

### Francesco Buccisano

## MEASURABLE RESIDUAL DISEASE IN ACUTE **MYELOID LEUKEMIA, CONSENSUS DOCUMENT OF EUROPEAN LEUKEMIANET**

## 1

# **Conflict of Interest Disclosure**

In accordance with criterion 24 of document UEMS 2012/30 "Accreditation of Live Educational Events by the EACCME®" we herewith declare to have submitted a Conflict of Interest Disclosure Form to ESCCA.

This COI Disclosure Form can be viewed at the ESCCA 2019 Conference website www.escca.eu/norway2019 - Programme section / Accreditation page

2

4

## European LeukemiaNet recommendations for AML



## Diagnosis and management of adult AML: 2017 ELN recommendations by international expert panel



3

# ELN MRD recommendation expert panel

### Flow MRD

 Gerrit Jan Schuurhuis Paresh Vvas Brent Wood
 Wolfgang Kern
 Luca Maurillo Claude Preud'homme
 Francesco Buccisano Jeffrey Jorgensen Jacqueline Cloos Marie-Christine Bene
 Sylvie Freeman

Molecular MRD

 Christian Thiede
 Bert van de Reijden Michael Heuser
 Konstanze Döhner
 Torsten Haferlach

### **Clinical MRD** Gert Ossenkoppele

 Robert Hills
 Gail Roboz Roland Walter • Adriano Venditti

## Standardization or Harmonization?

- Standardization: is the process of implementing and developing technical standards based on the consensus of different parties (firms, users, interest groups, governments, standards organizations). Output is a SOP or a guideline.
- Harmonization: is the process of coordinating different systems by eliminating mayor differences and creating minimum requirements of standards. Output is a recommendation.

## Minimal/measurable residual disease in AML: a consensus document from the European LeukemiaNet MRD Working Party

Gent J. Schuzhuis, <sup>1</sup> Michael Heuser,<sup>14</sup> Sylve Freeman,<sup>14</sup> Marie-Christine Beine<sup>1</sup>, Francesco Buccisano, <sup>3</sup> Jucqueller Cloos, <sup>1</sup> David Grennesski, <sup>17</sup>Orsten Halfelder,<sup>18</sup> Robert K. Hills, <sup>17</sup>Orstopher S. Hourgan, <sup>2</sup> Millery, Lorgenesen<sup>11</sup> Wolfgeng Kent, <sup>1</sup> Francis Lacombe, <sup>19</sup> Luca Maurillo, <sup>17</sup> Claude Pecultaria Dilone<sup>17</sup>, <sup>16</sup> Gel J. Robert,<sup>11</sup> Conder Thielde, <sup>11</sup> Adriano Verdetti, <sup>1</sup> Parenk Vyas, <sup>14</sup> Bent L. Wood, <sup>17,18</sup> Robert J. Schwarz, <sup>10</sup> Claude Pecultaria Dilone<sup>17,17</sup> Gel J. Robert,<sup>11</sup> and Ger J. Oservicoppell

- · There are several reasons to apply MRD detection in AML
  - To provide an objective methodology to establish a deeper remission status, - To refine outcome prediction and inform post-remission treatment,
  - To identify impending relapse and enable early intervention in the post-treatment (e.g. post-
  - transplant) phase.
  - To use as a surrogate endpoint to accelerate drug testing and approval.

7

Outline

- Technical requirements
- Approach for MRD detection
  - Markers selection
  - Gating strategies (Next presentation)
  - Timepoints, thresholds
  - Rare events analysis requirements (B. Brando, PAR08, this morning)
- MRD reporting
- · Clinical studies and surrogacy
- 9

## General principles for clinical practice

- Should be monitored using RT-PCR
  - Acute Promyelocytic Leukemia
  - Core-binding factor AML
  - AML with NPM1 mutation
- · Use flow cytometry for MRD assessment - AML subgroups NOT including APL, CBF AML, and AML with NPM1 mutation

8

urhuis GJ, Blood 2018 💿 blood

**Technical requirements** 

- Bone marrow (BM) sampling
   It is strongly recommend to submit the first BM pull for MRD analysis
   It is recommended to estimate the possible contamination with PB
- BM transport
- Transport at controlled room temperature.

Up to 3 days storage is allowed, without the need for a viability marker, provided BM is stored undiluted. Flow cytometers

- Harmonization of instrument settings is of high value for interlaboratory comparison of results.
- Farmonization of instrument settings is of might value for internationary comparison or results.
   Preparation of samples
   Stain/tyse/wash (or no wash) has the advantage of reducing cell losses;
   Bulk hysis followed by washing and staining (and washing) has the advantage of having all tubes prepared in a similar way for the different staining steps.
   Both proceedses are in use for AML MR0 assays.

Schuurhuis GJ, Blood 2018

Schuurhuis GJ, Blood 2018

10

## Estimate of the possible contamination with PB

• It is recommended to estimate the possible contamina- tion with PB, the presence of >90% mature neutrophils in a BM sample indicating significant hemodilution.

rki M. Welle D.A. N ilution in flow cy 

Schuurhuis GJ, Blood 2018

## Defining a Sample as UNSUITABLE for MRD Analysis

- · When an excess peripheral blood contamination is observed (i.e. if CD16+ mature myeloid cells are >20%, or if the presence of more than 90% mature neutrophils)
- When red cell precursors are overall <10-15 %.
- When B-Lymphoid progenitors are absent or <1-2%.
- When normal PCs are undetectable
- When mast cells ≤0.002%

# Markers for MRD assessment

- Number and nature of fluorochromes
  - Taking advantage of extensive validation studies as done, for example, by the Euroflow consortium
- Panel content
  - Gating on CD45, sideward scatter (SSC), forward scatter (FSC), a primitive marker (CD34, CD117), and abnormal expression of marker(s) or abnormal combination(s) of marker expression.
  - Monocytic combination, including CD64, CD11b and CD4 is proposed
  - Leukemic Stem Cell analysis requires a dedicated approach

urhuis GJ, Blood 2018

Olaru et al., Cytometry 2008

13

# Types of LAIPs

- With stem cell markers
  - Cross lineage
  - Asynchronous (including under-expression)
- Without stem cell markers
- Quality of LAIPs
  - Sensitivity (% coverage of blast compartment)
  - Specificity (LAP expression in normal and regenerating bone marrow)

About LAIPs

- Stability (immunophenotypic shifts)

14

## LAIP absent or present at very low frequency in normal or post-chemotherapy BM

- Multiparameter four- and six-color flow cytometry test
- normal individuals (n° 20)
- patients receiving chemotherapy for acute lymphoblastic leukemia (n° 20)
- Patients with AML (n° 53)
- In six-color panel
  - 47 phenotypes were totally absent
  - 41 phenotypes were identified in less than 0.05% of blast cells
- In four-color panel
  - 30 phenotypes present at a frequency <0.05%.</li>

15

PerCP-Horizon Horizor FITC PE-Cv7 APC APC-H7 PE Cy5.5 V450 V500 CD11b CD14 CD4 CD34 HLADR CD33 CD45 Normal BM Post-CT BM median (range)  $\begin{array}{c} 14+\text{DR}+4+11\text{B}+64-\\ 14+\text{DR}+4-11\text{B}+64-\\ 14+\text{DR}+4-11\text{B}-64-\\ 14+\text{DR}-4+11\text{B}+64-\\ 14+\text{DR}-4+11\text{B}+64-\\ 14+\text{DR}-4+11\text{B}-64-\\ 14+\text{DR}+4-11\text{B}-64-\\ 14-\text{DR}+4+11\text{B}-64+\\ 14-\text{DR}+4+11\text{B}+64+\\ 14-\text{DR}-4+11\text{B}+64-\\ 14-\text{DR}-4+110+\\ 14-\text{DR}-4+10+\\ 14-\text{DR}-4+10+\\ 14-\text{DR}-4+10+\\ 14-\text{DR}-4+10+\\ 14-\text{DR}-4+10+\\ 14-\text{DR}-4+10+\\ 14-\text{DR}-4+10+\\ 14-\text{DR}-4+10+\\ 14-$ <0.01 <0.01 (0-0.03) <0.01 (0-0.02) <0.01 <0.01 <0.01 <0.01 <0.01 <0.01 <0.01 <0.01 <0.01 <0.01 <0.01 <0.01 (0-0.02) <0.01 <0.01 <0.01 <0.01 <0.01 <0.01 <0.01 <0.01 <0.01

Olaru et al., Cytometry 2008

## Consensus on markers in ELN

Schuurhuis GJ, Blood 2018

Matarraz S. Cytometry Part B. 2017

- 7/7 for 7 markers: CD7, CD13, CD15, CD33, CD34, CD45, CD117
- 6/7: for 4 markers: CD14, CD19, CD56, HLA-DR
- 4/7: for 5 markers: CD2, CD4, CD11b, CD38, CD64
- 2/7 for 4 markers: CD16, CD36, CD123, CD133
- 1/7: for 5 marker: CD5, CD22, CD25, CD65, CD71

16

## Patterns of monocytic aberrancies



ESCCA/ICCS/ELN MonoCon committee kick-off in Bergen

3

## Gating strategies for MFC MRD assessment (LAIP vs different from normal)

- LAIPs are DfN abnormalities in the vast majority of cases, and the difference between these two approaches is likely to disappear if an adapted, sufficiently large panel of antibodies (preferably ≥ 8 colors) is utilized.
- We recommend that the advantages of both approaches be combined to best define MFC MRD burden, allowing detection of new aberrancies emerging at followup, and monitoring patients when there is an absence of diagnostic information.
- New definition of "LAIP-based DfN approach"

### Focus on gating strategies coming on



rhuis GJ, Blood 2018

20

Timepoints, thresholds and denominator cell

number target for MRD assessment

MRD is to be used for risk analysis at an early time point (after 1-2 cycles),
The suggested threshold to assess a positive/negative status is 0.1% (10<sup>-3</sup>),

• The minimum number of cells needed for accurate reporting of MRD is

500,000 - 1,000,000, excluding all CD45-negative cells and debris,

Lower cell numbers may still suffice if the level of MRD is relatively high,
 Higher numbers enable to assess possible MRD below the level of 0.1%.

Schuurhuis GJ, Blood 2018

Estimated LOQ and LOQ According to the Total Number of Cells Acquired



21



- Early Timepoints
  - Fast treatment allocation (e.g. allogeneic transplant for high-risk patients)
     Caveat:
    - · Overtreatment of slow responders
- Late Timepoints
  - No over-treatment of slow responders
- Caveat:
  - Longer time to transplant delivery (e.g. alternative donors)
  - Relapses before transplant delivery

Optimal time-points are those functioning to the global treatment strategy

22







23

# Threshold determination in MRD studies

- Threshold selection is affected by a number of technical and clinical factors
  - technical threshold vs. clinical threshold
- We recommend the use of a dedicated statistical approach
- ROC analysis, Maximally selected log-rank statistics
  The reproducibility of that specific threshold throughout different laboratories still remains subject of debate
  - Particular cut-off which different laboratories can refer to
  - Should any laboratory set up its own?

## 25



- What do we need to tailor therapy on a biomarker (MRD):
  - Measurable biological or clinical characteristics
  - Well documented risk categories
  - Robust retrospective validation
  - · Prospective randomized studies showing benefits of tailoring



26



Threshold of positivity: 0.035% leukemic cells post consolidation cycle

27



no et. al. Blood 2010

fondazione GIMEMA\*

itti et al.. Blood 2019

AML1310 – Schedule



28



AML1310: intermediate-risk OS and DFS by MRD status



Key features of MRD report

- Detection sensitivity threshold (LOD)
- If known should be specified for the aberrancy used
   Denominator population (mononuclear cells, leukocytes, CD45 positive events, etc.)
- Comments on quality of the sample, including total blast percentage, poor viability,
- insufficient regeneration, and peripheral blood contamination
- Reports on MRD status should be constructed to allow the clinicians to draw clear conclusions about how to interpret the report

   MRD positive vs. MRD negative, crude percentage, reference protocol.

Schuurhuis GJ, Blood 2018

Sante v 2000

30

29

Schuurhuis GJ, Blood 2018

w fda.cov/downloads/drups/guida

n070107.pd



## Design of MRD studies: multicenter vs single center approaches

- For multicenter studies samples may be processed by different centers applying the same MRD panels, according to the ELN recommendations. With insufficient experience in MRD analysis, the final interpretation should be performed at a central institute or in a group workshop.
- Alternatively, samples may be sent under carefully controlled conditions to a central institute for workup and analysis.
- Single center studies without relevant experience are strongly discouraged.

Use of MRD as a surrogate endpoint for survival to accelerate drug approval

- If MRD negativity is established as a surrogate endpoint for survival, it is likely to be helpful for the evaluation of new drugs, possibly accelerating drug approval or,
- stopping development of suboptimal drugs or treatment strategies
  - Schuurhuis GJ. Blood 2018
- This task will be accomplished only when prospective, randomized trials evaluating MRD driven therapy-interventions combined with survival end-points within homogeneous subgroups of non-APL ANL, will be completed. Hourigan CS, Leukemia 2017

## FDA caveat on MRD in AML

- The molecular heterogeneity of AML poses substantial challenges to use of MRD as a biomarker.
  - For the marker (e.g., cell surface or genetic mutation) selected to assess MRD, the sponsor should provide data showing that the marker reflection the leukemia and not underlying clonal hematopoiesis (false positive result).
  - The sponsor should also describe the false-negative rate that might result from relapse from a marker-negative clone.
  - If multiple markers and/or multiple platforms are used, the sponsor should provide an analysis of the risk of false-positive and false marker individually and for the panel as a whole. negative results for each

33

31

34

32

## Conclusions

- MRD is a biomarker measuring the quality of morphological CR.
- · Regardless of the technique employed, MRD confers a negative prognosis that is comparable to the one associated with morphological persisting leukemia.
- Multiparametric flow cytometry (MFC) and real-time quantitative PCR (RT-qPCR) are the leading techniques for MRD monitoring.
- MFC should be employed in AML subgroups NOT including APL, CBF AML, and AML with NPM1 mutation
- Standardization/harmonization process is underway.