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# **Figure S1.** Forest plots for subgroup analyses of OS by age (< 70 vs ≥ 70), primary refractory patients (Yes vs No), number of prior therapies (1 vs ≥ 2), prior ASCT (Yes vs No) and refractoriness by last therapy line (Yes vs No). A: Tafasitamab plus lenalidomide versus systemic therapies pooled. B: Tafasitamab plus lenalidomide versus BR. C: Tafasitamab plus lenalidomide versus R-GemOx. HR < 1 indicates that treatment effect favors the cohort of patients treated by tafasitamab plus lenalidomide. The x-axis of the forest plot is presented in logarithmic scale. CI, confidence interval; HR, hazard ratio; N/N, number of patients in the tafasitamab plus lenalidomide and observational cohort, respectively; E/E, number of events in tafasitamab plus lenalidomide and observational cohort, respectively.



# Figure S2.Forest plots for subgroup analyses of PFS by age (< 70 vs ≥ 70), primary refractory patients (Yes vs No), number of prior therapies (1 vs ≥ 2), prior ASCT (Yes vs No) and refractoriness by last therapy line (Yes vs No). **A**: Tafasitamab plus lenalidomide versus systemic therapies pooled. **B**: Tafasitamab plus lenalidomide versus BR. **C**: Tafasitamab plus lenalidomide versus R-GemOx. HR < 1 indicates that treatment effect favors the cohort of patients treated by tafasitamab plus lenalidomide. The x-axis of the forest plot is presented in logarithmic scale. CI, confidence interval; HR, hazard ratio; N/N, number of patients in the tafasitamab plus lenalidomide and observational cohort, respectively; E/E, number of events in tafasitamab plus lenalidomide and observational cohort, respectively.