

Safety of concomitant delivery of radiotherapy for second primary malignancy in patients with chronic lymphocytic leukemia treated with continuous novel agents

Samuel R. Kosydar, Sameer A. Parikh, Scott C. Lester, Kari G. Rabe, Wei Ding, Saad S. Kenderian, Yucai Wang, Eli Muchtar, Amber B. Koehler, Susan M. Schwager,³ Susan L. Slager,^{1,4} Neil E. Kay,^{1,5} Timothy G. Call,¹ William G. Breen,² and Paul J. Hampel¹

¹Division of Hematology, Department of Medicine, Mayo Clinic, Rochester, MN

²Department of Radiation Oncology, Mayo Clinic, Rochester, MN

⁴Division of Computational Biology, Department of Health Sciences Research, Mayo Clinic, Rochester, MN

⁵Department of Immunology, Mayo Clinic, Rochester, MN

³Division of Biomedical Statistics & Informatics, Department of Health Sciences Research, Mayo Clinic, Rochester, MN

BACKGROUND

- Patients with chronic lymphocytic leukemia (CLL) are at elevated risk of developing non-hematologic malignancies.
- Radiation therapy (RT) is a critical component of management in localized solid organ malignancies.
- CLL patients treated with novel agents (e.g., BTKi, venetoclax) receive continuous daily dosing and unnecessary dose interruptions are avoided.
- Safety data are lacking to guide the concurrent administration of radiation therapy for a second cancer in patients receiving ongoing CLL novel agent treatment.

- · We identified patients treated concurrently with novel age CLL and RT for second prin malignancy at Mayo Clinic 2014-2022.
- Adverse events within 3 m RT were evaluated using t International Workshop on Lymphocytic Leukemia (iw criteria for hematological to and the Common Termino Criteria for Adverse Events (CTCAE) version 5 for non hematological toxicity.
- · Patients without seamless concurrent treatment with agent therapy and RT were excluded; sequential thera not considered. The Wilcoxon signed-rank test was used to assess the median difference before and after radiation.
- © 2023 Mayo Foundation for Medical Education and Research

Novel Agent	N=26	Secondary Malignancy	
		adenocarcinoma prostate	9 (34.6%)
Ibrutinib	23 (88.5%)	head/neck carcinoma	8 (30.8%)
140 mg daily	6 (23.1%)	NSCLC	3 (11.5%)
140 mg every 3 days	1 (3.8%)	glioblastoma	1 (3.8%)
280 mg daily	6 (23.1%)	IDC breast	1 (3.8%)
420 mg daily	10 (38.5%)	plasmacytoma	1 (3.8%)
		melanoma	1 (3.8%)
Venetoclax	1 (3.8%)	RCC	1 (3.8%)
200 mg daily		thymoma	1 (3.8%)
		Radiation	
Acalabrutinib	2 (7.7%)	Radiation Type	
100 mg twice daily	1 (3.8%)	Photon	18 (69.2%)
100 mg daily	1 (3.8%)	Proton	7 (26.9%)

Both

Yes

No

Adjuvant

Definitive

Radiation Sensitizing Agent

Prior Therapies METHODS

Table 1.

gents for rimary	Number of CLL therapies prior to NA		Radiation Location		
c from	0	6 (23.1%)	pelvis	8 (30.8%)	
	1	9 (34.6%)	head/neck	8 (30.8%)	
nonths of the	2	6 (23.1%)	Lung	4 (15.4%)	
n Chronic	3	3 (11.5%)	brain	1 (3.8%)	
wCLL) toxicity	4	2 (7.7%)	chest wall	2 (7.7%)	
ology			mediastinum	1 (3.8%)	
ts n-	Number of CLL therapies prior to NA		pelvis+lung	1 (3.8%)	
	Mean (SD)	1.5 (1.2)	renal	1 (3.8%)	
5,	Median	1	Radiation Intent		
novel re	Range	(0.0-4.0)	Palliative	1 (3.8%)	
apy was			Neoadjuvant	0	

Hematological adverse events

	Pre Radiation	Post Radiation	P value	CTCAE Criteria	Attribution	iwCLL Criteria
Hemoglobin, median (range) g/dL	13.3(10.1-18.6)	12.4(5.9-17.4)	0.001	grade 1: 13 (50.0%) grade 2: 3 (11.5%) grade 3: 2 (7.7%)	unrelated: 8 (30.8%) unlikely: 1 (3.8%) possibly: 7 (26.9%)	grade 0: 17 (65.4 %) grade 1: 6 (23.1%) grade 2: 3 (11.5%) grade 3: 0 grade 4: 0
Platelet Count, median(range) x10 ⁹ /L	175.5(78.0- 373.0)	140.5(10.0- 287.0)	0.004	grade 1: 8 (30.8%) grade 2: 1 (3.8%) grade 3: 1 (3.8%)	unlikely: 1 (3.8%) possibly: 5 (19.2%)	grade 0: 19 (73.1%) grade 1: 3 (11.5%) grade 2: 2 (7.7%) grade 3: 0 grade 4: 2 (7.7%)
Neutrophil Count, median(range) x10 ⁹ /L	4.4(1.2-19.3)	3.4(0-6.6)	<0.001	grade 1: 1 (3.8%) grade 2: 2 (7.7%) grade 3: 1 (3.8%)	unlikely: 0 possibly: 4 (15.4%)	grade 0: 19 (73.1%) grade 1: 5 (19.2%) grade 2: 0 grade 3: 1 (3.8%) grade 4: 1 (3.8%)

Frequency of grade 3 and 4 toxicities per patient

Patient	Novel Agent	Second Primary Malignancy	RT cGy/ fraction	Grade 3/4 Adverse Events*
1	Ibrutinib	head/neck cancer	with weekly	grade 4 thrombocytopenia grade 4 neutropenia grade 4 febrile neutropenia grade 4 lung infection grade 3 acute kidney injury grade 3 mucositis oral
2	ibrutinib	head/neck cancer	6600/33	grade 4 thrombocytopenia grade 4 acute kidney injury grade 4 sepsis grade 5 respiratory failure
3	ibrutinib	head/neck cancer	6600/33	grade 3 neutropenia

Table 2.

1 (3.8%)

2 (7.7%)

24 (92.3%)

10 (38.5%)

15 (57.7%)

*iwCLL used for hematological adverse events

 Average age at start of concurrent radiation treatment 68 years (range: 51-85 years).

RESULTS

- Four patients had del(17p) and 18 patients had unmutated IGHV.
- The most common conventionally fractionated prescriptions (cGy/fx) were 6000/30 (n=6) and >6000-7020/20-33 (n=7). SBRT ranged from 3300/5 to 5400/3 (n=8). Five patients received other, varied RT prescriptions.
- 58% of patients were receiving a reduced dose prior to RT start. There were no reports of dose reduction in anticipation of radiation therapy.

RESULTS CONT.

- Grade ≥3 hematological toxicities occurred 3 patients detailed in Table 2
- Grade ≥3 non-hematological toxicities occurred in 2 patients that required hospitalization for critical illness (Table 2)
- There were no reports of tumor lysis syndrome, malignant hypertension, grade ≥3 hemorrhage or severe cardiac arrhythmias.
- The most common side effects documented were grade 1 fatigue (n=7, 26.9%) and grade 1 radiation dermatitis (n=5, 19.2%).
- Every patient completed their course of radiation and there were no cases of dose reduction for radiation.
- This study provides the first assessment of patients with CLL on novel agents who were concurrently treated with radiotherapy for a subsequent solid organ malignancy.

CONCLUSIONS

- · Our study found limited CLLtreatment related adverse events. Radiation side effects did not appear to be heightened.
- Our results suggest that concurrent treatment should be a shared decision-making discussion regarding potential harms versus benefits.
- A comprehensive clinical evaluation that accounts for the patient's medical comorbidities and personal risk factors should inform the discussion.