

Since January 2020 Elsevier has created a COVID-19 resource centre with free information in English and Mandarin on the novel coronavirus COVID-19. The COVID-19 resource centre is hosted on Elsevier Connect, the company's public news and information website.

Elsevier hereby grants permission to make all its COVID-19-related research that is available on the COVID-19 resource centre - including this research content - immediately available in PubMed Central and other publicly funded repositories, such as the WHO COVID database with rights for unrestricted research re-use and analyses in any form or by any means with acknowledgement of the original source. These permissions are granted for free by Elsevier for as long as the COVID-19 resource centre remains active.



Biology of Blood and Marrow Transplantation



journal homepage: www.bbmt.org

Breif Articles

Hematopoietic Cell Transplantation with Cryopreserved Grafts for Severe Aplastic Anemia



Mary Eapen^{1,2,*}, Mei-Jie Zhang^{1,3}, Xiao-Ying Tang¹, Stephanie J. Lee⁴, Ming-Wei Fei¹, Hai-lin Wang¹, Kyle M. Hebert¹, Mukta Arora⁵, Saurabh Chhabra^{1,2}, Steven M. Devine⁶, Mehdi Hamadani^{1,2}, Anita D'Souza^{1,2}, Marcelo C. Pasquini^{1,2}, Rachel Phelan^{1,7}, J. Douglas Rizzo^{1,2}, Wael Saber^{1,2}, Bronwen E. Shaw^{1,2}, Daniel J Weisdorf⁵, Mary M. Horowitz^{1,2}

¹ Center for International Blood and Marrow Transplant Research, Department of Medicine, Medical College of Wisconsin, Milwaukee, Wisconsin

² Division of Hematology-Oncology, Department of Medicine, Medical College of Wisconsin, Milwaukee, Wisconsin

³ Division of Biostatistics, Institute for Health and Equity, Medical College of Wisconsin, Milwaukee, Wisconsin

⁴ Fred Hutchinson Cancer Research Center, University of Washington, Seattle, Washington

⁵ Division of Hematology-Oncology, University of Minnesota, Minneapolis, Minnesota

⁶ National Marrow Donor Program/Be The Match, Minneapolis, Minnesota

⁷ Division of Hematology-Oncology, Department of Pediatrics, Medical College of Wisconsin, Milwaukee, Wisconsin

Article history: Received 22 April 2020 Accepted 28 April 2020

Keywords: Cryopreserved graft Severe aplastic anemia

ABSTRACT

With the COVID-19 pandemic and the ensuing barriers to the collection and transport of donor cells, it is often necessary to collect and cryopreserve grafts before initiation of transplantation conditioning. The effect on transplantation outcomes in nonmalignant disease is unknown. This analysis examined the effect of cryopreservation of related and unrelated donor grafts for transplantation for severe aplastic anemia in the United States during 2013 to 2019. Included are 52 recipients of cryopreserved grafts who were matched for age, donor type, and graft type to 194 recipients who received noncryopreserved grafts. Marginal Cox regression models were built to study the effect of cryopreservation and other risk factors associated with outcomes. We recorded higher 1-year rates of graft failure (hazard ratio [HR], 2.26; 95% confidence interval, 1.17 to 4.35; P = .01) and of 1-year overall mortality (HR, 3.13; 95% Cl, 1.60 to 6.11; P = .0008) after transplantation of cryopreserved differ between the 2 groups. Adjusted probabilities of 1-year survival were 73% (95% Cl, 60% to 84%) in the cryopreserved graft group and 91% (95% Cl, 86% to 94%) in the noncryopreserved grafts group. These data support the use of noncryopreserved grafts whenever possible in patients with severe aplastic anemia.

© 2020 American Society for Transplantation and Cellular Therapy. Published by Elsevier Inc.

INTRODUCTION

The emergence of coronavirus disease 2019 (COVID-19) as a global pandemic has triggered an unprecedented worldwide healthcare crisis. It also has impacted the world economy and disrupted travel across international borders and within countries. These travel restrictions, combined with potentially reduced HCT donor availability (due to infection, quarantine,

https://doi.org/10.1016/j.bbmt.2020.04.027

and constraints on travel to collection centers) and complex allograft processing logistics (eg, donor assessment, collection, on-schedule delivery for fresh infusion), directly impact the ability to infuse fresh donor cells into intended recipients on the scheduled day of transplantation. Consequently, the American Society for Transplantation and Cellular Therapy (ASTCT) [1] and the National Marrow Donor Program/Be The Match (NMDP) [2] have issued strong recommendations that unrelated donor products should be delivered and cryopreserved at transplantation centers before the initiation of patient conditioning. The NMDP now requires that grafts be delivered and cryopreserved at the transplantation center before the initiation of a transplantation conditioning regimen for any patient scheduled for unrelated donor hematopoietic cell transplantation (HCT) in the absence of unique considerations [2]. Many transplantation centers also have instituted a similar practice

Financial disclosure: See Acknowledgments on page e165.

^{*}Correspondence and reprint requests: Mary Eapen, MBBS, MS, Center for International Blood and Marrow Transplant Research, Department of Medicine, Medical College of Wisconsin, 9200 West Wisconsin Ave, Suite C5, Milwaukee, WI 53226.

E-mail address: meapen@mcw.edu (M. Eapen).

^{1083-8791/© 2020} American Society for Transplantation and Cellular Therapy. Published by Elsevier Inc.

for related donor HCT, given that related donors face many of the same issues as unrelated donors.

The use of cryopreserved grafts provides increased flexibility and has been sporadic over the last several decades, although to our knowledge the practice has been ad hoc [3]. Several reports have examined the effect of transplantation of cryopreserved grafts for hematologic malignancies, including a study published very recently by the Center for International Blood and Marrow Transplant Research (CIBMTR), in response to the need for information during the COVID-19 pandemic; none showed a difference in survival [4-7]. To our knowledge, there are no reports of outcomes after transplantation of cryopreserved related or unrelated donor grafts for nonmalignant hematologic diseases. Thus, the current analysis was undertaken to inform clinical practice for transplantation for severe aplastic anemia, a common nonmalignant indication for HCT.

METHODS Patients

Patients with severe aplastic anemia who underwent HCT between 2013 and 2019 in the United States were identified from the CIBMTR database. Donors included HLA-matched siblings, haploidentical relatives, and HLAmatched and HLA-mismatched unrelated adults who donated bone marrow or peripheral blood. Recipients of cord blood transplants were excluded, because all cord blood units are cryopreserved. The patients were followed longitudinally until death or loss to follow-up. Patients or their legal guardians provided written informed consent for the study. The NMDP's Institutional Review Board approved this study.

Endpoints

The primary outcome was 1-year survival. Death from any cause was considered an event, and surviving patients were censored at 1 year or earlier for follow-up of <1 year. Neutrophil recovery was defined as the first of 3 consecutive days with an absolute neutrophil count (ANC) \geq .5 × 10⁹/L, and platelet recovery was defined as a platelet count \geq 20 × 10⁹/L without transfusion for 7 days. Graft failure was defined as failure to achieve ANC \geq .5 × 10⁹/L or a decline in ANC to <.5 × 10⁹/L without recovery after having achieved an ANC \geq .5 × 10⁹/L, or myeloid donor chimerism (<5%), or second HCT [8]. Other outcomes studied were grade II-IV acute graft-versus-host disease (GVHD) and chronic GVHD, graded using standard criteria [9,10].

Statistical Analysis

Fifty-two patients (cases) who underwent transplantation with a cryopreserved graft were matched on age (\leq 17, 18 to 39, and \geq 40 years) [11,12], donor type (HIA-matched sibling, haploidentical relative, and HIA-matched or HIA-mismatched unrelated donor) [12,13], and graft type (bone marrow or peripheral blood) [14,15] to 195 controls identified from a pool of 979 patients who underwent HCT during the same period with a noncryopreserved graft. Forty-five cases were matched to 4 controls, 2 cases were matched to 3 controls, 4 cases were matched to 2 controls, and 1 case was matched to 1 control.

To study the effect of cryopreserved grafts compared with noncryopreserved grafts, (matched-pair) marginal Cox regression models were built and adjusted for sex, cytomegalovirus serostatus, performance score, comorbidity score, and donor-recipient ABO blood group match [16]. All variables met the assumptions for proportional hazards. Results are expressed as hazard ratio (HR) with 95% confidence interval (CI). Adjusted probabilities for outcomes of interest were generated from the marginal Cox model [17,18]. The level of significance was set at $P \le 0.01$ (2-sided), in consideration of the multiple comparisons. Analyses were done using SAS version 9.4 (SAS Institute, Cary, NC).

RESULTS

Patients and Transplantation Characteristics

The characteristics of the treatment groups matched for age, donor type, and graft type are shown in Table 1 [11-15]. Females were more likely to receive cryopreserved grafts, but other characteristics, such as recipient cytomegalovirus serostatus, performance score, comorbidity index, donor-recipient ABO blood group match, transplantation conditioning regimen, and GVHD prophylaxis were similar in the 2 treatment groups. Although the total nucleated cell (TNC) doses of harvested bone marrow were similar in the 2 groups, the TNC dose infused differed, with recipients of cryopreserved bone marrow grafts receiving significantly lower cell doses (Table 1). The difference between cell dose at harvest and infusion was statistically significant (P = .0008; paired t test). CD34 doses for peripheral blood grafts were not significantly different between cryopreserved and noncryopreserved grafts (Table 1). The median duration of follow-up of surviving cases and controls was 35 months (range 6 to 74 months) and 26 months (range, 5 to 76 months), respectively.

Hematopoietic Recovery

We did not record a statistically significant difference in day +28 neutrophil recovery between the cryopreserved and noncryopreserved groups (83% [95% CI, 71% to 92%] versus 91% [95% CI, 86% to 94%]; P = .17). The corresponding incidences of day +100 platelet recovery were 91% (95% CI, 79% to 98%) and 90% (95% CI, 86% to 94%) (P = .89). In multivariate analysis, the rates of neutrophil recovery (HR, .76; 95% CI, .54 to 1.08; P = .13) and platelet recovery (HR, .77; 95% CI, .57 to 1.04; P = .08) were lower in the cryopreserved group, but the difference did not reach statistical significance. However, the risk of 1-year graft failure was significantly higher in the cryopreserved group (HR, 2.26; 95% CI, 1.17 to 4.35; P = .01) (Figure 1A). Graft failure was primary for 7 patients in the cryopreserved group and for 8 patients in the noncryopreserved group. Three patients in the cryopreserved group and 11 patients in the noncryopreserved group developed secondary graft failure. The likelihood of hematopoietic recovery and risk for graft failure were adjusted for sex, recipient cytomegalovirus serostatus, performance score, comorbidity index, and blood group ABO match.

Acute and Chronic GVHD

We did not observe any significant between-group differences in grade II-IV acute GVHD (HR, .93; 95% Cl, .41 to 2.13; P = .87) or chronic GVHD (HR, .79; 95% Cl, .41 to 1.50; P = .46). The day +100 incidence of grade II-IV acute GVHD after transplantation was 12% (95% Cl, 5% to 22%) in the cryopreserved group and 13% (95% Cl, 8% to 18%) in the noncryopreserved group (P = .94). The corresponding incidences of 1-year chronic GVHD were 23% (95% Cl, 12% to 37%) and 28% (95% Cl, 21% to 35%), respectively (P = .49).

Overall Survival

One-year mortality was higher in the cryopreserved group compared with the noncryopreserved group (HR, 3.31; 95% CI, 1.60 to 6.11; P = .0008), after adjusting for sex, recipient cytomegalovirus serostatus, performance score, comorbidity index, and blood group ABO match. The adjusted 1-year probability of overall survival was 73% (95% CI, 60% to 84%) in the cryopreserved group and 91% (95% CI, 86% to 94%) in the noncryopreserved group (Figure 1B). We also evaluated mortality risks without censoring at 1-year post-transplantation and observed similar HRs of mortality after transplantation of cryopreserved products. A subset analysis limited to 19 cryopreserved peripheral blood transplant recipients and 63 controls also showed a higher rate of graft failure (HR, 2.98, 95% CI, .92 to 9.64; *P* = .06) and higher mortality (HR, 3.84; 95% CI, 1.44 to 10.21; P = .007) with cryopreservation. Seventeen patients (17 of 52; 33%) died after transplantation of cryopreserved grafts. Primary disease was reported as the predominant cause of death (13 of 17; 76%); other causes of death included GVHD (n = 2), infection (n = 1), and hemorrhage (n = 1). Thirty-three patients (33 of 194; 17%) died after transplantation of noncryopreserved grafts. Primary disease was also reported as the predominant cause of death in this group (24 of 33; 73%); other

 Table 1

 Patient and Transplantation Characteristics

Number1995252Age, yr, undiancage)12149(20)13430(20)36Age 13-39, undiancage)17140(20)13120(20)37Age 13-39, undiancage)13120(20)3131Age 13-39, undiancage)13120(20)3131Age 13-39, undiancage)1315(20)312(20)31Age 13-39, undiancage)1315(20)3131Sex makefmake, all136(20)3131Sex makefmake, all136(20)3131Sex makefmake, all136(20)3131Sex makefmake, all136(20)3131Sex makefmake, all136(20)3131Sex makefmake, all136(20)3131Sex makefmake, all34(3)3131Sex makefmake, all35(10)3131Sex makefmake, all35(11)3131Sex makefmake, all313131Sex makefmake, all313131Sex makefmake, all313131Sex makefmake, all313131Sex makefmake, all	Characteristic	Controls (Noncryopreserved Graft)	Cases (Cryopreserved Graft)	P Value
Age. ray. ancian (range)122 (407)215 (540)96Age: 197, n(3)142 (237)132 (237)37Age: 207, n(3)145 (559)0 (41)22 (242)0 (58)17Sex. nuclemater, n(3)112 (56)31 (60)7Sex. nuclemater, n(3)116 (70)44 (65)7Sex. nuclemater, n(3)116 (70)44 (65)7Sex. nuclemater, nucle	Number	195	52	
Age 11-39 m (3)177.40021.40095Age 13-39 m (3)1723718.25313125Age 249 m (3)115.59.80(4)22.1230(58)31Performance men (13)121.60011.00012.05390 0061.3119.127590 0061.3119.127530061.3119.127523061.3119.127523156.70034.655523159.70044.655523159.70042.813523159.70042.813524157.70042.813519.000 rope, 63'10.101519.000 rope, 63'10.101519.000 rope, 63'10.10110.10119.000 rope, 63'10.10110.10119.000 rope, 63'10.10110.10110.10119.000 rope, 63'10.10110.101 </td <td>Age, yr, median (range)</td> <td>22 (4-67)</td> <td>21 (5-64)</td> <td>.96</td>	Age, yr, median (range)	22 (4-67)	21 (5-64)	.96
Age 43 syr.n (x) 72.371 18.43. 5 Age 43 syr.n (x) 46.271 11.259.	Age 1-17 yr, n (%)	77 (40)	21 (40)	.95
Age Ady p. (1) 13 (2) 13 (2) 25 Sex malg/make n(h) 125 (598) (4) 22 (2)20 (58) .03 Performance sore, n(3) 10 (13) 14 (157) .72 90-100 .61 (31) 14 (157) .72 .60 .61 (31) 14 (157) .72 .60 .63 (2) .24 (2) .55 .22 .55 (30) 16 (70) .34 (65) .72 .53 .55 (30) 10 (19) .72 .72 Positive .58 (30) 10 (19) .72 .72 Positive .58 (30) 10 (19) .72 .74 Positive .52 (2) (3) .82 (3) .74 (3) .74 Positive .52 (3) .62 (3) .74 (4) .72 (4) .74 (4) .74 (4) .74 (4) .74 (4) .74 (4) .74 (4) .74 (4) .74 (4) .74 (4) .74 (4) .74 (4) .74 (4) .74 (4) .74 (4) .74 (4) .74 (4) .74 (4) .74 (4) .74 (4) .7	Age 18-39 yr, n (%)	72 (37)	18 (35)	
Sex malfemale.n (T)115.598,00 (1)22 (23)0.08).01Performance score.n (3)128.66)31 (60).2290-10061 (31)10 (37)Self or (3)61 (3)10 (37)Self or (3)61 (3)10 (37)Self or (3)34 (65)2.2136 (70)34 (65)2.359 (30)18 (15)Self or (3)21 (10)Positive58 (30)10 (19)Positive137 (70)42 (81)Positive137 (70)42 (81)HA-matched sibling79 (41)21 (41)HA-matched sibling79 (41)16 (31)HA-matched sibling63 (32)16 (37)HA-matched murchat31 (16)6 (11)Matched63 (32)16 (37)Matched sibling79 (41)21 (41)Natched sibling67 (21)6 (11)Natched sibling67 (21)6 (11)Natched sibling67 (21)6 (11)Natched sibling67 (21)6 (11)Natched sibling67 (21)10 (21)Natched sibling67 (21)6 (11)Natched sibling67 (21)11 (21)Natched sibling67 (21)6 (11)Natched sibling79 (21)11 (21)Natched	Age \geq 40 yr, n (%)	46 (23)	13 (25)	
preformance some n(3) Decomposing Display Display <thdisplay< th=""> Display Displa</thdisplay<>	Sex, male/female, n (%)	115 (59)/80 (41)	22 (42)/30 (58)	.03
99-100128(6)51(60)100_28061(31)19(17)	Performance score, n (%)			.72
±8019(37)19(37)19(37)Not reported6(3)2(3)3Somobidity screen (E)136 (70)44 (63)13±2159 (70)14 (53)132359 (30)16 (53)13System (E)58 (30)10 (19)13Pestive137 (70)42 (31)9Ponor type, (18)?177 (70)42 (31)9Ponor type, (18)?21 (41)21 (41)14HA-matched sinling27 (14)7 (14)14HA-matched motiated64 (33)16 (31)16 (31)HA-matched motiated63 (32)19 (37)86Matched53 (16)61 (13)16 (13)16 (13)HA-matched motiated22 (11)61 (13)16 (13)16 (13)Moor mismatch22 (11)61 (13)16 (13)16 (13)Moor mismatch22 (11)61 (13)16 (13)16 (13)Moor mismatch22 (11)61 (12)16 (13)16 (13)Moor mismatch22 (11)61 (12)16 (13)16 (13)Moor mismatch22 (11)11 (21)16 (13)16 (13)Moor mismatch13 (16)11 (21)16 (13)16 (14)Moor misma	90-100	128 (66)	31 (60)	
Not reported6(3)2(3)2Comorbidity score, n(3)53-2136(70)34 (65)-356 (30)18 (13)Cytomegalovirus scrotatus, n(3)63 (30)10 (19)Cytomegalovirus scrotatus, n(3)10Positive53 (30)10 (19)Positive53 (30)10 (19)Positive137 (70)42 (81)Danor type, n(2)'79 (41)21 (41)Likh-hapiohemical25 (13)81 (15)Hikh-antiched surelated27 (14)71 (40)Hikh-antiched surelated27 (14)71 (41)Bout recipient AB0 match, n(2)19 (37)86Matched63 (12)19 (37)Matched numbrated27 (14)21 (14)Matched numbrated27 (14)21 (14)Matched numbrate13 (16)61 (11)Matched numbrateh21 (11)21 (14)Matched numbrateh21 (11)21 (14)Matched numbrateh21 (11)12 (14)Matched numbrateh21 (11)12 (14)Matched numbrateh13 (16)61 (11)Matched numbrateh13 (16)11 (12)Matched numbrateh13 (16)11 (21)Matched numbrateh13 (16)11 (21)Matched numbrateh13 (19)81 (15)Matched numbrateh13 (19)12 (11)Matched numbrateh13 (19)12 (11)Matched numbrateh13 (19)12 (11)Matched numbrateh13 (19)13 (19)Matched n	<u>≤</u> 80	61 (31)	19 (37)	
Communitary scene, n(3)Image and the second scene of the seco	Not reported	6(3)	2(3)	
s2136(70)34(65):>3S9(30)18(35)Cytnegalovirus senotatus, n(X)1NegativeS8(30)10(19)Positive13(70)42(81)Positive137(70)42(81)Diver (Vpc, n(X))27(41)21(41)HA-natched sbling27(14)21(41)HA-hatched sbling27(14)7(14)HA-hatched unclated27(13)8(15)HA-mismatched unclated63(32)19(37)Matched63(32)19(37)Matched63(32)19(37)Matched nuclated27(14)6(11)Not reported79(41)21(41)Not reported6111Not reported31(16)6(11)Not reported59(30)11(21)Not reported42(2)3(6)Not reported42(2)3(6)Not reported10(1)1(2)Ru<(y + ATG	Comorbidity score, n (%)			.55
>3 99(30) 18 (5) .13 Cytomeglavirus senstatus, n(3)	<u>≤2</u>	136(70)	34 (65)	
cynonegaborins sensiatus, n(%)	≥3	59 (30)	18 (35)	
Negative58(30)10(19)1Positive137(70)42(81)7Boor type, r(3)"777HA-matched sibling79(41)21(41)7HA-haplodentical25(13)8(15)7HA-matched unrelated64(33)16(31)7IHA-matched unrelated63(32)19(37)7Matched63(2)19(37)7Matched63(12)16(11)7Matched79(41)21(41)7Minor mismatch22(11)6(11)7Not reported79(41)21(41)7Conditioning regimen, n(3)"11(21)1010Not reported59(30)11(21)10Sy +ATG42(2)3(6)1110Pin +Cy +ATG18(9)6(12)1010Sy +ATG11(1)1(2)1010Sy +ATG1011(2)1010Sy +ATG +TBI(200 Cy)38(19)8(15)10Cy +ATG +TBI(200 Cy)38(19)33(64)10Sy +ATG +TBI(200 Cy)132(68)33(64)10Sy +ATG +TBI(200 Cy)0112210Sy +ATG +TBI(200 Cy)33(4)1010Sy +ATG +TBI(200 Cy)33(64)5(9)11Sy +ATG +TBI(200 Cy)33(64)5(9)11Sy +ATG +TBI(200 Cy)33(64)5(9)11Sy +ATG +TBI(200 Cy)33(10)1010Sy +ATG +TBI(200 Cy)33(20)33(64)	Cytomegalovirus serostatus, n (%)			.13
Positive137(0)42(81)	Negative	58 (30)	10 (19)	
Domorype, n (S)* 97 HAA-hapledentical 79 (41) 21 (41) HAA-hapledentical 25 (13) 8 (15) HAA-matched unrelated 64 (33) 16 (31) Donor-recipient ABO match, n (2) 9 (17) 86 Matched 63 (12) 19 (17) 86 Minor mismatch 22 (11) 6 (11) 1 Not reported 79 (41) 21 (41) 6 Ounditioning regimen, n (2) 1 1121 1 Not reported 59 (30) 11 (21) 1 Q+ ATG 18 (9) 6 (12) 1 1 Bul(2y ± ATG 11 (1) 1 (2) 1 1 Q+ ATG 18 (9) 8 (15) 1 1 Bul(2y ± ATG 10 (2) 1 1 1 1 Q+ ATG + TB (200 cGy) 38 (19) 8 (15) 1 1 1 Q+ ATG + TB (200 cGy) 0 1 (2) 5 1 1 1 1 1 1 1	Positive	137 (70)	42 (81)	
HA-matched sibling79(41)21(41)1HA-matched unrelated25(13)8(15)1HA-matched unrelated64(33)16(31)1Donor-recipient ABO match, n(%)63(32)19(37)86Matched63(32)19(37)1Minor mismatch22(11)6(11)1Mijor mismatch31(16)6(11)1Not reported79(41)21(41)1Qv +ATG59(30)11(21)1Ru + Cy +ATG59(30)11(21)1Ru + Cy +ATG4(2)3(6)1Bu (Cy +ATG4(2)3(6)1Bu (Cy +ATG4(2)3(6)1Bu + Cy +ATG6(12)11Pu + Cy +ATG4(2)3(6)1Bu (Cy +ATG + TBI (200 CGy)01(2)1Cy +ATG + TBI (200 CGy)01(2)1Pu + Cy +ATG + TBI (200 CGy)01(2)1Pu + Cy +ATG + TBI (200 CGy)012(4)1Fu + Cy +ATG + TBI (200 CGy)012(3)1Pu + Cy +ATG + TBI (200 CGy)0112Pu + Cy +ATG + TBI (200 CGy)0111Pu + Cy +ATG + TBI (200 CGy)0111Fu + Cy +ATG + TBI (200 CGy)1111Pu + Cy +ATG + TBI (200 CGy)0111Pu + Cy +ATG + TBI (200 CGy)13(111Pu + Cy +ATG + TBI (200 CGy)3(3) <td>Donor type, n (%)*</td> <td></td> <td></td> <td>.97</td>	Donor type, n (%)*			.97
HA-haploidentical25(13)8(15).1HA-misatched unrelated64(33)16(31)1Donor-recipient ABO match, n(%)7(14)7(14)8Matched63(32)19(37)8Minor mismatch22(11)6(11)1Minor mismatch31(16)6(11)1Not reported79(41)21(41)1Conditioning regimen, n(%)11(21)15Cy+ATG18(9)6(12)1Bu(y + ATG18(9)6(12)1Bu(y + ATG18(9)6(12)1Bu(y + ATG18(9)6(12)1Bu(y + ATG18(9)6(12)1Bu(y + ATG18(9)6(12)1Cy+ATG18(9)8(15)1Pu+Tg + TG38(19)8(15)1Cy+ATG + TB1(200 cGy)01 (2)1Cy+ATG + TB1(200 CGy)55(28)13(25)1Flu+Sy +ATG2(1)2(4)11Flu+Sy +ATG10(5)2(4)1Flu+welphalan + thiotepa + ATG2(1)2(4)1Flu+melphalan + thiotepa + ATG33(6)11Percipheral blood63(32)19(38)11Percipheral blood63(32)19(38)11Percipheral blood633(2)33(2-05-07)(n=19 of 33)04Percipheral blood63(32)19(38)11Percipheral blood CD3* cell dose (x 10 ⁶ /bg), median (RR)7.00 (7.14-8.74)(n=15 of 19)1 <td>HLA-matched sibling</td> <td>79 (41)</td> <td>21 (41)</td> <td></td>	HLA-matched sibling	79 (41)	21 (41)	
HA-matched unrelated 64 (33) 16 (31) International (31) HIA-mainnatched unrelated 27 (14) 7 (14) 36 Matched 63 (32) 19 (37) 36 Matched 63 (32) 19 (37) 37 Minor mismatch 22 (11) 6 (11) 57 Major mismatch 31 (16) 6 (11) 57 Conditioning regimen. n (3) ¹ 58 (30) 11 (21) 57 Conditioning regimen. n (3) ¹ 58 (30) 11 (21) 58 Bu/Cy # ATG 48 (9) 6 (12) 58 Bu/Cy # ATG 18 (9) 6 (12) 58 Bu/Cy # ATG 48 (9) 6 (12) 58 Bu/Cy # ATG 11 (1) 1 (2) 56 Bu/Cy # ATG 6 (12) 38 (19) 8 (15) 56 Bu/Cy # ATG 10 (10) Coly 0 12 56 Bu/Cy # ATG 11 (10) 12 (2) 56 59 51 Bu/E + Bu ± ATG 2 (1) 2 (4) 56 56	HLA-haploidentical	25(13)	8 (15)	
HÅ-mismatched unrelated 27(14) 7(14)	HLA-matched unrelated	64(33)	16 (31)	
Denor-recipient A80 match, n (%) 63 (32) 19 (37) 88 Matched 63 (32) 19 (37) 6 Minor mismatch 22 (11) 6 (11) 6 Major mismatch 31 (16) 6 (11) 1 Not reported 79 (41) 21 (41) 1 Conditioning regimen, n (%)	HLA-mismatched unrelated	27 (14)	7 (14)	
Matched 63 (32) 19 (37) Image Minor mismatch 22 (11) 6 (11) Image Major mismatch 31 (16) 6 (11) Image Not reported 79 (41) 21 (41) Image Conditioning regimen, n(3)' Image Image Image Q+ ATG 59 (30) 11 (21) Image Ru v Cy ATG 4 (2) 3 (6) Image Bu v TB (200 cCy) 1 (1) 1 (2) Image Cy + ATG + TB (200 cCy) 0 1 (2) Image Ru + Cy + ATG + TB (200 cCy) 0 (11) 1 (2) Image Ru + Cy + ATG + TB (200 cCy) 0 (11) 1 (2) Image Ru + Cy + ATG + TB (200 cCy) 0 (2) 1 (2) Image Ru + Cy + ATG + TB (200 cCy) 5 (2) 1 (3 (2)) Image Ru + Cy + ATG + TB (200 cCy) 5 (2) 1 (3 (2)) Image Ru + melphalan + thiotep + ATG 2 (1) 2 (4) Image Graft type, n(3) 10 (5) 2 (4) Image Imag	Donor-recipient ABO match, n (%)			.86
Minor mismatch 22(11) 6(11) Image: constraint of the second s	Matched	63 (32)	19 (37)	
Major mismatch $31(16)$ $6(11)$ 1 Not reported $79(41)$ $21(41)$ 1 Conditioning regimen, $n(3)^{\circ}$ 1 1 1 Gu + ATG $59(30)$ $11(21)$ 1 Bu + $(y + ATG$ $18(9)$ $6(12)$ 6 Bu/($y \pm ATG$ $4(2)$ $3(6)$ 1 Fu + TBI(200 cGy) 0 $1(2)$ 1 $(y + ATG + TBI(200 cGy)$ 0 $1(2)$ 1 $(y + ATG + TBI(200 cGy)$ 0 $1(2)$ 1 $Fu + Bu \pm ATG$ $8(4)$ $5(9)$ 1 $Fu + relphalan + thore ATG 2(1) 2(4) 1 Fu + relphalan + thore 10(5) 33(64) 1 1 Peripheral blood $	Minor mismatch	22(11)	6(11)	
Not reported 79(41) 21(41) Interported Conditioning regimen, n(%)	Major mismatch	31 (16)	6(11)	
Conditioning regimen, $n(X)^i$.15 $Q_Y + ATG$ 59(30) 11(21) - $Hu + Cy + ATG$ 18(9) 6(12) - $Bu(Y_2) \times ATG$ 4(2) 3(6) - $Hu + TBI (200 cGy)$ 0 1(2) - $Q_Y + ATG + TBI (200 cGy)$ 0 1(2) - $Q_Y + ATG + TBI (200 cGy)$ 0 1(2) - $Flu + SBI (200 cGy)$ 0 1(2) - $Pu + TBI (200 cGy)$ 0 1(2) - $Flu + Bu \pm ATG$ 8(4) 5(9) - $Flu + Bu \pm ATG$ 2(1) 2(4) - $Flu + Bu \pm ATG$ 10(5) 2(4) - $Graft type, n(X)$ - - - $Graft type, n(X)$ - - - $Bore marrow$ 132 (68) 33 (64) - Peripheral blood 63 (32) 196 (3) - Infusion Not applicable 383 (2.0-5.07) (n = 19 of 33) . Proteryopreservation	Not reported	79 (41)	21 (41)	
$Gy + ATG$ 59 (30) 11 (21) $Hu + Cy + ATG$ 18 (9) 6 (12) $Bu/Cy \pm ATG$ 4 (2) 3 (6) $Bu/Cy \pm ATG$ 11 (1) 12 $Gy + ATG + TBI (200 cCy)$ 38 (19) 8 (15) $Cy + ATG + TBI (200 cCy)$ 0 1 (2) $Hu + TG + TBI (200 cCy)$ 55 (28) 13 (25) $Hu + melphalan$ 0 2 (4) $Hu + melphalan$ 10 (5) 2 (4) $Graft type, n(3)$ 2 (3 . Bone marrow 132 (68) 33 (64) Peripheral blod 63 (32) 19 (36) Bone marrow TNC dose (× 10 ⁶ /kg), median (UQR) . . Pre-cryopreservation Not applicable 3.83 (2.70-5.07) (n = 19 of 33) Infusion 3.40 (2.45-4.57) (n = 109 of 132) 2.63 (1.49-3.05) (n = 23 of 33) .004 Peripheral blod CD34* cell dose (× 10 ⁶ /kg), median (QR) . . . Pre-tyopreservation Not applicable 7.90 (7.14-8.74) (n = 15 of 19) . Infusion 6.63 (4.78-10.97) (n = 62 of 63) 5.28	Conditioning regimen, n (%) [†]			.15
Hu + Cy + ATC 18(9) 6(12) Bu(Cy ± ATG 4(2) 3(6) Hu + TBI (200 Cy) 1(1) 1(2) Cy + ATG + TBI (200 Cy) 38(19) 8(15) Cy + ATG + TBI (200 Cy) 0 1(2) Flu + Cy + ATG + TBI (200 Cy) 55 (28) 13 (25) Hu + Cy + ATG + TBI (200 Cy) 55 (28) 13 (25) Hu + Bu ± ATG 2(1) 2(4) Hu + melphalan + thiotepa + ATG 2(1) 2(4) Graft type, n(%) Bone marrow 132 (68) 33 (64) Peripheral blood 63 (32) 19 (36) Bone marrow TNC dose (× 10 ⁶ /kg), median (10R) Pre-cryopreservation Not applicable Infusion 6.63 (4.78-1097) (n = 62 of 63) 5.83 (3.78-10.97) (n = 15 of 19)	Cy + ATG	59 (30)	11 (21)	
Bul(y ± ATG 4(2) 3(6) Fu + TBI (200 cGy) 1 (1) 1 (2) Gy + ATG + TBI (200 cGy) 38 (19) 8 (15) Gy + ATG + TBI (200 cGy) 0 1 (2) Fu + TBI (200 cGy) 0 1 (2) Fu + TBI (200 cGy) 55 (28) 13 (25) Fu + Bu ± ATG 8 (4) 5 (9) Fu + melphalan + thiotepa + ATG 2 (1) 2 (4) Fu + melphalan 10 (5) 2 (4) Graft type, n(X) 2 33 (64) Bone marrow 132 (68) 33 (64) Peripheral blood 63 (32) 19 (36) Bone marrow 132 (68) 38 (2,70-5.07) (n = 19 of 33) Infusion 3.40 (2.45-4.57) (n = 109 of 132) 2.63 (1.49-3.05) (n = 23 of 33) .004 Peripheral blood CD34' cell dose (× 10 ⁶ /kg), median (IQR) 7.90 (7.14-8.74) (n = 15 of 19) .07 Infusion 6.63 (4.78-10.97) (n = 62 of 63) 5.38 (3.78-10.97) (n = 15 of 19) .45 GVHD prophylaxis, n(X) 6.63 (4.78-10.97) (n = 62 of 63) 5.38 (3.78-10.97) (n = 15 of 19) .45 GVHD pro	Flu + Cy + ATG	18 (9)	6(12)	
Flu + TBI (200 cGy) 1 (1) 1 (2) $Cy + ATG + TBI (200 cGy)$ 38 (19) 8 (15) $Cy + ATG + TBI (200 cGy)$ 0 1 (2) $Flu + Cy + ATG + TBI (200 cGy)$ 55 (28) 13 (25) $Flu + Sty + ATG + TBI (200 cGy)$ 55 (28) 13 (25) $Flu + melphalan + thiotepa + ATG$ 2 (1) 2 (4) $Graft type, n(%)$ 2 (4) $Graft type, n(%)$ Bone marrow 132 (68) 33 (64) Peripheral blood 63 (32) 19 (36) Bone marrow TNC dos (× 10 ⁸ /kg), median (IQR) Pre-cryperservation Not applicable 3.83 (2.70-5.07) (n = 19 of 33) Infusion 3.40 (2.45-4.57) (n = 109 of 132) 2.63 (1.49-3.05) (n = 23 of 33) .004 Peri-cryperservation Not applicable 7.90 (7.14-8.74) (n = 15 of 19) Infusion 6.63 (4.78-10.97) (n = 62 of 63) 5.38 (3.78-10.97) (n = 15 of 19) <	$Bu/Cy \pm ATG$	4(2)	3 (6)	
Cy + ATC + TBI (200 cCy) 38 (19) 8 (15) Cy + ATC + TBI (200 cCy) 0 1(2) Flu + Cy + ATC + TBI (200 cCy) 55 (28) 13 (25) Flu + Bu \pm ATC 8(4) 5(9) Flu + Bu \pm ATG 2 (1) 2 (4) Flu + melphalan + thiotepa + ATG 2 (1) 2 (4) Flu + melphalan + thiotepa + ATG 33 (64) 56 Bone marrow 132 (68) 33 (64) 56 Bone marrow TNC dose (x 10 ⁶ /kg), median (IQR) 63 (32) 19 (36) 56 Bone marrow TNC dose (x 10 ⁶ /kg), median (IQR) 2.63 (1.49-3.05)(n = 130 of 33) 00 Pre-cryopreservation Not applicable 3.83 (2.70-5.07) (n = 19 of 33) 00 Infusion 3.40 (2.45-4.57) (n = 109 of 132) 2.63 (1.49-3.05) (n = 23 of 33) 00 Pre-cryopreservation Not applicable 7.90 (7.14-8.74) (n = 15 of 19) 45 GVHD prophylaxis, n (3) 6.63 (4.78-10.97) (n = 62 of 63) 5.38 (3.78-10.97) (n = 15 of 19) 45 GVHD prophylaxis, n (3) 22 (11) 6 (12) 07 5 Ex vivo T cell depletion or CD34*	Flu + TBI (200 cGy)	1(1)	1(2)	
$Qy + ATG + TBI (1000 cGy)$ 0 1 (2) Flu + Cy + ATG + TBI (200 cGy) 55 (28) 13 (25) Flu + Bu $\pm ATG$ 8 (4) 5 (9) Flu + melphalan + thiotep + ATG 2 (1) 2 (4) Graft type, n (%) 2 (4) 56 Bone marrow 10 (5) 2 (4) 56 Bone marrow 132 (68) 33 (64) 56 Bone marrow TNC dos (× 10 ⁸ /kg), median (IQR) 63 (32) 19 (36) 56 Bone marrow TNC dos (× 10 ⁸ /kg), median (IQR) 700 700 700 Pre-tryopreservation Not applicable 3.83 (2.70-5.07) (n = 19 of 33) .004 Pre-tryopreservation Not applicable 3.83 (2.70-5.07) (n = 10 of 132) 2.63 (1.49-3.05) (n = 23 of 33) .004 Peripheral blood CD34* cell dos (× 10 ⁶ /kg), median (IQR) 7.90 (7.14-8.74) (n = 15 of 19) .07 Infusion 6.63 (4.78-10.97) (n = 62 of 63) 5.38 (3.78-10.97) (n = 15 of 19) .45 GVHD prophylaxis, n (%) 18 (9) 4 (7) .07 .07 Ex vior 1 cell depletion or CD34* 18 (9) 2 (4) .07	Cy + ATG + TBI (200 cGy)	38 (19)	8 (15)	
Flu + Cy + ATG + TBI (200 CCy) 55 (28) 13 (25) Flu + Bu \pm ATG 8 (4) 5 (9) Flu + melphalan + thiotepa + ATG 2 (1) 2 (4) Flu + melphalan + thiotepa + ATG 10 (5) 2 (4) Graft type, n (%) Bone marrow 132 (68) 33 (64) Peripheral blood 63 (32) 19 (36) Bone marrow TNC dose (x 10 ⁸ /kg), median (QR) Pre-cryopreservation Not applicable 3.83 (2.70-5.07) (n = 19 of 33) Infusion 3.40 (2.45-4.57) (n = 109 of 132) 2.63 (1.49-3.05) (n = 23 of 33) .0.04 Peripheral blood CD34* cell dose (x 10 ⁶ /kg), median (IQR) Pre-cryopreservation Not applicable 7.90 (7.14-8.74) (n = 15 of 19) .45 GVHD prophylaxis, n (%) Ex vior T cell depletion or CD34* 18 (9) 4 (7)	Cy + ATG + TBI (1000 cGy)	0	1(2)	
Flu + Bu \pm ATG 8 (4) 5 (9) I Flu + melphalan + thiotepa + ATG 2 (1) 2 (4) I Flu + melphalan 10 (5) 2 (4) I Graft type, n (%) 2 (3) 33 (64) I Graft type, n (%) 33 (64) 56 I Bone marrow 132 (68) 33 (64) I Peripheral blood 63 (32) 19 (36) I Bone marrow TNC dose (× 10 ⁶ /kg), median (IQR) 3.83 (2.70-5.07) (n = 19 of 33) I Infusion 3.40 (2.45-4.57) (n = 109 of 132) 2.63 (1.49-3.05) (n = 23 of 33) .004 Peripheral blood CD34* cell dose (× 10 ⁶ /kg), median (IQR) Image: Component of the compo	Flu + Cy + ATG + TBI (200 cGy)	55 (28)	13 (25)	
Flu + melphalan + thiotepa + ATG $2(1)$ $2(4)$ Flu + melphalan 10(5) $2(4)$ Graft type, n(%)	$Flu + Bu \pm ATG$	8 (4)	5 (9)	
Flu + melphalan 10 (5) 2 (4) Graft type, n (%) .56 Bone marrow 132 (68) 33 (64) .56 Bone marrow TNC dose (× 10 ⁸ /kg), median (IQR) .63 (32) 19 (36) . Pre-cryopreservation Not applicable $3.83 (2.70-5.07) (n = 19 of 33)$. Infusion $3.40 (2.45-4.57) (n = 109 of 132)$ $2.63 (1.49-3.05) (n = 23 of 33)$.004 Peripheral blood CD34* cell dose (× 10 ⁶ /kg), median (IQR) Pre-cryopreservation Not applicable 7.90 (7.14-8.74) (n = 15 of 19) .45 GVHD prophylaxis, n (%) . .	Flu + melphalan + thiotepa + ATG	2(1)	2 (4)	
Graft type, n(%) Image: matrix type, n(%) Sec Sec Bone marrow 132 (68) 33 (64) Image: matrix type, n(%) Image: matrix type, n(%) <td< td=""><td>Flu + melphalan</td><td>10(5)</td><td>2(4)</td><td></td></td<>	Flu + melphalan	10(5)	2(4)	
Bone marrow 132 (68) 33 (64) Image: marrow mar	Graft type, n (%)			.56
Peripheral blood 63 (32) 19 (36) Bone marrow TNC dose ($\times 10^8$ /kg), median (IQR) Not applicable $3.83 (2.70-5.07)(n = 10 of 33)$ Pre-cryopreservation Not applicable $3.83 (2.70-5.07)(n = 10 of 33)$ Infusion $3.40 (2.45-4.57) (n = 109 of 132)$ $2.63 (1.49-3.05) (n = 23 of 33)$ Peripheral blood CD34* cell dose ($\times 10^6$ /kg), median (IQR) Not applicable $7.90 (7.14-8.74) (n = 15 of 19)$ Pre-cryopreservation Not applicable $7.90 (7.14-8.74) (n = 15 of 19)$ Infusion $6.63 (4.78-10.97) (n = 62 of 63)$ $5.38 (3.78-10.97) (n = 15 of 19)$.45 GVHD prophylaxis, $n(\%)$ Infusion $6.63 (4.78-10.97) (n = 62 of 63)$ $5.38 (3.78-10.97) (n = 15 of 19)$.45 GVHD prophylaxis, $n(\%)$ Infusion $6.63 (4.78-10.97) (n = 62 of 63)$ $5.38 (3.78-10.97) (n = 15 of 19)$.45 GVHD prophylaxis, $n(\%)$ Infusion $6.63 (4.78-10.97) (n = 62 of 63)$ $5.38 (3.78-10.97) (n = 15 of 19)$.45 Galcineurin inhibitor + MMF 22 (11) $6 (12)$ Calcineurin inhibitor + MTX	Bone marrow	132 (68)	33 (64)	
Bone marrow TNC dose (× 10 ⁸ /kg), median (IQR) Not applicable $3.83 (2.70-5.07) (n = 19 of 33)$ Pre-cryopreservation $3.40 (2.45-4.57) (n = 109 of 132)$ $2.63 (1.49-3.05) (n = 23 of 33)$ $.004$ Peripheral blood CD34 ⁺ cell dose (× 10 ⁶ /kg), median (IQR) Pre-cryopreservation Not applicable 7.90 (7.14-8.74) (n = 15 of 19) Infusion 6.63 (4.78-10.97) (n = 62 of 63) 5.38 (3.78-10.97) (n = 15 of 19) .45 GVHD prophylaxis, n (%) .07 Ex vivo T cell depletion or CD34 ⁺ 18 (9) 4 (7) Post-transplantation Cy + other 22 (11) 6 (12) Calcineurin inhibitor + MMF 21 (11) 14 (27) Calcineurin inhibitor + MTX 110 (56) 25 (48) Other agents 3 (2) 1 (2) .28 $\leq 3 \mod$ 44 (22) 8 (15) .28 .3 .24 Other agents 44 (22) 15 (29) .28 .3	Peripheral blood	63 (32)	19 (36)	
Pre-cryopreservation Not applicable $3.83 (2.70-5.07) (n = 19 of 33)$.004 Infusion $3.40 (2.45-4.57) (n = 109 of 132)$ $2.63 (1.49-3.05) (n = 23 of 33)$.004 Peripheral blood CD34* cell dose (× 10 ⁶ /kg), median (IQR) Pre-cryopreservation Not applicable $7.90 (7.14-8.74) (n = 15 of 19)$ Infusion $6.63 (4.78-10.97) (n = 62 of 63)$ $5.38 (3.78-10.97) (n = 15 of 19)$.45 GVHD prophylaxis, n (%) 0.07 .07 Ex vivo T cell depletion or CD34* 18 (9) 4 (7) .07 Octacineurin inhibitor + MMF 21 (11) 14 (27) .01 Calcineurin inhibitor + MTX 110 (56) 25 (48) .01 Other agents 3 (2) 1 (2) .28 $\leq 3 \mod 4$ 44 (22) 8 (15) .28 $\leq 3 \mod 4$ 44 (22) 15 (29) $7.12 \mod 1$ 42 (22) 15 (29)	Bone marrow TNC dose ($\times 10^8$ /kg), median (IQR)			
Infusion $3.40(2.45-4.57)(n = 109 of 132)$ $2.63(1.49-3.05)(n = 23 of 33)$.004 Peripheral blood CD34* cell dose (× 10 ⁶ /kg), median (IQR) Pre-cryopreservation Not applicable $7.90(7.14-8.74)(n = 15 of 19)$ Infusion $6.63(4.78-10.97)(n = 62 of 63)$ $5.38(3.78-10.97)(n = 15 of 19)$.45 GVHD prophylaxis, n(%) .07 .07 Ex vivo T cell depletion or CD34* 18(9) 4(7) .07 Post-transplantation Cy + other 22(11) 6(12) .07 Calcineurin inhibitor + MMF 21(11) 14(27) .07 Calcineurin inhibitor + other 21(11) 2(4) .07 Other agents 3(2) 1(2) .07 Interval from diagnosis to HCT, n(%) $\leq 3 \mod \frac{1}{2}$ 44(22) 8(15) $3-6 \mod \frac{5}{2}$ 41(21) 15(29) $7-12 \mod \frac{1}{2}$ 68(35) 14(27)	Pre-cryopreservation	Not applicable	3.83 (2.70-5.07) (n = 19 of 33)	
Peripheral blood CD34* cell dose (× 10 ⁶ /kg), median (IQR) Not applicable 7.90 (7.14-8.74) (n = 15 of 19) 1 Pre-cryopreservation Not applicable $7.90 (7.14-8.74) (n = 15 of 19)$.45 GVHD prophylaxis, n (%) $6.63 (4.78-10.97) (n = 62 of 63)$ $5.38 (3.78-10.97) (n = 15 of 19)$.45 GVHD prophylaxis, n (%) $18 (9)$ $4 (7)$.07 Ex vivo T cell depletion or CD34* $18 (9)$ $4 (7)$.07 Post-transplantation Cy + other $22 (11)$ $6 (12)$.07 Calcineurin inhibitor + MMF $21 (11)$ $14 (27)$.07 Calcineurin inhibitor + other $21 (11)$ $2 (4)$.07 Other agents $3 (2)$ $1 (2)$.07 Interval from diagnosis to HCT, n (%) $\leq 3 \mod 4$ $44 (22)$ $8 (15)$ $3 - 6 \mod 5$ $41 (21)$ $15 (29)$ $> 12 \mod 4$ $68 (35)$ $14 (27)$	Infusion	3.40 (2.45-4.57) (n = 109 of 132)	2.63 (1.49-3.05) (n = 23 of 33)	.004
Pre-cryopreservationNot applicable $7.90 (7.14-8.74) (n = 15 of 19)$.45Infusion $6.63 (4.78-10.97) (n = 62 of 63)$ $5.38 (3.78-10.97) (n = 15 of 19)$.45GVHD prophylaxis, n (%)	Peripheral blood CD34 ⁺ cell dose ($\times 10^6$ /kg), median (IQR)			
Infusion 6.63 (4.78-10.97) (n = 62 of 63) 5.38 (3.78-10.97) (n = 15 of 19) .45 GVHD prophylaxis, n (%)	Pre-cryopreservation	Not applicable	7.90 (7.14-8.74) (n = 15 of 19)	
GVHD prophylaxis, n (%) .07 Ex vivo T cell depletion or CD34* 18 (9) 4 (7) Post-transplantation Cy + other 22 (11) 6 (12) Calcineurin inhibitor + MMF 21 (11) 14 (27) Calcineurin inhibitor + MTX 110 (56) 25 (48) Calcineurin inhibitor + other 21 (11) 2 (4) Other agents 3 (2) 1 (2) Interval from diagnosis to HCT, n (%) .28 $\leq 3 \mod 1$ 44 (22) 8 (15) 3-6 $\mod 3$ 41 (21) 15 (29) >12 $\mod 1$ 68 (35) 14 (27)	Infusion	6.63 (4.78-10.97) (n = 62 of 63)	5.38 (3.78-10.97) (n = 15 of 19)	.45
Ex vivo T cell depletion or CD34 ⁺ 18 (9) 4 (7) Post-transplantation Cy + other 22 (11) 6 (12) Calcineurin inhibitor + MMF 21 (11) 14 (27) Calcineurin inhibitor + MTX 110 (56) 25 (48) Calcineurin inhibitor + other 21 (11) 2 (4) Other agents 3 (2) 1 (2) Interval from diagnosis to HCT, n (%)	GVHD prophylaxis, n (%)			.07
Post-transplantation Cy + other $22(11)$ $6(12)$ Image: constraint of the system	Ex vivo T cell depletion or CD34 ⁺	18 (9)	4(7)	
Calcineurin inhibitor + MMF 21 (11) 14 (27) Calcineurin inhibitor + MMF 110 (56) 25 (48) Calcineurin inhibitor + other 21 (11) 2 (4) Other agents 3 (2) 1 (2) Interval from diagnosis to HCT, n (%)	Post-transplantation Cy + other	22(11)	6(12)	
Calcineurin inhibitor + MTX 110 (56) 25 (48) Calcineurin inhibitor + other 21 (11) 2 (4) Other agents 3 (2) 1 (2) Interval from diagnosis to HCT, n (%)	Calcineurin inhibitor + MMF	21 (11)	14 (27)	
Calcineurin inhibitor + other $21(11)$ $2(4)$ Other agents $3(2)$ $1(2)$ Interval from diagnosis to HCT, $n(\%)$.28 $\leq 3 \mod 4$ $44(22)$ $8(15)$ $3-6 \mod 5$ $41(21)$ $15(29)$ $7-12 \mod 1$ $42(22)$ $15(29)$ > 12 \mod 1 $68(35)$ $14(27)$	Calcineurin inhibitor + MTX	110 (56)	25 (48)	
Other agents 3 (2) 1 (2) Interval from diagnosis to HCT, n (%) .28 ≤3 mo‡ 44 (22) 8 (15) 3-6 mo§ 41 (21) 15 (29) 7-12 mo∥ 42 (22) 15 (29) > 12 mo¶ 68 (35) 14 (27)	Calcineurin inhibitor + other	21 (11)	2 (4)	1
Interval from diagnosis to HCT, n (%) .28 ≤3 mo‡ 44 (22) 8 (15) .28 3-6 mo§ 41 (21) 15 (29) .28 7-12 mo∥ 42 (22) 15 (29) .28 > 12 mo¶ 68 (35) 14 (27) .28	Other agents	3 (2)	1(2)	
$\leq 3 \text{ mo}^{\ddagger}$ $44(22)$ $8(15)$ $3-6 \text{ mo}_{\$}$ $41(21)$ $15(29)$ $7-12 \text{ mo}_{\$}$ $42(22)$ $15(29)$ > 12 mo ${\$}$ $68(35)$ $14(27)$	Interval from diagnosis to HCT, n (%)			.28
3-6 mo§ 41 (21) 15 (29) 7-12 mo∥ 42 (22) 15 (29) >12 mo¶ 68 (35) 14 (27)	≤3 mo‡	44 (22)	8 (15)	
7-12 mol 42 (22) 15 (29) >12 mol 68 (35) 14 (27)	3-6 mo§	41 (21)	15 (29)	1
>12 mo¶ 68 (35) 14 (27)	7-12 mo	42 (22)	15 (29)	1
	>12 mo¶	68 (35)	14 (27)	

Table 1 (Continued)

Characteristic	Controls (Noncryopreserved Graft)	Cases (Cryopreserved Graft)	P Value
Transplantation period, n (%)			.16
2013-2015	103 (53)	20 (39)	
2016-2019	92 (47)	32 (61)	

Cy indicates cyclophosphamide; ATG, antithymocyte globulin; Flu, fludarabine; TBI, total body irradiation; MMF, mycophenolate mofetil; MTX, methotrexate. *Donor age, yr, median (range):

haploidentical: controls, 32 (10-65); cases, 36 (14-65); unrelated: controls, 27 (18-59); cases, 30 (19-43).

[†]Cyclophosphamide dosing:

Cy + ATG:

cases, 200 mg/kg (n = 11); controls, 200 mg/kg (n = 56), 120 mg/kg (n = 3);

Flu + Cy + ATG:

cases, 120 mg/kg (n = 5), 60 mg/kg (n = 1); controls, 120 mg/kg (n = 15), 60 mg/kg (n = 3);

Bu + Cy:

cases, 200 mg/kg (n = 1), 120 mg/kg (n = 2); controls, 200 mg/kg (n = 2), 120 mg/kg (n = 2);

Cy + ATG + TBI (200 cGy):

cases, 200 mg/kg (n = 6), 29 mg/kg (n = 2); controls, 200 mg/kg (n = 22), 120 mg/kg (n = 1), 100 mg/kg (n = 4), 50 mg/kg (n = 2), 29 mg/kg (n = 8), unknown (n = 1); Cy + ATG + TBI (1000 cGy):

cases, 120 mg/kg (n = 1); Flu + Cy + ATG + TBI (200 cGy): cases, 100 mg/kg (n = 4), 50 mg/kg (n = 4), 29 mg/kg (n = 5); controls, 100 mg/kg (n = 19), 50 mg/kg (n = 15), 29 mg/kg (n = 19). Interval between diagnosis and HCT:

[‡]77% HLA-matched sibling transplant; 23% HLA-matched or mismatched unrelated donor transplant.

⁸55% HLA-matched sibling transplant; 30% HLA-matched or mismatched unrelated donor transplant; 14% HLA-haploidentical transplant.

23% HLA-matched sibling transplant; 59% were HLA-matched or mismatched unrelated donor transplant; 19% HLA-haploidentical transplant.

¹20% HLA-matched sibling transplant; 63% HLA-matched or mismatched unrelated donor transplant; 17% HLA-haploidentical transplant.

causes of death included infection (n = 3), interstitial pneumonitis (n = 2), organ failure (n = 2), and hemorrhage (n = 3).

DISCUSSION

The present analysis was undertaken to examine whether there are differences in survival or other transplantation outcomes after transplantation of cryopreserved bone marrow or peripheral blood for severe aplastic anemia. Recipients of cryopreserved grafts were matched to recipients of noncryopreserved grafts for age at transplantation, donor type/donorrecipient HLA match, and graft type, factors that are consistently associated with outcomes of HCT for this disease [11-15]. The analyses also considered the effect of other potential risk factors on transplantation outcomes. After carefully controlled analyses, we observed higher graft failure and mortality rates after transplantation of cryopreserved grafts compared with noncryopreserved grafts. Thus, our findings favor the transplantation of noncryopreserved grafts for severe aplastic anemia.

Transplantation conditioning regimens for patients with severe aplastic anemia vary by the type of donor [19]. Other reports have shown an effect of conditioning regimen for survival after HLA-matched sibling transplants [19]. None of the patients in the present analysis received cyclophosphamide alone or with fludarabine-conditioning regimens associated with higher graft failure and mortality rates [19]. The cell dose of the graft also has been associated with graft failure; it is recommended that bone marrow grafts contain a minimum of 3×10^8 /kg TNCs to avoid graft failure [20]. These data are derived from an analysis of noncryopreserved bone marrow grafts. Data on infused bone marrow TNC dose were available for only 70% (23 of 33) of cryopreserved grafts and 83% (109 of 132) of noncryopreserved grafts. Despite this limitation, we found significantly lower TNC doses infused in the cryopreservation group. Although 68% of patients receiving cryopreserved bone marrow grafts had $\ge 3 \times 10^8$ /kg TNCs harvested, only 26% had that amount infused. This loss of cells might have led to the observed differences in outcomes between the 2 treatment groups.

The difference between TNC dose at harvest and at infusion implies that the cryopreservation/thawing process is associated with cell loss. However, other unmeasured or unknown factors also might have influenced the observed differences in outcome. We do not have data on cell function at any time point. An earlier report on the functional assay of cryopreserved bone marrow suggests preservation of cell function, although that report included only 7 grafts [21]. An analysis of noncryopreserved bone marrow cellular subsets for unrelated donor transplantations failed to show an effect of graft composition on hematopoietic recovery or survival; however, that study included only 7 patients with aplastic anemia [22].

All cryopreserved peripheral blood grafts in the current analysis contained a CD34⁺ dose $> 2 \times 10^6$ /kg, the recommended minimum dose for severe aplastic anemia [23]. A subset analysis limited to recipients of peripheral blood grafts was consistent with the findings of the main analysis. Cryopreserved CD34⁺ cells from peripheral blood have been shown to have a significant loss of membrane integrity, viability, and CFU potential [23], which collectively could have contributes to the adverse effects of transplantation of cryopreserved peripheral blood seen in our study.

We hypothesize that several factors led to the poor outcomes seen after transplantation of cryopreserved grafts. Optimizing the cell dose is desirable, but a controlled study that examines for changes in graft composition with cryopreservation/thaw that is specific for aplastic anemia is needed. A detailed analysis of the composition and function of cryopreserved grafts is beyond the scope of this study. We did not observe any statistically significant differences in neutrophil and platelet recovery despite lower rates of recovery after transplantation of cryopreserved grafts. We hypothesize that the absence of significant differences is attributed to the modest number of patients in our study cohort. We do not know the indications for the use of cryopreserved grafts in the patients included in this analysis. The interval between diagnosis and HCT was not different between the 2 treatment groups. Furthermore, the timing of transplantation by donor type is also consistent with accepted clinical practice guidelines. HLA-matched sibling transplants were mostly offered within 6 months of diagnosis, and alternative donor transplants were offered later after failure of at least 1 course of immunosuppressive therapy [24]. Recipients of cryopreserved and noncryopreserved grafts were matched



Figure 1. Graft failure and overall survival. (A) The 1-year graft failure was 19% (95% CI, 10% to 31%) in the cryopreserved group and 10% (95% CI, 6% to 14%) in the noncryopreserved group. (B) The 1-year overall survival was 73% (95% CI, 60% to 84%) in the cryopreserved group and 91% (95% CI, 86% to 94%) in the noncryopreserved group.

for graft type (bone marrow or peripheral blood). Subset analyses limited to peripheral blood transplants confirmed higher graft failure and mortality, consistent with the main analysis, and suggest a greater effect than seen with bone marrow grafts.

These findings differ from findings in previous studies of patients receiving cryopreserved grafts for hematologic malignancies. Compared with patients with aplastic anemia, patients with malignancy often come to HCT after multiple chemotherapy and immune-suppressive therapies and also usually receive more intensive pretransplantation conditioning. For these reasons, and perhaps because of differences in the nature of the underlying diseases, the risk of graft failure is generally lower after HCT for malignant disease compared with after HCT for aplastic anemia and may be less affected by any alterations in cell dose or function induced by cryopreservation.

In summary, the data presented herein support the use of noncryopreserved bone marrow or peripheral blood for HCT in patients with severe aplastic anemia. If this is not possible, it may be prudent to delay transplantation until it is. These transplantations are often not deemed urgent, and every effort must be made to provide the best available supportive care for the patient until the transplantation center can ensure the availability of a noncryopreserved graft. If a delay is not possible, careful assessment of the risk of using a cryopreserved graft versus the risk of not undergoing indicated HCT is necessary. The NMDP/Be The Match considers the diagnosis of aplastic anemia a valid reason to try to deliver fresh grafts for unrelated donor transplantation in patients with severe aplastic anemia.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

Financial disclosure: The Center for International Blood and Marrow Transplant Research is supported primarily by Public Health Service Grant/Cooperative Agreement 5U24-CA076518 from the National Cancer Institute, the National Heart, Lung and Blood Institute, and the National Institute of Allergy and Infectious Diseases; Contract HHSH250201200016C with the Health Resources and Services Administration (HRSA); and Grants N00014-15-1-0848 and N00014-16-1-2020 from the Office of Naval Research. The views expressed in this article do not reflect the official policy or position of the National Institutes of Health, Department of the Navy, Department of Defense, HRSA, or any other agency of the US Government.

Conflict of interest statement: M.H. has received research support from Takeda Pharmaceutical, Otsuka Pharmaceutical, Spectrum Pharmaceuticals, and Astellas Pharma; has served as a consultant for Incyte, ADC Therapeutics, Celgene, Pharmacyclics, Magenta Therapeutics, Omeros, AbGenomics, Verastem, and TeneoBio; and has served on the speakers bureau for Sanofi Genzyme and AstraZeneca. A.D. has received research support from Takeda Pharmaceutical, Sanofi Genzyme, Astra-Zeneca, TeneoBio, Prothena, EDO, and Mundipharma and has received consulting fees from Prothena, Pfizer, Akcea, Imbrium, and Janssen. The other authors have no conflicts of interest to report.

REFERENCES

- American Society for Transplantation and Cellular Therapy. ASTCT resources for COVID-19. Available at: https://www.astct.org/communities/pub lic-home?CommunityKey=d3949d84-3440-45f4-8142-90ea05adb0e5. Accessed April, 2020.
- National Marrow Donor Program (Be The Match). Response to COVID-19. Available at: https://network.bethematchclinical.org/news/nmdp/be-thematch-response-to-covid-19/. Accessed April, 2020.
- Frey NV, Lazarus HM, Goldstein SC. Has allogeneic stem cell cryopreservation been given the 'cold shoulder'? An analysis of the pros and cons of using frozen versus fresh stem cell products in allogeneic stem cell transplantation. Bone Marrow Transplant. 2006;38:399–405.
- Stockschläder M, Hassan HT, Krog C, et al. Long-term follow-up of leukaemia patients after related cryopreserved allogeneic bone marrow transplantation. Br J Haematol. 1997;96:382–386.
- Kim DH, Jamal N, Saragosa R, et al. Similar outcomes of cryopreserved allogeneic peripheral stem cell transplants (PBSCT) compared to fresh allografts. Biol Blood Marrow Transplant. 2007;13:1233–1243.
- Medd P, Nagra S, Hollyman D, Craddock C, Malladi R. Cryopreservation of allogeneic PBSC from related and unrelated donors is associated with delayed platelet engraftment but has no impact on survival. *Bone Marrow Transplant*. 2013;48:243–248.
- Hamadani M, Zhang MJ, Tang XY, et al. Graft cryopreservation does not impact overall survival after allogeneic hematopoietic cell transplantation using post-transplant cyclophosphamide for graft-versus-host disease prophylaxis. *Biol Blood Marrow Transplant*. 2000;26:1312–1317.
- Olsson R, Remberger M, Schaffer M, et al. Graft failure in the modern era of allogeneic hematopoietic SCT. *Bone Marrow Transplant.* 2013;48: 537–543.
- 9. Przepiorka D, Weisdorf D, Martin P, et al. 1994 Consensus Conference on Acute GVHD Grading. *Bone Marrow Transplant*. 1995;15:825–828.
- 10. Atkinson K, Horowitz MM, Gale RP, Lee MB, Rimm AA, Bortin MM. Consensus among bone marrow transplanters for diagnosis, grading and

treatment of chronic graft versus host disease. Committee of the International Bone Marrow Transplant Registry. *Bone Marrow Transplant*. 1989;4:247–254.

- Gupta V, Eapen M, Brazauskas R, et al. Impact of age on outcomes after bone marrow transplantation for acquired aplastic anemia using HLAmatched sibling donors. *Haematologica*. 2010;95:2119–2125.
- 12. Bacigalupo A. How I treat acquired aplastic anemia. *Blood*. 2017;129: 1428–1436.
- Horan J, Wang T, Haagenson M, et al. Evaluation of HLA matching in unrelated hematopoietic cell transplantation for nonmalignant disorders. *Blood.* 2012;120:2918–2924.
- 14. Schrezenmeier H, Passweg JR, Marsh JC, et al. Worse outcome and more chronic GVHD with peripheral blood progenitor cells than bone marrow in HLA-matched sibling donor transplants for young patients with severe acquired aplastic anemia. *Blood*. 2007;110:1397–1400.
- Eapen M, Le Rademacher J, Antin JH., et al. Effect of stem cell source on outcomes after unrelated donor transplantation in severe aplastic anemia. *Blood*. 2011;118:2618–2621.
- Cox DR. Regression models and life tables. J R Stat Soc Series B Stat Methodol. 1972;34:187–220.

- Zhang X, Loberiza FR, Klein JP, Zhang MJ. A SAS macro for estimation of direct adjusted survival curves based on a stratified Cox regression model. *Comput Methods Programs Biomed.* 2007;88:95–101.
- Zhang X, Zhang MJ. SAS macros for estimation of direct adjusted cumulative incidence curves under proportional subdistribution hazards models. *Comput Methods Programs Biomed.* 2011;101:87–93.
- Bejanyan N, Kim S, Hebert KM, et al. Choice of conditioning regimens for bone marrow transplantation in severe aplastic anemia. Blood Adv. 2019;3:3123-3131.
- 20. Marsh JC, Ball SE, Cavenagh J, et al. Guidelines for the diagnosis and management of aplastic anemia. *Br J Haematol*. 2009;147:43–70.
- Islam MS, Anoop P, Datta-Nemdharry P, et al. Implications of CD34⁺ cell dose on clinical and hematological outcome of allo-SCT for acquired aplastic anemia. *Bone Marrow Transplant*. 2010;45:886–894.
- 22. Collins NH, Gee AP, Durett AG, et al. Effect of the composition of unrelated donor bone marrow and peripheral blood progenitor cell grafts on transplantation outcomes. *Biol Blood Marrow Transplant*. 2010;16:253–262.
- **23.** Lioznov M, Dellbrügger C, Sputtek A. Transportation and cryopreservation may impact hematopoietic stem cell function and engraftment of allogeneic PBSCs, but not BM. *Bone Marrow Transplant*. 2008;42:121–128.
- 24. Young NS. Aplastic anemia. N Engl J Med. 2018;379:1643-1656.