1	Real-world treatment patterns and clinical outcomes in Korean
2	patients with AML ineligible for first-line intensive
3	chemotherapy: A subanalysis of the CURRENT study, a non-
4	interventional, retrospective chart review
5	
6	Short title: Real-world treatment for Korean patients with AML not candidates for intensive
7	chemotherapy
8	
9	Soo-Mee Bang ¹ , Ka-Won Kang ² , Ik-Chan Song ³ , Alexander Delgado ⁴ , Cynthia Llamas ⁵ ,
10	Yinghui Duan ⁵ , Ji-Young Jeong ⁶ , Je-Hwan Lee ^{7*}
11	
12	¹ Division of Hematology and Medical Oncology, Department of Internal Medicine, Seoul
13	National University, College of Medicine, Seoul National University Bundang Hospital,
14	Seongnam, Korea
15	² Division of Hematology and Oncology, Department of Internal Medicine, Korea University
16	College of Medicine, Seoul, Korea
17	³ Division of Hematology and Oncology, Department of Internal Medicine, Chungnam
18	National University School of Medicine, Daejeon, Korea
19	⁴ Medical Affairs, Oncology JAPAC, AbbVie Singapore Pte Ltd, Singapore
20	⁵ Evidence Solutions, AbbVie Inc., North Chicago, IL, USA
21	⁶ Medical Affairs, AbbVie Korea Ltd, Seoul, Korea
22	⁷ Department of Hematology, Asan Medical Center, University of Ulsan College of Medicine,
23	NOTE: This preprint reports new research that has not been certified by peer review and should not be used to guide clinical practice. SCOUL, KOICa

- 25 *Corresponding author
- 26 Email: jhlee3@amc.seoul.kr (JHL)

27 Abstract

28 Background

29 Although most elderly patients with acute myeloid leukemia are ineligible for intensive

30 chemotherapy, treatment options remain limited. CURRENT (UMIN000037786), a real-

31 world, non-interventional, retrospective chart review, evaluated clinical outcomes,

32 clinicopathologic characteristics, and treatment patterns in these patients. We present results

33 from a subanalysis of Korean patients in this study.

34 Methods

Patients were aged ≥18 years with primary or secondary acute myeloid leukemia ineligible for intensive chemotherapy who initiated first-line systemic therapy or best supportive care between 2015 and 2018 across four centers in Korea. Primary endpoint was overall survival from diagnosis. Secondary endpoints included progression-free survival, time to treatment failure, and response rates. Data analyses were primarily descriptive, with time-to-event outcomes estimated using the Kaplan-Meier method, and Cox regression used to determine prognostic factors for survival.

42 **Results**

43 Among 194 patients enrolled, 84.0% received systemic therapy and 16.0% received best 44 supportive care. Median age at diagnosis was 74 and 78 years, and Eastern Cooperative 45 Oncology Group performance status 0 or 1 was reported in 73.0% and 48.4% of patients, 46 respectively; poor cytogenetic risk was reported in 30.1% and 16.1% of patients. Median 47 overall survival was 7.83 versus 4.50 months, and median progression-free survival was 6.73 48 versus 4.50 months in the systemic therapy versus best supportive care groups. Prognostic 49 factors (all P < 0.05) affecting overall survival included secondary acute myeloid leukemia 50 (hazard ratio, 1.67 [95% CI: 1.13–2.45]), Eastern Cooperative Oncology Group performance

- 51 status ≥ 2 (2.41 [1.51–3.83]), poor cytogenetic risk (2.10 [1.36–3.24]), and Charlson
- 52 comorbidity index ≥ 1 (2.26 [1.43–3.58]).

53 Conclusion

- 54 Clinical outcomes are poor in Korean patients with acute myeloid leukemia ineligible for
- 55 intensive chemotherapy who are prescribed current systemic therapies or best supportive
- 56 care. There is a substantial unmet need for novel agents (monotherapy or in combination) to
- 57 improve clinical outcomes in this patient population.

58

60 Introduction

61	Acute myeloid leukemia (AML) is a hematologic malignancy characterized by the rapid
62	proliferation of abnormally differentiated myeloid blast cells [1]. AML, the most common
63	type of leukemia in adults worldwide [2], predominantly affects elderly individuals, with
64	about 60% of patients diagnosed at \geq 65 years of age [3]. From 1990 to 2017, the global
65	incidence of AML rose by 87%, with 119,570 cases recorded in 2017 [4]. In Korea, AML is
66	the most frequently diagnosed myeloid malignancy and is most prevalent in patients aged 60
67	to 79 years [5]. Despite the greater prevalence of AML in older versus younger adults,
68	survival outcomes for this population remain extremely poor [6].
69	
70	The current standard of care for AML is intensive chemotherapy (ICT), but approximately
71	50% of patients are ineligible for this treatment [7] owing to factors such as advanced age,
72	poor performance status, and prevalence of comorbidities [8, 9]. AML-related genetic
73	abnormalities can also increase the likelihood of resistance to ICT [9]. Treatment options for
74	these patients remain limited and include low-intensity treatment with hypomethylating
75	agents (HMAs), low-dose cytarabine (LDAC), and best supportive care (BSC) [2, 10]. The
76	availability of targeted therapies, such as inhibitors of B-cell lymphoma-2 (BCL-2), isocitrate
77	dehydrogenase isoforms 1/2 (IDH1/2), FMS-like tyrosine kinase-3 (FLT3), and Hedgehog
78	(Hh), is also increasing for patients who are ineligible for ICT [11].
79	
80	Prognostic models have been developed to determine the suitability of older patients for ICT,
81	yet there is no consensus regarding their optimal treatment [12-14]. Treatment decision-
82	making for elderly patients with AML is an escalating global clinical challenge in light of
83	emerging new agents and is compounded by an increasing incidence of AML due to the

84	aging population [4, 15]. Thus, there is a growing need to understand current treatment
85	strategies and their associated clinical outcomes in patients who are ineligible for ICT.
86	
87	The CURRENT study was an international, real-world, non-interventional, retrospective
88	chart review that aimed to evaluate clinical outcomes, clinicopathologic characteristics, and
89	treatment patterns of patients with AML deemed ineligible for ICT [16]. Here, we report that
90	clinical outcomes were poor among the subgroup of Korean patients included in the
91	CURRENT study.

92

93 Methods

94 Study design

95 The CURRENT study [16] enrolled 1792 patients across 112 community or hospital medical 96 centers from 22 countries between January 1, 2015, and December 31, 2018; four of the 97 medical centers were in Korea. Notification was made to the responsible ethics committees, 98 health institutions, and/or competent authorities as required by local laws and regulations. 99 Ethics committee approval was obtained for this study, with the following institutional 100 review board approval numbers (Seoul National University Bundang Hospital: B-1908/559-101 102; Korea University College of Medicine: K2019-1535-001; Chungnan National 102 University School of Medicine: 2019-09-027; Asan Medical Center: S2019-1692-0001). Data 103 collection was carried out anonymously, and final data cut-off was March 31, 2020. 104

105 Study population

Eligible patients were aged ≥18 years, diagnosed with primary or secondary AML, and
ineligible for ICT based on physician assessment of age, Eastern Cooperative Oncology

108	Group (ECOG) performance status, comorbidities, regional guidelines, and institutional
109	practice. Patients were also required to have commenced first-line systemic therapy with low
110	intensity chemotherapy (e.g. HMAs, including azacytidine and decitabine, or LDAC),
111	targeted therapy, or BSC and to have attended at least two practice visits to the physician
112	during the treatment period in addition to the initial treatment visit. Exclusion criteria
113	included undiagnosed AML, acute promyelocytic leukemia, and having received first-line
114	therapy for AML in a clinical trial. Patients were followed up until the last recorded contact
115	or death (whichever came first), and all visits were completed before data extraction.
116	
117	Endpoints

L

118 The primary endpoint was overall survival (OS; measured from diagnosis of AML).

119 Secondary endpoints included progression-free survival (PFS), time to treatment failure

120 (TTF), response rate (including complete remission [CR] and CR with incomplete

121 hematologic recovery [CRi]), and duration of response (DoR).

122

123 Data collection

Anonymized patient data including age, sex, disease characteristics, prior treatment, ECOG performance status, cytogenetic risk, and Charlson comorbidity index (CCI) were extracted from patient charts and/or site documentation, and recorded via electronic case report forms (CRFs) completed by each center.

128

129 Sample size

130 Target sample size for the overall CURRENT study was 1600 patients, and the target sample

131 size in Korea was 170 patients. Because of the descriptive nature of the study, formal

statistical power considerations are not provided. However, the sample size was consideredsufficient to provide reasonably precise estimates.

134

135 Statistical analyses

Data analyses were primarily descriptive. Continuous variables were described using mean,
standard deviation (SD), median, and ranges. Categorical variables were reported as counts

138 and proportions. Time-to-event data were estimated using the Kaplan-Meier method, with

139 median time and 95% confidence intervals (CIs) reported. Log-rank test or Wilcoxon test

140 were used to compare Kaplan-Meier estimates of survival between patient subgroups. Cox

141 regression analyses were performed to evaluate the association between patient variables and

142 estimates of median OS and PFS. Missing data were captured via an "unknown" option in the

143 electronic CRFs wherever appropriate. No imputation was performed, and all analyses were

144 conducted on available data only.

145

146 **Results**

147 **Patient demographics and clinical characteristics**

148 At final data cut-off, 194 Korean patients were enrolled. Patient baseline characteristics by

treatment group are provided in Table 1. In the first-line systemic therapy and BSC groups,

respectively, median age was 74.0 and 78.0 years, 64.4% and 48.4% of patients were male,

and secondary AML was diagnosed in 25.2% and 29.0% of patients. The majority (73.0%) of

152 patients in the first-line systemic therapy group had an ECOG performance status of 0 or 1; in

- 153 the BSC group, approximately half (51.6%) had an ECOG performance status ≥ 2 .
- 154 Cardiovascular, pulmonary, liver, renal, and other comorbidities were reported in 130

- 155 (89.7%), 18 (100.0%), and 28 (90.3%) patients who received HMA, LDAC and other
- 156 systemic therapies, and BSC, respectively (S1 Table).
- 157

158 **Table 1. Baseline demographics and patient characteristics.**

	First-line systemic therapy				
			LDAC &		
	All	HMA	other	BSC	
	(n = 163)	(n = 145)	(n = 18)	(n = 31)	P value
Male	105 (64.42)	89 (61.38)	16 (88.89)	15 (48.39)	0.0186*
Age at diagnosis,					
median (range),	74 (53–87)	74 (53–87)	72 (61–82)	78 (46–87)	0.0500^{+}
years					
>75	61 (37.42)	56 (38.62)	5 (27.78)	20 (64.52)	0.0133*
Secondary AML	41 (25.15)	35 (24.14)	6 (33.33)	9 (29.03)	0.2654‡
MDS	22 (53.66)	17 (48.57)	5 (83.33)	7 (77.78)	0.6057‡
CMML	7 (17.07)	6 (17.14)	1 (16.67)	1 (11.11)	_
MPN	7 (17.07)	7 (20.00)	0	0	_
t-AML	5 (12.20)	5 (14.29)	0	1 (11.11)	—
Prior HMA Tx for	8 (19 51)	3 (8 57)	5 (83 33)	6 (66 67)	<0.0001‡
antecedent disorder	0(17.51)	5 (0.57)	5 (85.55)	0 (00.07)	<0.0001
ECOG					
performance status					
0-1	119 (73.01)	109 (75.17)	10 (55.56)	15 (48.39)	0.0059*
≥2	44 (26.99)	36 (24.83)	8 (44.44)	16 (51.61)	_

159 Data are n (%) unless otherwise stated.

161 LDAC and other systemic therapies.

162 AML, acute myeloid leukemia; BSC, best supportive care; CMML, chronic myelomonocytic

163 leukemia; ECOG, Eastern Cooperative Oncology Group; HMA, hypomethylating agent;

164 LDAC, low-dose cytarabine; MDS, myelodysplastic syndrome; MPN, myeloproliferative

165 neoplasm; t-AML, therapy-related AML; Tx, treatment.

^{*}Chi-squared test; [†]Kruskal-Wallis test; [‡]Fisher's exact test.

¹⁶⁰ P value indicates statistical difference in a three-way comparison between BSC, HMA, and

168	Patient molecular profiling and cytogenetic risk data by treatment groups are provided in S2
169	Table. Of the patients who received first-line systemic therapy with available cytogenic risk
170	data (n = 145), 66 (45.5%), 30 (20.7%), and 49 (33.8%) had favorable, intermediate, and poor
171	risk, respectively, according to the cytogenetic risk classification in the CRF (S3 Table). Of
172	16 patients who received BSC with available cytogenic risk data, the respective risk
173	proportions were seven (43.8%), four (25.0%), and five (31.2%) patients. Of the patients who
174	received first-line systemic therapy with available molecular data (obtained using next-
175	generation sequencing or targeted mutation testing; $n = 144$), 49 (34.0%) had a mutation.
176	None of the patients who received BSC with available molecular data ($n = 22$) had mutations.
177	
178	Patients who received first-line systemic therapy were more likely to be <75 years of age
179	compared with the BSC group (62.6% vs 35.5%), more likely to be male (64.4% vs 48.4%),
180	and more likely to have an ECOG performance status <2 (73.0% vs 48.4%) and poor
181	cytogenic risk (30.1% vs 16.1%). Among patients who received first-line systemic therapy
182	who had AML-related mutation(s), $NPM1$ (n = 11; 22.4%), MLL ^{PTD} (n = 11; 22.4%), CEBPA
183	(n = 8; 16.3%), <i>TET2</i> $(n = 8; 16.3%)$, and <i>FLT3</i> ^{ITD} $(n = 7; 14.3%)$ were most frequently
184	identified.
185	
186	Among the 194 patients in this Korean subanalysis, 163 (84.0%) received first-line systemic
187	therapy and 31 (16.0%) received BSC. In the first-line systemic therapy group, 10 had
188	ongoing treatment, 152 discontinued treatment, and the status of one patient was unknown

189 (S1 Fig). There were 145 (89.0%) patients who received HMA monotherapy (azacytidine, n =

190 5 [3.1%]; decitabine, n = 140 [85.9%]), five (3.1%) who received LDAC monotherapy, and

191 13 (8.0%) who received HMA and/or LDAC in combination with other systemic therapies

192 (S2 Fig).

193

194 **Primary endpoint**

- 195 Median (95% CI) OS was 7.83 (6.30–9.27) months in patients who received systemic therapy
- 196 (HMAs, 8.07 [6.27–9.50] months; LDAC and other systemic therapies, 7.57 [3.90–9.80]
- 197 months), and 4.50 (2.93–11.83) months in those who received BSC (Table 2 and Fig 1).
- 198 Thirty-seven patients had missing OS data.
- 199

200 Table 2. Median OS, PFS, TTF, response rate, and duration of response for

201 patients who received first-line systemic therapy or BSC.

	First-line systemic therapy			
	All HMA LDAC & other		BSC	
	(n = 163)	(n = 145)	(n = 18)	(n = 31)
OS, median (95%	7.83	8.07	7.57	4.50
CI), mo*	(6.30–9.27)	(6.27–9.50)	(3.90–9.80)	(2.93–11.83)
PFS, median (95%	6.73	6.87	6.27	4.50
CI), mo†	(5.90-8.20)	(5.90-8.20)	(2.37–10.03)	(2.93–11.83)
Best overall				
response, n (%)				
CR	27 (16.56)	22 (15.17)	5 (27.78)	0
CRi	10 (6.13)	7 (4.83)	3 (16.67)	0
PR	5 (3.07)	5 (3.45)	0	0
SD	57 (34.97)	53 (36.55)	4 (22.22)	2 (6.45)
PD	14 (8.59)	13 (8.97)	1 (5.56)	1 (3.23)
Unknown	50 (30.67)	45 (31.03)	5 (27.78)	28 (90.32)
Duration of CR+CRi, median (range), d	275.00 (47.00–919.00)	296.00 (47.00–919.00)	252.50 (69.00–763.00)	_
TTF, median (95% CI), mo [‡]	4.13 (2.73–5.00)	4.13 (2.70–5.03)	4.13 (0.93–9.97)	_

BSC, best supportive care; CI, confidence interval; CR, complete remission; CRi, CR with

203 incomplete hematologic recovery; d, days; HMA, hypomethylating agent; LDAC, low-dose

204	cytarabine; mo, months; OS, overall survival; PFS, progression-free survival; PR, partial
205	response; PD, progressive disease; SD, stable disease; TTF, time to treatment failure.
206	*37 patients with missing data; †42 patients with missing data; ‡52 patients with missing data.
207	
208	Fig 1. Kaplan-Meier analysis of OS in patients who received HMA, LDAC and other
209	systemic therapies, or BSC. BSC, best supportive care; CI, confidence interval; HMA,
210	hypomethylating agent; LDAC, low-dose cytarabine; mo, months; OS, overall survival.
211	*Log-rank test by comparing between three groups; *Log-rank test by comparing between
212	every two groups; [‡] HMA vs BSC; [§] LDAC and other systemic therapies vs BSC; [¶] HMA vs
213	LDAC and other systemic therapies. Patients with missing data across all groups, $n = 37$.
214	
215	Subgroup analyses showed that median OS was significantly different (all $P < 0.005$) between
216	patients without (8.20 months) versus with (4.73 months) secondary AML, patients with an
217	ECOG performance status of 0 or 1 (8.30 months) versus ≥ 2 (4.43 months), patients with
218	favorable (10.67 months) versus intermediate (6.13 months) and poor (6.32 months)
219	cytogenic risk, and patients with CCI of 0 (8.30 months) versus ≥ 1 (5.73 months; S4 Table).
220	
221	Using Cox regression analyses, we identified several prognostic factors for OS, including
222	presence of secondary AML (hazard ratio [95% CI], 1.67 [1.13–2.45]; $P = 0.0094$), ECOG
223	performance status ≥ 2 (2.41 [1.51–3.83]; $P = 0.0002$), intermediate (1.77 [1.10–2.84]; $P =$
224	0.0182) or poor (2.10 [1.36–3.24]; $P = 0.0008$) cytogenetic risk, and CCI ≥ 1 (2.26 [1.43–
225	3.58]; $P = 0.0005$; Table 3).
226	

227 Table 3. Prognostic factors that affect OS.

Category	HR (95% CI)	<i>P</i> value
Sex		
Male vs female	0.98 (0.68–1.41)	0.9192
Age		
>75 vs ≤75 years	0.98 (0.67–1.45)	0.9279
Secondary AML		
Yes vs no	1.67 (1.13–2.45)	0.0094*
Unknown vs no	2.04 (0.26–16.12)	0.5006
ECOG performance status		
$\geq 2 \text{ vs} < 2$	2.41 (1.51–3.83)	0.0002*
Cytogenetic risk [†]		
Intermediate vs favorable	1.77 (1.10–2.84)	0.0182*
Poor vs favorable	2.10 (1.36–3.24)	0.0008*
Unknown vs favorable	2.91 (1.21-6.96)	0.0167*
Charlson comorbidity index		
$\geq 1 \text{ vs } 0$	2.26 (1.43-3.58)	0.0005*

AML, acute myeloid leukemia; CI, confidence interval; ECOG, Eastern Cooperative

229 Oncology Group; HR, hazard ratio; OS, overall survival.

230 *Statistically significant; †Risk stratification according to the cytogenetic risk classification

231 described in S3 Table.

232

233 Secondary endpoints

- 234 Median (95% CI) PFS was 6.73 (5.90–8.20) months for patients who received systemic
- therapy (HMAs, 6.87 [5.90–8.20] months; LDAC and other systemic therapies, 6.27 [2.37–

10.03] months), and 4.50 (2.93–11.83) months for patients who received BSC (Table 2 and

- 237 S3 Fig). Median (95% CI) TTF was 4.13 (2.73–5.00) months for patients who received
- systemic therapy (HMAs: 4.13 [2.70–5.03] months; LDAC and other systemic therapies: 4.13
- [0.93–9.97] months; Table 2). The number of patients with missing data for PFS and TTF
- was 42 and 52, respectively. Among the 163 patients who received systemic therapy, 37
- 241 (22.7%) achieved CR or CRi, with a median (95% CI) DoR of 275.00 (47.00–919.00) days

242 (Table 2). CR or CRi was achieved in 20.0% of patients who received HMAs and 44.4% of

243 patients who received LDAC and other systemic therapies, with a corresponding median

244 (95% CI) DoR of 296.00 (47.00–919.00) and 252.50 (69.00–763.00) days, respectively

245 (Table 2).

246

- Subgroup analysis showed that median PFS was significantly different (all P < 0.05) between
- 248 patients without (7.37 months) versus with (4.68 months) secondary AML, patients with
- ECOG performance status 0 or 1 (7.23 months) versus ≥ 2 (4.20 months), patients with
- favorable (8.37 months) versus intermediate (5.77 months) and poor (6.23 months) cytogenic
- risk, and patients with CCI of 0 (7.27 months) versus ≥ 1 (5.73 months; S5 Table).

252

- 253 Using Cox regression analyses, we identified several factors associated with PFS, including
- 254 presence of secondary AML (hazard ratio [95% CI], 1.58 [1.08–2.33]; *P* = 0.0190), ECOG
- 255 performance status ≥ 2 (2.25 [1.40–3.62]; P = 0.0008), poor cytogenetic risk (1.96 [1.27–
- 256 3.04]; P = 0.0026), and CCI ≥ 1 (2.01 [1.28–3.16]; P = 0.0025; S6 Table).

257

258 **Discussion**

259 In the overall CURRENT study population, HMAs were associated with longer median OS,

260 PFS, and TTF, compared with other systemic therapies or BSC [7]. This subanalysis revealed

similar survival outcomes among the study's Korean subpopulation. We also found that

several patient demographic and genetic factors were associated with OS and PFS.

- 264 Survival outcomes among all patients in this Korean subanalysis were poor. Median OS was
- higher in patients who received systemic therapy (7.83 months) compared with those who
- received BSC (4.50 months), although this was not statistically significant. Notably, median

267 OS was highest in patients who received HMAs (8.07 months). Survival outcomes in patients 268 receiving HMAs were largely consistent with previous reports in clinical trials [17-19] and 269 real-world studies [20] (median OS, 6.6–10.4 months). In line with previous studies and the 270 overall CURRENT study [16], this subanalysis highlights the preference for HMAs in 271 patients who are ineligible to receive ICT, which was not surprising given the favorable 272 survival outcomes associated with HMAs compared with other available therapies. Median 273 OS for the HMA cohort in this subanalysis closely mirrored that of a systematic review and 274 meta-analysis of the efficacy and safety of decitabine in the treatment of elderly patients with 275 AML (n = 718; median [95% CI] OS, 8.09 [5.77–10.41] months) [21]. Notably, 85.9% of 276 patients in the present subanalysis received decitabine as first-line systemic therapy. In 277 contrast to our results, a US study reported a median (95% CI) OS of 4.30 (3.20-5.80) 278 months in patients treated with HMAs [22]. Furthermore, median OS in the LDAC and BSC 279 cohorts were slightly longer than reported previously [18]. These differences may be 280 explained by the present population being more representative of real-world clinical practice 281 and comprising only Korean patients. When evaluating OS in patient subgroups, we found 282 that those diagnosed with versus without secondary AML, with an ECOG performance status 283 ≥ 2 versus 0 or 1, with poor or intermediate versus favorable cytogenetic risk, or with CCI ≥ 1 284 versus 0 had a shorter median OS. Similar observations have been reported in previous 285 studies [14, 23-25].

286

Median PFS in this subanalysis was higher in patients who received systemic therapy (6.73 months) compared with patients who received BSC (4.50 months), although this was not statistically significant. Notably, median PFS was highest in patients who received HMAs (6.87 months), which is consistent with the global CURRENT study [16]. Evaluation of PFS according to patient subgroups revealed that patients diagnosed with versus without

secondary AML, with an ECOG performance status ≥2 versus 0 or 1, with poor or
intermediate versus favorable cytogenetic risk, or with CCI ≥1 versus 0 had shorter median
PFS. These results are consistent with previous studies in which poor ECOG performance
status and comorbidity index scores were associated with shorter median PFS [23].
Median TTF was comparable between all patients receiving first-line systemic therapies,

which is in contrast to the overall CURRENT study in which longer median TTF was reported in patients who received HMAs [16]. CR and CRi rates were lower in patients who received HMAs compared with LDAC and other systemic therapies, which is consistent with results from the CURRENT study [16]. On the other hand, median duration of CR and CRi were higher in patients who received HMAs compared with other systemic therapies, which was not observed in the main study [16].

304

305 Baseline characteristics of Korean patients in this subanalysis were generally consistent with 306 the global CURRENT study [16]. The vast majority of patients reported comorbidities, and 307 patients who received HMAs were more likely to report ECOG performance status <2 with 308 favorable or intermediate cytogenic risk, compared with patients who received LDAC and 309 other systemic therapies, or BSC. The mutation rate in this subanalysis among patients who 310 received systemic therapies was 34.0%; the most frequently occurring mutations reported here and in the CURRENT study [16] were NPM1 and FLT3^{ITD}, confirming findings from a 311 312 previous report [26]. In addition, we found that there was a significant difference between 313 median age, proportion of male patients, and the proportion of patients aged >75 years for the 314 HMA, LDAC and other systemic therapies, and BSC groups. Fewer patients in the systemic 315 therapies groups versus the BSC group were >75 years of age, indicating that patients in this 316 subanalysis who received systemic therapies may have had a better prognosis [27], although

317 age was not found to be a significant prognostic factor for survival in this Korean

318 subanalysis.

319

320 Factors associated with poorer OS and PFS included secondary AML, ECOG performance 321 status ≥ 2 , intermediate or poor cytogenetic risk, and CCI ≥ 1 . This is consistent with a 322 multicenter trial in which better performance status, non-adverse cytogenetics, and lower CCI 323 scores were associated with better survival outcomes in patients with AML who were 324 ineligible for ICT and received decitabine as first-line treatment [28]. Better performance 325 status was similarly found to be prognostic for survival in elderly Korean patients with AML 326 [29]. This may have influenced the outcomes of patients in our study, in which 75% of 327 patients in the HMA group had ECOG performance status <2 compared with just 55.6% and 328 48.4% in the LDAC and other systemic therapies and BSC groups, respectively. In contrast to 329 our results, a study of 248 elderly patients on low-intensity therapy did not find an association 330 between survival and ECOG performance status or cytogenetic risk, but identified response 331 to the first induction cycle and lactate dehydrogenase levels as prognostic parameters [27]. 332 neither of which were examined in our study. With regard to treatment with HMAs, patients 333 with DNA methylation-related mutations have improved OS, and TET2 mutation has been 334 recognized as an independent prognostic factor for PFS [30]. In this subanalysis, TET2 335 mutation was identified in 18.2% of patients in the HMA cohort, whereas none of the patients 336 in the other treatment groups had this mutation. Overall, the prognostic parameters associated 337 with median OS and PFS in our study were consistent with those reported in patients who 338 received ICT [19, 31-34].

339

340 Finally, we have shown that more patients who were ineligible for ICT received HMAs

341 compared with LDAC and BSC, which is consistent with the CURRENT study [16].

342 Regardless, survival was poor among all patients. Studies investigating outcomes in patients 343 who received HMA compared with ICT have found that HMA was more frequently used in 344 older patients, despite better outcomes with ICT, even in those with comorbidities [20, 22]. 345 Conversely, two recent analyses of elderly patients (>65 years) with AML in Korea noted 346 that despite lower response rates in patients who received HMAs compared with those who 347 received ICT, survival outcomes were comparable [35, 36]. Other studies involving elderly 348 patients with AML have also reported comparable or better survival outcomes for those who 349 received HMAs compared with those who received ICT or palliative care [37]. Notably, there 350 were patients in this subanalysis who received only palliative BSC despite the availability of 351 first-line systemic therapies. Given that baseline characteristics, except for age, were largely 352 consistent between the first-line systemic therapy and BSC groups, it may be that BSC is 353 considered for elderly patients because age is regarded as a critical factor when making 354 treatment decisions. There remains a significant unmet need for higher efficacy treatments for 355 patients who are ineligible for ICT owing to advanced age. Although targeted treatments have 356 been associated with a moderate improvement in outcomes for patients unfit for ICT [38-43]. 357 prognosis remains poor and there is a lack of consensus regarding optimal treatment for these 358 patients.

359

Several limitations should be considered when interpreting the results of this study. As with all real-world retrospective studies, the CURRENT study was uncontrolled and nonrandomized. Missing data may limit interpretation; missing molecular and cytogenetic data may limit assessment of their effect on outcomes, and missing response rate data for >30% of patients who received systemic therapies may limit the generalizability of these findings. There are many systemic therapies included in the "other systemic therapy" group of this study, which may limit interpretation of the clinical outcomes of patients who received

ach of these therapies. Intra- and inter-site variability may exist, but to reduce variations and
the need for corrections in the data collected, we optimized and ensured the clarity of the
electronic CRF, and provided all study sites with adequate training.

370

371 Conclusion

372 Overall, this subanalysis of the real-world CURRENT study provided several insights into the clinical management of Korean patients with AML who are ineligible for ICT. The 373 374 clinical outcomes for this Korean subgroup are poor, with a median OS <10 months in 375 patients who received systemic therapy and <5 months in patients who received BSC. The 376 majority of Korean patients with AML who are unfit for ICT receive HMAs, which are associated with numerically longer median OS and PFS relative to other systemic therapies 377 378 and BSC. Factors such as secondary AML, ECOG performance status, cytogenetic risk, and 379 CCI may be prognostic for survival. Given the rising incidence of AML due to the aging 380 population, there is a substantial unmet need for novel therapies and combination regimens to 381 improve clinical outcomes in this patient population.

382

383 Acknowledgments

Editorial assistance was provided by Liting Hang BSc (Hons), PhD, and Alice Carruthers BSc (Hons), PhD, (Nucleus Global Shanghai, Shanghai, China) and statistical analysis was provided by Medi Help Line, both funded by AbbVie Korea. We would like to acknowledge the contributions of our colleague, Maria Belen Guijarro Garbayo in memoriam, formerly of AbbVie, for her contributions to the study concept and design, and contributions to drafts of this publication.

390

391 **References**

- Saultz JN, Garzon R. Acute myeloid leukemia: A concise review. J Clin Med. 2016;5(3):33.
- Pollyea DA, Bixby D, Perl A, Bhatt VR, Altman JK, Appelbaum FR, et al. NCCN guidelines insights: Acute myeloid leukemia, Version 2. 2021. J Natl Compr Canc Netw. 2021;19(1):16-27.
- Cancer stat facts: Leukemia acute myeloid leukemia. National Cancer Institute
 Surveillance, Epidemiology and End Results Program. 2021. Available from: https://seer.cancer.gov/statfacts/html/amyl.html.
- 4. Yi M, Li A, Zhou L, Chu Q, Song Y, Wu K. The global burden and attributable risk
 factor analysis of acute myeloid leukemia in 195 countries and territories from 1990
 to 2017: Estimates based on the global burden of disease study 2017. J Hematol
 Oncol. 2020;13(1):72.
- 4045.Park E-H, Lee H, Won Y-J, Ju HY, Oh C-M, Ingabire C, et al. Nationwide statistical405analysis of myeloid malignancies in Korea: Incidence and survival rate from 1999 to4062012. Blood Res. 2015;50(4):204-17.
- 407 6. Thein MS, Ershler WB, Jemal A, Yates JW, Baer MR. Outcome of older patients with
 408 acute myeloid leukemia: an analysis of SEER data over 3 decades. Cancer.
 409 2013;119(15):2720-7.
- 410 7. Deschler B, de Witte T, Mertelsmann R, Lübbert M. Treatment decision-making for
 411 older patients with high-risk myelodysplastic syndrome or acute myeloid leukemia:
 412 problems and approaches. Haematologica. 2006;91(11):1513-22.
- 8. Ferrara F, Barosi G, Venditti A, Angelucci E, Gobbi M, Pane F, et al. Consensusbased definition of unfitness to intensive and non-intensive chemotherapy in acute
 myeloid leukemia: a project of SIE, SIES and GITMO group on a new tool for
 therapy decision making. Leukemia. 2013;27(5):997-9.
- 417 9. Döhner H, Estey E, Grimwade D, Amadori S, Appelbaum FR, Büchner T, et al.
 418 Diagnosis and management of AML in adults: 2017 ELN recommendations from an 419 international expert panel. Blood. 2017;129(4):424-47.
- Heuser M, Ofran Y, Boissel N, Brunet Mauri S, Craddock C, Janssen J, et al. Acute
 myeloid leukaemia in adult patients: ESMO clinical practice guidelines for diagnosis,
 treatment and follow-up. Ann Oncol. 2020;31(6):697-712.
- Palmieri R, Paterno G, De Bellis E, Mercante L, Buzzatti E, Esposito F, et al.
 Therapeutic choice in older patients with acute myeloid leukemia: A matter of fitness.
 Cancers (Basel). 2020;12(1):120.
- Büchner T, Berdel WE, Haferlach C, Haferlach T, Schnittger S, Müller-Tidow C, et
 al. Age-related risk profile and chemotherapy dose response in acute myeloid
 leukemia: a study by the German Acute Myeloid Leukemia Cooperative Group. J Clin
 Oncol. 2009;27(1):61-9.

- 430 13. Wahlin A, Markevärn B, Golovleva I, Nilsson M. Prognostic significance of risk
 431 group stratification in elderly patients with acute myeloid leukaemia. Br J Haematol.
 432 2001;115(1):25-33.
- 433 14. Wheatley K, Brookes CL, Howman AJ, Goldstone AH, Milligan DW, Prentice AG, et
 434 al. Prognostic factor analysis of the survival of elderly patients with AML in the MRC
 435 AML11 and LRF AML14 trials. Br J Haematol. 2009;145(5):598-605.
- 436 15. Krok-Schoen JL, Fisher JL, Stephens JA, Mims A, Ayyappan S, Woyach JA, et al.
 437 Incidence and survival of hematological cancers among adults ages ≥75 years. Cancer
 438 Med. 2018;7(7):3425-33.
- Miyamoto T, Sanford D, Tomuleasa C, Hsiao HH, Olivera LJE, Enjeti AK, et al.
 Real-world treatment patterns and clinical outcomes in patients with AML unfit for
 first-line intensive chemotherapy. Leuk Lymphoma. 2022;63(4):928-38.
- International phase 3 study of azacitidine vs conventional care regimens in older
 patients with newly diagnosed AML with >30% blasts. Blood. 2015;126(3):291-9.
- 18. Seymour JF, Döhner H, Butrym A, Wierzbowska A, Selleslag D, Jang JH, et al.
 Azacitidine improves clinical outcomes in older patients with acute myeloid
 leukaemia with myelodysplasia-related changes compared with conventional care
 regimens. BMC Cancer. 2017;17(1):852.
- Kantarjian HM, Thomas XG, Dmoszynska A, Wierzbowska A, Mazur G, Mayer J, et
 al. Multicenter, randomized, open-label, phase III trial of decitabine versus patient
 choice, with physician advice, of either supportive care or low-dose cytarabine for the
 treatment of older patients with newly diagnosed acute myeloid leukemia. J Clin
 Oncol. 2012;30(21):2670-7.
- 454 20. Medeiros BC, Satram-Hoang S, Hurst D, Hoang KQ, Momin F, Reyes C. Big data
 455 analysis of treatment patterns and outcomes among elderly acute myeloid leukemia
 456 patients in the United States. Ann Hematol. 2015;94(7):1127-38.
- 457 21. He P-F, Zhou J-D, Yao D-M, Ma J-C, Wen X-M, Zhang Z-H, et al. Efficacy and
 458 safety of decitabine in treatment of elderly patients with acute myeloid leukemia: A
 459 systematic review and meta-analysis. Oncotarget. 2017;8(25):41498-507.
- Bell JA, Galaznik A, Farrelly E, Blazer M, Murty S, Ogbonnaya A, et al. A
 retrospective study evaluating treatment patterns and survival outcomes in elderly
 patients with acute myeloid leukemia treated in the United States with either 7+3 or a
 hypomethylating agent. Leuk Res. 2019;78:45-51.
- Papageorgiou SG, Kotsianidis I, Bouchla A, Symeonidis A, Galanopoulos A, Viniou
 N-A, et al. Serum ferritin and ECOG performance status predict the response and
 improve the prognostic value of IPSS or IPSS-R in patients with high-risk
 myelodysplastic syndromes and oligoblastic acute myeloid leukemia treated with 5azacytidine: a retrospective analysis of the Hellenic national registry of
 myelodysplastic and hypoplastic syndromes. Ther Adv Hematol.
 2020;11:2040620720966121.

- 471 24. Dhakal P, Shostrom V, Al-Kadhimi ZS, Maness LJ, Gundabolu K, Bhatt VR.
 472 Usefulness of Charlson comorbidity index to predict early mortality and overall
 473 survival in older patients with acute myeloid leukemia. Clin Lymphoma Myeloma
 474 Leuk. 2020;20(12):804-12.e8.
- 475 25. Gbadamosi B, Ezekwudo D, Bastola S, Jaiyesimi I. Predictive and prognostic markers
 476 in adults with acute myeloid leukemia: A single-institution experience. Clin
 477 Lymphoma Myeloma Leuk. 2018;18(7):e287-e94.
- Papaemmanuil E, Gerstung M, Bullinger L, Gaidzik VI, Paschka P, Roberts ND, et al.
 Genomic classification and prognosis in acute myeloid leukemia. The New England
 journal of medicine. 2016;374(23):2209-21.
- 481 27. Chen Y, Yang T, Zheng X, Yang X, Zheng Z, Zheng J, et al. The outcome and
 482 prognostic factors of 248 elderly patients with acute myeloid leukemia treated with
 483 standard-dose or low-intensity induction therapy. Medicine (Baltimore).
 484 2016;95(30):e4182.
- 485 28. Lübbert M, Rüter BH, Claus R, Schmoor C, Schmid M, Germing U, et al. A
 486 multicenter phase II trial of decitabine as first-line treatment for older patients with
 487 acute myeloid leukemia judged unfit for induction chemotherapy. Haematologica.
 488 2012;97(3):393-401.
- 489 29. Yi HG, Lee MH, Kim CS, Hong J, Park J, Lee JH, et al. Clinical characteristics and
 490 treatment outcome of acute myeloid leukemia in elderly patients in Korea: A
 491 retrospective analysis. Blood Res. 2014;49(2):95-9.
- Wang RQ, Chen CJ, Jing Y, Qin JY, Li Y, Chen GF, et al. Characteristics and
 prognostic significance of genetic mutations in acute myeloid leukemia based on a
 targeted next-generation sequencing technique. Cancer Med. 2020;9(22):8457-67.
- 31. Roboz GJ, Wei AH, Ravandi F, Pocock C, Montesinos P, Dombret H, et al.
 Prognostic factors of overall (OS) and relapse-free survival (RFS) for patients with acute myeloid leukemia (AML) in remission after intensive chemotherapy (IC):
 Multivariate analyses from the QUAZAR AML-001 trial of oral azacitidine (Oral-AZA). J Clin Oncol. 2021;39(15_Suppl):7014.
- 500 32. Kim DS, Kang KW, Yu ES, Kim HJ, Kim JS, Lee SR, et al. Selection of elderly acute
 501 myeloid leukemia patients for intensive chemotherapy: effectiveness of intensive
 502 chemotherapy and subgroup analysis. Acta Haematol. 2015;133(3):300-9.
- Ma TT, Lin XJ, Cheng WY, Xue Q, Wang SY, Liu FJ, et al. Development and
 validation of a prognostic model for adult patients with acute myeloid leukaemia.
 EBioMedicine. 2020;62:103126.
- 506 34. Suvajdžić N, Cvetković Z, Dorđević V, Kraguljac-Kurtović N, Stanisavljević D,
 507 Bogdanović A, et al. Prognostic factors for therapy-related acute myeloid leukaemia
 508 (t-AML)--a single centre experience. Biomed Pharmacother. 2012;66(4):285-92.
- 509 35. Oh SB, Park SW, Chung JS, Lee WS, Lee HS, Cho SH, et al. Therapeutic decision510 making in elderly patients with acute myeloid leukemia: conventional intensive

511 512		chemotherapy versus hypomethylating agent therapy. Ann Hematol. 2017;96(11):1801-9.
513 514 515	36.	Choi EJ, Lee JH, Park HS, Lee JH, Seol M, Lee YS, et al. Decitabine versus intensive chemotherapy for elderly patients with newly diagnosed acute myeloid leukemia. Clin Lymphoma Myeloma Leuk. 2019;19(5):290-9.e3.
516 517 518 519	37.	Österroos A, Eriksson A, Antunovic P, Cammenga J, Deneberg S, Lazarevic V, et al. Real-world data on treatment patterns and outcomes of hypomethylating therapy in patients with newly diagnosed acute myeloid leukaemia aged \geq 60 years. Br J Haematol. 2020;189(1):e13-e6.
520 521 522 523	38.	Amadori S, Suciu S, Selleslag D, Aversa F, Gaidano G, Musso M, et al. Gemtuzumab ozogamicin versus best supportive care in older patients with newly diagnosed acute myeloid leukemia unsuitable for intensive chemotherapy: Results of the randomized phase III EORTC-GIMEMA AML-19 trial. J Clin Oncol. 2016;34(9):972-9.
524 525 526 527	39.	Cortes JE, Heidel FH, Hellmann A, Fiedler W, Smith BD, Robak T, et al. Randomized comparison of low dose cytarabine with or without glasdegib in patients with newly diagnosed acute myeloid leukemia or high-risk myelodysplastic syndrome. Leukemia. 2019;33(2):379-89.
528 529 530	40.	DiNardo CD, Pratz K, Pullarkat V, Jonas BA, Arellano M, Becker PS, et al. Venetoclax combined with decitabine or azacitidine in treatment-naive, elderly patients with acute myeloid leukemia. Blood. 2019;133(1):7-17.
531 532 533	41.	Lambert J, Pautas C, Terré C, Raffoux E, Turlure P, Caillot D, et al. Gemtuzumab ozogamicin for de novo acute myeloid leukemia: final efficacy and safety updates from the open-label, phase III ALFA-0701 trial. Haematologica. 2019;104(1):113-9.
534 535 536	42.	Ohanian M, Garcia-Manero G, Levis M, Jabbour E, Daver N, Borthakur G, et al. Sorafenib combined with 5-azacytidine in older patients with untreated FLT3-ITD mutated acute myeloid leukemia. Am J Hematol. 2018;93(9):1136-41.
537 538 539 540	43.	Pollyea DA, Tallman MS, de Botton S, Kantarjian HM, Collins R, Stein AS, et al. Enasidenib, an inhibitor of mutant IDH2 proteins, induces durable remissions in older patients with newly diagnosed acute myeloid leukemia. Leukemia. 2019;33(11):2575- 84.
541	Sup	porting information
542	S1 Ta	ble. Baseline comorbidities. Each patient can have multiple comorbidities. BSC, best
5.40		

- 543 supportive care; HMA, hypomethylating agent; LDAC, low-dose cytarabine. *Fisher exact
- 544 test; [†]Marked as 'Other' in case report form (disease not specified). *P* value indicates
- 545 statistical difference in a three-way comparison between BSC, HMA, and LDAC and other
- 546 systemic therapies.

5	1	7
J	4	1

347	
548	S2 Table. Baseline molecular profiling and cytogenetic risk. Percentages may total more
549	than 100% because multiselection was allowed. BSC, best supportive care; HMA,
550	hypomethylating agent; LDAC, low-dose cytarabine; NGS, next-generation sequencing.
551	*Chi-squared test; **Kruskal-Wallis test; *Percentages were calculated for each respective
552	treatment group using the number of patients with known mutation status from NGS or
553	targeted mutation testing; *Risk stratification according to the cytogenetic risk classification
554	described in S3 Table. P value indicates statistical difference in a three-way comparison
555	between BSC, HMA, and LDAC and other systemic therapies.
556	
557	S3 Table. Cytogenetic risk classification.
558	
559	S4 Table. Kaplan-Meier estimate for median OS by baseline clinical characteristics.
560	AML, acute myeloid leukemia; AML-MRC, AML with myelodysplasia-related changes;
561	BSC, best supportive care; CI, confidence interval; ECOG, Eastern Cooperative Oncology
562	Group; mo, months; NA, not applicable; NR, not reached; OS, overall survival. *Statistically
563	significant; †Risk stratification according to the cytogenetic risk classification described in S3
564	Table. The lower limit of the 95% CI is a closed interval (indicated by a square bracket)
565	whereas the upper limit of the 95% CI is an open interval (indicated by a round bracket).
566	
567	S5 Table. Kaplan-Meier estimate for median PFS by baseline clinical characteristics.
568	AML, acute myeloid leukemia; AML-MRC, AML with myelodysplasia-related changes;
569	BSC, best supportive care; CI, confidence interval; ECOG, Eastern Cooperative Oncology
570	Group; mo, months; NA, not applicable; NR, not reached; PFS, progression-free survival.
571	*Statistically significant; †Risk stratification according to the cytogenetic risk classification
572	described in S3 Table. The lower limit of the 95% CI is a closed interval (indicated by a

- 573 square bracket) whereas the upper limit of the 95% CI is an open interval (indicated by a
- 574 round bracket).
- 575
- 576 **S6 Table. Prognostic factors that affect PFS.** AML, acute myeloid leukemia; CI,
- 577 confidence interval; ECOG, Eastern Cooperative Oncology Group; HR, hazard ratio, PFS,
- 578 progression-free survival. *Statistically significant.
- 579
- 580 **S1 Fig. Patient disposition.** *Overlapping count.
- 581
- 582 S2 Fig. Overview of patients receiving first-line systemic therapies and BSC. BSC, best
- supportive care; $CA \pm G$, cytarabine and aclarubicin \pm granulocyte colony-stimulating factor
- 584 combination regimen; LDAC, low-dose cytarabine.
- 585

586 S3 Fig. Kaplan–Meier analysis of PFS in patients who received HMA, LDAC and other

- 587 systemic therapies, and BSC. BSC, best supportive care; CI, confidence interval; HMA,
- 588 hypomethylating agent; LDAC, low-dose cytarabine; mo, months; PFS, progression-free
- 589 survival. *Log-rank test by comparing between three groups; †Log-rank test by comparing
- 590 between every two groups; [‡]HMA vs BSC; [§]LDAC & other vs BSC; [¶]HMA vs LDAC &
- 591 other. Patients with missing data across all groups, n = 42.



Treatment	OS, median (95% CI), mo	P value*	P value⁺
HMA (n = 126)	8.07 (6.27–9.50)	0.40	0.17‡ 0.77§ 0.94¶
LDAC & other (n = 13)	7.57 (3.90–9.80)		
BSC (n = 18)	4.50 (2.93–11.83)		

Figure