





Blood 142 (2023) 1360-1362

The 65th ASH Annual Meeting Abstracts

POSTER ABSTRACTS

509.BONE MARROW FAILURE AND CANCER PREDISPOSITION SYNDROMES: CONGENITAL

Deciphering the Differential Diagnosis of Inherited Versus Acquired Bone Marrow Failure Syndromes: A Large Cohort Study

Marta Bortolotti¹, Roochi Trikha², Sarah Salter³, Joanna Large⁴, Shreyans Gandhi⁵, Bruno Fattizzo, MD⁶, Wilma Barcellini, MD⁷, Austin Kulasekararaj, MD PhD MPH⁸

¹FONDAZIONE IRCCS CA' GRANDA OSPEDALE MAGGIORE POLICLINICO and UNIVERSITY OF MILA, MILANO, Italy ²King's College Hospital NHS Foundation Trust, London, GBR

³King's College Hospital, London, GBR

⁴King's College Hospital NHS Foundation Trust, London, United Kingdom

⁵Department of Haematological Medicine, King's College Hospital NHS, London, United Kingdom

⁶Department of Oncology and Onco-hematology, Fondazione IRCCS Ca' Granda - Ospedale Maggiore Policlinico, Milano, Italy

⁷Hematology Unit, Fondazione IRCCS Ca' Granda Ospedale Maggiore Policlinico, Milan, Italy

⁸Department of Haematological Medicine, King's College Hospital NHS Foundation Trust, London, United Kingdom

The wide overlaps in clinical and hematologic features of inherited (iBMF) and acquired (aBMF) bone marrow failures are often the cause of diagnostic difficulties and delay in proper therapeutic approaches. Screening tests for iBMF are complex and expensive and have limited availability. Data-driven machine learning algorithms may reveal useful tools in clinical practice to guide differential diagnosis. We collected data about clinical, laboratory and natural history of 597 patients with BMF (55 iBMF; 542 aBMF). iBMFs were typically younger (30 y, 0.1-71 vs 44 y, 2-85, p <0.001) and presented higher baseline blood counts (reticulocytes 62x10^9/L, 31-205 vs 35x10^9/L, 0-216; neutrophiles 1.4x10^9/L, 0-4.3 vs 0.6x10^9/L, 0-4.6; platelets 93x10^9/L, 7-356 vs 23x10^9/L, 1-355, p <0.001), and more cytogenetic aberrations (32% vs 13%, p 0.002). Conversely, PNH clones were detected and confirmed overtime mainly in aBMF (51% vs 9% p <0.001), with median clone size of 0.6% (range 0.02-3.8) in iBMF. By NGS analysis, no differences in acquired myeloid gene mutations incidence were detected between the groups (25% vs 13%, p 0.1). Evolution to MDS occurred in 20% of iBMF vs 11% of aBMF (p 0.04), and to AML in 3.6% vs 1.5% (p 0.2). Time between diagnosis and evolution was shorter in iBMF (2 y, 0-14 vs 5.4 y, 0.2-32 p 0.01). Survival was similar between the 2 groups with median values of 7 y (95%CI, 6.1-7.6), reaching 8 y (95%CI, 6.9-9.2) in transplanted patients. Factors significantly associated with a better survival were female gender (HR: 0.73, 95%CI: 0.59-0.90, p 0.004), BMT (HR: 0.62, 95%CI: 0.47-0.83, p 0.001), number of therapy lines (HR: 0.67, 95%CI: 0.51-0.87, p 0.003), response to 1 st line (HR: 0.53, 95%CI: 0.41-0.69, p < 0.001), and evolution to PNH (HR: 0.61, 95%CI: 0.40-0.96, p 0.03). Conversely, a lower survival was associated with older age: patients aged 31-60 had 2-fold risk of death compared to those under 30 (HR 1.8, 95%CI 1.15-2.75, p <0.001); patients over 60 had a 3.2 times higher risk compared to under 30 (HR 3.2, 95%CI 2.35-4.45, p < 0.001). Presence of trilineage cytopenia also predicted poorer survival (HR: 2.92, 95%CI: 2.25-3.79, p <0.001 versus single- or bi-lineage cytopenias). No clear association with survival was found regarding karyotype and presence of mutations at myeloid NGS panel (Table 1). Finally, via a 10-folds cross-validation, we built a multivariate logistic model to predict the probability of having an iBMF. A dataset composed of 139 patients (120 aBMF and 19 iBMF) was used to train and validate the model, while subjects with missing information were excluded from the analysis. The obtained classifier was tested on an independent test set, resulting in 96% (81-100) accuracy, with 26/27 patients correctly assigned to their true class, 100% sensitivity and 96% specificity and having area under the ROC curve (AUC) equal to 0.97. Factors showing an impact on the predictive model were as follows: higher Hb levels (OR 2.35, range 0.98-5.60, p 0.05), reticulocytes (OR 1.01, range 0.99-1.04, p 0.29), platelets (OR 1.05, range 1.01-1.09, p 0.005), and erythropoietin (OR 1.0, range 1.00-1.01, p 0.009) were associated with IBMF; whilst older age (OR 0.91, range 0.84-0.99, p 0.03), normal NGS myeloid panel (OR 0.09, range 0.01-1.52, p 0.09), and the presence of a PNH clone (OR 0.46, range 0.04-4.83, p 0.52) showed a negative association (Figure 1).

In conclusion, iBMF and aBMF differ in clinical presentation and risk of clonal evolution, and deserve specific treatments (IST in aBMF vs BMT and androgens in iBMF) and special considerations (i.e. choice of BMT donor and conditioning in iBMF). The

proposed model includes few and routinely available variables and may be a practical tool to be implemented in the clinic, though it will require validation on an independent cohort to confirm its feasibility and prediction accuracy.

Disclosures Gandhi: Novartis: Honoraria, Membership on an entity's Board of Directors or advisory committees; Alexion: Honoraria, Membership on an entity's Board of Directors or advisory committees, Speakers Bureau; SOBI: Honoraria, Membership on an entity's Board of Directors or advisory committees, Speakers Bureau; Gilead: Honoraria, Speakers Bureau. **Fattizzo:** Agios: Consultancy, Research Funding, Speakers Bureau; Janssen: Speakers Bureau; Zenas Biopharma: Research Funding; Sobi: Speakers Bureau. **Barcellini:** Novartis: Consultancy, Honoraria, Speakers Bureau; Alexion, AstraZeneca Rare Disease: Consultancy, Membership on an entity's Board of Directors or advisory committees, Research Funding. **Kulasekararaj:** Achillion: Consultancy; Celgene/BMS: Consultancy, Honoraria, Membership on an entity's Board of Directors or advisory committees; Samsung: Consultancy; Novartis: Consultancy, Honoraria, Membership on an entity's Board of Directors or advisory committees; Akari Therapeutics: Consultancy; BioCryst: Consultancy; F. Hoffmann-La Roche Ltd: Consultancy, Membership on an entity's Board of Directors or advisory committees; Amgen: Honoraria, Membership on an entity's Board of Directors or advisory committees; Alexion, AstraZeneca Rare Disease: Consultancy, Honoraria, Membership on an entity's Board of Directors or advisory committees; Alexion, AstraZeneca Rare Disease: Consultancy, Honoraria, Membership on an entity's Board of Directors or advisory committees.

Variables	HR	Standard error	z	р	95% CI	
Gender	0.65	0.11	-2.41	0.016	0.46 - 0.92	
Age				1		
• 31-60 years	1.66	0.39	2.18	0.03	1.05 - 2.63	
• >60 years	2.94	0.76	4.18	<0.001	1.77 - 4.87	
Categories	_					
• aBMF	Ref					
• iBMF	0.88	0.37	-0.29	0.773	0.38 - 2.03	
Pancytopenia at diagnosis	2.08	0.56	3.35	0.001	1.36 - 3.2	
Therapy						
 >n° therapy lines 	0.48	0.09	-3.57	<0.001	0.32 - 0.72	
• Response to I line	0.42	0.09	-3.85	<0.001	0.27 - 0.66	
BMT	0.54	0.13	-2.6	0.009	0.34 - 0.86	
Evolution						
AMIL/MDS	0.68	0.19	-1.38	0.168	0.39 - 1.18	
Hemolytic PNH	0.43	0.18	-1.96	0.05	0.18 - 1.00	
Abnormal karyotype	0.7	0.14	-1.71	0.087	0.47 - 1.05	
Myeloid NGS						
BCOR	1.24	0.58	0.46	0.643	0.49 - 3.13	
 Other mutation 	0.63	0.14	-2.00	0.045	0.4 - 0.99	

Table 1. Survival, multivariate analysis.

aBMF, acquired bone marrow failure; AML, acute myeloid leukemia; iBMF, inherited bone marrow failure; MDS myelodysplastic syndrome; NGS, next generation sequencing; PNH, paroxysmal nocturnal hemoglobinuria.

ariable	N			Odds ra	río			
kge"	112						0.63 (0.38, 0.94)	0.0
Haemoglobin '	112					·	2.35 (1.08, 6.60)	0.0
Refoulocytes *	112					H -	1.16 (0.90, 1.60)	0.25
Publiets '	112					H•	1.62 (1.24, 2.53)	0.00
Erythropoletin "	112					•	1.03 (1.04, 1.07)	0.0
PNH presence '	112		H					0.52
Normal NGS 1	112	<u> </u>		•			0.09 (0.00, 1.26)	0.0

Figure 1. Logistic model, Odds ratio.

https://doi.org/10.1182/blood-2023-186516