

**Outcome of Childhood Hematologic
Malignancies in Ain Shams University
Hospital: A Ten-Year Retrospective Study**

Thesis

*Submitted for the Partial Fulfillment of Master Degree in
Pediatrics*

By

Mahmoud Mohamed Shawiesh

MBBCh 2011

Faculty of Medicine-Ain Shams University

Supervised By

Dr. Iman Ahmed Ragab

Assistant Professor of Pediatrics

Faculty of medicine - Ain Shams University

Dr. Sara Mostafa Makkeyah

Lecturer of Pediatrics

Faculty of Medicine -Ain Shams University

Dr. Ayat Farouk Mohamed

Lecturer of Community, Environmental and Occupational Medicine

Faculty of Medicine -Ain Shams University

Faculty of Medicine

Ain Shams University

2017

بِسْمِ اللَّهِ الرَّحْمَنِ الرَّحِيمِ

قالوا

سبحانك لا علم لنا
إلا ما علمتنا إنك أنت
العليم العظيم

صدق الله العظيم

سورة البقرة الآية: ٢٢



Acknowledgement

*First of all, all gratitude is due to **Allah** almighty for blessing this work, until it has reached its end, as a part of his generous help, throughout my life.*

*Really I can hardly find the words to express my gratitude to **Dr. Iman Ahmed Ragab**, Assistant Professor of Pediatrics, Faculty of Medicine, Ain Shams University, for her supervision, continuous help, encouragement throughout this work and tremendous effort she has done in the meticulous revision of the whole work. It is a great honor to work under her guidance and supervision.*

*I would like also to express my sincere appreciation and gratitude to **Dr. Sara Mostafa Makkeyah**, Lecturer of Pediatrics, Faculty of Medicine, Ain Shams University, for her continuous directions and support throughout the whole work.*

*I cannot forget the great help of **Dr. Ayat Farouk Mohamed**, Lecturer of Community, Environmental and Occupational Medicine, Faculty of Medicine, Ain Shams University, for her invaluable efforts, tireless guidance and for her patience and support to get this work into light.*

*Words fail to express my love, respect and appreciation to **my wife** for her unlimited help and support.*

Last but not least, I dedicate this work to my family, whom without their sincere emotional support, pushing me forward this work would not have ever been completed.

Mahmoud Mohamed Shawiesh



List of Contents

	Page
Acknowledgment	--
List of Abbreviations	i
List of Figures	ii
List of Tables	v
Abstract	vii
Introduction	1
Aim of the Work	4
Review of Literature	5
Chapter 1: Childhood Acute Lymphoblastic Leukemia .	6
Chapter 2: Childhood Acute Myeloid Leukemia	18
Chapter 3: Childhood Non-Hodgkin lymphoma.....	24
Chapter 4: Childhood Hodgkin lymphoma	28
Subjects and Methods	35
Results	52
Discussion	81
Summary	92
Conclusion	95
Recommendations	96
References	97
Appendix	119
Arabic Summary	--

List of Abbreviations

ABVD	Adriamycin, bleomycin, vinblastine, dacarbazine
AIEOP	Associazione Italiana Ematologia Oncologia Pediatrica
ALL	Acute lymphoblastic leukemia
AML	Acute myeloid leukemia
ASCT	Autologous stem cell transplantation
BFM-SG	Berlin-Frankfurt-Munster-Study-Group
CBC	Complete blood picture
CMT	Combined modality therapy
CNS	Central nervous system
CR	Complete response
DFS	Disease-free survival
EFS	Event free survival
ESR	Erythrocyte sedimentation rate
FAB	French-American-British
FDG-PET	18F-fluorodeoxyglucose positron emission tomography
GPOH	German Pediatric Oncology and Hematology Group
HSCT	Hematopoietic stem cell transplantation
IPT	Immunophenotyping
MRC	Medical Research Council
MRD	Minimal residual disease
NK	Natural killer
OS	Overall survival
PD	Progressive disease
WHO	World Health Organization

List of Figures

Figure	Title	Page
1	Improved overall survival in childhood acute lymphoblastic leukemia ALL.	5
2	Risk stratification groups for pediatric B-cell non-Hodgkin lymphoma.	27
3	Distribution of cases with hematologic malignancies during the 10 years studied period.	52
4	Kaplan-Meier graph of the overall survival OS for the total group of ALL patients.	58
5	Kaplan-Meier graph of the event free survival EFS for ALL patients.	58
6	Kaplan-Meier graph of the overall survival OS for ALL patients based on different parameters for risk stratification.	59
7	Kaplan-Meier graph showing OS for different immunophenotypes of ALL patients (Pre-B vs T-ALL).	60
8	Kaplan-Meier graph showing EFS for different immunophenotypes of ALL patients (Pre-B vs T-ALL).	60
9	Kaplan-Meier graph showing OS for ALL patients receiving single intensification versus double intensification.	61
10	Kaplan-Meier graph showing EFS for ALL patients receiving single intensification versus double intensification.	61
11	Kaplan-Meier graph showing OS function of ALL 3 risk groups in patients adopting single delayed intensification.	64

List of Figures (Cont.)

Figure	Title	Page
12	Kaplan-Meier graph showing OS function of ALL 3 risk groups in patients adopting double delayed intensification.	64
13	Kaplan-Meier graph showing EFS function of ALL 3 risk groups in patients adopting single delayed intensification.	65
14	Kaplan-Meier graph showing EFS function of ALL 3 risk groups in patients adopting double delayed intensification.	65
15	Kaplan-Meier graph showing Overall survival of AML patients.	69
16	Kaplan-Meier graph showing EFS of total number of AML patients.	69
17	Kaplan-Meier graph showing OS of AML patients with different immunophenotypes.	70
18	Kaplan-Meier graph showing EFS of AML patients with different immunophenotypes.	70
19	Kaplan-Meier graph showing OS of AML patients with different risk stratification.	71
20	Kaplan-Meier graph showing the 10-year OS of the total number of NHL patients.	74
21	Kaplan-Meier graph showing a survival curve EFS of the total number of NHL patients.	75
22	Kaplan-Meier graph showing survival curve OS of NHL patients according to stage.	75
23	Kaplan-Meier graph showing survival curve for OS of NHL patients according to risk stratification.	76

List of Figures (Cont.)

Figure	Title	Page
24	Kaplan-Meier graph showing survival curve for OS of NHL patients according to response to treatment.	76
25	Kaplan-Meier graph showing a curve for OS of the total number of HL patients.	79
26	Kaplan-Meier graph showing a survival curve EFS of the total number of HL patients.	79
27	Kaplan-Meier graph showing survival curve OS of HL patients according to stage.	80
28	Kaplan-Meier graph showing survival curve OS of HL patients according to risk stratification.	80

List of Tables

Table	Title	Page
1	WHO classification of Acute Lymphoblastic Leukemia.	7
2	WHO classification of myeloid neoplasm.	20
3	Detailed protocol of therapy of different risk stratification groups of childhood ALL.	49
4	Detailed protocol of treatment of AML patients.	42
5	Risk stratification for mature B-NHL.	44
6	The ABVD regimen.	48
7	Clinical characteristics and outcome of hematologic malignancies.	53
8	Clinical and laboratory characteristics of ALL patients.	54
9	Initial disease characteristics of ALL patients.	55
10	Assigned protocol of therapy and outcome of ALL patients based on different groups of risk stratification.	56
11	Outcome of relapsed ALL patients treated according to BFM relapse protocol	57
12	Clinical characteristics and outcome among ALL patients with different immunophenotypes.	62
13	Survival outcome among the different 3 risk groups in patients adopting CCG protocol.	63
14	Outcome among patients receiving single vs double delayed intensification.	63
15	Survival outcome among the different 3 risk groups in patients with Single versus double delayed intensification.	63

List of Tables (Cont.)

Table	Title	Page
16	Clinical and laboratory characteristics of the studied AML patients.	66
17	Initial disease characteristics of the studied AML patients.	67
18	Outcome of the total group of AML patients	68
19	Clinical characteristics and outcome among non-DS non-APL AML patients	68
20	Clinical and laboratory characteristics of NHL patients.	72
21	Patient characteristics and outcome of NHL patients.	73
22	Clinical characteristics of relapsed NHL patients.	74
23	Clinical and Demographic Characteristic of HL patients.	78
24	Patient characteristics and outcome of HL patients.	78
25	Treatment Results from Selected Clinical Trials for Childhood ALL.	82
26	Treatment Results from Selected Clinical Trials for Childhood AML.	87
27	Outcome results from trials adopting different treatment regimens across the world	90
28	Treatment protocol of B-NHL.	119
29	Treatment protocol of T-lymphoblastic lymphoma.	121

Abstract

Background: Hematopoietic neoplasms constitute more than 40% of malignancies in children and represent a wide range of disorders that include acute leukemias and lymphomas. **Aim:** We aimed to evaluate outcome of children with hematologic malignancies in Ain Shams University at Pediatric Oncology clinic with the use of the current treatment protocols and assess the need for a more risk based adapted therapy. **Methods:** 194 patients with ALL, 42 with AML, 65 with NHL, and 29 HL patients, registered at Pediatric Oncology Clinic, Ain Shams University Children's Hospital from January 2005 through December 2014, were included in the study. ALL patients were treated according to a modified CCG 1991 and 1961 for standard and high risk respectively. Patients were stratified into 3 risk groups. SR, HR-SA and HR-AA. AML patients were treated according to a modified MRC based protocol, they included 3 risk groups, favorable, intermediate and high. NHL was classified into lymphoblastic lymphoma, mature B-NHL and anaplastic large cell lymphoma, and treated according to BFM protocols for the different entities. HL patients were stratified into 3 risk groups; low, intermediate and high, and were treated according to the ABVD regimen and. **Results:** For ALL patients, the mean age at diagnosis was 6.1 ± 3.9 years, male: female ratio 1.3:1. The 10-year OS was 85.3% while the 10-year EFS was 80.4%. Pre-B patients had significantly better outcome than T-cell patients (OS 88.8% and 68.6%, $P=0.001$; EFS 83.2% and 66.7%, $P=0.015$ for pre-B and T-cell respectively). There was no significant difference regarding OS and EFS in patients receiving single versus double delayed intensification, however DDI had higher OS and EFS in SR and not in HR groups. In the AML group, EFS was 74.4% for the total group. 10-year OS for favorable and intermediate risk group were 83.3% and 60% respectively. For NHL group, OS and EFS of the total group

of NHL patients were 89.1% and 84.6% respectively. The 10-year OS and EFS of for HL patients were 88.9% and 75.9% being 100% for low and intermediate risk patients and 80% for high risk patients. **Conclusion:** Standard risk acute lymphoblastic leukemia treated with CCG 1991 had the highest relapse rate among other risk groups and international outcomes. The use of double delayed intensification showed no survival benefits. T-cell ALL still have inferior outcome as compared to Pre-B patients. The outcome in non-APL AML patients was relatively good yet it should be interpreted cautiously due to the small number of studied patients and the defect in our records and filing system. The use of 2-3 gm/m² of methotrexate in B-NHL therapy showed a favorable outcome. Survival of Hodgkin lymphoma patients was lower than international rates and mandates the application of response based therapy.

INTRODUCTION

Cancer is the second commonest cause of death in children in the developed countries. Owing to highly specific diagnostic procedures and the introduction and continuous improvement of multimodal treatment strategies, the past decades have seen a marked rise in the probability of cure (*Kaatsch 2010*).

Hematologic malignancies account for 9.5% of new cancer diagnoses in the United States. For the years 1975-2012, the NCI SEER program reports an incidence of 49.1 and 24.9 per 1000, 000 for leukemia and lymphoma respectively in children younger than 19 years of age (*Howlader et al., 2015*).

Acute leukemias account for about 40% of childhood cancers; of which acute lymphoblastic leukemia (ALL) comprises about 70-80% and acute myeloid leukemia (AML) about 10-15%. Presently, the cure rates in ALL in developed countries are as high as 79-86% using intensive protocols (*Pui et al. 2010*).

The incidence of childhood AML has been estimated to be between about 5 to 7 cases per million people per year. There is evidence for variation in the incidence among some racial and ethnic groups. For example, black children have an

incidence of 5.8 cases per million compared to 4.8 cases per million in Caucasian children. Children of Hispanic background have the highest incidence. Current therapy for AML involves the stabilization of the patient at the time of diagnosis followed by remission induction therapy and postremission intensification with chemotherapy or HSCT along with CNS prophylaxis (*Golub and Arceci, 2006*).

Lymphomas are the third most common group of cancers in children and adolescents after leukemias and brain tumors, accounting for 10-15% of newly diagnosed cancers. Hodgkin lymphoma comprises 40% of all childhood lymphomas. It occurs in 5-7 per 100, 000 population. The incidence is highest in late childhood and early adulthood (15-35 years). It is very uncommon under 5 years of age (*Schwartz 2003*).

Although Hodgkin lymphoma is considered a highly curative neoplasm, about one-third of all patients fail to respond to conventional chemotherapy alone or combined with radiotherapy. However, the outcome of patients with primary progressive disease (PD) defined as progression during induction treatment or within 90 days after the end of treatment is dismal. Treatment results with second-line chemotherapy produces low remission rates, with long-term disease-free survival (DFS) in 0% to 10% of patients with

primary progressive HD. Salvage radiotherapy is an effective treatment for localized relapsed HD (*Engert et al. 2003*).

Non-Hodgkin lymphoma accounts for approximately 7% of cancers in children less than 20 years of age. It occurs most commonly in the second decade of life, and occurs less frequently in children younger than 3 years of age. With current treatments, about 80% of children and adolescents with NHL will survive at least 5 years (*Gore & Trippett 2010*).