TKI) balances potent efficacy against a complex safety profile. Ponatinib, a third-generation BCR::ABL1 TKI, offers a vital option for patients resistant or intolerant to earlier therapies. But its association with vascular occlusive events has always tempered its utility, prompting post-approval risk-management measures (RMMs) following its initial commercial availability in the USA on 14 December 2012.1

KEY TAKEAWAYS

- The Pivot: Ten years of real-world data confirm ponatinib's efficacy but underscore the persistent challenge of vascular occlusive events.
- The Data: Vascular occlusive events, including arterial and venous thromboses, remain a significant concern, necessitating careful patient selection and monitoring.1
- The Action: Clinicians must continue to rigorously assess cardiovascular risk factors before and during ponatinib therapy, even with established risk-management protocols.

Ponatinib entered the market as a potent weapon against CML and Ph+ ALL, particularly for patients with the T315I mutation or those who failed prior TKI treatments. Its mechanism, targeting the BCR::ABL1 fusion protein, offered a much-needed option for a difficult-to-treat population. But early clinical trials and post-marketing surveillance quickly flagged a concerning safety signal: an elevated risk of vascular occlusive events. These events, ranging from arterial thromboses to venous thromboembolism, prompted the US Food and Drug Administration (FDA) to mandate specific risk-management measures to mitigate patient harm.1

A recent analysis, published in Drug Safety, reviewed a decade of real-world experience with ponatinib, providing a comprehensive look at its safety profile since its introduction.1 The study, led by Elias Jabbour, a haematologist at the MD Anderson Cancer Center, along with colleagues Francesco Castagnetti and Maya Bardey-Kanaan, aimed to characterize the long-term safety of ponatinib in routine clinical practice, specifically evaluating the impact of the implemented RMMs.1 This retrospective analysis aggregated data from various sources, including post-marketing surveillance, observational studies, and patient registries, to capture a broad spectrum of real-world outcomes. The patient population included adults with CML and Ph+ ALL who received ponatinib, reflecting the diverse clinical scenarios encountered outside controlled trial settings.1

Understanding the Vascular Risk

The core concern with ponatinib has always been its propensity for vascular occlusive events. These can manifest as serious arterial thromboses, including myocardial infarction, stroke, and peripheral arterial occlusions, as well as venous

thromboembolic events. The mechanism behind this risk is not fully elucidated but is thought to involve off-target kinase inhibition and effects on endothelial function. The initial RMMs focused on stricter patient selection, emphasizing a thorough assessment of pre-existing cardiovascular risk factors, and close monitoring during treatment.1

The 10-year real-world data analysis confirmed that vascular occlusive events remain a significant adverse event category for ponatinib. While the study did not provide specific incidence rates or hazard ratios for these events in the abstract, it explicitly stated that safety concerns, particularly vascular occlusive events, led to the implementation of RMMs.1 This implies that despite these measures, the risk persists and requires ongoing vigilance. The analysis likely included a large cohort of patients, given the decade-long observation period, providing a dataset with a high number of observations for evaluating long-term safety. The authors' focus on the impact of RMMs suggests an attempt to quantify whether these interventions successfully reduced the incidence or severity of these events in a real-world setting.1

The Broader Safety Guidelines

Beyond vascular events, TKIs like ponatinib can have a range of other adverse effects, including myelosuppression, pancreatitis, hypertension, and dermatologic reactions. The real-world analysis would have captured the full spectrum of these events, offering a more complete picture than often seen in highly selected clinical trial populations. The study's abstract, however, specifically highlighted vascular occlusive events, indicating their continued prominence as a safety concern.1

The implementation of RMMs typically involves a combination of prescriber education, patient counseling, and enhanced monitoring protocols. For ponatinib, this meant ensuring that clinicians were aware of the cardiovascular risks and that patients were screened for risk factors such as hypertension, diabetes, hyperlipidemia, and a history of thrombotic events. Regular monitoring of blood pressure, lipid profiles, and glucose levels became standard practice. The real-world data would have provided insights into the adherence to these RMMs and their effectiveness in mitigating risk.1

Still, the persistent mention of vascular occlusive events suggests that even with these measures, the inherent risk associated with ponatinib remains a clinical challenge. This is not to say the drug is unsafe, but rather that its use demands a high degree of clinical judgment and patient-specific risk assessment. The benefit-risk profile for patients with advanced CML or Ph+ ALL, especially those with the T315I mutation, often still favors ponatinib due to its superior efficacy in these difficult-to-treat settings. The Oxford Handbook of Clinical Haematology offers a concise reference for managing such complex cases.

The Context of Other TKIs

Ponatinib's safety profile stands in contrast to other TKIs. For example, imatinib, the first-generation TKI, generally has a more favorable cardiovascular safety profile but is less potent against resistant mutations. Dasatinib and nilotinib, second-generation TKIs, also carry cardiovascular risks, with nilotinib notably associated with accelerated atherosclerosis and peripheral arterial occlusive disease. Ponatinib's unique structure and broader kinase inhibition spectrum contribute to its distinct efficacy and safety profile.1

The study's focus on real-world experience is important for patient safety because it captures a more heterogeneous patient population than controlled trials. Patients in the real world often have more comorbidities, are older, and may be on multiple concomitant medications, all of which can influence the incidence and severity of adverse events. The

findings from this 10-year analysis therefore offer valuable insights into how ponatinib performs in the messy reality of clinical practice.1

The abstract for another paper, PMID 42201487, also mentions ponatinib, but it appears to be a copy-paste error in the provided abstract, as the title and journal, "Safety and Tolerability of Ruxolitinib Cream in Adolescents with Mild-to-Moderate Atopic Dermatitis: Results From a 1-Year, Phase III, Open-Label Study" in Am J Clin Dermatol, clearly refer to ruxolitinib cream for atopic dermatitis.2 Similarly, PMID 41824279, titled "First-in-Human Phase I Study of KPT-9274, a First-in-Class Dual Inhibitor of PAK4 and NAMPT, in Patients with Advanced Solid Malignancies" in Target Oncol, also contains the identical ponatinib abstract.3 This suggests the provided abstracts for these two papers are incorrect and do not pertain to ponatinib or its safety profile. Therefore, only the first paper, PMID 42471499, provides relevant information for this discussion.1

The open-label nature of real-world data collection is an obvious caveat. Without a comparator arm, it is challenging to definitively attribute all observed events solely to ponatinib or to precisely quantify the reduction in risk due to RMMs. But the sheer volume of data collected over a decade provides a strong signal regarding the drug's safety in routine use. The study did not specify the exact methodology for data collection, but real-world analyses often rely on pharmacovigilance databases, electronic health records, and patient registries, which can introduce biases related to reporting completeness and data standardization.1

Looking Ahead

The continued monitoring of ponatinib's safety profile is essential. As patients live longer with CML and Ph+ ALL, the long-term effects of their treatments become increasingly important. The 10-year real-world data analysis serves as a vital update, reinforcing the need for careful patient selection and proactive management of cardiovascular risk factors. It also highlights the ongoing challenge of balancing potent anti-leukemic activity with serious adverse events in a complex patient population.1

CLINICAL IMPLICATIONS

The decade of real-world data on ponatinib confirms what many haematologists already know: it is a powerful drug, but its vascular risks are not easily dismissed. Even with risk-management measures in place since 2012, clinicians must remain acutely aware of the potential for arterial and venous occlusive events. This means a rigorous pre-treatment cardiovascular assessment is not merely a box-ticking exercise, but a critical step in patient selection.

For patients, this translates to an ongoing dialogue with their prescribing physician about cardiovascular health. Regular monitoring of blood pressure, lipid levels, and glucose control is non-negotiable. The data reinforces that while ponatinib offers a lifeline for those with resistant CML or Ph+ ALL, it demands a proactive, multidisciplinary approach to mitigate its inherent risks.

The pharmaceutical industry's role in post-market surveillance is highlighted here. The initial safety concerns led to RMMs, and this 10-year analysis provides important feedback on their real-world impact. It suggests that while RMMs are necessary, they do not entirely eliminate the need for clinical vigilance and patient-specific risk stratification. Future drug development should continue to prioritize not just efficacy, but also a more favorable long-term safety profile, particularly for chronic conditions.

EDITORIAL & AI STANDARDS

AI tools are used to structure and summarise evidence from peer-reviewed primary sources. Articles that carry a signed Editor's take have been read in full by William Lopes. The others are not individually read by an editor, so check the cited source before relying on a figure.

REFERENCES

1. 1. Jabbour E, Castagnetti F, Bardey-Kanaan M. Ponatinib Safety Profile: An Analysis of 10 Years of Real-World Experience. Drug Saf. 2026;49(2):123-134. https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/42471499/

2. 2. Joyce JC, Hong HC, Siri DD. Safety and Tolerability of Ruxolitinib Cream in Adolescents with Mild-to-Moderate Atopic Dermatitis: Results From a 1-Year, Phase III, Open-Label Study. Am J Clin Dermatol. 2026;27(1):45-56. https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/42201487/

3. 3. Razak A, Mahipal A, Diamond JR. First-in-Human Phase I Study of KPT-9274, a First-in-Class Dual Inhibitor of PAK4 and NAMPT, in Patients with Advanced Solid Malignancies. Target Oncol. 2026;21(3):301-312. https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/41824279/

LICENCE & RIGHTS

© 2026 The Life Science Feed. All rights reserved. This content is produced for medical education purposes. It may not be reproduced, distributed, or transmitted without prior written permission from The Life Science Feed.

MEDICAL DISCLAIMER

This content is intended for healthcare professionals only and does not constitute medical advice. Clinical decisions must be made by qualified practitioners based on individual patient circumstances.

FOLLOW THE LIFE SCIENCE FEED

Instagram @lifesciencefeed **LinkedIn** linkedin.com/company/thelifesciencefeed

thelifesciencefeed.com