

Post remission consolidation by autologous HCT for AML in CR1, negative implications for subsequent allogeneic HCT in CR2. A Study by the Acute Leukemia Working Party of the European Society for Blood and Marrow Transplantation (EBMT).

J.R. Passweg , M. Labopin , M. Christopeit , J. Cornelissen , T. Pabst , G. Socié , N. Russel , I. Yakoub-Agha , D. Blaise , T. Gedde-Dahl , H. Labussière-Wallet , R Malladi , E Forcade , S. Maury , E. Polge , F. Lanza , N.C. Gorin , M. Mohty , A. Nagler

PII: S1083-8791(19)30788-8
DOI: https://doi.org/10.1016/j.bbmt.2019.11.021
Reference: YBBMT 55801

To appear in: *Biology of Blood and Marrow Transplantation*

Received date: 23 September 2019
Accepted date: 15 November 2019

Please cite this article as: J.R. Passweg , M. Labopin , M. Christopeit , J. Cornelissen , T. Pabst , G. Socié , N. Russel , I. Yakoub-Agha , D. Blaise , T. Gedde-Dahl , H. Labussière-Wallet , R Malladi , E Forcade , S. Maury , E. Polge , F. Lanza , N.C. Gorin , M. Mohty , A. Nagler , Post remission consolidation by autologous HCT for AML in CR1, negative implications for subsequent allogeneic HCT in CR2. A Study by the Acute Leukemia Working Party of the European Society for Blood and Marrow Transplantation (EBMT)., *Biology of Blood and Marrow Transplantation* (2019), doi: https://doi.org/10.1016/j.bbmt.2019.11.021

highlights

- Non relapse mortality after prior autologous HCT for subsequent allogeneic HCT in CR2
- Conditioning toxicity
- Consolidation of AML by autologous HCT

Post remission consolidation by autologous HCT for AML in CR1, negative implications for subsequent allogeneic HCT in CR2. A Study by the Acute Leukemia Working Party of the European Society for Blood and Marrow Transplantation (EBMT).

JR Passweg[1], M Labopin[2], M Christopeit[3], J Cornelissen[4], T Pabst[5], G Socié[6], N Russel[7], I Yakoub-Agha[8], D Blaise[9], T Gedde-Dahl[10], H Labussière-Wallet[11], R Malladi[12], E Forcade[13], S Maury[14], E Polge[15], F Lanza[16], NC Gorin[2], M Mohty*[2],A Nagler*[17]

* equal contribution

1) University Hospital – Hematology, Basel, Switzerland

2) Department of Hematology and Cell Therapy, Institut National de la Santé et de la Recherche Médicale (INSERM) UMRs 938, Hopital Saint Antoine Assistance Publique-Hopitaux de Paris, Paris Sorbonne University, Paris, France

3) University Medical Center Hamburg-Eppendorf, Hamburg, Germany

4) Erasmus MC Cancer Institute University Medical Center Rotterdam Department of Hematology Rotterdam Netherlands

5) Department of Medical Oncology; University Hospital, Bern, Switzerland

6) Hopital St. Louis Dept.of Hematology - BMT Paris France

7) Nottingham University Haematology Nottingham City Hospital Nottingham UK

8) CHU de Lille, LIRIC, INSERM U995, université de Lille, 59000 Lille, France

9) Programme de Transplantation&Therapie Cellulaire Centre de Recherche en Cancérologie de Marseille Institut Paoli Calmettes Marseille, France

10) Oslo University Hospital, Rikshospitalet, Hematology Dept and Institute for Clinical Medicine, University of Oslo, Norway

11) Centre Hospitalier Lyon Sud Hospices Civils de Lyon Lyon, France

12) Centre for Clinical Haematology Queen Elizabeth Hospital Birmingham UK

13) CHU Bordeaux - Hôpital Haut-Leveque, Pessac, France

14) Hôpital Henri Mondor Wervice d` Hematologie Creteil France

15)Acute Leukemia Working Party of the European Society for Blood and Marrow Transplantation (EBMT); EBMT Paris Office

16) Romagna Transplant Network- Ravenna, Italy

17) Division of Hematology and Bone Marrow Transplantation, Chaim Sheba Medical Center, Tel-Hashomer and Sackler School of Medicine, Ramat Gan, Israel

Address for correspondence:

Jakob R Passweg MD MS

Division of Hematology

University Hospital Basel

CH-4031 Basel, Switzerland

Tel: + 41 61 265 42 54

Fax: +41 61 265 44 50

Email: jakob.passweg@usb.ch

none of the authors has declared a conflict of interest with the published material

Abstract

After autologous hematopoetic cell transplantation, (HCT in 1st complete remission (CR1), patients with acute myeloid leukemia (AML) may relapse and undergo allogeneic HCT in CR2. The aim of this study was to analyze outcome of allogeneic HCT performed in CR2 comparing patients with prior consolidation by autologous HCT vs. patients with chemotherapy consolidation. Included were 2619 adults, with allogeneic HCT in CR2, in 2000-2017 with (n=417) or without (n=2202) prior autologous HCT. Patient groups were not entirely comparable; patients with prior autologous HCT were younger, had less often a favorable cytogenetic profile, had more commonly donors other than matched siblings and more often received reduced intensity conditioning (RIC) conditioning. In multivariate analysis non relapse mortality (NRM) risks in patients with prior autologous HCT were 1.34 (1.07-1.67), p=0.01 after adjustment for age, cytogenetic risk, transplant year, donor, conditioning intensity, sex matching, interval diagnosis-relapse and relapse-allogeneic HCT as compared to chemotherapy consolidation. Similarly, risks of events in leukemia free survival and graft versus host disease, relapse free survival were higher with prior autologous HCT, 1.17 (1.01-1.35), p=0.03 and 1.18 (1.03-1.35) p= 0.02, respectively. Risk of death was also higher 1.13 (0.97-1.32) p=0.1 but this was not significant. Post remission consolidation with autologous HCT for AML in CR1 increases toxicity of subsequent allogeneic HCT in CR2.

Introduction:

During the past decades, autologous hematopoietic cell transplantation (HCT) has been widely used as consolidation treatment in patients with acute myeloid leukemia (AML) in first or second complete remission (CR) (1-11). Over time, donors for allogeneic stem cell transplantation have become available and allogeneic HCT appears to have in part replaced autologous HCT.

Autologous HCT has been shown to reduce relapse rates by approximately 10% and increase LFS although not overall survival in a randomized clinical study (1). Consolidation by autologous HCT is used more commonly in patients with low and intermediate risk AML, while for high risk AML allogeneic HCT is more commonly recommended. Up to half of patients receiving consolidation by autologous HCT in CR1 will relapse and will be candidates for allogeneic HCT in CR2 (1). Although observational registry studies will not be able to answer the question whether a strategy of early allogeneic HCT is better than consolidation by chemotherapy or autologous HCT and allogeneic HCT in case of relapse, the toxicity of allogeneic HCT in CR2 in patients having received consolidation treatment by autologous HCT or by chemotherapy can be quantified and compared.

This study compares mortality after allogeneic HCT in CR2 in AML patients who have received consolidation treatment in CR1 by autologous HCT versus those who have received consolidation by chemotherapy only. A difference in mortality may indicate added burden of toxicity by autologous HCT consolidation in case later allogeneic HCT is required to treat relapsed disease.

Patients and Methods:

This is an observational study including adult patients (≥18 years) with de novo AML (non-APL) registered with EBMT receiving an allogeneic HCT in CR2 between the year 2000 and 2017 and who had received either chemotherapy consolidation (n=2202) or consolidation by autologous HCT (n=417) in CR1. Included were patients in whom the date of relapse was reported and whose donor was either a matched sibling, an unrelated donor or a haploidentical donor.

The EBMT is a non-profit scientific society representing more than 600 transplant centers, mostly located in Europe, that are required to report all consecutive stem cell transplantations and follow-up data once a year. Data are entered, managed and maintained in a central database with internet access; each EBMT center is represented in this database. Audits are routinely performed to determine the accuracy of the data. Patients or their legal guardians provide informed consent authorizing the use of their personal information for research purposes according to the declaration of Helsinki. The Review Board of the EBMT approved this study.

Endpoints

The main outcome of this study was Non Relapse Mortality (NRM) of allogeneic HCT in CR2 comparing patients with prior autologous HCT to patients with chemotherapy consolidation. NRM was defined as death without evidence of relapse or progression. CR was understood as complete hematologic remission and this was defined as less than 5% bone marrow blasts. Relapse was defined as presence of 5% or more bone marrow blasts after remission was obtained.

Secondary outcomes were overall survival (OS) defined as time from allogeneic HCT in CR2 to death from any cause. LFS was defined as time from allogeneic HCT in CR2 to relapse or progression or death from any cause. Acute graft versus host disease (aGVHD) was graded according to the modified Seattle-Glucksberg criteria (12) and chronic graft versus host

disease (cGVHD) according to the revised Seattle criteria (13). GvHD-free, relapse free survival (GFRFS) was defined using the EBMT definition for registry based analyses where the time to first event amongst the following is recorded: severe grade III or IV acute GvHD, severe chronic GvHD, relapse, death (14).

Definitions

Conditioning regimen was defined myeloablative (MAC) when containing total body irradiation (TBI) with a dose >6 Gray or a total dose of busulfan (Bu) >8 mg/kg or >6.4 mg/kg when administered orally or intravenously, respectively. All other regimens were defined as RIC (15). Cytogenetic abnormalities were classified according to MRC criteria (15).

Statistics

Groups were compared using the Mann Whitney U test for continuous and Chi squared test for categorical variables. Cumulative incidence was used to estimate the endpoints of NRM, relapse incidence (RI), to accommodate for competing risks (17, 18). Probabilities of OS, LFS, and GRFS were calculated using the Kaplan–Meier method (19). Univariate analyses were done using the Gray's test for cumulative incidence functions and the log rank test for OS, GRFS, and LFS. Continuous variables were entered as continuous covariates in multivariate analyses. Cox proportional hazards model were run to adjust for differences among groups (20,21) entering all variables differing significantly between the 2 groups. All variables differing significantly between the 2 groups or factors known to influence outcomes were included in the Cox model: patient age, year of transplant, time to diagnosis to relapse and time from relapse to allograft were included as continuous variables. Other variables were cytogenetic risk group (favorable, intermediate, adverse or NA), donor type, conditioning intensity, sex matching, Karnofsky performance score and patient CMV serology. Probabilities of the respective survival times are reported at 2 years after allogeneic HCT. In order to test for a centre effect, we introduced a random effect or frailty for each center into

the model (22,23). Results were expressed as the hazard ratio (HR) with the 95% confidence interval (95%CI). All tests were 2-sided. The type I error rate was fixed at 0.05 for the determination of factors associated with time-to-event outcomes. Statistical analyses were performed with SPSS 24.0 (SPSS Inc, Chicago, IL, USA) and R 3.4.0 (R Core Team (2017). R: A language and environment for statistical computing. R Foundation for Statistical Computing, Vienna, Austria. URL https://www.R-project.org/.)

Results:

This study included: 2619 adults with de novo AML, receiving their first allogeneic HCT in CR2 in the years 2000-2017. . Four hundred and seventeen patients had undergone autologous HCT as part of the consolidation treatment in CR1 and had subsequently relapsed, 2202 patients had undergone consolidation treatment by chemotherapy only. Patient, Disease and Treatment characteristics are shown in Table 1. Patients with prior autologous HCT differed from patients with chemotherapy consolidation in many ways. They were younger by 2.7 years, were transplanted earlier (median 2009 as compared to 2010), less often had a favorable cytogenetic profile, they were more commonly transplanted with alternative donors other than matched siblings, and more often had RIC as compared to MAC conditioning. Patients with prior autologous HCT had an interval to relapse that was shorter by a median of 41 days from diagnosis of AML. Time from CR2 to allogeneic HCT was comparable in both groups.

Conditioning for prior autologous HCT was by TBI in 50, by busulphan in combination with cyclophosphamide in 168, with melphalan in 56, with other drugs in 34; by drug combinations not containing busulphan in 23. The type of conditioning for prior autologous HCT was unknown in 86, these had not been reported as transplants to the EBMT.

Univariate outcomes are shown in Table 2 and in Figures 1 (NRM) and 2 (LFS). In univariate analysis NRM was higher and LFS lower by approximately 4% in patients with prior autologous HCT consolidation as compared to chemotherapy consolidation. Given the important differences among groups multivariate analysis adjusting for these differences including, patient age, cytogenetic risk, year of transplant, donor type, conditioning intensity, sex matching, the time interval from diagnosis to relapse, the time interval from relapse to allogeneic HCT into the model are more reliable.

Relative Risks of NRM were 1.34 (1.07-1.67), p=0.01 in patients with prior autologous HCT vs. chemotherapy consolidation. Similarly LFS risks were 1.17 (1.01-1.35), p=0.03, GRFS risks were 1.18 (1.03-1.35) p= 0.02, and OS 1.13 (0.974-1.32), p=0.1 comparing the groups with prior autologous HCT to patients with chemotherapy consolidation. A subgroup of patients with prior autologous HCT had particularly poor outcome, these were patients who had received conditioning by TBI for autologous HCT (n=50) contributing to higher mortality of subsequent allogeneic HCT, this had been reported in a previous paper by our group (10). Relative risk of NRM was 1.32 (1.03-1.69) for all patients comparing patients with prior autologous HCT consolidation to patients without. When analyzing patients with autologous HCT conditioned without TBI separately from patients with TBI the risk of NRM of the non-TBI patients was 1.21 (0.957-1.54) as compared to patients without autologous HCT. Conversley, NRM risks of allogeneic HCT were highest in the patients with TBI conditioning for autologous HCT (RR: 2.7 (1.67-4.37)). Causes of death after allogeneic HCT in CR2 in both groups were dominated by relapsed disease 39.1% and 46.7% and GvHD in 16.4% and 19.9%, infectious disease with 26.8% vs 19.4% comparing patients with autologous HCT consolidation to chemotherapy consolidation in CR1. Sinusoidal obstruction syndrome of the liver was the cause of death in 2.7% vs. 1.9% interstitial pneumonitis in 4.1% vs. 2.7%, cardiac toxicity in 0.9%vs. 0.7% and secondary malignancy in 3.2% vs. 1.7% of patients, respectively. The p value of comparing cause of death was 0.28.

Discussion

Use of autologous HCT for AML is not well standardized. Some groups advocate this strategy as appropriate consolidation treatment in patients with genetically low or intermediate risk AML. Use, particularly in CR1 shows a steep increase over the 1990s with a rapid drop after the year 2000 as reported to the EBMT activity survey. Authors interpret the data as showing a probable switch to allogeneic HCT consolidation at the time when HLA high resolution typing became available and large numbers of unrelated donors were accessible for HCT, rather than the result of comparative studies, of which only relatively few have been published.

The best evidence for autologous HCT in CR1 comes from a randomized clinical trial showing reduced relapse rate by approximately 10% with improved LFS but no significant difference in OS (1) published in 2011. This study had not found an interaction between relapse risk reduction by autologous HCT and genetic risk categories. Patients in CR1 even if in genetic low and intermediate risk categories will have risk of relapse of 40-50% even after consolidation by autologous HCT (1). Relapsing patients will most commonly undergo re-induction chemotherapy following consolidation in CR2 by allogeneic HCT.

Previous studies from the ALWP of the EBMT had compared outcome of patients with acute leukemia with a relapse after autologous HCT treated with chemotherapy, a second autologous HCT or an allogeneic HCT (6, 7). In these studies with patients treated before 2000, outcome was not significantly different after a second autograft or an allogeneic HCT with OS of 42±6% and 32±5%, respectively. Young age and interval from first autograft to the second transplant > 8 months and the absence of prior total body irradiation (TBI) had more favorable outcome. Outcome of patients treated without a second transplant was very poor. A study published in 2013 with 302 patients undergoing an unrelated allogeneic HCT for relapse after autologous HCT with either myeloablative (MAC) or reduced-intensity conditioning (RIC) showed LFS of 20% at 5 years, results were better in patients with a

longer interval to second HCT, a high Karnofsky Performance Score and RIC conditioning (8). These studies and the one recently published by the ALWP of the EBMT (10) looked at outcome of allogeneic HCT following relapse after autologous HCT report that patients with less aggressive disease and in a better state of health fared better. However, these studies did not address the issue whether prior autologous HCT impacted the toxicity of subsequent allogeneic HCT.

Here we provide evidence that toxicity measured as NRM is increased after allogeneic HCT in CR2 if consolidation in CR1 had been by autologous HCT rather than chemotherapy alone. However differences are small i.e. approximately 4% by univariate analysis and it is not clear whether this difference is driven by cumulative toxicity of higher doses of chemotherapy or by other factors. The groups of patients with prior autologous HCT and chemotherapy consolidation differed in many aspects and groups were heterogeneous. In particular, patients with prior autologous HCT had more commonly RIC conditioning for allogeneic HCT in CR2, in spite of them being younger as compared to the chemotherapy consolidation group. As this is an observational study, we do not have control over treatment choices and assume that RIC regimens were chosen more commonly in order to avoid toxicity considered to be higher, given prior autologous HCT conditioning. Patients with prior autologous HCT had more often intermediate risk cytogenetics as compared to chemotherapy consolidation, pointing towards a (desired) selection bias. There were however no differences in relapse rates. We carefully adjusted for these differences by multivariate analysis in particular also for conditioning intensity, but other factors not measured or not appreciated sufficiently may have an inpact. For instance, we lack information on the number of chemotherapy cycles to achieve CR1 as well as number of cycles to achieve CR2. In addition, there is data missing on the conditioning regimen of autologous HCT in a proportion of these patients. Patients with conditioning for autologous HCT by TBI fared particularly poorly, but patients without TBI conditioning had higher NRM risks, although this was only of borderline significance. Last,

this study is obviously agnostic to the benefit of autologous HCT in CR1, i.e. we only analyzed patients who experienced a relapse and achieved CR2. We also do not know about patients who did not achieve a CR2 or patients who could not undergo an allogeneic HCT in CR2 because of lack of donor or comorbid conditions. In spite of these limitations this study shows that patients receiving an allograft in CR2 may be at a slightly higher risk of nonrelapse mortality after having received a consolidation treatment by autologous HCT as compared to chemotherapy consolidation.

References:

1. Vellenga E, van Putten W, Ossenkoppele GJ, et al. Autologous peripheral blood stem cell transplantation for acute myeloid leukemia. Blood. 2011;118(23):6037-42.
2. Passweg JR, Baldomero H, Bader P, Bonini C, Cesaro S, Dreger P, Duarte RF, Dufour C, Kuball J, Farge-Bancel D, Gennery A, Kröger N, Lanza F, Nagler A, Sureda A, Mohty M. Hematopoietic stem cell transplantation in Europe 2014: more than 40 000 transplants annually. Bone Marrow Transplant. 2016 Jun;51(6):786-92.
3. Gorin NC. Autologous stem cell transplantation in acute myelocytic leukemia. Blood 1998; 92(4): 1073-1090.
4. Gorin NC, Giebel S, Labopin M, Savani BN, Mohty M, Nagler A. Autologous stem cell transplantation for adult acute leukemia in 2015: time to rethink? Present status and future prospects. Bone Marrow Transplant 2015; 50(12): 1495-1502.
5. Czerw T, Labopin M, Gorin N, Giebel S, Blaise D, Meloni G et al. Long term follow up of autologous hematopoietic stem cell transplantation for acute myeloid leukemia: a survey of 3567 patients in CR at two years post transplantation, from the acute leukemia working party of the EBMT. Cancer 2016; 122(12): 1880-1887.
6. Ringden O, Labopin M, Frassoni F, Sanz G, Demeocq F, Prentice H *et al.* Allogeneic bone marrow transplant or second autograft in patients with acute leukemia who relapse after an autograft. Acute Leukaemia Working Party of the European Group for Blood and Marrow Transplantation (EBMT). *Bone Marrow Transplant* 1999; **24**(4)**:** 389-396.
7. Ringden O, Labopin M, Gorin NC, Meloni G, Blaise D, Reiffers J et al. The dismal outcome in patients with acute leukaemia who relapse after an autograft is improved if a second autograft or a matched allograft is performed. Acute Leukaemia Working Party of the European Group for Blood and Marrow Transplantation (EBMT). Bone Marrow Transplant 2000; 25(10): 1053-1058.

8. Foran JM, Pavletic SZ, Logan BR, Agovi-Johnson MA, Perez WS, Bolwell BJ *et al.* Unrelated donor allogeneic transplantation after failure of autologous transplantation for acute myelogenous leukemia: a study from the center for international blood and marrow transplantation research. Biology of blood and marrow transplantation 2013; **19**(7)**:** 1102-1108.
9. Tsai T, Goodman S, Saez R, Schiller G, Adkins D, Callander N et al. Allogeneic bone marrow transplantation in patients who relapse after autologous transplantation. Bone Marrow Transplant 1997; 20(10): 859-863.
10. Christopeit M, Labopin M, Gorin NC, et al. Allogeneic stem cell transplantation following relapse post autologous stem cell transplantation in adult patients with acute myeloid leukemia: A retrospective analysis of 537 patients from the Acute Leukemia Working Party of the EBMT. Am J Hematol. 2018 Dec;93(12):1532-1542
11. Mannis GN, Martin TG 3rd, Damon LE, et al. Long-term outcomes of patients with intermediate-risk acute myeloid leukemia treated with autologous hematopoietic cell transplant in first complete remission. Leuk Lymphoma. 2016 Jul;57(7):1560-
12. Przepiorka D, Weisdorf D, Martin P, Klingemann HG, Beatty P, Hows J et al. 1994 Consensus Conference on Acute GVHD Grading. Bone Marrow Transplant 1995; 15(6): 825-828.
13. Lee SJ, Vogelsang G, Flowers ME. Chronic graft-versus-host disease. Biology of blood and marrow transplantation : 2003; 9(4): 215-233.
14. Ruggeri A, Labopin M, Ciceri F, Mohty M, Nagler A. Definition of GvHD-free, relapse-free survival for registry-based studies: an ALWP-EBMT analysis on patients with AML in remission. Bone Marrow Transplant 2016; 51(4): 610-611.
15. Bacigalupo A, Ballen K, Rizzo D, Giralt S, Lazarus H, Ho V et al. Defining the intensity of conditioning regimens: working definitions. Biology of blood and marrow

transplantation : journal of the American Society for Blood and Marrow Transplantation 2009; 15(12): 1628-1633

16. Grimwade D, Hills RK, Moorman AV, Walker H, Chatters S, Goldstone AH et al. Refinement of cytogenetic classification in acute myeloid leukemia: determination of prognostic significance of rare recurring chromosomal abnormalities among 5876 younger adult patients treated in the United Kingdom Medical Research Council trials. Blood 2010; 116(3): 354-165
17. Fine JP, Gray RJ. A proportional hazards model for the subdistribution of a competing risk. Journal of the American Statistical Association 1999; 94(446): 496-509.
18. Gooley TA, Leisenring W, Crowley J, Storer BE. Estimation of failure probabilities in the presence of competing risks: new representations of old estimators. Statistics in medicine 1999; 18(6): 695-706.
19. Kaplan EL, Meier P. Nonparametric Estimation from Incomplete Observations. Journal of the American Statistical Association 1958; 53(282): 457-481
20. Cox DR. Regression models and life tables. J R Stat Soc B 1972; 34: 187-220.
21. Keating A, DaSilva G, Perez WS, Gupta V, Cutler CS, Ballen KK et al. Autologous blood cell transplantation versus HLA-identical sibling transplantation for acute myeloid leukemia in first complete remission: a registry study from the Center for International Blood and Marrow Transplantation Research. Haematologica 2013; 98(2): 185-192
22. Hoogard P. Frailty model for survival data. Lifetime Data Anal. 1995; 1 (3): 255-273.
23. Andersen PK, Klein JP, Zhang MJ. Testing for centre effects in multi-centre survival studies: a Monte Carlo comparison of fixed and random effects tests. Stat Med. 1999; 18(12):1489-500.)

Figure legend

Figure 1: univariate NRM incidence for patients with prior autologous HCT consolidation vs chemotherapy consolidation

Figure 2: univariate LFS probabilities for patients with prior autologous HCT consolidation vs chemotherapy consolidation

Figure 1



Figure 2



Table 1 Patient Disease and Transplant Characteristics

	Chemotherapy consolidation	Autologous HCT consolidation	P
N	2202	417	
Age (IQR)	48.2 (36.9-58.4)	45.5 (36-55.5)	0.003
Year of transplant	2010 (2006-2014)	2009 (2005-2013)	0.002
Time to first relapse (d)	406 (281-630)	365 (222-695)	0.03

Time relapse to allo HCT (d)	130(15-361)(98-171)	128(29-363)(98-176)	NS
Genetic Risk category			0.001
Favorable	569 (29.0%)	55 (18.8%)	
Intermediate	1244 (63.5%)	216 (73.7%)	
Unfavorable	146 (7.5%)	22 (7.5%)	
Karnofsky Performance Score			0.92
<80	101 (5.1%)	20 (5.2%)	
>=80	1888 (94.9%)	365 (94.8%)	
Patient CMV serology			0.38
negative	785 (36.3%)	123 (33.9%)	
positive	1380 (63.7%)	240 (66.1%)	
Donor			0.0001
Matched sibling	763 (34.7%)	77 (18.5%)	
Unrelated	1291 (58.6%)	301 (72.2%)	
Haploidentical	148 (6.7%)	39 (9.4%)	
Donor recipient sex mismatch			0.22
Female into male	401 (18.3%)	65 (15.7%)	
Other combinations	1792 (81.7%)	348 (84.3%)	
Conditioning			0.0001
Myeloablative	1227 (55.8%)	190 (46.1%)	
Reduced intensity	973 (44.2%)	222 (53.9%)	
In vivo T-cell depletion			0.08
Yes	1252 (57.3%)	230 (62.2%)	
No	934 (42.7%)	140 (37.8%)	
In vitro T-cell depletion	79 (3.6%)	23 (5.5%)	0.06

Stem cell source			0.11
BM	451 (20.5%)	100 (24.0%)	
PB	1751 (79.5%)	317 (76.0%)	

Table 2: Outcome Uni- and Multivariate

	Chemotherapy consolidation	Autologous HCT consolidation	P	MVA*	P
NRM (2y)	21.3%[19.6-23.1]	25.2%[21-29.6]	0.008	1.32 (1.03-1.69)	0.03
Relapse (2y)	28.1%[26.1-30]	28.6%[24.1-33.2]	NS	1.07 (0.85-1.34)	0.58
OS (2y)	58.1%[55.9-60.2]	55.2%[50.2-60.2]	0.02	1.19 (1.01-1.41)	0.04
LFS (2y)	50.6%[48.4-52.8]	46.2%[41.2-51.2]	0.004	1.20 (1.02-1.41)	0.03
GRFS (2y)	39.7%[37.5-41.8]	35.7%[30.8-40.5]	0.02	1.18 (1.01-1.38)	0.03
Acute GVHD II-IV (100 days)	25.6% [23.8-27.5]	23.7% [19.6-28]	0.33	0.87 (0.66-1.13)	0.29
Chronic GVHD (2y)	40.2% [37.9-42.4]	37.5% [32-43]	0.27	0.93 (0.73-1.19)	0.56

*MVA: Multivariate analysis, Baseline is chemotherapy consolidation with a relative risk of event of 1.00; NRM: Non Relapse Mortality, OS: Overall survival, LFS: Leukemia free survival; GRFS: GvHD and Leukemia free Survival