Consensus Panel 2

Risk Stratification



- Not to decide whether to treat or not
 SMM with t(4:14) or del13 by FISH or on cytogenetics – Treat or not?
- To determine prognosis
- To stratify patients in trials
- To update prognostic factors in the era of novel therapies (thalidomide, bortezomib, lenalidomide)

- Preliminary reports suggest that Velcade® is able to overcome t(4;14) prognosis.
- Conflicting data on IMIDs.

•Currently, to mandate definitive treatment according to cytogenetic abnormalities is premature

• Further data needed for treatment recommendations

At diagnosis

• The current risk stratification is applicable to newly-diagnosed patients the parameters obtained at diagnosis

•Serum markers

- Cytogenetics (Karyotype)
- FISH



- Evidence of change in risk factors at relapse. e.g. mean labeling index increased from 1% at diagnosis to 2.5% at relapse
- If a patient acquires high risk features at relapse or progression, then that patient should be reclassified as having high-risk disease. i.e. a patient without t(4;14) at diagnosis, at relapse has 20% cells +

<u>At relapse</u>

• Same genetic abnormalities characteristic of poor outcome at diagnosis may suggest poor outcome if detected at the time of relapse.

•re-determination of factors such as b-2M or ISS at relapse or at follow up is not considered predictive of change in risk stratification.

•Role of f serum LDH at relapse is less clear.

At relapse

- Re-determination of factors such as β -2M or ISS at relapse or at follow up is not currently considered as predictive of change in risk stratification.
- •Therapy-related poor risk features include length of response to prior therapy – ether progression while on therapy or short duration of response
- •If a patient already has an identified high risk feature at diagnosis, then there is no need to look for the same feature again.

- Serum: β2m, albumin, LDH
- Conventional cytogenetic abnormality



What risk factors?



At least : t(4;14) del(17p) t(14;16)

Others: 1q, 1p, 8p, 12p, 16q, 22q, hyperdiploidy

What risk factors?

ISS

Based on $\beta 2m$ and albumin levels

Built before novel drug era

Still valid with current approaches?

Method used for measurement should be standard.

Although extremely convenient requires incorporation of additional myeloma-specific features

Durie-Salmon Staging System

- •A system to determine tumor mass
- •Still remains a means to measure tumor mass
- •Could be replaced by CRAB criteria for diagnosis
- •Useful for trial analyses Stage I versus II/III

Imaging

•Number of bone lytic lesions, per DS system, is not considered of any prognostic significance.

•Limited series showing prognostic value of MRI

•Might be useful for response evaluation

•Requires further validation studies



Gene expression profiling (GEP)

- Two large studies showed prognostic value
- Two different sets of 17 and 15 genes
- Pb: feasibility in multicenter setting



SNP/CGH array

- No large series
- Place vs FISH?
- SNP analyses on constitutional DNA

To decide treatment?

Allo-transplants

For high-risk patients? Or for low-risk?
Frontline? Or at 1st relapse?

Novel drugs in t(4;14)?

To decide treatment?

Maintenance

•Current level of evidence does not provide direction in deciding if a specific group of patients will benefit from maintenance therapy

Is risk stratification specific for specific treatment

• The risk stratification should be a global stratification, and not stratification for old versus new therapy or risk stratification for particular one treatment.

What other risk factors?

LDH IgA extramedullary disease renal failure High serum free light chain and κ/λ ratio, **Plasmablastic disease Plasma cell leukemia**

If a patient already has an identified high risk feature at diagnosis, then there is no need to look for the same feature again.

LDH, IgA, extramedullary disease, renal failure, high serum free light chain and kappa/lambda ratio, plasmablastic disease, and plasma cell leukemia