| Methods of minimal residual disease assessment in acute myeloid leukemia | | | | |
|--|------------|---------------|--|--|
| Sensitivity | Advantages | Disadvantages | | |

| Conventional karyotyping | 5% | Common in routine clinical practice | Poor sensitivity Time consuming and labor intensive Applicable only to patients with baseline abnormal karyotype (~50%) | |
|---|---|--|--|--|
| Fluorescent in situ hybridization | Up to 10 ⁻² | Useful for numeric cytogenetic tabnormalities (i.e. gains or • deletions) | Worse sensitivity than MFC or PCR Applicable only to patients with baseline abnormal karyotype (~50%) | |
| Multiparameter flow cytometry for LAIPs* or DfN** | 10 ⁻³ to 10 ⁻⁵ | Sensitive Fast (results usually available within 24 h) Relatively inexpensive Applicable to >90% of AML cases | Potential for immunophenotypic shifts (mitigated by using DfN-based approach) Requires significant technical expertise to interpret Limited standardization across laboratories | |
| RT-qPCR | 10 ⁻⁴ to 10 ⁻⁶ | Sensitive Well standardized Can be run in any laboratory with RT-qPCR capabilities Applicable to >90% of AML cases | Appropriate molecular targets present in <50% of cases (<35% in older adults) Many mutations are not suitable for MRD detection (e.g. FL T3) Time consuming and labor intensive Results may take several days | |
| Next-generation sequencing | Highly variable (1% to 10 ⁻⁶) | Potential for very high sensitivity (depending on technology) Can test multiple genes at once | Low sensitivity with most commonly used platforms May be confounded by persistence of preleukemic mutations (e.g. CHIP) Results may take several days Expensive | |
| *LAIPs: leukemia-associated immunophenotypes **DfN: difference from normal analysis • Not standardized • Requires complex bioinforma Short and Ravandi, Ha | | | | |