LETTER TO THE EDITOR



Reduced bendamustine for elderly patients with follicular lymphoma

Yosuke Masamoto¹ · Arika Shimura¹ · Mineo Kurokawa^{1,2}

Received: 17 April 2021 / Accepted: 8 June 2021 / Published online: 21 June 2021 © The Author(s), under exclusive licence to Springer-Verlag GmbH Germany, part of Springer Nature 2021

Dear Editor,

As the outcome of follicular lymphoma (FL), the most common subtype of indolent non-Hodgkin's lymphoma, has been improved since the introduction of immunochemotherapy, non-lymphoma-related causes of death, including infections, have become increasingly important [1, 2]. Bendamustine is widely used as one of the key drugs of the standard therapy, and characterized by long-term lymphocytopenia as a frequent adverse event, rendering the patients especially vulnerable to various infections [2, 3]. During a pandemic of COVID-19, the use of bendamustine is not generally recommended due to its highly immunosuppressive property [4, 5]. However, it would be a serious matter that we cannot use one of the most potent therapeutic agents, while the mild epidemic is expected to continue for a long time. To mitigate the immunosuppression, we have reduced the dose of bendamustine to 2/3 for patients > 69 years old when we use obinutuzumab-bendamustine, one of the most potent therapy against both untreated and relapsed FL [2, 6]. In this study, we aimed to clarify the short-term outcome and toxicities of the reduced bendamustine.

We retrospectively analyzed the elecronic records of 18 untreated and 17 relapsed FL patients consecutively started on obinutuzumab-bendamustine at the Department of Hematology & Oncology, the University of Tokyo Hospital from January 2019 to December 2020, with initial lymphocyte counts of more than 500/µL. The baseline characteristics, frequency of adverse effects, and responses are summarized in Table 1. Baseline characteristics were not significantly different between full- and reduced-dose groups except for age. Most patients underwent bendamustine treatment without dose reduction from the original plan. The frequency of grade ≥ 3 non-hematological and grade 4 hematological adverse effects except lymphocytopenia did not differ (Table 1). The reduced-dose group experienced milder lymphocytopenia, as to lowest lymphocyte count (130 ± 70 vs $230 \pm 90/\mu$ L, p < 0.001), while the difference in duration of grade ≥ 3 lymphocytopenia was marginal (median 5.9 vs 2.0 months, p=0.183, Gray's test) (Table 1). Objective response rate and progression-free survival were not different (Table 1). There was no death in both groups (data not shown).

Compared to conventional cytotoxic therapy, little clinical data support the association of dose intensity of bendamustine with the patient outcome as well as toxicities [7–9]. Considering the lack of evidence, treatment decisions whether to use bendamustine and at what dose are difficult since bendamustine is associated with higher mortality in the case of COVID-19, despite its high efficacy [4]. Elderly patients in our cohort showed promising outcomes with a similar rate of toxicities except for lymphocytopenia. Our study had some limitations, in addition to the retrospective nature. A relatively small number of patients with shortterm observation periods were included. Our cohorts contain heterogeneous populations including newly diagnosed and relapsed patients, while the profile of response and adverse events was not different (data not shown). However, considering a dearth of evidence regarding optimal dose intensity for different populations, reduced bendamustine can be an attractive option for vulnerable patients, especially under a special condition where immunosuppression should be avoided to the maximum.

Mineo Kurokawa kurokawa-tky@umin.ac.jp

¹ Department of Hematology and Oncology, Graduate School of Medicine, The University of Tokyo, Tokyo, Japan

² Department of Cell Therapy and Transplantation Medicine, The University of Tokyo Hospital, Tokyo, Japan

Table 1 Characteristics of the patients

	Full-dose group		Reduce-dose group			
	n=18		n = 17		p value	
Baseline characteristics						
Age (median, range)	61	(37–69)	79	(71–86)	< 0.001	
Male gender	7	(38.9%)	9	(52.9%)	0.505	
Relapsed/refractory (R/R)	9	(50%)	8	(47.1%)	1.000	
Median prior regimens of R/R patients	1	(1-4)	1	(1–3)	1.000	
Days from diagnosis to treatment (median, range)	92	(8–2475)	61	(30–1966)	0.517	
Observation period (days) (median, range)	412	(92–799)	393	(195–731)	0.987	
FLIPI						
Low	1	(5.6%)	1	(5.9%)	0.324	
Intermediate	6	(33.3%)	2	(11.8%)		
High	11	(55.6%)	14	(82.4%)		
FLIPI2						
Intermediate	8 10	(44.4%)	5 12	(29.4%)	0.489	
High Treatment and adverse effects	10	(55.6%)	12	(70.6%)		
	5.00	(1, 71)	5 10	1 05	0.771	
Treatment cycles (mean, S.D.)	5.00	(1.71) 3.79	5.18 31.29	1.85 2.73	0.771	
Intervals between cycles (days) (mean, S.D.)	31.91				0.600 < 0.001	
Relative dose intensity of bendamustine (mean, S.D.)	0.87	(0.13)	0.60	(0.07)		
Lowest lymphocyte count (/ μ L) (mean, S.D.)	130	(90)	230	(70)	0.001	
Day to lymphocyte recovery to $500 / \mu L$ (median, range)	180	(14-424)	62	(0-503)	0.183	
Grade 4 lymphocytopenia	12	(66.7%)	1	(5.9%)	< 0.001	
Grade 4 neutropenia	3	(16.7%)	2	(11.8%)	1.000	
Grade 4 thrombocytopenia	0	(0%)	1	(5.9%)	0.486	
$Grade \ge 3$ non-hematological AEs	4	(22.2%)	3	(17.6%)	1.000	
Grade ≥ 3 infections	1	(5.6%)	1	(5.9%)	1.000	
Response						
СТ						
CR	5 10	(31.2%)	5	(31.2%)	1.000	
PR SD	0	(62.5%) (0%)	9 1	(56.2%) (6.2%)		
PD	1	(6.2%)	1	(6.2%)		
FDG-PET						
CMR	10	(90.9%)	8	(70.6%)	0.724	
PMR	0	(0%)	1	(9.1%)		
SMR	0	(0%)	1	(9.1%)		
PMR	1	(9.1%)	1	(9.1%)		
1-year progression-free survival rate (95% CI)	0.929	0.591-0.990	0.878	0.595-0.968	0.685	

Factors with p-value < 0.05 are indicated in bold

Declarations

Ethical approval All procedures performed in studies involving human participants were following the ethical standards of the institutional and/or national research committee and with the 1964 Helsinki declaration and its later amendments or comparable ethical standards.

Conflict of interest Yosuke Masamoto received lecture fees from Sym-Bio Pharmaceutical, Nippon Shinyaku, Eisai, and Chugai Pharmaceutical. Mineo Kurokawa received research funding from Chugai Pharmaceutical, Eisai, and Nippon Shinyaku. Mineo Kurokawa received the advisory fee from Chugai Pharmaceutica. Mineo Kurokawa received the lecture fee from Eisai, Chugai Pharmaceutical, and Nippon Shinyaku.

References

- Luminari S, Ferrari A, Manni M, Dondi A, Chiarenza A, Merli F, Rusconi C, Tarantino V, Tucci A, Vitolo U, Kovalchuk S, Angelucci E, Pulsoni A, Arcaini L, Angrilli F, Gaidano G, Stelitano C, Bertoldero G, Cascavilla N, Salvi F, Ferreri AJM, Vallisa D, Marcheselli L, Federico M (2018) Long-term results of the FOLL05 trial comparing R-CVP versus R-CHOP versus R-FM for the initial treatment of patients with advanced-stage symptomatic follicular lymphoma. J Clin Oncol 36(7):689–696. https://doi.org/10.1200/jco.2017.74.1652
- 2. Marcus R, Davies A, Ando K, Klapper W, Opat S, Owen C, Phillips E, Sangha R, Schlag R, Seymour JF, Townsend

W, Trněný M, Wenger M, Fingerle-Rowson G, Rufibach K, Moore T, Herold M, Hiddemann W (2017) Obinutuzumab for the first-line treatment of follicular lymphoma. N Engl J Med 377(14):1331–1344. https://doi.org/10.1056/NEJMoa1614598

- Rummel MJ, Niederle N, Maschmeyer G, Banat GA, von Grünhagen U, Losem C, Kofahl-Krause D, Heil G, Welslau M, Balser C, Kaiser U, Weidmann E, Dürk H, Ballo H, Stauch M, Roller F, Barth J, Hoelzer D, Hinke A, Brugger W (2013) Bendamustine plus rituximab versus CHOP plus rituximab as first-line treatment for patients with indolent and mantle-cell lymphomas: an open-label, multicentre, randomised, phase 3 non-inferiority trial. Lancet (London, England) 381(9873):1203–1210. https://doi.org/10.1016/s0140-6736(12)61763-2
- 4. Lamure S, Duléry R, Di Blasi R, Chauchet A, Laureana C, Deau-Fischer B, Drenou B, Soussain C, Rossi C, Noël N, Choquet S, Bologna S, Joly B, Kohn M, Malak S, Fouquet G, Daguindau E, Bernard S, Thiéblemont C, Cartron G, Lacombe K, Besson C (2020) Determinants of outcome in Covid-19 hospitalized patients with lymphoma: a retrospective multicentric cohort study. EClinicalMedicine 27:100549. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.eclinm.2020. 100549
- Percival M-EM, Lynch RC, Halpern AB, Shadman M, Cassaday RD, Ujjani C, Shustov A, Tseng YD, Liu C, Pergam S, Libby EN, Scott BL, Smith SD, Green DJ, Gopal AK, Cowan AJ (2020) Considerations for managing patients with hematologic malignancy during the COVID-19 pandemic: the Seattle strategy. JCO Oncology Practice 16(9):571–578. https://doi.org/10.1200/op.20.00241
- Sehn LH, Chua N, Mayer J, Dueck G, Trněný M, Bouabdallah K, Fowler N, Delwail V, Press O, Salles G, Gribben J, Lennard A, Lugtenburg PJ, Dimier N, Wassner-Fritsch E, Fingerle-Rowson

G, Cheson BD (2016) Obinutuzumab plus bendamustine versus bendamustine monotherapy in patients with rituximab-refractory indolent non-Hodgkin lymphoma (GADOLIN): a randomised, controlled, open-label, multicentre, phase 3 trial. Lancet Oncol 17(8):1081–1093. https://doi.org/10.1016/s1470-2045(16) 30097-3

- Tedeschi A, Picardi P, Ferrero S, Benevolo G, Margiotta Casaluci G, Varettoni M, Baratè C, Motta M, Gini G, Goldaniga MC, Visco C, Zaja F, Belsito Petrizi V, Ravelli E, Gentile M, Urbano MA, Franceschetti S, Ghione P, Orsucci L, Frustaci AM, Gaidano G, Vitolo U, Morra E (2015) Bendamustine and rituximab combination is safe and effective as salvage regimen in Waldenström macroglobulinemia. Leuk Lymphoma 56(9):2637–2642. https://doi.org/10.3109/10428194.2015. 1012714
- Bond DA, Huang Y, Ruppert AS, Walker AR, Dotson EK, Roddy J, Blum KA, Christian BA (2017) Retrospective analysis of bendamustine and rituximab use in indolent and mantle cell non-Hodgkin lymphoma based on initial starting dose. Leuk Lymphoma 58(7):1589–1597. https://doi.org/10.1080/10428194.2016.12538 35
- Yamasaki S, Matsushima T, Minami M, Kadowaki M, Takase K, Iwasaki H (2021) Clinical impact of bendamustine exposure on lymphocytopenia risk after bendamustine and rituximab combination therapy for follicular lymphoma: a single-institute retrospective study. Ann Hematol 1–3. https://doi.org/10.1007/ s00277-020-04388-6

Publisher's note Springer Nature remains neutral with regard to jurisdictional claims in published maps and institutional affiliations.