

# Efficacy, safety, and cost of mobilization strategies in multiple myeloma: a prospective, observational study

Binod Dhakal,<sup>1</sup> Mei-Jei Zhang,<sup>2,3</sup> Linda J. Burns,<sup>3</sup> Xiaoying Tang,<sup>3</sup> Christa Meyer,<sup>4</sup> Lih-Wen Mau,<sup>4</sup> Ajay K. Nooka,<sup>5</sup> Edward Stadtmauer,<sup>6</sup> Ivana N. Micallef,<sup>7</sup> Joseph McGuirk,<sup>8</sup> Luciano Costa,<sup>9</sup> Mark B. Juckett,<sup>10</sup> Nina Shah,<sup>11</sup> Richard E. Champlin,<sup>12</sup> Saad Z. Usmani,<sup>13</sup> Sherif S. Farag,<sup>14</sup> Taiga Nishihori,<sup>15</sup> Vivek Roy,<sup>16</sup> Andrew Bodiford,<sup>17</sup> Yvonne J. Barnes,<sup>18</sup> Edward J. Drea,<sup>19</sup> Parameswaran Hari<sup>3</sup> and Mehdi Hamadani<sup>1,3</sup>

<sup>1</sup>BMT and Cellular Therapy Program, Department of Medicine, Medical College of Wisconsin, Milwaukee, WI; <sup>2</sup>Division of Biostatistics, Institute for Health and Equity, Medical College of Wisconsin, Milwaukee, WI; <sup>3</sup>CIBMTR® (Center for International Blood and Marrow Transplant Research), Department of Medicine, Medical College of Wisconsin, Milwaukee, WI; <sup>4</sup>CIBMTR® (Center for International Blood and Marrow Transplant Research), National Marrow Donor Program/Be The Match, Minneapolis, MN; <sup>5</sup>Department of Hematology and Medical Oncology, Winship Cancer Institute, Emory University School of Medicine, Atlanta, GA; <sup>6</sup>University of Pennsylvania Abramson Cancer Center, Philadelphia, PA; <sup>7</sup>Division of Hematology, Mayo Clinic, Rochester, MN; <sup>8</sup>Division of Hematologic Malignancies and Cellular Therapeutics, The University of Kansas Cancer Center, Kansas City, KS; <sup>9</sup>Division of Hematology/Oncology, Department of Medicine, University of Alabama at Birmingham, Birmingham, AL; <sup>10</sup>Department of Medicine, Division of Hematology, Oncology and Transplantation, University of Minnesota, Minneapolis, MN; <sup>11</sup>Division of Hematology-Oncology; University of California San Francisco, San Francisco, CA; <sup>12</sup>Department of Stem Cell Transplantation and Cellular Therapy, Division of Cancer Medicine, The University of Texas MD Anderson Cancer Center, Houston, TX; <sup>13</sup>Department of Medicine, Memorial Sloan Kettering Cancer Center, New York, NY; <sup>14</sup>Division of Hematology and Oncology, Indiana University School of Medicine, Indianapolis, IN; <sup>15</sup>Department of Blood and Marrow Transplant and Cellular Immunotherapy (BMT CI), Moffitt Cancer Center, Tampa, FL; <sup>16</sup>Blood and Marrow Transplant Program, Mayo Clinic, Jacksonville, FL; <sup>17</sup>US Medical Affairs – Transplantation, Sanofi, Bridgewater, NJ; <sup>18</sup>US Medical Affairs – Hematology Oncology, Sanofi Specialty Care, Cambridge, MA and <sup>19</sup>US Medical – Oncology Medical Value & Outcomes, Sanofi Specialty Care, Cambridge, MA, USA

Correspondence:

M. HAMADANI - mhamadani@mcw.edu

<https://doi.org/10.3324/haematol.2022.282269>

**Table 1S: Baseline characteristics**

	<b>G+/-JIT (N=402)</b>	<b>G+P (N=269)</b>	<b>G+C (N=73)</b>	<b>p-value</b>
<b>No of centers</b>	18	15	12	
<b>Age, median (range)</b>	61 (28-71)	61 (25-71)	63 (39-70)	0.14
<b>Sex, female</b>	174 (43)	115 (43)	24 (33)	0.24
<b>Race, white</b>	302 (75)	192 (71)	58 (79)	0.03
<b>KPS</b>				0.02
≥90	205 (51)	169 (63)	44 (60)	
<90	185 (46)	96 (36)	29 (40)	
NR	12 (3)	4 (1)	0 (0)	
<b>HCT-CI,</b>				<0.01
0	81 (20)	95 (35)	14 (19)	
1-2	126 (31)	71 (26)	30 (41)	
≥3	194 (48)	102 (38)	29 (40)	
NR	2 (0)	1(0)	0(0)	
<b>ISS</b>				0.91
I-II	267 (66)	180 (67)	40 (64)	
III	81 (20)	50 (19)	17 (23)	
NR	54 (13)	39 (12)	9 (12)	
<b>Disease risk</b>				<0.01
High risk	183 (46)	111 (41)	24 (33)	
Standard risk	208 (52)	148 (55)	40 (55)	
NR	11 (3)	10 (4)	9 (12)	
<b>Serum creatinine</b>				0.11
< 2 mg/dl	339 (84)	238 (88)	64 (88)	
≥ 2 mg/dl	63 (16)	30 (11)	8 (11)	
NR	0 (0)	1 (0)	1 (11)	
<b>Involved light chain</b>				0.03
Kappa	264 (66)	148 (55)	45 (62)	
Lambda	125 (31)	101 (38)	24 (33)	
NR	13 (3)	20 (7)	4 (5)	
<b>Induction</b>				0.19
VTD/VRD/VCD	344 (86)	242 (90)	66 (90)	
VD/RD/TD	41 (10)	12 (4)	5 (7)	
VAD/others	7 (2)	7 (3)	1 (1)	
NR	10 (2)	8 (3)	1 (1)	
<b>Disease status at HCT</b>				<0.01
sCR/CR	79 (20)	44 (16)	3 (4)	
near CR	34 (8)	13 (5)	1 (1)	
VGPR	151 (38)	102 (38)	18 (25)	
PR	126 (31)	99 (37)	40 (55)	
SD	11 (3)	11 (4)	10 (14)	
PD	0 (0)	0 (0)	1 (1)	
NR	1 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	
<b>Time from diagnosis to transplant</b>				<0.01
< 6 months	207 (51)	113 (42)	16 (22)	
6-12 months	178 (44)	147 (55)	52 (71)	
≥ 12 months	17 (4)	9 (3)	5 (7)	
<b>Year of transplant</b>				<0.01
2017	12 (3)	8 (3)	1 (1)	
2018	383 (95)	247 (92)	63 (86)	
2019	7 (2)	14 (5)	9 (12)	
Median follow up, months (range)	25 (6-38)	24 (1-38)	24 (10-36)	

Abbreviations: G-CSF, granulocyte colony-stimulating factor; HCT, hematopoietic cell transplantation; HCT-CI, Hematopoietic Cell Transplantation Comorbidity, JIT, just-in-time; RD, lenalidomide [Revlimid] and dexamethasone; TD, thalidomide and dexamethasone; VAD, vincristine, doxorubicin [Adriamycin], and dexamethasone; VCD, bortezomib [Velcade], cyclophosphamide, and dexamethasone; VD, bortezomib [Velcade] and dexamethasone; VRD, bortezomib [Velcade], lenalidomide, and dexamethasone; VTD, bortezomib [Velcade], thalidomide, and dexamethasone; GCSF+/- just in time plerixafor- G+/- JIT; G+P- GCSF + plerixafor and G+C- GCSF + cyclophosphamide

**Table 2S: Multivariate analysis of mobilization strategies on outcomes**

Outcomes	Hazard ratio (HR)	p-value	Co-variates
<b>Neutrophil engraftment</b>			Year of transplant
G+P vs. G +/- JIT plerixafor	1.27 (1.12-1.45)	0.0002	
G+ C vs. G +/- JIT	1.35 (1.12-1.63)	0.0015	
G+C vs. G + P	1.06 (0.88-1.29)	0.5306	
<b>Platelet engraftment</b>			None
G+P vs. G +/- JIT plerixafor	1.26 (1.11-1.43)	0.0004	
G+ C vs. G +/- JIT	1.35 (1.13-1.63)	0.0013	
G+C vs. G + P	1.08 (0.89-1.30)	0.4449	
<b>Non-relapse mortality<sup>a</sup></b>			ISS stage at diagnosis
G+P vs. G +/- JIT plerixafor	1.29 (0.35-4.76)	0.7009	
G+ C vs. G +/- JIT	1.20 (0.14-10.68)	0.8696	
G+C vs. G + P	0.93 (0.10-8.37)	0.9483	
<b>Relapse/Progression</b>			Cytogenetic risk, serum creatinine pre-HCT, disease status, sex
G+P vs. G +/- JIT plerixafor	1.16 (0.88-1.53)	0.2865	
G+ C vs. G +/- JIT	1.32 (0.86-2.04)	0.2062	
G+C vs. G + P	1.14 (0.73-1.76)	0.5628	
<b>Progression-free survival<sup>b</sup></b>			
G+P vs. G +/- JIT plerixafor	1.18 (0.91-1.54)	0.2161	
G+ C vs. G +/- JIT	1.34 (0.88-2.04)	0.1685	
G+C vs. G + P	1.14 (0.74-1.74)	0.5547	
<b>Overall survival</b>			Cytogenetic risk, serum creatinine pre-HCT
G+P vs. G +/- JIT plerixafor	1.32 (0.74-2.36)	0.3493	
G+ C vs. G +/- JIT	1.87 (0.80-4.35)	0.1465	
G+C vs. G + P	1.42 (0.59-3.39)	0.4348	

<sup>a</sup> Fine and Gray's sub distribution hazards model

<sup>b</sup> Cox proportional hazards model

Abbreviations: G-CSF, granulocyte colony-stimulating factor; HCT, hematopoietic cell transplantation; ISS, International Staging System; JIT, just-in-time

Variables included in the model include age, sex, race, KPS, HCT-CI, serum creatinine, isotype, involved free light, induction treatment, response to chemotherapy (sensitive vs. resistant), disease status at time of transplant, year of transplant

**Table 3S: Service utilization and costs by mobilization strategy**

Service utilization	G-CSF alone (N=44)			G+P or G+ JIT (N=146)			C+G (N=32)			
	Pre-A	Apheresis	Post-A	Pre-A	Apheresis	Post-A	Pre-A	Apheresis	Post-A	
Inpatient services, patient no.	<11	<11	<11	<11	<11	<11	<11	<11	<11	
Outpatient services, patient no.	44 (100)	44 (100)	36 (82)	146 (100)	146 (100)	107 (73)	32 (100)	32 (100)	27 (84)	
Median (IQR) no. of visits <sup>a</sup>	2.5 (2)	1 (1)	1.5 (2)	3.5 (2)	1 (1)	2 (2)	10 (11)	1 (1)	2 (2)	
Home health services, patients, no.	<11	<11	<11	<11	<11	<11	<11	<11	<11	
Outpatient pharmacy, patients no.	16 (36)	<11	26 (72)	56 (38)	37 (25)	72 (49)	28 (88)	<11	18 (56)	
Median (IQR) no. prescription fills	1.5 (1)	NR	2.5 (3)	1 (1)	1 (1)	2 (3)	2.5 (3.5)	NR	2 (1)	
Service days, median (IQR)	4 (1)	2 (1)	7 (0)	4 (0)	2 (1)	7 (0)	10.5 (2)	2 (1)	7 (0)	
Mean (SD) GCSF use	4.6 (0.5)			4.7 (0.5)			9.4 (2.5)			
Costs	G (N=44)			G + P OR JIT (N=146)			G + C (N=32)			p-value for comparison of cost for all time periods by mobilization strategy
	Pre-A	Apheresis	Post-A	Pre-A	Apheresis	Post-A	Pre-A	Apheresis	Post-A	
Inpatient costs	NR	NR	NR	NR	NR	NR	NR	NR	NR	NR
Outpatient costs <sup>a</sup> , median (IQR)	4879 (2895)	4502 (3699)	340 (871)	11953 (3293)	7256 (11502)	225 (896)	13079 (5896)	4956 (4792)	437 (1044)	<0.0001
Home health costs	NR	NR	NR	NR	NR	NR	NR	NR	NR	NR
Outpatient pharmacy costs, median (IQR)	11 (47)	NR	68 (156)	15 (53)	14 (26)	28 (120)	31 (43)	NR	23 (73)	0.81
Total costs by time-period, median (IQR)	4879 (2968)	4502 (3732)	397 (2196)	11968 (3476)	7256 (11591)	258 (1587)	13320 (5883)	4959 (4792)	472 (1015)	<0.0001
Total costs <sup>b</sup> by mobilization strategy, median (IQR)	11191 (9695)			23033 (15512)			19522 (10132)			<0.0001

<sup>a</sup> Number of outpatient visits was calculated by distinct claim counts; each claim can span more than 1 day; claims for transplant were excluded in the post-apheresis time period.

Abbreviations: G-CSF, granulocyte colony-stimulating factor; IQR, interquartile range; pre-A, pre-apheresis; post-A, post-apheresis; NR, not reportable; SD, standard deviation.

Note: Cells with counts less than 11 cannot be displayed due to Centers for Medicare & Medicaid Services (CMS) Data Use Agreement; Mean service days for pre-apheresis varied by mobilization strategy ( $P < 0.001$ ). There was no significant difference in mean service days of apheresis among the groups ( $P=0.785$ ). The post-apheresis time period was defined in the protocol as 7 days after completion of apheresis for all mobilization strategies.

<sup>a</sup> Outpatient costs also include outpatient drug costs, including antibiotics and antiemetics.

<sup>b</sup> Total costs include inpatient, outpatient, home health care, and outpatient pharmacy costs; transplant costs were excluded.

Abbreviations: IQR, interquartile range; pre-A, pre-apheresis; post-A, post-apheresis. NR, not reportable; SD, standard deviation.

Note. All costs are in US dollars. Some costs are not reportable due to the number of patients for each strategy and time period being < 11 due to Centers for Medicare & Medicaid Services (CMS) Data Use Agreement.