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NCCN Multiple Myeloma Panel Members

Summary of Guidelines Updates

Initial Diagnostic Workup and Clinical Presentation (MYEL-1)
Solitary Plasmacytoma (Osseous or Extraosseous) Primary Treatment (MYEL-2)
Multiple Myeloma: Primary Treatment and Follow-Up / Surveillance (MYEL-3)
Active (Symptomatic) Myeloma Follow-Up / Surveillance (MYEL-4)
Additional Treatment Post Stem Cell Transplant (MYEL-5)
Active Disease: Additional Treatment for Relapse or Progressive Disease (MYEL-6)
Staging Systems for Multiple Myeloma (MYEL-A)
Definition of Multiple Myeloma (Smoldering and Active) (MYEL-B)
Response Criteria for Multiple Myeloma (MYEL-C)
Myeloma Therapy (MYEL-D)
Adjunctive Treatment (MYEL-E)

Clinical Trials: NCCN believes that the best management for any cancer patient is in a clinical trial. Participation in clinical trials is especially encouraged.

To find clinical trials online at NCCN Member Institutions, click here: nccn.org/clinical_trials/physician.html.

NCCN Categories of Evidence and Consensus: All recommendations are category 2A unless otherwise specified.

See NCCN Categories of Evidence and Consensus
Updates in Version 2.2014 of the NCCN Guidelines for Multiple Myeloma from Version 1.2014 include:

**MYEL-3**

**MYEL-4**

**MYEL-B**
- Definition of Multiple Myeloma, modified the table for Smoldering (Asymptomatic) Myeloma to include:
  “IgG ≥3 g/dL; IgA > 1 g/dL or Bence-Jones protein >1 g/24h.”
- Added the following footnote to Smoldering (asymptomatic) myeloma: The understanding of smoldering (asymptomatic) myeloma is evolving rapidly. Some studies have shown that patients with certain characteristics including IgG levels of > 3 g/dL, IgA of > 2 g/dL, or urinary Bence Jones protein of > 1 g/24 hours (Mateos MV, Hernandez M, Giraldo P, et al. Lenalidomide plus dexamethasone for high-risk smoldering multiple myeloma. N Engl J Med 2013;369:438-447) or abnormal free light chain ratios (Dispenzieri A, Kyle R, Katzmann J, et al. Immunoglobulin free light chain ratio is an independent risk factor for progression of smoldering (asymptomatic) multiple myeloma. Blood 2008;111:785-789), have an increased risk of progression to active (symptomatic) myeloma. It is also increasingly recognized, that the classical definition of smoldering myeloma using certain tests such as plain x-rays is outdated. Efforts to modify these criteria and reclassify some patients previously classified as "asymptomatic" to having "active disease" are underway.

Note: All recommendations are category 2A unless otherwise indicated.
Clinical Trials: NCCN believes that the best management of any cancer patient is in a clinical trial. Participation in clinical trials is especially encouraged.
Updates in Version 1.2014 of the NCCN Guidelines for Multiple Myeloma from Version 2.2013 include:

**MYEL-2**
- Under Follow-up/Surveillance, changed “calcium” to “corrected calcium.”

**MYEL-3**
- Under Follow-up/Surveillance, changed “calcium” to “corrected calcium.”

**MYEL-5**
- Post-autologous stem cell transplant, response or stable disease:
  - Added “± maintenance therapy” following “second tandem transplant.”
  - Removed “or additional autologous stem cell transplant.”
  - Added a new footnote: “Retrospective studies suggest a 2-3 y minimum length of remission for consideration of a second autologous stem cell transplant for salvage therapy (category 2B).”

**MYEL-6**
- Active disease, additional treatment for relapse or progressive disease:
  - Removed “or additional autologous stem cell transplant.”

**MYEL-D**
- Added the following therapeutic options to “Maintenance therapy, other regimens”
  - Bortezomib + prednisone (category 2B)
  - Bortezomib + thalidomide (category 2B)
INITIAL DIAGNOSTIC WORKUP

- H&P
- CBC, differential, platelet count
- BUN/creatinine, electrolytes
- LDH
- Calcium/albumin
- Beta-2 microglobulin
- Serum free light chain (FLC) assay
- Serum quantitative immunoglobulins, serum protein electrophoresis (SPEP), serum immunofixation electrophoresis (SIFE)
- 24 h urine for total protein, urine protein electrophoresis (UPEP), urine immunofixation electrophoresis (UIFE)
- Skeletal survey
- Unilateral bone marrow aspirate + biopsy, including bone marrow immunohistochemistry and/or bone marrow flow cytometry
- Cytogenetics
- FISH [del 13, del 17p13, t(4;14), t(11;14), t(14;16), 1q21 amplification]

Useful Under Some Circumstances

- MRI
- CT scan (avoid contrast)
- PET/CT scan
- Tissue biopsy to diagnose a solitary osseous or extraosseous plasmacytoma
- Bone densitometry
- Plasma cell labeling index
- Staining of marrow and fat pad for amyloid
- Serum viscosity
- HLA typing

CLINICAL PRESENTATION

Solitary plasmacytoma

- See Solitary Osseous: Primary Treatment (MYEL-2)

Smoldering (asymptomatic)

- See Solitary Extraosseous: Primary Treatment (MYEL-2)

Active (symptomatic)

- See Primary Treatment (MYEL-3)
# NCCN Guidelines Version 2.2014
## Multiple Myeloma

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CLINICAL PRESENTATION</th>
<th>PRIMARY TREATMENT</th>
<th>FOLLOW-UP/SURVEILLANCE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Solitary Osseous      | RT (≥45 Gy) to involved field | • CBC  
• Serum chemistry for creatinine, albumin, corrected calcium  
• LDH as clinically indicated  
• Beta-2 microglobulin as clinically indicated  
• Serum FLC assay  
• 24 h urine for total protein, UPEP, UIFE  
• Serum quantitative immunoglobulins, SPEP, SIFE  
• Bone marrow aspirate and biopsy as clinically indicated  
• Bone survey as clinically indicated or annually  
• MRI and or CT and or PET/CT as clinically indicated |
| Solitary Extrasseous  | RT (≥45 Gy) to involved field and/or surgery | Primary progressive or Response followed by progression → Restage with myeloma workup → See Active (Symptomatic) (MYEL-3) |

*See Response Criteria for Multiple Myeloma (MYEL-C).*

Note: All recommendations are category 2A unless otherwise indicated. Clinical Trials: NCCN believes that the best management of any cancer patient is in a clinical trial. Participation in clinical trials is especially encouraged.
## NCCN Guidelines Version 2.2014
### Multiple Myeloma

### Clinical Presentation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Smoldering (asymptomatic) (^{a,b,c,d})</th>
<th>Observe at 3- to 6-mo intervals (category 1) or Clinical trial</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

### Primary Treatment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Active (symptomatic) (^{a,e})</th>
<th>Myeloma therapy (^d) + bisphosphonates (^h) + adjunctive treatment (^h) as indicated</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

### Follow-Up/Surveillance

| - Quantitative immunoglobulins + quantitation of M protein (serum and urine) |
| - CBC, differential, platelet count |
| - BUN, creatinine, corrected calcium |
| - Bone survey annually or for symptoms |
| - Bone marrow aspirate and biopsy as clinically indicated |
| - Serum FLC assay as clinically indicated |
| - MRI as clinically indicated |
| - PET/CT scan as clinically indicated |
| - Multi-parameter flow cytometry as clinically indicated |

### Progression to symptomatic myeloma \(^e\)

- See Active (Symptomatic) Myeloma below

### Response

- Stem-cell harvest (adequate for 2 transplants), if candidate for transplantation (Refer for evaluation by stem cell transplant center)

### Note: All recommendations are category 2A unless otherwise indicated.

Clinical Trials: NCCN believes that the best management of any cancer patient is in a clinical trial. Participation in clinical trials is especially encouraged.

---

\(^a\) See Staging Systems for Multiple Myeloma (MYEL-A).
\(^b\) See Smoldering (Asymptomatic) Myeloma (MYEL-B).
\(^c\) Includes Durie-Salmon Stage I Myeloma.
\(^d\) A relatively small randomized prospective study has shown benefit of early treatment with lenalidomide and dexamethasone for a subset of patients with smoldering myeloma with certain high-risk features predictive for early clinical progression (Mateos MV, Hernandez M, Giraldo P, et al. Lenalidomide plus dexamethasone for high-risk smoldering multiple myeloma. N Engl J Med 2013;369:438-447). However, the high-risk criteria specified in the study are not in common use.


\(^e\) See Active (Symptomatic) Myeloma (MYEL-B).
\(^f\) See Response Criteria for Multiple Myeloma (MYEL-C).
\(^g\) See Myeloma Therapy (MYEL-D).
\(^h\) See Adjunctive Treatment (MYEL-E).
## ACTIVE (SYMPTOMATIC) MYELOMA

### FOLLOW-UP/SURVEILLANCE

| Response after primary therapy | Autologous \(^{\text{k,j}}\) stem cell transplant (category 1) | Quantitative immunoglobulins + quantitation of M protein at least every 3 mo |
| OR | CBC, differential, platelet count |
| OR | Bone survey annually or for symptoms |
| OR | Bone marrow aspirate and biopsy as clinically indicated |
| OR | Serum FLC assay as clinically indicated |
| OR | MRI as clinically indicated |
| OR | PET/CT scan as clinically indicated |

### Discussion

- **Autologous**\(^{\text{k,j}}\) stem cell transplantation (category 1)
- **OR**
- **Allogeneic**\(^{\text{i,j}}\) stem cell transplant in clinical trial
- **OR**
- **Continue myeloma therapy until best response**\(^{\text{f}}\)
- **OR**
- **Monitor as above and/or maintenance therapy**\(^{\text{g}}\)

### Note

All recommendations are category 2A unless otherwise indicated.

Clinical Trials: NCCN believes that the best management of any cancer patient is in a clinical trial. Participation in clinical trials is especially encouraged.

---

\(^{\text{f}}\) See Response Criteria for Multiple Myeloma (MYEL-C).

\(^{\text{g}}\) See Myeloma Therapy (MYEL-D).

\(^{\text{i}}\) A prospective trial by Bruno et al found improved survival for patients receiving an autologous transplant followed by non-myeloablative allograft compared to patients who received tandem autologous grafts. In contrast, the IFM trial (99-03) by Garban et al and the BMT-CTN 0102 trial by Stadtmauer et al reported no overall survival or progression-free survival with autologous transplant followed by mini-allograft in high-risk myeloma patients.


\(^{\text{j}}\) Allogeneic stem cell transplant may include nonmyeloablative (mini) following autologous stem cell transplant or fully myeloablative on a clinical trial (off-trial category 3).

Current data do not support miniallografting alone.

\(^{\text{k}}\) Autologous transplantation: Category 1 evidence supports proceeding straight after induction therapy to high-dose therapy and stem cell transplant versus saving the stem cell transplant for salvage therapy. Evidence suggests equivalent overall survival, although progression-free survival can be prolonged by an early transplant.


\(^{\text{l}}\) Renal dysfunction and advanced age are not contraindications to transplant.
### Active (Symptomatic) Myeloma

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Post-allogeneic stem cell transplant:</th>
<th>Additional Treatment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Progressive disease</strong></td>
<td><strong>Salvage therapy on or off clinical trial</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Response or stable disease</strong></td>
<td><strong>Maintenance therapy on clinical trial or Observe</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Progressive disease</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Post-autologous stem cell transplant:</th>
<th>Additional Treatment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Progressive disease</strong></td>
<td><strong>Salvage therapy on or off clinical trial or Allogeneic stem cell transplant on clinical trial</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Response or stable disease</strong></td>
<td><strong>Maintenance therapy or Second tandem transplant ± maintenance therapy or Observe</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Progressive disease</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

**Post-allogeneic stem cell transplant:**
- **Progressive disease:** Maintenance therapy on clinical trial or Observe
- **Response or stable disease:** salvage therapy on or off clinical trial or Donor lymphocyte infusion

**Post-autologous stem cell transplant:**
- **Progressive disease:** salvage therapy on or off clinical trial or Allogeneic stem cell transplant on clinical trial
- **Response or stable disease:** Maintenance therapy or Second tandem transplant ± maintenance therapy or Observe

---

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Notes</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>See Response Criteria of Multiple Myeloma (MYEL-C).</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>See Myeloma Therapy (MYEL-D).</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Allogeneic stem cell transplant may include nonmyeloablative (mini) following autologous stem cell transplant or fully myeloablative on a clinical trial (off-trial category 3).</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current data do not support miniallografting alone.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Additional autologous transplant on or off clinical trial is an option depending on the time interval between the preceding stem cell transplant and documented progression.</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Note:</strong> All recommendations are category 2A unless otherwise indicated. Clinical Trials: NCCN believes that the best management of any cancer patient is in a clinical trial. Participation in clinical trials is especially encouraged.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

© National Comprehensive Cancer Network, Inc. 2013, All rights reserved. The NCCN Guidelines® and this illustration may not be reproduced in any form without the express written permission of NCCN®.
**ACTIVE (SYMPTOMATIC) MYELOMA**

**ADDITIONAL TREATMENT**

Transplant candidate → Autologous stem cell transplant\(^k\) (category 1) → Progressive disease\(^f\) → Salvage therapy\(^g\) on or off clinical trial or Allogeneic stem cell transplant on clinical trial\(^j\)

Relapse\(^f\) or progressive disease\(^f\)

Non-transplant candidate → Salvage therapy\(^g\) on or off clinical trial → Palliative care

\(^f\)See Response Criteria for Multiple Myeloma (MYEL-C).
\(^g\)See Myeloma Therapy (MYEL-D).
\(^j\)Allogeneic stem cell transplant may include nonmyeloablative (mini) following autologous stem cell transplant or fully myeloablative on a clinical trial (off-trial category 3).

Current data do not support miniallografting alone.

\(^k\)Autologous transplantation: Category 1 evidence supports proceeding straight after induction therapy to high-dose therapy and stem cell transplant versus saving the stem cell transplant for salvage therapy. Evidence suggests equivalent overall survival although progression-free survival can be prolonged by an early transplant.


Note: All recommendations are category 2A unless otherwise indicated.

Clinical Trials: NCCN believes that the best management of any cancer patient is in a clinical trial. Participation in clinical trials is especially encouraged.
### STAGING SYSTEMS FOR MULTIPLE MYELOMA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stage</th>
<th>Durie-Salmon Criteria</th>
<th>ISS Criteria</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>All of the following:</td>
<td>Serum beta-2 microglobulin &lt;3.5 mg/L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Hemoglobin value &gt;10 g/dL</td>
<td>Serum albumin ≥3.5 g/dL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Serum calcium value normal or ≤12 mg/dL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Bone x-ray, normal bone structure or solitary bone plasmacytoma only</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Low M-component production rate</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- IgG value &lt;5 g/dL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- IgA value &lt;3 g/dL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Bence Jones protein &lt;4 g/24 h</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II</td>
<td>Neither stage I nor stage III</td>
<td>Neither stage I nor stage III</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III</td>
<td>One or more of the following:</td>
<td>Serum beta-2 microglobulin ≥5.5 mg/L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Hemoglobin value &lt;8.5 g/dL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Serum calcium value &gt;12 mg/dL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Advanced lytic bone lesions</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- High M-component production rate</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- IgG value &gt;7 g/dL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- IgA value &gt;5 g/dL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Bence Jones protein &gt;12 g/24 h</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Subclassification Criteria**

- A Normal renal function (serum creatinine level <2.0 mg/dL)
- B Abnormal renal function (serum creatinine level ≥2.0 mg/dL)

---

**Note:** All recommendations are category 2A unless otherwise indicated.

Clinical Trials: NCCN believes that the best management of any cancer patient is in a clinical trial. Participation in clinical trials is especially encouraged.

---


### Definition of Multiple Myeloma (Smoldering and Active)

#### Smoldering (Asymptomatic) Myeloma

- M-protein in serum
  - IgG ≥3 g/dL
  - IgA >1 g/dL
- Bone marrow clonal plasma cells ≥10%
- No related organ or tissue impairment (no end organ damage, including bone lesions) or symptoms.

#### Active (Symptomatic) Myeloma

Requires any one of the criteria for smoldering (asymptomatic) myeloma be present AND one or more of the following:

- Calcium elevation ( >11.5 mg/dL) [>2.65 mmol/L]
- Renal insufficiency (creatinine >2 mg/dL) [177 µmol/L or more]
- Anemia (hemoglobin <10 g/dL or 2 g/dL < normal) [<12.5 mmol/L or 1.25 mmol/l<normal]
- Bone disease (lytic or osteopenic)

---

1. The understanding of smoldering (asymptomatic) myeloma is evolving rapidly. Some studies have shown that patients with certain characteristics including IgG levels of > 3 g/dL, IgA of > 2 g/dL, or urinary Bence Jones protein of > 1 g/24 hours (Mateos MV, Hernandez M, Giraldo P, et al. Lenalidomide plus dexamethasone for high-risk smoldering multiple myeloma. N Engl J Med 2013;369:438-447) or abnormal free light chain ratios (Dispenzieri A, Kyle R, Katzmann J, et al. Immunoglobulin free light chain ratio is an independent risk factor for progression of smoldering (asymptomatic) multiple myeloma. Blood 2008;111:785-789), have an increased risk of progression to active (symptomatic) myeloma. It is also increasingly recognized, that the classical definition of smoldering myeloma using certain tests such as plain x-rays is outdated. Efforts to modify these criteria and reclassify some patients previously classified as "asymptomatic" to having "active disease" are underway.

2. Other examples of active disease include: repeated infections, amyloidosis, or hyperviscosity.

---

Note: All recommendations are category 2A unless otherwise indicated. Clinical Trials: NCCN believes that the best management of any cancer patient is in a clinical trial. Participation in clinical trials is especially encouraged.
# RESPONSE CRITERIA FOR MULTIPLE MYELOMA

## International Myeloma Working Group Uniform Response Criteria - CR and Other Response Categories

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response Category</th>
<th>Response Criteria</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>sCR, stringent complete response</td>
<td>CR as defined below plus: Normal free light chain (FLC) ratio and absence of clonal cells in bone marrow by immunohistochemistry or immunofluorescence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CR, complete response</td>
<td>Negative immunofixation on the serum and urine and disappearance of any soft tissue plasmacytomas and ( \leq 5% ) plasma cells in bone marrow</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VGPR, very good partial response</td>
<td>Serum and urine M-protein detectable by immunofixation but not on electrophoresis or ( 90% ) or greater reduction in serum M-protein plus urine M-protein level (&lt; 100 \text{ mg per } 24 \text{ h} )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PR, partial response</td>
<td>( \geq 50% ) reduction of serum M-protein and reduction in 24 h urinary M-protein by ( \geq 90% ) or to (&lt; 200 \text{ mg per } 24 \text{ h} )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SD, stable disease</td>
<td>Not meeting criteria for CR, VGPR, PR, or progressive disease</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. All response categories require two consecutive assessments made at any time before the institution of any new therapy; all categories also require no known evidence of progressive or new bone lesions if radiographic studies were performed. Radiographic studies are not required to satisfy these response requirements. Confirmation with repeat bone marrow biopsy not needed.
2. Presence/absence of clonal cells is based upon the kappa/lambda ratio. An abnormal kappa/lambda ratio by immunohistochemistry and/or immunofluorescence requires a minimum of 100 plasma cells for analysis. An abnormal ratio reflecting presence of an abnormal clone is of \( > 4:1 \) or \( < 1:2 \).

Note: All recommendations are category 2A unless otherwise indicated.

Clinical Trials: NCCN believes that the best management of any cancer patient is in a clinical trial. Participation in clinical trials is especially encouraged.


Continued on next page

## Response Criteria for Multiple Myeloma

### International Myeloma Working Group Uniform Response Criteria - Disease Progression and Relapse

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Relapse Subcategory</th>
<th>Relapse Criteria</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **Progressive disease**<sup>1</sup> (To be used for calculation of time to progression and progression-free survival and points for all patients including those in CR) | Progressive Disease: requires any one or more of the following:  
- Increase of ≥ 25% from baseline in:  
  - Serum M-component and/or (the absolute increase must be ≥ 0.5 g/dL)<sup>2</sup>  
  - Urine M-component and/or (the absolute increase must be ≥ 200 mg/24 h)  
- Only in patients without measurable serum and urine M-protein levels: the difference between involved and uninvolved FLC levels. The absolute increase must be > 10 mg/dL.  
- Bone marrow plasma cell percentage: the absolute % must be ≥ 10%<sup>3</sup>  
- Definite development of new bone lesions or soft tissue plasmacytomas or definite increase in the size of existing bone lesions or soft tissue plasmacytomas  
- Development of hypercalcemia (corrected serum calcium > 11.5 mg/dL or 2.65 mmol/L) that can be attributed solely to the plasma cell proliferative disorder |
| **Clinical relapse**<sup>1</sup> | Clinical relapse requires one or more of:  
- Direct indicators of increasing disease and/or end organ dysfunction (CRAB features). It is not used in calculation of time to progression or progression-free survival but is listed here as something that can be reported optionally or for use in clinical practice  
- Development of new soft tissue plasmacytomas or bone lesions  
- Definite increase in the size of existing plasmacytomas or bone lesions. A definite increase is defined as a 50% (and at least 1 cm) increase as measured serially by the sum of the products of the cross-diameters of the measurable lesion  
- Hypercalcemia (> 11.5 mg/dL) [2.65 mmol/L]  
- Decrease in hemoglobin of ≥ 2 g/dL [1.25 mmol/L]  
- Rise in serum creatinine by 2 mg/dL or more [177 µmol/L or more] |
| **Relapse from CR**<sup>1</sup> (To be used only if the end point studied is DFS, disease free survival)<sup>4</sup> | Any one or more of the following:  
- Reappearance of serum or urine M-protein by immunofixation or electrophoresis  
- Development of ≥ 5% plasma cells in the bone marrow<sup>3</sup>  
- Appearance of any other sign of progression (ie, new plasmacytoma, lytic bone lesion, or hypercalcemia) |

---

1. All relapse categories require two consecutive assessments made at any time before classification as relapse or disease progression and/or the institution of any new therapy.  
2. For progressive disease, serum M-component increases of ≥ 1 g/dL are sufficient to define relapse if starting M-component is ≥ 5 g/dL.  
3. Relapse from CR has the 5% cutoff versus 10% for other categories of relapse.  
4. For purposes of calculating time to progression and progression-free survival, CR patients should also be evaluated using criteria listed above for progressive disease.


---

Note: All recommendations are category 2A unless otherwise indicated.  
Clinical Trials: NCCN believes that the best management of any cancer patient is in a clinical trial. Participation in clinical trials is especially encouraged.
## MYELOMA THERAPY

Exposure to myelotoxic agents (including alkylating agents and nitrosoureas) should be limited to avoid compromising stem-cell reserve prior to stem-cell harvest in patients who may be candidates for transplants.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Preferred Regimens</th>
<th>Other Regimens</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **Primary Therapy for Transplant Candidates** (Assess for response after 2 cycles) | **Carfilzomib\(^6\)/lenalidomide\(^4\)/dexamethasone**  
**Dexamethasone (category 2B)**  
**Liposomal doxorubicin/vincristine/dexamethasone (DVD) (category 2B)**  
**Thalidomide/dexamethasone (category 2B)** |
| • Bortezomib/dexamethasone (category 1)  
• Bortezomib/cyclophosphamide/dexamethasone  
• Bortezomib/doxorubicin/dexamethasone (category 1)  
• Bortezomib/lenalidomide\(^4\)/dexamethasone  
• Bortezomib/thalidomide/dexamethasone (category 1)  
• Lenalidomide\(^4\)/dexamethasone (category 1) | |
| **Primary Therapy for Non-Transplant Candidates** (Assess for response after 2 cycles) | **Dexamethasone (category 2B)**  
**Liposomal doxorubicin/vincristine/dexamethasone (DVD) (category 2B)**  
**Thalidomide/dexamethasone (category 2B)**  
**Vincristine/doxorubicin/dexamethasone (VAD) (category 2B)** |
| • Bortezomib/dexamethasone  
• Lenalidomide/low-dose dexamethasone (category 1)  
• Melphalan/prednisone/bortezomib (MPB) (category 1)  
• Melphalan/prednisone/lenalidomide (MPL) (category 1)  
• Melphalan/prednisone/thalidomide (MPT) (category 1) | |
| **Maintenance Therapy** | **Bortezomib + prednisone (category 2B)**  
**Bortezomib + thalidomide (category 2B)**  
**Interferon (category 2B)**  
**Steroids (category 2B)**  
**Thalidomide + prednisone (category 2B)** |
| • Bortezomib  
• Lenalidomide\(^5\) (category 1)  
• Thalidomide (category 1) | |

1Selected, but not inclusive of all regimens.
2Recommend herpes zoster prophylaxis for patients treated with bortezomib and carfilzomib. Consider using subcutaneous bortezomib for patients with pre-existing or high-risk peripheral neuropathy.
3Prophylactic anticoagulation recommended for patients receiving thalidomide-based therapy or lenalidomide with dexamethasone.
4Consider harvesting peripheral blood stem cells prior to prolonged exposure to lenalidomide.
5There appears to be an increased risk for secondary cancers, especially with lenalidomide maintenance following transplant. The benefits and risks of maintenance therapy vs. secondary cancers should be discussed with patients.
6Optimal dosing in this regimen has not been defined.

**Note:** All recommendations are category 2A unless otherwise indicated. Clinical Trials: NCCN believes that the best management of any cancer patient is in a clinical trial. Participation in clinical trials is especially encouraged.
### MYELOMA THERAPY

**Exposure to myelotoxic agents (including alkylating agents and nitrosoureas) should be limited to avoid compromising stem-cell reserve prior to stem-cell harvest in patients who may be candidates for transplants.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Salvage Therapy</th>
<th>Preferred Regimens</th>
<th>Other Regimens</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Repeat primary induction therapy (if relapse at &gt; 6 mo)</td>
<td>• Bendamustine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Bortezomib (category 1)</td>
<td>• Bortezomib/vorinostat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Bortezomib/dexamethasone</td>
<td>• Lenalidomide/bendamustine/dexamethasone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Bortezomib/lenalidomide/dexamethasone</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Bortezomib/liposomal doxorubicin (category 1)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Bortezomib/thalidomide/dexamethasone</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Carfilzomib⁶</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Cyclophosphamide/bortezomib/dexamethasone</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Cyclophosphamide/lenalidomide/dexamethasone</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Dexamethasone/cyclophosphamide/etoposide/cisplatin (DCEP)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Dexamethasone/thalidomide/cisplatin/doxorubicin/cyclophosphamide/etoposide (DT-PACE) ± bortezomib (VTD-PACE)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• High-dose cyclophosphamide</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Lenalidomide/dexamethasone⁹ (category 1)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Pomalidomide⁸/dexamethasone⁹</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Thalidomide/dexamethasone⁹</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

¹Selected, but not inclusive of all regimens.

²Recommend herpes zoster prophylaxis for patients treated with bortezomib and carfilzomib. Consider using subcutaneous bortezomib for patients with pre-existing or high-risk peripheral neuropathy.

³Prophylactic anticoagulation recommended for patients receiving thalidomide-based therapy or lenalidomide with dexamethasone.

⁷Consideration for appropriate regimen is based on the context of clinical relapse.

⁸Indicated for patients who have received at least two prior therapies including bortezomib and an immunomodulatory agent and have demonstrated disease progression on or within 60 days of completion of the last therapy.

⁹Consider single-agent lenalidomide, pomalidomide, or thalidomide for steroid-intolerant individuals.

---

Note: All recommendations are category 2A unless otherwise indicated.

Clinical Trials: NCCN believes that the best management of any cancer patient is in a clinical trial. Participation in clinical trials is especially encouraged.
ADJUNCTIVE TREATMENT

Bone Disease

- Bisphosphonates (pamidronate and zoledronic acid)\(^1\)
  - All patients receiving primary myeloma therapy should be given bisphosphonates (category 1)
  - Use of bisphosphonates in smoldering or stage I disease preferably in the context of a clinical trial. These patients should have bone survey annually and if symptomatic
  - Monitor for renal dysfunction with use of bisphosphonates
  - Monitor for osteonecrosis of the jaw
- RT
  - Low-dose RT (10–30 Gy) can be used as palliative treatment for uncontrolled pain, for impending pathologic fracture or impending cord compression
  - Limited involved fields should be used to limit the impact of irradiation on stem-cell harvest or impact on potential future treatments
- Orthopedic consultation should be sought for impending or actual long-bone fractures or bony compression of spinal cord or vertebral column instability
- Consider vertebroplasty or kyphoplasty for symptomatic vertebral compression fractures

Hypercalcemia

- Hydration/furosemide, bisphosphonates (zoledronic acid preferred), steroids, and/or calcitonin.

Hyperviscosity

- Plasmapheresis should be used as adjunctive therapy for symptomatic hyperviscosity

Anemia (See NCCN Guidelines for Cancer and Treatment-Related Anemia)

- Consider erythropoietin for anemic patients

Infection (See NCCN Guidelines for Prevention and Treatment of Cancer-Related Infections)

- Intravenous immunoglobulin therapy should be considered in the setting of recurrent life-threatening infection
- Consider pneumovax and influenza vaccine
- PCP, herpes, and antifungal prophylaxis if high-dose dexamethasone regimen
- Herpes zoster prophylaxis for patients treated with bortezomib

Renal Dysfunction

- Maintain hydration to avoid renal failure
- Avoid use of NSAIDs
- Avoid IV contrast
- Plasmapheresis (category 2B)
- Not a contraindication to transplant
- Monitor for renal dysfunction with chronic use of bisphosphonates

Coagulation/thrombosis

- Prophylactic anticoagulation recommended for patients receiving thalidomide-based, or lenalidoide with dexamethasone therapy (See NCCN Guidelines for Venous Thromboembolic Disease)

---

\(^1\) Both pamidronate and zoledronic acid have shown equivalence in terms of reducing risk of skeletal-related events in randomized trials. In a recent MRC IX trial, in addition to benefits for bone health, zoledronic acid reduced mortality by 16% versus clodronic acid and extended median overall survival by 5.5 months. Morgan GJ, Davies FE, Gregory WM, et al. First-line treatment with zoledronic acid as compared with clodronic acid in multiple myeloma (MRC Myeloma IX): a randomised controlled trial. Lancet 2010;376:1989-1999.

Note: All recommendations are category 2A unless otherwise indicated.
Clinical Trials: NCCN believes that the best management of any cancer patient is in a clinical trial. Participation in clinical trials is especially encouraged.
Discussion

NCCN Categories of Evidence and Consensus

Category 1: Based upon high-level evidence, there is uniform NCCN consensus that the intervention is appropriate.

Category 2A: Based upon lower-level evidence, there is uniform NCCN consensus that the intervention is appropriate.

Category 2B: Based upon lower-level evidence, there is NCCN consensus that the intervention is appropriate.

Category 3: Based upon any level of evidence, there is major NCCN disagreement that the intervention is appropriate.

All recommendations are category 2A unless otherwise noted.

Active (Symptomatic) Multiple Myeloma ........................................MS-7
Primary Therapy for Active (Symptomatic) MM .........................MS-7
Preferred Primary Therapy Regimens ........................................MS-8
Other Primary Therapy Regimens .............................................MS-12
Preferred Primary Therapy Regimens ........................................MS-13
Other Primary Therapy Regimens .............................................MS-16
Follow-up after Primary Therapy for Active MM .......................MS-16

Stem Cell Transplants ..........................................................MS-17
Introduction ...........................................................................MS-17
Autologous Stem Cell Transplants ..........................................MS-17
Tandem Stem Cell Transplants ...............................................MS-19
Allogeneic Stem Cell Transplant .............................................MS-20

Maintenance Therapy ............................................................MS-22

Treatment of Progressive or Relapsed Myeloma .....................MS-24
Salvage Therapy .....................................................................MS-25
Preferred Salvage Therapy Regimens .......................................MS-25
Other Salvage Therapy Regimens ............................................MS-30

Adjunctive Treatment for Multiple Myeloma .........................MS-30

References ............................................................................MS-33

Overview ...................................................................................MS-2
Initial Diagnostic Workup ......................................................MS-2
Additional Diagnostic Tests ...................................................MS-4
Diagnostic Categories ............................................................MS-4
Response Criteria .....................................................................MS-5

Solitary Plasmacytoma ............................................................MS-5
Primary Therapy for Solitary Plasmacytoma ............................MS-5
Surveillance/Follow-up Tests for Solitary Plasmacytoma .........MS-5

Smoldering (Asymptomatic) Myeloma ......................................MS-6
Primary Therapy for Smoldering MM .................................MS-6
Surveillance/Follow-up Tests for Smoldering MM .................MS-6
Overview

Multiple myeloma (MM) is a malignant neoplasm of plasma cells that accumulate in bone marrow, leading to bone destruction and marrow failure. The American Cancer Society has estimated 22,350 new cancer cases of MM in the United States in 2013, with an estimated 10,710 deaths. The mean age of affected individuals is 62 years for men (75% older than 70 years) and 61 years for women (79% older than 70 years). The 5-year survival rate reported in the SEER database has increased from 25% in 1975 to 34% in 2003 owing to newer and more effective treatment options available.

MM is typically sensitive to a variety of cytotoxic drugs, both as initial treatment or as treatment for relapsed disease. Unfortunately responses are transient, and MM is not considered curable with current approaches. However, treatment of MM has been evolving rapidly because of the introduction of new drugs, such as thalidomide, lenalidomide, and bortezomib. In addition, there is emerging understanding of the microenvironment of the bone marrow, creating the rationale for new combinations of therapies and new drug development. Studies of the associated cytogenetic abnormalities indicate that MM is a heterogeneous disease suggesting that risk-adapted approaches and individualizing treatment will further help refine patient management.

Initial Diagnostic Workup

The initial diagnostic workup in all patients should include a history and physical (H&P) examination and the following baseline blood studies and biological assessments to differentiate symptomatic and asymptomatic MM: a complete blood count (CBC) with differential and platelet counts; blood urea nitrogen (BUN); serum creatinine, and serum electrolytes; serum calcium; albumin; lactate dehydrogenase (LDH); and beta-2 microglobulin. Increased BUN and creatinine indicate decreased kidney function, whereas LDH levels help assess tumor cell burden. The level of beta-2 microglobulin reflects the tumor mass and is now considered a standard measure of the tumor burden.

The monoclonal protein (M-protein) component in serum and urine is detected and evaluated by the following urine and serum analyses. Urine analysis as a part of the initial diagnostic workup includes evaluating 24 hour urine for total protein; urine protein electrophoresis (UPEP) and urine immunofixation electrophoresis (UIFE).

Serum analysis also includes quantitative immunoglobulin levels of different types of antibodies (IgG, IgA, and IgM); serum protein electrophoresis (SPEP); and serum immunofixation electrophoresis (SIFE) to obtain more specific information about the type of abnormal antibodies present. Assessing changes and proportions of various proteins, particularly the M-protein, helps track the progression of myeloma disease and response to treatment. Use of serum free light chain (FLC) assay along with SPEP and SIFE yields high sensitivity while screening for MM and related plasma cell disorders. Therefore, this assay is now included as a part of the initial diagnostic workup in the NCCN Guidelines for Multiple Myeloma. The serum FLC assay also has prognostic value in plasma cell disorders, including monoclonal gammopathy of undetermined significance (MGUS), smoldering myeloma, active myeloma, immunoglobulin light chain amyloidosis and solitary plasmacytoma. The serum FLC assay also allows for quantitative monitoring of patients with light chain amyloidosis and oligosecretory myeloma. In addition to all of the above, the FLC ratio is...
required for documenting stringent complete response (sCR) according to the International Myeloma Working Group (IMWG) Uniform Response Criteria. The FLC assay cannot replace the 24-h UPEP for monitoring myeloma patients with measurable urinary M proteins.

Most patients have serum proteins with or without associated urinary protein. In the Mayo Clinic review of 1027 patients newly diagnosed with MM, 20% of patients had secretory urinary proteins; however, 3% of patients had neither serum nor urine proteins, therefore had nonsecretory myeloma. Once the myeloma or M-protein is quantified, it is important to use the same test for serial studies to ensure accurate relative quantification.

To evaluate bone marrow plasma cell infiltration, bone marrow aspiration and biopsy is recommended to detect quantitative and/or qualitative abnormalities of bone marrow plasma cells. To evaluate lytic bone lesions, full skeleton radiographic survey is recommended.

Although MM may be morphologically similar, several subtypes of the disease have been identified at the genetic and molecular level. Bone marrow studies at initial diagnosis should include chromosome analysis by conventional karyotyping (cytogenetics) and fluorescence in situ hybridization (FISH) performed with the plasma cells obtained from bone marrow aspiration. Specific chromosomal abnormalities have been identified in MM patients involving translocations, deletions, or amplifications.

Deletion of chromosome 13 [del(13)] seems to have an amplifying effect on cell cycle gene expression and is reported to be associated with short event-free survival (EFS) and overall survival (OS). Deletion of 17p13 (the locus for the tumor-suppressor gene, p53) leads to loss of heterozygosity of TP53 and is considered a high-risk feature in MM. Other high-risk chromosomal aberrations in MM are characterized by structural changes that include specific rearrangements involving the IGH gene (encoding immunoglobulin heavy chain), located at 14q32.

Several subgroups of patients are identified, on the basis of 14q32 translocations. The three main ones are the t(11;14)(q13;q32), t(4;14)(p16;q32) and t(14;16)(q32;q23). From a clinical point of view, t(4;14) is the most important one. Several studies have confirmed that patients with this translocation have a poor prognosis.

Conflicting data exist regarding t(14;16); although one study showed no impact on prognosis, some studies have shown a negative prognostic impact. A translocation between 11 and 14 [t(11;14)] has been reported to be associated with an improved survival. Abnormalities of chromosome 1 are also among the frequent chromosomal alterations in MM. The short arm is most often associated with deletions and the long arm with amplifications. Gains/amplification of 1q21 increases the risk of MM progression and incidence of the amplification is higher in relapsed than in newly diagnosed patients.

Stratification of patients into various risk groups based on the chromosomal markers is being utilized by some centers for prognostic counseling, selection, and sequencing of therapy approaches. According to the NCCN Multiple Myeloma Panel Members, the FISH panel for prognostic estimation should include t(4;14), t(14;16), and 17p13 deletions, t(11;14), chromosome 13 deletion, and chromosome 1 amplification. The utility of this information is to determine biological subtype and for prognostic recommendations.

In addition to cytogenetic markers of prognosis, it is postulated that biological factors or gene expression signatures may be capable of discriminating prognosis and helping rational therapeutic decisions. Further understanding of the molecular subtypes of MM is emerging.

Deletion of chromosome 13 [del(13)] seems to have an amplifying effect on cell cycle gene expression and is reported to be associated with short event-free survival (EFS) and overall survival (OS). Deletion of 17p13 (the locus for the tumor-suppressor gene, p53) leads to loss of heterozygosity of TP53 and is considered a high-risk feature in MM. Other high-risk chromosomal aberrations in MM are characterized by structural changes that include specific rearrangements involving the IGH gene (encoding immunoglobulin heavy chain), located at 14q32.

Several subgroups of patients are identified, on the basis of 14q32 translocations. The three main ones are the t(11;14)(q13;q32), t(4;14)(p16;q32) and t(14;16)(q32;q23). From a clinical point of view, t(4;14) is the most important one. Several studies have confirmed that patients with this translocation have a poor prognosis.

Conflicting data exist regarding t(14;16); although one study showed no impact on prognosis, some studies have shown a negative prognostic impact. A translocation between 11 and 14 [t(11;14)] has been reported to be associated with an improved survival. Abnormalities of chromosome 1 are also among the frequent chromosomal alterations in MM. The short arm is most often associated with deletions and the long arm with amplifications. Gains/amplification of 1q21 increases the risk of MM progression and incidence of the amplification is higher in relapsed than in newly diagnosed patients.

Stratification of patients into various risk groups based on the chromosomal markers is being utilized by some centers for prognostic counseling, selection, and sequencing of therapy approaches. According to the NCCN Multiple Myeloma Panel Members, the FISH panel for prognostic estimation should include t(4;14), t(14;16), and 17p13 deletions, t(11;14), chromosome 13 deletion, and chromosome 1 amplification. The utility of this information is to determine biological subtype and for prognostic recommendations.

In addition to cytogenetic markers of prognosis, it is postulated that biological factors or gene expression signatures may be capable of discriminating prognosis and helping rational therapeutic decisions. Further understanding of the molecular subtypes of MM is emerging.
from the application of high-throughput genomic tools such as gene expression profiling (GEP). With the currently available novel treatment approaches, a majority of patients with MM can now anticipate long-term disease control. However, patients with cytogenetically and molecularly defined high-risk disease do not receive the same benefit from current approaches as the low-risk patients. GEP is a powerful and fast tool with the potential to provide additional prognostic value to further refine risk-stratification, help therapeutic decisions, and inform novel drug design and development. At the present time, standardized testing for GEP is not available and there is inadequate data to determine how this prognostic information should be used to direct patient management.

Bone marrow immunohistochemistry may be useful in some cases to confirm presence of monoclonal plasma cells, to more accurately measure plasma cell involvement, and bone marrow flow cytometry can help define the disease.

**Additional Diagnostic Tests**

The NCCN Multiple Myeloma Panel recommends additional tests that maybe useful under some circumstances. These include MRI, CT, or PET/CT scan. Active myeloma is positive on PET scan. PET/CT and MRI scans are more sensitive than plain radiographs and are indicated when symptomatic areas show no abnormality on routine radiographs. A recent multivariate analysis showed persistent fluorodeoxyglucose PET/CT positivity before and after primary therapy and subsequent high-dose therapy, and is a predictor of prognosis in patients with symptomatic MM.

A tissue biopsy may also be necessary to confirm the presence of plasmacytomas. Plasma cell labeling index may be helpful to identify the fraction of the myeloma cell population that is proliferating. Also bone marrow and fat pad staining for the presence of amyloid and serum viscosity should be evaluated if hyperviscosity is suspected.

In selected patients with MM, physicians may use allogeneic (i.e., from someone else) transplantation. In this approach, physicians administer non-myeloablative therapy and infuse stem cells (i.e., peripheral blood or bone marrow) obtained from a donor, preferably a human leukocyte antigen (HLA) -identical sibling. In such cases, the patient will need to be HLA-typed.

Since bisphosphonate therapy is a consideration in patients with MM, a baseline bone densitometry test may be recommended.

**Diagnostic Categories**

Based on the results of the clinical and laboratory evaluation discussed in previous sections, patients are initially classified as either having smoldering (asymptomatic) disease or active (symptomatic) disease. For definitions refer to the NCCN Guidelines for Multiple Myeloma section titled “Definition of Multiple Myeloma (Smoldering and Active)”.

The criteria agreed upon by the IMWG for smoldering (asymptomatic) patients includes low concentrations of M-protein (≥ 30 g/L) and/or bone marrow infiltration greater than or equal to 10% plasma cells with no anemia, renal failure, hypercalcemia, or bone lesions.

Those with active disease are then further categorized according to stage, based on either the Durie-Salmon staging system or the International Staging System (ISS). The ISS system is based on easily obtained laboratory measures (serum beta-2 -microglobulin and serum albumin) and is easier to use than the Durie-Salmon staging system for patients with previously untreated MM.
Response Criteria
Assessing the response to treatment is a key determinant of myeloma treatment.

The IMWG response criteria were developed from the European Group for Blood and Marrow Transplant/ International Bone Marrow Registry/ Autologous Blood and Bone Marrow Registry (EBMT/ IBMTR/ ABMTR) response criteria, with revisions and improvements to help uniform reporting.

The updated IMWG response criteria definitions for complete response (CR), sCR, very good partial response (VGPR), partial response (PR), stable disease, and progressive disease are outlined in the NCCN Guidelines for Multiple Myeloma section titled “Response Criteria for Multiple Myeloma”. It is recommended that the IMWG uniform response criteria should be used in future clinical trials.

Solitary Plasmacytoma
The diagnosis of solitary plasmacytoma requires a thorough evaluation to rule out the presence of systemic disease because many patients presumed to have solitary plasmacytomas are found to have occult disease. Solitary plasmacytomas are further categorized as osseous or extraosseous. Osseous plasmacytoma is defined as a plasmacytoma emanating from bone without other evidence of disease. Solitary plasmacytomas derived from soft tissue are termed extraosseous. An analysis of the SEER database between 1992 and 2004 found that incidence of osseous plasmacytoma was 40% higher than extraosseous plasmacytoma (P < .0001).

Primary Therapy for Solitary Plasmacytoma
The treatment and follow-up options for osseous and extraosseous plasmacytomas are similar. Radiation therapy has been shown to provide excellent local control of solitary plasmacytomas.

For those patients with osseous plasmacytoma, the NCCN Panel recommends that primary radiation therapy (45 Gy or more) to the involved field is the initial treatment and is potentially curative. Extraosseous plasmacytomas are treated initially with radiation therapy (45 Gy or more) to the involved field followed by surgery if necessary.

Surveillance/Follow-up Tests for Solitary Plasmacytoma
Follow-up and surveillance tests for both solitary plasmacytoma and extra-osseous plasmacytoma consist of blood and urine tests. Serial and frequent measurements of M-protein are required to confirm disease sensitivity.

The blood tests include CBC; serum chemistry for creatine, albumin, and corrected calcium; serum quantitative immunoglobulins, SPEP, and SIFE; and serum FLC assay. Testing for LDH levels and beta-2 microglobulin may be useful under some circumstances.

The urine tests include 24-hour urine assay for total protein, UPEP, and UIFE.

Bone marrow aspirate and biopsy, and imaging studies using MRI and/or CT and/or PET/CT are recommended as clinically indicated. PET imaging may detect early bone marrow involvement in patients with solitary plasmacytoma. Bone survey is recommended annually or as clinically indicated.
If progressive disease emerges, then the patient should be re-evaluated as described under “Initial Diagnostic Workup” and systemic therapy must be administered as indicated.

**Smoldering (Asymptomatic) Myeloma**

Smoldering (asymptomatic) myeloma describes a stage of disease with no symptoms and no related organ or tissue impairment. Patients with Durie-Salmon stage I myeloma who also have low amounts of M-protein without significant anemia, hypercalcemia, or bone disease, would be included in this category. Patients with asymptomatic smoldering MM have an indolent course for many years without therapy.

**Primary Therapy for Smoldering (Asymptomatic) MM**

Patients with smoldering myeloma, including Durie-Salmon stage I, do not need primary therapy as it may take many months to years before the disease progresses. The risk of transformation to symptomatic myeloma in these patients is life-long and therefore should be followed closely.

A relatively small randomized prospective (n = 125) phase III study by the PETHEMA group investigated whether early treatment with lenalidomide and dexamethasone in patients with smoldering myeloma, at high risk of progression to active MM, prolongs the time to progression. The high-risk group in the study was defined using the following criteria: plasma-cell bone marrow infiltration of at least 10% and/or a monoclonal component (defined as an IgG level of ≥3 g/dL, an IgA level of ≥2 g/dL, or a urinary Bence Jones protein level of >1 g per 24 hours); at least 95% phenotypically aberrant plasma cells in the bone marrow infiltrate.

At a median follow-up of 40 months (range, 27-57 months), treatment with lenalidomide and dexamethasone delayed median time to progression to symptomatic disease compared to no treatment (time to progression was not reached in the treatment arm compared to 21 months in the observation arm; HR 0.18; 95% CI, 0.09-0.32; P < .001). The OS reported in the trial at 3 years was higher in the group treated with lenalidomide and dexamethasone arm (94% vs. 80%) (HR 0.31; 95% CI, 0.10-0.91; P = .03).

According to the NCCN panel, the high-risk criteria specified in the study are not currently in common use. Based on the criteria used in the trial, some patients with active myeloma were classified as having high-risk smoldering myeloma. This fact is evident from the striking differences in outcome seen between patients who were treated and those who were only observed. The NCCN panel strongly believes there is need to re-evaluate the definition of high-risk smoldering myeloma. The panel believes that it is too early to begin treating all smoldering myeloma patients at high-risk (as defined in the trial) for progression to active MM with any anti-myeloma therapy. The NCCN Multiple Myeloma Panel recommends that patient with smoldering myeloma should initially be observed at 3 to 6-month intervals (category 1 recommendation) or strongly recommends enrolling eligible smoldering myeloma patients in clinical trials.

**Surveillance/Follow-up Tests for Smoldering (Asymptomatic) MM**

The surveillance/follow-up tests include CBC; serum chemistry for creatinine, albumin, LDH, calcium, and beta-2 microglobulin; serum quantitative immunoglobulins, SPEP, and SIFE; and serum FLC assay. The urine tests include 24 hour urine assay for total protein, UPEP, and UIFE.
Bone survey is recommended annually or as clinically indicated. Bone marrow aspiration and biopsy and imaging studies with MRI and/or CT and/or PET/CT are recommended as clinically indicated. PET imaging seems to reliably predict active myeloma; by virtue of FDG uptake, low-level smoldering myeloma is consistently negative on the PET scan.\textsuperscript{32} It can also assess the extent of active disease, detect extramedullary involvement or evaluate treatment response.\textsuperscript{33,51-53}

Multiparameter flow cytometry is a newly available tool that can help individualize the follow-up/surveillance strategy for patients with smoldering myeloma. It measures abnormal cells in the bone marrow and provides information regarding the risk of progression to active myeloma. A high proportion of abnormal plasma cells within the bone marrow plasma cell compartment (> 95%), has been shown to predict the risk of progression in patients with smoldering myeloma or MGUS, as has quantity and type of M protein (non-IgG) and abnormal serum FLC assay.\textsuperscript{54,55} According to the NCCN Multiple Myeloma Panel Members, multiple parameter flow cytometry information may be a useful consideration in the follow-up/surveillance plan of patients with smoldering myeloma. Since this test is not standardized and widely available, they recommend that it should only be performed in laboratories with experience.

If the disease progresses to symptomatic myeloma then patients should be treated according to the guidelines for symptomatic MM. The IMWG definition for progressive disease is in the section titled “Response Criteria for Multiple Myeloma” in the NCCN Guidelines for Multiple Myeloma.

Active (Symptomatic) Multiple Myeloma

Primary Therapy for Active (Symptomatic) MM

Patients presenting with active (symptomatic) myeloma are initially treated with primary therapy and in selected patients, primary therapy is followed by high dose chemotherapy with autologous stem cell support. Stem cell toxins, such as nitrosoureas or alkylating agents may compromise stem cell reserve and regimens with these agents (notably melphalan) should be avoided in patients who are potential candidates for stem cell transplant (SCT). Therefore, one of the first steps in evaluating patients with advanced MM is to determine whether they are a candidate for high dose therapy and transplant, based on age and co-morbidities. However, it should be noted that advanced age and renal dysfunction are not absolute contraindications to transplant. It is also important to consider supportive care for all patients at diagnosis. For example, 80% of patients have bone disease and up to 33% have renal compromise. Bone disease, renal dysfunction and other complications such as hypercalcemia, hyperviscosity, and coagulation/thrombosis should be treated with appropriate adjunctive measures (see section on Adjunctive Treatment). In all patients, careful attention to supportive care is critical to avoid early complications that may compromise therapeutic outcome.

The page titled “Myeloma Therapy” in the guidelines has a list of primary therapy regimens recommended by the NCCN Multiple Myeloma Panel Members for transplant and non-transplant candidates and also lists drugs recommended for maintenance therapy. The list is selected and not inclusive of all regimens. The NCCN Multiple Myeloma Panel Members have classified the regimens either as “preferred regimens” or “other regimens” on the basis of a balance of efficacy and toxicity. Research into various primary regimens has focused on improving the CR rates in both transplant and non-transplant
candidates. The NCCN Panel Members have noted that it is important to assess for response to primary therapy after 2 cycles.

Lenalidomide is a potent analogue of thalidomide. Both lenalidomide and thalidomide possess immunomodulatory properties.56 Prophylaxis with an anticoagulation agent is recommended for patients receiving thalidomide- or lenalidomide-based therapy.

Bortezomib-based regimens may be of value in patients with renal failure, and in those with certain adverse cytogenetic features.57 Bortezomib treatment has been associated with an increased incidence of herpes zoster.58-60 The incidence of bortezomib-associated herpes zoster may be reduced with the use of prophylactic acyclovir.61 The risk of deep vein thrombosis (DVT) is low with bortezomib; however, peripheral neuropathy and gastrointestinal disturbance can be higher. Bortezomib-related adverse events are predictable and managed with patient monitoring and appropriate supportive care.62

**Preferred Primary Therapy Regimens for Transplant Candidates**

**Bortezomib/Dexamethasone**

Bortezomib is a proteasome inhibitor that not only directly targets the myeloma cell, but also targets the interaction between the tumor cell and the bone marrow microenvironment. Bortezomib targets both intrinsic and extrinsic signaling pathways, whereas dexamethasone targets only the intrinsic pathway. This emerging understanding of the bone marrow microenvironment provides the rationale of combining these two drugs.

In the IFM cooperative group trial, 482 transplant-eligible patients were randomized to one of the following four primary therapy arms: Vincristine, doxorubicin, and dexamethasone (VAD) (n = 121), or bortezomib and dexamethasone (n = 121), or bortezomib, dexamethasone plus consolidation with DCEP (n = 119).63 The primary endpoint was assessing response rate after primary therapy. The investigators evaluated the response according to modified EBMT criteria,38 including additional categories of near CR (CR but immunofixation-positive)64 and VGPR (serum M-protein reduction ≥90%; urine light chain <100 mg/24 hours).9 After primary therapy, the ORR (78.5% vs. 62.8%) and the rates of CR/near CR (14.8% vs. 6.4%) and VGPR (37.7% vs. 15.1%) were significantly higher with bortezomib plus dexamethasone versus VAD.63 At a median follow-up of 32.2 months, median progression-free survival (PFS) was modestly but not statistically significantly prolonged, 36.0 months with bortezomib and dexamethasone versus 29.7 months with VAD.63 Use of DCEP as consolidation therapy after primary therapy did not have a significant impact on response rates.63 Bortezomib and dexamethasone regimen was equally effective in patients with high-risk MM, including those with ISS stage III disease and poor-risk cytogenetic abnormalities. The incidence of severe adverse events reported was similar between the two groups. Hematologic toxicity and deaths related to toxicity were more frequent with VAD versus bortezomib and dexamethasone (7 vs. 0). The rates of grade 2 (20.5% vs. 10.5%) and grades 3 to 4 (9.2% vs. 2.5%) peripheral neuropathy during induction through first transplantation were significantly higher with bortezomib and dexamethasone compared to VAD.63

The IFM conducted a phase III randomized trial comparing bortezomib and dexamethasone with a combination of reduced doses of bortezomib and thalidomide plus dexamethasone.65 The response rates achieved in the comparing bortezomib and dexamethasone arm seen in
this study match those described in previous trials comparing VAD with bortezomib and dexamethasone.\textsuperscript{63}

Patients with either t(4;14) or del(17p) are known to have a short EFS and OS. A study analyzed a large series of patients (younger 65 years) with newly diagnosed transplant-eligible MM treated and t(4;14) or del(17p) treated with bortezomib and dexamethasone versus VAD as primary therapy before treatment.\textsuperscript{57} The analysis demonstrated that bortezomib improves the prognosis (in terms of both EFS and OS; \(P < .001\) and \(P < .001\), respectively) of patients with t(4;14) compared with patients treated with VAD primary therapy.\textsuperscript{57}

Based on these data and the uniform consensus among the NCCN Multiple Myeloma Panel Members, bortezomib and dexamethasone is listed as a category 1 primary therapy option for transplant eligible patients with MM. The panel recommends herpes prophylaxis in patients receiving bortezomib therapy.

**Bortezomib/Doxorubicin/Dexamethasone**

The updated results from the HOVON-65/GMMG-HD4 group phase III trial of newly diagnosed patients with stage II/III myeloma demonstrated high response rates after primary therapy with the bortezomib, doxorubicin, and dexamethasone versus VAD, and this superior response rate (CR, near CR was 31% vs. 15%; \(P < .001\)) was maintained even after SCT with significantly higher ORR.\textsuperscript{66} No unexpected toxicities occurred, and del(13q) did not have a significant impact on response. Responses rates improved with bortezomib maintenance (34% vs. 49%; \(P < .001\)).\textsuperscript{66} After a median follow-up of 41 months, PFS in patients treated with bortezomib, doxorubicin, and dexamethasone as primary therapy followed by SCT and bortezomib maintenance was 35 months versus 28 months in patients treated with VAD followed by SCT and maintenance with thalidomide. Patients treated with bortezomib, doxorubicin, and dexamethasone had a significantly better PFS (hazard ratio [HR], 0.75; 95% CI, 0.62 to 0.90; \(P = .002\)).\textsuperscript{66} The OS was also found to be better in the bortezomib, doxorubicin, and dexamethasone arm (HR, 0.77; 95% CI, 0.60 to 1.00; \(P = .049\)). In high-risk patients presenting with increased creatinine more than 2 mg/dL, bortezomib significantly improved PFS from a median of 13 months to 30 months (HR, 0.45; 95% CI, 0.26 to 0.78; \(P = .004\)) and OS from a median of 21 months to 54 months (HR, 0.33; 95% CI, 0.16 to 0.65; \(P < .001\)). A benefit in terms of increased PFS was also observed in patients with deletion 17p13.\textsuperscript{66} The rate of grade 2 to 4 peripheral neuropathy was higher in those treated with the bortezomib containing regimen versus VAD (40% vs. 18%). In addition, newly developed grade 3 to 4 peripheral neuropathy occurred in 8% of patients during thalidomide maintenance and 5% of patients during bortezomib maintenance.\textsuperscript{66}

Based on data from the HOVON-65/GMMG-HD4 trial and the uniform consensus among the NCCN Multiple Myeloma Panel Members, the bortezomib, doxorubicin, and dexamethasone regimen is a category 1 option for primary therapy for transplant-eligible patients with MM.

**Bortezomib/Thalidomide/Dexamethasone**

Thalidomide attacks multiple targets in the microenvironment of the myeloma cell, producing apoptosis, inhibition of angiogenesis and cytokine circuits, among others. The GIMEMA Italian Multiple Myeloma Network reported results of a phase III trial investigating bortezomib, thalidomide, and dexamethasone (\(n = 241\)) versus thalidomide and dexamethasone (\(n = 239\)) as primary therapy, followed by tandem autologous SCT with high-dose melphalan and then consolidation therapy with the same primary regimen.\textsuperscript{67} The addition of bortezomib to thalidomide and dexamethasone significantly improved ORR after primary treatment. After primary therapy, CR/near CR was achieved in
73 patients (31%, 95% CI 25.0–36.8) receiving bortezomib, thalidomide, and dexamethasone, and 27 (11%, CI 7.3–15.4) on thalidomide/dexamethasone. Rates of CR/near CR and VGPR or better continued to be significantly higher in the bortezomib, thalidomide, and dexamethasone group than in the thalidomide/dexamethasone group after the first and second autologous SCT, and subsequent consolidation therapy. Patients receiving the bortezomib-containing regimen experienced grade 3/4 peripheral neuropathy.

Data from a single-institution retrospective study are similar to the interim data from the GIMEMA trial. The findings of this analysis demonstrate that with ORR after primary therapy with bortezomib, thalidomide, and dexamethasone was 94% of the patients (32 of 34 patients showed some response, including a VGPR rate ≥56%).

The results of the randomized phase III trial by the Spanish Myeloma Group (PETHEMA/GEM) also demonstrated a significantly higher CR rate with bortezomib, thalidomide, and dexamethasone as primary therapy overall (35% vs. 14%, P = .001) and in patients with high-risk cytogenetics (35% vs. 0%, P = .002). The CR rate continued to be significantly higher after autologous SCT (46% vs. 24%) in patients treated with bortezomib, thalidomide, and dexamethasone versus thalidomide and dexamethasone as primary therapy.

Based on the above data and the uniform consensus among the NCCN Multiple Myeloma Panel Members the bortezomib, thalidomide, and dexamethasone regimen is a category 1 option as primary therapy for transplant eligible patients with MM.

**Cyclophosphamide/Bortezomib/Dexamethasone**

Data from three phase II studies involving newly diagnosed MM patients (n = 495) has demonstrated high response rates with cyclophosphamide, bortezomib, and dexamethasone (CyBorD) as primary treatment. The trial by Reeder et al carried out in the United States and Canada demonstrated an ORR of 88% including a VGPR or greater of 61% and 39% CR/near CR with CyBorD as the primary regimen. The depth of response seen after primary treatment was maintained after transplant in those who underwent transplantation (70% rates of CR/near CR; rate of at least VGPR or better was 74%).

Analysis of the German DSMM XIa study also demonstrated high responses with CyBorD as primary treatment (ORR was 84%; with 74% PR rate and 10% CR rate). High response rates were seen in patients with unfavorable cytogenetics.

In the updated results of the phase II EVOLUTION study, primary treatment with CyBorD demonstrated ORR of 75% (22% CR; and 41% ≥ VGPR), and one year PFS rate was 93%.

Based on data from these three phase II studies, the NCCN Multiple Myeloma Panel has now included the combination of cyclophosphamide/bortezomib/dexamethasone as a category 2A recommendation to the list of primary treatment options available for transplant candidates.

Twice weekly bortezomib can be associated with toxicities that may limit efficacy caused by treatment delays or discontinuation. Therefore, Reeder et al modified the regimen to a once weekly schedule of bortezomib. In the study, patients treated with weekly bortezomib achieved responses similar to the twice weekly schedule (ORR 93% vs. 88%, VGPR 60% vs. 61%). In addition, they experienced less grade 3/4 adverse events (37%/3% vs. 48%/12%). Fewer dose reductions of
bortezomib and dexamethasone were required in the modified schedule and neuropathy rates were the same in both cohorts, even though the total bortezomib dose per cycle was higher in the weekly versus the twice weekly schedule (6.0 mg/m² vs. 5.2/mg/m²).  

**Lenalidomide/Dexamethasone**

Lenalidomide is a potent analogue of thalidomide. Like thalidomide it is believed to attack multiple targets in the microenvironment of the myeloma cell, producing apoptosis and inhibition of angiogenesis and cytokine circuits, among others. Lenalidomide received approval from the U.S. Food and Drug Administration (FDA) for the treatment of relapsed/refractory MM in combination with dexamethasone (discussed further under Salvage Therapy). Lenalidomide and dexamethasone have also been investigated as primary therapy. The phase III randomized controlled study, S0232, by Southwest Oncology Group (SWOG) compared dexamethasone single agent with dexamethasone plus lenalidomide for patients newly diagnosed with MM. This trial was halted at interim analysis and patients on dexamethasone alone were allowed to switch to lenalidomide with dexamethasone. The SWOG data and safety monitoring committee based its recommendation to permanently close enrollment based on the preliminary results from the ECOG phase III study (E4A03). At the time the SWOG trial was halted, at the end of one year, the lenalidomide plus dexamethasone arm showed improved CR rate compared to dexamethasone alone (22.1% vs. 3.8%).

In a recent open-label trial, 445 newly diagnosed MM patients were randomly assigned to high-dose or low-dose regimens. The response was superior with high-dose dexamethasone. One hundred and sixty-nine (79%) of 214 patients receiving high-dose therapy and 142 (68%) of 205 patients on low-dose therapy had CR or PR within four cycles. However, the high response rates did not result in superior time to progression, PFS, or OS compared with low-dose dexamethasone. The trial was stopped after one year. Patients on high-dose therapy were allowed to cross-over to the low-dose arm since the OS rate was significantly higher in that arm. At 1-year interim analysis, OS was 96% in the low-dose dexamethasone group compared with 87% in the high-dose group ($P = .0002$); 2-year OS was 87% versus 75%, respectively.

The cause of inferior OS with high-dose dexamethasone seems to be related to increased deaths caused by toxicity. Fifty-two percent on the high-dose regimen compared with 35% on the low-dose regimen had grade 3 or worse toxic effects in the first 4 months, including DVT (26% vs. 12%); infections including pneumonia (16 vs. 9%); and fatigue (15% vs. 9%). The 3-year OS of patients who received four cycles of primary treatment with either dose followed by autologous SCT was 92%, suggesting that lenalidomide and dexamethasone is a reasonable choice for primary therapy before SCT.

A retrospective analysis of 411 newly diagnosed patients treated with either the lenalidomide and dexamethasone regimen ($n = 228$) or the thalidomide and dexamethasone regimen ($n = 183$) was performed at the Mayo Clinic. In a matched-pair analysis, the differences between the two arms were similar for age, sex, transplantation status, and dexamethasone dose. The proportion of patients achieving at least a PR to lenalidomide and dexamethasone was 80.3% versus 61.2% with thalidomide/dexamethasone; VGPR rates were 34.2% and 12.0%, respectively. Patients receiving lenalidomide and dexamethasone had longer time to progression (median, 27.4 vs. 17.2 months; $P = .019$), longer PFS (median, 26.7 vs. 17.1 months; $P = .036$), and better OS (median not reached vs. 57.2 months; $P = .018$). Grade 3 or 4 adverse events (57.5% vs. 54.6%, $P = .568$) were seen in a similar proportion of patients in both groups. Grade 3 or 4 toxicities of
Lenalidomide and dexamethasone were hematologic, mainly neutropenia (14.6% vs. 0.6%, \( P < .001 \)); the most common toxicities in thalidomide and dexamethasone were venous thromboembolism (VTE) (15.3% vs. 9.2%, \( P = .058 \)) and peripheral neuropathy (10.4% vs. 0.9%, \( P < .001 \)). Based on the results of this meta-analysis lenalidomide and dexamethasone seems well-tolerated and more effective than thalidomide and dexamethasone.\(^7\) However, randomized prospective trials are needed to confirm these results.

The incidence of DVT is low with single-agent lenalidomide or lenalidomide plus low-dose dexamethasone, but risk rises when combined with high-dose dexamethasone. According to a recent report, patients treated with lenalidomide and high-dose dexamethasone that developed a VTE did not experience shorter OS or time to progression.\(^7\) Prophylactic anticoagulation is recommended in patients receiving this therapy.\(^62,80\)

A decrease in CD34-positive cells collected after prolonged lenalidomide treatment has been reported.\(^81,82\) Guidelines by the IMWG suggest that patients treated with lenalidomide and dexamethasone should have stem cells collected within the first 4 cycles of therapy.\(^83\)

The NCCN Multiple Myeloma Panel recommends harvesting peripheral blood early in the course of primary treatment with lenalidomide. Lenalidomide and dexamethasone is listed as a category 1 primary treatment option in the NCCN Guidelines. The Panel recommends appropriate thromboprophylaxis for patients receiving this therapy.

Bortezomib/Lenalidomide/Dexamethasone
Phase I/II study results have shown that primary therapy with bortezomib, lenalidomide, and dexamethasone is active and well tolerated in newly diagnosed patients with MM.\(^84\) Response rate is 100% with 74% VGPR or better and 52% CR/near CR. Given this high extent and frequency of response, a randomized trial is now evaluating this regimen with or without high-dose melphalan and stem cell support in newly diagnosed transplant candidates.

The benefits of bortezomib, lenalidomide, and dexamethasone as primary therapy were also seen in the results of the phase II IFM 2008 trial,\(^85,86\) and phase II EVOLUTION trial.\(^7\) In the phase II IFM 2008 trial, the ORR after primary treatment was 97% (13% sCR; 16% CR; and 54% ≥ VGPR).\(^85\) The phase II EVOLUTION trial was designed to examine the tolerability and efficacy of combining bortezomib, cyclophosphamide, lenalidomide, and dexamethasone versus bortezomib, lenalidomide, and dexamethasone versus cyclophosphamide, bortezomib, and dexamethasone in a randomized multicenter setting. The ORR after primary treatment followed by maintenance with bortezomib for four 6-week cycles was 85% (51% ≥ VGPR and 24% CR) with one-year PFS of 83% for the bortezomib, lenalidomide, and dexamethasone arm.\(^7\)

The NCCN Panel included the bortezomib, lenalidomide, and dexamethasone regimen as a category 2A option for primary treatment of transplant eligible patients with MM.

Other Primary Therapy Regimens for Transplant Candidates

Thalidomide/Dexamethasone
Rajkumar et al reported the results of a study involving 207 patients with newly diagnosed MM randomized to receive thalidomide and dexamethasone alone.\(^87\) The response rate to the combined therapy was significantly higher compared to those receiving dexamethasone alone (63% vs. 41%, respectively). Stem cells for subsequent transplant were also successfully collected. However,
increased toxicity is associated with thalidomide specifically DVT; therefore prophylactic anticoagulation is recommended if thalidomide and dexamethasone are given.\textsuperscript{80} Other side effects of thalidomide included rash, gastrointestinal disturbance, peripheral neuropathy, or somnolence.\textsuperscript{62} The use of thalidomide requires individual patient consideration, and the higher response rate of the thalidomide and dexamethasone combination must be weighed against the increased side effects.

Thalidomide in combination dexamethasone as a primary regimen is a category 2B recommendation in the NCCN Guidelines. The Panel recommends appropriate thromboprophylaxis for patients receiving this therapy.

**Single-Agent Dexamethasone**

Dexamethasone alone may be an option as short-term primary therapy for a highly selected group of patients (eg, in those with renal failure, hypercalcemia, cord compromise requiring radiation therapy, cytopenia).

Single-agent dexamethasone as primary treatment is a category 2B recommendation in the NCCN Guidelines.

**Liposomal Doxorubicin/Vincristine/Dexamethasone**

In a non-inferiority trial, newly diagnosed, active MM patients (n = 192) were randomized to receive pegylated liposomal doxorubicin (PLD), vincristine, and dexamethasone regimen (DVD) or VAD regimen.\textsuperscript{88} The primary endpoints were response and toxicity. Objective response, PFS, and OS were similar between the treatment groups. However, pegylated DVD was associated with less toxicity compared with VAD.\textsuperscript{88} Data from this and other recent studies suggest that VAD should no longer be recommended, as most patients respond to induction regimen based on novel drug combinations.

The DVD regimen is listed as a category 2B recommendation for primary treatment in the NCCN Guidelines.

**Carfilzomib/Lenalidomide/Dexamethasone**

Carfilzomib is a second-generation proteasome inhibitor that binds highly selectively and irreversibly to the proteasome. It is administered intravenously. Preclinical studies with carfilzomib show lack of neurodegeneration in vitro,\textsuperscript{89} and less neurotoxicity in animal studies.\textsuperscript{90} Carfilzomib has demonstrated antmyeloma activity in patients with relapsed and/or refractory MM with an acceptable tolerability profile, including limited neuropathy after prolonged treatment.\textsuperscript{91-93}

The safety and efficacy of carfilzomib in combination with lenalidomide and dexamethasone, as primary therapy for patients with MM were evaluated in two single-arm trials. First, a multicenter phase I/II trial evaluated the combination of carfilzomib, lenalidomide, and dexamethasone in newly diagnosed MM patients.\textsuperscript{94} In this trial, patients (n =53) received carfilzomib (20, 27, or 36 mg/m², days 1, 2, 8, 9, 15, 16 and 1, 2, 15, 16 after cycle 8) with lenalidomide 25 mg/day days 1 to 21 and dexamethasone first 40 mg weekly for cycles 1 to 4 then 20 mg weekly for cycles 5 to 8 in 28 day cycles. After 8 cycles, patients received the regimen every other week (days 1, 2 and 15, 16 of 28-day cycles) for 8 cycles. After 24 cycles of therapy, maintenance with single-agent lenalidomide was recommended off study. After a median of 12 cycles, 62% achieved at least a near-CR and 42% achieved a stringent CR. In 36 patients who completed 8 or more cycles, 78% achieved at least a near CR and 61% achieved a sCR. With median follow-up of 13 months, 24-month PFS was estimated at 92%. The most
common grade 3 and 4 toxicities in \( \geq 10\% \) of patients included hypophosphatemia (25%), hyperglycemia (23%), anemia (21%), thrombocytopenia (17%), and neutropenia (17%). Peripheral neuropathy was limited to grade 1/2 (23%).

The second phase 1/2 trial also evaluated the same regimen (carfilzomib in combination with lenalidomide and dexamethasone) in newly diagnosed MM patients. The dosing in this study was carfilzomib 20 or 36 mg/m\(^2\) (20 mg/m\(^2\) on days 1 and 2 of cycle 1 only) on days 1, 2, 8, 9, 15, and 16, with lenalidomide 25 mg/day on days 1 to 21 and dexamethasone 20 mg on days 1, 2, 8, 9, 15, 16, 22, and 23 for cycles 1 to 4, then decreased to 10 mg for cycles 5 to 8 (28 day cycles). After 8 cycles of treatment, patients received 12 cycles of lenalidomide 10 mg/day days 1 to 21. Fifty out of the eighteen patients enrolled in the trial were evaluated for toxicity and response. The median time to stringent CR was 4.5 cycles. Four patients who achieved a near CR or sCR (after 5 cycles of treatment) were evaluated by flow cytometry; all were negative for minimal residual disease. The most common grade 3 and 4 toxicities in \( \geq 10\% \) of patients included lymphopenia (60%), liver function tests elevation (20%), fatigue (15%), rash/pruritus (15%), dyspnea (10%), and cardiac failure (10%). Peripheral neuropathy in this trial was limited to grade 1/2.

Based on the above data, the NCCN Panel has included the carfilzomib, lenalidomide, and dexamethasone regimen as a category 2A option for primary treatment of transplant eligible patients with MM.

**Preferred Primary Therapy Regimens for Nontransplant Candidates**

Many of the regimens described above for transplant candidates are also options for non-transplant candidates. The regimens containing melphalan compromise stem cell reserve, and thus are options only for non-transplant candidates.

**Melphalan/Prednisone/Thalidomide**

Melphalan and prednisone (MP) has been a standard treatment of MM since 1960. A review of the clinical trials reported that MP results in a 60% response rate with duration of 18 months and an OS of 24 to 36 months. Palumbo and colleagues were the first to report that when thalidomide was combined with melphalan and prednisone (MPT), combined near CR and CR rates were 27.9% for MPT compared to 7.2% for MP. In the updated analysis, after a median follow-up of 38.1 months, the median PFS was 21.8 months for MPT and 14.5 months for MP (\( P = .004 \)). The median OS was 45.0 months for MPT and 47.6 months for MP (\( P = .79 \)).

Subsequently, several phase III trials have reported significant higher ORR with MPT versus MP (57%-76% vs. 31%-48%), including a higher CR or VGPR rate (7%-15.5%). The impact of MPT on survival is not clear, as only the IFM studies have reported a survival advantage in patients on MPT.

The phase III IFM 01-01 study compared the standard MP versus MPT in 232 newly diagnosed elderly (age \( \geq 75 \) years) patients with MM. After a median follow-up time of 47.5 months, median OS was significantly prolonged in the MPT group (44.0 months; 95% CI, 33.4-58.7) compared with the MP group (29.1 months; 95% CI, 26.4-34.9) (HR, 0.68 in favor of MPT; \( P = .028 \)). Median PFS time was significantly longer in the MPT group versus MP (24.1 months; 95% CI, 19.4 to 29.0 vs. 18.5 months; 95% CI, 14.6-21.3; HR, 0.62 in favor of MPT; \( P = .001 \)).

The phase III study by the HOVON group compared the standard MP versus MPT in 333 newly diagnosed elderly patients with MM. Significantly higher responses rates were seen with MPT treated patients compared to MP and were comparable with response rates. 

seen in the French and Italian trials described above. With MPT, the ORR (CR+VGPR+PR) was 66% versus 45% with MP. The percentage of patients not responding to therapy or with progressive disease was 55% with MP and 34% with MPT. The EFS was 13 months with MPT versus 9 months with MP, and OS was 40 months with MPT versus 31 months with MP. Comparisons between these studies are difficult because of differences in patient populations, duration of treatment, and use of maintenance regimens.

A meta-analysis has demonstrated that in previously untreated, transplant-ineligible, elderly myeloma patients, MPT results in significantly improved response rates and PFS with a trend towards improvement in OS compared with MP alone.

Based on the significantly higher ORR consistently seen in all these studies, the NCCN Panel has included MPT as a category 1 primary treatment in transplant ineligible patients with MM. The Panel cautions that there is a significant risk of DVT with thalidomide-based therapy; therefore, use of thromboprophylaxis in patients on MPT therapy is highly recommended.

**Melphalan/Prednisone/Bortezomib**

Addition of bortezomib to MP (MPB) was investigated in a large, randomized, international phase III VISTA (Velcade as Initial Standard Therapy in Multiple Myeloma) trial. The trial evaluated MP (n = 338) versus MPB (n = 344) in previously untreated patients with MM who were 65 years of age or older, or patients younger than 65 years of age and transplant ineligible. The regimen was well-tolerated. The addition of bortezomib resulted in high rates of CR and significant prolongation of time to disease progression, PFS, OS, and time to next treatment. Importantly, adverse cytogenetics, advanced age, and renal function had no impact on the efficacy of the bortezomib-containing regimen.

The final analysis of the phase III VISTA trial with median follow-up of 60.1 months (range, 0 to 74 months), showed a 31% reduced risk of death with MPB versus MP (HR, 0.695; P < .001). Median OS reported was 56.4 months with MPB versus 43.1 months with MP, with 5-year OS rates of 46.0% with MPB versus 34.4% with MP. No OS benefit was seen with the use of bortezomib among the small subgroup of patients with documented high-risk cytogenetics. Another interesting finding from this study was that patients relapsing after bortezomib-based therapy were not resistant to subsequent therapies and could be successfully treated with immunomodulatory drug-based therapies. Among patients who received subsequent therapies, survival from start of subsequent therapy was similar after treatment with MPB (median, 28.1 months) or MP (median, 26.8 months; HR, 0.914). These findings support the strategy of using bortezomib-based treatment as first-line therapy instead of reserving it for salvage therapy. In addition, no increased risk of second primary malignancies was observed with MPB versus MP. The incidence of hematologic malignancies and solid tumors were similar in both arms, and were consistent with background incidence rate of for all cancers in the general US population of similar age group.

There is no randomized head-to-head study comparing MPT and MPB; however, a meta-analysis of the phase III studies has demonstrated that better response rates could be expected with MPB than with MPT. Existing data on MP, MPT, and MPB were compared, and analysis showed 81% probability that MPB was the most efficacious among the three regimens in terms of ORR, with a greater than 99% probability that it was also the most efficacious in terms of CR.

Advantages of MPB over MPT for transplant-ineligible patients include more rapid response and higher rates of CR, with improved survival. No difference was seen in OS and PFS between MPB and MPT.
regimens. Based on the VISTA trial results, the MPB regimen is now a NCCN category 1 primary treatment option for transplant-ineligible patients with MM.

**Lenalidomide/Low-dose Dexamethasone**

The results of the SWOG SO232 trial that included transplant-ineligible patients and the ECOG E4A03 trial that included elderly patients with MM demonstrate that lenalidomide in combination with low-dose dexamethasone is a well-tolerated and effective regimen for these groups of patients. In the ECOG E4A03 trial the OS rate was significantly higher in the lenalidomide plus low-dose dexamethasone arm compared to lenalidomide plus high-dose dexamethasone arm (also discussed under Preferred Primary Therapy Regimens for Transplant Candidates). The inferior survival outcome seen with high-dose dexamethasone was greatest in patients 65 years and older. At 2 years, patients who did not proceed to transplant had an OS rate of 91% with lenalidomide and low-dose dexamethasone.

Lenalidomide in combination with low-dose dexamethasone is considered a category 1 option by the NCCN Multiple Myeloma Panel for transplant-ineligible patients with MM. The Panel recommends appropriate thromboprophylaxis for patients receiving this therapy.

**Bortezomib/Dexamethasone**

A U.S. community-based, randomized, open-label, multicenter phase IIIb UPFRONT trial compared safety and efficacy of three highly active bortezomib-based regimens in previously untreated elderly patients with MM ineligible for SCT. The patients with symptomatic, measurable MM were randomized (1:1:1) to one of the following regimens: bortezomib and dexamethasone (n = 168); bortezomib, thalidomide, and dexamethasone (n = 167); or MPB (n = 167) followed by maintenance therapy with bortezomib. The primary endpoint was PFS; secondary endpoints included ORR, CR/near CR and VGPR rates, OS, and safety. All three induction regimens exhibited substantial activity, with ORR of 73% (bortezomib and dexamethasone), 80% (bortezomib, thalidomide, and dexamethasone), and 69% (MPB) during the treatment period. After a median follow-up of 21.8 months, no significant difference in PFS was observed between the treatment arms. Response rates, including CR and ≥VGPR, improved after bortezomib maintenance, with no concomitant increase in the incidence of peripheral neuropathy.

The NCCN Multiple Myeloma Panel has included bortezomib and dexamethasone as a category 2A primary therapy option for patients with MM, ineligible for transplant.

**Other Primary Therapy Regimens for Non-transplant Candidates**

Both MPT and MPB regimens have reported superior responses compared to MP. However, MP may still have a role in patients who do not have access to novel agents. According to the NCCN Multiple Myeloma Panel, MP is a category 2A recommendation. The other NCCN category 2B options for patients not eligible for SCT include thalidomide and dexamethasone, single-agent dexamethasone, DVD, and VAD.

**Follow-Up of Transplant and Non-transplant Candidates After Primary Therapy**

After primary therapy, it is recommended to re-evaluate (after 2 cycles) with the laboratory tests, bone survey and bone marrow aspiration and biopsy to determine treatment response, or whether the primary disease is progressive. Potential transplant candidates must undergo a stem cell harvest, collecting enough stem cells for two transplants in anticipation of a tandem transplant or a second transplant as salvage therapy. Alternatively, all patients may consider continuation of primary
therapy till the best response is reached. The optimal duration of primary therapy after achieving maximal response is unknown; hence, maintenance therapy (see section on Maintenance Therapy), or observation can be considered beyond maximal response.

**Stem Cell Transplants**

**Introduction**

High-dose therapy with stem cell support is a critical component in the treatment plan for eligible, newly diagnosed MM patients. The types of SCT may be single autologous SCT, a tandem SCT (a planned second course of high-dose therapy and SCT within 6 months of the first), or an allogeneic SCT. An allogeneic SCT can be either performed after prior myeloablative therapy or after nonmyeloablative therapy. Nonmyeloablative therapy also referred to as “mini transplant” has been investigated as a technique to decrease toxicity of the allotransplant while preserving the alloimmune graft-versus-myeloma effect. An allogeneic SCT may also follow an autologous SCT.

The NCCN Guidelines for Multiple Myeloma indicate that all types of SCT are appropriate in different clinical settings; these indications are discussed further below. However, in general, all candidates for high-dose chemotherapy must have sufficient liver, renal, pulmonary, and cardiac function. Earlier studies of autologous transplant included total body irradiation (TBI) as a component of the preparative regimen. Regimens with chemotherapy only have recently been shown to have equivalent efficacy and less toxicity than TBI. TBI regimens have now been abandoned, but newer, potentially less toxic radiation techniques aimed to deliver total marrow irradiation while reducing toxicities to non-target organs are currently undergoing evaluation in clinical trials.

**Autologous Stem Cell Transplants**

Autologous SCT results in high response rates and remains the standard of care after primary therapy for eligible patients. In 1996, results of the first randomized trial were reported; this trial demonstrated that autologous SCT is associated with statistically significant higher response rates and increased overall and EFS when compared with the response of similar patients treated with conventional therapy. In 2003, results of a second trial comparing high-dose therapy to standard therapy showed an increase in the CR rate and an improvement in OS (54 months in the high-dose group compared to 42 months for standard therapy). The benefit was more pronounced for higher risk patients. Barlogie and colleagues reported on the results of an American trial that randomized 510 patients to receive high-dose therapy with autologous stem cell support or standard therapy. With a median follow-up of 76 months, there were no differences in response rates, PFS, or OS between the two groups. The reason for the discrepant results are not clear, but may be related to differences in the specific high dose and conventional regimens between the American and French study. For example, the American study included TBI as part of the high-dose regimen; TBI has subsequently been found to be inferior to high-dose melphalan.

Another trial included 190 patients 55 to 65 years of age randomized to standard or high-dose therapy. This study was specifically designed to include older patients, since the median age of the participants in other trials ranged from 54 to 57 years whereas the median age in this trial was 61 years. After 120 months of follow-up, there was no significant difference in OS, although there was a trend toward improved EFS in the high-dose group ($P = .7$). Additionally, the period of time without symptoms, treatment, or treatment toxicity (TWiSTT) was significantly longer in the high-dose group. The study concluded
that the equivalent survival suggests that the treatment choice between high-dose and conventional-dose chemotherapy should be based on personal choice in older patients. For example, an early transplant may be favored because patients can enjoy a longer interval of symptom-free time. However, this study also showed that a transplant performed at relapse (as salvage therapy) has a similar OS compared to an early transplant. The choice of early versus late transplant was examined in a randomized French trial, and the results in both arms are comparable with respect to OS. However, early SCT was superior in terms of quality of life, assessed as time without symptoms and side effects from therapy.

It should be noted that all randomized studies of autologous SCT after primary therapy were designed and implemented before the availability of thalidomide, lenalidomide or bortezomib. Therefore, the role of transplant may evolve in the future. The results of the PETHEMA trial strongly support the use of upfront autologous SCT for MM even in the era of novel agents. The response rates were evaluated after induction therapy and after autologous SCT. Taking into consideration patients who actually underwent the autologous SCT, the CR rates were increased from 35% pre-transplant to 57% post-transplant, in the group treated with bortezomib, thalidomide, and dexamethasone as induction therapy and from 14% to 40% in the group treated with thalidomide and dexamethasone as induction therapy.

Results from the IFM 2005/01 study of patients with symptomatic myeloma receiving primary therapy with either bortezomib and dexamethasone versus VAD showed a marked improvement in ORR with bortezomib and dexamethasone over VAD (discussed under section titled Preferred Primary Therapy Regimens for Transplant Candidates). Responses were evaluated after primary treatment and post-autologous SCT. After the first autologous SCT, CR/near CR rates were 35.0% in the bortezomib plus dexamethasone arm, compared with 18.4% in the VAD arm. The VGPR rates were 54.3% versus 37.2%. Median PFS was 36.0 months versus 29.7 months ($P = .064$) with bortezomib plus dexamethasone versus VAD after a median follow-up of 32.2 months. The PFS was significantly longer in patients achieving greater than or equal to a VGPR after autologous SCT than in the 188 patients achieving less than VGPR (median 41.1 versus 33.5 months). Also, PFS was also significantly longer in the patients achieving greater than or equal to a VGPR after primary treatment than in patients achieving a less than VGPR (median 41.1 versus 29.0 months).

In another study, 474 patients were randomized to primary therapy with bortezomib, dexamethasone, and thalidomide ($n = 236$) or thalidomide and dexamethasone ($n = 238$) before double autologous SCT. The three-drug regimen yielded high response rates compared with the two drug regimen, with a CR rate of 19% (versus 5%) and ≥ VGPR of 62% (vs. 31%). After SCT, improved incremental responses were still seen with bortezomib/dexamethasone/thalidomide compared with thalidomide plus dexamethasone. Taken together, these studies suggest that improved responses with the primary regimen results in improved outcomes after transplantation.

Studies have found that progressive disease emerging after primary therapy does not preclude a good response to autologous SCT. For example, Kumar and colleagues reported on a case series of 50 patients with primary progressive MM receiving an autologous SCT. Results were compared to 100 patients with responsive disease undergoing autologous SCT. The one-year PFS from the time of transplant was 70% in the primary progressive group compared to 83% in the chemosensitive group. For this reason, the NCCN Guidelines...
indicate autologous SCT as a category 1 option for treatment of primary progressive or refractory disease post primary treatment.

**Tandem Stem Cell Transplants**

Tandem SCT refers to a planned second course of high dose therapy and SCT within 6 months of the first course. Planned tandem transplants have been studied in several randomized trials. The IFM94 trial reported by Attal et al randomized newly diagnosed myeloma patients to single or tandem autologous transplants. A total of 78% of patients assigned to the tandem transplant group received the second transplant at a median time of 2.5 months after the first. A variety of options for salvage therapy were provided. For example relapsing patients in either group underwent either no therapy, additional conventional therapy, or another SCT. The probability of surviving event free for seven years after the diagnosis was 10% in the single transplant group compared to 20% in the double transplant group. An accompanying editorial by Stadtmauer questions whether the promising results might be related to regimens used, rather than to the effect of two courses of high-dose therapy. For example patients in the single transplant arm received 140 mg/m² melphalan plus TBI, whereas those in the tandem arm received the same dose without TBI for the initial transplant and with TBI for the second transplant. As noted above, TBI has been shown to be more toxic without providing additional benefit. Based on this, the editorial suggests that the increased survival in IFM94’s tandem arm may have resulted from greater cumulative exposure to melphalan (280 versus 140 mg/m²). In a subset analysis, those patients who did not achieve a complete CR or a VGPR within 3 months after the first transplant appeared to benefit the most from a second transplant. The investigators of the IFM94 study have suggested that the improvement in projected survival associated with tandem transplant is related not to improved response rates, but to longer durations of response. Four other randomized trials have compared single versus tandem transplant. None of these trials showed a significant improvement in OS. However, since the median follow-up in these trials ranged from 42 to 53 months, the lack of significant improvement is not surprising. The trial by Cavo et al found that patients not in CR or near CR after the first transplant benefited the most from a second transplant. This confirms the observations of the IFM94 trial using non-TBI-based high-dose regimens.

In both the French and Italian trials, the benefit of a second autologous SCT was seen in patients failing to achieve a CR or VGPR (greater than 90% reduction in M-protein level) with the first procedure. These two studies were not adequately powered to evaluate the equivalence of one versus two transplants in patients achieving a CR or VGPR after the first transplantation.

A review of long-term outcomes of several trials of autologous transplantation by Barlogie et al found that tandem transplantations were superior to both single transplantations and standard therapies. Also, post-relapse survival was longer when EFS was sustained for at least 3.5 years after tandem transplantation. The NCCN Multiple Myeloma Panel recommends collecting enough stem cells for two transplants in all eligible patients. According to the NCCN Multiple Myeloma Panel, a tandem transplant with or without maintenance therapy can be considered for all patients who are candidates for SCT, and is an option for patients who do not achieve at least a VGPR after the first autologous SCT. The benefit from the second transplant in patients, who are in CR, or VGPR, and also in those who achieve less than VGPR after the first SCT, should preferably be answered in a clinical trial. In fact, such a randomized prospective NIH and
Intergroup-supported trial is currently ongoing. The other options for this group of patients include maintenance therapy or observation.

A retrospective case-matched control analysis was performed comparing patients who underwent a second autologous SCT to those treated with conventional chemotherapy for relapsed MM. Similar to previously published smaller studies, this retrospective analysis demonstrated that a second autologous SCT is associated with superior relapse-associated mortality compared with conventional chemotherapy (68% vs. 78%), along with improved OS (32% vs. 22%) at 4 years. In this analysis, factors associated with improved OS and PFS included younger age (<55 years), beta-2 microglobulin <2.5 mg/L at diagnosis, a remission duration of >9 months, and a greater than PR to their first ASCT. This analysis indicates that a second autologous transplant, for relapsed or progressive MM patients, may be an option for carefully selected patients. Some of these patients can achieve durable complete or partial remission.

The NCCN Multiple Myeloma algorithms identify the following situations where a repeat autologous SCT as salvage therapy may be considered either on or off clinical trial depending on the time interval between the preceding SCT and documented progression (category 2A). Based on the data from retrospective studies, the NCCN Panel suggests 2 to 3 years as the minimum length of remission for consideration of second autologous transplant as salvage therapy (category 2B).

Allogeneic Stem Cell Transplant

Allogeneic SCT includes either myeloablative or nonmyeloablative (ie “mini” transplant) transplants. Allogeneic SCT has been investigated as an alternative to autologous SCT both to avoid the contamination of re-infused autologous tumor cells, but also to take advantage of the beneficial graft-versus-tumor effect associated with allogeneic transplants. However lack of a suitable donor and increased morbidity has limited this approach, particularly for the typical older MM population. Non-myeloablative transplants are designed to decrease the morbidity of the high-dose chemotherapy but preserve the beneficial graft-versus-tumor effect. Therefore, the principal difference between myeloablative and nonmyeloablative transplants relates to the chemotherapy regimen used. Specific preparatory regimens have not been a focus of the NCCN Guidelines, and therefore these Guidelines do not make a distinction between these approaches.

Given the small candidate pool, it is not surprising that there have been no randomized clinical trials comparing myeloablative allogeneic to autologous SCT, but multiple case series have been published describing allogeneic SCT as an initial or salvage therapy for MM. In a 1999 review, Kyle reported a mortality rate of 25% within 100 days and overall transplant-related mortality of approximately 40% and few patients were cured. Other reviews have also reported increased morbidity without convincing proof of improved survival. However, there are intriguing data from the SWOG randomized trial of autologous transplant versus conventional chemotherapy. The original trial had an ablative, allogeneic transplant group consisting of patients with HLA identical siblings. Thirty-six patients received allografts, and due to the high 6-month mortality of 45%, the allogeneic arm was closed. With seven years of follow-up the OS of the conventional chemotherapy, autologous and allogeneic arms were all identical at 39%. The autologous and conventional chemotherapy arms do not demonstrate a plateau, whereas the allogenic curve was flat at 39%. This suggests that a proportion of these patients are long-term survivors. Thus, there is ongoing interest in myeloablative allogeneic SCT, particularly given the lack of a significant cure rate for single or tandem autologous SCT.
The NCCN Guidelines consider myeloablative allogeneic SCT an accepted option, only as a part of a clinical trial in: 1) patients responding to primary therapy; 2) patients with primary progressive disease; or 3) salvage therapy in patients with progressive disease after an initial autologous SCT. Off a clinical trial, allogeneic transplantation for patients with MM is category 3.

Another strategy that has been investigated is initial autologous SCT followed by a mini-allogeneic transplant. A prospective trial by Bruno et al showed that, among patients (<65 years) with HLA-matched siblings who received an autograft-allograft regimen, CR rate after allografting was 55%, compared with 26% after double autograft in patients without HLA-matched siblings. Median OS was higher (80 vs. 54 months). In the prospective PETHEMA trial in patients failing to achieve at least near CR with a first autologous SCT, there was no significant difference in OS after double autologous SCT versus autologous SCT followed by mini-allogeneic transplant, but a trend toward a longer PFS was observed. In contrast, the IFM trial (99-03) by Garban et al and the BMT-CTN 0102 trial by Stadtmauer et al reported no OS or PFS advantage with autologous transplant followed by mini-allogeneic transplant in high-risk myeloma patients.

In a prospective study of patients with previously untreated multiple myeloma, patients were selected for treatment with autologous SCT followed by reduced-intensity conditioning allogeneic SCT or autologous SCT based on the availability of an HLA-identical sibling. The induction chemotherapy in this study consisted of the chemotherapy that was standard at the time- the VAD or VAD-like regimen. After 60 months, the incidence of relapse/progression was 49% in the group treated with autologous SCT followed by reduced-intensity conditioning allogeneic SCT versus 78% in the autologous SCT group. AT 60 months, the OS and CR rate were 65% and 51% respectively for patients treated with autologous SCT followed by reduced-intensity conditioning allogeneic SCT compared with 58% and 41% for those treated with autologous SCT. Based on this study results, patients who have an HLA-identical sibling may be considered candidates for reduced-intensity allogeneic SCT as part of their first-line treatment.

Mini-allogeneic transplants have also been investigated as salvage therapy by virtue of their graft-versus-myeloma effect. Responsive disease to prior transplantation and younger age are associated with better response and OS rates. In a case series report, 54 patients with previously treated relapsed or progressive disease were treated with an autologous SCT followed by a mini-allogeneic transplant. There was a 78% OS at a median 552 days after the mini-allogeneic transplant, with a 57% CR rate and an ORR of 83%. This study concluded that this approach reduced the acute toxicities of a myeloablative allogeneic SCT while preserving anti-tumor activity. The largest case series was reported by the EBMT. In this heterogeneous population of 229 patients, the 3-year OS and PFS were 41% and 21%, respectively. Adverse OS was associated with chemoresistant disease and more than 1 prior transplant, whereas improved OS was associated with graft-versus-host disease, confirming the importance of a graft-versus-leukemia effect. This study concluded that mini-allogeneic transplantation is feasible, but heavily pretreated and patients with progressive disease are unlikely to benefit.

Patients whose disease either does not respond to or relapses after allogeneic stem cell grafting may receive donor lymphocyte infusions to stimulate a beneficial graft-versus-myeloma effect or salvage therapy on or off a clinical trial.
**Maintenance Therapy**

**Thalidomide as Maintenance Therapy After Autologous SCT**

Thalidomide as maintenance therapy after a prior autologous SCT has been studied in retrospective and independent randomized trials. In a retrospective review of 112 patients undergoing autologous SCT, Brinker and colleagues reported on the outcomes of 36 patients who received thalidomide as maintenance compared to 76 patients who received no post-transplant therapy. The median survival in the thalidomide group was 65.5 months compared to 44.5 months in the no treatment group ($P = .9$). Attal et al randomized 597 patients to one of three different strategies after tandem autologous SCT, either no maintenance, pamidronate alone, or pamidronate combined with thalidomide. There was a highly significant EFS and OS advantage in the thalidomide and pamidronate arm. The group that appeared to benefit the most was one that had patients who achieved only a PR after transplantation. In another randomized trial, thalidomide maintenance induced improvement in PFS in patients achieving less than a VGPR after autologous SCT with no survival benefit. Thalidomide has also been used before, during, and after tandem autologous SCT. In a randomized study of 668 newly diagnosed patients, half received thalidomide throughout the course of the tandem autologous SCT, ie thalidomide was incorporated into primary therapy, continued between the tandem autologous SCT, and incorporated into consolidation therapy and continued as maintenance therapy. The group that was not treated with thalidomide received the same core therapy. After a median follow-up of 42 months, the group that received thalidomide had improved CR rates (62% vs. 43%) and five-year EFS rates (56% vs. 44%). However, the OS rate was approximately 65% in both groups. Patients who did not receive thalidomide throughout therapy benefited from thalidomide therapy at relapse. The results of this study suggest that sequencing drugs may be important. For example, if thalidomide is used as part of primary therapy, another drug should be considered for maintenance therapy.

An Australian study compared thalidomide plus prednisone versus prednisone alone as maintenance therapies post autologous SCT. The results confirm that thalidomide added to maintenance is superior to prednisone alone. A recent analysis of the Canadian NCIC randomized study comparing thalidomide and prednisone with observation after ASCT, showed that thalidomide and prednisone improves the duration of disease control, but is associated with lower patient-reported quality of life, and no OS benefit.

Based on the above evidence, the NCCN Multiple Myeloma Panel has listed single-agent thalidomide as a category 1 option under Preferred Maintenance Regimens. Thalidomide in combination with prednisone is included under Other Maintenance Regimens and is a category 2A. There are concerns about the cumulative toxicity with thalidomide. For example, peripheral neuropathy observed with thalidomide is related to the duration of treatment and is cumulative. The benefits and risks of maintenance therapy with thalidomide should be discussed with patients.

**Lenalidomide as Maintenance Therapy After Autologous SCT**

Lenalidomide as maintenance therapy after autologous transplantation has been evaluated in two independent randomized phase III studies. In The CALGB 100104 trial, patients were randomized to maintenance therapy with lenalidomide ($n = 231$) versus placebo ($n = 229$) after autologous SCT. At a median follow-up of 34 months, 37% of the patients who received lenalidomide versus 58% who received placebo had disease progression or died. The median time to
progression in the lenalidomide group was 46 months versus 27 months in the placebo group (\( P < .001 \)). Second primary cancers occurred in 18 patients who received lenalidomide (8%) and 6 patients who received placebo (3%).

Data from the international, randomized, double-blind phase III IFM 2005-02 trial (\( n = 614 \)) show that patients treated with lenalidomide as consolidation therapy after an autologous SCT followed by lenalidomide as maintenance therapy had upgraded responses. Of the 614 patients enrolled in the trial, 307 were randomly assigned to lenalidomide maintenance therapy and 307 to placebo. Maintenance treatment was continued until the patient withdrew consent, the disease progressed, or unacceptable toxic effects occurred. The final analysis of the IFM 2005-02 trial was performed after a median follow-up of 30 months and 264 patients had disease progression (104 in the lenalidomide group and 160 in the placebo group). The median PFS was 41 months in the lenalidomide group, compared with 23 months in the placebo group (HR, 0.50; \( P < .001 \); median follow-up period was 30 months). The probability of surviving without progression for 3 years after randomization was 59% in those treated with lenalidomide and 35% in those who received the placebo. The benefit of lenalidomide maintenance therapy, evidenced by rate of PFS at 3 years after randomization, was higher in all patients who received lenalidomide maintenance therapy, compared with those who received placebo; this benefit was observed in patients who had a VGPR at randomization (64% vs. 49%, \( P = .006 \)) and those who did not (51% vs. 18%, \( P < .001 \)). An increased incidence of second primary cancers was observed in the lenalidomide group (32 had second primary cancers in the lenalidomide group and 12 in the placebo group).

Lenalidomide as Maintenance Therapy After Non-transplant Active Primary Treatment

Data from the phase III MM-015 study shows that lenalidomide maintenance after MPL primary therapy significantly reduced the risk of disease progression and also increased PFS. In this study, newly diagnosed patients with MM (\( n = 459 \)) aged \( \geq 65 \) years were randomized to receive MP followed by placebo, or MPL, or MPL followed by lenalidomide until progression. Maintenance with lenalidomide significantly prolonged PFS. The PFS of patients treated with MPL followed by maintenance lenalidomide was significantly prolonged (\( n = 152 \); median, 31 months) compared with the other two arms: MPL (\( n = 153 \); median, 14 months; HR, 0.49; \( P < .001 \)) or MP (\( n = 154 \); median, 13 months; HR, 0.40; \( P < .001 \)). Lenalidomide maintenance therapy improved PFS by 66% compared with placebo, regardless of age.

A recent report from the HOVON 76 trial indicates that lenalidomide maintenance may not be a feasible option after mini-allogeneic SCT.

Based on the evidence from the phase III trials, the NCCN Multiple Myeloma Panel lists single-agent lenalidomide as one of the preferred maintenance regimens (category 1). Lenalidomide lacks the neurologic toxicity seen with thalidomide. However, there seems to be an increased risk for secondary cancers, especially with prolonged use of lenalidomide as maintenance therapy. The NCCN Panel notes that the benefits and risks of maintenance therapy with lenalidomide versus secondary cancers should be discussed with patients.

Bortezomib as Maintenance Therapy after Autologous SCT

The results from the HOVON study show that maintenance with single agent bortezomib after autologous SCT is well tolerated and is associated with improvement of ORR. Patients in the HOVON trail...
were randomly assigned to one of the two arms consisting of either primary treatment with vincristine/ doxorubicin/dexamethasone followed autologous SCT and maintenance with thalidomide or with bortezomib/doxorubicin/dexamethasone followed autologous SCT and bortezomib as maintenance therapy. Maintenance therapy in both arms was given for 2 years. The study reported high near CR/CR rates after primary treatment with the bortezomib-based regimen. Bortezomib as maintenance therapy was well tolerated and associated with additional improvement of response rates.66 (see section Preferred Primary Therapy Regimens for Transplant Candidates)

Bortezomib as Maintenance Therapy After Nontransplant Active Primary Treatment

The preliminary results of the phase III UPFRONT study also show that maintenance with single-agent bortezomib is well-tolerated when administered after treatment with bortezomib-based primary therapy.170 Newly diagnosed MM patients ineligible for high-dose therapy and SCT enrolled in the UPFRONT trial were randomized (1:1:1) and treated with one of the following bortezomib-based primary regimens: bortezomib and dexamethasone; bortezomib in combination with thalidomide and dexamethasone; or bortezomib with melphalan and prednisone followed by maintenance treatment with bortezomib. The updated results show that the response rates, including CR and ≥VGPR, improved after bortezomib maintenance in all arms, with no concomitant increase in the incidence of peripheral neuropathy.170

The NCCN Multiple Myeloma Panel Members have added bortezomib to the listed of preferred maintenance regimens with a category 2A designation.

Other Maintenance Therapy Regimens

Several other maintenance therapies, such as steroids (dexamethasone) and interferon, have been investigated in patients whose disease responds to high-dose therapy followed by autologous or allogeneic SCT.171 At the present time, the role of interferon172 or steroid maintenance therapy173 in general is uncertain; therefore, these are category 2B recommendations as maintenance therapy in the NCCN Guidelines for Multiple Myeloma.

Patients enrolled in the PETHEMA trial were randomized to either maintenance with thalidomide plus bortezomib, or thalidomide, or alfa-2b-interferon, after treatment with induction therapy and autologous SCT.174 Maintenance with bortezomib plus thalidomide increased the post-transplant CR rate by 21% compared with maintenance with either thalidomide or alfa-2b interferon, each of which increased the CR rate by 15%. After a median follow-up of 34.9 months, PFS from start of maintenance was significantly longer with bortezomib plus thalidomide versus thalidomide or alfa-2b interferon (P = .0009); there was no significant difference in OS (P = .47) between the three arms. Rates of grade 3 and 4 thrombocytopenia were 10% with bortezomib plus thalidomide versus thalidomide versus 2% with thalidomide (P=.01). Rates of grade 3 peripheral neuropathy were 15%, 14%, and 0% in the bortezomib plus thalidomide arm, thalidomide arm and alfa-2b-interferon arm respectively.174

Transplant-ineligible patients from the Spanish GEM2005MAS65 phase III trial were randomized to maintenance with bortezomib plus thalidomide or bortezomib plus prednison after bortezomib-based primary therapy.175 After a median of 38 months from the start of maintenance the results reported an overall CR rate increased from 24% after primary therapy to 42% (the difference in CR between the
two maintenance regimens was not significant for bortezomib plus thalidomide: 46%, bortezomib plus prednisone: 39%).

After a median follow-up of 46 months from initiation of primary therapy, median PFS among all patients receiving maintenance was 35 months (39 months in patients receiving bortezomib plus thalidomide and 32 months in patients receiving bortezomib plus prednisone; \( P = .1 \)). The 5-year median OS rate was 59% (69% in those receiving bortezomib plus thalidomide, and 50% in those receiving bortezomib plus prednisone; \( P = .1 \)). Rates of non-hematologic grade 3 and 4 adverse events with bortezomib and thalidomide versus bortezomib and prednisone were 17% versus 5% (\( P = .009 \)), including 9% versus 3% grade 3 and 4 peripheral neuropathy.

Based on the above data, the NCCN Multiple Myeloma Panel Members have added bortezomib plus thalidomide and bortezomib plus prednisone as options for maintenance therapy (category 2B).

### Treatment of Progressive or Relapsed Myeloma

#### Salvage Therapy

Salvage therapy is considered in the following clinical situations: for patients with relapsed disease after allogeneic or autologous SCT; for patients with primary progressive disease after initial autologous or allogeneic SCT; and for patients ineligible for SCT with progressive or relapsing disease after initial primary therapy.

A variety of therapies are available as options for salvage therapy. If the relapse occurs at greater than 6 months after completion of the initial primary therapy, patients may be retreated with the same primary regimen.

**Preferred Salvage Therapy Regimens**

The phase III APEX trial compared bortezomib versus high-dose dexamethasone as salvage therapy. Among the 669 participants, patients randomized to bortezomib had a combined CR and PR rate of 38% compared to 18% for those receiving dexamethasone, improved median time to progression (6.22 vs 3.49 months) and one-year survival (80% vs. 66%). In an updated efficacy analysis, the response rate was 43% with bortezomib versus 18% for dexamethasone (\( P < .0001 \)). A CR or near CR was observed in 16% versus 0% of relapsed patients, respectively. Median OS was 29.8 months with bortezomib and 23.7 months with dexamethasone, despite nearly two thirds of patients’ crossing over to bortezomib. Survival rates after one year were 80% and 67%, respectively (\( P = .00002 \)). Patients with poor prognostic factors also benefited from bortezomib. Patients with del(13q) had worse survival when treated with dexamethasone than those without the deletion. However, for bortezomib-treated patients, the outcome was the same for those with or without the deletion.

Based on the above phase III trial data, the NCCN Multiple Myeloma Panel Members have included bortezomib monotherapy as a category 1 salvage therapy option for patients with relapsed/refractory myeloma.

A randomized trial, MMY-3021 of 222 patients compared single-agent bortezomib administered by the conventional intravenous (IV) route versus by subcutaneous route. The findings from the phase III MMY-3021 study demonstrate non-inferior efficacy with subcutaneous versus intravenous bortezomib with regards to the primary endpoint (ORR after 4 cycles of single-agent bortezomib). Consistent results were shown with regards to secondary endpoints. The results showed no significant differences in terms of time to progression or in one-year OS between groups. However, patients receiving bortezomib subcutaneously had a significant reduction in peripheral neuropathy.
The NCCN Panel has noted in a footnote that subcutaneous bortezomib may be considered for patients with pre-existing or high-risk peripheral neuropathy.

Bortezomib with PLD was approved by the FDA as a treatment option for MM patients who have not previously received bortezomib and have received at least 1 prior therapy. The approval was based on a priority review of data from an international phase III trial (n = 646) showing that use of the combination significantly extended the median time to disease progression compared with bortezomib alone (9.3 vs. 6.5 months). Median duration of response was increased from 7.0 months to 10.2 months with the combination therapy. Based on these results, the NCCN Multiple Myeloma Panel considers bortezomib with PLD regimen as a category 1 salvage therapy option for patients with relapsed/refractory myeloma.

Addition of dexamethasone to bortezomib in patients with relapsed/refractory myeloma who had progressive disease during bortezomib monotherapy resulted in improvement of response in 18% to 34% of patients. The NCCN Multiple Myeloma Panel Members have included the bortezomib and dexamethasone regimen as a category 2A salvage therapy option for patients with relapsed/refractory myeloma.

Lenalidomide combined with dexamethasone received approval from the FDA as a treatment option for patients with MM who had received at least one prior treatment. This was based on the results of two studies of a total of 692 patients randomized to receive dexamethasone either with or without lenalidomide. The primary efficacy endpoint in both studies was time to progression. A pre-planned interim analysis of both studies reported that the median time to progression was significantly longer in the lenalidomide arm compared to the control group. The updated clinical data from the pivotal North American phase III trial (MM-009) in 353 previously treated MM patients reported increased OS and median time to disease progression in patients receiving lenalidomide plus dexamethasone compared to patients receiving dexamethasone plus placebo. Similar results were seen in the international trial MM-010. Patients in both of these trials had been heavily treated before enrollment, many having failed three or more rounds of therapy with other agents and more than 50% of patients having undergone SCT. Most adverse events and Grade 3/4 adverse events were more frequent in MM patients who received the combination of lenalidomide/dexamethasone compared to placebo and dexamethasone. Thrombocytopenia (61.5%) and neutropenia (58.8%) were the most frequently reported adverse events observed. The NCCN Multiple Myeloma Panel now considers this regimen as a category 1 option as salvage therapy for patients with relapsed/refractory myeloma. Lenalidomide monotherapy has also been investigated and found effective in patients with relapsed/refractory myeloma. The NCCN Multiple Myeloma Panel suggests considering lenalidomide monotherapy for steroid-intolerant individuals.

Data from preclinical studies showed lenalidomide sensitizes myeloma cells to bortezomib and dexamethasone. The results of phase I and phase II studies show that bortezomib, lenalidomide, and dexamethasone is well-tolerated and active, with durable responses in patients with heavily pretreated relapsed and/or refractory myeloma, including patients who have had prior lenalidomide, bortezomib, thalidomide, and SCT. The updated data after over 2 years of follow-up report a median PFS of 9.5 months and median OS of 26 months, with 12- and 24-month OS rates of 86% and 55% respectively. The NCCN Multiple Myeloma Panel Members have
included bortezomib, lenalidomide, and dexamethasone as a category 2A option for relapsed/refractory myeloma.

The effects of adding of an alkylating agent (such as cyclophosphamide) and a novel agent (such as lenalidomide or bortezomib) to dexamethasone have been investigated for patients with relapsed/refractory myeloma. A retrospective analysis to assess the efficacy of lenalidomide in combination with cyclophosphamide and dexamethasone showed that this regimen is effective in heavily pre-treated patients with manageable adverse effects. The combination of bortezomib, dexamethasone and cyclophosphamide was found to be effective in relapsed/refractory myeloma patients with an acceptable toxicity profile. The NCCN Multiple Myeloma Panel Members have included cyclophosphamide, dexamethasone in combination with either lenalidomide or bortezomib to the list of options for relapsed/refractory myeloma.

The addition of dexamethasone to thalidomide to treat relapsed/refractory myeloma patients has been reported to have higher response rates of approximately 50%, when compared to thalidomide alone. Furthermore, combination therapy of dexamethasone and thalidomide along with infusional chemotherapy such as cisplatin, doxorubicin cyclophosphamide and etoposide (DT-PACE regimen) was also found to be effective, especially in patients with progressive disease. Both the above regimens have been included in NCCN Guidelines for Multiple Myeloma as category 2A options for relapsed/refractory myeloma. Thalidomide monotherapy has also been shown to be effective in refractory/relapsed myeloma, with 20% to 48% of the patients obtaining at least a PR. Thalidomide-based combination regimens are more effective than thalidomide monotherapy; however, for steroid-intolerant individuals, the NCCN Multiple Myeloma Panel suggests considering thalidomide monotherapy.

An international randomized, controlled, open-label study randomized 269 patients, with progressive or relapsed MM after at least one autologous SCT, to receive bortezomib with thalidomide and dexamethasone or thalidomide and dexamethasone. Patients receiving the triple drug combination of bortezomib with thalidomide and dexamethasone had significantly better outcomes. Median time to progression was significantly longer (19.5 vs. 13.8) and PFS was also significantly longer (18.3 months vs. 13.6 months) compared with thalidomide and dexamethasone. The CR + near CR rate was higher in patients receiving bortezomib, thalidomide and dexamethasone compared to thalidomide and dexamethasone (45% vs. 25%; P = .001). No significant difference was seen in OS between the two arms over a median follow-up of 30 months. The most clinically significant adverse event was grade 3 peripheral sensory neuropathy in 29% of patients on bortezomib, thalidomide, and dexamethasone versus 12% on thalidomide and dexamethasone. The bortezomib, thalidomide, and dexamethasone regimen is included as an option for relapsed/refractory myeloma (category 2A).

Results of an open-label, single-arm, phase II study in which 266 patients received single-agent carfilzomib intravenously two times a week for 3 of 4 weeks showed that 95% of the evaluable patients were refractory to their last therapy; 80% were refractory to both bortezomib and lenalidomide. Patients had a median of 5 prior lines of therapy, including bortezomib, lenalidomide, and thalidomide. The primary endpoint of this trial was ORR and secondary endpoints included duration of response, clinical benefit response rate (≥minimal response), PFS, OS, and safety. The ORR seen in the trial was 23.7%, median duration of response was 7.8 months, and median OS was 15.6 months.
No cumulative toxicities were reported. Common adverse events reported in this trial were fatigue (49%), anemia (46%), nausea (45%), and thrombocytopenia (39%). Treatment-related peripheral neuropathy occurred in overall 12.4% of patients. This is substantially lower than incidence of peripheral neuropathy seen in the study evaluating subcutaneous bortezomib. The rate of cardiac events observed in this study were within the expected range for this population and also it was not greater than previously reported with bortezomib.

The safety and efficacy data of carfilzomib seen in this trial is comparable to those reported by other phase II trials. The results of the ongoing phase III studies should provide insight into optimal use of carfilzomib in all patients with MM. The international, randomized, multicenter phase III trial known as ASPIRE has completed enrollment and is comparing lenalidomide plus low-dose dexamethasone with or without carfilzomib in patients who have received 1 to 3 prior therapies for relapsed MM.

Other phase III trials that are currently recruiting patients include an international phase III trial, known as the ENDEAVOR trial which will evaluate the combination of carfilzomib and low-dose dexamethasone versus the combination of bortezomib and low-dose dexamethasone. A phase 3 clinical trial, known as the FOCUS trial, will evaluate single-agent carfilzomib versus best supportive care in patients with relapsed refractory MM who have received three or more prior therapies.

The available data indicate that carfilzomib produces durable responses with an acceptable tolerability profile in heavily-pretreated myeloma patients. Based on this, the NCCN Panel has included single agent carfilzomib as a salvage therapy option in patients who have received at least two prior therapies, including bortezomib and an immunomodulatory agent, and have demonstrated disease progression on or within 60 days of completion of the last therapy (category 2A).

Pomalidomide, like lenalidomide is an analogue of thalidomide. It possesses potent immunomodulatory and significant anti-myeloma properties. The results of a phase I study of pomalidomide (4 mg orally on days 1 to 21 of each 28-day cycle) with or without dexamethasone (40 mg/week), showed encouraging activity with manageable toxicity in patients with relapsed refractory MM, including those refractory to both lenalidomide and bortezomib. A subsequent phase II randomized, open-label study evaluated the combination of pomalidomide and low-dose dexamethasone versus single agent pomalidomide in patients with relapsed, refractory MM who had received a trial of lenalidomide and bortezomib. Of the 221 patients who were evaluated for response, 29.2% (95% CI 21.0, 38.5) achieved a partial response or better with pomalidomide plus low-dose dexamethasone arm compared to 7.4% (95% CI 3.3, 14.1) with those who received pomalidomide alone. The most common grade 3 or 4 adverse events reported in ≥15% of patients treated with pomalidomide and low-dose dexamethasone versus the pomalidomide alone were neutropenia (38% vs. 47%), anemia (21% vs.22%), thrombocytopenia (19% vs. 22%), and pneumonia (23% vs.16%). Updated results of the MM-002 trial were presented at the 2012 annual ASH meeting. With a median follow-up of 14.2 months, the median PFS, was 4.6 months in patients treated with pomalidomide and low-dose dexamethasone versus the pomalidomide alone were 2.6 months. With a median OS, was 16.5 months compared with median duration of response of 8.8 months and OS of 13.6 months with pomalidomide alone.
A phase III, multicenter, randomized, open-label study conducted in Europe compared the efficacy and safety of pomalidomide and low-dose dexamethasone (n=302) versus high-dose dexamethasone (n=153) in patients with relapsed myeloma who were refractory to both lenalidomide and bortezomib. In an interim analysis, PFS was significantly longer in patients who received pomalidomide and low-dose dexamethasone compared with those who received high-dose dexamethasone (3.6 vs. 1.8 months; HR, 0.45; P < .001). In addition, pomalidomide and low-dose dexamethasone demonstrated a statistically significant improvement in OS compared with high-dose dexamethasone (median OS not reached vs. 7.8 months; HR, 0.53; P<.001). The most common hematologic grade 3 and 4 adverse effects reported in the study, for patients receiving pomalidomide and low-dose dexamethasone, were neutropenia (42%), anemia (27%), and thrombocytopenia (21%). Grade 3 and 4 non-hematologic adverse events included infections (24%, including pneumonia 9%) and fatigue (5%). Other phase III studies of pomalidomide plus low-dose dexamethasone in combination with other agents (eg bortezomib) are currently ongoing (Clinical Trial ID: NCT01734928).

In addition, several complementary phase II studies have been published evaluating the use of pomalidomide and dexamethasone in MM patients relapsed/refractory to lenalidomide and/or bortezomib. A phase II study investigated two different dose regimens of pomalidomide and dexamethasone in 84 patients with advanced MM. Pomalidomide (4 mg) was given orally on days 1 to 21 or continuously over a 28-day cycle, and dexamethasone (40 mg) was given orally once weekly. ORR was 35% and 34% for patients in the 21-day and 28 day groups, respectively. With median follow-up of 23 months, median duration of response, PFS, and OS were 7.3, 4.6, and 14.9 months across both groups, respectively. All patients experienced similar adverse events in both groups. The adverse events were primarily due to myelosuppression. Another phase II trial evaluated two doses of pomalidomide 2 or 4 mg/day with dexamethasone 40 mg weekly in heavily pre-treated patients (n = 35). The ORR in the 2-mg cohort was 49% versus 43% in the 4 mg cohort. OS at 6 months was 78% and 67% in the 2- and 4 mg cohort, respectively. Myelosuppression was the most common toxicity.

The FDA has approved pomalidomide for patients with M who have received at least two prior therapies including lenalidomide and bortezomib and have demonstrated disease progression on or within 60 days of completion of the last therapy. The FDA recommended dose and schedule of pomalidomide is 4 mg orally on days 1 to 21 of repeated 28-day cycles with cycles repeated until disease progression along with the recommendation to monitor patients for hematologic toxicities, especially neutropenia.

Based on the above data, the NCCN Panel has included pomalidomide plus dexamethasone as a salvage therapy option in patients who have received at least two prior therapies, including lenalidomide and bortezomib, and have demonstrated disease progression on or within 60 days of completion of the last therapy (category 2A). For steroid-intolerant individuals, the NCCN Multiple Myeloma Panel suggests considering pomalidomide monotherapy.

In addition, the NCCN Guidelines include the regimens containing high-dose (non-marrow ablative) cyclophosphamide, DCEP, and VTD-PACE (bortezomib, thalidomide, dexamethasone, cisplatin, doxorubicin, cyclophosphamide, and etoposide) as preferred salvage therapy options.
Other Salvage Therapy Regimens

In a trial by Knop and colleagues, 31 patients who had experienced relapse after high-dose chemotherapy and autologous transplantation were enrolled to receive increasing doses of bendamustine. The ORR was 55%, with a median PFS of 26 weeks for all patients and 36 weeks for patients who received higher doses of bendamustine (90 - 100 mg/m²). Toxicity was mild and mainly hematologic. A retrospective analysis of 39 patients has reported that bendamustine is effective and tolerable in patients with advanced progressive myeloma, with an ORR of 36%. Bendamustine is currently a NCCN category 2A treatment option for relapsed/refractory myeloma.

A multicenter phase I/II trial investigated the combination of bendamustine, lenalidomide, and dexamethasone as treatment for patients (n = 29) with relapsed refractory MM. PR rate was seen in 52% (n = 13) of patients, with VGPR in 24% (n = 6). The median PFS in the trial was 6.1 months (95% CI, 3.7-9.4 months), and the one-year PFS rate was 20% (95% CI, 6%-41%). The NCCN Panel has included lenalidomide in combination with bendamustine and dexamethasone as a treatment option for relapsed/refractory myeloma (category 2A).

Vorinostat is an oral inhibitor of histone deacetylase class I and class II proteins. It regulates genes and proteins involved in tumor growth and survival. The synergistic effects of vorinostat and bortezomib have been shown in preclinical studies and were confirmed in independent phase 1 trials in patients with relapsed/refractory multiple myeloma (MM), showing ORR of up to 42%. An international, multi-centered, open-label, single-arm phase IIb trial called Vantage 095 studied the combination of vorinostat and bortezomib in bortezomib-refractory patients and patients considered refractory, intolerant, or ineligible for immunomodulatory drug-based regimens. The combination of vorinostat and bortezomib was found to be active and well-tolerated. The ORR in the Vantage 095 study was 17%. The median OS observed was 11.2 months with a 2-year OS rate of 32%. Another international multicenter, randomized, double-blind phase II trial studied vorinostat and bortezomib compared with bortezomib and placebo in patients with relapsed/refractory MM. The ORR seen in patients treated with vorinostat and bortezomib was 56% versus 41% in those treated with bortezomib and placebo. The median PFS was 7.63 versus 6.83 months for vorinostat in combination with bortezomib versus bortezomib plus placebo treated patients, respectively. Based on these data, the NCCN Panel has included vorinostat in combination with bortezomib as a treatment option for relapsed/refractory myeloma (category 2A).

Adjunctive Treatment for Multiple Myeloma

Important advances have been made in adjunctive treatment/supportive care of patients with MM. This involves careful patient education about the probable side effects of each drug and the drug combinations being used, and the supportive care measures required. Supportive care can be categorized into those measures required for all patients and those that address specific drugs.

Bony manifestations of myeloma, in the form of diffuse osteopenia and/or osteolytic lesions, develop in 85% of patients. Related complications are the major cause of limitations in quality of life and performance status in patients with MM. A large, double-blind, randomized trial has shown that monthly use of intravenous pamidronate (a bisphosphonate) can decrease pain and bone-related complications, improve performance status, and, importantly, preserve quality of life in patients with Durie-Salmon stage III myeloma and at least one lytic lesion. Zoledronic acid has equivalent benefits.
Results from the study conducted by Zervas et al\textsuperscript{228} show a 9.5-fold greater risk for the development of osteonecrosis of the jaw with zoledronic acid compared to pamidronate. Patients who are on bisphosphonates should have their renal function monitored. They should be monitored for osteonecrosis of the jaw.

The MRC Myeloma IX study examined effects of zoledronic acid versus clodronate (a bisphosphonate not currently FDA approved) in MM patients initiating chemotherapy regardless of bone disease. The patients were randomized to receive zoledronic acid (n = 981) or clodronic acid (n = 979). Zoledronic acid was reported to reduce mortality and significantly improve PFS.\textsuperscript{229} Patients on clodronate and zoledronic acid had similar occurrence of acute renal failure and treatment-related serious adverse events. Zoledronic acid was associated with higher rates of confirmed osteonecrosis of the jaw than was clodronic acid.\textsuperscript{229-231}

A recent metaanalysis of 20 randomized controlled trials of comparing bisphosphonates with either placebo or a different bisphosphonate as a comparator concluded that adding bisphosphonates to the treatment of MM reduces vertebral fractures and probably pain. Whether zoledronate is superior to pamidronate and other bisphosphonates remains to be determined.\textsuperscript{232}

The NCCN Guidelines for Multiple Myeloma recommend bisphosphonates for all patients receiving myeloma therapy for symptomatic disease regardless of documented bone disease (category 1). In patients with smoldering or stage I MM, according to the NCCN Panel, bisphosphonates may be considered but preferably in a clinical trial. Skeletal survey annually or as clinically indicated is recommended for these patients. Bone densitometry or other metabolic studies should be reserved for clinical trials.

Low-dose radiation therapy (10-30 Gy) is used for the palliative treatment of uncontrolled pain, impending pathologic fracture, or impending spinal cord compression.\textsuperscript{43} Limited involved fields should be used to limit the effect of irradiation on stem cell harvest or its effect on potential future treatments; the radiation doses administered should not preclude stem cell collection in potential candidates for high-dose therapy and hematopoietic SCT. Orthopedic consultation should be obtained for impending or actual fractures in weight-bearing bones, bony compression of the spinal cord, or vertebral column instability. Either vertebroplasty or kyphoplasty should be considered for symptomatic vertebral compression fractures.

Excess bone resorption from myeloma bone disease can lead to excessive release of calcium into the blood, contributing to hypercalcemia. Symptoms include polyuria and gastrointestinal disturbances, with progressive dehydration and decreases in glomerular filtration rate. Hypercalcemia should be treated with hydration and furosemide, bisphosphonates, steroids, and/or calcitonin. Among the bisphosphonates (zoledronic acid, pamidronate, and ibandronate), the NCCN Multiple Myeloma Panel Members prefer zoledronic acid for treatment of hypercalcemia.\textsuperscript{233-235}

Plasmapheresis should be used as adjunctive therapy for symptomatic hyperviscosity.\textsuperscript{236} Institutions differ in their use of plasmapheresis for adjunctive treatment of renal dysfunction.

Erythropoietin therapy should be considered for anemic patients, especially those with renal failure. Measuring endogenous erythropoietin levels may also be helpful in treatment planning.\textsuperscript{237,238} (see NCCN Guidelines for Cancer and Treatment Related Anemia).
To prevent infection: 1) intravenous immunoglobulin therapy should be considered for recurrent, life-threatening infections; 2) pneumococcal and influenza vaccine should also be considered; and 3) *Pneumocystis carinii* pneumonia (PCP), herpes, and antifungal prophylaxis is recommended, if a high-dose regimen is used. Bortezomib treatment has been associated with an incidence of herpes zoster.\(^{59,60}\) Herpes prophylaxis is recommended in patients receiving bortezomib therapy.\(^{58}\) (see NCCN Guidelines for Prevention and Treatment of Cancer Related Infections).

Thrombosis is relatively common when thalidomide or lenalidomide is used with steroids, and is particularly frequent when treating newly diagnosed patients. Use of prophylactic anticoagulation agents (see NCCN Guidelines for Venous Thromboembolic Disease) is recommended when immunomodulatory drugs are used in combination therapy during induction.\(^{80,239,240}\)

Hydration should be maintained and nonsteroidal anti-inflammatory drugs (NSAIDs) should be avoided to decrease the chances of renal dysfunction. According to the NCCN Multiple Myeloma Panel Members, the use of plasmapheresis to improve renal function is a category 2B. The use of intravenous contrast media and NSAIDs should also be avoided in patients with renal impairment.
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