## JOURNAL OF CLINICAL ONCOLOGY

# Unrelated Donor Bone Marrow Transplantation for Children With Acute Myeloid Leukemia Beyond First Remission or Refractory to Chemotherapy

Nancy J. Bunin, Stella M. Davies, Richard Aplenc, Bruce M. Camitta, Kenneth B. DeSantes, Rakesh K. Goyal, Neena Kapoor, Nancy A. Kernan, Joseph Rosenthal, Franklin O. Smith, and Mary Eapen

A B S T R A C T

#### Purpose

Identify prognostic factors that influence outcome after unrelated donor bone marrow transplantation in children with acute myeloid leukemia (AML).

## **Patients and Methods**

Included are 268 patients (age  $\leq$  18 years) with AML in second complete remission (n = 142), relapse (n = 90), or primary induction failure (n = 36) at transplantation. All patients received bone marrow grafts from an unrelated donor and a myeloablative conditioning regimen. Cox regression models were constructed to identify risk factors that influence outcome after transplantation.

#### Results

In this analysis, the only risk factor that predicted leukemia recurrence and overall and leukemiafree survival was disease status at transplantation. The 5-year probabilities of leukemia-free survival were 45%, 20%, and 12% for patients who underwent transplantation at second complete remission, relapse, and primary induction failure, respectively. As expected, risk of acute but not chronic graft-versus-host disease (GVHD) was lower with T-cell–depleted bone marrow grafts; T-cell–depleted grafts were not associated with higher risks of leukemia recurrence. We observed similar risks of leukemia relapse in patients with and without acute and chronic GVHD.

#### Conclusion

Children who underwent transplantation in remission had a superior outcome compared with children who underwent transplantation during relapse or persistent disease. Nevertheless, 20% of children who underwent transplantation in relapse are long-term survivors, suggesting that unrelated donor bone marrow transplantation is an effective therapy in a significant proportion of children with recurrent or primary refractory AML.

J Clin Oncol 26:4326-4332. © 2008 by American Society of Clinical Oncology

#### INTRODUCTION

Eighty to ninety percent of children with acute myeloid leukemia (AML) treated on current chemotherapeutic trials achieve a complete remission.<sup>1-6</sup> However, 30% to 40% of patients achieving a first remission experience relapse, and less than a third of these patients with recurrent leukemia survive long term.7-12 Although most reports identify the length of first remission as the best predictor of survival, others have reported that sex and French-American-British classification are predictors of achieving a second remission and long-term survival.7-12 Therapies for patients who experience relapse are variable and often include allogeneic hematopoietic stem-cell transplantation when a suitable donor is available. In this report, we sought to identify prognostic factors that influence outcome after unrelated donor bone marrow transplantation in children with AML who experience leukemia recurrence after achieving a first complete remission or who received transplantation for primary induction failure.

#### **PATIENTS AND METHODS**

#### **Data Collection**

The National Marrow Donor Program (NMDP) collects detailed demographic, disease, and transplantation characteristics and outcome data on all unrelated donor transplantations it facilitates in the United States. All patients are observed longitudinally, and computerized error checks, physician review of submitted data, and onsite audits of participating centers ensure data quality. The NMDP retrospectively obtained consent for data submission and study participation from surviving patients or

From the Children's Hospital of Philadelphia, Philadelphia; Children's Hospital of Pittsburgh, Pittsburgh, PA; Cincinnati Children's Hospital Medical Center, Cincinnati, OH; Center for International Blood and Marrow Transplant Research, Medical College of Wisconsin, Milwaukee; University of Wisconsin Hospital and Clinics, Madison, WI; Children's Hospital of Los Angeles, Los Angeles; City of Hope National Medical Center, Duarte, CA; and Memorial Sloan-Kettering Cancer Center, New York, NY.

Submitted January 25, 2008; accepted May 1, 2008.

The views expressed in this article do not reflect the official policy or position of the National Institute of Health, the Department of the Navy, the Department of Defense, or any other agency of the US Government.

Authors' disclosures of potential conflicts of interest and author contributions are found at the end of this article.

Corresponding author: Mary Eapen, MBBS, MS, Statistical Center, Center for International Blood and Marrow Transplant Research, Medical College of Wisconsin, 8701 Watertown Plank Rd, Milwaukee, WI; e-mail: meapen@ mcw.edu.

© 2008 by American Society of Clinical Oncology

0732-183X/08/2626-4326/\$20.00

DOI: 10.1200/JCO.2008.16.4442

their parent/legal guardian for transplantations it facilitated in the United States before 2002. Thereafter, informed consent was obtained prospectively. The Institutional Review Board of the NMDP waived consent for patients who had died before soliciting consent (transplantations facilitated before 2002). To overcome the bias caused by the inclusion of a proportion of surviving patients (those consenting) but all deceased recipients, and hence their overrepresentation, a sample of deceased patients was selected using a weighted randomized scheme that adjusts for over-representation of deceased patients in the consented cohort.<sup>13</sup> This weighted randomized scheme was developed based on all survivors in the NMDP database. A logistic regression model was fit to identify the factors that predicted whether a patient had consented or not consented to use of data collected by the NMDP. This analysis found that the following factors were associated with the likelihood of a patient consenting: age, disease type, race, sex, cytomegalovirus serostatus, and country of transplantation (United States v not United States). Using estimated consenting probabilities from this model based on the characteristics of dead patients, the biased coin method of randomization was performed to determine which of the dead patients likely would have consented to participate had they been alive. Thus, this procedure includes the dead patients at the same probability as surviving patients who consented to participate. Approximately 13% of surviving patients declined to consent, and 12% of dead patients were deleted by the weighted randomized method. This method was tested several times, and on every occasion, the proportion of deleted dead patients was similar.

#### Inclusion Criteria

The study population includes 268 recipients of unrelated donor bone marrow transplantations performed in the United States between 1990 and 2003. Patients (age  $\leq$  18 years at transplantation) with AML who underwent transplantation in second complete remission or first or subsequent relapse and patients with primary induction failure are included. Complete remission was defined as neutrophil count more than  $1.0 \times 10^9/L$ ; platelets more than  $100 \times 10^9/L$ ; RBC transfusion independent; less than 5% blasts in bone marrow with absence of cells with Auer rods; normal maturation of the erythrocytic, granulocytic, and megakaryocytic series; and absence of extramedullary disease. All patients received bone marrow grafts and a myeloablative transplantation conditioning regimen. Patients who received an unrelated donor bone marrow transplantation in first complete remission, patients in third or subsequent remission, children with Down's syndrome, and recipients of peripheral-blood or umbilical cord blood grafts were excluded because risk factors were likely to vary in these groups.

#### End Points

The primary outcomes studied were neutrophil and platelet recovery, acute and chronic graft-versus-host disease (GVHD), and early and overall mortality. Neutrophil recovery was defined as achieving an absolute neutrophil count of  $\geq 0.5 \times 10^9$ /L and platelets more than  $20 \times 10^9$ /L unsupported for 7 days. Failure to achieve an absolute neutrophil count of  $\geq 0.5 \times 10^9$ /L or a decline to less than  $0.5 \times 10^9$ /L after an initial recovery and without a subsequent recovery was considered graft failure. Incidence of grades 2, 3, and 4 acute GVHD and chronic GVHD were determined in all patients. Diagnosis of acute<sup>14</sup> and chronic GVHD has based on local institutional criteria, with overall grade of acute GVHD assigned retrospectively by the NMDP based on stage of involvement reported for each individual organ. Any death occurring during continuous remission was defined as treatment-related mortality. Relapse was defined as morphologic leukemia recurrence at any site, and leukemia-free survival was defined as survival in a state of continuous complete remission.

#### Statistical Analysis

The probabilities of leukemia-free and overall survival were calculated using the Kaplan-Meier method.<sup>16</sup> For analysis of survival, death from any cause was considered an event, and data on patients still alive were censored at date of last follow-up. For analysis of leukemia-free survival, leukemia relapse or death from any cause is considered an event, and patients were censored at last follow-up. The probabilities of neutrophil and platelet recovery, acute and chronic GVHD, transplantation-related mortality, and relapse were calculated with the use of the cumulative incidence function method.<sup>16</sup> For neutrophil and platelet recovery and GVHD, death without the event (hematopoietic recovery or GVHD) was the competing event. Data on patients without an event were censored at last follow-up. For relapse, transplantation-related mortality was the competing event, and for transplantation-related mortality, relapse was the competing event. CIs were calculated using log transformation.

Cox regression models were built for analysis of risk factors for GVHD, transplantation-related mortality, relapse, treatment failure, and overall mortality.<sup>17</sup> Multivariate models were built with the use of stepwise forward selection, with  $P \leq .01$  considered to indicate statistical significance. The variable for cytogenetic risk group did not attain the level of significance. Given the reported prognostic significance of cytogenetics in AML, analyses for transplantation-related mortality, relapse, treatment failure, and overall mortality were stratified by cytogenetic risk group. All variables met the proportional hazards assumptions. Variables considered in multivariate model building are listed in Table 1. We tested for an effect of transplantation center on outcome and found none.<sup>18</sup> P values are two sided. Analyses were performed using SAS software, version 9.1 (SAS Institute, Cary, NC).

## RESULTS

Patient, disease, and transplantation characteristics by disease status at transplantation are listed in Table 1. Median age at transplantation was 10 years (range, < 1 to 18 years), and median time from diagnosis to transplantation was 13 months (range, < 1 to 88 months). Twenty patients (7%) had myelodysplastic syndrome that evolved to AML before transplantation. Fifty-three percent of patients were in second complete remission, 34% were in first or subsequent relapse at transplantation, and 13% had primary induction failure. Sixty-eight (76%) of 90 patients who underwent transplantation in relapse received chemotherapy before transplantation but did not achieve clinical remission. Most patients (87%) received total-body irradiation–containing conditioning regimens. All patients received bone marrow grafts, and 38% of bone marrow grafts were T-cell depleted. Median follow-up time of surviving patients is 5 years (range, 5 to 156 months).

## Hematopoietic Recovery

Most patients achieved neutrophil and platelet recovery. The probability of neutrophil recovery at day 28 was 95% (95% CI, 83% to 98%), and the probability of platelet recovery at day 28 was 70% (95% CI, 64% to 76%).

## **GVHD**

Grade 2 to 4 acute GVHD rates were lower after transplantation of T-cell–depleted bone marrow grafts (hazard ratio [HR] = 0.55; 95% CI, 0.37 to 0.82; P = .003); the probability of grade 2 to 4 acute GVHD at day 100 was 31% (95% CI, 22% to 40%) after transplantation of T-cell–depleted bone marrow compared with 52% (95% CI, 44% to 59%) after transplantation of non–T-cell–depleted grafts. In the current analysis, none of the factors tested was predictive for chronic GVHD. The 5-year probability of chronic GVHD was 34% (95% CI, 28% to 40%).

## Transplantation-Related Mortality

Transplant-related mortality rates were higher in older patients (age 11 to 18 years) compared with those aged  $\leq$  10 years. The probabilities of early (day 100) and late (5-year) transplantation-related mortality in patients aged  $\leq$  10 years were 14% (95% CI, 9% to 21%) and 19% (95% CI, 12% to 26%), respectively; the corresponding probabilities in older patients were 25% (95% CI, 18% to 32%) and 41% (95% CI, 33% to 50%), respectively.

## Bunin et al

		Disease Status at Transplantation						
Characteristic         No. of Paients         %         No. of Paients         %         No. of Paients           Main see:         14         52         49         54         7           Main See:         10         75         53         54         60         24           Main See:         10         71         11         12         8         8           Sol ON 10% 10         24         17         14         16         1           Main Mayme         24         17         14         16         1           Main Mayme         1         <1         -         -         -           MM         10         7         15         17         3           MM         22         1         3         3         2           MM         22         1         3         3         2           MM         2         1         3         3         3         3		Second Complete Remission $(n = 142)$		First or Second Relapse* (n = 90)		Primary Induction Failure $(n = 36)$		
Mele soc.         74         62         49         54         17           St N 10 <sup>A</sup> , 10 <sup>A</sup> ,         75         51         54         60         24           S N 10 <sup>A</sup> , 10 <sup>A</sup> ,         75         51         54         60         24           S N 10 <sup>A</sup> , 10 <sup>A</sup> ,         17         12         11         12         3           S N 10 <sup>A</sup> , 10 <sup>A</sup> ,         17         14         16         1           FAB stablysis         -         -         -         -         -           M0         1         <1         -         -         -         -           M3         23         16         2         2         -         -           M4         10         7         1         3         3         2         -           M4         23         16         2         2         -	Characteristic	No. of Patients	%	No. of Patients	%	No. of Patients	%	
WRC cont at disposals	Male sex	74	52	49	54	17	42	
Sol 10% tright7533546024> 501-0 x tright7511123> 501-0 x tright771711123IAB subtype7151733IAS subtype7151733IAB subtype10715173IAB subtype222324225MS2324222-MS201333322MS201333322MS2014442Unknown16818233MS2014442Othe subs in CNS75333CNS coffer sites701671610Othe subs in CNS7671610Othe subs in CNS7671010Part in sisk10776710Part in sisk10778667Part in sisk107788010S IA 0107788010S IA 01077186024Part in sisk1213148Part in sisk1213148S IA 0107121414Outh sold1314 </td <td>WBC count at diagnosis</td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td>	WBC count at diagnosis							
<ul> <li>⇒ b-100 × ti<sup>0</sup>/L</li> <li>160 × ti<sup>0</sup>/L</li> <li>17</li> <li>12</li> <li>11</li> <li>12</li> <li>14</li> <li>16</li> <li>1</li> <li>17</li> <li>18</li> <li>18</li> <li>17</li> <li>18</li> <li>18</li> <li>18</li> <li>18</li> <li>19</li> <li>19</li> <li>14</li> <li>16</li> <li>1</li> <li>1</li> <li>15</li> <li>17</li> <li>3</li> <li>16</li> <li>2</li> <li>2</li> <li>23</li> <li>24</li> <li>27</li> <li>5</li> <li>17</li> <li>3</li> <li>18</li> <li>18</li> <li>19</li> <li>14</li> <li>16</li> <li>10</li> <li>11</li> <li>12</li> <li>13</li> <li>24</li> <li>27</li> <li>19</li> <li>14</li> <li>16</li> <li>16</li> <li>17</li> <li>18</li> <li>18</li> <li>19</li> <li>14</li> <li>12</li> <li>14</li> <li14< li=""> <li14< li=""> <li>14</li> <li1< td=""><td><math>\le 50 \times 10^{9}</math>/L</td><td>75</td><td>53</td><td>54</td><td>60</td><td>24</td><td>6</td></li1<></li14<></li14<></ul>	$\le 50 \times 10^{9}$ /L	75	53	54	60	24	6	
> 10 0 × 10%111111FAB subspace	> 50-100 $ imes$ 10 <sup>9</sup> /L	26	18	11	12	3	8	
Unknown241714161M01<1	$> 100 \times 10^{9}$ /L	17	12	11	12	8	22	
FAB sublypicMQ1<1	Unknown	24	17	14	16	1	3	
M0         1         <1         -         -         -           M1         10         7         15         17         3           M2         32         33         24         27         5           M3         23         16         2         2         -           M4         27         19         14         16         8           M5         26         13         33         2         4           M6         2         1         3         3         2           M7         5         4         11         12         4           Unknown         16         17         8         2         31           CNS = other sites         20         14         43         92         31           Crigametics         7         5         3         3         3           Crigametics         7         5         3         3         3           Crigametics         7         6         7         10         10           Ords = other sites         7         6         7         10         10           Add = other sites         7 <td< td=""><td>FAB subtype</td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td></td<>	FAB subtype							
M110715173M2232324275M3231622M3231622M3271916168M52618677M621332M75411124LbRoom161017177Extramedullary disese at diagnosis3233Cycloganetics75333Cycloganetics71671010Cycloganetics71671010Poor risk1076710Poor risk1076710Poor risk1017593017> 10.15191313148> 15.16322323232425Poformine Score719288326> 12 months9635374114Uhroom71928316> 12 months9636374114Uhroom719101010Cyclogoriet = other7101010Cyclogoriet = there10101010Cyclogoriet = there1010 <td< td=""><td>M0</td><td>1</td><td>&lt; 1</td><td>_</td><td>_</td><td>_</td><td>_</td></td<>	M0	1	< 1	_	_	_	_	
M2323232323232343M3271914168M4271914168M52618677M621332M75411124Absent1581839231CN375333CN475333Cycognoticst7575216God risk7766710Unknown292024278Ag et transplation, yearst7513148> lo1o15412928316> lo1o15412928316> lo1o15412928316> lo1o15412928316> lo1o15412928311Unknown54331Unknown71928312Volton of fit complete remission8758336> 12 months9668758336> 12 months91141242Cofficion containing1286798832Containing meine12461222Cofficion co	M1	10	7	15	17	3	8	
MA231622-MA261944168MS26186477MS21332M75411124Ublinown16015177Extramedulary disease at diagnocie75333Chast stas, not CNS753333Coord risk, not CNS753333Coord risk, not CNS72514442Coord risk31221314216Poor risk107671010Poor risk101313148331S550352730175516331S10191313148311	M2	32	23	24	27	5	14	
MA         27         19         14         16         8           MS         26         18         6         7         7           MM         2         1         3         3         2           MM         5         4         11         12         4           Linknown         16         10         15         17         7           Extramedulary disease at diagnosis         3         3         3         3           CNS = other sites         20         14         4         4         2           CNS = other sites         20         14         4         4         2           Cheer sites, nCLNS         7         5         3         3         3           Cheer sites, nCLNS         7         5         147         52         16           Application, vearsites         20         24         27         8         3           Application, vearsites         50         35         27         30         17           Application, vearsites         52         23         22         23         22         24         3         1           Dictown         5         4 <td>M3</td> <td>23</td> <td>16</td> <td>2</td> <td>2</td> <td>_</td> <td>_</td>	M3	23	16	2	2	_	_	
M6         26         18         6         7         7           M6         2         1         3         3         2           M7         5         4         11         12         4           Unknown         18         10         15         17         7           Extrameduliny disease at diagnosis          3         3         3           CNS = other sites         20         14         4         4         2           Other sites, not CNS         7         5         3         3         3           Cytogenetics         7         5         3         3         3           Cytogenetics         7         6         7         10         10         7         6         7         10           Por risk         10         7         6         7         3         3         14         2           Age at transplantation, years <sup>±</sup> 5         5         50         3         3         11         10         2         2         24         5           90 10         10         7         13         3         14         3         1	M4	27	19	14	16	8	22	
Min         2         1         3         3         2           Min         5         4         11         12         4           Linnown         16         10         15         17         7           Externedlary disease at diagnosis         3         92         31         4         20           CNS is other sites         20         14         4         4         2           Other sites, not CNS         7         7         5         3         3           Cycoganeticst	M5	26	18	6	7	7	19	
M75411124Likrown161016177Extramedullary disease at diagnosisAbsent11561839231CNS ± other sites, on CNS75333Cytogenetics75333Cytogenetics75333Cytogenetics75213142Farmer with sites, in CNS776710Poor risk1076710Poor risk1076710Outhnown292024278Age at transplantation, years²7314655101313146> 10719283116> 10719283111Unknown5422283111078331110783311107833111079883231107944499220107831107833110794449920107 <t< td=""><td>M6</td><td>2</td><td>1</td><td>3</td><td>3</td><td>2</td><td>6</td></t<>	M6	2	1	3	3	2	6	
Unknown         16         10         15         17         7           Extramedulary disease at diagnosis	M7	5	4	11	12	4	1.	
Extramedulary disease at diagnosis         No.         No.         No.           Absent         115         81         83         92         31           CNS ± other sites         20         14         4         4         2           Other sites, not CNS         7         5         3         3         3           Cytogenetics         -         -         -         -         -           God risk         31         22         13         14         2         -           Intermediate risk         72         51         17         52         16           Poor risk         10         7         6         7         10           Unknown         29         20         24         27         8           A et at ransploration, years <sup>1</sup> -         -         -         10         -           S 10         19         13         13         14         8         -           > 10.15         41         29         28         31         6           > 10.5         41         29         28         31         -           Unknown         5         4         3         3 <td>Unknown</td> <td>16</td> <td>10</td> <td>15</td> <td>17</td> <td>7</td> <td>19</td>	Unknown	16	10	15	17	7	19	
Absent         115         81         83         92         31           CNS         20         14         4         4         2           Chter sites, ot CNS         7         5         3         3           Cytogenetics *         -         -         -         -           God risk         31         22         51         47         52         16           Poor risk         10         7         6         7         10         -           Juknown         29         20         24         27         8           Age at transplantation, years #         -         -         -         10         -           > 5 -10         19         13         13         14         8           > 10.15         41         29         28         31         6           > 15.18         32         23         22         24         6           90-100         10         10         75         83         36           -10 Inknown         -         -         1         -         -           90-100         110         29         86         79         88         32	Extramedullary disease at diagnosis	10	10		.,	,		
CNS ± other sites         CO         CO         CO         CO         CO         CO           CMS ± other sites, not CMS         7         5         3         3         3           Choor sites, not CMS         7         5         3         3         3           Cytogenetics +         -         -         -         6         7         10           Unknown         29         20         24         27         8           Age at transplantation, yearst         -         -         7         6         7         10           Unknown         29         22         24         27         8         -         -           Age at transplantation, yearst         -         -         13         14         8         -         -         -         16         - <t< td=""><td>Absent</td><td>115</td><td>81</td><td>83</td><td>92</td><td>31</td><td>86</td></t<>	Absent	115	81	83	92	31	86	
Drue sites         Drie         Na	$CNS \pm other sites$	20	14	05	52	2	6	
Outer sites, indicites         i           Intermediate risk         3	Other sites not CNS	20	5		4	2		
Cyrolgenerics         Cyrolgen	Outer sites, not CN3	1	5	3	5	3	C	
decide insk         31         22         13         14         2           Poor risk         10         7         6         7         10           Poor risk         10         7         6         7         10           Age at transplantation, years‡         -         -         -         10           \$ 51         50         35         27         30         17           > 5-10         19         13         13         14         8           > 10-15         41         29         28         31         6           > 1518         32         23         22         24         5           Performance score         -         -         -         -         -           90.100         110         77         59         66         24           (s0         27         19         28         31         11           Unknown         5         4         3         3         6           > 12 months         46         32         28         31         -           Unknown         -         -         1         1         -           Condition containing		21	20	10	1.4	2	,	
Intermediate risk         1/2         51         4/7         52         10           Poor risk         10         7         6         7         10           Unknown         29         20         24         27         8           Age at transplantation, years ‡         -         -         8         -         8           ≤ 5         50         35         27         30         17           > 5-10         19         13         13         14         8           > 10-15         41         29         28         31         6           > 15-18         32         22         24         5           Performance score         -         -         7         5         66         24           < 90	GOOD TISK	31	22	13	14	2	t d	
Profinsk         10         7         6         7         10           Unknown         29         20         24         27         8           Age at transplantation, years‡         - <td< td=""><td>Intermediate risk</td><td>12</td><td>51</td><td>47</td><td>52</td><td>16</td><td>44</td></td<>	Intermediate risk	12	51	47	52	16	44	
Unknown         29         20         24         27         8           Age at tansplantation, years! $\leq$ $27$ $30$ $17$ $\leq$ 5 $50$ $35$ $27$ $30$ $17$ $>$ 5-10 $19$ $13$ $14$ $8$ > 10-15 $41$ $29$ $28$ $31$ $6$ > 15-18 $32$ $23$ $22$ $24$ $5$ Performance score $=$ $=$ $=$ $=$ $=$ 90-100 $110$ $77$ $59$ $66$ $24$ $< 90$ $27$ $19$ $28$ $31$ $11$ Duration of first complete remission $=$ $=$ $=$ $=$ $=$ $10$ $75$ $83$ $36$ $>$ $27$ $13$ $41$ $=$ $0$ $6$ $32$ $28$ $31$ $=$ $0$ $05$ $35$ $37$ $41$	Poor risk	10	7	6	/	10	28	
Age at transplantation, years 1 $= 5$ 5035273017> 5-10191313148> 10-15412928316> 15-18322322245Performance score $$	Unknown	29	20	24	27	8	-22	
= 5         50         35         27         30         17           > 5-10         19         13         13         14         8           > 10-15         41         29         28         31         6           > 15-18         32         23         22         24         5           Performance score	Age at transplantation, years‡							
> 5-10       19       13       13       14       8         > 10-15       41       29       28       31       6         > 15-18       32       23       22       24       5         Performance score	≤ b	50	35	27	30	17	4.	
> 10-15         41         29         28         31         6           >> 15-18         32         23         22         24         5           Performance score	> 5-10	19	13	13	14	8	22	
> 15-18322322245Performance score90-10011077596624< 90	> 10-15	41	29	28	31	6	17	
Performance score         90-100         110         77         59         66         24           90-100         27         19         28         31         11           Unknown         5         4         3         3         1           Duration of first complete remission         5         4         3         3         1           State constrained of the c	> 15-18	32	23	22	24	5	14	
90-100         110         77         59         66         24           < 90	Performance score							
< 90         27         19         28         31         11           Unknown         5         4         3         3         1           Duration of first complete remission         ≤         12         months         96         68         75         83         36           > 12 months         46         32         28         31         —           Unknown         —         —         1         1         —           Conditioning regimen         —         —         1         1         —           Irradiation containing         123         86         79         88         32           Onthining regimen         —         —         —         1         14         12         4           GVHD prophylaxis         —         —         —         —         —         —         —           T-cell depletion         50         35         37         41         14         4           Cyclosporine ± other         6         4         2         2         2         2           Tacrolinus ± other         14         10         7         8         1	90-100	110	77	59	66	24	6	
Unknown         5         4         3         3         1           Duration of first complete remission         5         2         83         36           > 12 months         96         68         75         83         36           > 12 months         46         32         28         31            Unknown         -         -         1         1            Conditioning regimen         -         -         1         1            Irradiation containing         123         86         79         88         32           Non-irradiation containing         19         14         11         12         4           GVHD prophylaxis         -         -         -         -         -           T-cell depletion         50         35         37         41         14           Cyclosporine ± other         6         4         2         2         2           Tacrolimus ± other         14         10         7         8         1           Methotrexate ± other         2         1          -         -           Donor-recipient sex match         -         1	< 90	27	19	28	31	11	31	
Duration of first complete remission         ≤ 12 months       96       68       75       83       36         > 12 months       46       32       28       31          Unknown       -       -       1       1          Conditioning regimen       -       -       1       1          Irradiation containing       19       14       11       12       4         GVHD prophylaxis       -       -       -       -       -       -         T-cell depletion       50       35       37       41       14         Cyclosporine ± other       6       4       2       2       2         Tacrolinus ± other       14       10       7       8       1         Methotrexate ± other       2       1        -       -         Donor-recipient sex match       -       -       -       -       -         Male to male       34       24       16       18       12         Female to female       34       24       25       28       7         Donor regitive/recipient negative       54       38       37       41       <	Unknown	5	4	3	3	1	3	
≤ 12 months         96         68         75         83         36           > 12 months         46         32         28         31            Unknown         -         -         1         1            Conditioning regimen         -         1         1             Irradiation containing         123         86         79         88         32           Nonirradiation containing         19         14         11         12         4           GVHD prophylaxis         -         -         -         -         -           T-cell depletion         50         35         37         41         14           Cyclosporine + methotrexate         70         49         44         49         19           Cyclosporine ± other         6         4         2         2         2           Tacrolinus ± other         14         10         7         8         1           Meto traue ± other         2         1         -         -         -           Donor-recipient sex match         -         -         1         1         1           Female to male         34	Duration of first complete remission							
> 12 months         46         32         28         31            Unknown         -         -         1         1            Conditioning regimen         -         -         1         1            Irradiation containing         123         86         79         88         32           Non-irradiation containing         19         14         11         12         4           GVHD prophylaxis         -         -         -         -         -           T-cell depletion         50         35         37         41         14           Cyclosporine + methotrexate         70         49         44         49         19           Cyclosporine ± other         6         4         2         2         2         2           Tacrolimus ± other         14         10         7         8         1         1           Methotrexate ± other         2         1          -         -         -           Donor-recipient sex match         -         -         -         -         -         -           Male to female         34         24         16         18	$\leq$ 12 months	96	68	75	83	36	100	
Unknown          1         1            Conditioning regimen         Irradiation containing         123         86         79         88         32           Non-irradiation containing         19         14         11         12         4           GVHD prophylaxis                T-cell depletion         50         35         37         41         14           Cyclosporine + methotrexate         70         49         44         49         19           Cyclosporine + other         6         4         2         2         2           Tacrolimus ± other         14         10         7         8         1           Methotrexate ± other         2         1             Donor-recipient sex match         -              Male to female         34         24         16         18         12           Female to male         34         24         25         28         7           Donor-recipient CMV serostatus          Donor-recipient CMV serostive/recipient negative <td>&gt; 12 months</td> <td>46</td> <td>32</td> <td>28</td> <td>31</td> <td>—</td> <td>_</td>	> 12 months	46	32	28	31	—	_	
Conditioning regimen         Irradiation containing         123         86         79         88         32           Non-irradiation containing         19         14         11         12         4           GVHD prophylaxis	Unknown	_	—	1	1	—	_	
Iradiation containing         123         86         79         88         32           Non-irradiation containing         19         14         11         12         4           GVHD prophylaxis	Conditioning regimen							
Non-irradiation containing         19         14         11         12         4           GVHD prophylaxis         T-cell depletion         50         35         37         41         14           Cyclosporine + methotrexate         70         49         44         49         19           Cyclosporine ± other         6         4         2         2         2           Tacrolimus ± other         14         10         7         8         1           Methotrexate ± other         2         1             Donor-recipient sex match         7         33         31         34         10           Male to male         47         33         31         34         10           Male to female         34         24         16         18         12           Female to male         34         24         25         28         7           Donor-recipient CMV serostatus         5         18         16         18         5           Donor positive/recipient negative         5         18         16         18         5           Donor positive/recipient positive         29         20         18         20	Irradiation containing	123	86	79	88	32	89	
GVHD prophylaxis           T-cell depletion         50         35         37         41         14           Cyclosporine + methotrexate         70         49         44         49         19           Cyclosporine ± other         6         4         2         2         2           Tacrolimus ± other         14         10         7         8         1           Methotrexate ± other         2         1             Donor-recipient sex match         7         33         31         34         10           Male to male         47         33         31         34         10           Male to female         34         24         16         18         12           Female to male         34         24         25         28         7           Donor-recipient CMV serostatus         7         19         18         20         7           Donor positive/recipient negative         54         38         37         41         16           Donor positive/recipient negative         25         18         16         18         5           Donor positive/recipient positive         29         20         18	Non-irradiation containing	19	14	11	12	4	11	
T-cell depletion5035374114Cyclosporine + methotrexate7049444919Cyclosporine $\pm$ other64222Tacrolimus $\pm$ other1410781Methotrexate $\pm$ other21Donor-recipient sex match733313410Male to male4733313410Male to female3424161812Female to male271918207Female to female2628722Donor-recipient CMV serostatus5438374116Donor negative/recipient negative543837415Donor negative/recipient negative251816185Donor positive/recipient positive292018206Donor positive/recipient positive312215178Unknown32441	GVHD prophylaxis							
Cyclosporine + methotrexate       70       49       44       49       19         Cyclosporine $\pm$ other       6       4       2       2       2         Tacrolimus $\pm$ other       14       10       7       8       1         Methotrexate $\pm$ other       2       1            Donor-recipient sex match       7       33       31       34       10         Male to male       47       33       31       34       10         Male to female       27       19       18       20       7         Female to male       27       19       18       20       7         Ponor-recipient CMV serostatus       2       25       28       7         Donor negative/recipient negative       54       38       37       41       16         Donor negative/recipient negative       25       18       16       18       5         Donor negative/recipient positive       29       20       18       20       6         Donor positive/recipient positive       31       22       15       17       8         Unknown       3       2       4       4       1 <td< td=""><td>T-cell depletion</td><td>50</td><td>35</td><td>37</td><td>41</td><td>14</td><td>39</td></td<>	T-cell depletion	50	35	37	41	14	39	
Cyclosporine $\pm$ other         6         4         2         2         2           Tacrolimus $\pm$ other         14         10         7         8         1           Methotrexate $\pm$ other         2         1              Donor-recipient sex match         7         33         31         34         10           Male to male         47         33         31         34         10           Male to female         34         24         16         18         12           Female to male         27         19         18         20         7           Female to female         34         24         25         28         7           Donor-recipient CMV serostatus         34         24         25         28         7           Donor negative/recipient negative         54         38         37         41         16           Donor positive/recipient negative         25         18         16         18         5           Donor negative/recipient positive         29         20         18         20         6           Donor positive/recipient positive         31         22         15         17	Cyclosporine + methotrexate	70	49	44	49	19	53	
Tacrolimus $\pm$ other1410781Methotrexate $\pm$ other21Donor-recipient sex matchMale to male4733313410Male to female3424161812Female to male271918207Female to female342425287Donor-recipient CMV serostatus738374116Donor negative/recipient negative5438374116Donor negative/recipient negative251816185Donor negative/recipient positive292018206Donor positive/recipient positive3122441	Cyclosporine ± other	6	4	2	2	2	6	
Methotrexate $\pm$ other       2       1            Donor-recipient sex match       Male to male       47       33       31       34       10         Male to male       47       33       31       34       10         Male to female       34       24       16       18       12         Female to male       27       19       18       20       7         Female to female       34       24       25       28       7         Donor-recipient CMV serostatus	Tacrolimus ± other	14	10	7	8	1	3	
Donor-recipient sex match           Male to male         47         33         31         34         10           Male to female         34         24         16         18         12           Female to male         27         19         18         20         7           Female to female         34         24         25         28         7           Donor-recipient CMV serostatus         34         24         25         28         7           Donor negative/recipient negative         54         38         37         41         16           Donor negative/recipient negative         25         18         16         18         5           Donor negative/recipient positive         29         20         18         20         6           Donor positive/recipient positive         31         22         15         17         8           Unknown         3         2         4         4         1	Methotrexate ± other	2	1	_	_	_	_	
Male to male         47         33         31         34         10           Male to female         34         24         16         18         12           Female to male         27         19         18         20         7           Female to female         34         24         25         28         7           Donor-recipient CMV serostatus         34         24         25         28         7           Donor negative/recipient negative         54         38         37         41         16           Donor positive/recipient negative         25         18         16         18         5           Donor negative/recipient positive         29         20         18         20         6           Donor positive/recipient positive         31         22         15         17         8           Unknown         3         2         4         4         1	Donor-recipient sex match							
Male to female         34         24         16         18         12           Female to male         27         19         18         20         7           Female to female         34         24         25         28         7           Donor-recipient CMV serostatus         54         38         37         41         16           Donor negative/recipient negative         25         18         16         18         5           Donor negative/recipient positive         29         20         18         20         6           Donor positive/recipient positive         31         22         15         17         8           Unknown         3         2         4         4         1	Male to male	47	33	31	34	10	28	
Female to male         27         19         18         20         7           Female to female         34         24         25         28         7           Donor-recipient CMV serostatus         54         38         37         41         16           Donor negative/recipient negative         25         18         16         18         5           Donor negative/recipient positive         29         20         18         20         6           Donor positive/recipient positive         31         22         15         17         8           Unknown         3         2         4         4         1	Male to female	34	24	16	18	12	33	
Female to female342425287Donor-recipient CMV serostatusDonor negative/recipient negative5438374116Donor positive/recipient negative251816185Donor negative/recipient positive292018206Donor positive/recipient positive312215178Unknown32441	Female to male	27	19	18	20	7	19	
Donor-recipient CMV serostatus5438374116Donor negative/recipient negative251816185Donor negative/recipient positive292018206Donor positive/recipient positive312215178Unknown32441	Female to female	34	24	25	28	7	19	
Donor negative/recipient negative         54         38         37         41         16           Donor positive/recipient negative         25         18         16         18         5           Donor negative/recipient positive         29         20         18         20         6           Donor positive/recipient positive         31         22         15         17         8           Unknown         3         2         4         4         1	Donor-recipient CMV serostatus							
Donor positive/recipient negative251816185Donor negative/recipient positive292018206Donor positive/recipient positive312215178Unknown32441	Donor negative/recipient negative	54	38	37	41	16	44	
Donor negative/recipient positive292018206Donor positive/recipient positive312215178Unknown32441	Donor positive/recipient negative	25	18	16	18	5	12	
Donor positive/recipient positive202010200Unknown32441	Donor negative/recipient positive	29	20	18	20	6	1-	
Unknown 3 2 4 4 1	Donor positive/recipient positive	31	20	15	17	Ř	2	
		31 2	22	л	і / Л	1	24	
(continued on following page)	GIRIOWI	5	continued on falls		4	I		

		Disease Status at Transplantation							
Characteristic	Second Complete Remission $(n = 142)$		First or Second Relapse* $(n = 90)$		Primary Induction Failure (n = 36)				
	No. of Patients	%	No. of Patients	%	No. of Patients	%			
Donor age, years									
18-30	42	30	22	24	9	25			
31-40	58	41	35	39	11	31			
41-50	35	25	26	29	12	33			
51-60	7	5	7	8	4	11			
Donor-recipient HLA disparity									
Matched§	42	30	22	24	13	36			
One locus mismatched	61	43	43	48	12	33			
> One locus mismatched¶	39	27	25	28	11	31			

Abbreviations: FAB, French-American-British; GVHD, graft-versus-host disease; CMV, cytomegalovirus.

\*Sixty-six patients were in first relapse, 24 patients were in second relapse, and three patients were aplastic at transplantation.

†Cytogenetic classification (Medical Research Council of the United Kingdom) was as follows: good risk: inv16/t(16;16)/del(16q), t(15;17), t(8;21)  $\pm$  secondary abnormalities; intermediate risk: normal, 11q23 abn, +8, del(9q), del(7q), +21, +22, all others; and poor risk: del(5q)/-5,-7, abn(3q), t(9;22), t(6;9), complex karyotypes (≥ five unrelated abnormalities).

 $\pm$ Nine patients were  $\leq$  1 year old at transplantation.

\$Matched: 66 patients were matched at HLA-A, HLA-B, HLA-C, and DRB1 (allele level); three were matched at HLA-A, HLA-B, and DRB1 (allele level) and HLA-C (low resolution); seven were matched at HLA-A, HLA-B, HLA-C (low resolution), and DRB1; and one was matched at HLA-A, HLA-B, and DRB1 (allele level, HLA-C typing not known).

One locus mismatched: 48 patients were mismatched at one locus considering allele-level typing at HLA-A, HLA-B, HLA-C, and DRB1; 13 were mismatched at one locus considering low-resolution typing at HLA-A, HLA-B, and HLA-C and matched at DRB1; 55 were matched (low resolution) at HLA-A and HLA-B and mismatched at one locus at DRB1, with data on HLA-C not known.

¶> One locus mismatched: 46 patients were mismatched at more than one locus considering allele-level typing at HLA-A, HLA-B, HLA-C, and DRB1; 25 were mismatched at one locus considering HLA-A, HLA-B, and DRB1, with HLA-C not known; four were mismatched at one locus considering low-resolution typing at HLA-A, HLA-B, and DRB1, with HLA-C not known.

## Relapse

Relapse rates were higher in patients who underwent transplantation in first or second relapse and at primary induction failure compared with patients who underwent transplantation in second complete remission, stratified for cytogenetic risk (Table 2). Rates were similar when transplantation was performed at relapse or primary induction failure (HR = 1.33; 95% CI, 0.73 to 2.40; P = .355). The 5-year probabilities of leukemia recurrence were 22% (95% CI, 15% to 29%), 57% (95% CI, 46% to 67%), and 51% (95% CI, 34% to 66%) for patients who underwent transplantation in second complete remission, relapse, and primary induction failure, respectively (Fig 1). The duration of first complete remission was not associated with

Table 2. Multivariate Analysis of Transplantation Outcome: Treatment-Related Mortality, Leukemia Relapse, Treatment Failure (relapse or death, inverse of           leukemia-free survival), and Overall Mortality Stratified by Cytogenetic Risk Group						
Outcome and Disease Status at Transplantation	No. of Patients	Total No. of Patients Assessable	Hazard Ratio	95% CI	P	
Transplantation-related mortality						
$\leq$ 10 years old at transplantation	24	134	1.00			
> 10-18 years old at transplantation	55	134	2.20	1.35 to 3.60	.002	
Relapse						
Second complete remission	29	142	1.00		< .001*	
Primary induction failure	18	36	4.33	2.28 to 8.19	< .0001	
First or subsequent relapse	51	90	3.41	2.15 to 5.40	< .0001	
Treatment failure						
Second complete remission	75	142	1.00		< .001*	
Primary induction failure	31	36	2.59	1.64 to 4.09	< .001	
First or subsequent relapse	71	90	1.77	1.27 to 2.45	.001	
Overall mortality						
Second complete remission	72	142	1.00		.004*	
Primary induction failure	29	36	2.10	1.32 to 3.34	.002	
First or subsequent relapse	62	90	1.46	1.03 to 2.06	.032	

NOTE. The variable for cytogenetic risk group was nonproportional in the model for overall mortality; therefore, multivariate models for treatment-related mortality, relapse, treatment failure, and overall mortality were stratified by cytogenetic risk group. The following categories were collapsed because there were no differences between groups: disease status at transplantation: first relapse and second relapse; and age at transplantation:  $\leq 5$  and > 5-10 years and > 10-15 and > 15-18 years. \*Two *df* test.



Fig 1. The 5-year probabilities of leukemia relapse after unrelated donor bone marrow transplantation by disease status at transplantation. PIF, primary induction failure; CR, complete remission.

leukemia recurrence after transplantation (HR = 1.61; 95% CI, 0.91 to 2.86; P = .106). In the current study, we observed similar rates of relapse in patients with and without acute and chronic GVHD (data not shown).

### Leukemia-Free Survival

Treatment failure rates (relapse or death; inverse of leukemia-free survival) were higher in patients who underwent transplantation in first or second relapse and primary induction failure, stratified for cytogenetic risk (Table 2). Failure rates were similar when transplantation was performed in primary induction failure and in relapse (HR = 1.56; 95% CI, 0.98 to 2.48; P = .059). Treatment failure rates were not associated with duration of first complete remission (HR = 1.43; 95% CI, 0.95 to 2.13; P = .084). The 5-year probabilities of leukemia-free survival were 45% (95% CI, 37% to 54%), 20% (95% CI, 13% to 30%), and 12% (95% CI, 3% to 26%) for patients who underwent transplantation in second clinical remission, relapse, and primary induction failure, respectively.

## **Overall Survival**

One hundred sixty-three patients died; overall mortality rates were higher in patients who underwent transplantation in primary induction failure compared with patients who underwent transplantation in second complete remission, stratified for cytogenetic risk (Table 2). The 5-year probabilities of overall survival were 47% (95% CI, 38% to 55%), 28% (95% CI, 19% to 38%), and 17% (95% CI, 7% to 32%) for patients who underwent transplantation in second complete remission, relapse, and primary induction failure, respectively (Fig 2). Mortality rates were similar in patients who underwent transplantation in primary induction failure compared with patients in relapse (HR = 1.48; 95% CI, 0.91 to 2.39; P = .111). Recurrent leukemia was the cause of death in 85 of 163 patients who died. Other causes of mortality included GVHD (n = 18), infection (n = 30), adult respiratory distress syndrome or interstitial pneumonitis (n = 9), hemorrhage (n = 8), organ failure (n = 11), and graft failure (n = 2).



Fig 2. The 5-year probabilities of overall survival after unrelated donor bone marrow transplantation by disease status at transplantation. PIF, primary induction failure; CR, complete remission.

#### DISCUSSION

Sibling donor transplantation in first remission has been used for many years as a primary approach to treatment of AML, with survival rates of 60% to 70% reported from many centers and cooperative groups.<sup>2,3,5,6</sup> Improvements in risk stratification on the basis of genetic abnormalities in leukemic blasts and more effective chemotherapy protocols now allow the identification of subgroups of children with AML for whom transplantation is deemed unnecessary in first remission because cure with chemotherapy is equally likely.<sup>2</sup> In parallel with interest in limiting use of transplantation in children with a good prognosis, there is increased interest in investigating whether unrelated donor transplantation can improve outcomes for children with particularly poor prognoses, such as those with primary induction failure and those who relapse after a first remission.<sup>11,19,20</sup> In this study, we have explored outcomes in a large group of children receiving unrelated donor transplantations facilitated by the NMDP in the United States to determine how successful this therapy is in rescuing children for whom chemotherapy has been ineffective and to identify risk factors that predict a good outcome after transplantation.

The majority of children included in this study underwent transplantation in second remission. Overall, outcomes were encouraging, with almost half of the children receiving transplantation in second complete remission surviving 5 years later and significant numbers of survivors among the children with refractory disease receiving transplantation. In the current report, the only risk factor that predicted relapse, overall survival, and leukemia-free survival was disease status at the time of transplantation, with children who underwent transplantation in second complete remission having superior outcomes to children who underwent transplantation in relapse or with primary refractory disease. Despite this, 28% of children who underwent transplantation in relapse and 17% of children who underwent transplantation with primary induction failure were alive 5 years after transplantation, suggesting that transplantation can cure at least some children with the most resistant disease. It is perhaps surprising that length of first complete remission did not predict outcome in our study. This may be a reflection of the demographics of the patients, the majority of whom had experienced relapse early, with first complete remission of less than 12 months, limiting statistical power to look at this risk factor.

Children receiving transplantation in remission clearly had a superior outcome to those who underwent transplantation in relapse. It is commonly debated whether it is preferable to perform transplantation in children identified in early relapse immediately or to pursue reinduction chemotherapy and attempt to achieve a second remission before performing transplantation. Although our data show better disease control in children who underwent transplantation in remission, these patients had chemotherapysensitive disease and would, therefore, be expected to have better outcomes. Importantly, 76% of the patients who underwent transplantation in relapse had received chemotherapy but did not achieve remission; however, these patients had a 5-year probability of overall survival of 28%. This result suggests that transplantation is worthwhile in this group of particularly difficult patients. Our data are unable to definitively answer the question of the efficacy of immediate transplantation without an attempt at reinduction because there were only 22 such patients in this study. However, the 5-year leukemia-free survival rate was 25% in this group, which is similar to the rate in the group for whom reinduction was attempted. Most of the 22 patients reported good performance scores (90 to 100) despite a high tumor burden; nine patients had peripheral blasts, 10 patients had marrow blast counts of more than 10%, and three patients had marrow blast counts of 5% to 10%. We did not observe differences in leukemia-free survival rates after transplantation for patients in first relapse and second relapse, but there were only 24 patients in the latter group, and our inability to observe differences may be explained by the relatively small number of patients (5-year leukemia-free survival rates of 19% and 22%, respectively).

The importance of adverse cytogenetics was challenging to assess in this group. Our analysis failed to show a significant effect of intermediate- or poor-risk cytogenetics on leukemia recurrence, leukemia-free survival, or overall survival. This may be explained by the fact that patients with recurrent leukemia have high-risk disease, and consequently, the relevance of cytogenetics is limited by the relatively small sample size of approximately 260 patients. Data on cytogenetics were not available for approximately 23% of patients, which is a limitation that occurs when using data reported to an observational database and when transplantations are performed over a 10-year period because cytogenetic testing was not routinely performed during the early years. We adjusted for this limitation by stratifying all analysis of risk factors for transplantation outcome by cytogenetic risk group given the prognostic importance of cytogenetics for this disease.

Almost one third of grafts in this study were T-cell depleted. Although T-cell depletion reduced acute GVHD rates, treatmentrelated mortality was unchanged, as were leukemia-free and overall survival and relapse, indicating a neutral effect of T-cell depletion on overall outcome. As reported by others, we did not observe lower

## REFERENCES

1. Creutzig U, Zimmermann M, Ritter J, et al: Treatment strategies and long-term results in paediatric patients treated in four consecutive AML-BFM trials. Leukemia 19:2030-2042, 2005 chronic GVHD rates after T-cell–depleted transplantations.<sup>21</sup> Age and WBC count at diagnosis were not associated with transplantation outcome after a first relapse. This is similar to observations by Webb et al<sup>11</sup> on outcome for children with relapsed AML after treatment on the Medical Research Council AML 10 trial at diagnosis. We did not observe a graft-versus-leukemia effect in our cohort. This may be explained by the inclusion of patients who received T-cell–depleted grafts (38% of patients) and patients with high tumor burden (47% of patients underwent transplantation in relapse or primary induction failure).

This study represents the largest series of children receiving unrelated donor bone marrow transplantation for AML currently in the literature. The strengths of the study are its large size and high-quality audited data. The limitations of the study are its retrospective nature, the heterogeneity inevitable in registry studies describing aggregate outcomes of transplantations performed at multiple centers, and our inability to compare transplantation outcomes to those after chemotherapy alone in a similar group of patients. We did not observe a significant correlation between year of transplantation, HLA mismatch, and survival, and this may be explained by the relatively few patients who received allele-matched bone marrow grafts in this report. Larger studies in unrelated donor bone marrow transplantation clearly demonstrate the negative effect of HLA mismatch on survival, and matching between donor and recipient using allele-level typing at HLA-A, HLA-B, HLA-C, and DRB1 represents the current standard of care.<sup>22</sup> Despite these limitations, these data indicate that unrelated donor bone marrow transplantation is an effective therapy for a significant proportion of children with recurrent or refractory AML who are unlikely to be cured with chemotherapy alone.

## AUTHORS' DISCLOSURES OF POTENTIAL CONFLICTS OF INTEREST

The author(s) indicated no potential conflicts of interest.

## **AUTHOR CONTRIBUTIONS**

**Conception and design:** Nancy J. Bunin, Stella M. Davies, Richard Aplenc, Bruce M. Camitta, Kenneth B. DeSantes, Rakesh K. Goyal, Neena Kapoor, Nancy A. Kernan, Joseph Rosenthal, Franklin O. Smith, Mary Eapen

Collection and assembly of data: Mary Eapen

**Data analysis and interpretation:** Nancy J. Bunin, Stella M. Davies, Richard Aplenc, Bruce M. Camitta, Kenneth B. DeSantes, Rakesh K. Goyal, Neena Kapoor, Nancy A. Kernan, Joseph Rosenthal, Franklin O. Smith, Mary Eapen

Manuscript writing: Nancy J. Bunin, Stella M. Davies, Bruce M. Camitta, Franklin O. Smith, Mary Eapen

**Final approval of manuscript:** Nancy J. Bunin, Stella M. Davies, Richard Aplenc, Bruce M. Camitta, Kenneth B. DeSantes, Rakesh K. Goyal, Neena Kapoor, Nancy A. Kernan, Joseph Rosenthal, Franklin O. Smith, Mary Eapen

2. Gibson BE, Wheatley K, Hann IM, et al: Treatment strategy and long-term results in paediatric patients treated in consecutive UK AML trials. Leukemia 19:2130-2138, 2005

3. Ravindranath Y, Chang M, Steuber CP, et al: Pediatric Oncology Group (POG) studies of acute myeloid leukemia (AML): A review of four consecutive childhood AML trials conducted between 1981 and 2000. Leukemia 19:2101-2116, 2005

**4.** Ribeiro RC, Razzouk BI, Pounds S, et al: Successive clinical trials for childhood acute myeloid leukemia at St Jude Children's Research Hospital, from 1980 to 2000. Leukemia 19:2125-2129, 2005

#### Bunin et al

5. Smith FO, Alonzo TA, Gerbing RB, et al: Longterm results of children with acute myeloid leukemia: A report of three consecutive phase III trials by the Children's Cancer Group: CCG 251, CCG 213 and CCG 2891. Leukemia 19:2054-2062, 2005

6. Woods WG, Neudorf S, Gold S, et al: A comparison of allogeneic bone marrow transplantation, autologous bone marrow transplantation, and aggressive chemotherapy in children with acute myeloid leukemia in remission. Blood 97:56-62, 2001

 Aladjidi N, Auvrignon A, Leblanc T, et al: Outcome in children with relapsed acute myeloid leukemia after initial treatment with the French Leucemie Aique Myeloide Enfant (LAME) 89/91 protocol of the French Society of Pediatric Hematology and Immunology. J Clin Oncol 21:4377-4385, 2003

8. Johnston DL, Alonzo TA, Gerbing RB, et al: Risk factors and therapy for isolated central nervous system relapse of pediatric acute myeloid leukemia. J Clin Oncol 23:9172-9178, 2005

9. Rubnitz JE, Razzouk BI, Lensing S, et al: Prognostic factors and outcome of recurrence in childhood acute myeloid leukemia. Cancer 109:157-163, 2007

**10.** Stahnke K, Boos J, Bender-Gotze C, et al: Duration of first remission predicts remission rates and long-term survival in children with relapsed acute myelogenous leukemia. Leukemia 12:1534-1538, 1998 11. Webb DK, Wheatley K, Harrison G, et al: Outcome for children with relapsed acute myeloid leukaemia following initial therapy in the Medical Research Council (MRC) AML 10 trial: MRC Childhood Leukaemia Working Party. Leukemia 13:25-31, 1999

**12.** Wells RJ, Adams MT, Alonzo TA, et al: Mitoxantrone and cytarabine induction, high-dose cytarabine, and etoposide intensification for pediatric patients with relapsed or refractory acute myeloid leukemia: Children's Cancer Group Study 2951. J Clin Oncol 21:2940-2947, 2003

**13.** Farag SS, Bacigalupo A, Eapen M, et al: The effect of KIR ligand incompatibility on the outcome of unrelated donor transplantation: A report from the Center for International Blood and Marrow Transplant Research, the European Blood and Marrow Transplant Registry, and the Dutch Registry. Biol Blood Marrow Transplant 12:876-884, 2006

14. Przepiorka D, Weisdorf D, Martin P, et al: 1994 Consensus Conference on Acute GVHD Grading. Bone Marrow Transplant 15:825-828, 1995

**15.** Flowers ME, Kansu E, Sullivan KM: Pathophysiology and treatment of graft-versus-host disease. Hematol Oncol Clin North Am 13:1091-1112, 1999

**16.** Klein JP, Moeschberger ML: Survival Analysis: Techniques of Censored and Truncated Data (ed 2). New York, NY, Springer-Verlag, 2003

**17.** Cox DR: Regression models and life tables. J R Stat Soc B 34:187-200, 1972

**18.** 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 18:1489-1500, 1999

**19.** Eapen M, Rubinstein P, Zhang MJ, et al: Outcomes of transplantation of unrelated donor umbilical cord blood and bone marrow in children with acute leukaemia: A comparison study. Lancet 369:1947-1954, 2007

**20.** Locatelli F, Labopin M, Ortega J, et al: Factors influencing outcome and incidence of long-term complications in children who underwent autologous stem cell transplantation for acute myeloid leukemia in first complete remission. Blood 101: 1611-1619, 2003

**21.** Wagner JE, Thompson JS, Carter SL, et al: Effect of graft-versus-host disease prophylaxis on 3-year disease-free survival in recipients of unrelated donor bone marrow (T-Cell Depletion Trial): A multi-centre, randomised phase II-III trial. Lancet 366:733-741, 2005

**22.** Lee SJ, Klein J, Haagenson M, et al: Highresolution donor-recipient HLA matching contributes to the success of unrelated donor marrow transplantation. Blood 110:4576-4583, 2007

# Acknowledgment

The Acknowledgment is included in the full-text version of this article, available online at www.jco.org. It is not included in the PDF version (via Adobe® Reader®).