Normal karyotype is a poor prognostic factor in myeloid leukemia of Down syndrome: a retrospective, international study
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Methods

Patients
Data on 451 patients with ML-DS were collected from 13 collaborative study groups participating in the International AML-BFM Study Group, including the Berlin-Frankfurt-Munster Study Group (Germany and Austria; n=122), the Japanese Pediatric Leukemia/ Lymphoma Study Group (Japan; n=96), the Société Francaise de Lutte contre les Cancers et Leucémies de l’Enfant et de l’Adolescent (France; n=45), the Czech Pediatric Hematology Working Group (Czech Republic; n=6), St. Jude Children’s Research Hospital (USA, n=8), the Children’s Oncology Group Study, POG 9421 (USA, n=57), the Associazione Italiana di Ematologia ed Oncologia Pediatrica (Italy; n=3), the Nordic Society of Pediatric Haematology and Oncology (NOPHO; Denmark, Finland, Iceland, Norway and Sweden; n=44), the Dutch Childhood Oncology Group (the Netherlands; n=23), the Hong Kong Paediatric Haematology and Oncology Study Group (Hong Kong; n=13), the Polish Paediatric Leukaemia and Lymphoma Study Group (Poland; n=23), the Israel National Study group for Childhood ALL (Israel; n=6), and the Hungarian Pediatric Oncological Network (Hungary; n=5). For comparison, a reference cohort of non-DS AML patients (n=543) from the same treatment era, kindly provided by the AML-BFM Study Group, was used. This study was approved according to local law and guidelines by the Institutional Review Boards.

ML-DS patients, including those with a constitutional trisomy 21 (96.4%) or unbalanced Robertsonian translocation (3.6%), were identified by the various study groups. Patients were eligible if diagnosed between January 1, 1995 and January 1, 2005. Patients who were not treated with curative intent from diagnosis were excluded. The collected data at diagnosis comprised karyotype (if considered evaluable and centrally reviewed), sex, age, white blood cell count (WBC), hemoglobin, platelet counts, immunophenotypic data and FAB morphology. In addition, we collected data on treatment, such as therapy protocol (cumulative dosages of drugs), including stem-cell transplantation (SCT), and all events during follow-up (including non-responders, relapse, second malignancy or death). Only patients between 6 months and up to 5 years of age were included in the analyses; TMD-patients were excluded. Patients were treated on national or collaborative group AML trials. The treatment protocols were approved according to local law and guidelines by the Institutional Review Boards of each participating center and/or collaborative group.

Cytogenetic results
All karyotypes were provided after review by a national collaborative group, and centrally reviewed by 2 cytogeneticists (EF, BJ). FISH analyses were not standardly performed. Of the 451 cases, karyotypes were available from 358 (79%), comprising 103 (29%) with a normal karyotype (NK; i.e., with the constitutional trisomy 21 only), 55 (15%) with numerical aberrations only, and 120 (34%) with structural aberrations only. Both types of aberrations were found in 80 karyotypes (22%). Typical nonrandom cytogenetic aberrations, such as t(8;21)(q22;q22) and inv(16)(p13q22), frequently found in non-DS pediatric AML were not identified in the DS patients. Only one case had the acute promyelocytic leukemia-associated t(15;17)(q22;q21) and only one had an MLL rearrangement – t(9;11)(p21;q23).
As there was no a priori knowledge on the prognostic impact of the various cytogenetic groups in ML-DS, the classification of the cases was based on the premise that all groups should be mutually exclusive, i.e. each patient was included only once, although we could not avoid some overlap in additional cytogenetic abnormalities, and sufficiently large (≥5 cases) to allow meaningful statistical analyses.

The numerically largest group included 103 patients (29%) with a normal karyotype (NK). Another entity that was readily delineated consisted of 49 cases with trisomy 8 (14% of all cases), either as a single abnormality (n=16), or with additional cytogenetic aberrations (n=33). The latter group included a) trisomy 8 and gain of chromosome 21 (n=13, ± other additional changes); and b) trisomy 8 and other changes (n=20, excluding chromosome 5/7 aberrations and excluding +21). Next, a group of 82 cases (23%) with losses of chromosome 5/7 material (excluding those with +21) was distinguished. This group could be further subdivided into 50 cases with abnormalities of the p (short) arms only, 13 cases with monosomies 5/7, 10 cases with del(5q)/del(7q), and 9 cases with changes of both the p and q (long) arms of chromosomes 5/7. Other smaller groups consisted of 28 cases (6%) with a gain of chromosome 21 (in addition to +21c); 14 cases (4%) with a duplication of chromosome 1q; and 9 cases (3%) with a deletion of chromosome 16q. Finally, a group of 73 cases (20%) remained, harboring other aberrations that could not be sub-categorized further (Figure 1) (FigureS1).

Statistical analyses
Complete remission (CR) was defined as less than 5% blasts in the bone marrow, with regeneration of normal hematopoiesis, and absence of leukemic cells in the cerebrospinal fluid or elsewhere. Patients who failed to achieve CR in time (as specified in the various protocols) were classified as non-responders and considered as failures at day 0. Early death was defined as any death within the first 4-6 weeks of treatment, before evaluation of CR.

Overall survival (OS) was measured from the date of diagnosis to the date of last follow-up or death from any cause. Event-free survival (EFS) was calculated from the date of diagnosis to the first event (non-response, relapse, second malignancy, or death) or to the date of last follow-up. For the OS and EFS analyses, patients who did not experience an event were censored at the time of last follow-up. The Kaplan-Meier method was used to estimate the 7-years probabilities of OS (pOS) and EFS (pEFS), and survival estimates were compared using the log-rank test. Cumulative incidence functions of relapse (with other events and death while in CR as competing event) and cumulative incidence (CI) of toxic death were constructed using the method of Kalbfleisch and Prentice and compared using Gray’s test. For multivariate analysis, the Cox proportional-hazard regression model was used. We focused on differences in relapse-free survival (RFS) in order to avoid the influence of non-leukemic events on survival estimates.

Continuous variables were categorized according to cut-off points; age < or ≥ 3 years, WBC counts < or ≥ 20 x 10^9 and Ara-C <or ≥ 20.000 mg/m^2. The χ2 or Fisher exact test was used to compare discrete variables among groups; the Mann-Whitney U test was used for continuous variables. All p-values are descriptive and explorative, and were considered significant if ≤ 0.05. Statistical analyses were performed using SAS software (SAS-PC, Version 9.1).
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Figure S2: Survival curves of the subgroups of monosomy 7 patients (n=10) and patients with a deletion of 7q (n=11).
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Figure S3A: Event-free survival (EFS) (7 years) for ML-DS patients (n=444) according to white blood cell count (WBC).
- WBC < 20 x 10^9: Log-Rank p = .047 (N=363, 74 events)
- WBC >= 20 x 10^9: Log-Rank p = .070 (N=81, 24 events)

Figure S3B: Overall survival (OS) (7 years) for ML-DS patients (n=444) according to white blood cell count (WBC).
- WBC < 20 x 10^9: Log-Rank p = .047 (N=363, 69 events)
- WBC >= 20 x 10^9: Log-Rank p = .070 (N=81, 22 events)

Figure S3C: Cumulative incidence of relapse (CI at 7 Y.) for ML-DS patients (n=444) according to white blood cell count (WBC).
- WBC < 20 x 10^9: NR/Relapse p(Gray)= 0.10 (N=363, 36 events)
- WBC >= 20 x 10^9: NR/Relapse p(Gray)= 0.16 (N=81, 13 events)

Figure S3D: Cumulative incidence of toxic death (CI at 1.5 Y.) for ML-DS patients (n=444) according to white blood cell count (WBC).
- WBC < 20 x 10^9: Toxic death p(Gray)= 0.83 (N=363, 25 events)
- WBC >= 20 x 10^9: Toxic death p(Gray)= 0.86 (N=81, 5 events)
Figure S4A: Survival curves for ML-DS (n= 448) patients according to age.
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Figure S5A: Survival curves for ML-DS patients (n=221), positive and negative for CD7
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Figure S6A: EFS (7 years) Log-Rank p = .79
CD56-negative (N= 77, 16 events) CD56-positive (N= 92, 21 events)

Figure S6B: OS (7 years) Log-Rank p = .66
CD56-negative (N= 77, 14 events) CD56-positive (N= 92, 20 events)

Figure S6C: CI at 7 Y.
NR/Relapse p(Gray)= 0.41
CD56-negative .09, SE=.03 Events/N 7/77
CD56-positive .13, SE=.04 Events/N 12/92

Figure S6C: CI at 1.5 Y.
Toxic death p(Gray)= 0.77
CD56-negative .06, SE=.03 Events/N 5/77
CD56-positive .05, SE=.02 Events/N 5/92

Figure S6: Survival curves for ML-DS patients (n=169), positive and negative for CD56
A. Event-free survival curves
B. Overall survival curves
C. Cumulative incidence of relapse
D. Cumulative incidence of toxic death
Figure S7A: EFS (7 years)

Figure S7B: OS (7 years)

Figure S7C: CI at 7 Y.

Figure S7D: CI at 1.5 Y.

Figure S7: Survival curves for ML-DS patients (n=221), positive and negative for CD34
A. Event-free survival curves
B. Overall survival curves
C. Cumulative incidence of relapse
D. Cumulative incidence of toxic death
Figure S8: Survival curves for ML-DS patients (n=359) treated with different dosages of cytarabine (Ara-C)
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Figure S9: Survival curves for non-DS AML patients (n=543) compared to ML-DS patients (n=358)
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Figure S10A: EFS (7 years)

Log-Rank p = .091, SE=.04

Figure S10B: OS (7 years)

Log-Rank p = .094, SE=.03

Figure S10C: CI at 7 Y.
NR/Relapse p(Gray) <.0001

Figure S10D: CI at 1.5 Y.
Toxic death (Gray)= 0.88

Figure S10: Survival curves for trisomy 8 patients; non-DS AML (n=39) vs. ML-DS (n=49)
A. Event-free survival curves
B. Overall survival curves
C. Cumulative incidence of relapse
D. Cumulative incidence of toxic death
Figure S11: Survival curves for patients with monosomy 7/ del 7q; non-DS AML (n=27) vs. ML-DS (n=21)

A. Event-free survival curves
B. Overall survival curves
C. Cumulative incidence of relapse
D. Cumulative incidence of toxic death