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Click here for papers on Hodgkin lymphoma.

When one queries lymphoma investigators about the key data sets from the December ASH meeting, at the top of almost every list is a stunning report in which 102 patients with Hodgkin lymphoma (HL) and disease progression after a median of 3.5 prior chemotherapy treatments and an autologous stem cell transplant were treated with brentuximab vedotin. “B vedotin” is an immune conjugate, with an antibody against CD30 hooked to an antitubulin agent (monomethyl auristatin E) that is similar to vinblastine.

Like the trastuzumab/maytansine conjugate T-DM1 in breast cancer, B vedotin is thought to deliver the cytotoxic to or into the tumor cell, but the exact mechanism of antitumor effect has yet to be defined. Of great interest, unlike its breast cancer cousin, the naked antibody in B vedotin is not active in heavily pretreated HL.

In this pivotal Phase II, single-arm trial, more than 90 percent of patients had tumor responses (check out the waterfall plot), with 34 percent complete and 40 percent partial remissions. The agent was well tolerated with apparently reversible peripheral neuropathy identified as the only important toxicity. It should come as no surprise that this fascinating agent is quickly tracking through the FDA and being incorporated into ongoing and emerging clinical trials, including as consolidation after transplant and up front with ABVD.
Three other ASH presentations on HL are also profiled in our slide sets:

1. The long-awaited **Phase III ECOG/Intergroup trial** in locally extensive or bulky advanced HL randomizing between ABVD and Stanford V.

Many were disappointed to see that there was no major efficacy difference between the two arms, and in the US, ABVD remains the standard. In this trial, only patients with bulky mediastinal disease received radiation therapy with ABVD as opposed to essentially a multimodality approach with Stanford V.

2. **A German study** evaluating PET scanning in patients with advanced-stage HL and a residual mass on CAT scan greater than 2.5 cm after BEACOPP.

Ninety-two percent of patients with negative PETs were disease-free at three years without radiation therapy. Whether this can be extrapolated to ABVD is being debated.

3. **An Italian study** of interim PET scanning after two cycles of ABVD in patients with both early and advanced disease.

Patients with PET positivity did poorly and should be considered for immediate referral to a tertiary center for clinical trial consideration.

It is worth remembering that while most of the 8,000 patients diagnosed with HL annually in the US are cured, approximately 1,500 (mostly those presenting with advanced disease) are not. Fortunately, for the first time maybe ever there are a number of promising agents in development, including B vedotin, lenalidomide, panobinostat and everolimus, offering new hope that some of these mostly younger patients can be salvaged.

Next up on ASH 5-Minute Journal Club: Another major paper on B vedotin — this time in anaplastic large cell lymphoma — and other new data in T-cell lymphomas.

Neil Love, MD
Research To Practice
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Presentations discussed in this issue


Slides from presentations at ASH 2010 and transcribed comments from a recent interview with Craig Moskowitz, MD (1/3/11)
Early Interim $^{18}$f-FDG PET in Hodgkin’s Lymphoma: Evaluation on 304 Patients

Zinzani PL et al. Proc ASH 2010;Abstract 3879.

Study Schema

Eligibility (N = 304)
- Newly diagnosed Hodgkin lymphoma

PET scan at baseline → ABVD x 2 → Interim PET scan → ABVD (complete course) → Follow-up (median 31 months) → PET scan

Distribution of Patients
- 147 early stage
- 157 advanced stage

Results (from Abstract)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Efficacy Outcome</th>
<th>Positive Interim PET (n = 53)</th>
<th>Negative Interim PET (n = 251)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Complete Remission</td>
<td>24.5%</td>
<td>92.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Early Stage (n = 19, 128)</td>
<td>21.0%</td>
<td>97.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advanced Stage (n = 34, 123)</td>
<td>26.4%</td>
<td>88.6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comparison between interim PET-positive and interim PET-negative patients indicated a significant association between PET findings and 9-year PFS ($p = 0.0000$) and 9-year overall survival ($p = 0.0000$).


Author Conclusions

- These results confirm the role of early PET as a significant step forward for the management of both early and advanced-stage Hodgkin lymphoma.

- Interim PET scans may offer the potential for an immediate switch to high-dose treatments, if required.

Assessment of Residual Bulky Tumor Using FDG-PET in Patients with Advanced-Stage Hodgkin Lymphoma After Completion of Chemotherapy: Final Report of the GHSG HD15 Trial


Study Schema

Eligibility (N = 2,137)
Advanced-stage Hodgkin lymphoma

BEACOPP x 6-8 cycles

CT scan

PR with residual disease ≥ 2.5 cm (n = 728)

PET scan

Positive
Radiation to residual disease

Negative
No immediate radiation

CR
PR with residual disease < 2.5 cm
No response

No PET scan

### Results (from Abstract)

#### Patients with PR and Residual Disease ≥ 2.5 cm (n = 728)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PET Status</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PET Negative</td>
<td>74.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PET Positive</td>
<td>25.8%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>PET Negative</th>
<th>PET Positive</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Negative Prognostic Value</td>
<td>94.6%</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of Progression Events at 3 Years</td>
<td>92.1%</td>
<td>86.1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. Patients with PET-positive disease received immediate radiation.
2. Radiation counted as a progression event in PET-negative patients.

Engert A et al. *Proc ASH* 2010;Abstract 764.

### Results (from Abstract)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Current Trial</th>
<th>Earlier Trials</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Radiation after BEACOPP</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>71%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In addition, there was no difference in PFS or overall survival as compared to earlier trials in advanced-stage HL.

Engert A et al. *Proc ASH* 2010;Abstract 764.
Author Conclusion

- Patients with a negative PET scan after BEACOPP do not need additional radiation therapy.
  - 94.6% negative prognostic value of negative PET


Investigator comment on role of PET scan in Hodgkin lymphoma

The study by Zinzani is important. The question in my mind is whether all patients with Hodgkin lymphoma (HL) need the interim PET scan. Approximately 90 percent of patients with early-stage HL are cured in the pre-PET era, and the corresponding proportion in advanced-stage HL is 75 percent. I believe that patients with advanced-stage HL and a positive PET after two cycles fare extremely poorly and should be referred to major academic centers for second-line therapy. For patients who have early-stage HL with positive interim PET, to me that is still a debatable issue.

The presentation by Engert is mainly applicable to patients receiving BEACOPP and to practices that have traditionally administered involved field radiation therapy to patients with residual disease of 2.5 cm or more. This might also be applicable to patients receiving ABVD, but I don’t know that. For patients with advanced HL and a negative PET after BEACOPP, there is definitely no role for consolidative radiation therapy anymore.

*Interview with Craig Moskowitz, MD, January 3, 2011*