



Biology of Blood and Marrow Transplantation

journal homepage: www.bbmt.org



Survival of Patients with Acute Myeloid Leukemia Relapsing after Allogeneic Hematopoietic Cell Transplantation: A Center for International Blood and Marrow Transplant Research Study



Nelli Bejanyan^{1,*}, Daniel J. Weisdorf¹, Brent R. Logan^{2,3}, Hai-Lin Wang², Steven M. Devine⁴, Marcos de Lima⁵, Donald W. Bunjes⁶, Mei-Jie Zhang³

¹ Division of Hematology, Oncology and Transplantation, University of Minnesota, Minneapolis, Minnesota

² Center for International Blood and Marrow Transplant Research, Department of Medicine, Medical College of Wisconsin, Milwaukee, Wisconsin

³ Division of Biostatistics, Institute for Health and Society, Medical College of Wisconsin, Milwaukee, Wisconsin

⁴ Department of Internal Medicine, The Ohio State University Comprehensive Cancer Center – James, Columbus, Ohio

⁵ Department of Medicine, Seidman Cancer Center, University Hospitals Case Medical Center, Cleveland, Ohio

⁶ Department of Internal Medicine III, Universitätsklinikum Ulm, Ulm, Germany

Article history:

Received 1 August 2014

Accepted 9 November 2014

Key Words:

Acute myeloid leukemia
Relapse
Allogeneic transplantation
Donor lymphocyte infusion
Second transplantation

A B S T R A C T

Acute myeloid leukemia (AML) relapse after allogeneic hematopoietic cell transplantation (alloHCT) remains a major therapeutic challenge. We studied outcomes of 1788 AML patients relapsing after alloHCT (1990 to 2010) during first or second complete remission (CR) to identify factors associated with longer postrelapse survival. Median time to post-HCT relapse was 7 months (range, 1 to 177). At relapse, 1231 patients (69%) received intensive therapy, including chemotherapy alone ($n = 660$), donor lymphocyte infusion (DLI) \pm chemotherapy ($n = 202$), or second alloHCT \pm chemotherapy \pm DLI ($n = 369$), with subsequent CR rates of 29%. Median follow-up after relapse was 39 months (range, <1 to 193). Survival for all patients was 23% at 1 year after relapse; however, 3-year overall survival correlated with time from HCT to relapse (4% for relapse during the 1- to 6-month period, 12% during the 6-month to 2-year period, 26% during the 2- to 3-year period, and 38% for ≥ 3 years). In multivariable analysis, lower mortality was significantly associated with longer time from alloHCT to relapse (relative risk, .55 for 6 months to 2 years; relative risk, .39 for 2 to 3 years; and relative risk, .28 for ≥ 3 years; $P < .0001$) and a first HCT using reduced-intensity conditioning (relative risk, .77; 95% confidence interval [CI], .66 to .88; $P = .0002$). In contrast, inferior survival was associated with age >40 years (relative risk, 1.42; 95% CI, 1.24 to 1.64; $P < .0001$), active graft-versus-host disease at relapse (relative risk, 1.25; 95% CI, 1.13 to 1.39; $P < .0001$), adverse cytogenetics (relative risk, 1.37; 95% CI, 1.09 to 1.71; $P = .0062$), mismatched unrelated donor (relative risk, 1.61; 95% CI, 1.22 to 2.13; $P = .0008$), and use of cord blood for first HCT (relative risk, 1.23; 95% CI, 1.06 to 1.42; $P = .0078$). AML relapse after alloHCT predicted poor survival; however, patients who relapsed ≥ 6 months after their initial alloHCT had better survival and may benefit from intensive therapy, such as second alloHCT \pm DLI.

© 2015 American Society for Blood and Marrow Transplantation.

INTRODUCTION

Allogeneic hematopoietic cell transplantation (alloHCT) is a potentially curative treatment option for patients with acute myeloid leukemia (AML); however, relapse accounts for approximately 40% of alloHCT treatment failures. Among relapsed patients, the 2-year postrelapse survival rate is reported at less than 20% [1-7]. Unfortunately, sustainable remissions are rare in patients with post-transplantation AML

relapse, especially for those relapsing soon after alloHCT [8,9]. Commonly used treatment options for relapsed patients include intensive chemotherapy with or without donor lymphocyte infusion (DLI), second alloHCT, withdrawal of immunosuppression, or supportive care [4,7,8,10-13]. Treatment decisions for management of relapsed AML could be improved by identifying prognostic factors associated with postrelapse survival and developing a risk stratification model.

A recent study by the European Blood and Marrow Transplantation group identified several prognostic factors associated with improved survival among AML patients who relapsed after reduced-intensity conditioning (RIC) alloHCT:

Financial disclosure: See Acknowledgments on page 458.

* Correspondence and reprint requests: Nelli Bejanyan, MD, Division of Hematology, Oncology and Transplantation, 420 Delaware Street SE, Mayo Mail Code 480, Minneapolis, MN 55455.

E-mail address: nbejanya@umn.edu (N. Bejanyan).

<http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.bbmt.2014.11.007>

1083-8791/© 2015 American Society for Blood and Marrow Transplantation.

longer interval from transplantation to relapse, low bone marrow tumor burden at relapse, and absence of acute graft-versus-host disease (GVHD). Longer survival was seen primarily among patients who achieved complete remission (CR) with chemotherapy followed by either DLI or a second alloHCT [1]. These findings are consistent with other single-institution reports of alloHCT outcomes among patients treated for relapsed AML. These reports suggested that intensive therapy resulted in better survival than withdrawal of immunosuppression alone [5,7,11], independent of donor source or intensity of initial conditioning [7]; however, a detailed analysis of prognostic factors associated with survival was limited by the relatively small sample sizes of these previous reports. We, therefore, used the Center for International Blood and Marrow Transplant Research (CIBMTR) database to compare clinical outcomes and factors associated with survival among a large cohort of AML patients whose leukemia relapsed after alloHCT.

METHODS

Data Source

We used the CIBMTR observational registry to compare clinical outcomes and factors associated with survival among AML patients whose leukemia relapsed after alloHCT between 1990 and 2010. The CIBMTR is a research organization combined with the National Marrow Donor Program that collects information from over 500 transplantation centers worldwide that prospectively report detailed information on consecutive transplantations. To ensure data quality, a computerized system and scheduled data audits independently check all collected data based on specific disease forms provided by participating transplantation centers. Privacy protections for patients participating in observational studies conducted by the CIBMTR are in compliance with all applicable federal regulations. Additionally, the CIBMTR ensures protected health information for all participants under the Health Insurance Portability and Accountability Act Privacy Rule.

Patient Selection and Definitions

Adult and pediatric patients with AML relapsing after alloHCT were included in the study if they were in first or second CR when they received myeloablative or RIC alloHCT. Patients with de novo or secondary AML and patients receiving related donor (RD), unrelated donor (URD), or umbilical cord blood (UCB) donor grafts were included. Patients whose AML relapsed within the first 30 days of transplantation (n = 64) or whose relapse date or conditioning regimens were unavailable for analysis (n = 106) were excluded.

CR was defined as <5% bone marrow blasts with no morphological evidence of leukemia in the marrow or peripheral blood. *Secondary AML* was defined as leukemia arising from underlying myelodysplastic syndrome or treatment-related AML due to previous chemotherapy or radiation. The Southwest Oncology Group cytogenetic classification was used for cytogenetic risk stratification as previously reported [14]. *Intensive therapy* was defined as induction-type cytoreductive chemotherapy with or without DLI and/or second allograft. HLA typing for URD recipients was classified using published CIBMTR criteria [15]. Intensity of conditioning regimens was classified according to established CIBMTR definitions [16,17].

Study Endpoints and Statistical Analysis

The primary study endpoint was overall survival (OS) of AML patients relapsing after alloHCT. OS was defined as the time from relapse to death or last follow-up for surviving patients. Secondary endpoints included clinical and disease prognostic factors of OS after post-transplantation relapse. *Long-term survival* was defined as survival ≥ 1 year after alloHCT relapse.

The Kaplan-Meier method was used to estimate OS probability [18]. Cox proportional hazards regression model was used to identify factors predictive of survival. The assumption of proportional hazards for each factor was tested by adding a time-dependent covariate. When the test indicated differential effects over time (nonproportional hazards), models were constructed breaking the post-transplantation time course into 2 periods, using the maximized partial likelihood method to find the most appropriate breakpoint. A stepwise model selection approach was used to identify all significant risk factors predictive of survival. All statistical analysis was performed with SAS software (SAS Institute, Cary, NC, Version 9.2).

Table 1
Patient Characteristics

Variable	Total n (%)	Survival ≥ 1 Year after Relapse n (%)
No. of patients	1788	413
Year of HCT		
1990-2000	745 (42)	203 (49)
2001-2010	1043 (59)	210 (51)
HCT during		
CR1	1249 (70)	312 (76)
CR2	539 (30)	101 (24)
Age		
Median (range)	32 (<1-76)	30 (1-75)
0-18 yr	613 (34)	136 (33)
19-40 yr	439 (25)	138 (33)
41-76 yr	736 (41)	139 (34)
AML type		
De novo	1450 (81)	348 (84)
Secondary	276 (15)	47 (11)
Missing	62 (3)	18 (4)
Cytogenetics scoring		
Favorable	138 (8)	45 (11)
Intermediate/normal	805 (45)	190 (46)
Unfavorable	334 (19)	52 (13)
Missing	511 (29)	126 (31)
Myeloablative	1374 (77)	337 (82)
RIC/NMA	414 (23)	76 (18)
Graft type		
Bone marrow	935 (52)	240 (58)
Peripheral blood	621 (35)	138 (33)
Cord blood	232 (13)	35 (8)
Donor type		
HLA-identical sibling	936 (52)	245 (59)
URD well matched	317 (18)	69 (17)
URD partially matched	134 (7)	35 (8)
URD mismatched	56 (3)	7 (2)
URD unknown	113 (6)	22 (5)
Cord blood	232 (13)	35 (8)
GVHD prophylaxis		
ATG/alemtuzumab	406 (23)	80 (19)
Ex vivo T cell depletion	48 (3)	12 (3)
CSA/tac \pm other	1334 (75)	321 (78)
Time from HCT to relapse		
Median (range)	7 (1-177)	14 (1-177)
<6 mo	774 (43)	88 (21)
6 mo-2 yr	702 (39)	191 (46)
2-3 yr	138 (8)	52 (13)
≥ 3 yr	174 (10)	82 (20)
AML relapse site		
Extramedullary only	80 (4)	25 (6)
Bone marrow \pm other sites	1046 (59)	200 (48)
Not reported/missing	662 (37)	188 (44)
Active GVHD before relapse		
Yes	727 (41)	170 (41)
No	1028 (57)	234 (57)
Missing	33 (2)	9 (2)
Treatment for relapse		
Second HCT \pm chemo \pm DLI	369 (21)	182 (44)
DLI \pm chemo	202 (11)	57 (14)
Chemo only	660 (37)	87 (21)
Supportive care/no therapy	357 (20)	35 (8)
Missing	200 (11)	52 (13)
Response to therapy		
CR	271 (15)	165 (40)
No response	704 (39)	121 (29)
Missing	813 (45)	127 (31)
Surviving at last follow-up	229 (13)	173 (42)
Median follow-up after relapse, mo	39 (<1-193)	59 (12-193)

ATG indicates antithymocyte globulin; CSA, cyclosporine; tac, tacrolimus.

RESULTS

Patient Characteristics

We identified 1788 patients with AML relapsing after alloHCT from 286 CIBMTR centers in 43 countries. Of these, 413 patients survived ≥ 1 year after relapse (Table 1). Median

Table 2
Characteristics of Patients Treated with DLI and/or Second HCT

Variable	Total n (%)	Survival ≥ 1 Year after Relapse n (%)
DLI \pm Second HCT	267	87
DLI + chemotherapy		
Yes	216 (81)	75 (86)
No	51 (19)	12 (14)
DLI* + second HCT		
+ Second HCT	65 (24)	30 (34)
No second HCT	202 (76)	57 (66)
Type of donor		
HLA-identical sibling	162 (61)	59 (68)
Unrelated	102 (38)	26 (30)
Missing	3 (1)	2 (2)
Donor gender		
Male	144 (54)	46 (53)
Female	105 (39)	38 (44)
Missing	18 (7)	3 (3)
Time from relapse to DLI		
Median (range)	2 (<1-12)	2 (<1-12)
≤ 6 mo	226 (85)	70 (80)
> 6 mo	11 (4)	5 (6)
Missing	25 (9)	9 (10)
Second HCT	369	182
Conditioning		
MA	181 (49)	99 (54)
RIC/NMA	110 (30)	57 (31)
Missing	78 (21)	26 (14)
Donor type of second HCT		
Related	197 (53)	94 (52)
Unrelated	127 (34)	70 (38)
Cord blood	20 (5)	9 (5)
Missing	25 (7)	9 (5)
Donor gender		
Male	168 (46)	78 (43)
Female	126 (34)	67 (37)
Missing	75 (20)	37 (20)
Same donor as first HCT		
No	81 (22)	49 (27)
Yes	166 (45)	73 (40)
Missing	122 (33)	60 (33)
Time from relapse to second HCT		
Median (range)	3 (<1-50)	3 (<1-50)
≤ 6 mo	299 (81)	135 (74)
> 6 mo	52 (14)	40 (22)
Missing	18 (5)	7 (4)

MA indicates myeloablative.

* Reflects DLI with or without chemotherapy.

time from transplantation to relapse was 7 months (range, 1 to 177 months) and median follow-up of survivors after post-transplantation relapse was 39 months (range, <1 to 193 months). Seventy percent of the patients underwent alloHCT in CR1. Median age of patients was 32 years (range, <1 to 76); 37% of patients were children (0 to 18 years old)

and 39% were >40 years old. Fifteen percent of patients had secondary AML and 19% had unfavorable cytogenetics. A myeloablative conditioning regimen was used on over three quarters of cases and 52% of patients received a bone marrow graft. Donor types included HLA-identical RD (52%), well-matched URD (25%), UCB (13%), and mismatched URD (3%). Relapse within 6 months of transplantation occurred in 43% of patients, and isolated extramedullary relapse was rare (4%). AML relapse beyond 2 years of alloHCT occurred in only 18% of cases, and active GVHD before relapse was present in 41% of patients. The majority ($n = 1231$, 69% of total) of patients received treatment for relapse, which included chemotherapy alone (37%), second HCT with or without chemotherapy and/or DLI (21%), or DLI with or without chemotherapy (11%). However, only 15% of all patients achieved a subsequent CR. Although second HCTs were rarely administered to those relapsing within 6 months, we found no association between use of intensive therapy and the time from HCT to relapse or the conditioning intensity of the first HCT.

Median time from HCT to relapse was 14 months for long-term survivors (>1 year after relapse). Survivors living longer often received active treatment for relapse (79%), most frequently a second HCT (44%), and they commonly achieved subsequent CR (40%).

Management of Post-transplantation Relapse

A total of 267 patients received DLI for AML relapse, and DLI plus chemotherapy was used in 81% of them (Table 2). DLI was followed by second HCT in 24% of patients treated with DLI. Median time from relapse to DLI was 2 months (range, <1 to 12 months), with 85% of patients receiving DLI within 6 months of leukemia relapse. Among all patients receiving DLI, 87 (32.6%) survived more than 1 year after leukemia relapse. The source of DLI was an HLA-identical sibling donor for 61% of patients. Patients who received DLI and survived beyond 1 year often received a subsequent second HCT (34%).

A second HCT was performed on 369 patients, of whom 182 (49.3%) survived more than 1 year after relapse. The second HCT conditioning regimens were myeloablative for 49%, RIC/or nonmyeloablative (NMA) for 30%, and unknown for the rest of the patients. RD second HCT was performed in about one half, URD in one third, UCB in 5% of the patients, and second HCT donor source was unknown for the rest of the cases. A different donor for the second HCT was chosen in 45% of patients but data on the donor were unavailable for one third of patients. Median time from post-transplantation leukemia relapse to the second HCT was 3 months (range, <1




Figure 1. (A) Adjusted OS by time from HCT to relapse. (B) Adjusted overall survival by age.

Table 3
Survival after DLI and Second HCT

Time from HCT to Relapse	DLI			Second HCT		
	n	Survival ≥1 Year after Relapse n (%)	P Value*	n	Survival ≥1 Year after Relapse n (%)	P Value*
<6 mo	90	12 (13)	<.001	110	35 (32)	<.001
6 mo-2 yr	81	28 (35)		167	92 (55)	
2-3 yr	14	7 (50)		37	23 (62)	
≥3 yr	17	10 (59)		55	32 (58)	
Median (range)	7 (1-177) [†]	13 (2-106)		12 (1-150) [‡]	14 (2-78)	

* P value reflects the time from HCT to relapse.

[†] Median survival of all patients receiving DLI.[‡] Median survival of all patients receiving second HCT.

to 50 months), with the majority (81%) of relapses occurring within 6 months.

Among patients with evaluable status for response to therapy (n = 846), subsequent CR was achieved in 29% of patients. DLI with or without chemotherapy (n = 139) resulted in CR for 37% of cases, second HCT with or without chemotherapy and/or DLI (n = 264) resulted in CR for 44%, and chemotherapy alone (n = 443) induced CR in only 16%. Only rare remissions (6%) were observed among patients managed supportively.

Survival after Post-transplantation Relapse

Median follow-up was 39 months after relapse (<1 to 193 months). Only 13% of all patients remained alive at the time of study analysis. Survival at 1 year after post-transplantation

relapse was 23%; however, survival probability at 3 years was only 4% for patients relapsing within 6 months of alloHCT, 12% for those relapsing from 6 months to 2 years, 26% for 2 to 3 years, and 38% for 3+ years (Figure 1A). Adjusted probabilities of survival at 3 years were 13% for patients younger than 18 years, 17% for those 19 to 40 years old, and 8% for patients older than 41 years (Figure 1B). Median survival was 7 months (range, 1 to 177 months) among patients receiving DLI and 12 months (1 to 150 months) among those receiving second HCT. Cell-based therapy (DLI or second HCT) resulted into significantly better ≥1 year post-relapse survival among patients relapsing 6 months and later after HCT (Table 3). In multivariable analysis, a longer time from HCT to relapse (P < .0001) and use of a RIC/NMA conditioning regimen (hazard ratio [HR], .77; P = .0002) for the initial alloHCT were associated with better survival (Table 4). In contrast, age > 41 years (HR, 1.42; P < .0001), unfavorable cytogenetics (HR, 1.37; P < .0062), mismatched URD (HR, 1.61; P < .0008), UCB (HR, 1.23; P < .0078), and presence of active GVHD at relapse (HR, 1.25; P < .0001) were independent predictors of inferior survival.

Relapse or persistent leukemia was the primary cause of death in 71% of cases. Although relapse was the cause of death in 80% of patients surviving less than 1 year, only 42% of longer surviving patients died of leukemia. Infection (4%) followed by GVHD (3%) and organ failure (3%) were the next most frequent causes of death and were similar in longer and shorter survivors.

DISCUSSION

In the 1788 AML patients relapsing after myeloablative or RIC/NMA alloHCT, we found that survival after post-transplantation relapse was significantly influenced by time

Table 4
Factors Influencing Survival of AML Patients Relapsing after alloHCT

Variable	n	Univariate		Multivariate	
		RR (95% CI)	P Value	RR (95% CI)	P Value
Time from HCT to relapse			<.0001		<.0001
<6 mo	774	1.00		1.00	
6 mo-2 yr	702	.60 (.53-.66)	<.0001	.55 (.50-.62)	<.0001
2-3 yr	138	.40 (.33-.50)	<.0001	.39 (.32-.49)	<.0001
≥3 yr	174	.30 (.24-.37)	<.0001	.28 (.23-.35)	<.0001
Year of HCT					
1990-2000	745	1.00		NS	NS
2001-2010	1043	1.19 (1.08-1.32)	.0006		
Age			<.0001		<.0001
≤18 yr	656	1.00		1.00	
19-40 yr	433	.86 (.75-.98)	.02	1.00 (.87-1.15)	.10
≥41 yr	699	1.27 (1.13-1.42)	<.0001	1.42 (1.24-1.64)	<.0001
Gender					
Male	988	1.00		NS	NS
Female	800	.98 (.88-1.08)	.63		
Cytogenetics			<.0001		.02
Favorable	138	1.00		1.00	
Intermediate/normal	805	1.27 (1.04-1.56)	.02	1.15 (.94-1.41)	.18
Unfavorable	334	1.64 (1.32-2.04)	<.0001	1.37 (1.09-1.71)	.01
Unknown	511	1.22 (.99-1.51)	.06	1.13 (.91-1.39)	.27
Conditioning					
MA	1374	1.00		1.00	
RIC/NMA	414	1.18 (1.05-1.33)	.01	.77 (.66-.88)	.0002
Donor type			<.0001		.0007
RD/URD-matched	1387	1.00		1.00	
URD-mismatched	56	1.65 (1.25-2.17)	.0003	1.61 (1.22-2.13)	.0008
URD-unknown	113	1.10 (.90-1.35)	.37	1.10 (.89-1.36)	.37
Cord blood	232	1.38 (1.19-1.60)	<.0001	1.23 (1.06-1.42)	.01
Active GVHD at relapse			.20		.0002
No	1028	1.00		1.00	
Yes	727	1.10 (.99-1.21)	.07	1.25 (1.13-1.39)	<.0001
Unknown	33	1.01 (.70-1.47)	.95	1.05 (.72-1.52)	.80

RR indicates relative risk.

from HCT to relapse, patients' age, cytogenetic risk group, donor type, HLA matching, and conditioning intensity. Although similar to prior reports we observed poor survival after AML relapse after alloHCT [1,2,5,7,11,19], longer remission after the initial alloHCT was an independent predictor of better survival. Patients who remained in remission ≥ 3 years after HCT had promising survival even after late relapse. In contrast, patients whose AML relapsed within 6 months of alloHCT had dismal survival, as observed in prior reports [1,5]. We also observed favorable survival after relapse in those receiving a second HCT with or without chemotherapy and/or DLI, particularly those achieving CR; this outcome is also consistent with prior reports [1,5,19].

Other prognostic factors associated with survival after post-alloHCT relapse were patient age, active GVHD at the time of relapse, cytogenetic risk group, donor type/HLA matching, and conditioning intensity. Older patients are more likely to be unfit at the time of relapse and unable to tolerate further intensive therapy, and they are more likely to be managed supportively. The 37% of our patients who were children were more likely to receive further intensive therapy and survive longer. Similarly, active GVHD at the time of relapse precludes the use of potentially valuable cell-based therapy and might increase the risk of infectious complications. Poor survival was seen with partially matched URD and UCB transplants [7]. Without the option of DLI for UCB patients, the only potential curative option for these patients remains a second HCT, but this was rarely performed. Somewhat surprisingly, RIC/NMA conditioning at first HCT was associated with better survival independent of patient age and time from transplantation to relapse. Previous reports of single-institution studies have made similar observations [5,7]. We speculate that the lower risks of post-HCT morbidity after RIC/NMA conditioning may allow these patients to be better candidates for subsequent intensive therapy versus those treated with more intensive myeloablative alloHCT. It is also possible that leukemia relapse after RIC/NMA conditioning may remain more sensitive to chemotherapy than after myeloablative conditioning and subsequently contribute to a better clinical outcome.

We had no available data to assess the influence of tumor burden at the time of relapse on subsequent response to therapy and survival. In addition, we were unable to systematically analyze the impact of each therapeutic approach on subsequent clinical outcomes because these were intermediate events occurring after relapse and data reporting was incomplete. Additionally, we were unable to directly assess the effect of immunosuppression withdrawal on achievement of remission; however, all previous reports suggest that this approach alone has minimal, if any, therapeutic benefit [7,20].

In conclusion, relapse of AML after alloHCT predicted poor outcomes. We recommend that patients with longer remission after initial alloHCT be considered for second HCT or chemotherapy plus DLI, as this approach was associated with prolonged survival in our cohort. Patients who relapse early, are elderly, or have active GVHD at the time of relapse are unlikely to benefit from intensive therapy and might best be managed supportively. Beyond compassionate supportive care, new approaches including prevention strategies [21] are needed for patients with early relapse after alloHCT.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The Center for International Blood and Marrow Transplant Research is supported by Public Health Service

Grant/Cooperative Agreement U24-CA076518 from the National Cancer Institute, the National Heart, Lung, and Blood Institute, and the National Institute of Allergy and Infectious Diseases; a grant/cooperative agreement 5U10HL069294 from NHLBI and NCI; a contract HHS250201200016C with Health Resources and Services Administration (HRSA/DHHS); 2 grants (N00014-12-1-0142 and N00014-13-1-0039) from the Office of Naval Research; and grants from *Actinium Pharmaceuticals; Allos Therapeutics, Inc.; *Amgen, Inc.; Anonymous donation to the Medical College of Wisconsin; Ariad; Be the Match Foundation; *Blue Cross and Blue Shield Association; *Celgene Corporation; Chimerix, Inc.; Fred Hutchinson Cancer Research Center; Fresenius-Biotech North America, Inc.; *Gamida Cell Teva Joint Venture Ltd.; Genentech, Inc.; *Gentium SpA; Genzyme Corporation; GlaxoSmithKline; Health Research, Inc. Roswell Park Cancer Institute; HistoGenetics, Inc.; Incyte Corporation; Jeff Gordon Children's Foundation; Kiadis Pharma; The Leukemia & Lymphoma Society; Medac GmbH; The Medical College of Wisconsin; Merck & Co, Inc.; Millennium: The Takeda Oncology Co.; *Milliman USA, Inc.; *Miltenyi Biotec, Inc.; National Marrow Donor Program; Onyx Pharmaceuticals; Optum Healthcare Solutions, Inc.; Osiris Therapeutics, Inc.; Otsuka America Pharmaceutical, Inc.; Perkin Elmer, Inc.; *Remedy Informatics; *Sanofi US; Seattle Genetics; Sigma-Tau Pharmaceuticals; Soligenix, Inc.; St. Baldrick's Foundation; StemCyte, A Global Cord Blood Therapeutics Co.; Stemsoft Software, Inc.; Swedish Orphan Biovitrum; *Tarix Pharmaceuticals; *TerumoBCT; *Teva Neuroscience, Inc.; *THERAKOS, Inc.; University of Minnesota; University of Utah; and *Wellpoint, Inc. 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, Health Resources and Services Administration, or any other agency of the US government.

*Corporate Members.

Financial disclosure: The authors have nothing to disclose.

Conflict of interest statement: There are no conflicts of interest to report.

REFERENCES

- Schmid C, Labopin M, Nagler A, et al. Treatment, risk factors, and outcome of adults with relapsed AML after reduced intensity conditioning for allogeneic stem cell transplantation. *Blood*. 2012;119:1599-1606.
- Devillier R, Crocchiolo R, Etienne A, et al. Outcome of relapse after allogeneic stem cell transplant in patients with acute myeloid leukemia. *Leuk Lymphoma*. 2013;54:1228-1234.
- Savani BN, Mielke S, Reddy N, et al. Management of relapse after allo-SCT for AML and the role of second transplantation. *Bone Marrow Transplant*. 2009;44:769-777.
- Schmid C, Labopin M, Nagler A, et al. Donor lymphocyte infusion in the treatment of first hematological relapse after allogeneic stem-cell transplantation in adults with acute myeloid leukemia: a retrospective risk factors analysis and comparison with other strategies by the EBMT Acute Leukemia Working Party. *J Clin Oncol*. 2007;25:4938-4945.
- Thanarajasingam G, Kim HT, Cutler C, et al. Outcome and prognostic factors for patients who relapse after allogeneic hematopoietic stem cell transplantation. *Biol Blood Marrow Transplant*. 2013;19:1713-1718.
- van den Brink MR, Porter DL, Giralt S, et al. Relapse after allogeneic hematopoietic cell therapy. *Biol Blood Marrow Transplant*. 2010;16:S138-S145.
- Bejanyan N, Oran B, Shanley R, et al. Clinical outcomes of AML patients relapsing after matched-related donor and umbilical cord blood transplantation. *Bone Marrow Transplant*. 2014;49:1029-1035.
- Eapen M, Giralt SA, Horowitz MM, et al. Second transplant for acute and chronic leukemia relapsing after first HLA-identical sibling transplant. *Bone Marrow Transplant*. 2004;34:721-727.
- Arellano ML, Langston A, Winton E, et al. Treatment of relapsed acute leukemia after allogeneic transplantation: a single center experience. *Biol Blood Marrow Transplant*. 2007;13:116-123.

10. Loren AW, Porter DL. Donor leukocyte infusions for the treatment of relapsed acute leukemia after allogeneic stem cell transplantation. *Bone Marrow Transplant*. 2008;41:483-493.
11. Oran B, Giral S, Couriel D, et al. Treatment of AML and MDS relapsing after reduced-intensity conditioning and allogeneic hematopoietic stem cell transplantation. *Leukemia*. 2007;21:2540-2544.
12. Levine JE, Braun T, Penza SL, et al. Prospective trial of chemotherapy and donor leukocyte infusions for relapse of advanced myeloid malignancies after allogeneic stem-cell transplantation. *J Clin Oncol*. 2002;20:405-412.
13. Lee JH, Lee KH, Kim S, et al. Combination chemotherapy of intermediate-dose cytarabine, idarubicin, plus etoposide and subsequent mobilized donor leukocyte infusion for relapsed acute leukemia after allogeneic bone marrow transplantation. *Leuk Res*. 2001;25:305-312.
14. Slovak ML, Kopecky KJ, Cassileth PA, et al. Karyotypic analysis predicts outcome of preremission and postremission therapy in adult acute myeloid leukemia: a Southwest Oncology Group/Eastern Cooperative Oncology Group Study. *Blood*. 2000;96:4075-4083.
15. Weisdorf D, Spellman S, Haagenson M, et al. Classification of HLA-matching for retrospective analysis of unrelated donor transplantation: revised definitions to predict survival. *Biol Blood Marrow Transplant*. 2008;14:748-758.
16. Bacigalupo A, Ballen K, Rizzo D, et al. Defining the intensity of conditioning regimens: working definitions. *Biol Blood Marrow Transplant*. 2009;15:1628-1633.
17. Giral S, Ballen K, Rizzo D, et al. Reduced-intensity conditioning regimen workshop: defining the dose spectrum. Report of a workshop convened by the center for international blood and marrow transplant research. *Biol Blood Marrow Transplant*. 2009;15:367-369.
18. Kaplan EL, Meier P. Nonparametric estimation from incomplete observations. *J Am Stat Assoc*. 1958;53:457-481.
19. Kedmi M, Resnick IB, Dray L, et al. A retrospective review of the outcome after second or subsequent allogeneic transplantation. *Biol Blood Marrow Transplant*. 2009;15:483-489.
20. Porter DL, Alyea EP, Antin JH, et al. NCI First International Workshop on the Biology, Prevention, and Treatment of Relapse after Allogeneic Hematopoietic Stem Cell Transplantation: Report from the Committee on Treatment of Relapse after Allogeneic Hematopoietic Stem Cell Transplantation. *Biol Blood Marrow Transplant*. 2010;16:1467-1503.
21. Bishop MR, Alyea EP 3rd, Cairo MS, et al. National Cancer Institute's First International Workshop on the Biology, Prevention, and Treatment of Relapse after Allogeneic Hematopoietic Stem Cell Transplantation: summary and recommendations from the organizing committee. *Biol Blood Marrow Transplant*. 2011;17:443-454.