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The introduction of tyrosine kinase inhibitors (TKI) has revolutionised the management of patients with chronic myeloid leukemia (CML) over the last twenty years, but despite significant improvements in survival, patients exhibit long-term side effects that impact on quality of life. A major advance in CML management has been the ability to discontinue TKI therapy achieving a treatment-free remission (TFR), yet this option is only available to eligible patients who present with low-risk disease and who subsequently attain deep and sustained molecular responses. A case is described of a patient with CML who self-initiated stopping of TKI therapy when in a less than optimal molecular remission. Despite this action, the patient continues to experience a TFR with prospective close molecular monitoring performed. It is emphasized that this approach may lead to ineffective treatment discontinuation, molecular relapse, and increased patient anxiety. As TFR for patients with CML moves from clinical trials into routine clinical practice, emphasis is placed on adherence to (evolving) guidelines critical to ensure optimal counselling, selection, monitoring, and continued management of patients whether TFR is successful or not.

1. Introduction

Chronic myeloid leukemia (CML) patients with optimal responses to tyrosine kinase inhibitors (TKI) have achieved long-term survival with life expectancy in younger CML patients approaching near normal [1]. Despite this improved outcome, long-term use of TKIs is associated with adverse events that may severely affect patient quality of life and impact on morbidity and mortality [2]. In the last decade, the remarkable phenomenon of treatment-free remission (TFR) has been witnessed: in a pivotal study, approximately 40% of CML patients on imatinib therapy for more than two years and in a deep molecular response remained in sustained clinical and molecular remission upon antileukemic TKI discontinuation [3]. TFR rates of 40–60% in eligible patients have been corroborated by numerous, subsequent, randomised clinical trials (in which the eligibility criteria of TKI, time on TKI, and length and depth of molecular response have varied) and have been recently reviewed [4, 5]. Outside of clinical trials, similar TFR rates are also achievable in the “real-world” setting [6–8]. Importantly, in all these studies where patients relapse after discontinuation (nearly always within the first six months of stopping), reintroduction of a TKI results in attainment of a favourable molecular response in the vast majority of patients [9]. The persistence of quiescent CML stem cells in those patients in successful TFR suggests some form of immunological interaction is partly responsible for control of the residual leukemic clone, the mechanisms of which remain poorly defined [10, 11]. Of note is the recurrent adverse event in 20–30% of those CML patients attempting TFR of a transient TKI withdrawal syndrome manifesting as musculoskeletal pain [12].

With the increased acceptance and uptake of attempting TFR in routine clinical practice, recommendations for the minimal requirements for treatment discontinuation have
been proposed by both European and North American experts groups [13, 14]. Similarities exist between these two sets of criteria although there remains limited consensus on the requirements for TKI treatment duration or depth and stability of the molecular remission prior to attempting TFR [15]. Both sets of guidelines concur on the importance of instigating frequent molecular monitoring so that molecular relapse can be rapidly captured prompting reintroduction of TKI.

Improving quality of life may alone provide sufficient rationale for TFR consideration. Younger patients may have a desire to lessen the potential of future adverse events or by personal/family goals, whereas older patients may seek to mitigate the adverse effects they currently experience on TKI therapy [16]. Given that nonadherence is not an uncommon pattern in patients on long-term TKI therapy [17] and an increased awareness of TFR, CML patients may be independently motivated to stop therapy.

2. Case Report

A 55-year-old man presented in November 2008 with fatigue, headache, left upper quadrant abdominal discomfort, and palpable splenomegaly. He had a hemoglobin of 11.6 g/dL, a white cell count of 53.7 × 10^9/L, and platelets of 165 × 10^9/L. Bone marrow aspirate revealed moderate hypercellularity with less than 2% myeloblasts, and cytogenetics demonstrated a karyotype of 46,XY,t(9;22)(q34;q11.2). Molecular analysis revealed high levels of e14a2 BCR-ABL1 transcripts, all consistent with a diagnosis of chronic phase CML with a low-risk Sokal score of 0.75.

The patient was enrolled on an open label, single stage, multicentre, nonrandomized, phase II clinical trial to assess the efficacy of upfront nilotinib 300 mg twice daily [18]. Prospective molecular BCR-ABL1 monitoring was performed in a European Treatment and Outcome Study (EUTOS)-certified laboratory according to standardized procedures with results reported in line with standardized definitions of response [19, 20]. The patient achieved a major molecular response (MMR; BCR-ABL1/ABL1 IS ≤ 0.1% on the International Scale) at 16 months that was maintained for seven years (Figure 1). Thereafter, a deeper molecular response (MR4; BCR-ABL1/ABL1 IS ≤ 0.01% on the International Scale) was transiently noted.

During his treatment he continued to have mild fatigue and headaches. Transient grade-II increase in serum lipase was also noted which normalised on temporary interruption of nilotinib. Later in the treatment, he reported having frequent nightmares, sleep disturbances, poor concentration, and in general, poor quality of life. Overall, his treatment was continuous with three short (<7 days) interruptions due to impairment in baseline renal functions and transient increase in serum lipase at one instance but was not considered a candidate for attempting TFR at any time due to the lack of a prolonged, deep molecular response. However, at a follow-up appointment, the patient stated that he had stopped taking his TKI in March 2018 and reported feeling much better having stopped nilotinib and did not wish to restart. He had not noticed any symptoms suggestive of a TKI withdrawal syndrome. Counselling that his response could be lost and being offered treatment with an alternative TKI, he preferred to pursue a trial of treatment cessation, prompting immediate monthly BCR-ABL1 monitoring to detect any loss of molecular response as per European guidelines [13]. The patient is now 18 months after TKI discontinuation maintaining a stable BCR-ABL1 level of 0.01% (Figure 1) and remains clinically well. Given the less than optimal BCR-ABL1 history, molecular monitoring continues at six weekly intervals.

3. Discussion

For many CML patients who have achieved stable and deep molecular responses with TKI therapy, evidence from both clinical trials and real-world settings has demonstrated the feasibility of TFR with current guidelines outlining minimal criteria for eligibility [13, 14]. While these guidelines concur that CML patients attempting TFR must be under the care of CML specialist physicians, have low-risk, chronic phase disease, and have been on continuous TKI therapy for a specified number of years, several aspects of these evolving guidelines remain equivocal (Table 1).

Initial TKI choice appears to have little impact on attaining TFR which has been achieved at a similar frequency of CML patients treated with first-line with imatinib, dasatinib, or nilotinib. The use of more potent inhibitors first-line may increase the number of patients eligible for TFR consideration and reduce overall TKI exposure [21]. Furthermore, in those patients who have switched TKI due to intolerance, TKI rates are comparable to those patients who received only a single agent, provided criteria regarding molecular response and other features are met and are superior to those patients previously experiencing resistance to their first-line TKI [16]. A further intriguing development is the de-escalation of TKI prior to cessation, recently demonstrated to improve the success of TFR protocols though the mechanism of this benefit is not yet clear [22].

Interest has focussed on the influence of the BCR-ABL1 transcript type on response to first-line TKI with the patients expressing e14a2 transcripts having superior molecular responses to those harboring e13a2 transcripts; however, the impact on overall survival remains unclear [23, 24]. This theory has been extrapolated to those patients attempting TFR with one recent study suggesting that the e14a2 BCR-ABL1 transcript, as expressed in the above case, favourably impacts on sustained TFR upon TKI discontinuation [25].
The initial molecular response to TKI in this case was slow and would be considered as a warning under current European LeukemiaNet guidelines, yet this did not prevent the patient achieving a subsequent TFR [26]. It is known that early molecular response and female sex strongly predict stable undetectable BCR-ABL1 transcripts (the criteria for TKI discontinuation) [27, 28] but whether this actually translates to maintaining TFR upon cessation is not yet apparent. Most TKI discontinuation trials intuitively conclude that both the depth and duration of molecular response are key indicators of successful TFR [5] although a sustained MR4 prior to TKI cessation was not apparent in this case. While rare instances of TFR have been recently described in CML patients in only MMR [29], TFR trials to date have required deep molecular responses of a minimum of MR4 for entry. For those patients not achieving MR4, the possibility exists of clinical trials that facilitate switching to an alternative TKI in order to improve and sustain the molecular response before TFR. It is in patients with significant long-term side effects that such an approach may be beneficial.

Many factors contribute to the decision to attempt TFR in patients who are eligible and include risk of relapse, side effects, financial considerations, polypharmacy, and willingness to change something that is already working [30]. In an analysis of real-world experience of unplanned TKI discontinuation, patient request was one of the most frequent reasons for stopping with information on TFR clinical trials increasingly available through multiple media sources [31]. Acknowledging patient preference, TKI discontinuation should always follow a full assessment and consultation with patient-initiated discontinuation firmly discouraged.

Given the expected increased prevalence of CML in the forthcoming years driven by both population aging and a relative survival improvement, TFR is likely to become an increasingly sought long-term option and goal [32]. From a clinical practice perspective, an up-to-date survey of oncologists and hematologists regarding TKI therapy discontinuation practice including molecular monitoring, adequate response for discontinuation, and relapse and symptoms following discontinuation suggested discontinuation was often attempted under suboptimal conditions underscoring the requirement for clinician education [33]. Given the heterogeneity of inclusion criteria in previous TFR studies, further clinical trials, including biological investigations, are warranted to establish the optimal preconditions for achieving TFR [5]. Adherence to existing guidelines is recommended though these are likely to evolve with refinement and harmonization of TKI discontinuation trials.

Conflicts of Interest

The authors declare that there are no conflicts of interest regarding the publication of this paper.

References

[1] J. F. Apperley, “CML and tyrosine kinase inhibition: the hope becomes reality,” The Lancet Haematology, vol. 2, no. 5, pp. e176–e177, 2015.
[2] F. Efficace, M. Baccarani, M. Breccia et al., “Health-related quality of life in chronic myeloid leukemia patients receiving long-term therapy with imatinib compared with the general population,” Blood, vol. 118, no. 7, pp. 4554–4560, 2011.
[3] F.-X. Mahon, D. Réa, J. Guilhot et al., “Discontinuation of imatinib in patients with chronic myeloid leukemia who have maintained complete molecular remission for at least 2 years: the prospective, multicentre Stop Imatinib (STIM) trial,” The Lancet Oncology, vol. 11, no. 11, pp. 1029–1035, 2010.
[4] P. Laneuville, “When to stop tyrosine kinase inhibitors for the treatment of chronic myeloid leukemia,” Current Treatment Options in Oncology, vol. 19, no. 3, p. 15, 2018.
[5] K. K. Chen, T. F. Du, P. S. Xiong, G. H. Fan, and W. Yang, “Discontinuation of tyrosine kinase inhibitors in chronic myeloid leukemia with losing major molecular response as a definition for molecular relapse: a systematic review and meta-analysis,” Frontiers in Oncology, vol. 9, p. 372, 2019.
[6] J. C. Hernández-Boluda, A. Pereira, I. Pastor-Gálán et al., “Feasibility of treatment discontinuation in chronic myeloid leukemia; MR: molecular response; MMR: major molecular response.

| Criteria for TKI cessation | ESMO guidelines [18] | NCCN guidelines [19] |
|---------------------------|---------------------|---------------------|
| Consultation | CML speciality centre | CML speciality centre |
| Age | Not specified | ≥18 years |
| Risk category or phase at diagnosis | Non-high Sokal score | Chronic phase |
| On TKI therapy | >5 years | >3 years |
| BCR-ABL1 transcript | e13a2, e14a2 or other transcript quantifiable over 4.5 log range | Evidence of quantifiable transcript |
| Molecular response achieved & duration | MR4.5 achieved/MR4.0 ≥ 2 years | MR4.0 ≥ 2 years |
| BCR-ABL1 test sensitivity/turnaround | At least MR4.5/4 weeks | At least MR4.5/2 weeks |
| Monitoring frequency | Monthly for 6 months/weekly for next 6 months/3 monthly thereafter | Monthly for one year/weekly for second year/3 monthly thereafter |
| TKI resumption | Not specified | Within 4 weeks of loss of MMR with monthly monitoring |

TKI: tyrosine kinase inhibitor; ESMO: European Society for Medical Oncology; NCCN: National Comprehensive Cancer Network; CML: chronic myeloid leukemia; MR: molecular response; MMR: major molecular response.
leukemia in clinical practice: results from a nationwide series of 236 patients,” *Blood Cancer Journal*, vol. 8, no. 10, p. 91, 2018.

[7] N. Cerveira, B. Loreiro, S. Bizarro et al., “Discontinuation of tyrosine kinase inhibitors in CML patients in a real-world clinical practice at a single institution,” *BMC Cancer*, vol. 18, no. 1, p. 1245, 2018.

[8] K. Chamoun, H. Kantarjian, R. Atallah et al., “Tyrosine kinase inhibitor discontinuation in patients with chronic myeloid leukemia: a single-institution experience,” *Journal of Hematology & Oncology*, vol. 12, no. 1, p. 1, 2019.

[9] D. Rea and F. X. Mahon, “How I manage relapse of chronic myeloid leukaemia after stopping tyrosine kinase inhibitor therapy,” *British Journal of Haematology*, vol. 180, no. 1, pp. 34–32, 2018.

[10] M. Ilander, U. Olsson-Strömberg, H. Schlums et al., “Increased proportion of mature NK cells is associated with successful imatinib discontinuation in chronic myeloid leukemia,” *Leukemia*, vol. 31, no. 5, pp. 1108–1116, 2017.

[11] E. Cayssials, F. Jacomet, N. Piccirilli et al., “Sustained treatment-free remission in chronic myeloid leukaemia is associated with an increased frequency of innate CD8(+) T-cells,” *British Journal of Haematology*, vol. 186, no. 1, pp. 54–59, 2019.

[12] V. Kota and E. Atallah, “Musculoskeletal pain in patients with chronic myeloid leukemia after stopping tyrosine kinase inhibitor therapy cessation,” *Clinical Lymphoma Myeloma and Leukemia*, vol. 19, no. 8, pp. 480–487, 2019.

[13] A. Hochhaus, S. Saussele, G. Rosti et al., “Corrections to "Chronic myeloid leukaemia: ESMO Clinical Practice Guidelines for diagnosis, treatment and follow-up,"” *Annals of Oncology*, vol. 29, no. 4, p. iv261, 2018.

[14] J. P. Radich, M. Deininger, C. N. Abboud et al., “Chronic myeloid leukemia, version 1.2019, NCCN clinical practice guidelines in oncology,” *Journal of the National Comprehensive Cancer Network*, vol. 16, no. 9, pp. 1108–1135, 2018.

[15] S. Soverini, R. Bassan, and T. Lion, “Treatment and monitoring of Philadelphia chromosome-positive leukemia patients: recent advances and remaining challenges,” *Journal of Hematology & Oncology*, vol. 12, no. 1, p. 39, 2019.

[16] J. Cortes, D. Rea, and J. H. Lipton, “Treatment-free remission with first- and second-generation tyrosine kinase inhibitors,” *American Journal of Hematology*, vol. 94, no. 3, pp. 346–357, 2019.

[17] D. Marin, A. Bazeos, F.-X. Mahon et al., “Adherence is the critical factor for achieving molecular responses in patients with chronic myeloid leukemia who achieve complete cytogenetic responses on imatinib,” *Journal of Clinical Oncology*, vol. 28, no. 14, pp. 2381–2388, 2010.

[18] M. E. O’Dwyer, R. Swords, A. Nagler et al., “Nilotinib 300 mg Bid as frontline treatment of CML: prospective analysis of the Xpert BCR-ABL Monitor system and significance of 3-month molecular response,” *Leukemia Research*, vol. 38, no. 3, pp. 310–315, 2014.

[19] L. Foroni, G. Wilson, G. Gerrard et al., “Guidelines for the measurement of BCR-ABL1 transcripts in chronic myeloid leukemia,” *British Journal of Haematology*, vol. 153, no. 2, pp. 179–190, 2011.

[20] N. C. P. Cross, H. E. White, D. Colomer et al., “Laboratory recommendations for scoring deep molecular responses following treatment for chronic myeloid leukemia,” *Leukemia*, vol. 29, no. 5, pp. 999–1003, 2015.

[21] D. M. Ross, T. Masszi, M. T. Gómez Casares et al., “Durable treatment-free remission in patients with chronic myeloid leukemia in chronic phase following frontline nilotinib: 96-week update of the ENESTfreedom study,” *Journal of Cancer Research and Clinical Oncology*, vol. 144, no. 5, pp. 945–954, 2018.

[22] R. E. Clark, F. Polydoros, J. F. Apperley et al., “De-escalation of tyrosine kinase inhibitor therapy before complete treatment discontinuation in patients with chronic myeloid leukemia (DESTINY): a non-randomised, phase 2 trial,” *The Lancet Haematology*, vol. 6, no. 7, pp. e375–e383, 2019.

[23] P. Jain, H. Kantarjian, K. P. Patel et al., “Impact of BCR-ABL transcript type on outcome in patients with chronic-phase CML treated with tyrosine kinase inhibitors,” *Blood*, vol. 127, no. 10, pp. 1269–1275, 2016.

[24] M. Pfirrmann, D. Evtimova, S. Saussele et al., “No influence of BCR-ABL1 transcript types e13a2 and e14a2 on long-term survival: results in 1494 patients with chronic myeloid leukemia treated with imatinib,” *Journal of Cancer Research and Clinical Oncology*, vol. 143, no. 5, pp. 843–850, 2017.

[25] P. Jain, H. Kantarjian, K. P. Patel et al., “Impact of BCR-ABL transcript type and specific K252A BCR-ABL on outcome in patients with chronic myeloid leukemia who receive tyrosine kinase inhibitors,” *Leukemia*, vol. 125, no. 10, pp. 1674–1682, 2019.

[26] M. Baccarani, M. W. Deininger, G. Rosti et al., “European LeukemiaNet recommendations for the management of chronic myeloid leukemia: 2013,” *Blood*, vol. 122, no. 6, pp. 872–884, 2013.

[27] S. Branford, D. T. Yeung, D. M. Ross et al., “Early molecular response and female sex strongly predict stable undetectable BCR-ABL1, the criteria for imatinib discontinuation in patients with CML,” *Blood*, vol. 121, no. 19, pp. 3818–3824, 2013.

[28] H.-X. Lin, J. Sjaarda, J. Dyck et al., “Gender and BCR-ABL transcript type are correlated with molecular response to imatinib treatment in patients with chronic myeloid leukemia,” *European Journal of Haematology*, vol. 96, no. 4, pp. 360–366, 2016.

[29] M. Dragani, G. Rege-Cambrin, D. Ferrero et al., “Beyond the comfort zone of deep molecular response: discontinuation in major molecular response chronic myeloid leukemia,” *Leukemia & Lymphoma*, vol. 60, no. 13, pp. 3330–3332, 2019.

[30] K. E. Flynn, J. M. Myers, A. D’Souza, C. A. Schiffer, J. E. Thompson, and E. Atallah, “Exploring patient decision making regarding discontinuation of tyrosine kinase inhibitors for chronic myeloid leukemia,” *The Oncologist*, vol. 24, no. 9, pp. 1253–1258, 2019.

[31] M. Iino, T. Yamamoto, and Y. Sakamoto, “Outcomes of unplanned tyrosine kinase inhibitor discontinuation in patients with chronic myeloid leukemia: retrospective analysis of real-world experience in a single institution,” *Hematology*, vol. 24, no. 1, pp. 355–361, 2019.

[32] M. Delord, S. Foulon, J.-M. Cayuela, P. Rousselet, and J. Bonastre, “The rising prevalence of chronic myeloid leukemia in France,” *Leukemia Research*, vol. 69, pp. 94–99, 2018.

[33] E. K. Ritchie, D. Latremouille-Viau, A. Guerin et al., “Tyrosine kinase inhibitor therapy treatment and discontinuation in patients with chronic myeloid leukemia in chronic phase in the United States: a clinical practice perspective,” *Leukemia & Lymphoma*, vol. 60, no. 6, pp. 1476–1484, 2019.