

AperTO - Archivio Istituzionale Open Access dell'Università di Torino

ABVD vs BEACOPP escalated in advanced-stage Hodgkin's lymphoma: Results from a multicenter European study

This is the author's manuscript

Original Citation:

Availability:

This version is available <http://hdl.handle.net/2318/1790895> since 2021-06-21T12:44:31Z

Published version:

DOI:10.1002/ajh.25871

Terms of use:

Open Access

Anyone can freely access the full text of works made available as "Open Access". Works made available under a Creative Commons license can be used according to the terms and conditions of said license. Use of all other works requires consent of the right holder (author or publisher) if not exempted from copyright protection by the applicable law.

(Article begins on next page)



**ABVD versus BEACOPP escalated in Advanced-Stage
Hodgkin's Lymphoma: results from a multicenter European
study**

Journal:	<i>American Journal of Hematology</i>
Manuscript ID	AJH-20-0207.R2
Wiley - Manuscript type:	Research Article
Date Submitted by the Author:	n/a
Complete List of Authors:	<p>Mondello, Patrizia; Memorial Sloan Kettering Cancer Center Caterina, Musolino; University of Messina, Internal Medicine - Division of Hematology Dogliotti, Irene; University of Turin Bohn, Jan-Paul; Medical University of Innsbruck, Internal Medicine V Cavallo, Federica; A.O.U. Città della Salute e della Scienza di Torino, Clinica Ematologica Ferrero, Simone; University of Torino, Department of Molecular Biotechnologies and Health Sciences Botto, Barbara; Azienda Ospedaliera Città della Salute e della Scienza, Cerchione, Claudio; Università degli Studi di Napoli Federico II Nappi, Davide; Università degli Studi di Napoli Federico II De Lorenzo, Sonia; Hematology and T.M.O.-A.O.R.N. "S. G. Moscati", Martinelli, Giovanni ; Istituto Scientifico Romagnolo per lo Studio e la Cura dei Tumori Wolf, Dominik; Medical University of Innsbruck, Internal Medicine V Schmitt, Clemens ; Kepler University Hospital GmbH Loseto, Giacomo; Hematology and Cell Therapy Unit - IRCCS Istituto Tumori "Giovanni Paolo II", Cuzzocrea, Salvatore; University of Messina, Biological and Environmental Sciences Willenbacher, Wolfgang ; Medical University of Innsbruck Mian, Michael; Hospital of Bolzano, Hematology & CBMT; Medical University of Innsbruck, Department of Hematology & Oncology Straus, David; Memorial Sloan-Kettering Cancer Center, Medicine</p>
Keywords:	ABVD, BEACOPP, Hodgkin Lymphoma, advanced-stage, first-line therapy

SCHOLARONE™
Manuscripts

1
2
3 **1 ABVD versus BEACOPP escalated in Advanced-Stage Hodgkin's Lymphoma:**
4
5 **2 results from a multicenter European study**
6

7 3 Patrizia Mondello MD, PhD, MSc^{1,2}, Caterina Musolino MD², Irene Dogliotti MD³, Jan-Paul Bohn
8 4 MD⁴, Federica Cavallo MD³, Simone Ferrero MD, PhD³, Barbara Botto MD⁵, Claudio Cerchione
9 5 MD, PhD⁶, Davide Nappi MD⁷, Sonya De Lorenzo MD⁸, Giovanni Martinelli MD⁶, Dominik Wolf
10 6 MD^{4,9}, Clemens Schmitt MD¹⁰, Giacomo Loseto MD¹¹, Salvatore Cuzzocrea MD, PhD¹²,
11 7 Wolfgang Willenbacher MD^{4,13}, Michael Mian MD^{14*}, David J Straus MD^{1*}
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19

20 9 ¹Department of Medicine, Memorial Sloan Kettering Cancer Center, New York, NY, USA

21
22 10 ²Department of Human Pathology, University of Messina, Messina, Italy

23
24 11 ³Hematology Division I, Department of Molecular Biotechnologies and Health Sciences,
25 12 University of Turin/AOU "Città della Salute e della Scienza di Torino", Turin, Italy

26
27 13 ⁴Department of Internal Medicine V, Medical University of Innsbruck, Innsbruck, Austria

28
29 14 ⁵Department of Hematology, "Città della Salute e della Scienza Torino", Turin, Italy

30
31 15 ⁶Hematology Unit, Istituto Scientifico Romagnolo per lo Studio e la Cura dei Tumori (IRST)
32 16 IRCCS, Meldola, Italy

33
34
35
36
37 17 ⁷Department of Medicine and Surgery, Hematology and Hematopoietic Stem Cell Transplant
38 18 Center, University of Naples Federico II, Naples, Italy

39
40
41 19 ⁸Hematology and T.M.O.-A.O.R.N. "S. G. Moscati", Avellino, Italy

42
43 20 ⁹Medical Clinic 3, University Hospital Bonn, Bonn, Germany

44
45 21 ¹⁰Kepler University Hospital GmbH, Linz, Austria

46
47 22 ¹¹Hematology and Cell Therapy Unit, IRCCS Cancer Institute "Giovanni Paolo II", Bari, Italy

48
49 23 ¹²Department of Chemical, Biological, Pharmaceutical and Environmental Sciences, University
50 24 of Messina, Messina, Italy

51
52
53 25 ¹³Oncotyrol, Center for Personalized Cancer Medicine, Innsbruck, Austria
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 1 ¹⁴Department of Haematology & CBMT, Central Hospital of Bolzano (SABES-ASDAA), Bolzano-
4
5 2 Bozen, Italy

6
7 3 *These Authors contributed equally
8
9 4

10
11 5 **Correspondence:**

12 6 Patrizia Mondello, MD, PhD, MSc
13
14 7 Advanced Oncology Fellow
15
16 8 Lymphoma Service,
17
18 9 Department of Medicine
19
20 10 Memorial Sloan Kettering Cancer Center,
21
22 11 1275 York Avenue, New York, NY 10065, USA
23
24 12 Phone: +1.917.353.5554
25
26 13 Assistant Professor
27
28 14 Department of Human Pathology, University of Messina,
29
30 15 Via Consolare Valeria, 98100 Messina, Italy
31
32 16 Phone: +39.347.400.8400,
33
34 17 e-mail: patriziamondello@hotmail.it
35
36 18 mondello@mskcc.org
37
38
39
40
41
42

43 20 **Running Title:** ABVD vs BEACOPP in Advanced Hodgkin Lymphoma

44
45 21 **Keywords:** ABVD, BEACOPP, Hodgkin Lymphoma, advanced-stage, first-line therapy
46
47 22

48
49 23 **Word count Abstract:** 250

50
51 24 **Word count Text:** 3,356

52
53 25 **Table count:** 2

54
55 26 **Figures count:** 2
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1 **References count: 35**

2

3 **Key Points:**

4 1. Although ABVD is associated with lower disease control than BEACOPP, it is better
5 tolerated and leads to a similar overall survival rate.

6 2. BEACOPP is associated with severe, early and late toxicities, which may impact
7 survival.

For Peer Review

1

2 **Abstract**

3 The optimal first-line treatment for advanced-stage Hodgkin's lymphoma (HL) is still a matter of
4 debate. While ABVD is less toxic and as effective as other more intensive chemotherapy
5 regimens, escalated BEACOPP (BEACOPPesc) is superior to ABVD for initial disease control
6 and prolonged time-to-relapse. However, this advantage is associated with higher rate of early
7 and late toxicities. As most of these data have been accumulated from clinical trials, a
8 retrospective analysis was conducted in a large database of patients treated outside clinical
9 trials to investigate the advantages and disadvantages of these regimes in a real-world setting.
10 From October 2009 to October 2018, 397 advanced-stage HL patients treated with either ABVD
11 or BEACOPPesc were retrospectively assessed in 7 European cancer centers (2 Austrian and 5
12 Italian centers). Complete metabolic remission (CMR) by PET was achieved in 76% and 85% of
13 patients in the ABVD and BEACOPPesc groups, respectively ($p=0.01$). Severe adverse events
14 occurred more frequently with BEACOPPesc than ABVD. At a median follow-up of 8 years, 9%
15 of the patients who achieved CMR after BEACOPPesc relapsed compared to 16.6% in the
16 ABVD group ($p= 0.043$). No statistical difference in progression free survival (PFS; $p=0.11$) was
17 observed between the two cohorts overall, but there was a trend towards a superior PFS in
18 high-risk patients treated with BEACOPPesc ($p=0.074$). Nevertheless, overall survival was
19 similar between the two groups ($p=0.94$). In conclusion, we confirm that ABVD is an effective
20 and less toxic therapeutic option for advanced-stage HL. Although BEACOPP results in better
21 initial tumor control, the long-term outcome remains similar between the two regimens.

22

23

1 Introduction

Hodgkin's lymphoma (HL) is a rare B-cell neoplasia accounting for about 11% of all newly diagnosed lymphomas in the Western World.¹ This disease has a bimodal distribution with an increased incidence in young adults as well as in patients 55 years and older.² The most commonly used first line treatment is ABVD (doxorubicin, bleomycin, vinblastine and dacarbazine).³ This regimen achieves remission in approximately 80% of patients with a relapse rate of about 25%.⁴ Approximately 50% of those who progress or relapse after first line therapy can still be cured by salvage treatments including high dose chemotherapy (HDCT) followed by autologous bone marrow transplant (ASCT).⁴ In the attempt to improve cure rate with front line treatment, several groups developed novel combinations. The alternating combinations of ABVD and MOPP and more intensive chemotherapy regimens were explored; however, treatment results were similar and toxicity higher than with ABVD alone.⁵⁻⁷ Subsequently, the German Hodgkin Study Group (GHSg) developed BEACOPPesc (escalated bleomycin, etoposide, doxorubicin, cyclophosphamide, vincristine, procarbazine and prednisone), an intensified front line regimen, which demonstrated better initial disease control and prolonged time to relapse as compared with ABVD.⁸ However, this advantage was associated with higher rates of severe hematologic toxicity, treatment-related deaths, secondary neoplasms and infertility.^{9,10} Four clinical trials have directly compared ABVD and BEACOPP and all demonstrated a lower relapse rate after treatment with BEACOPP, but no difference in survival rates between the two regimens in primary data analysis.^{9,11-13} Therefore, which regimen should be preferred as first line for advanced-stage HL has not been established yet.

Up to now, there has been no large real-world analysis comparing the efficacy and toxicity of these two regimens in advanced Hodgkin lymphoma outside of clinical trials. This is important because patients enrolled in clinical trials are often highly selected, and consequently may not reflect results in clinical practice. To shed some light on this open question we retrospectively assessed advanced HL patients treated with either ABVD or BEACOPPesc in

1 seven European cancer centers outside of clinical trials and compared efficacy, safety and long-
2 term outcome of both regimens in a real-life setting.

3 4 **2 Methods**

5 *2.1 Patients*

6 From October 2009 to October 2018, treatment results in patients with newly diagnosed HL
7 stage III-IV who received either ABVD or BEACOPPesc outside of clinical trials were
8 retrospectively assessed from 7 European cancer centers: 2 Austrian and 5 Italian centers.
9 Histologic diagnosis was performed according to World Health Organization criteria by an expert
10 pathologist at each participating center.¹⁴ All patients were ≥ 18 years or older. The clinical
11 stage of the disease was determined on the basis of a medical history and physical
12 examination; complete blood count; serum biochemical profile; chest radiography; computed
13 tomography of the chest, abdomen, and pelvis; positron-emission tomography (PET) with ¹⁸F-
14 fluorodeoxyglucose; and core biopsy of the iliac crest. To preserve fertility, ovarian stimulation
15 and cryopreservation of oocytes in females and sperm banking in males were performed before
16 the initiation of treatment. All patients were followed for disease progression/relapse, re-
17 treatment and death; all events were validated with medical records. The study was reviewed
18 and approved by the local ethics committees, and all patients provided written informed consent
19 before inclusion in the study. The study was conducted according to the Declaration of Helsinki.

20 21 *2.2 Treatment Plan*

22 First line treatment consisted of either six cycles of ABVD given every 4 weeks or six cycles of
23 BEACOPPesc given every three weeks, based on the physician's choice. For historical reasons,
24 the Austrian centers favored BEACOPPesc while the Italian ABVD. All patients underwent
25 routine inter-cycle hematological and biochemical evaluation. Starting within 1 month from the
26 end of chemotherapy, patients with residual metabolic active disease received high-energy

1 irradiation (30 Gy), with daily doses ranging between 1.5 and 1.8 Gy. The Deauville 5-point
2 scoring system was used for assessment of treatment response. Complete metabolic response
3 (CMR), partial metabolic response (PMR), no metabolic response (NMR) and progressive
4 metabolic disease (PMD) determined by PET were defined according to international
5 lymphoma consensus guidelines.^{15,16} PET response was evaluated in all patients after two
6 cycles of treatment (PET2) and at the end of treatment. Patients with an interim PET showing
7 NMR or PMD received alternative treatment: those in the ABVD group received BEACOPPesc
8 while those in the BEACOPPesc group underwent further salvage treatment in accordance with
9 local protocols. After completion of the first line therapy, patients were evaluated every 3 months
10 during the first year, every 6 months from the second year through the fifth year after the
11 completion of treatment, and annually thereafter. All patients were evaluated for toxicity
12 according to the National Cancer Institute's Common Toxicity Criteria (NCI-CTC).

13 All patients who progressed or relapsed after a CMR were treated according to a salvage
14 chemotherapy program consisting of a reinduction regimen of multiple cycles of DHAP
15 (cisplatin, cytosine arabinoside and dexamethasone) or ifosfamide-containing therapy followed
16 by one high-dose course of autologous hematopoietic stem-cell-supported BEAM (carmustine,
17 etoposide, cytarabine and melphalan).

19 *2.3 Statistical Analysis*

20 The χ^2 test was performed to assess the significance of differences between categorical
21 variables. PFS and OS were defined according to Cheson¹⁵ and plotted as curves using the
22 Kaplan-Meier method. Statistical analyses were performed with MedCalc (version 11.0;
23 MedCalc Software, Ostend, Belgium, <http://www.medcalc.org>) and GraphPad Prism (version
24 5.0; Graph-Pad, San Diego, CA, <http://www.graphpad.com>). All tests were two-sided. The limit
25 of significance for all analyses was defined as $p < 0.05$.

1

2 **3 Results**3 *3.1 Patient Characteristics at Start of Treatment*

4 A total of 397 consecutive patients were included in the study. One-hundred and twenty-one
5 patients were treated with BEACOPPesc and 276 with ABVD (**Supplemental Table 1**). The
6 baseline characteristics of the two groups did not differ significantly (**Table 1**). Overall, the
7 median age at time of diagnosis was 37 years (range, 19-75). A male predominance was
8 observed (n=269, 67.7%). Most patients had nodular sclerosing subtype (n=302, 76%), B
9 symptoms (n=219, 55.1%) and elevated erythrocyte sedimentation rate (ESR, n=226, 56.9%).
10 Only a minority had bulky disease (n=86, 21.6%), defined as a tumor mass of >7 cm¹⁷, and a
11 mediastinal mass (n=66, 16.6%). A lower proportion of patients with low international prognostic
12 score (IPS 0-1) received BEACOPPesc compared with ABVD (12.4% vs 28.3% respectively; p=
13 0.041), while no differences were observed in the other IPS groups.

14

15 *3.2 Treatment Response*

16 After two cycles of treatment, a CMR was achieved in 69% of the ABVD group and in 78% of
17 the BEACOPPesc group (p= 0.003), respectively. Seventy-two (25.6%) of the ABVD group
18 achieved a PMR, 4 (1.4%) an NMR and 11 (4%) had a PMD. In contrast, 17 of the patients in
19 the BEACOPPesc group had a PMR (14%), 6 progressed (5%) and another 4 (3%) interrupted
20 therapy because of life-threatening toxicity. Patients with NMR or PMD at interim PET were
21 escalated to BEACOPPesc or received salvage treatment if they were previously treated with
22 ABVD (n=15) or BEACOPPesc (n=10), respectively. At the end of the therapy, CMR was 76% in
23 the ABVD group and 85% in the BEACOPPesc group (p= 0.01). A total of 20% of patients in the
24 ABVD group and 14% of patients in the BEACOPPesc group received consolidation involved
25 field radiotherapy to residual metabolic active disease at the dose of 30Gy. After radiotherapy,
26 the number of patients with CMR increased to 81% and 90% in the two groups, respectively (p=

1 0.021). All patients that failed to respond or progressed at end of treatment PET received a
2 salvage regimen followed by HDCT with autologous hematopoietic stem-cell support.
3 Forty-two patients (35%) in the BEACOPPesc group required chemotherapy dose reduction due
4 to toxicity compared to 14 patients (5%; $p = <0.001$) in the ABVD group. Overall, the rate of
5 severe toxicities was higher in the BEACOPPesc group in comparison with the ABVD cohort.
6 There was a significant increased frequency of acute grade 3-4 hematologic adverse events in
7 the BEACOPPesc group as compared with the group treated with ABVD (neutropenia 61% vs
8 24%, $p < 0.001$; anemia 29% vs 4%, $p < 0.001$; thrombocytopenia 29% vs 3%, $p < 0.001$), febrile
9 neutropenia (29% vs 3%, $p < 0.001$) and severe infections (18% vs 3%, $p = 0.002$). Myeloid
10 growth factors were administered to 85% of patients in the BEACOPPesc group compared with
11 59% in the ABVD group ($p = 0.01$). **Figure 1** Blood transfusions were required in 41% of patients
12 in the BEACOPPesc group compared with 6% in the ABVD cohort ($p = < 0.001$). No case of
13 death due to acute treatment-related toxicity was registered in either group.

15 3.3 Follow-up

16 Progression during or shortly after treatment occurred in 6 patients in the BEACOPPesc group
17 (4.9%) and in 16 patients in the ABVD group (5.8%; $p = 0.71$). During the median follow-up
18 period of 8.7 years (range, 6.5-10.6 years), 10 out of 109 patients who achieved a CMR after
19 BEACOPPesc relapsed (9%) compared to 37 of 223 patients in the ABVD group (16.6%; $p =$
20 0.043). However, no statistical difference in 8-year PFS rate was observed between the
21 BEACOPPesc and ABVD cohorts (**Figure 2A**, 80% vs 75%; $p = 0.11$) irrespective of PET2 status
22 (**Supplemental Figure 1A-B**, 84% vs 80%; $p = 0.42$ in PET2-negative patients and 69% vs
23 63.5%; $p = 0.12$ in PET2-positive patients treated with BEACOPPesc and ABVD, respectively).
24 The baseline international prognostic score (IPS < 3 vs ≥ 3)¹⁸ predicted a trend towards higher
25 PFS for the high-risk group treated with BEACOPPesc as compared with ABVD (**Supplemental**
26 **Figure 2A-B**, 81% vs 72%; $p = 0.074$). However, there was no difference in 8-year OS rate

1
2
3 1 between the two treatment groups (**Figure 2B**; 90% vs 87%; $p=0.94$) irrespective of PET2
4
5 2 status (**Supplemental Figure 1C-D**, 93.7% vs 91%; $p=0.86$ in PET2-negative patients and 77%
6
7 3 vs 78.8%; $p=0.61$ in PET2-positive patients treated with BEACOPPesc and ABVD, respectively)
8
9 4 or IPS risk score (**Supplemental Figure 2C-D**, 85% vs 83%; $p=0.81$ in IPS <3 patients and
10
11 5 77% vs 79%; $p=0.94$ in IPS ≥ 3 patients in the BEACOPPesc and ABVD group, respectively).
12
13 6 During the follow-up period, secondary malignancies were observed in 5.8% of the patients
14
15 7 treated with BEACOPPesc compared to less than 1% of those who received ABVD. The median
16
17 8 time from the end of treatment to diagnosis of second malignancy was 80 months (range, 3-115
18
19 9 months). All patients treated with BEACOPPesc who developed second malignancies were in
20
21 10 first remission, while the ones in the ABVD cohort received second line therapy followed by
22
23 11 autologous transplant. In particular, three patients in the BEACOPPesc group developed
24
25 12 myelodysplasia and one acute leukemia. Second solid tumors developed in two patients in the
26
27 13 ABVD group (one lung cancer and one breast cancer) and seven in the BEACOPPesc group
28
29 14 (four breast cancer, one lung cancer, one melanoma and one thyroid cancer). **Table 2** Four of
30
31 15 these 9 patients received radiotherapy as part of their initial treatment, with tumor development
32
33 16 within or close to the irradiated field (one lung and one breast cancer in ABVD group, and one
34
35 17 lung and one thyroid cancer in the BEACOPPesc cohort).
36
37
38
39
40

41 **4 Discussion**

42
43 20 The preferred treatment for advanced Hodgkin's lymphoma has been a matter of discussion for
44
45 21 three decades. Four international clinical trials addressed this important question by directly
46
47 22 comparing ABVD and BEACOPPesc.^{9,11-13} All of them demonstrated the superiority of
48
49 23 BEACOPP in achieving disease control; however, this benefit did not translate into long term
50
51 24 advantage due to a higher rate of late major events, particularly second malignancies, which led
52
53 25 to treatment-related patient deaths and ultimately comparable survivals to ABVD.^{9,10,12,13} Hence,
54
55 26 a balance between efficacy and toxicity should be considered in selecting the first line treatment
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 1 for these patients. Since a real-world analysis was lacking, we retrospectively assessed a large
4
5 2 European cohort of advanced stage HL patients who underwent either ABVD or BEACOPP
6
7 3 outside of clinical trials. This study provides real-world data confirming that ABVD is better
8
9 4 tolerated and has similar survival rate as BEACOPPesc as previously reported in published
10
11 5 clinical trials.

12
13
14 6 The main limitations of this study were the retrospective rather than prospective analysis
15
16 7 and lack of central review of the diagnostic pathology and PET images. The strengths of this
17
18 8 analysis were the relative long follow-up and the uniform treatment in a multicenter setting
19
20 9 although patients were treated outside a clinical trial.

21
22 10 Patient characteristics at the time of diagnosis were comparable between both treatment
23
24 11 groups and similar to those of other published cohorts^{9,12,13,19}. As expected, a lower proportion of
25
26 12 patients with IPS 0-1 received BEACOPPesc compared to ABVD (12.4% vs 28.3%,
27
28 13 respectively; $p=0.041$). For historical reasons, BEACOPP was the preferred first line regimen in
29
30 14 the Austrian centers compared to the Italian ones (80.2% vs 19.2%). This different therapeutic
31
32 15 preference among centers may actually be an advantage as a similar patient population was
33
34 16 treated with either regimen. In the present analysis, the response rate of patients who received
35
36 17 BEACOPPesc was superior to those who received ABVD (85% vs 76%, $p=0.01$). Interestingly,
37
38 18 the rate of patients with disease progression and interruptions for life threatening toxicity was
39
40 19 high in the BEACOPPesc group (8%) relative to 5.4% of NMR/PMD with ABVD. Our results are
41
42 20 in line with three prospective studies using the same treatment program, which obtained a
43
44 21 complete response rate between 85-96% and 73-85% in the BEACOPPesc and ABVD groups,
45
46 22 respectively.^{8,9,13} However, EORTC 20012 and HD2000 failed to show a difference in CR^{11,12}
47
48 23 between the two regimens probably due to the poor tolerance of the BEACOPPesc regimen
49
50 24 which ultimately led to dose reduction or treatment discontinuation. Indeed, the high activity of
51
52 25 BEACOPPesc is associated with severe acute hematologic and non-hematologic toxicities. In
53
54 26 our study 93% of patients who underwent this intensive treatment regimen experienced at least
55
56
57
58
59
60

1 one severe acute toxic effect, most commonly myelosuppression and febrile neutropenia. This
2 translated into superior costs for growth factor and antibiotic use, supportive measures and
3 hospitalization, and led to the permanent discontinuation in 4 cases. These results are
4 comparable to those of the four prospective trials where severe hematologic toxicity was also
5 the most frequent adverse event.^{9,12,13,19} Considering the young age of patients with HL, even
6 more important is the long-term toxicity associated with BEACOPP, which ultimately affects
7 overall survival related to the higher incidence of second malignancies with BEACOPPesc
8 compared with ABVD. In our study the rate of secondary malignancy was 5.8% in the patients
9 treated with BEACOPPesc. Similarly, the GHSG H9, HD12 and HD2000 trials reported a
10 cumulative risk for second malignancies between 4.9% and 6.5%.^{8,10,20}

11 Previous studies showed a superior PFS at 5 years in patients treated with BEACOPP
12 compared to ABVD^{11,13}; however this advantage was lost with a longer observation time^{9,10}.
13 Similarly, we did not observe difference in long-term outcomes between the two regimens
14 irrespective of the International Prognostic Score and PET2 status. One explanation may be the
15 high efficacy of salvage therapies after ABVD. Another explanation might be the higher
16 incidence of secondary malignancies in patients treated with BEACOPP, which is consistent
17 with previous reports^{10,12}. It should also be noted that despite its historical importance, IPS has
18 lost its prognostic value in the modern era using PET-guided therapy.²⁹ Nevertheless, it is also
19 possible that a larger study may have captured the difference between the two treatment
20 groups. In addition, our study used 6 cycles of BEACOPPesc while 4 cycles has become the
21 standard in PET2-negative patients since 2018.²¹ This PET-adapted treatment led to less
22 severe acute toxicities, and ultimately to a slightly superior 5-year OS compared with the
23 extended treatment (97.7% vs 95.4%); however, the incidence of second malignancies did not
24 differ between the two treatment groups (3.3% vs 3.8%; $p=0.37$)²¹, suggesting the need for a
25 longer observation period for occurrence of further second malignancies to confirm the small
26 survival advantage. It is known that the addition of radiotherapy to chemotherapy increases the

1
2
3 1 risk of secondary malignancies. However, in our study a similar number of patients in either
4
5 2 treatment group received additional radiation therapy for residual disease. In contrast to our
6
7 3 data, the HL9 trial demonstrated a superior 10-year OS for BEACOPPesc compared with
8
9 4 COPP/ABVD, which has similar survival to ABVD²². It should be noted that this was an
10
11 5 unplanned secondary late analysis and not the primary endpoint of the trial. It should also be
12
13 6 noted that survival has improved with ABVD in recent retrospective analyses outside of a clinical
14
15 7 trial setting.²³ Although a meta-analysis from the GHSG group comparing BEACOPP and
16
17 8 ABVD showed a 10% OS benefit favoring BEACOPP²⁴, these results were reported after only 5
18
19 9 years of follow-up, and 10-year results are needed to observe long-term toxicities and
20
21 10 consequent loss of survival advantage.

22
23
24 11 Achieving high cure rates while lowering early and late treatment-related toxicity remains
25
26 12 a challenge for patients with advanced-stage Hodgkin's lymphoma. The use of functional
27
28 13 imaging with PET early in the course of therapy offers a way to make treatment adjustment
29
30 14 based on response to therapy. Recent studies have showed that excellent results can be
31
32 15 achieved by using PET2 to modulate therapy, with escalation for those with an unsatisfactory
33
34 16 response and de-escalation for those with chemosensitive disease.²⁵⁻²⁸ Such an approach
35
36 17 would spare the 70% of patients destined to be cured by ABVD from receiving the more toxic
37
38 18 BEACOPP regimen, and avoid prolonged exposure to BEACOPP to those who do not need it.
39
40 19 The RATHL (Response-Adapted Therapy in Advanced-Stage Hodgkin Lymphoma) trial showed
41
42 20 that in PET2-negative patients the bleomycin-deleted AVD was as good as ABVD, hence
43
44 21 reducing lung toxicity, with a 3-year PFS of 86%. In those who were PET2-positive after two
45
46 22 cycles of ABVD, switching to BEACOPPesc seemed to improve outcomes, with a 3-year PFS
47
48 23 rate of 71.1% and OS rate of 82.8%.²⁵ In support of the predictive power of PET in this setting,
49
50 24 the Italian GITIL0607 study showed that PET2-negative patients treated with continued ABVD
51
52 25 regimen reached a 3-year PFS of 87%. In this trial, the randomization of PET2-negative patients
53
54 26 to receive or not RT did not show a PFS advantage.³⁰ However, in our study the outcome of
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 1 PET2-negative patients is more disappointing than the 2 larger studies with an 8-year PFS of
4
5 2 84% and 80% ($p=0.42$) in the two treatment cohorts. Our data are in line with the SWOG0816
6
7 3 trial which reported a 5-year PFS of only 74% for PET2-negative patients who received 6 cycles
8
9 4 of ABVD.³¹ The longer follow-up of our analysis and of the SWOG trial might be explanatory of
10
11 5 the difference to the 2 previous studies. Indeed, toxicity related deaths occur more frequently
12
13 6 beyond 3 years after chemotherapy. To further argue against the predictive power of PET, the
14
15 7 HD18 trial showed that the two arms of patients with advanced Hodgkin lymphoma who were
16
17 8 PET2-positive after 2 cycles of BEACOPPesc and continued to a total of six/eight cycles
18
19 9 reported 5-year PFS rates of 89.7% and 88.1%, respectively. No significant differences in PFS
20
21 10 ($p= 0.30$) and OS ($p= 0.49$) were observed between PET2-positive and PET2-negative
22
23 11 patients.²¹

24
25
26 12 Several efforts have been made to incorporate novel molecules into the backbone of the
27
28 13 two first line regimens to improve efficacy of ABVD and decrease toxicity of BEACOPP.
29
30 14 Recently, Brentuximab vedotin (BV), an anti-CD30 antibody-drug conjugate, has shown
31
32 15 remarkable activity in Hodgkin lymphoma.³² In an attempt to improve efficacy of ABVD, the
33
34 16 ECHELON-1 phase III trial evaluated a modified variant which replaced bleomycin with BV (A-
35
36 17 AVD) in advanced Hodgkin lymphoma patients. The 2-year modified PFS rate favored A-AVD
37
38 18 (82.1% vs 77.2%, $p= 0.004$),³³ leading to the FDA approval of this new combination. However,
39
40 19 the study has not yet showed a benefit in overall survival since the number of events has not
41
42 20 been reached. Similarly, two modified BEACOPP variants incorporating BV were compared in a
43
44 21 randomized phase II trial.³⁴ One of these variants, BrECADD (BV, etoposide,
45
46 22 cyclophosphamide, doxorubicin, dacarbazine, and dexamethasone) seems to be less toxic and
47
48 23 highly active and is currently compared to BEACOPPesc in the GHSG phase III HD21 trial
49
50 24 (NCT02661503). In addition, there are the promising immune checkpoint inhibitors which have
51
52 25 demonstrated impressive activity in Hodgkin lymphoma.³⁵ These molecules have become

1
2
3 1 crucial in the therapeutic armament of HL and currently are evaluated as part of first line
4
5 2 treatment (NCT03907488).
6

7 3 In conclusion, our study confirms that ABVD is an effective and well tolerated regimen
8
9 4 with similar survival rate as BEACOPPesc and supports its role as first line in advanced-stage
10
11 5 Hodgkin patients, irrespective of the IPS. However, the therapeutic horizon of Hodgkin
12
13 6 lymphoma is likely to change in the near future with a new generation of drugs that will
14
15 7 increasingly modify or even replace standard chemotherapies. This approach may eventually
16
17 8 supplant both ABVD and BEACOPPesc.
18
19

20 9

21
22 10 .
23

24 11 **Acknowledgements**

25
26 12 This article did not receive any specific grant from any funding agency in the public, commercial,
27
28 13 or not-for-profit sector
29

30 14

31 15 **Author Contributions**

32
33 16 PM designed and wrote the project, analyzed the data, reviewed the literature and wrote the
34
35 17 paper, CM, ID, JPB, FC, SF, BB, CC, DN, SDL, GM, CS, GL, SC collected the data, WD, WW,
36
37 18 MM and DJS revised the paper, all the authors approved it.
38
39

40 19

41 20 **Conflict of Interest**

42
43 21 PM, CM, ID, J-PB, FC, BB, CC, DN, SDL, GM, WD, GL, SC and DJS have no financial
44
45 22 disclosure. SF and MM have received honoraria from Mundipharma, WW has received
46
47 23 honoraria and research funding from Mundipharma and Roche.
48
49

50 24

51 25

52 26

1 References

1. Siegel RL, Miller KD, Jemal A. Cancer statistics, 2016. *CA Cancer J Clin.* 2015;66(1):n/a-n/a. doi:10.3322/caac.21332
2. Glaser SL, Jarrett RF. The epidemiology of Hodgkin's disease. *Baillieres Clin Haematol.* 1996;9(3):401-416. doi:10.1016/s0950-3536(96)80018-7
3. Bonadonna G, Viviani S, Bonfante V, Gianni AM, Valagussa P. Survival in Hodgkin's disease patients--report of 25 years of experience at the Milan Cancer Institute. *Eur J Cancer.* 2005;41(7):998-1006. doi:10.1016/j.ejca.2005.01.006
4. Evens AM, Hutchings M, Diehl V. Treatment of Hodgkin lymphoma: the past, present, and future. *Nat Clin Pract Oncol.* 2008;5(9):543-556. doi:10.1038/ncponc1186
5. Longo DL, Glatstein E, Duffey PL, et al. Alternating MOPP and ABVD chemotherapy plus mantle-field radiation therapy in patients with massive mediastinal Hodgkin's disease. *J Clin Oncol.* 1997;15(11):3338-3346. doi:10.1200/JCO.1997.15.11.3338
6. Gobbi PG, Pieresca C, Federico M, et al. MOPP/EBV/CAD hybrid chemotherapy with or without limited radiotherapy in advanced or unfavorably presenting Hodgkin's disease: a report from the Italian Lymphoma Study Group. *J Clin Oncol.* 1993;11(4):712-719. doi:10.1200/JCO.1993.11.4.712
7. Gobbi PG, Pieresca C, Ghirardelli ML, et al. Long-term results from MOPPEBVCAD chemotherapy with optional limited radiotherapy in advanced Hodgkin's disease. *Blood.* 1998;91(8):2704-2712. <http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/9531579>. Accessed October 11, 2019.
8. Engert A, Diehl V, Franklin J, et al. Escalated-Dose BEACOPP in the Treatment of Patients With Advanced-Stage Hodgkin's Lymphoma: 10 Years of Follow-Up of the GHSG HD9 Study. *J Clin Oncol.* 2009;27(27):4548-4554. doi:10.1200/JCO.2008.19.8820
9. Viviani S, Zinzani PL, Rambaldi A, et al. ABVD versus BEACOPP for Hodgkin's Lymphoma When High-Dose Salvage Is Planned. *N Engl J Med.* 2011;365(3):203-212.

- 1
2
3 1 doi:10.1056/NEJMoa1100340
4
5 2 10. Merli F, Luminari S, Gobbi PG, et al. Long-Term Results of the HD2000 Trial Comparing
6
7 3 ABVD Versus BEACOPP Versus COPP-EBV-CAD in Untreated Patients With Advanced
8
9 4 Hodgkin Lymphoma: A Study by Fondazione Italiana Linfomi. *J Clin Oncol*.
10
11 5 2016;34(11):1175-1181. doi:10.1200/JCO.2015.62.4817
12
13 6 11. Federico M, Luminari S, Iannitto E, et al. ABVD Compared With BEACOPP Compared
14
15 7 With CEC for the Initial Treatment of Patients With Advanced Hodgkin's Lymphoma:
16
17 8 Results From the HD2000 Gruppo Italiano per lo Studio dei Linfomi Trial. *J Clin Oncol*.
18
19 9 2009;27(5):805-811. doi:10.1200/JCO.2008.17.0910
20
21 10 12. Carde P, Karrasch M, Fortpied C, et al. Eight Cycles of ABVD Versus Four Cycles of
22
23 11 BEACOPP_{escalated} Plus Four Cycles of BEACOPP_{baseline} in Stage III to IV, International
24
25 12 Prognostic Score ≥ 3 , High-Risk Hodgkin Lymphoma: First Results of the Phase III
26
27 13 EORTC 20012 Intergroup Trial. *J Clin Oncol*. 2016;34(17):2028-2036.
28
29 14 doi:10.1200/JCO.2015.64.5648
30
31 15 13. Mounier N, Brice P, Bologna S, et al. ABVD (8 cycles) versus BEACOPP (4 escalated
32
33 16 cycles ≥ 4 baseline): final results in stage III-IV low-risk Hodgkin lymphoma (IPS 0-2) of
34
35 17 the LYSA H34 randomized trial†. *Ann Oncol*. 2014;25(8):1622-1628.
36
37 18 doi:10.1093/annonc/mdu189
38
39 19 14. Swerdlow SH, Campo E, Pileri SA, et al. The 2016 revision of the World Health
40
41 20 Organization classification of lymphoid neoplasms. *Blood*. 2016;127(20):2375-2390.
42
43 21 doi:10.1182/blood-2016-01-643569
44
45 22 15. Cheson BD, Pfistner B, Juweid ME, et al. Revised response criteria for malignant
46
47 23 lymphoma. *J Clin Oncol*. 2007;25(5):579-586. doi:10.1200/JCO.2006.09.2403
48
49 24 16. Cheson BD, Fisher RI, Barrington SF, et al. Recommendations for Initial Evaluation,
50
51 25 Staging, and Response Assessment of Hodgkin and Non-Hodgkin Lymphoma: The
52
53 26 Lugano Classification. *J Clin Oncol*. 2014;32(27):3059-3067.
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

- 1
2
3 1 doi:10.1200/JCO.2013.54.8800
4
5 2 17. Kumar A, Burger IA, Zhang Z, et al. Definition of bulky disease in early stage Hodgkin
6
7 3 lymphoma in computed tomography era: prognostic significance of measurements in the
8
9 4 coronal and transverse planes. *Haematologica*. 2016;101(10):1237-1243.
10
11 5 doi:10.3324/haematol.2016.141846
12
13 6 18. Hasenclever D, Diehl V. A prognostic score for advanced Hodgkin's disease. *N Engl J*
14
15 7 *Med*. 1998;339(21):1506-1514. doi:10.1056/NEJM199811193392104
16
17 8 19. Federico M, Luminari S, Iannitto E, et al. ABVD Compared With BEACOPP Compared
18
19 9 With CEC for the Initial Treatment of Patients With Advanced Hodgkin's Lymphoma:
20
21 10 Results From the HD2000 Gruppo Italiano per lo Studio dei Linfomi Trial. *J Clin Oncol*.
22
23 11 2009;27(5):805-811. doi:10.1200/JCO.2008.17.0910
24
25 12 20. Borchmann P, Haverkamp H, Diehl V, et al. Eight cycles of escalated-dose BEACOPP
26
27 13 compared with four cycles of escalated-dose BEACOPP followed by four cycles of
28
29 14 baseline-dose BEACOPP with or without radiotherapy in patients with advanced-stage
30
31 15 hodgkin's lymphoma: final analysis of the HD12 trial of the German Hodgkin Study
32
33 16 Group. *J Clin Oncol*. 2011;29(32):4234-4242. doi:10.1200/JCO.2010.33.9549
34
35 17 21. Borchmann P, Goergen H, Kobe C, et al. PET-guided treatment in patients with
36
37 18 advanced-stage Hodgkin's lymphoma (HD18): final results of an open-label, international,
38
39 19 randomised phase 3 trial by the German Hodgkin Study Group. *Lancet (London,*
40
41 20 *England)*. 2018;390(10114):2790-2802. doi:10.1016/S0140-6736(17)32134-7
42
43 21 22. Canellos GP, Anderson JR, Propert KJ, et al. Chemotherapy of Advanced Hodgkin's
44
45 22 Disease with MOPP, ABVD, or MOPP Alternating with ABVD. *N Engl J Med*.
46
47 23 1992;327(21):1478-1484. doi:10.1056/NEJM199211193272102
48
49 24 23. Moccia AA, Donaldson J, Chhanabhai M, et al. International prognostic score in
50
51 25 advanced-stage Hodgkin's lymphoma: Altered utility in the modern era. *J Clin Oncol*.
52
53 26 2012;30(27):3383-3388. doi:10.1200/JCO.2011.41.0910
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

- 1
2
3 1 24. Skoetz N, Trelle S, Rancea M, et al. Effect of initial treatment strategy on survival of
4
5 2 patients with advanced-stage Hodgkin's lymphoma: A systematic review and network
6
7 3 meta-analysis. *Lancet Oncol*. 2013;14(10):943-952. doi:10.1016/S1470-2045(13)70341-3
8
9 4 25. Johnson P, Federico M, Kirkwood A, et al. Adapted Treatment Guided by Interim PET-CT
10
11 5 Scan in Advanced Hodgkin's Lymphoma. *N Engl J Med*. 2016;374(25):2419-2429.
12
13 6 doi:10.1056/NEJMoa1510093
14
15 7 26. Press OW, Li H, Schöder H, et al. US Intergroup Trial of Response-Adapted Therapy for
16
17 8 Stage III to IV Hodgkin Lymphoma Using Early Interim Fluorodeoxyglucose–Positron
18
19 9 Emission Tomography Imaging: Southwest Oncology Group S0816. *J Clin Oncol*.
20
21 10 2016;34(17):2020-2027. doi:10.1200/JCO.2015.63.1119
22
23 11 27. Casasnovas O, Brice P, Bouabdallah R, et al. Randomized Phase III Study Comparing
24
25 12 an Early PET Driven Treatment De-Escalation to a Not PET-Monitored Strategy in
26
27 13 Patients with Advanced Stages Hodgkin Lymphoma: Interim Analysis of the AHL2011
28
29 14 Lysa Study. *Blood*. 2015;126(23). [http://www.bloodjournal.org/content/126/23/577?sso-](http://www.bloodjournal.org/content/126/23/577?sso-checked=true)
30
31 15 checked=true. Accessed November 9, 2018.
32
33 16 28. Engert A, Haverkamp H, Kobe C, et al. Reduced-intensity chemotherapy and PET-guided
34
35 17 radiotherapy in patients with advanced stage Hodgkin's lymphoma (HD15 trial): a
36
37 18 randomised, open-label, phase 3 non-inferiority trial. *Lancet*. 2012;379(9828):1791-1799.
38
39 19 doi:10.1016/S0140-6736(11)61940-5
40
41 20 29. Bari A, Marcheselli R, Sacchi S, et al. The classic prognostic factors in advanced
42
43 21 Hodgkin's lymphoma patients are losing their meaning at the time of Pet-guided
44
45 22 treatments. *Ann Hematol*. 2020;99(2):277-282. doi:10.1007/s00277-019-03893-7
46
47 23 30. Gallamini A, Tarella C, Viviani S, et al. Early Chemotherapy Intensification With Escalated
48
49 24 BEACOPP in Patients With Advanced-Stage Hodgkin Lymphoma With a Positive Interim
50
51 25 Positron Emission Tomography/Computed Tomography Scan After Two ABVD Cycles:
52
53 26 Long-Term Results of the GITIL/FIL HD 0607 Trial. *J Clin Oncol*. 2018;36(5):454-462.
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

- 1
2
3 1 doi:10.1200/JCO.2017.75.2543
4
5 2 31. Stephens DM, Li H, Schöder H, et al. Five-year follow-up of SWOG S0816: limitations
6 and values of a PET-adapted approach with stage III/IV Hodgkin lymphoma. *Blood*.
7 3
8 and values of a PET-adapted approach with stage III/IV Hodgkin lymphoma. *Blood*.
9 4
10 2019;134(15):1238-1246. doi:10.1182/blood.2019000719
11 5 32. Younes A, Gopal AK, Smith SE, et al. Results of a Pivotal Phase II Study of Brentuximab
12 Vedotin for Patients With Relapsed or Refractory Hodgkin's Lymphoma. *J Clin Oncol*.
13 6
14 Vedotin for Patients With Relapsed or Refractory Hodgkin's Lymphoma. *J Clin Oncol*.
15 7
16 2012;30(18):2183-2189. doi:10.1200/JCO.2011.38.0410
17 8 33. Connors JM, Jurczak W, Straus DJ, et al. Brentuximab Vedotin with Chemotherapy for
18 Stage III or IV Hodgkin's Lymphoma. *N Engl J Med*. 2018;378(4):331-344.
19 9
20 Stage III or IV Hodgkin's Lymphoma. *N Engl J Med*. 2018;378(4):331-344.
21 doi:10.1056/NEJMoa1708984
22 10
23 doi:10.1056/NEJMoa1708984
24 11 34. Eichenauer DA, Plütschow A, Kreissl S, et al. Incorporation of brentuximab vedotin into
25 first-line treatment of advanced classical Hodgkin's lymphoma: final analysis of a phase 2
26 12
27 first-line treatment of advanced classical Hodgkin's lymphoma: final analysis of a phase 2
28 13
29 randomised trial by the German Hodgkin Study Group. *Lancet Oncol*. 2017;18(12):1680-
30 14
31 1687. doi:10.1016/S1470-2045(17)30696-4
32 15 35. Ansell SM, Lesokhin AM, Borrello I, et al. PD-1 blockade with nivolumab in relapsed or
33 refractory Hodgkin's lymphoma. *N Engl J Med*. 2015;372(4):311-319.
34 16
35 refractory Hodgkin's lymphoma. *N Engl J Med*. 2015;372(4):311-319.
36 17
37 doi:10.1056/NEJMoa1411087
38
39 18
40
41 19
42
43 20
44
45 21
46 22
47 23
48 24
49 25
50 26
51 27
52 28
53 29
54 30
55 31
56
57
58
59
60

1 **Figure Legends**

2 **Figure 1. Severe hematologic toxicities.** Bar graph showing the frequency of acute grade 3-4
3 hematologic adverse events that occurred in advanced-stage Hodgkin's lymphoma patients
4 treated with either BEACOPPesc (black) or ABVD (gray). Differences between groups were
5 calculated with the Student *t* test. ** $p=0.002$; *** $p<0.001$.

6
7 **Figure 2.** Kaplan-Meier analysis of progression-free survival (**A**; $p=0.11$) and overall survival (**B**;
8 $p=0.94$) for advanced-stage Hodgkin's lymphoma patients treated with either BEACOPP
9 escalated (black) or ABVD (gray). BEACOPP, bleomycin, etoposide, doxorubicin,
10 cyclophosphamide, vincristine, procarbazine and prednisone; ABVD, doxorubicin, bleomycin,
11 vinblastine and dacarbazine.

12 **Supplemental Figure Legends**

13
14 **Supplemental Figure 1.** Kaplan-Meier analysis of progression-free survival and overall survival
15 in PET2-negative (**A-C**) and PET2-positive (**B-D**) advanced-stage Hodgkin's lymphoma patients
16 treated with either BEACOPP escalated (black) or ABVD (gray). BEACOPP, bleomycin,
17 etoposide, doxorubicin, cyclophosphamide, vincristine, procarbazine and prednisone; ABVD,
18 doxorubicin, bleomycin, vinblastine and dacarbazine.

19
20 **Supplemental Figure 2.** Kaplan-Meier analysis of progression-free survival and overall survival
21 in advanced-stage Hodgkin's lymphoma patients with International Prognostic Score <3 (**A-C**)
22 and ≥ 3 (**B-D**) who were treated with either BEACOPP escalated or ABVD. BEACOPP,
23 bleomycin, etoposide, doxorubicin, cyclophosphamide, vincristine, procarbazine and
24 prednisone; ABVD, doxorubicin, bleomycin, vinblastine and dacarbazine; IPS, International
25 Prognostic Score.
26

Table 1. Baseline patient characteristics

	BEACOPPesc (n=121)		ABVD (n=276)		p-value
	n	%	n	%	
Age					
Median, years	37	N.A.	36.5	N.A.	N.A
>50 years (EORTC)	24	19.8	60	21.7	0.42
>60 years	4	3.3	11	4	0.77
Sex					
Female	29	24	99	35.8	0.06
Male	92	76	177	64.1	0.08
Hodgkin subtype					
Nodular sclerosing	91	75.2	211	76.4	0.77
Mixed cellularity	20	16.5	42	15.2	0.54
Lymphocytes depleted	9	7.4	21	7.6	0.82
Lymphocytes rich	1	0.9	2	0.8	0.88
B-Symptoms	72	59.5	147	53.2	0.23
Bone marrow involvement	20	16.5	25	9.0	0.08
Bulky disease (> 7cm)	25	20.6	61	22.1	0.11
Mediastinal mass	18	14.8	48	17.4	0.37
Elevated LDH	44	36.4	97	35.1	0.83
Elevated B2M	31	25.6	60	21.7	0.28
Elevated ESR	70	57.8	156	56.5	0.77
Hb < 10.5 g/dL	28	23.1	55	19.9	0.09
WBC > 15,000/mm³	25	20.6	64	23.2	0.43
Lymphocytes <600/mm³	15	12.4	33	11.9	0.75
Monocytes >900/mm³	13	10.7	31	11.2	0.41
PLT <150,000	8	6.6	11	4.0	0.09
Albumin <4 g/dL	28	23.1	57	20.6	0.18
Stage					
III	59	48.8	139	50.3	0.11
IV	62	51.2	137	49.7	0.15
ECOG					
0-1	99	81.8	198	71.7	0.062
>1	22	18.2	78	28.2	0.065
International Prognostic Score (IPS)					
0-1	15	12.4	78	28.3	0.041
2-3	52	43	103	37.3	0.071
4-7	54	44.6	95	34.4	0.065

Abbreviations: ABVD, doxorubicin, bleomycin, vinblastine and dacarbazine; BEACOPPesc, escalated bleomycin, etoposide, doxorubicin, cyclophosphamide, vincristine, procarbazine and prednisone; LDH, lactate dehydrogenase; B2M, Beta2 microglobulin; ESR, erythrocyte sedimentation rate; Hb, hemoglobin; WBC, white blood count; PLT, platelet.

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

Figure 1




Figure 1. Severe hematologic toxicities. Bar graph showing the frequency of acute grade 3-4 hematologic adverse events that occurred in advanced-stage Hodgkin’s lymphoma patients treated with either BEACOPPesc (black) or ABVD (gray). Differences between groups were calculated with the Student t test. ** p= 0.002; *** p< 0.001.

190x254mm (96 x 96 DPI)

Figure 2




Figure 2. Kaplan-Meier analysis of progression-free survival (A; $p=0.11$) and overall survival (B; $p=0.94$) for advanced-stage Hodgkin's lymphoma patients treated with either BEACOPP escalated (black) or ABVD (gray). BEACOPP, bleomycin, etoposide, doxorubicin, cyclophosphamide, vincristine, procarbazine and prednisone; ABVD, doxorubicin, bleomycin, vinblastine and dacarbazine.

190x254mm (96 x 96 DPI)

Table 2. Secondary Malignancies by treatment group.

Secondary Malignancy	BEACOPPesc (n=121)	ABVD (n=276)
Lung cancer	1	1
Breast cancer	4	1
Thyroid cancer	1	-
Melanoma	1	-
Myelodysplasia	3	-
Acute leukemia	1	-

Abbreviations: BEACOPPesc, escalated bleomycin, etoposide, doxorubicin, cyclophosphamide, vincristine, procarbazine, and prednisone; ABVD, doxorubicin, bleomycin, vinblastine, and dacarbazine.

For Peer Review