Primary Therapy: Treatment Schema (Three 21-d Cycles)

VTD:
- Bortezomib 1.3 mg/m²
- Dexamethasone 40 mg/d
- Thalidomide 200 mg/d

TD:
- Thalidomide 200 mg/d
- Dexamethasone 40 mg/d
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Editor’s Note

Medical oncologists and hematologists face a continuous barrage of clinical research reports spanning a spectrum of different cancers. Our education group's committed content team of oncology clinicians knows this firsthand and spends its days and nights trying to stay on top of what's going on in more than two dozen tumor types. It's quite understandable that we spend a larger portion of that time focused on breast, colon and lung cancer — which make up at least two thirds of oncology practice — but in the last year alone we dove headfirst into the clinical and translational data in thyroid cancer, GIST, head and neck, ovary, renal cell, HCC and malignant glioma in order to produce in-depth education programs on these important topics.

Similarly, this slide set/monograph is our first major foray into multiple myeloma (MM). The need for effective CME in this unique cancer increased considerably after the recent data explosion at the December 2007 American Society of Hematology Annual Meeting, where no fewer than six Phase III randomized trials in MM were presented. Realizing that this marked a true turning point in the management of this disease, we wanted to create a super-practical resource that clinicians could use to quickly yet effectively obtain the bottom line on what all this newly emerging research in MM really means to clinical practice.

FACULTY
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To do this, our clinical team identified more than 230 2007-08 MM abstracts, manuscripts, presentations and review articles from major publications such as JCO, the New England Journal, Blood, The Lancet and important scientific meetings including ASCO and ASH. We then enlisted the help of a stellar faculty of four highly knowledgeable myeloma mavens with superb teaching skills and an eye toward what’s important. We asked them to take a look at our list and hone it down.

After several rounds of review, we arrived at a collection of 46 key publications, which we then sent to a select group of 23 practicing oncologists who agreed to consult with us on this project, including Dr Chuck Farber, a practicing doc who was previously on the faculty at Memorial Sloan-Kettering and worked closely with us as a gown-to-town liaison.

The community docs had previously worked with us on our Meet The Professors audio series, and we knew them to be highly knowledgable clinicians. They were given the important task of rating each article (on a 1-to-10 scale) for relevance and applicability to their practices. Based on the aggregated ratings, we eliminated the bottom half of the list, leaving us with 25 publications. We then posed two more challenges to these individuals:

1. Segment the 25 papers into those that are essential for any oncologist or hematologist providing care to people with MM (Priority 1) and those that are important but not absolutely critical (Priority 2).

2. Provide three MM cases from their practices, along with relevant clinical questions they had about those cases. We asked that the cases reflect the most challenging decisions currently involving patients with this disease. Our content group — headed on this project by a progressively obsessed Rick Kaderman, PhD — studied and classified these decisions and used the most common questions as a further basis to evaluate the value of the 25 “contestants” for “pubs of the year.”

With both faculty and practicing doc input, we reached a consensus that the 11 papers/presentations referred to in Figure 1 were required understanding for any doc caring for a patient with MM. My informal vote for paper of the year is Cavo's stunning ASH presentation of a Phase III evaluation of VTD.

A close runner-up is Rajkumar’s ECOG study on lenalidomide with high- and low-dose dex, followed by faculty member Paul Richardson's ASH data set on Rev/Vel/Dex. We then conducted in-depth interviews with the four faculty members about the papers and then combined their edited comments with supporting graphics to create the slides contained in this monograph.

Simultaneously, we analyzed all the submitted cases and from them developed 36 multiple-choice case scenarios that address the clinical questions that were most important to our community oncologist panel, and we asked our faculty to tell us how they would likely manage such a case currently. If it all sounds rather complex and nightmarish to implement, well...in a way, it was, except that the traffic cop for this electronic mayhem was our supremely talented faculty relations coordinator, Melissa Vives — an unflappable, profoundly organized human being who in a sweet, very gentle but highly insistent way, cannot be ignored when she asks for work returned on time.

When the dust settled, we had somehow been able to boil down one year’s worth of clinical research in MM to approximately 137 data slides and 36 related case-based question slides that can be paired with keypad polling devices to facilitate interactive Q&A during live events. Our hope is that oncology clinicians will use this monograph and the PowerPoint slides contained on the enclosed CD for their own education or during lectures on this important subject. As in many areas of cancer medicine, biologic agents are revolutionizing clinical management of MM, and just in the past year, major research findings have had a clear-cut impact on treatment algorithms in practice.

We are hopeful that as more data emerge on an annual basis, we will be able to revisit this process to document for busy clinicians the most important developments in the field and provide an efficient review of the potential benefits of these advances to patients struggling with this disease.

— Neil Love, MD
DrNeilLove@ResearchToPractice.com
Editor’s Note

1. Process for Identifying Key Recent Reports on the Management of Multiple Myeloma

   - Initial Search* 1/2007 to 2/2008 (237 publications and meeting abstracts)
   - Initial Faculty Review (46 publications/abstracts selected)
   - Community Oncologists’ & Faculty Ratings (1-10 scale)
   - Editorial Review of Ratings (25 publications/abstracts selected)
   - In-Depth Faculty Interviews
     - 11 essential publications/presentations
     - 14 recommended publications/presentations


   - Community Oncologists’ Submission of Clinical Cases from Their Practices (Approximately 70 patients with multiple myeloma)
   - Editorial Review of Cases for Key Clinical Questions
   - Development of Prototype Clinical Case Scenarios and Poll Questions
   - Editorial Review and Revision of Prototype Clinical Case Scenarios and Poll Questions (36 cases/questions)
   - Faculty Submission of Responses to Cases
**FACULTY COMMENTS**

**DR RICHARDSON:** The GIMEMA trial compared induction with bortezomib/thalidomide/dexamethasone — the so-called VTD regimen — to thalidomide/dexamethasone (TD) in preparation for autologous transplantation. Impressively responses to primary therapy were seen, including a 36 percent nCR*/CR rate for VTD, versus nine percent for thal/dex, and a doubling in the number of patients achieving VGPR† or better with the addition of bortezomib to the thal/dex.

What was particularly interesting in my view was that although TD had a six percent rate of progressive disease, which is low, this was zero for VTD, suggesting that the combination of the three drugs was active in all the patients treated.

An important point observed in this trial was that bortezomib-based therapy was effective regardless of chromosome 13 deletion or other adverse risk features, including high β₂-microglobulin and 4;14 translocation.

Whilst it’s fair to say that we have been very pleased with the impact of bortezomib in the relapsed/refractory setting, the magnitude of impact in the up-front setting has now been found to be dramatic.

Thalidomide/dexamethasone has been a very important up-front combination. This study shows that when bortezomib is added to this combination, the quality and depth of responses are significantly improved, which is likely to translate into clinical benefit, although long-term follow-up data are of course needed and are awaited with interest.

**DR JAKUBOWIAK:** VTD was superior across the board compared to TD, and transplant did not nullify this difference, which means that it is important to initiate therapy with a superior regimen. At the end of transplant, you may have a higher percentage of patients achieving VGPR or CR, and the presumption is that this will eventually translate into a longer progression-free and overall survival.

---

* nCR = near complete response (CR, except immunofixation-positive)
† VGPR = very good partial response
Priority 1 Publications/Presentations (Essential)

Background

- Phase I/II trial of VTD in 85 patients with refractory multiple myeloma (Pineda-Roman 2008):
  - Maximum tolerated dose: 1.3 mg/m² bortezomib and 150 mg thalidomide
  - Dose-limiting toxicity: Myelosuppression
  - PR rate 63%; nCR rate 22%

- Phase II trial of VTD in 38 patients with newly diagnosed multiple myeloma (Wang 2007):
  - Clinical response rate 87%; CR rate 16%

V = bortezomib; T = thalidomide; D = dexamethasone


Study Design
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Primary Therapy: Treatment Schema (Three 21-d Cycles)

VTD:

Bortezomib 1.3 mg/m²

Dexamethasone 40 mg/d

Thalidomide 200 mg/d

TD:

Thalidomide 200 mg/d

Dexamethasone 40 mg/d

### Response to Primary Therapy

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>VTD (n = 129)</th>
<th>TD (n = 127)</th>
<th>p-value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CR + nCR</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>&lt;0.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>≥VGPR</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>&lt;0.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&lt;PR</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>0.003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Progression</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>5.5%</td>
<td>0.008</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


### Key Grade III/IV Nonhematologic Adverse Events

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>VTD (n = 129)</th>
<th>TD (n = 127)</th>
<th>p-value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Peripheral neuropathy</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>0.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skin rash</td>
<td>6.5%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>0.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deep vein thrombosis</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>6.5%</td>
<td>0.01</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


### Response to First ASCT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>VTD (n = 74)</th>
<th>TD (n = 79)</th>
<th>p-value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CR + nCR</td>
<td>57%</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>&lt;0.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CR</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>&lt;0.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>≥VGPR</td>
<td>77%</td>
<td>54%</td>
<td>0.003</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Conclusions

- VTD as primary therapy for multiple myeloma significantly increased the rate of CR + nCR (36%) or ≥VGPR (60%)
- Superior CR + nCR rate effected by VTD was not adversely influenced by t(4;14) or del(13)
- Grade III/IV adverse events, including SAE, were similar for VTD and TD, except for a higher rate of PN (7%) and rash (6.5%) with VTD, and of DVT (6.5%) with TD
- The relatively low toxicity profile of VTD was reflected by:
  - Low discontinuation rate of therapy (3%)
  - High probability (91%) of receiving >90% of planned bortezomib administrations
  - Absence of early deaths


A Randomized Trial of Lenalidomide plus High-Dose Dexamethasone (RD) versus Lenalidomide plus Low-Dose Dexamethasone (Rd) in Newly Diagnosed Multiple Myeloma (E4A03)


FACULTY COMMENTS

DR RICHARDSON: ECOG-E4A03 is a landmark trial, which evaluated the activity and toxicity of high-dose dexamethasone versus lower-dose dexamethasone when combined with lenalidomide and how this affects patient outcome, including overall survival. The most powerful message from this study was that the one-year Kaplan-Meier overall survival estimate is striking, with a 96.5 percent survival for lenalidomide and low-dose dexamethasone, which is probably the best seen in any Phase III trial of this size to date. In contrast, the high-dose arm did less well, with an 88 percent chance of one-year survival. Somewhat surprising was that the response rates were significantly higher for the high-dose dexamethasone arm, which ultimately performed poorer in terms of survival. Having said that, the overall response rates for both arms are very respectable, and I believe the good news for patients is that we’re dealing with a new combination — lenalido-
mide and low-dose dex — which is associated with a very encouraging survival at one year, coupled with the convenience of an oral regimen. Unfortunately, high-dose dex contributes excess toxicity to this combination, and therefore, low-dose dex should generally be used. However, the quality of responses on low-dose dexamethasone was lower, and so this may indicate that we need a third drug, or even more, to achieve a better response and to potentially further enhance clinical benefit.

**DR JAKUBOWIAK:** Mostly, we eliminated the high toxicity levels with high-dose dex, which was the primary cause of early mortality, especially in older patients. It is important not to lose any patient from toxicity, but the switch to low-dose dex may haunt us. The response rate for Rd was clearly inferior compared to other active regimens, including PAD, VDD, RVD and VTD, which are in the 90 percent range. The response rate for Rd is approximately 70 percent. Some predict these patients will relapse earlier and have a shorter survival.

**Background**

- Mayo Phase II trial (Rajkumar 2005; Lacy 2007) of Len/Dex as initial therapy for multiple myeloma (N = 34)
  - RR = 91%
  - CR/VGPR rate: 56%
  - 88% OS at three years

**Study Design**

445 patients (pts)

- Len + low-dose Dex (Rd) x 4 cycles
- Less than PR
- Thal + Dex x 4 cycles
- CR/PR/stable
- @ 4 months pts can go off study

### Best Overall Response

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>RD (n = 196)</th>
<th>Rd (n = 190)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CR</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VGPR</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PR</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>29%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*CR + VGPR, p-value = 0.06


### Response within Four Cycles

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>RD (n = 196)</th>
<th>Rd (n = 190)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CR</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PR</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>69%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*CR + PR, p-value = 0.007

### Survival Probability (95% CI)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Survival Time</th>
<th>RD (n = 223)</th>
<th>Rd (n = 222)</th>
<th>p-value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>12-month</td>
<td>0.88 (0.83-0.92)</td>
<td>0.96 (0.93-0.99)</td>
<td>0.003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24-month</td>
<td>0.75 (0.68-0.82)</td>
<td>0.87 (0.81-0.93)</td>
<td>0.009</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


### Survival Rate by Age

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age Category</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>12-month survival probability (95% CI)</th>
<th>24-month survival probability (95% CI)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Age &lt; 65</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Len-high dex</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>0.92 (0.87-0.97)</td>
<td>0.85 (0.78-0.93)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Len-low dex</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>0.97 (0.94-1.00)</td>
<td>0.91 (0.84-0.98)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>p = 0.13</td>
<td>p = 0.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age ≥ 65</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Len-high dex</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>0.84 (0.77-0.91)</td>
<td>0.67 (0.56-0.77)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Len-low dex</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>0.95 (0.84-1.00)</td>
<td>0.82 (0.74-0.91)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>p = 0.01</td>
<td>p = 0.009</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


### Serious Adverse Events (≥Grade III): Nonhematologic

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Adverse Event</th>
<th>RD (n = 222)</th>
<th>Rd (n = 222)</th>
<th>Fisher exact p-value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DVT/PE</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>&lt;0.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Infection/pneumonia</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>0.030</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nonneuropathic weakness</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>0.008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Any nonhematologic toxicity (Grade ≥ III)</td>
<td>65%</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>&lt;0.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Early deaths (&lt;4 months)</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
<td>0.01</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Serious Adverse Events

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>RD (n = 222)</th>
<th>Rd (n = 219)</th>
<th>Fisher exact p-value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hemoglobin</td>
<td>8.1%</td>
<td>6.8%</td>
<td>0.718</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Platelets</td>
<td>5.4%</td>
<td>5.5%</td>
<td>1.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neutrophils</td>
<td>11.7%</td>
<td>18.7%</td>
<td>0.047</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Conclusions

- RD and Rd are highly active in newly diagnosed multiple myeloma (MM)
- Rd had lower response rates, but this was within the 15% limit that was defined in study design as clinically equivalent
- Rd is associated with superior OS
- Response duration, TTP or PFS with Rd not inferior
- The excess mortality in the RD arm was due to both disease progression (myeloma deaths) and increased toxicity
- This study has major implications for the use of high-dose dexamethasone in the treatment of newly diagnosed MM

FACULTY COMMENTS

DR RICHARDSON: Our Phase I/II study combined bortezomib with the lenalidomide/dexamethasone couplet in the up-front setting.

We had preclinical data to suggest that the triplet was at least additive and possibly synergistic. Clinical experience in the relapsed/refractory setting demonstrated that this drug regimen was active, even in patients in whom either bortezomib or lenalidomide had failed.

We identified a maximally tolerated dose in the up-front setting of 1.3 mg/m² of bortezomib, 25 milligrams of lenalidomide and dexamethasone at 20 milligrams, administered according to the protocol schedule. This translated into a 98 percent overall response rate using EBMT criteria, with 100 percent of patients treated at the maximum planned dose achieving PR or better.

We also observed low rates of deep vein thrombosis and peripheral neuropathy, and generally the toxicity profile of the combination proved manageable.

The regimen is already moving into a Phase III clinical trial through ECOG, led by my colleague Dr Rafael Fonseca, in which Rev/Vel/Dex is compared to bortezomib and dexamethasone. Also, Brian Durie from SWOG is testing Rev/Vel/Dex versus lenalidomide and low-dose dexamethasone. Participation in these clinical trials is especially encouraged, and other studies using the Rev/Vel/Dex platform are also underway.

DR LONIAL: Many of us believe now that Rev/Vel/Dex is probably the backbone on which we’re going to start adding other drugs to build a CHOP-like regimen for myeloma.

DR ORLOWSKI: In the future, Rev/Vel/Dex may prove to be the best regimen for all patients.

Being able to achieve response rates of close to 100 percent with shorter durations of therapy is encouraging.
**Background**

- **Phase I**: Lenalidomide/bortezomib with or without dexamethasone in relapsed/refractory MM: 58% response rate

- **Phase II study of Rev/Vel/Dex in relapsed/refractory MM** (Richardson 2007b)
  - 73% overall response rate — including 55% CR/nCR/PR
  - Well tolerated but Dex dose lowered


**Study Design**

* Dex, amended to 20 mg/10 mg for cycles 1-4/5-8 based on safety data

- Patients ≥PR may proceed to ASCT after ≥4 cycles
- Maintenance therapy permitted in patients ≥SD using weekly (days 1 and 8) schedule of Vel, and Dex on days 1, 2, 8 and 9
- Antithrombotic therapy with daily aspirin (81 or 325 mg)
- Antiviral therapy as herpes zoster prophylaxis


**Efficacy — Overall**

- Best response (EBMT/UC) in 42 evaluable patients
  - 9 CR (21%)
  - 3 nCR (7%)
  - 29 PR (69%)
  - 10 VGPR (24%)
  - 1 MR (2%)

- Overall response rate; CR/nCR + PR: 98% (95% CI: 87.4% to 99.9%)
- CR/nCR + VGPR: 52%
- CR/nCR: 29%

Conclusions

- Rev/Vel/Dex is active and well tolerated in patients with newly diagnosed MM
  - ORR currently 98% in 42 evaluable patients (Phase I/II), including 52% CR/nCR/VGPR
  - Maximum planned dose has been reached: Vel 1.3 mg/m², Rev 25 mg, Dex 20 mg
- Toxicities are manageable
  - No GIII/IV PNY and only 2 DVTs
- Rev/Vel/Dex has not adversely affected stem cell harvesting in most patients; transplant course unremarkable to date

Future Directions

- Additional analyses are under way for
  - Cytogenetics
  - Proteomics
  - Gene expression profiling
- Future directions:
  - Rev/Vel/Dex versus Rev/low-dose dex (SWOG)
  - Rev/Vel/Dex versus Vel/low-dose dex (ECOG)
  - Rev/Vel/Dex versus cyclophosphamide/Rev/Vel/Dex (Phase I/II)
- Rev/Vel/Dex with other novel agents (Phase I/II)

Bortezomib Appears to Overcome the Poor Prognosis Conferred by Chromosome 13 Deletion in Phase 2 and 3 Trials

**FACULTY COMMENTS**

**DR ORLOWSKI:** This paper reported on a retrospective analysis of the impact of bortezomib on the poor prognosis conferred by chromosome 13 deletion.

They examined data from the Phase II SUMMIT trial, which led to the first approval of bortezomib for third-line or later therapy, and the APEX trial, which led to approval of bortezomib for use in the second line or later. They showed that bortezomib seemed to overcome the adverse effects of the deletion of chromosome 13.

The APEX trial data are particularly nice in that regard because this trial had the control group with dexamethasone on one arm. The patients on that arm with deletion of chromosome 13 did more poorly than those without, as would be expected.

In the bortezomib arm, however, the patients with this deletion fared about the same as patients who did not have deletion of chromosome 13.

**Background**

- Chromosome 13 deletion (del[13]) is associated with poor prognosis in multiple myeloma (MM), independent of therapy
  - Chemotherapy OS 10 versus 35 months (Seong 1998)
  - Chemotherapy with single or tandem autotransplantation (Desikan 2000; Tricot 1997)
  - Miniallogeneic transplantation (Kröger 2004)

**SUMMIT and APEX Trials**

**Phase II SUMMIT Trial**
- Accrual: 202
- Eligibility: Relapsed and refractory MM
- Bortezomib 1.3 mg/m² twice/wk for 2 weeks q3wk x 8 followed by once/wk for 4 weeks q5wk x 3
- Dexamethasone 40 mg on days 1, 8, 15, and 22 followed by days 1-4 q4wk x 5

**Phase III APEX Trial**
- Accrual: 669
- Eligibility: Relapsed MM
- Bortezomib 1.3 mg/m² twice/wk for 2 weeks q3wk x 8 or bortezomib, same schedule + dexamethasone 20 mg*
- Dexamethasone added on day of and day after bortezomib if progressive disease after 2 cycles or stable disease after first 4 cycles

**SUMMIT Trial: Impact of Del(13) on Efficacy of Bortezomib**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Chromosome 13 deletion by metaphase cytogenetics</th>
<th>p-value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Present (percent)</td>
<td>Absent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unmatched analysis</td>
<td>26 (18%)</td>
<td>121 (82%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Response rate</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Median overall survival</td>
<td>10 months</td>
<td>15 months</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matched-pair analysis*</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n</td>
<td>Response rate</td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Median overall survival</td>
<td>10 months</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

NS = not significant; NR = not reached

*Balanced for patient age and International Staging System (ISS)


---

**APEX Trial: Impact of Del(13) on Response and Survival**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Bortezomib by metaphase cytogenetics</th>
<th>p-value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Present (percent)</td>
<td>Absent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unmatched analysis</td>
<td>11 (15%)</td>
<td>63 (85%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>38%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Response rate</td>
<td>12 months</td>
<td>38%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Median OS</td>
<td>12.5 months</td>
<td>NR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Matched-pair analysis*</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n</td>
<td>Response rate</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Median OS</td>
<td>12.5 months</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

NS = not significant; NR = not reached; *Balanced for patient age, adverse prognostic variables and ISS parameters


---

**Conclusions**

- In SUMMIT and APEX, patients with del(13) by metaphase cytogenetics appear to have a poorer prognosis
  - The difference was not significant in SUMMIT
  - The difference was more pronounced in the dexamethasone arm of APEX
- Matched-pair analyses indicate that bortezomib may overcome some of the adverse prognostic impact of del(13)
- Sample size in this study was small. Further studies are required to confirm these findings

**Activity and Safety of Bortezomib in Multiple Myeloma Patients with Advanced Renal Failure: A Multicenter Retrospective Study**


**FACULTY COMMENTS**

**DR LONIAL:** The Chanan-Khan paper was a multicenter, retrospective analysis evaluating the ability to use bortezomib in patients with hemodialysis-dependent renal failure. It reassures us that the response rates are good. The toxicity associated with bortezomib in the setting of hemodialysis was not worse than one would have expected in a similarly heavily pretreated patient population. Bortezomib is probably one of the first drugs you want to use in patients with renal dysfunction. If the renal dysfunction is related to myeloma, you have a good chance of reversing it.

**DR JAKUBOWIAK:** This study puts a stamp on what we already know — namely, we don’t have to be worried about renal insufficiency for patients who will be treated with bortezomib-based regimens. The response rates and toxicities are in the same range, regardless of renal functioning.

**Background**

- 30% of patients with newly diagnosed multiple myeloma (MM) have renal dysfunction
- 1-13% have renal failure requiring dialysis support
- Renal dysfunction:
  - Is associated with shorter survival or early death
  - Poses challenges in the delivery of effective and safe treatment
  - Does not seem to negatively affect response rates, toxicity or treatment discontinuation in patients with relapsed and/or refractory MM receiving bortezomib

Results

- 24 patients treated with bortezomib between May 2003 and November 2005
- 83% received bortezomib at a starting dose of 1.3 mg/m² in combination with other agents (median number of cycles = 5)
- Four out of 18 patients with available data became independent of dialysis

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Overall response rate (n = 20 for patients with response data)</th>
<th>75%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Complete response</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Near complete response</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Partial response</td>
<td>45%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Median duration of response</td>
<td>12.5+ months</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Conclusions

- Overall response rate and durability of response are comparable to MM patients with primarily normal renal function treated in the relapsed setting
- 83% of patients received treatment after completion of dialysis, suggesting that delivery of bortezomib subsequent to dialysis does not affect its activity
- Bortezomib has a potentially positive impact on renal function, with normalization occurring in some patients
Lenalidomide plus Dexamethasone for Relapsed or Refractory Multiple Myeloma


**FACULTY COMMENTS**

DR ORLOWSKI: This paper reports on one of the two studies that led to the combination of lenalidomide and dexamethasone becoming a standard approach for relapsed or refractory multiple myeloma. Comparing the combination to dexamethasone alone, the median time to progression was approximately 11 months as opposed to less than five months, respectively, and the median overall survival had not yet been reached for the combination but was approximately 20.6 months for dexamethasone alone. Thromboembolic events were more common with the combination, and I believe most people in the field would recommend prophylactic anticoagulants, although debate with regard to the specific strategy continues. The International Myeloma Working Group published a consensus paper in *Leukemia*, with Antonio Palumbo as the lead author, which says every patient who receives lenalidomide and low-dose dexamethasone should take a baby aspirin daily, at the minimum.

**Study Design**

Accrual: 351 (Closed)

Eligibility
- ≥18 years of age with multiple myeloma
- ≥1 prior antimyeloma regimen
- ECOG performance status ≤ 2
- No disease progression on prior high-dose dexamethasone

Lenalidomide* on days 1-21 of a 28-day cycle

Placebo* on days 1-21 of a 28-day cycle

*All patients received oral dexamethasone 40 mg/d on days 1-4, 9-12 and 17-20 for the first 4 cycles, then on days 1-4 only.

Priority 1 Publications/Presentations (Essential)

Efficacy Results

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>L + D (n = 176)</th>
<th>D (n = 175)</th>
<th>Hazard ratio*</th>
<th>p-value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Median TTP (months)</td>
<td>11.3</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>2.85</td>
<td>&lt;0.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Median OS (months)</td>
<td>Not yet reached</td>
<td>20.6</td>
<td>0.66†</td>
<td>0.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall response</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CR</td>
<td>60.2%</td>
<td>24.0%</td>
<td></td>
<td>&lt;0.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Near CR</td>
<td>15.9%</td>
<td>3.4%</td>
<td></td>
<td>&lt;0.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PR</td>
<td>8.5%</td>
<td>1.7%</td>
<td>—</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>35.8%</td>
<td>18.9%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* HR > 1 favors L + D; † Hazard ratio for death; L = lenalidomide; D = dexamethasone


Select Grade III/IV Adverse Events

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Adverse Event</th>
<th>Lenalidomide + dexamethasone (n = 176)</th>
<th>Dexamethasone (n = 175)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Febrile neutropenia</td>
<td>3.4%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neutropenia</td>
<td>29.5%</td>
<td>2.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thrombocytopenia</td>
<td>11.4%</td>
<td>5.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Infection</td>
<td>11.3%</td>
<td>6.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deep vein thrombosis*</td>
<td>4.0%</td>
<td>3.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Venous thromboembolism*</td>
<td>11.4%</td>
<td>4.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pulmonary embolism*</td>
<td>4.5%</td>
<td>1.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fatigue</td>
<td>6.8%</td>
<td>3.4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Thromboprophylaxis was not required


Conclusions

- L combined with D is more effective than D alone in patients with relapsed or refractory MM
  - Increased TTP, CR rate, overall response rate and OS
- Primary toxicity associated with lenalidomide/dexamethasone is hematologic, which is manageable with dose adjustments
- Thromboembolic complications are more common with lenalidomide/dexamethasone
- Lenalidomide is not associated with peripheral neuropathy

Lenalidomide plus Dexamethasone for Relapsed Multiple Myeloma in North America


**FACULTY COMMENTS**

**DR JAKUBOWIAK:** This study shows that the combination of lenalidomide (R) and dexamethasone (D) in patients who had relapsed is superior across the board to the prior traditional standard therapy, which was dexamethasone. RD was highly superior to D for progression-free and overall survival. So this is another study showing that more patients can be rescued successfully from relapsing disease, and as a result more will have their lives prolonged.

**DR LONIAL:** This was one of the trials used to obtain FDA approval for lenalidomide/dexamethasone in patients with relapsed myeloma. An improvement was seen not only in response rate but also in overall and progression-free survival. Toxicities associated with RD were manageable, and the incidence of DVT was relatively low. This is an important study, as it clearly establishes the response rate and efficacy of RD in relapsed myeloma.

**Study Design**

Accrual: 353

Eligibility:
- ≥18 years of age
- ECOG performance status ≤ 2
- Progressive, measurable disease that was not resistant to dexamethasone
- Serum creatinine < 2.5 mg/dL

Lenalidomide* on days 1-21 of a 28-day cycle
Placebo* on days 1-21 of a 28-day cycle

*All patients received oral dexamethasone 40 mg/d on days 1-4, 9-12 and 17-20 for the first 4 cycles, then on days 1-4 only.


---
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## Results

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>LD (n = 177)</th>
<th>D (n = 176)</th>
<th>Hazard ratio</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Median TTP</td>
<td>11.1 months</td>
<td>4.7 months</td>
<td>0.35*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Median OS</td>
<td>29.6 months</td>
<td>20.2 months</td>
<td>0.44*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall response</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CR</td>
<td>61.0%</td>
<td>19.9%*</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Near CR</td>
<td>14.1%</td>
<td>0.6%*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PR</td>
<td>10.2%</td>
<td>1.1%*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>36.7%</td>
<td>18.2%</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* p < 0.001

L = lenalidomide; D = dexamethasone


## Select Grade III and IV Adverse Events

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>LD (n = 177)</th>
<th>D (n = 175)</th>
<th>p-value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Neutropenia</td>
<td>41.2%</td>
<td>4.5%</td>
<td>p &lt; 0.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anemia</td>
<td>13.0%</td>
<td>5.1%</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thrombocytopenia</td>
<td>14.7%</td>
<td>6.9%</td>
<td>p = 0.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Any infection</td>
<td>21.4%</td>
<td>12.0%</td>
<td>p = 0.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pneumonia</td>
<td>12.4%</td>
<td>7.4%</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


## Select Grade III and IV Adverse Events

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>LD (n = 177)</th>
<th>D (n = 175)</th>
<th>p-value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Deep vein thrombosis*</td>
<td>11.9%</td>
<td>3.4%</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Venous thromboembolism*</td>
<td>14.7%</td>
<td>3.5%</td>
<td>p &lt; 0.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pulmonary embolism*</td>
<td>3.4%</td>
<td>0.6%</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hyperglycemia</td>
<td>10.8%</td>
<td>8.6%</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fatigue</td>
<td>6.2%</td>
<td>6.3%</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peripheral neuropathy</td>
<td>1.7%</td>
<td>1.1%</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Thromboprophylaxis was not required
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Conclusions

- LD is superior to D in patients with relapsed or refractory MM
  - Overall response rate (61% versus 20%)
  - Median time to progression (11.1 months versus 4.7 months)
  - Median overall survival (29.6 months versus 20.2 months)
- Neutropenia is more common with LD than D
  - Managed with dose adjustment, G-CSF or both
- Thromboembolic events are more common with LD than D
  - Managed with anticoagulants


Randomized Phase III Study of Pegylated Liposomal Doxorubicin plus Bortezomib Compared with Bortezomib Alone in Relapsed or Refractory Multiple Myeloma: Combination Therapy Improves Time to Progression

Orlowski RZ et al, on behalf of DOXIL-MMY-3001 Study Investigators.

FACULTY COMMENTS

DR ORLOWSKI: Our Phase III trial compared bortezomib with or without pegylated liposomal doxorubicin (PLD) in patients with relapsed or refractory multiple myeloma.

The median time to progression, progression-free survival and 15-month survival rate are all significantly greater with the combination.

The overall response rate doesn't appear much different between the two arms, partially because we have to report it in an intent-to-treat analysis as opposed to the response-evaluable population. Still, the response quality, as measured by CR and very good PR (VGPR), was about 30 percent with bortezomib and PLD versus 20 percent with bortezomib alone.

Also, we saw that there seemed to be a special benefit with this combination for patients with high-risk features, such as patients with both relapsed and refractory disease or patients with a

Continued on page 27
moderate to high β₂-microglobulin. Usually, trials show just the opposite — that it’s the good-risk patients that do the best. I can’t speculate as to why we saw this opposite effect.

**DR LONIAL:** This paper clearly established that while the overall response rate was not appreciably different, a much higher rate of VGPR or better was observed in the patients treated with PLD and bortezomib. This led to an improvement in time to progression and overall survival.

I believe this is a two-drug combination that improves overall survival compared to single-agent bortezomib. Based on this trial, you can feel confident that PLD with bortezomib will have a better response rate for a bortezomib-naïve patient.

**DR JAKUBOWIAK:** To Dr Orlowski’s credit, this was the first randomized study in patients with relapsed disease to show that a two-drug combination with a novel agent was superior to a novel single agent, which was bortezomib.

### Background

- Phase I (bortezomib + pegylated liposomal doxorubicin [PLD]) demonstrated safety and efficacy (Orlowski 2005)
  - CR = 36%
  - Overall RR = 73%
  - TTP = 9.3 months
  - Median overall survival > 3 years

### Study Design

- **n = 646**
- **Eligibility**
  - Confirmed MM diagnosis
  - Relapsed or refractory disease

**R**

- **Bortezomib 1.3 mg/m² days 1, 4, 8, 11 q3wk**
- **Bortezomib same schedule as above + PLD 30 mg/m² day 4**

Primary endpoint: Time to progression

**MM =** multiple myeloma; **PLD =** pegylated liposomal doxorubicin
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**Initial Analysis (7.2 Months)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Efficacy</th>
<th>Bortezomib + PLD (n = 324)</th>
<th>Bortezomib (n = 322)</th>
<th>Hazard ratio</th>
<th>p-value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Median TTP</td>
<td>9.3mo</td>
<td>6.5mo</td>
<td>1.82</td>
<td>0.000004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Median PFS</td>
<td>9.0mo</td>
<td>6.5mo</td>
<td>1.69</td>
<td>0.000026</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15-month survival</td>
<td>76%</td>
<td>65%</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>0.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall response rate (CR + PR)</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>0.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CR + VGPR</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>0.0157</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Median DOR</td>
<td>10.2mo</td>
<td>7.0mo</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>0.0008</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TTP = time to progression; PFS = progression-free survival; CR = complete response; PR = partial response; DOR = duration of response


**Hazard Ratio Estimates for Time to Disease Progression**

### Subgroup: Prior anthracycline use

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subgroup</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>HR</th>
<th>95% CI</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>436</td>
<td>1.88</td>
<td>1.38 to 2.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>210</td>
<td>1.83</td>
<td>1.12 to 3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Subgroup: Cytogenetic abnormality

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subgroup</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>HR</th>
<th>95% CI</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>1.62</td>
<td>0.83 to 3.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>141</td>
<td>1.71</td>
<td>0.95 to 3.08</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Subgroup: Chromosome 13 deletion

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subgroup</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>HR</th>
<th>95% CI</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>0.94</td>
<td>0.32 to 2.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>1.69</td>
<td>0.78 to 4.58</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Select Grade III/IV Adverse Events (AE)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Event</th>
<th>PLD + Bortezomib (n = 318)</th>
<th>Bortezomib (n = 318)</th>
<th>p-value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Any AE Grade III/IV</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>64%</td>
<td>&lt;0.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peripheral neuropathy</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>NR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neutropenia</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>&lt;0.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Febrile neutropenia</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>NR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thrombocytopenia</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>0.249</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bleeding/hemorrhage</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>NR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thromboembolic events</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>NR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diarrhea</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>0.034</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hand-foot syndrome</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>&lt;0.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cardiac events</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>NR</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

NR = not reported


**Select Adverse Events (%)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Event</th>
<th>PLD + Bortezomib (n = 318)</th>
<th>Bortezomib (n = 318)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grade III/IV</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peripheral neuropathy</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Febrile neutropenia</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bleeding/hemorrhage</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thromboembolic events</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cardiac events</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alopecia</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


**Symptomatic Cardiac Adverse Events (AE)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cardiac AE</th>
<th>PLD + Bortezomib (n = 318)</th>
<th>Bortezomib (n = 318)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total patients with AE</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Congestive heart failure</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Symptomatic arrhythmia</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coronary ischemia disease</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Rated by investigator as at least probably related to treatment

PLD with Bortezomib versus Bortezomib: Conclusions

- PLD/bortezomib is superior to bortezomib in relapsed/refractory MM
  - Significantly prolonged DOR, PFS and TTP
  - Evidence of benefit in patients with moderate to high β₂-microglobulin
  - Early evidence of survival benefit
- PLD/bortezomib resulted in more Grade III/IV AEs
  - No increase in febrile neutropenia
  - No increase in treatment-emergent neuropathy
- PLD/bortezomib represents a new therapeutic option for relapsed/refractory MM


MMY-3002: A Phase 3 Study Comparing Bortezomib-Melphalan-Prednisone (VMP) with Melphalan-Prednisone (MP) in Newly Diagnosed Multiple Myeloma

San Miguel JF et al, on behalf of the MMY-3002 study investigators.
American Society of Hematology 2007. Abstract 76

FACULTY COMMENTS

DR RICHARDSON: It was exciting to see Dr San Miguel present the randomized Phase III VISTA trial at the 2007 ASH meeting.

A protocol-specified interim analysis showed that the combination with bortezomib and melphalan/prednisone was significantly superior to melphalan/prednisone alone for all of the efficacy endpoints, including time to progression, progression-free survival, overall survival and time to next therapy.

The difference in complete response rate — 35 percent for the bortezomib-based arm versus five percent for the control arm — was striking.

CR rates of this order of magnitude for older patients who are not candidates for transplant are quite remarkable, in my opinion.

Continued on page 31
We at Dana-Farber were the lead enroller for the US, and our experience was that the responses to the combination were rapid and deep. Moreover, adverse cytogenetics and poor renal function had no impact on VMP efficacy overall.

In terms of the side-effect profile, cytopenias were seen in both arms, and the neuropathy rate was higher, as one would expect, with VMP. In the majority of cases, however, it was reversible using the dose-reduction algorithm that is now a standard with bortezomib-based therapy.

Interestingly, low rates of deep vein thrombosis were observed on both arms with this combination approach.

The clinical implication of these data is that bortezomib and melphalan/prednisone is now an important standard in the up-front setting for patients who are not candidates for high-dose therapy.

**Background**

Phase I/II trial (Mateos 2006): VMP in newly diagnosed MM (median age = 75) resulted in:
- CR rate = 32%
- CR/nCR rate = 43%
- Projected 2-year survival = 86%
- Median time to progression not yet reached at 16-month follow-up

V = bortezomib; M = melphalan; P = prednisone; MM = multiple myeloma

Source: San Miguel JF et al. Proc ASH 2007. Abstract 76

**Eligibility and Design**

- Symptomatic MM, end organ damage with measurable disease
  - ≥65y or <65y and not transplant eligible; KPS ≥ 60%

VMP

Cycles 1-4: Bortezomib 1.3 mg/m² IV: days 1, 4, 8, 11, 22, 25, 29, 32; melphalan 9 mg/m² and prednisone 60 mg/m² days 1-4

Cycles 5-9: Bortezomib 1.3 mg/m² IV: days 1, 8, 22, 29; melphalan 9 mg/m² and prednisone 60 mg/m² days 1-4

MP

Cycles 1-9: Melphalan 9 mg/m² and prednisone 60 mg/m² days 1-4

9 x 6-week cycles (54 weeks) in both arms

Source: San Miguel JF et al. Proc ASH 2007. Abstract 76
Patient Demographics and Disease Characteristics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>VMP, N = 344</th>
<th>MP, N = 338</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>51%</td>
<td>49%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>88%</td>
<td>87%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Median age, years</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age ≥ 75y</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age 31-70y</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KPS ≤ 70%</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ISS Stage I/II/III</td>
<td>19/47/35%</td>
<td>19/47/34%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>β₂-m &lt;2.5/2.5-5.5/&gt;5.5 mg/L (median β₂-m, mg/L)</td>
<td>12/55/33% (4.2)</td>
<td>12/55/33% (4.3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Albumin &lt; 3.5 g/dL, (median albumin, g/dL)</td>
<td>58% (3.3)</td>
<td>59% (3.3)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: San Miguel JF et al. Proc ASH 2007. Abstract 76

Patient Demographics and Disease Characteristics (continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>VMP, N = 344</th>
<th>MP, N = 338</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Region: Europe/N America/other</td>
<td>78/9/12%</td>
<td>78/9/13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IgG/IgA/light chain</td>
<td>64/24/8%</td>
<td>62/26/8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lytic bone lesions</td>
<td>65%</td>
<td>66%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plasma cells in bone marrow biopsy, median</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>41%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Serum creatinine, median (mg/dL)</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CrCl ≤30/&gt;30-60/&gt;60 ml/min</td>
<td>6/48/46%</td>
<td>5/50/46%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>History of neurological conditions</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>History of cardiac conditions</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>31%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: San Miguel JF et al. Proc ASH 2007. Abstract 76

Results

- 682 patients randomly assigned from 12/04 to 9/06
- VMP was significantly superior for all efficacy endpoints
- IDMC recommended that the study stop in 9/07

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Efficacy endpoint</th>
<th>HR</th>
<th>p-value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TTP</td>
<td>0.540</td>
<td>0.000002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PFS</td>
<td>0.609</td>
<td>0.0001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OS</td>
<td>0.607</td>
<td>0.00782</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TNT</td>
<td>0.522</td>
<td>0.000009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CR</td>
<td>11.2*</td>
<td>&lt;0.000001</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Odds ratio

Source: San Miguel JF et al. Proc ASH 2007. Abstract 76
VISTA Response Data

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>EBMT criteria</th>
<th>VMP (n = 344)</th>
<th>MP (n = 338)</th>
<th>p-value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ORR (CR + PR)</td>
<td>69%</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>10^-10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CR</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PR</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


VISTA Efficacy

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time to progression</th>
<th>VMP (n = 344)</th>
<th>MP (n = 338)</th>
<th>Hazard ratio</th>
<th>p-value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>52% reduced risk of progression on VMP</td>
<td>24.0mo</td>
<td>16.6mo</td>
<td>0.483</td>
<td>&lt;0.000001</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Overall survival

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age</th>
<th>VMP</th>
<th>MP</th>
<th>Hazard ratio</th>
<th>p-value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Age &lt; 75y</td>
<td>82.6%</td>
<td>69.5%</td>
<td>0.607</td>
<td>0.0078</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age ≥ 75y</td>
<td>79.0%</td>
<td>74.0%</td>
<td>60.0%</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

40% reduced risk of death on VMP

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Treatment-related deaths</th>
<th>VMP</th>
<th>MP</th>
<th>—</th>
<th>—</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NR</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

NR = not yet reached

Source: San Miguel JF et al. Proc ASH 2007. Abstract 76

Grade III and IV Adverse Events (%)

VMP serious adverse events: 46%; MP: 36%

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Adverse Event</th>
<th>VMP (n = 340)</th>
<th>MP (n = 337)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Neutropenia</td>
<td>Grade III: 30</td>
<td>Grade IV: 10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thrombocytopenia</td>
<td>Grade III: 20</td>
<td>Grade IV: 17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anemia</td>
<td>Grade III: 16</td>
<td>Grade IV: 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gastrointestinal symptoms</td>
<td>Grade III: 19</td>
<td>Grade IV: 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peripheral sensory neuropathy</td>
<td>Grade III: 13</td>
<td>Grade IV: &lt;1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fatigue</td>
<td>Grade III: 7</td>
<td>Grade IV: 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asthenia</td>
<td>Grade III: 6</td>
<td>Grade IV: &lt;1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pneumonia</td>
<td>Grade III: 5</td>
<td>Grade IV: 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Herpes zoster</td>
<td>Grade III: 3</td>
<td>Grade IV: 0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: San Miguel JF et al. Proc ASH 2007. Abstract 76
Grade III and IV Adverse Events (%)

- Transfusion (26% versus 35%) and EPO support (34% versus 42%) were somewhat lower on the VMP arm
- PN resolved or improved in 75% of cases in a median of 64 days
- DVT rate was low and the same on both arms (1%)

Source: San Miguel JF et al. Proc ASH 2007. Abstract 76

Conclusions

- VMP was superior to MP for all efficacy endpoints, including TTP, PFS, OS, time to next treatment and response rate
- VMP was well tolerated
  - Patients remained on therapy for a median of 46 weeks (8 cycles) versus 39 weeks with MP (7 cycles)
  - VMP was associated with more Grade III/IV peripheral neuropathy and fatigue than MP
- Adverse cytogenetics, age and renal function had no effect on VMP efficacy

Source: San Miguel JF et al. Proc ASH 2007. Abstract 76

VELCADE®/Dexamethasone (Vel/D) versus VAD as Induction Treatment Prior to Autologous Stem Cell Transplantation (ASCT) in Newly Diagnosed Multiple Myeloma (MM): Updated Results of the IFM 2005/01 Trial

Harousseau JL et al.
American Society of Hematology 2007. Abstract 450
**Priority 2 Publications/Presentations (Recommended)**

**FACULTY COMMENTS**

**DR RICHARDSON:** The IFM 2005/01 trial is another landmark study with an innovative design comparing bortezomib and dexamethasone versus the standard approach of VAD as an induction treatment prior to at least one transplant.

It examined the role of consolidation chemotherapy as a part of induction and evaluated the need for tandem transplants based on the quality of response to each induction approach.

The results of response to induction were presented at the recent ASH 2007 meeting and showed a pretransplant VGPR or better of 47 percent with bortezomib and dexamethasone, versus 19 percent with VAD.

A key message from this trial is that the depth and quality of response were not only better pretransplant but also continued post-transplant.

Importantly, this randomized trial suggested that consolidation chemotherapy with DCEP did not convey benefit.

In aggregate, the data suggest that bortezomib-based therapy pretransplant should be considered a new standard, because it is generally believed that the quality of response pretransplant matters, and bortezomib-based therapy also appears to enhance the quality of response post-transplant.

**DR JAKUBOWIAK:** The study demonstrated superior response rates for bortezomib and dexamethasone compared to VAD, regardless of whether the patient had poor-risk cytogenetics and that superiority was maintained when patients subsequently underwent transplant.

Harousseau and colleagues designed this study so that patients who achieved a VGPR after first transplant did not need to receive a second transplant. So, fewer patients treated with bortezomib and dexamethasone needed to undergo a second transplant. This could save lives because there is a five percent mortality rate with any single transplant.

---

**Study Design**

**Randomization**

Stratified by β₂-microglobulin level (>3mg/L vs ≤3mg/L) and presence of chromosome 13 abnormalities (by FISH analysis)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>A1</th>
<th>A2</th>
<th>B1</th>
<th>B2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>VAD x 4</td>
<td>VAD x 4</td>
<td>Induction</td>
<td>Vel/D x 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>DCEP x 2</td>
<td>Consolation</td>
<td></td>
<td>DCEP x 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Melphalan</td>
<td>Transplant 1</td>
<td>Melphalan</td>
<td>Melphalan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>200 mg/m²</td>
<td>+ ASCT</td>
<td>200 mg/m²</td>
<td>200 mg/m²</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>+ ASCT</td>
<td></td>
<td>+ ASCT</td>
<td>+ ASCT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Second ASCT or RIC allo if &lt;VGPR</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Response to Induction*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>VAD (n = 242)</th>
<th>Vel/D (n = 240)</th>
<th>p-value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CR</td>
<td>2.9%</td>
<td>9.6%</td>
<td>0.0023</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CR + nCR</td>
<td>8.3%</td>
<td>21.3%</td>
<td>&lt;0.0001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>≥VGPR</td>
<td>18.6%</td>
<td>46.7%</td>
<td>&lt;0.0001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>≥PR</td>
<td>62.8%</td>
<td>80.0%</td>
<td>&lt;0.0001</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Intent to treat; investigator assessment


### Post-ASCT Response*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>VAD (n = 242)</th>
<th>Vel/D (n = 240)</th>
<th>p-value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CR + nCR</td>
<td>23.6%</td>
<td>35.0%</td>
<td>0.0056</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>≥VGPR</td>
<td>41.7%</td>
<td>61.7%</td>
<td>&lt;0.0001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>≥PR</td>
<td>72.7%</td>
<td>80.4%</td>
<td>0.0463</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Intent to treat


### Impact of β₂-m and Del(13) on Post-Induction Responses (CR + nCR)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>VAD</th>
<th>Vel/D</th>
<th>p-value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>β₂-m level</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt;3.0 mg/L</td>
<td>7.9% (n = 140)</td>
<td>18.3% (n = 137)</td>
<td>0.0101</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>≤3.0 mg/L</td>
<td>8.8% (n = 102)</td>
<td>25.2% (n = 103)</td>
<td>0.0018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chr 13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deletion</td>
<td>9.6% (n = 104)</td>
<td>25.7% (n = 101)</td>
<td>0.0024</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Normal/NE</td>
<td>7.3% (n = 138)</td>
<td>18.0% (n = 139)</td>
<td>0.0071</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Impact of DCEP Consolidation
ITT Analysis

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>No DCEP A1 + B1 N = 242</th>
<th>DCEP A2 + B2 N = 240</th>
<th>p-value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CR + nCR</td>
<td>16.5%</td>
<td>19.2%</td>
<td>0.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>≥VGPR</td>
<td>33.5%</td>
<td>37.5%</td>
<td>0.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>≥PR</td>
<td>71.1%</td>
<td>71.3%</td>
<td>0.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NE</td>
<td>3.7%</td>
<td>15.4%</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Hematologic Toxicity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>VAD (n = 239)</th>
<th>Vel/D (n = 238)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Anemia</td>
<td>21.8%</td>
<td>20.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neutropenia</td>
<td>12.2%</td>
<td>10.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Platelets</td>
<td>10.1%</td>
<td>11.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Infection</td>
<td>5.0%</td>
<td>7.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Herpes zoster</td>
<td>2.1%</td>
<td>8.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thrombosis</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>3.8%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Nonhematologic Toxicities (All Grades)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>VAD (n = 239)</th>
<th>Vel/D (n = 238)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fatigue</td>
<td>16.7%</td>
<td>21.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rash</td>
<td>5.4%</td>
<td>10.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gastrointestinal symptoms</td>
<td>25.9%</td>
<td>22.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peripheral neuropathy</td>
<td>22.6%</td>
<td>35.3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Conclusions

- Vel/D was well tolerated and significantly improved the postinduction response rate
- DCEP consolidation did not significantly improve outcome
- Better response after induction translated to better response after ASCT


Melphalan and Prednisone plus Thalidomide versus Melphalan and Prednisone Alone or Reduced-Intensity Autologous Stem Cell Transplantation in Elderly Patients with Multiple Myeloma (IFM 99-06): A Randomised Trial


FACULTY COMMENTS

DR ORLOWSKI: The bottom line of this paper is that with MPT we see about an 18-month improvement in median overall survival over MP.

I would conclude that if you have a patient who is not eligible for transplant and who has a reasonably good performance status and organ function, he or she should receive either MPT or MPV because those are the most active regimens, although they are associated with an increased risk of toxicity.

With MPT in particular, the patient can have problems with thrombosis and infection, while other issues like cytopenias are less problematic or at least easier for the average hematology/oncology practitioner to deal with. I believe that the current best combinations we have to offer are MPT, based on this paper and Hulin’s data, and MPV, based on the San Miguel paper.

Continued on page 39
Priority 1 Publications/Presentations (Essential)

Continued from page 38

DR LONIAL: MPT clearly was the winner across the board in terms of overall survival, progression-free survival and response rate. A little more myelosuppression, somnolence and peripheral neuropathy were observed with MPT compared to MP alone. The deep vein thrombosis rate was a little higher than I would have expected, but they didn’t use any prophylaxis. I believe this was the trial that established MPT as a standard for elderly patients with myeloma who are not transplant eligible.

DR JAKUBOWIAK: The simple answer from the Facon study is that the addition of thalidomide to MP results in a superior response rate, progression-free survival and overall survival compared to MP alone. Secondly, there is no way to “rescue” this superiority by using reduced-intensity ASCT, with melphalan 100 mg/m², in elderly patients. Those patients did not fare better than those treated with MP. So, to some extent, this tells us that adding a new drug to a regimen is better than escalating traditional cytotoxic drugs.

Background

• In newly diagnosed multiple myeloma, melphalan and prednisone with thalidomide (MPT) improves response rate (RR) and event-free survival (EFS) but with increased toxicity and no evident survival benefit (Palumbo 2006)

• High-dose M followed by autologous stem cell transplantation (ASCT) is not tolerated by most elderly patients (Attal 2003; Child 2003)

• GIMEMA trial of M 100 mg/m² (Palumbo 2004) - ASCT versus standard MP in patients 50 to 70 years old
  - Improved RR, EFS and OS


Eligibility and Design

n = 447

Eligibility

Stage II or III MM by Durie and Salmon criteria
Age 65-75 years
Previously untreated patients

Melphalan and prednisone (MP)
Melphalan and prednisone with thalidomide (MPT)
Reduced-intensity ASCT using melphalan 100 mg/m² (MEL100)

Primary endpoint: Overall survival (OS)
Secondary endpoints: Best response rate, progression-free survival (PFS), survival after progression, toxicity

Efficacy (51.5-Month Follow-Up)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>MP (n = 196)</th>
<th>MEL100 (n = 126)</th>
<th>MPT (n = 125)</th>
<th>MPT vs MP</th>
<th>MPT vs MEL100</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Median OS</td>
<td>33.2mo</td>
<td>38.3mo</td>
<td>51.6mo</td>
<td>0.59, 0.0006</td>
<td>0.59, 0.027</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Median PFS</td>
<td>17.8mo</td>
<td>19.4mo</td>
<td>27.5mo</td>
<td>0.51, &lt;0.0001</td>
<td>0.59, 0.0002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Survival after progression</td>
<td>11.4mo</td>
<td>14.1mo</td>
<td>13.4mo</td>
<td>Not reported</td>
<td>Not reported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Response</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At least PR</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>65%</td>
<td>76%</td>
<td>&lt;0.0001</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At least VGPR</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>&lt;0.0001</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CR</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>0.0008</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(39 to 43% of patients were 70 years old or older.)

Grade III/IV Toxicities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>MP (n = 193)</th>
<th>MEL100 (n = 122)</th>
<th>MPT (n = 124)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Anemia</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neutropenia</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>48%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thrombocytopenia</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Severe hemorrhage</td>
<td>1.5%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Infection</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>49%</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thrombosis or embolism</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peripheral neuropathy</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cardiac symptoms</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nausea</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somnolence/fatigue/dizziness</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Any Grade III/IV nonhematologic toxicity</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>58%</td>
<td>42%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Conclusions

- MPT compared to MP
  - Significantly increased RR, PFS and OS
  - More frequent hematologic and nonhematologic toxicity

- MPT compared to MEL100
  - RR similar, but increased PFS and OS
  - Less frequent hematologic and nonhematologic toxicity

- High incidence of relapse after MEL100 → ASCT

FACULTY COMMENTS

DR LONIAL: A number of trials have evaluated single versus tandem transplant, and few have been positive. The French trial was the only other positive trial for tandem transplant versus single transplant with melphalan, and it demonstrated that patients who had achieved a VGPR or better did not benefit from a second transplant. So I believe many of us have adopted that same approach. Patients who achieve a VGPR or better don’t need a second cycle of high-dose therapy and transplant.

The Cavo trial showed that tandem transplant appeared to be superior to single transplant in terms of event-free survival and response rate. No real difference in seven-year overall survival was observed, but a difference at five years favoring double autologous transplant was seen.

My conclusion is that, for patients who fail to achieve a near CR — and in the French trial, a VGPR — a tandem transplant is of benefit.

Prospective, Randomized Study of Single Compared with Double Autologous Stem-Cell Transplantation for Multiple Myeloma: Bologna 96 Clinical Study


Design

n = 321

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Eligibility</th>
<th>Single ASCT with melphalan (200 mg/m²)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Symptomatic or progressive MM</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>≤60 years old</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Previously untreated</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Double ASCT with melphalan (200 mg/m²)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>→ melphalan (120 mg/m²) + busulfan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(12 mg/kg)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Results**

Patients who failed to achieve at least an nCR after one transplantation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Single ASCT n = 94</th>
<th>Double ASCT n = 66</th>
<th>p-value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Median relapse-free survival</td>
<td>22 months</td>
<td>46 months</td>
<td>&lt;0.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Median event-free survival</td>
<td>22 months</td>
<td>42 months</td>
<td>&lt;0.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seven-year overall survival rate</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>0.10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


**Toxicity**

Most frequent WHO Grade III/IV nonhematologic toxicities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Single ASCT n = 130</th>
<th>Double ASCT n = 99</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mucositis</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>28%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Infections</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transplant-related mortality</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


**Superiority of Lenalidomide (Len) plus High-Dose Dexamethasone (HD) Compared to HD Alone as Treatment of Newly-Diagnosed Multiple Myeloma (NDMM): Results of the Randomized, Double-Blinded, Placebo-Controlled SWOG-S0232**

Zonder JA et al.
American Society of Hematology 2007. Abstract 77
FACULTY COMMENTS

DR LONIAL: SWOG-S0232 — the sister trial of ECOG-E4A03 — compared lenalidomide/high-dose dexamethasone (len/HD) to dexamethasone alone (HD) for the treatment of newly diagnosed myeloma.

It was a placebo-controlled Phase III trial, which was interrupted after enrollment of the first 25 or 30 patients because of a high incidence of deep vein thrombosis before prophylaxis was mandated. It was stopped early at 198 patients because of the E4A03 data — which I believe was somewhat premature — suggesting that it was unethical to use len/HD. So it’s not a truly finished trial in terms of accrual to its real power.

In this study, we saw the real CR rate of 22 percent for len/HD in the up-front setting. What I think is intriguing about this trial — and the follow-up is short — is that the 12-month overall survival was 93 percent, which is much better than the 12-month survival rate for len/HD in ECOG-E4A03.

The advantage of the SWOG trial is that it is easier to evaluate because it has a true control arm, and its data are consistent with what we have seen with len/dex in other trials.

The risk of infection was higher in the len/dex arm, but these were predominately Grade I/II, and neutropenia can be seen with lenalidomide. Thrombosis was the big surprise from this trial, and aspirin did not appear to reduce the risk. Practically speaking, len/dex has essentially replaced thal/dex because of the ECOG and SWOG data.

I believe that the responses are encouraging, but I also believe that we can do even better with combinations. Hence, RVD has become our standard, but I think len/HD or VD are reasonable up-front induction regimens.

DR JAKUBOWIAK: This presentation had the potential to be an important study, but it addressed a question that was already answered in the Weber and Dimopoulos studies, albeit not in a front-line setting, which demonstrated that lenalidomide/dexamethasone was superior to dexamethasone alone.

---

**Design**

**Eligibility**
- Newly diagnosed MM
- Ineligible for/declining immediate ASCT (n = 198*)

**Induction therapy**
- Three 35-day courses
  - Lenalidomide x 28 days + dexamethasone (n = 100)
  - Placebo x 28 days + dexamethasone (n = 98)
  - Aspirin 325 mg/day required

**Maintenance therapy**
- Repeat every 28 days until progressive disease (PD)
  - Lenalidomide x 21 days + dexamethasone (PD n = 40)
  - Placebo x 21 days + dexamethasone

*Protocol closed after early interim analysis by DSMC.

Efficacy Results

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Lenalidomide + high-dose dexamethasone (n = 78)</th>
<th>High-dose dexamethasone alone (n = 85)</th>
<th>p-value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CR</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>0.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PR</td>
<td>62%</td>
<td>49%</td>
<td>0.010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12-month PFS</td>
<td>77%</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>0.002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12-month OS</td>
<td>93%</td>
<td>91%</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Select Adverse Events

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Lenalidomide + high-dose dexamethasone (n = 78)</th>
<th>High-dose dexamethasone alone (n = 85)</th>
<th>p-value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Infections (Grade I-V)</td>
<td>51.4%</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>0.003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neutropenia (Grade III/IV)</td>
<td>13.8%</td>
<td>2.4%</td>
<td>0.010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thrombotic events</td>
<td>(25) 32.1%</td>
<td>(7) 8.2%</td>
<td>0.089</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


The Effect of Induction Therapy with Novel Agents on Stem Cell Mobilization in Multiple Myeloma

FACULTY COMMENTS

DR. JAKUBOWIAK: The Mazumder study demonstrates what was separately reported by the Mayo Clinic — namely, the IMiDs® seem to reduce the number of stem cells prior to transplant, thus increasing the number of phereases required.

When we use initial regimens that include thalidomide or lenalidomide, we must be cautious not to extend the induction therapy because we may have difficulty collecting enough stem cells.

Bortezomib-based regimens have less impact on stem cell collection. In the context of our current treatment algorithm, which incorporates transplant and potentially tandem transplant, collecting enough stem cells for tandem transplant is clinically important.

On average, most studies will have seven to nine million stem cells collected, which is barely enough for one stem cell transplant, much less a tandem transplant. If you reduce the number of stem cells collected, you may end up not being able to deliver two transplants for patients who may have indication for a second transplant.

My operational adjustment is that I’m more careful not to extend the initial period with patients who are on a thalidomide-based regimen or a lenalidomide-based regimen, and I try to mobilize them earlier than I would normally.

With a bortezomib-based regimen, I don’t have to be that concerned because I know that if I am seeing a continuous response to therapy, for instance, I keep going until I reach plateau, so I have less contamination of collections with myeloma cells and there is improvement in some outcomes. Some people agree that that’s important. Others who are not sure whether they will go for transplant anticipate that the patient may receive treatment longer, and they will wait to see whether the patient’s performance status improves.

In that setting I would likely favor a bortezomib-based rather than a thalidomide-based regimen because I could give the patient’s performance status more time to recover, so he or she could be a more acceptable candidate for transplant.

Methods

- Retrospective, single-center evaluation of stem cell mobilization after induction therapy (IT) with either thalidomide/dexamethasone (TD; n = 22) or bortezomib/dexamethasone (VD; n = 18)
- All patients balanced: Initial Durie-Salmon stage, median number of cycles of IT, response to IT, bone marrow cellularity and involvement and time from end of therapy to collection
- All patients mobilized with G-CSF 10 mcg/kg and collected in large volume pheresis, with a goal of at least 6 x 10^6 CD34+ cells/kg for tandem transplant

**Results**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>TD (n = 22)</th>
<th>VD (n = 18)</th>
<th>p-value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number of patients requiring</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>&lt;0.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>≥4 days of collection*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of patients requiring</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>&lt;0.005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>≥3 phereses†</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of patients collecting</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>&lt;0.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>enough CD34+ on day 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of CD34+ cells collected</td>
<td>183 x 10^6 in 65 phereses = 2.8 x 10^6</td>
<td>213 x 10^6 in 41 phereses = 5.2 x 10^6</td>
<td>&lt;0.005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Days to ANC &gt; 500/mcl (range)</td>
<td>11 (10-18)</td>
<td>11 (10-15)</td>
<td>&gt;0.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Days to platelets &gt; 20,000/mcl (range)</td>
<td>16 (14-22)</td>
<td>15 (14-18)</td>
<td>&lt;0.05</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*To reach goal of 6 x 10^6 CD34+ cells/kg; † 4/4 patients who had received lenalidomide (L) required ≥3 phereses.


**Conclusions**

- Yield of stem cells with V > T
  - V < T (and L?) in number of phereses required
  - V > T in number of CD34+ cells per pheresis
- A one-day delay in engraftment was evident for T versus V
- Lower yields may be clinically important when attempting to obtain stem cells from the elderly, patients with prior radiation therapy or patients with higher bone marrow plasma cell infiltration.
- IMiDs may act differently, biologically, than V on the bone marrow.


**Consolidation with Bortezomib, Thalidomide and Dexamethasone Induces Molecular Remissions in Autografted Multiple Myeloma Patients**

Ladetto M et al, on behalf of the Italian Multiple Myeloma Network, GIMEMA. American Society of Hematology 2007. Abstract 530
**FACULTY COMMENTS**

**DR LONIAL:** This trial evaluated VTD as consolidation therapy after an autologous transplant. They showed nicely that they were able to achieve molecular complete remissions (CRs) in about a quarter of the patients, which is something that has not been studied before. It’s a small study with encouraging data. In and of itself, however, I believe it’s food for thought more than anything else.

Personally, the way I’m starting to think about novel agents versus transplant is that a transplant can only take you so low in terms of minimal residual disease. I believe the new drugs can probably help you achieve a lower level of minimal residual disease. This trial certainly proves that point because melphalan alone wasn’t enough to get most of these patients to a molecular CR. They required VTD.

My questions are, did they even need the transplant? Could you do this with bortezomib and thalidomide or bortezomib and lenalidomide as induction?

---

**Study Design**

**Accrual:** 40 (Closed)

**Eligibility**

- CR or VGPR after ASCT
- No prior bortezomib or thalidomide
- IgH rearrangement present

**Consolidation therapy:**

VTD [bortezomib + thalidomide + dexamethasone] x 4

Molecular monitoring at study entry, after 2 VTD courses, end of treatment and then every 6 months

Source: Ladetto M et al. ASH 2007. [Abstract 530](#)

---

**VTD Consolidation After ASCT: Response Rates**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Response at study entry (n = 39)</th>
<th>Response after consolidation therapy (n = 27)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CR, %</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>nCR, %</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VGPR, %</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PD, %</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Ladetto M et al. ASH 2007. [Abstract 530](#)
Melphalan-Prednisone-Thalidomide (MP-T) Demonstrates a Significant Survival Advantage in Elderly Patients ≥ 75 Years with Multiple Myeloma Compared with Melphalan-Prednisone (MP) in a Randomized, Double-Blind, Placebo-Controlled Trial, IFM 01/01


**FACULTY COMMENTS**

**DR ORLOWSKI:** In the Hulin study, they examined a truly nontransplant-eligible population — patients age 75 or older — and showed major advantages for MP-T, even in this older patient population. The overall survival was 45 months with MP-T versus approximately 28 months with MP. I believe anytime we can increase overall survival by 18 months or so, that’s a dramatic benefit.

They also collected data about the efficacy of the next therapy these patients received after progression. Most of the patients on the MP arm received thalidomide, whereas patients on the MP-T arm received a variety of therapies, some with more thalidomide, some with bortezomib.

In both groups the median survival after relapse was approximately nine months. That tells me that what we do second line is less important than what we do first line and suggests that we need to go with our best therapy up front.

**Trial Design**

Eligibility

| Newly diagnosed Stage II/III MM |
| Age ≥ 75 years |
| No significant renal insufficiency, cardiac or hepatic dysfunction, clinically significant peripheral neuropathy, amyloidosis or contraindication to steroids |

- All patients received 12 cycles of MP every 6 weeks
  - Melphalan 0.2 mg/kg/d days 1-4
  - Prednisone 2 mg/kg/d days 1-4
- Clodronate administered to all patients
- No anticoagulant prophylaxis was planned

Efficacy (Intent to Treat)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>MP-T (n = 113)</th>
<th>MP (n = 116)</th>
<th>p-value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>OS</td>
<td>45.3 months</td>
<td>27.7 months</td>
<td>0.033</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PFS</td>
<td>24.1 months</td>
<td>19.0 months</td>
<td>0.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TTP</td>
<td>27.0 months</td>
<td>20.9 months</td>
<td>0.0009</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Toxicity*

- Peripheral neuropathy
  - MP: 16% Grade I, 4% Grade II, 2% Grade III
  - MP-T: 19% Grade I, 18% Grade II, 2% Grade III
  - p = 0.003

- Neutropenia (Grade III-IV)
  - MP: 9%
  - MP-T: 23%
  - p = 0.003

* Toxicity significantly different between MP-T and MP


Safety and Efficacy of Bortezomib in High-Risk and Elderly Patients with Relapsed Multiple Myeloma

FACULTY COMMENTS

DR ORLOWSKI: This paper examined the safety and efficacy of bortezomib in patients who were at high risk and elderly patients with relapsed disease. Indeed, older age by itself is a high-risk feature in patients with multiple myeloma.

The findings show that for advanced ISS stage, patients age 65 or older and patients with more than one prior line of therapy, bortezomib continued to be superior to dexamethasone. The data here are similar to those for the overall APEX population.

DR LONIAL: In this subset analysis of the APEX trial, the response rate for bortezomib in older patients with relapsed disease was clearly as good as for younger patients. Among patients who had received more than one prior line of therapy, the response rate held up with 34 percent achieving a CR and PR. I believe these are more confirmatory data.

Outcomes in Patients Over Age 65

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Bortezomib (n = 125)*</th>
<th>High-dose dexamethasone (n = 120)*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CR + PR</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>18%1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Median TTP</td>
<td>5.5 months</td>
<td>4.3 months2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One-year survival</td>
<td>79%</td>
<td>63%3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*n = 116 for CR + PR; † n = 115 for CR + PR; 1 p = 0.0004; 2 p = 0.002; 3 p = 0.009


Outcomes in Patients Who Received >One Prior Line of Therapy

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Bortezomib (n = 200)*</th>
<th>High-dose dexamethasone (n = 217)*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CR + PR</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>13%1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Median TTP</td>
<td>4.9 months</td>
<td>2.9 months1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One-year survival</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>62%2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*n = 187 for CR + PR; † n = 202 for CR + PR; 1 p < 0.0001; 2 p = 0.004

### Priority 2 Publications/Presentations (Recommended)

**FACULTY COMMENTS**

**DR JAKUBOWIAK:** The San-Miguel paper published in *Leukemia* is a subset analysis from the APEX study. The conclusions are similar to the Chanan-Khan paper, although this is from a randomized, Phase III study. Essentially, this analysis indicates that bortezomib is active and well tolerated in patients with different degrees of renal insufficiency. No differences in toxicity or efficacy were seen, regardless of degree of renal failure, which was a key observation.

**DR LONIAL:** This is an important paper because it clearly establishes the efficacy of bortezomib in patients with renal dysfunction. These data suggest that it’s safe to use bortezomib without dose modification in patients with low creatinine clearances. For patients with hepatic dysfunction, I would be more cautious. However, we use bortezomib in patients with renal failure at full doses all the time. Bortezomib reverses it in a fair number of patients.

---

### Outcomes in Patients with MM Refractory to Last Prior Line of Therapy

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Bortezomib (n = 212)</th>
<th>High-dose dexamethasone (n = 219)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CR + PR</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Median TTP</td>
<td>5.5 months</td>
<td>2.8 months</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One-year survival</td>
<td>74%</td>
<td>63%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* n = 199 for CR + PR; † n = 202 for CR + PR; ‡ p = <0.0001; § p = 0.01

---

### Efficacy and Safety of Bortezomib in Patients with Renal Impairment: Results from the APEX Phase 3 Study

San-Miguel JF et al.

---

**Source:** Richardson PG et al. *Br J Haem* 2007;137(5):429-35. [Abstract](#)
**Efficacy of Bortezomib in Patients with and without Renal Impairment**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Renal impairment*</th>
<th>Bortezomib</th>
<th>High-dose dexamethasone</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>Mild</td>
<td>Mod</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CR + PR (n)</td>
<td>36% (118)</td>
<td>40% (137)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Median TTP months, (n)</td>
<td>6.3 (127)</td>
<td>6.2 (141)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Median OS months, (n)</td>
<td>NE (127)</td>
<td>30.0 (141)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

NE = not estimable; CCr = creatinine clearance

* None (CCr > 80 mL/min); mild (CCr 51-80 mL/min); moderate (CCr 30-50 mL/min); severe (CCr < 30 mL/min)


**Extended Follow-Up of a Phase 3 Trial in Relapsed Multiple Myeloma: Final Time-To-Event Results of the APEX Trial**


**FACULTY COMMENTS**

**DR LONIAL:** This was an updated analysis of the APEX trial, and we learned that the response rate with bortezomib increased. This paper shows that with longer follow-up, the responses we saw in APEX held up and were durable. This is further confirmation of the data we had from the original paper.

The other piece of information I would take away from this paper is that patients on APEX were treated for a total of eight cycles, unless they achieved a CR, in which case they were treated for two cycles beyond CR. I believe the key is to treat them to maximal benefit, which in this trial was eight cycles.

**DR ORLOWSKI:** Richardson’s extended follow-up of the APEX trial — comparing bortezomib versus high-dose dexamethasone in patients with relapsed multiple myeloma — provides us with longer follow-up. With a median follow-up of 22 months, we see the response rate with bortezomib increases from the previously reported 38 percent to 43 percent.
**APEX Trial Design**

n = 669

- **Eligibility**
  - Relapsed MM
  - 1 to 3 prior therapies

- **Bortezomib**
- **High-dose dexamethasone**

*Assessment of Proteasome Inhibition for Extending Remissions


---

**Efficacy Results: Median Follow-Up 22 Months**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Bortezomib (n = 333)</th>
<th>High-dose dexamethasone (n = 336)</th>
<th>Hazard ratio, p-value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Complete response</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>&lt;1%</td>
<td>NA, &lt;0.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Partial response</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>17%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Median TTP</td>
<td>6.2 months</td>
<td>3.5 months</td>
<td>NA, p &lt; 0.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Median OS*</td>
<td>29.8 months</td>
<td>23.7 months</td>
<td>0.77, p = 0.027</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One-year* survival</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>NA, p = 0.001</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Survival analysis based on >62% of the patients receiving dexamethasone crossing over to bortezomib; NA = not available; *Updated analysis; *Initial analysis, arm halted


---

**Incorporating Bortezomib into Up-Front Treatment for Multiple Myeloma: Early Results of Total Therapy 3**

**FACULTY COMMENTS**

**DR JAKUBOWIAK:** Barlogie and colleagues from Little Rock believe that post-transplant management should include consolidation treatment, but not many people would agree.

I believe their paper in the *British Journal of Haematology* is important. In fact, I am using post-transplant bortezomib-based consolidation for patients with poor-prognosis disease because that can potentially extend progression-free survival and overall survival.

For patients with poor prognoses, there are no randomized trial data for bortezomib as maintenance therapy. So the recommendation for bortezomib is soft, and it comes from this Barlogie paper, which demonstrated that consolidation with a bortezomib-based regimen improves survival in patients with poor-prognosis cytogenetics. That’s the only information we have.

---

**Background**

- **Total Therapy 2 (TT2)** study evaluating up-front thalidomide in addition to intensive melphalan-based chemotherapy and ASCT demonstrated a five-year overall survival of 65%
- In the post-transplant salvage setting, VTD had a 60% PR rate and a 15% CR rate
- **Total Therapy 3 (TT3)** Phase II study evaluated the addition of VTD to PACE (cisplatin, doxorubicin, cyclophosphamide and etoposide) as induction and consolidation for high-dose melphalan in tandem transplants


**Study Design**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total Therapy 3 enrollment: 303</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Eligibility: newly diagnosed progressive or symptomatic MM; ≤75 years old; ≤1 cycle prior therapy; SWOG PS &lt; 3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Induction**: VTD-PACE x 2 cycles

**Tandem transplants**

1st transplant: MEL (200 mg/m²)
2nd transplant: MEL (200 mg/m²)

**Consolidation**: VTD-PACE x 2 cycles

**Maintenance**: Year 1: VTD qm; years 2-3: DT qm

*Thalidomide and dexamethasone bridging between induction cycles, between transplants and between consolidation therapies

**Results**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Two-year estimates*</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Overall survival</td>
<td>86%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Event-free survival</td>
<td>84%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24-month cumulative frequency of nCR</td>
<td>83%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of patients maintaining best response at two years from onset</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Complete response (CR)</td>
<td>90%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Near CR (nCR)</td>
<td>78%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Partial response</td>
<td>73%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Median postrelapse survival</td>
<td>12 months</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*20-month median follow-up


---

**>Grade II Toxicity by Protocol Stage**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Protocol Stage</th>
<th>Thromboembolic events*</th>
<th>Peripheral neuropathy</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Postinduction</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post-transplant 1</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post-transplant 2</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Postconsolidation</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Postmaintenance</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Treatment-related mortality: 5%

* 27% cumulative nonfatal thromboembolic complications despite prophylactic low-molecular-weight heparin


---

**Bortezomib, Doxorubicin and Dexamethasone (PAD) Front-Line Treatment of Multiple Myeloma: Updated Results After Long-Term Follow-Up**

FACULTY COMMENTS

DR JAKUBOWIAK: Bortezomib combined with doxorubicin and dexamethasone (PAD) is an extremely active regimen, with overall and complete response rates that are almost identical to VdoxD in indirect comparison. It is a tolerable regimen and can be used pretransplant with rapid and effective cytoreduction and no impact on collection of stem cells. The flip side of PAD is a reasonably high rate of peripheral neuropathy, especially in the arm with the higher dose of bortezomib.

I consider PAD (or VdoxD), RVD and VDT to be the top three-drug regimens for initial cytoreduction of patients who have disease requiring rapid cytoreduction and who are potential candidates for transplant.

DR ORLOWSKI: I'm a big fan of anthracyclines, so I certainly like the combination. The concerns are the relatively high rate of neurotoxicity that was seen with the 1.3-mg/m² dose, although with the 1.0-mg/m² dose the neuropathy was much lower.

Design

Accrual: 41 (Closed)

Eligibility
≥18 years old
Newly diagnosed MM
Candidate for HDT-PBSCT therapy

PAD1 cohort: [Bortezomib 1.3 mg/m² days 1, 4, 8 and 11 + doxorubicin* days 1-4 + dexamethasone] q3wk x 4 cycles

PAD2 cohort: [Bortezomib 1.0 mg/m² days 1, 4, 8 and 11 + doxorubicin 9 mg/m² days 1-4 + dexamethasone] q3wk x 4 cycles

*Escalating doxorubicin dose levels 1, 2 and 3: 0, 4.5 and 9 mg/m²


Study Endpoints

Primary objective:
- Evaluate feasibility of PBSC harvesting and post-HDT engraftment after PAD induction

Secondary objectives:
- Safety and toxicity assessment
- Overall response rate
- Progression-free survival
- Overall survival
- Time to re-treatment

### PAD Induction: Efficacy

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>PAD1 induction (n = 21)</th>
<th>PAD2 induction (n = 20)</th>
<th>p-value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Overall response rate</td>
<td>95%</td>
<td>89%</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Complete response (CR)</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Near CR</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very good partial response</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Partial response</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Median PFS*</td>
<td>29mo</td>
<td>24mo</td>
<td>0.1878</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Median time to re-treatment</td>
<td>36mo</td>
<td>29mo</td>
<td>0.5156</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One-year OS</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>95%</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two-year OS</td>
<td>95%</td>
<td>73%</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Median OS</td>
<td>Not reached</td>
<td>Not reached</td>
<td>0.2193</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Median follow-up: PAD1, 40 months; PAD2, 24 months


### Stem Cell Harvesting and Engraftment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>PAD1 (n = 21)</th>
<th>PAD2 (n = 20)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Peripheral blood stem cell harvesting success</td>
<td>95%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Median yields x 10⁶ CD34+ cells/kg (range)</td>
<td>3.75 (1.6-10.4)</td>
<td>5.15 (2.4-16)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Median time to neutrophil engraftment (range)</td>
<td>15 days (1-24)</td>
<td>15 days (6-28)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Median time to platelet engraftment (range)</td>
<td>13 days (10-33)</td>
<td>18 days (11-40)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


### PAD Induction: Toxicities*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Select Grade III/IV toxicities</th>
<th>PAD2 induction (n = 20)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Liver function test results</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psychiatric symptoms</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thrombocytopenia</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neutropenia</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Infection</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pneumonia</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sensory/painful neuropathy†</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Toxicities for PAD1 cohort with doxorubicin dose escalation were previously reported; †In PAD1 cohort, 48% incidence, with 5% being Grade III

Melphalan, Prednisone and Lenalidomide Treatment for Newly Diagnosed Myeloma: A Report From the GIMEMA — Italian Multiple Myeloma Network


FACULTY COMMENTS

DR ORLOWSKI: With the melphalan/prednisone and thalidomide (MPT) regimen, one of the things that we would like to improve upon is the toxicity profile. Thalidomide is not an easy drug to administer to older patients who may have problems like constipation, sedation, thrombosis and infection. The feeling is that lenalidomide will be better tolerated overall.

This study had a Phase I component, which determined appropriate doses. Then a Phase II component examined the impact. At the dose levels that were ultimately recommended for further therapy, MP with lenalidomide had a 100 percent response rate with minor responses or better. It is complicated by more hematologic toxicity than MPT, but those toxicities are probably a little easier to deal with.

This trial in part is the basis for one current Intergroup study in the US, which is comparing MPT versus MPR.

Patients and Methods

- Phase I/II dose-escalating, noncomparative, open-label study (n = 54)
- Patient eligibility
  - Newly diagnosed multiple myeloma
  - >65 years old or <65 years old if ineligible for high-dose therapy
  - Platelets ≥ 75 x 10⁹/L, neutrophils ≥ 1.5 x 10⁹/L, serum Ca²⁺ < 3.5 mmol/L
  - No amyloidosis or other cancer

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Test doses</th>
<th>Melphalan (days 1-4)</th>
<th>Lenalidomide (days 1-21)</th>
<th>Prednisone (days 1-4)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.18 mg/kg</td>
<td>5 mg</td>
<td>2 mg/kg</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.25 mg/kg</td>
<td>5 mg</td>
<td>2 mg/kg</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.18 mg/kg</td>
<td>10 mg</td>
<td>2 mg/kg</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.25 mg/kg</td>
<td>10 mg</td>
<td>2 mg/kg</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Results: Efficacy of MPR at MTD**

MTD = melphalan 0.18 mg/kg + prednisone 2 mg/kg + lenalidomide 10 mg

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Endpoint (n = 21)</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CR or VGPR</td>
<td>47.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PR</td>
<td>81%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One-year EFS</td>
<td>95.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One-year OS</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

M = melphalan; P = prednisone; R = lenalidomide


**Select Grade III/IV Adverse Events (AE) with MPR at MTD**

MTD = melphalan 0.18 mg/kg + prednisone 2 mg/kg + lenalidomide 10 mg

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grade III/IV AE (n = 21)</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Neutropenia</td>
<td>52.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thrombocytopenia</td>
<td>23.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Febrile neutropenia</td>
<td>9.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vasculitis</td>
<td>9.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thromboembolism</td>
<td>4.8%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


**Prevention of Thalidomide- and Lenalidomide-Associated Thrombosis in Myeloma**

FACULTY COMMENTS

DR JAKUBOWIAK: This is an important paper based on a good analysis of the available data. Dr Palumbo and colleagues concluded that there are two good primary preventive measures for thrombosis, or VTE. Essentially, they stratified patients based on a number of risk factors. If there is less than or equal to one risk factor, they believe aspirin is appropriate. For patients with more than one risk factor, they recommend low molecular weight heparin or full-dose anticoagulation with warfarin.

A few years ago we were surprised to learn that lenalidomide-based regimens were associated with an increased risk of clotting. Previously, it was an obvious risk for thalidomide combinations, and it may also be true for some bortezomib-based combinations, so stratification of patients is important. This paper provides some guidelines and will decrease morbidity. I adopted this stratification strategy in my practice, and subsequently I have never had a patient experience a DVT.

Methods

- Review of studies investigating prophylaxis for venous thromboembolism (VTE) in patients who received thalidomide or lenalidomide for the treatment of multiple myeloma
- Development of a prophylactic strategy according to a risk-assessment model


Incidence of VTE in Trials of Thalidomide (T) or Lenalidomide (R) without Thromboprophylaxis

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Treatment regimen</th>
<th>Newly diagnosed</th>
<th>Relapsed/refractory</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>VTE incidence</td>
<td>VTE incidence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>T</td>
<td>R</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alone</td>
<td>3-4%</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+ Dexamethasone</td>
<td>14-26%</td>
<td>8-75%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+ Melphalan</td>
<td>10-20%</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+ Doxorubicin</td>
<td>10-27%</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+ Cyclophosphamide</td>
<td>3-11%</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+ Multiagent chemo</td>
<td>16-34%</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+ Bortezomib</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Both at diagnosis and relapse

Incidence of VTE in Trials of Thalidomide (T) or Lenalidomide (R) with Thromboprophylaxis

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Treatment regimen</th>
<th>VTE incidence</th>
<th>LMWH</th>
<th>Low fixed-dose warfarin</th>
<th>Full-dose warfarin</th>
<th>Aspirin</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Thalidomide (T)</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>T</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+ Dexamethasone</td>
<td>13-25%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>3-14%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+ Melphalan</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+ Doxorubicin</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+ Multiagent chemo</td>
<td>15-24%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

LMWH = low-molecular-weight heparin

Risk Assessment Model for MM: Patients Treated with T or R

- Individual risk factors
  - Obesity (BMI ≥ 30 kg/m²)
  - Prior VTE
  - Central venous catheter or pacemaker
  - Associated disease
    - Cardiac disease
    - Chronic renal disease
    - Diabetes
    - Acute infection
    - Immobilization
  - Surgery
    - General surgery
    - Any anesthesia
    - Trauma
- Medications
  - Erythropoietin
  - Blood clotting disorders
- Myeloma-related risk factors
  - Diagnosis
  - Hyperviscosity
- Myeloma therapy risk factors
  - High-dose dex (≥480 mg/month)
  - Doxorubicin
  - Multiagent chemo

Recommendations for the Management of VTE in Patients Treated for MM

- Aspirin: Only for patients at low risk, such as those with no risk factors or one individual/myeloma-related risk factor
- LMWH or full-dose warfarin (INR 2-3):
  - At least two individual/myeloma-related risk factors
  - All patients receiving high-dose dexamethasone or doxorubicin or multiagent chemotherapy, independent of additional risk factors

Peripheral neuropathy is a complication of myeloma that can be particularly bothersome for patients and healthcare providers. Paul Richardson has data showing that up to 70 or 80 percent of newly diagnosed patients experience some element of neuropathy even before any drugs are introduced.

In addition, we know that some of the drugs we use can increase the incidence of neuropathy, or at least worsen the severity, including thalidomide, bortezomib and even other drugs like dexamethasone, which can be problematic if the patient develops diabetes.

In this retrospective analysis, they examined neurotoxicity, reviewing their own institutional experience and the literature. They emphasized the importance of following some of the dose-adjustment criteria that have been developed. Patients on bortezomib with worsening symptoms should be considered for early dose reduction because that’s one of the best ways to reduce the potential for the neuropathy becoming permanent.

In deciding when to reduce the dose, we need to know the patient’s baseline level of neuropathy so that we are aware when it begins to worsen. In patients with neuropathy at baseline, I try to intervene with agents that can help with symptoms, including gabapentin or tricyclic antidepressants.

Studies of bortezomib-associated neuropathy show that it tends to be slow in onset and the peak is usually not reached until the fifth cycle. I try to have a careful discussion with patients each cycle regarding their symptoms, and if there is any worsening, I start to consider reducing the dose from 1.3 to maybe 1.0 mg/m².

This paper by Badros and colleagues essentially supports the prior observations reported by Dr Richardson that a high percentage of patients with newly diagnosed multiple myeloma experience neuropathy before treatment, and those patients with pre-existing peripheral neuropathy are at greater risk for exacerbation of those problems when treated with bortezomib.
Occurrence of Peripheral Neuropathy

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grade</th>
<th>Number of patients*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Baseline</td>
<td>After bortezomib</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grade 0: Normal</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grade I: Loss of reflexes, or paresthesia without pain or loss of function</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grade II: Objective sensory loss; motor neuropathy interferes with function but not ADL</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grade III: Sensory loss or paresthesia; motor PN interferes with ADL</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grade IV: Disabling sensory or motor loss</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Number of patients treated = 78


Risk Factors for Bortezomib Neurotoxicity

- Factors not associated with incidence and grade of neuropathy
  - Age, sex, race
  - Creatinine level
  - Prior thalidomide
  - Whether bortezomib administered alone or combined with thalidomide, chemotherapy or dexamethasone

- Factors predictive of neuropathy
  - Prior neuropathy ($p = 0.03$)
  - Presence of diabetes ($p = 0.03$)

- Most peripheral neuropathy symptoms were reversible on stopping or reducing bortezomib


Bortezomib in Relapsed Multiple Myeloma: Response Rates and Duration of Response are Independent of a Chromosome 13q-Deletion

FACULTY COMMENTS

DR ORLOWSKI: Data from the early Phase II studies suggested that patients with deletion 13 did well with bortezomib, which was later borne out in the APEX trial. This paper provided further follow-up and also examined other poor-risk features, such as a 4;14 translocation. The findings suggest that in patients with relapsed multiple myeloma, incorporation of bortezomib is important and improves outcomes in patients with these poor-risk features.

In Cavo’s trial, comparing VTD versus TD, and Harousseau’s VD versus VAD studies, patients with deletion in chromosome 13 did well with the bortezomib combinations. In the Italian study, VTD induced a better complete and near-complete response rate in cases of deletion 13 or a 4;14 translocation. However, we still don’t know how durable the responses are. The problem with these patients has not necessarily been that their disease didn’t respond, but that it didn’t stay in a good response category, so we need long-term follow-up.

Results: Outcome by Del(13q14) Status

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>13q-normal (n = 29)</th>
<th>Del(13q14) (n = 33)</th>
<th>p-value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Median time from initiation of first-line therapy to start of bortezomib</td>
<td>51mo</td>
<td>26mo</td>
<td>0.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall response rate</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Complete response (CR)/near CR</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>0.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Partial response</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minor response</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Median duration of response</td>
<td>9.3mo</td>
<td>12.3mo</td>
<td>0.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Median time to treatment failure</td>
<td>6.7mo</td>
<td>4.6mo</td>
<td>0.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Median overall survival</td>
<td>Not yet reached</td>
<td>9.9mo</td>
<td>0.057</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Impact of Translocations and Laboratory Parameters on Outcome

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Translocations</th>
<th>Partial response</th>
<th>Median time to Rx failure</th>
<th>Median overall survival</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>t(14q32) translocation</td>
<td></td>
<td>(p = 0.9)</td>
<td>(p = 0.29)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Present (n = 28)</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>4.9mo</td>
<td>16.7mo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Absent (n = 31)</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>4.5mo</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>t(4;14) (p16:q32) present (n = 3)</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>11 to 40+ wk</td>
<td>NR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>t(11;14)(q13;q32) present (n = 8)</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>11 to 40+ wk</td>
<td>NR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prognostic laboratory parameters</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Δ2-m high (&gt;3.5 mg/L) low (≤3.5 mg/L)</td>
<td>51%</td>
<td>5.0mo</td>
<td>Not reached</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Serum albumin ≥3.5 g/dL &lt;3.5 g/dL</td>
<td>49%</td>
<td>4.4mo</td>
<td>Not reached</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>68%</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>NR</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

NR = not reported

Clinical Case Scenarios and Poll Questions

**55-yo with fatigue/anemia (HGB 9.5 gm/dl).**
Calculated globulin: 4.1 gm/dl. Calcium and creatinine: WNL. SPEP with immunofixation: IgG κ monoclonal gammopathy: 2.2 gm/dl. Quantitative immunoglobulins: Total IgG 3,000 mg/dl, with concomitant suppression of IgM and IgA. β₂-microglobulin: 3.9 and serum albumin: 3.6 g/L. Bone marrow: 32% infiltration of plasma cells. Skeletal survey: Osteopenia, no obvious lytic lesions. FISH and cytogenetics: Normal.

What is generally your preferred initial treatment strategy?

1. Induction → single autologous stem cell transplant (ASCT), with collection of cells for a 2nd autograft
2. Induction → tandem ASCT
3. Induction → nonmyeloablative allogeneic transplant
4. Induction → transplant, depending on response
5. Other systemic therapy
6. Observation

Preferred treatment if the patient was 60? 65? 70? 75?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Faculty</th>
<th>55yo</th>
<th>60yo</th>
<th>65yo</th>
<th>70yo</th>
<th>75yo</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dr Jakubowiak</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr Lonial</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr Orlowski</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr Richardson</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Clinical Case Scenarios and Poll Questions

Case 1b

55-yr with fatigue/anemia (HGB 9.5 gm/dl). Calculated globulin: 4.1 gm/dl. Calcium and creatinine: WNL. SPEP with immunofixation: IgG κ monoclonal gammopathy: 2.2 gm/dl. Quantitative immunoglobulins: Total IgG 3,000 mg/dl, with concomitant suppression of IgM and IgA. β₂-microglobulin: 3.9 and serum albumin: 3.6 g/L. Bone marrow: 32% infiltration of plasma cells. Skeletal survey: Osteopenia, no obvious lytic lesions. FISH and cytogenetics: Normal.

What is generally your preferred initial treatment for this patient?

1. Rd
2. TD
3. VD
4. VTD
5. RVD
6. VAD
7. PAD
8. VdoxD
9. MP
10. MPT
11. MPV

Faculty Response
Dr Jakubowiak RVD
Dr Lonial RVD
Dr Orlowski VTD
Dr Richardson RVD or VTD

Case 1c

55-yr with fatigue/anemia (HGB 9.5 gm/dl). Calculated globulin: 4.1 gm/dl. Calcium and creatinine: WNL. SPEP with immunofixation: IgG κ monoclonal gammopathy: 2.2 gm/dl. Quantitative immunoglobulins: Total IgG 3,000 mg/dl, with concomitant suppression of IgM and IgA. β₂-microglobulin: 3.9 and serum albumin: 3.6 g/L. Bone marrow: 32% infiltration of plasma cells. Skeletal survey: Osteopenia, no obvious lytic lesions. FISH and cytogenetics: Normal.

Which dosing of dexamethasone would you generally use?

1. Low (40 mg weekly)
2. High (40 mg days 1-4, 9-12, 16-20)
3. Other

Faculty Response
Dr Jakubowiak Low
Dr Lonial Other (20 mg on day of and day after bortezomib per RVD regimen)
Dr Orlowski Other (per VTD regimen)
Dr Richardson Low
This 55-yo patient is treated with induction bortezomib/thalidomide with dexamethasone (VTD) and concurrent bisphosphonate and erythropoietin. A near complete response occurs, anemia resolves and paraprotein disappears, with immunofixation positivity alone. Bone marrow plasmacytosis returns to <5% and β₂-microglobulin returns to WNL.

What would generally be your preferred approach to transplantation?

1. Single ASCT, with collection of cells for a 2nd transplant
2. Tandem ASCT
3. ASCT → allogeneic stem cell transplant
4. Miniallogeneic stem cell transplant
5. Full-intensity allogeneic stem cell transplant
6. Collection of stem cells for deferred transplant, continued thalidomide maintenance

If this 55-yo had adverse cytogenetics (eg, deletion 13 and/or translocation 4;14), what would generally be your preferred treatment?

1. Rd
2. TD
3. VD
4. VTD
5. RVD
6. VAD
7. PAD
8. VdooD
9. MP
10. MPT
11. MPV

Faculty | Response
--- | ---
Dr Jakubowiak | VdooD
Dr Lonial | RVD
Dr Orlowski | VTD
Dr Richardson | RVD
Clinical Case Scenarios and Poll Questions

**Case 1f**

If an allogeneic stem cell transplant was desired and no related match could be identified, at this stage in the patient’s course would you generally utilize a matched unrelated donor (MUD) allogeneic stem cell transplant?

1. Yes  
2. No

Would you generally utilize MUD if the patient relapsed after 4-5 years?

1. Yes  
2. No

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Faculty</th>
<th>Generally utilize MUD</th>
<th>After 4-5 years</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dr Jakubowiak</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr Lonial</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr Orlowski</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr Richardson</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Case 1g**

This 55-yr patient undergoes a single ASCT and remains asymptomatic. HGB is 13.6 gm/dl, creatinine is 1.1 mg/dl, and no M-protein is detected. Bone marrow plasmacytosis is 2%.

What is generally your approach to post-transplant management?

1. Surveillance only  
2. Bisphosphonates alone  
3. Steroids alone (± bisphosphonates)  
4. Lenalidomide (± bisphosphonates)  
5. Thalidomide (± bisphosphonates)  
6. Lenalidomide or thalidomide with steroids (± bisphosphonates)  
7. Bortezomib/thalidomide (± bisphosphonates)  
8. Interferon

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Faculty</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dr Jakubowiak</td>
<td>Surveillance only</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr Lonial</td>
<td>Bisphosphonates alone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr Orlowski</td>
<td>Surveillance only</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr Richardson</td>
<td>Surveillance only or bisphosphonates alone</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
This 55-ya completed induction VTD and a transient Grade I neuropathy resolved post-transplant followed by HDT/ASCT. Treatment was then a bisphosphonate alone for 18 months, with no maintenance therapy. Patient working, with excellent quality of life. Now has a rising paraprotein (1.2 gm/dl). HGB is 11.2 gm/dl. Creatinine and calcium: WNL. Bone marrow plasmacytosis is 2%.

What is generally your preferred initial treatment for this patient?

1. Rd  
2. TD  
3. VD  
4. VTD  
5. RVD  
6. PAD  
7. VdoxD  
8. Vd  
9. MP  
10. MPT  
11. MPV  
12. Cyclophosphamide-based regimen

Faculty | Response
---|---
Dr Jakubowiak | Bortezomib/thalidomide (± bisphosphonates)
Dr Lonal | Lenalidomide (± bisphosphonates)
Dr Orlowski | Bortezomib/thalidomide (± bisphosphonates)
Dr Richardson | Thalidomide (± bisphosphonates)

Assume that this 55-ya, with adverse cytogenetics (eg, deletion 13 and/or translocation 4:14), underwent a single ASCT and remained asymptomatic but had residual M-protein of 0.8. HGB 13.6 gm/dl and creatinine 1.1 mg/dl. Bone marrow plasmacytosis is 2%.

What would generally be your approach to post-transplant management?

1. Surveillance only
2. Bisphosphonates alone
3. Steroids (± bisphosphonates)
4. Lenalidomide (± bisphosphonates)
5. Thalidomide (± bisphosphonates)
6. Lenalidomide or thalidomide with steroids (± bisphosphonates)
7. Bortezomib/thalidomide (± bisphosphonates)
8. Interferon
9. Cyclophosphamide-based regimen

Faculty | Response
---|---
Dr Jakubowiak | Bortezomib/thalidomide (± bisphosphonates)
Dr Lonal | Lenalidomide (± bisphosphonates)
Dr Orlowski | Bortezomib/thalidomide (± bisphosphonates)
Dr Richardson | Thalidomide (± bisphosphonates)
**Case 1j**

This 55-yr-old was treated with a combination regimen for 12 weeks. After a modest response, the patient’s status plateaus (paraprotein 0.4 gm/dl, HGB is 12.5 gm/dl). Bone marrow: 5% plasma cells.

What is generally your next therapeutic choice?

What would be your choice if the time to relapse after HDT/ASCT was 5 months? 54 months?

1. A second ASCT
2. Miniallogeneic stem cell transplant if sibling match available
3. Full-intensity allogeneic stem cell transplant
4. I would not proceed to transplant, but salvage with bortezomib-based therapy

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Faculty</th>
<th>Next choice</th>
<th>5mo relapse</th>
<th>54mo relapse</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dr Jakubowiak</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr Lonial</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr Orlowski</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr Richardson</td>
<td>4/2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Case 2a**

A 60-yr-old presents with fatigue/anemia (HGB 9.5 gm/dl). Calculated globulin: 4.1 gm/dl. Calcium and creatinine: WNL. SPEP with immunofixation: IgG κ monoclonal gammopathy: 2.2 gm/dl. Quantitative immunoglobulins: Total IgG 3,000 mg/dl, with concomitant suppression of IgM and IgA. β₂-microglobulin: 3.9 and serum albumin: 3.6 g/L. Bone marrow: 32% infiltration of plasma cells. Skeletal survey: Osteopenia, no obvious lytic lesions. FISH and cytogenetics: Normal.

What is generally your preferred treatment for this patient with newly diagnosed multiple myeloma, who elects to collect stem cells but defer transplantation?

1. Rd
2. TD
3. VD
4. VTD
5. RVD
6. VAD
7. PAD
8. VodoxD
9. MP
10. MPT
11. MPV

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Faculty</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dr Jakubowiak</td>
<td>Rd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr Lonial</td>
<td>RVD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr Orlowski</td>
<td>VTD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr Richardson</td>
<td>Rd or RVD or VTD</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
A 60-yo presented with sudden onset of severe back pain and compression fracture of L2, with multiple lytic lesions. HGB was 9.7 gm/dl, calcium was minimally elevated, creatinine was 2.0 mg/dl, IgG λ was 7.0 gm/dl, and β₂-microglobulin was 7.8. 24-hour urine and electrophoresis: Positive for Bence Jones protein, and serum-free light chain was 2,000 mg/dl. Bone marrow: 62% infiltration of plasma cells, with multiple dysplastic large and multinucleated plasma cells. Adverse cytogenetics (eg, deletion 13 and/or translocation 4;14). Patient is hospitalized and hydrated and bisphosphonates are administered.

What is generally your preferred treatment for this patient with newly diagnosed multiple myeloma?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Faculty</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dr Jakubowiak</td>
<td>RVD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr Lonial</td>
<td>RVD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr Orlowski</td>
<td>VTD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr Richardson</td>
<td>RVD or VTD</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

If this 60-yo had adverse cytogenetics (eg, deletion 13 and/or translocation 4;14), what would generally be your preferred treatment for this patient who elects to collect stem cells but defer transplantation?

| 1. Rd  | 5. RVD | 9. MP |
| 2. TD  | 6. VAD | 10. MPT |
| 3. VD  | 7. PAD | 11. MPV |
| 4. VTD | 8. VdoxD |

A 60-yo presented with sudden onset of severe back pain and compression fracture of L2, with multiple lytic lesions. HGB was 9.7 gm/dl, calcium was minimally elevated, creatinine was 2.0 mg/dl, IgG λ was 7.0 gm/dl, and β₂-microglobulin was 7.8. 24-hour urine and electrophoresis: Positive for Bence Jones protein, and serum-free light chain was 2,000 mg/dl. Bone marrow: 62% infiltration of plasma cells, with multiple dysplastic large and multinucleated plasma cells. Adverse cytogenetics (eg, deletion 13, translocation 4;14). Patient is hospitalized and hydrated and bisphosphonates are administered.

What is generally your preferred treatment for this patient with newly diagnosed multiple myeloma?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Faculty</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dr Jakubowiak</td>
<td>VdoxD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr Lonial</td>
<td>RVD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr Orlowski</td>
<td>VTD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr Richardson</td>
<td>RVD or VTD</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Case 2b

Case 3a
This 60-yo symptomatic patient had a partial response to induction VTD x 4 cycles, with IgG λ declining from 7.0 to 3.4 gm/dl. β₂-microglobulin declined from 7.8 to 2.5, and bone marrow plasma cells decreased from 62% to 28%. His treatment course is complicated by treatment-emergent peripheral neuropathy.

Would you generally switch therapy to further cytoreduce?

1. Yes  2. No

What would generally be your preferred approach to transplantation?

1. Single or tandem ASCT, dependent upon response to 1st transplant
2. ASCT → allogeneic stem cell transplant
3. Miniallogeneic stem cell transplant
4. Full-intensity allogeneic stem cell transplant
5. ASCT, cells collected for 2nd transplant

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Faculty</th>
<th>Switch to cytoreduce</th>
<th>Preferred approach</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dr Jakubowiak</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr Lonial</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr Orlowski</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr Richardson</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This 60-yo patient has less than 90% overall response to single ASCT, with a monoclonal spike of 0.7 gm/dl, β₂-microglobulin 1.4, and bone marrow plasma cells measured at 7%.

What is generally your approach to ongoing care?

1. Proceed with a 2nd ASCT  3. Maintenance therapy
2. Miniallogeneic stem cell transplant

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Faculty</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dr Jakubowiak</td>
<td>Proceed with a 2nd ASCT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr Lonial</td>
<td>Proceed with a 2nd ASCT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr Orlowski</td>
<td>Proceed with a 2nd ASCT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr Richardson</td>
<td>Maintenance therapy</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
A 66-yo symptomatic patient has a partial response to induction MPV x 4 cycles and is tolerating treatment well, with IgG λ declining from 4.8 to 2.4 and infiltration of bone marrow with plasma cells decreased from 54% to 27%.

Would you switch therapy to further cytoreduce?

1. Yes
2. No

This 66-yo symptomatic patient has a partial response to induction MPV x 4 cycles and is tolerating treatment well, with IgG λ declining from 4.8 to 2.4 and infiltration of bone marrow with plasma cells decreased from 54% to 27%.

Would you switch therapy to further cytoreduce?

1. Yes
2. No

What is generally your preferred treatment for this patient with newly diagnosed multiple myeloma?

1. MP
2. MPT
3. MPV
4. Rd
5. TD
6. VD
7. VTD
8. RVD
9. VAD
10. PAD
11. VdooxD

What would generally be your preferred approach to transplantation?

1. Single or tandem ASCT, dependent upon response to 1st transplant
2. ASCT → allogeneic stem cell transplant
3. Miniallogeneic stem cell transplant
4. Full-intensity allogeneic stem cell transplant
5. ASCT, with collection of cells for a 2nd transplant
6. No transplant, MPV x 59 wk

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Faculty</th>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Preferred approach</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dr Jakubowiak</td>
<td>VdooxD</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr Lonial</td>
<td>RVD</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr Orlowski</td>
<td>VTD</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr Richardson</td>
<td>RVD or VTD</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Faculty</th>
<th>Switch to cytoreduce</th>
<th>Preferred approach</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dr Jakubowiak</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr Lonial</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr Orlowski</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr Richardson</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Clinical Case Scenarios and Poll Questions

Case 4c

This 66-yo patient has a less than complete response to single ASCT, with a monoclonal spike of 0.3 gm/dl, β₂-microglobulin 1.4, and bone marrow plasma cells measured at 7%.

What is generally your approach to continued treatment?

1. Proceed with a 2nd ASCT
2. Miniallogeneic stem cell transplant
3. Full-intensity allogeneic stem cell transplant
4. Maintenance therapy

Faculty Response

Dr Jakubowiak: Proceed with a 2nd ASCT
Dr Lonial: Maintenance therapy
Dr Orlowksi: Miniallogeneic stem cell transplant
Dr Richardson: Maintenance therapy

Case 5

A 65-yo with newly diagnosed, mildly symptomatic, intermediate-risk multiple myeloma had a partial response to ASCT and therefore began maintenance thalidomide. Since diagnosis, patient was treated with monthly zoledronic acid for 1 year, and bone density has improved 8% but mild osteopenia remains.

What is generally your recommended approach for continued bisphosphonate treatment?

What would generally be your recommended approach if the patient had received 2 years of treatment with a bisphosphonate?

1. Stop zoledronic acid
2. Continue monthly zoledronic acid
3. Decrease frequency of zoledronic acid to every 3 months
4. Decrease frequency of zoledronic acid to every 6 months
5. Decrease frequency of zoledronic acid to once yearly

Faculty After 1y of bisphosphonate After 2y of bisphosphonate

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Faculty</th>
<th>After 1y of bisphosphonate</th>
<th>After 2y of bisphosphonate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dr Jakubowiak</td>
<td>Continue monthly</td>
<td>Stop</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr Lonial</td>
<td>‡ frequency to q3m</td>
<td>‡ frequency to q3m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr Orlowksi</td>
<td>Continue monthly</td>
<td>Stop</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr Richardson</td>
<td>‡ frequency to q3m</td>
<td>‡ frequency to q3m</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

‡ decrease frequency to q3m
In general, which bisphosphonate do you typically utilize in the treatment of multiple myeloma?

1. Zoledronic acid
2. Pamidronate
3. Other

In general, how frequently do you administer the bisphosphonate to a patient with osteopenia and no lytic lesions? For a patient with multiple lytic lesions?

1. Monthly
2. Every 3 months
3. Every 6 months
4. Once per year
5. I would not administer a bisphosphonate

Faculty | Bisphosphonate | No lytic lesions | With lytic lesions
--- | --- | --- | ---
Dr Jakubowiak | Pamidronate | Monthly | Monthly
Dr Lonial | Zoledronic acid | Monthly | Monthly
Dr Orlowski | Pamidronate | Monthly | Monthly
Dr Richardson | Pamidronate | Every 3 months | Monthly

A 65-yo presented with high-risk multiple myeloma, with multiple lytic lesions and osteopenia. Patient had a partial response to ASCT and therefore began maintenance thalidomide. Since diagnosis, patient was treated with monthly zoledronic acid for 1 year, and bone density has improved 8% but mild osteopenia remains, with multiple lytic lesions that have not improved.

What is generally your recommended approach for continued bisphosphonate treatment?

What would generally be your recommended approach if the patient had received 2 years of treatment with a bisphosphonate?

1. Stop zoledronic acid
2. Continue monthly zoledronic acid
3. Decrease frequency of zoledronic acid to every 3 months
4. Decrease frequency of zoledronic acid to every 6 months
5. Decrease frequency of zoledronic acid to once yearly

Faculty | After 1y of bisphosphonate | After 2y of bisphosphonate
--- | --- | ---
Dr Jakubowiak | Continue monthly | Stop
Dr Lonial | Frequency to q3m | Frequency to q3m
Dr Orlowski | Continue monthly | Stop
Dr Richardson | Continue monthly | Continue monthly
Clinical Case Scenarios and Poll Questions

Case 8

For a 70-yo with newly diagnosed multiple myeloma and renal insufficiency (creatinine 1.8 mg/dl), which bisphosphonate would you use?

1. Zoledronic acid
2. Pamidronate

If monthly zoledronic acid (ZA), how would you administer it?

1. Standard 4-mg IV in 30-min infusion
2. ↓ dose from 4 to 3 mg
3. ↑ infusion time from 30 to 60 min
4. ↓ dose and ↑ infusion time

If pamidronate, how would you administer it?

1. Standard 90-mg IV in 2-h infusion
2. ↓ dose from 90 to 60 mg
3. ↓ dose from 90 to 30 mg
4. ↑ infusion time from 2 to 4 h
5. ↓ dose and ↑ infusion time

Faculty Bisphosphonate Monthly ZA Pamidronate
Dr Jakubowiak Pamidronate 4 2
Dr Lonial Pamidronate 4 5
Dr Orlowski Pamidronate 4 2
Dr Richardson Pamidronate 4 1

Case 9

For a 70-yo with newly diagnosed multiple myeloma and renal insufficiency (creatinine 2.5 mg/dl), which bisphosphonate would you generally use?

1. Zoledronic acid
2. Pamidronate

Faculty Response
Dr Jakubowiak Pamidronate
Dr Lonial Pamidronate
Dr Orlowski Pamidronate
Dr Richardson Pamidronate
A 70-yr smoker with high-risk multiple myeloma will be treated with bortezomib/thalidomide/dexamethasone (VTD). Three years ago, patient experienced a DVT without known precipitating factors. Treated with warfarin for 1 year. What prophylactic anticoagulation therapy would you generally recommend?

1. Warfarin 1 mg/day  
2. Warfarin INR 2.0-3.0  
3. Aspirin 81 mg/day  
4. Aspirin 325 mg/day  
5. Low-molecular-weight heparin (enoxaparin)  
6. None

Faculty Response  
Dr Jakubowiak: Low-molecular-weight heparin (enoxaparin)  
Dr Lonial: Low-molecular-weight heparin (enoxaparin)  
Dr Orlowski: Low-molecular-weight heparin (enoxaparin)  
Dr Richardson: Low-molecular-weight heparin (enoxaparin)

A 60-yr presented with new-onset CHF, which was angiography-negative for coronary artery disease. Subcutaneous abdominal fat pad aspirate was positive for amyloidosis. SIEP revealed free light chain $\kappa/\lambda$ of 20, with Bence Jones protein in the urine. Creatinine was 2.3, and the patient had albuminuria 5 gm/dl. Bone marrow: 8% infiltration with plasma cells. What is generally your preferred treatment approach?

1. MD  
2. MP  
3. MPV  
4. Rd  
5. TD  
6. VTD  
7. VAD  
8. ASCT

Faculty Response  
Dr Jakubowiak: MD  
Dr Lonial: MD  
Dr Orlowski: ASCT  
Dr Richardson: MD or MPV

A 70-yr smoker with high-risk multiple myeloma will be treated with bortezomib/thalidomide/dexamethasone (VTD). Three years ago, patient experienced a DVT without known precipitating factors. Treated with warfarin for 1 year. What prophylactic anticoagulation therapy would you generally recommend?

1. Warfarin 1 mg/day  
2. Warfarin INR 2.0-3.0  
3. Aspirin 81 mg/day  
4. Aspirin 325 mg/day  
5. Low-molecular-weight heparin (enoxaparin)  
6. None

Faculty Response  
Dr Jakubowiak: Low-molecular-weight heparin (enoxaparin)  
Dr Lonial: Low-molecular-weight heparin (enoxaparin)  
Dr Orlowski: Low-molecular-weight heparin (enoxaparin)  
Dr Richardson: Low-molecular-weight heparin (enoxaparin)
A 70-yr-old, who had pre-existing diabetes mellitus for 12 years and the onset of Grade I peripheral neuropathy in the lower extremities 4 years ago (with no current impact on his functioning), presents with high-risk multiple myeloma requiring treatment.

Which treatment would you generally recommend?

1. MP
2. MPV
3. MPR
4. Rd
5. TD
6. VTD
7. VAD

Faculty Response

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Faculty</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dr Jakubowiak</td>
<td>MPV</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr Lonial</td>
<td>VTD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr Orlowski</td>
<td>MPV</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr Richardson</td>
<td>MPR or Rd</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A 70-yr-old, who had pre-existing diabetes mellitus for 12 years and the onset of peripheral neuropathy in the lower extremities 4 years ago (with an increased frequency of falls), presents with high-risk multiple myeloma.

Which treatment would you generally recommend?

1. MP
2. MPV
3. MPR
4. Rd
5. TD
6. VTD
7. VAD

Faculty Response

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Faculty</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dr Jakubowiak</td>
<td>MPR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr Lonial</td>
<td>MPV</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr Orlowski</td>
<td>Rd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr Richardson</td>
<td>MPR</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
A 70-yo undergoes treatment with thalidomide/dex (TD) for multiple myeloma. After 6 months, patient achieves a partial response and continues with thalidomide maintenance therapy, which is successful in controlling the disease. Patient develops progressive neuropathy despite dose reduction. After 9 months of treatment, the peripheral neuropathy is worsening, and thalidomide has been decreased to 50 mg/day without benefit.

What would you generally recommend next for this patient?

1. Maintain thalidomide
2. Add back dexamethasone to thalidomide 50 mg/day
3. Reduce thalidomide to 50 mg every other day
4. Discontinue thalidomide, switch to another therapy

Faculty | Response
--- | ---
Dr Jakubowiak | Discontinue thalidomide, switch to another therapy
Dr Lonial | Discontinue thalidomide, switch to another therapy
Dr Orlowski | Discontinue thalidomide, switch to another therapy
Dr Richardson | Discontinue thalidomide, switch to another therapy

A 70-yo is responding to a bortezomib-containing regimen for intermediate-risk multiple myeloma but develops progressive peripheral neuropathy.

What is generally your approach to continued treatment?

1. Switch to a nonbortezomib-containing regimen
2. Reduce the dose of bortezomib and continue treatment

Faculty | Response
--- | ---
Dr Jakubowiak | Reduce the dose of bortezomib and continue treatment
Dr Lonial | Reduce the dose of bortezomib and continue treatment
Dr Orlowski | Reduce the dose of bortezomib and continue treatment
Dr Richardson | Reduce the dose of bortezomib and continue treatment
A 70- yo developed headaches and numbness of the fingers and toes. A CT C/A/P showed tiny vertebral lucencies, and IgM κ level was 7,300 mg/dl with serum viscosity of 2.60, bone marrow > 30% lymphoplasmacytoid cells, which were CD138-positive, CD5-negative, CD20 moderately positive, κ-positive and CD19-negative.

What would generally be your approach to initial therapy?

1. Observation
2. Steroids and plasmapheresis
3. Bortezomib/thalidomide
4. Rituximab
5. FCR
6. R-CHOP
7. Bortezomib/rituximab/dexamethasone

Faculty Response

Dr Jakubowiak: Steroids and plasmapheresis
Dr Lonial: R-CHOP
Dr Orlowski: Steroids and plasmapheresis
Dr Richardson: Steroids and plasmapheresis or bortezomib/rituximab/dexamethasone

A 68- yo with a history of right eye trauma developed acute onset of right orbit swelling and pain. An MRI revealed a destructive lesion of bone. Blood work revealed an IgG λ monoclonal protein of 1.3 gm/dl, ß₂-microglobulin of 3.9 and calcium of 11.3 mg/dl. Urine electrophoresis was negative, and serum κ light chain was minimally elevated. Bone marrow studies were entirely normal. The patient is lucid, and bone survey revealed no additional abnormalities. PET/CT was negative.

What would generally be your approach to initial therapy?

1. Observation
2. Radiation therapy with steroids
3. Radiation therapy with steroids and bisphosphonates
4. Bisphosphonates
5. TD
6. VTD

Faculty Response

Dr Jakubowiak: Radiation therapy with steroids
Dr Lonial: Radiation therapy with steroids
Dr Orlowski: Radiation therapy with steroids
Dr Richardson: Radiation therapy with steroids or radiation therapy with steroids and bisphosphonates
A 68-yr-old developed a paraspinal soft tissue mass centered 6 cm to the right of his T10 vertebral body. Imaging studies, including bone, revealed a solitary abnormality. Blood work revealed an IgG $\lambda$ monoclonal protein of 1.3 gm/dl, $\beta_2$-microglobulin of 3.9 and normal calcium level. A biopsy of the mass revealed sheets of plasma cells with IgG $\lambda$ surface markers. Bone marrow studies were normal.

What would generally be your approach to initial therapy?

1. Observation
2. Radiation therapy with steroids
3. Bisphosphonates
4. TD
5. VTD

Suppose the patient were 55 years old. Would you generally recommend transplantation?

1. Yes
2. No

If yes, which would generally be your preferred approach to transplant?

1. Single ASCT
2. Tandem ASCT
3. ASCT $\rightarrow$ allogeneic stem cell transplant
4. Miniallogeneic stem cell transplant
5. Full-intensity allogeneic stem cell transplant

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Faculty</th>
<th>Recommend transplantation?</th>
<th>Preferred approach</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dr Jakubowiak</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr Lonial</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr Orlowski</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr Richardson</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Faculty Recommend transplantation? Preferred approach

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Faculty</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dr Jakubowiak</td>
<td>Radiation therapy with steroids</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr Lonial</td>
<td>Radiation therapy with steroids</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr Orlowski</td>
<td>Radiation therapy with steroids</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr Richardson</td>
<td>Radiation therapy with steroids</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Case 18b

Suppose the patient were 55 years old. Would you consider transplantation?

1. Yes  
2. No

If yes, which would generally be your preferred approach to transplant?

1. Single ASCT  
2. Tandem ASCT  
3. ASCT → allogeneic stem cell transplant  
4. Miniallogeneic stem cell transplant  
5. Full-intensity allogeneic stem cell transplant

Faculty Recommend transplantation? Preferred approach
Dr Jakubowiak No NA
Dr Lonial No NA
Dr Orlowski No NA
Dr Richardson No NA

Case 19

Low-dose dexamethasone rather than high-dose dexamethasone should be utilized when combined with:

A. Lenalidomide
   1. Strongly agree  
   2. Agree  
   3. In between  
   4. Disagree  
   5. Strongly disagree

B. Thalidomide
   1. Strongly agree  
   2. Agree  
   3. In between  
   4. Disagree  
   5. Strongly disagree

C. Bortezomib
   1. Strongly agree  
   2. Agree  
   3. In between  
   4. Disagree  
   5. Strongly disagree

Faculty Lenalidomide Thalidomide Bortezomib
Dr Jakubowiak Strongly agree Strongly agree Strongly agree
Dr Lonial Disagree Strongly disagree Agree
Dr Orlowski Agree Disagree Disagree
Dr Richardson Strongly agree Agree Agree
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1. In the GIMEMA trial, comparing induction bortezomib/thalidomide/dexamethasone to thalidomide/dexamethasone in preparation for autologous stem cell transplantation, the addition of bortezomib significantly increase the nCR/CR rate.
   a. Did
   b. Did not

2. In data from the Phase III trial of lenalidomide with high-dose versus low-dose dexamethasone for patients newly diagnosed with multiple myeloma, which regimen was associated with a superior overall survival rate?
   a. Lenalidomide and high-dose dexamethasone
   b. Lenalidomide and low-dose dexamethasone

3. In a Phase III study reported by Richardson et al evaluating bortezomib/lenalidomide/dexamethasone for patients with newly diagnosed multiple myeloma, the regimen adversely affect stem cell harvesting in the majority of patients.
   a. Did
   b. Did not

4. In a retrospective analysis of Phase II and III trials, Jagannath et al concluded that bortezomib may overcome some of the adverse prognostic effects of chromosome 13 deletion.
   a. True
   b. False

5. In a multicenter, retrospective study by Chanan-Khan et al, which evaluated bortezomib for patients with multiple myeloma and advanced renal failure, the overall response rate and durability of responses were comparable to those among patients with primarily normal renal function treated with bortezomib.
   a. True
   b. False

6. In evaluating lenalidomide with dexamethasone for relapsed multiple myeloma, Weber et al reported that neutropenia was more common with the combination than with dexamethasone alone and could be managed with
   a. Dose adjustment
   b. G-CSF
   c. Both a and b

7. Due to the increased risk of thromboembolic events with the combination of lenalidomide and dexamethasone used in the treatment of patients with relapsed or refractory multiple myeloma, routine use of prophylactic anticoagulants is recommended.
   a. True
   b. False

8. In Orlowski and colleagues’ randomized Phase III study for patients with relapsed or refractory multiple myeloma, pegylated liposomal doxorubicin combined with bortezomib significantly improved which of the following compared to bortezomib alone?
   a. Overall response rate
   b. Time to disease progression
   c. Both a and b

9. In the VISTA trial, a Phase III study of bortezomib/melphalan/prednisone (VMP) or melphalan/prednisone (MP) for patients newly diagnosed with multiple myeloma, the complete response rate (immunofixation-negative) was percent with VMP versus five percent with MP.
   a. 10
   b. 22
   c. 35
   d. 60

10. Harousseau et al reported that in a randomized trial evaluating induction treatments prior to autologous stem cell transplants in patients newly diagnosed with multiple myeloma, bortezomib/dexamethasone was well tolerated and significantly improved postinduction response rates when compared to vincristine/doxorubicin/dexamethasone.
    a. True
    b. False

11. In the clinical trial by Facon and colleagues evaluating melphalan/prednisone with or without thalidomide for elderly patients with previously untreated multiple myeloma, the addition of thalidomide significantly improved which of the following?
    a. Median overall survival
    b. Median progression-free survival
    c. Response rate
    d. All of the above

12. In the SWOG-S0232 trial presented by Zonder and colleagues, which evaluated high-dose dexamethasone with or without lenalidomide, the combination significantly improved which of the following?
    a. Complete response rate
    b. 12-month progression-free survival
    c. 12-month overall survival
    d. Both a and b

13. In the Bologna 96 clinical study published by Cavo and colleagues, which evaluated single versus double autologous stem cell transplantation for multiple myeloma, a double transplant significantly prolonged overall survival.
    a. True
    b. False

14. In a trial by Ladetto et al evaluating bortezomib/thalidomide/dexamethasone as consolidation therapy following an autologous transplant, approximately of the patients achieved complete remission after consolidation therapy.
    a. 15 percent
    b. 32 percent
    c. 45 percent
    d. 66 percent

15. In a clinical trial by Hulin et al evaluating melphalan/prednisone with or without thalidomide for patients age 75 and older newly diagnosed with Stage II or III multiple myeloma, the addition of thalidomide significantly improved which of the following?
    a. Overall survival
    b. Progression-free survival
    c. Time to progression
    d. Response rate
    e. All of the above

16. In a subset analysis of the APEX trial by Richardson et al, patients who were at high risk or elderly patients who received bortezomib for relapsed multiple myeloma experienced a response rate compared to the overall study population.
    a. Significantly lower
    b. Similar
    c. Significantly higher

17. Data reported by San-Miguel et al showed that for patients with renal impairment who were treated with bortezomib, the efficacy of this agent was similar to high-dose dexamethasone.
    a. Inferior
    b. Superior

18. Richardson et al reported that in the extended follow-up of the Phase III APEX trial, comparing bortezomib to high-dose dexamethasone for patients with relapsed multiple myeloma, the response rate with bortezomib compared to the previously reported rate.
    a. Increased
    b. Decreased

19. According to Badros et al, factors predictive of neuropathy in patients with multiple myeloma receiving bortezomib include which of the following?
    a. Creatinine level
    b. Presence of diabetes
    c. Prior neuropathy
    d. Prior thalidomide treatment
    e. Both b and c
    f. All of the above

20. After long-term follow-up, updated results from Popat et al of the clinical trial evaluating bortezomib/doxorubicin/dexamethasone as front-line therapy for multiple myeloma indicated that this regimen is a highly effective induction regimen for untreated patients who are candidates for high-dose therapy with peripheral blood stem cell transplantation.
    a. True
    b. False

Post-test answer key: 1a, 2b, 3b, 4a, 5a, 6c, 7a, 8b, 9c, 10a, 11d, 12d, 13b, 14d, 15e, 16b, 17b, 18a, 19e, 20a
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