

# Research Article: Cyclophosphamide–Etoposide + G-CSF Compared to G-CSF alone in Peripheral Blood Stem Cell Mobilization for Multiple Myeloma

Aysun Halacoglu \*

Bahcelievler Medicana Hospital, Hematology Department Istanbul/Turkey.

\*Correspondence Author: Aysun Halacoglu, Bahcelievler Medicana Hospital, Hematology Department Istanbul/Turkey.

Received Date: September 15, 2022 | Accepted Date: September 26, 2022 | Published Date: October 03, 2022

**Citation:** Aysun Halacoglu, (2022), Research Article: Cyclophosphamide–Etoposide + G-CSF Compared to G-CSF alone in Peripheral Blood Stem Cell Mobilization for Multiple Myeloma, *Oral Health and Dentistry Case Reports*, 1(1); DOI:10.31579/2835-9259/002

**Copyright:** © 2022 Aysun Halacoglu, This is an open-access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution License, which permits unrestricted use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original author and source are credited.

## Abstract

**Background:** Multiple myeloma (MM) is the leading indication of autologous hematopoietic stem cell transplantation (AHSCT). There are different regimens used for peripheral blood stem cell mobilization in MM. A minimum of  $2 \times 10^6$  CD34 + cells/kg are needed for engraftment. This study that present a comparison of the mobilization outcomes Cyclophosphamide-Etoposide (Cy-Et) + granulocyte-colony stimulating factor (G-CSF) group and G-CSF alone group.

**Patients and methods:** This study has been performed in a retrospective manner. 110 patients with diagnosed MM who underwent stem cell mobilization at Memorial Sisli Hospital between the years of 2013 and 2018 were evaluated. We retrieved data on patient demographics, disease status at mobilization, treatment characteristics, stem cell mobilization, collection and post AHSCT outcomes. For mobilization, 70 patients received cyclophosphamide 1250 mg/m<sup>2</sup> for 2 day, etoposide 100 mg/m<sup>2</sup> for 3 day and G-CSF 10 mcg/kg/day from day 4 onwards and 40 patients received G-CSF alone.

**Results:** In 98 of 110 patients (89.1%) first mobilization trial was successful. Four patients in the Cy-Et group (5,7%) and eight patients in the G-CSF alone group (20%) were mobilized three times ( $p=0.001$ ). The number of CD34 in peripheral blood was significantly higher in Cy-Et group ( $94 \pm 14$ ) than G-CSF alone group ( $54 \pm 7$ ) ( $p=0.04$ ) on the stem cell mobilization time. Stem cell collection was higher in the Cy-Et group ( $13.8 \times 10^6$  CD34 + cells/kg) compared to the G-CSF alone group ( $8.8 \times 10^6$  CD34 + cells/kg) ( $p=0.001$ ). The median time to neutrophil engraftment was 11 and 13 days in Cy-Et group and G-CSF alone group respectively ( $p=0.014$ ). The median time to platelet engraftment was 15 and 17 days in Cy-Et group and G-CSF alone group respectively ( $p=0.006$ ). Median 360 ml stem cells in Cy-Et group and 470 ml stem cells in G-CSF alone group were collected and this difference was statistically significant ( $P=0.001$ ).

**Conclusion:** In conclusion, this study was demonstrated that Cy-Et + G-CSF mobilization provides a higher peripheral CD 34 count, less apheresis sessions, less volume, more stem cell mobilization, earlier neutrophils and platelet engraftment for patients with MM and eligible for AHSCT. Today, Cy-Et + G-CSF mobilization is a really useful method than G-CSF alone.

**Keywords:** stem cell; mobilization; multiple myeloma; AHSCT; G-CSF

## Introduction

Multiple myeloma (MM) is a malignant disease that occurs with an uncontrolled, clonal increase of plasma cells in the bone marrow (1). MM is the leading indication of autologous hematopoietic stem cell transplantation (AHSCT) worldwide (2). High-dose melphalan followed by AHSCT is the standard treatment for MM in eligible patients after induction therapy (3). There are different regimens used for peripheral blood stem cell mobilization in MM, however, there is no consensus as to the optimal mobilization regimen for the MM. A minimum of  $2 \times 10^6$  CD34 + cells/kg are needed for engraftment (4).

This study that present a comparison of the mobilization outcomes Cyclophosphamide-Etoposide (Cy-Et) + granulocyte-colony stimulating factor (G-CSF) group and G-CSF alone group.

## Materials and Methods

### Patients and methods

This study has been performed in a retrospective manner. 110 patients with diagnosed MM who underwent stem cell mobilization at Memorial Sisli Hospital between the years of 2013 and 2018 were evaluated. All patients gave informed consent for all aspects of AHSCT. We retrieved data on patient demographics, disease status at mobilization, treatment

characteristics, stem cell mobilization, collection and post AHSCT outcomes (Tables 1-2). For mobilization, 70 patients received cyclophosphamide 1250 mg/m<sup>2</sup> for 2 day, etoposide 100 mg/m<sup>2</sup> for 3 day and G-CSF 10 mcg/kg/day from day 4 onwards and 40 patients received G-CSF alone.

Prophylactic antibiotic was given from day +5 till absolute neutrophil count was more than 500 x 10<sup>6</sup> /L. Stem cell collection began when CD34+ was over 10 cells/μL. All ethical considerations were strictly followed in accordance with the Helsinki Declaration.

Variable	Cy-Et Group (N=70)	GCSF Alone Group (N=40)	P value
Median age (range)	62 (31-69)	63 (56-71)	0.74
Sex, n (%)			0.12
Female	34 (48.5%)	18 (45%)	
Male	36 (51.5%)	22 (55%)	
Myeloma Type, n (%)			0.94
Ig G/kappa	28 (40%)	18 (45%)	
Ig G/lambda	14 (20%)	8 (20%)	
Ig A/kappa	10 (14.3%)	5 (12.5%)	
Ig A/lambda	7 (10%)	3 (7.5%)	
Ig M/kappa	4 (5.7%)	2 (5%)	
Ig M/lambda	2 (2.9%)	-	
Kappa	3 (4.2%)	2 (5%)	
Lambda	2 (2.9%)	2 (5%)	
Induction Treatment, n (%)			0.30
Bortezomib	60 (85.7%)	35 (87.5%)	
Lenalidomide	8 (11.4%)	4 (10%)	
Carfilzomib	2 (2.9%)	1 (2.5%)	
Stage (R-ISS), n (%)			0.47
I	32 (45.7%)	22 (55%)	
II	21 (30%)	13 (32.5%)	
III	17 (24.3%)	5 (12.5%)	
Premobilization Status, n (%)			0.21
Complete Response	16 (22.9%)	10 (25%)	
Very Good Partial Response	39 (55.7%)	18 (45%)	
Partial Response	10 (14.3%)	9 (22.5%)	
Minor Response / Stable Disease	5 (7.1%)	3 (7.5%)	

Table 1: Patients Characteristics

Variable	Cy-Et Group (N=70)	GCSF Alone Group (N=40)	P value
Total CD34+ stem cell collected, x10 <sup>6</sup> cells/kg, median	13.8	8.8	0.001
Peak peripheral blood CD34 counts, range	94±14	54±7	0.04
CD34+ stem cell volume (ml), median	360	470	0.001

Table 2: Stem cell mobilization outcomes

## Definitions

Poor mobilization are a collection of < 2 × 10<sup>6</sup> CD34+ cells/kg body weight. Neutrophil engraftment was defined neutrophil count of ≥ 0.5 × 10<sup>9</sup> /L on 3 consecutive days. Platelet engraftment was defined platelet count of ≥ 20 × 10<sup>9</sup> /L on 7 consecutive days without platelet transfusion.

## Statistical Analyses

SPSS statistics 20 (SPSS Inc., Chicago, IL, USA) was used for statistical analyses. Comparisons of categorical variables in groups were tested by Chi-square or two-tailed Fisher's exact tests. All P values < 0.05 were considered significant.

## Results

One hundred and ten patients were included in this study. The median age was 55 (31–71) years at the time of the diagnosis. No significant difference was observed in baseline characteristics between groups, including the disease control and previous therapies.

In 98 of 110 patients (89.1%) first mobilization trial was successful. Four patients in the Cy-Et group (5.7%) and eight patients in the G-CSF alone group (20%) were mobilized three times (p=0.001).

The number of CD34 in peripheral blood was significantly higher in Cy-Et group (94±14) than G-CSF alone group (54±7) (p=0.04) on the stem cell

mobilization time.

Stem cell collection was higher in the Cy-Et group ( $13.8 \times 10^6$  CD34 + cells/kg) compared to the G-CSF alone group ( $8.8 \times 10^6$  CD34 + cells/kg) ( $p=0.001$ ).

The median time to neutrophil engraftment was 11 and 13 days in Cy-Et group and G-CSF alone group respectively ( $p=0.014$ ). The median time to a platelet count  $> 20,000 \times 10^9/L$  for more than 7 days without transfusion was 15 and 17 days in Cy-Et group and G-CSF alone group respectively ( $p=0.006$ ).

Median 360 ml stem cells in Cy-Et group and 470 ml stem cells in G-CSF alone group were collected and this difference was statistically significant ( $P=0.001$ ).

## Discussion

This single-center, retrospective study involving 110 MM patients who underwent stem cell mobilization, present a comparison of the mobilization outcomes Cy-Et + G-CSF group and G-CSF alone group.

Although different agents are used for stem cell mobilization in MM, there is no consensus on the most appropriate option. Plerixafor can be used in stem cell mobilization by evaluating its side effects, cost-benefit ratio and availability in suitable patients (5, 6). Today, Plerixafor comes to mind in case of failure of first-line mobilization regimens. In this study, adequate mobilization was achieved in all patients without the need for plerixafor use in any of the patients.

In a study (7), two groups that were applied Cy + G-CSF and Et + G-CSF for stem cell mobilization in MM were compared and more stem cells were obtained in the group mobilized with Et than in the group mobilized with Cy. In our study, more stem cell mobilization was achieved in the Cy-Et group than in the G-CSF alone group.

In this study, in the stem cell mobilization process, there was no increase in infection processes in the Cy-Et group, contrary to expectations, compared to the G-CSF alone group, and Cy-Et was easily tolerated by all patients. This may be related to the fact that the disease was under control before transplantation in patients who were planned for transplantation.

Some previous studies (8-10) used G-CSF alone or Cy + G-CSF as a mobilization regimen in MM. However, mobilization insufficiency is around 10-20%. In this study, adequate mobilization was performed in a single session in 89.1% of the patients. Mobilization was required 3 times in 5.7% of the patients in the Cy-Et group and in 20% of the patients in the G-CSF alone group.

In a study of 91 MM patients in the literature (11), 42 patients were mobilized with a novel pegylated form of the recombinant G-CSF filgrastim, 49 patients were mobilized with filgrastim, and it was shown that more stem cell mobilization and earlier engraftment were achieved with the pegylated form. The combination of Cy-Et with pegylated form filgrastim is a candidate to be the current cost-effective mobilization option in MM.

In the literature (12), in a multicenter study of 422 MM patients, it was shown that low-dose Cy provides optimal mobilization when Cy is  $2 \text{ g/m}^2$  and  $\geq 3 \text{ g/m}^2$  and G-CSF alone is used. In this study, when Cy was used with total  $2.5 \text{ g/m}^2$  and Et, more effective mobilization was achieved than G-CSF alone. In addition, in this study, no hemorrhagic cystitis or neutropenic infection was reported due to the use of Cy during stem cell mobilization in MM in previous studies (13-14).

In this study, the fact that more stem cell mobilization was obtained with less apheresis in the Cy-Et group offers an advantage especially for tandem transplantation in MM. Also, earlier neutrophil and platelet engraftment was obtained in the Cy-Et group compared to the G-CSF group alone, which may provide a cost advantage due to earlier post-transplant discharge and less hospital stay.

## Conclusions

In conclusion, this study was demonstrated that Cy-Et + G-CSF mobilization provides a higher peripheral CD34 count, less apheresis sessions, less volume, more stem cell mobilization, earlier neutrophils and platelet engraftment for patients with multiple myeloma and eligible for ASCT. Today, Cy-Et + G-CSF mobilization is a really useful method than G-CSF alone. Further randomized, prospective studies with larger sample size and

clinical, laboratory and histopathological data from such studies are required to support the results of this study.

## Compliance with ethical standards

All ethical considerations were strictly followed in accordance with the Helsinki Declaration.

## Financial support and sponsorship

Nil.

## Conflicts of interest

There are no conflicts of interest.

## References

1. Röllig C, Knop S, Bornhäuser M. Multiple myeloma. *Lancet*. (2015);385(9983):2197-2208.
2. Martino M, Lemoli RM, Girmania C, Castagna L, Bruno B, (2016): et al. A. Italian consensus conference for the outpatient autologous stem cell transplantation management in multiple myeloma. *Bone Marrow Transplant*.;51(8):1032-1040.
3. Ebraheem M, Kumar SK, Dispenzieri A, Jevremovic D, Buadi FK, (2022): et al. Deepening Responses after Upfront Autologous Stem Cell Transplantation in Patients with Newly Diagnosed Multiple Myeloma in the Era of Novel Agent Induction Therapy. *Transplant Cell Ther*.;28(11):760.e1-760.e5.
4. Cottler-Fox MH, Lapidot T, Petit I, Kollet O, DiPersio JF, (2003): et al. Stem cell mobilization. *Hematology Am Soc Hematol Educ Program*. 2003;419-437.
5. Fowler CJ, Dunn A, Hayes-Lattin B, Hansen K, Hansen L, (2009): et al. Rescue from failed growth factor and/or chemotherapy HSC mobilization with G-CSF and plerixafor (AMD3100): an institutional experience. *Bone Marrow Transplant*; 43(12):909-917.
6. Duarte RF, Shaw BE, Marín P, Kottaridis P, Ortiz M, (2011): et al. Plerixafor plus granulocyte CSF can mobilize hematopoietic stem cells from multiple myeloma and lymphoma patients failing previous mobilization attempts: EU compassionate use data. *Bone Marrow Transplant*.;46(1):52-58.
7. Song GY, Jung SH, Ahn SY, Jung SY, Yang DH, (2019): et al. Optimal chemo-mobilization for the collection of peripheral blood stem cells in patients with multiple myeloma. *BMC Cancer*.;19(1):59.
8. Pusic I, Jiang SY, Landua S, Uy GL, Rettig MP, (2008): et al. Impact of Mobilization and Remobilization Strategies on Achieving Sufficient Stem Cell Yields for Autologous Transplantation, *Biology of Blood and Marrow Transplant*.;14(9):1045-1056.
9. Pavone V, Gaudio F, Console G, Vitolo U, Lacopino P, (2006): et al. Poor mobilization is an independent prognostic factor in patients with malignant lymphomas treated by peripheral blood stem cell transplantation. *Bone Marrow Transplant*.;37(7):719-724.
10. Desikan KR, Barlogie B, Jagannath S, Vesole DH, Siegel D, (1998): et al. Comparable engraftment kinetics following peripheral-blood stem-cell infusion mobilized with granulocyte colony-stimulating factor with or without cyclophosphamide in multiple myeloma. *J Clin Oncol*.;16(4):1547-1553.
11. Ding X, Huang W, Peng Y, Fan H, Zhu Y, (2020): et al. Pegfilgrastim improves the outcomes of mobilization and engraftment in autologous hematopoietic stem cell transplantation for the treatment of multiple myeloma. *Ann Hematol*.;99(6):1331-1339.
12. Zannetti BA, Saraceni F, Cellini C, Fabbri E, Monaco F, (2021): et al. Low-Dose Cyclophosphamide versus Intermediate-High-Dose Cyclophosphamide versus Granulocyte Colony-Stimulating Factor Alone for Stem Cell Mobilization in Multiple Myeloma in the Era of Novel Agents: A Multicenter Retrospective Study. *Transplant Cell Ther*.;27(3):244.e1-244.e8.
13. Almalag HM, Alasmari SS, Alrayes MH, Binhameed MA, Alsudairi RA, (2021): et al. Incidence of hemorrhagic cystitis after cyclophosphamide therapy with or without mesna: A cohort study and

- comprehensive literature review. J Oncol Pharm Pract.;27(2):340-349.
14. Corso A, Arcaini L, Caberlon S, Zappasodi P, Mangiacavalli S, (2002): et al. A combination of dexamethasone, cyclophosphamide, etoposide, and cisplatin is less toxic and more effective than high-dose cyclophosphamide for peripheral stem cell mobilization in multiple myeloma. Haematologica.;87(10):1041-1045.

**Ready to submit your research? Choose ClinicSearch and benefit from:**

- fast, convenient online submission
- rigorous peer review by experienced research in your field
- rapid publication on acceptance
- authors retain copyrights
- unique DOI for all articles
- immediate, unrestricted online access

**At ClinicSearch, research is always in progress.**

Learn more <https://clinicsearchonline.org/journals/oral-health-and-dentistry-case-reports>



© The Author(s) 2022. **Open Access** This article is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License, which permits use, sharing, adaptation, distribution and reproduction in any medium or format, as long as you give appropriate credit to the original author(s) and the source, provide a link to the Creative Commons licence, and indicate if changes were made. The images or other third party material in this article are included in the article's Creative Commons licence, unless indicated otherwise in a credit line to the material. If material is not included in the article's Creative Commons licence and your intended use is not permitted by statutory regulation or exceeds the permitted use, you will need to obtain permission directly from the copyright holder. To view a copy of this licence, visit <http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>. The Creative Commons Public Domain Dedication waiver (<http://creativecommons.org/publicdomain/zero/1.0/>) applies to the data made available in this article, unless otherwise stated in a credit line to the data.