

EHA-SWG Scientific Meeting on Recent Advances in the Pathogenesis and Treatment of Secondary Acute Myeloid Leukemias







Analysis of Germline Variants in Taiwanese Pediatric AML Patients

Focus on Secondary AML and Family Cancer History

April/26/2025, Der-Shiun Wang MD



Pediatric AML: Advances, Gaps, and Biological Distinctions

Recent advances in molecular profiling have redefined AML classification and unveiled therapeutic vulnerabilities. (J Hematol Oncol. 2023;16:29)

Research progress in pediatric AML—particularly in novel agents and clinical trials—lags behind adult AML, primarily due to the significantly lower case numbers in children; some investigators even propose that pediatric and adult AML represent entirely distinct diseases. *(Front Oncol. 2025;15:1466818; Meshinchi S, Fred Hutchinson Cancer Research Center)*





This study aims to investigate the impact of germline variants previously associated with adult AML in a pediatric AML cohort using whole-exome sequencing (WES) data in Taiwan.







5 Analysis of Germline Variants in Taiwanese Pediatric AML Patients : Focus on Secondary AML and Family Cancer History





eha

Patient enrollment

		NIUH
		Germline
NIUH	N=67	SNPs
cohort		from
N=237		Irom
		St. Jude

Cohort Overview

- Total AML patients: 237
- Institution: NTUH
- Period: 1997–2019

Selected for Study

- 67 pediatric AML patients
- Complete AML treatment
- Clinical & genetic data available



LDH was higher in study group Follow-up time was longer in study group No significant difference between Sex, Diagnosis age, whether IVF or not, whether Down Syndrome or not, on of twin, family cancer history, de novo or secondary

AML and documented sepsis and overall survival rate.

8 Analysis of Germline Variants in Taiwanese Pediatric AML Patients : Focus on Secondary AML and Family Cancer History

supplement Table 1 Basline char	cters betweer	n enrolled a	nd not eni	rolled			
	Т	Total		Enrolled		Exculed	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	
	237	100.00	67	28.27	170	71.73	
Sex							0.912
Male	134	56.54	37	55.22	97	57.06	
Female	103	43.46	30	44.78	73	42.94	
Diagnosis age (Mean+/-SD)	9.23	± 5.75	8.09	± 5.46	9.69	± 5.82	0.054
IVF							0.611
Yes	3	1.27	2	2.99	1	0.59	
Not	183	77.22	65	97.01	118	99.16	
Down Syndrome							1.000
Yes	10	4.22	4	5.97	6	3.53	
Not	176	74.26	63	94.03	113	94.96	
One of Twin							0.950
Yes	4	1.69	2	2.99	2	1.18	
Not	182	76.79	65	97.01	117	98.32	
Family cancer history							0.751
Yes	37	15.61	12	17.91	25	14.71	
Not	149	62.87	55	82.09	94	78.99	
Secondary AML							0.176
Yes	12	5.06	7	10.45	5	2.94	
Not	174	73.42	60	89.55	114	95.80	
LDH	1465.9	± 1584.9	1953.15	± 2041.8	1273.6 ±	: 1322.59	0.0193*
Documented Sepsis							0.051
Yes	95	40.08	34	50.75	61	35.88	
Never	142	59.92	33	49.25	109	64.12	
Follow-up time (years)	5.29	± 5.35	6.72	± 5.52	4.72	± 5.31	0.0093*
overal survival rate	51.	50%	50.	70%	51.	80%	0.316

No significant difference of overall survival rate between study group and not enrolled group





Higher **LDH** in De novo AML than secondary AML

No significant difference between Sex, Diagnosis age, whether IVF or not, whether Down Syndrome or not, on of twin, family cancer history documented sepsis, follow-up time and overall survival rate.

Table 1. Baseline charaters of NT	UH Pediatric	AML cohort v	vith germlir	ie study			
	Т	Total		De novo AML		Secondary AML	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	
	67	100.00	60	89.55	7	10.45	
Sex							0.610
Male	37	55.22	32	53.33	5	71.43	
Female	30	44.78	28	46.67	2	28.57	
Diagnosis age (Mean+/-SD)	7.85	± 5.54	8.00	± 5.62	6.58	± 5.00	0.501
VF							0.495
Yes	2	2.99	1	1.67	1	14.29	
Not	65	97.01	59	98.33	6	85.71	
Down Syndrome							1.000
Yes	4	5.97	4	6.67	0	0.00	
Not	63	94.03	56	93.33	7	100.00	
One of Twin							0.495
Yes	2	2.99	1	1.67	1	14.29	
Not	65	97.01	59	98.33	6	85.71	
Family cancer history							0.798
Yes	12	17.91	10	16.67	2	28.57	
Not	55	82.09	50	83.33	5	71.43	
LDH	1953.2	± 2041.84	2129.4	±2108.99	619.00	± 311.63	1.060E-05
Documented Sepsis							0.967
Yes	34	50.75	31	51.67	3	42.86	
Never	33	49.25	29	48.33	4	57.14	
Follow-up time	6.72	± 5.22	6.53	± 5.11	8.32	± 6.37	0.498
overal survival rate	50	.70%	53	.30%	28	.60%	0.636



No significant difference of **overall survival rate** between de novo AML and secondary AML in study group





Diagnosis age in patient with family cancer history in order <u>s</u> than those without family cancer history.

LDH level was lower in patient with family cancer history than those without family cancer history

Sepsis occurred more in patient with family cancer history.

Table 2. Baseline charaters of NT	UH Pediatric	AML cohort v	with germlir	ne study				
	т	otal	With far	With family cancer		without family cancer		
	1	TOtal		history		histpry		
	Ν	%	Ν	%	Ν	%		
	67		12	17.91	55	82.09		
Sex							0.935	
Male	37	55.22	6	50.00	31	56.36		
Female	30	44.78	6	50.00	24	43.64		
Diagnosis age (Mean+/-SD)	7.85	± 5.54	11.07	7 ± 4.09	7.15	± 5.60	0.011	
IVF								
Yes	2	2.99	0	0.00	2	3.64		
Not	65	97.01	12	100.00	53	96.36		
Down Syndrome							1.000	
Yes	4	5.97	0	0.00	4	7.27		
Not	63	94.03	12	100.00	51	92.73		
One of Twin							0.771	
Yes	2	2.99	0	0.00	2	3.64		
Not	65	97.01	12	100.00	53	96.36		
Secondary AML							0.798	
Yes	7	10.45	2	16.67	5	9.09		
Not	60	89.55	10	83.33	50	90.91		
LDH	1953.2	± 2041.84	1253.9	9 ± 991.9	2128 ± 2201.6		0.048	
Documented Sepsis							0.005	
Yes	34	50.75	11	91.67	23	41.82		
Never	33	49.25	1	8.33	32	58.18		
Follow-up	6.72	± 5.22	8.24	± 5.25	6.39	± 5.21	0.285	
overal survival rate	50	.70%	7	75%	45	.50%	0.094	



No significant difference of overall survival rate between AML patients with and without family history in study group





Selected SNPs in this study



LETTER > Blood Adv. 2022 Sep 27;7(6):1040-1044. doi: <u>10.1182/bloodadvances.2022007988</u>

Germline SNPs previously implicated as prognostic biomarkers do not associate with outcomes in intensively treated AML

Aarif M N Batcha ^{1,2}, Nele Buckup ³, Stefanos A Bamopoulos ^{3,4}, Vindi Jurinovic ^{1,3}, Maja Rothenberg-Thurley ³, Hanna Gittinger ³, Bianka Ksienzyk ³, Annika Dufour ³, Stephanie Schneider ^{3,5}, Mika Kontro ^{6,7,8}, Joseph Saad ⁷, Caroline A Heckmann ⁷, Cristina Sauerland ⁹, Dennis Görlich ⁹, Wolfgang E Berdel ¹⁰, Bernhard J Wörmann ¹¹, Utz Krug ¹², Jan Braess ¹³, Ulrich Mansmann ^{1,2,14,15}, Wolfgang Hiddemann ^{3,14,15}, Karsten Spiekermann ^{3,14,15}, Klaus H Metzeler ^{16,*}, Tobias Herold ^{3,14,15,*,*}

Author information > Article notes > Copyright and License information
PMCID: PMC10036512 PMID: <u>36149944</u>

Visual Abstract

Germline SNPs previously implicated as prognostic biomarkers do not associate with outcomes in intensively treated AML

Supplementary Tables and Figures

Supplementary Table 1: List of SNPs analyzed from previous publications

SNPs	Ν	Information
rs1042919 ²³ , rs1045642 ²⁴ , rs1048977 ²⁵ , rs10883841 ²⁶ , rs10932125 ²⁷ , rs11231825 ²⁸ , rs1128503 ²⁴ , rs1130609 ²³ , rs11554137 ^{29,30} , rs12036333 ^{31,32} , rs1265138 ²³ , rs129081 ³³ , rs13171482 ³² , rs1567582 ³² , rs1561876 ²³ , rs1567581 ³² , rs1567582 ³² , rs17202778 ³⁴ , rs1799983 ³⁵ , rs1826909 ³⁶ , rs2070673 ³⁶ , rs2072671 ^{26,37,38} , rs212090 ³³ , rs212091 ³³ , rs2229109 ³⁹ , rs2302948 ³⁶ , rs2454206 ^{40,41} , rs2515641 ³⁶ , rs2897047 ^{31,32} , rs2898950 ²³ , rs3754446 ²⁸ , rs4073360 ³² , rs4148405 ²⁸ , rs4149056 ³⁶ , rs4956103 ³² , rs532545 ²⁶ , rs602950 ³⁷ , rs6550825 ³² , rs6550826 ³¹ , rs6811453 ³⁶ , rs747199 ⁴² , rs7729269 ^{31,32} , rs9883101 ^{31,32}	43	SNPs published to be associated with either of patient characteristics in previous AML studies
rs1045642 ²⁴ , rs10883841 ²⁶ , rs1128503 ²⁴ , rs11554137 ^{29,30} , rs12036333 ^{31,32} , rs129081 ³³ , rs2072671 ^{26,37,38} , rs212090 ³³ , rs212091 ³³ , rs2897047 ^{31,32} , rs532545 ²⁶ , rs602950 ³⁷	12	SNPs published to be associated with OS or RFS in previous AML studies. We tried to reproduce the results in the specified subgroups as best as we can.



No difference in de novo vs secondary AML

SNP Chi-square Test Results (De novo AML vs 2nd_AML)									
SNP	P value	Chi2	df						
rs104564	0.7659	0.533	2						
rs104897	0.6737	0.79	2						
rs108838	0.2415	1.372	1						
rs112318	0.1755	3.48	2						
rs112850	0.4998	1.387	2						
rs113060	0.7076	0.692	2						
rs115541	1	0	1						

Chi-Squar	re Test Wi	th Bonferr	oni Correc	tion		
SNP	P value	Chi2	df	Bonferroni-adjusted P va		
rs104564	0.7659	0.533	2	1		
rs104897	0.6737	0.79	2	1		
rs108838	0.2415	1.372	1	1		
rs112318	0.1755	3.48	2	1		
rs112850	0.4998	1.387	2	1		
rs113060	0.7076	0.692	2	1		
rs115541	1	0	1	1		

SNP Fisher's Exact Test Results (De novo AML vs 2nd_AM

<u>SNP</u>	<u>P value</u>	
rs1045642		
rs1048977		
rs10883841	0.1779	
rs11231825		
rs1128503		
rs1130609		
rs11554137	1	

Extended Fish		
SNP	P value	
rs1045642	0.8011	
rs1048977	0.6432	
rs10883841		
rs11231825	0.3483	
rs1128503	0.3526	
rs1130609	0.5471	

Dominant Mo	del Fisher Test				
SNP	P value				
rs1045642	0.4345				
rs1048977	0.6972				
rs10883841	0.1779				
rs11231825	1				
rs1128503	1				
rs1130609	0.6945				
rs11554137	1				
Dominant + R	ecessive Fisher Test with	n FDR Cor	rection		
SNP	Method	p-value			
rs1048977	Recessive Model Fisher	0.5559			
rs11231825	Recessive Model Fisher	0.1995			
rs1128503	Recessive Model Fisher	1			
rs1130609	Recessive Model Fisher	1			
Dominant Mo	del Fisher Test with Bon	ferroni			
SNP	Method	p-value	Bonferror	1i-adjusted	P value
rs1045642	Dominant	0.4345	1		
rs1048977	Dominant	0.6972	1		
rs10883841	Dominant	0.1779	1		
rs11231825	Dominant	1	1		
rs1128503	Dominant	1	1		
rs1130609	Dominant	0.6945	1		
rs11554137	Dominant	1	1		

Recessive Mode	el Fisher Test With Bor	nferroni			
SNP	Method	p-value	Bonferroni-adjusted P va		
rs1045642	Recessive	1	1		
rs1048977	Recessive	0.5559	1		
rs10883841	Recessive		1		
rs11231825	Recessive	0.1995	1		
rs1128503	Recessive	1	1		
rs1130609	Recessive	1	1		
rs11554137	Recessive		1		
Additive Mode	l (Mann–Whitney U To	est) with B	onferroni		
SNP	Test	p-value			
rs1048977	Mann–Whitney U	0.6781			
rs10883841	Mann–Whitney U	0.1086			
rs11231825	Mann–Whitney U	0.6474			
rs1128503	Mann–Whitney U	1			
rs1130609	Mann-WhitneyU	0.544			

0.6513

Analysis of Germline Variants in Taiwanese Pediatric AML Patients : Focus on Secondary AML and Family Cancer History

rs11554137

Mann-Whitney U



rs1048977 lower in patient without family cancer history group



SNP Test Results (Chi2, Fisher, MWU, T-test)									
SNP	Chi-square p	Fisher p(Mann?	T-test p	Chi-squar	Fisherp(Mann?⊡	T-testp(Bonferroni
rs1045642	0.55009161		0.5166	0.3855	1	1	1	1	
rs1048977	0.00951401		0.0104	0.0323	0.0666	1	0.0725	0.2259	
rs10883841	1	1	0.9827	0.9751	1	1	1	1	
rs11231825	0.48540115		0.7152	0.637	1	1	1	1	
rs1128503	0.73924312		0.6538	0.6421	1	1	1	1	
rs1130609	0.29665767		0.7027	0.7952	1	1	1	1	
rs11554137	1	1	0.5235	0.1592	1	1	1	1	

Dominant Mo	odel Fisher Test	(FDR/Bo	nferroni)			
SNP	model	P value	FDR-adju	Bonferron	ni-adjust P	value
rs1045642	Dominant	0.576	1	1		
rs1048977	Dominant	0.048	0.3341	0.3341		
rs10883841	Dominant	1	1	1		
rs11231825	Dominant	1	1	1		
rs1128503	Dominant	1	1	1		
rs1130609	Dominant	0.515	1	1		
rs11554137	Dominant	1	1	1		
Recessive Model Fisher Test (FDR/Bonferroni)						
SNP	model	P value	FDR-adju	Bonferron	ni-adjust P	value
rs1045642	Recessive	0.755	0.755	1		
rs1048977	Recessive	0.016	0.082	0.082		
rs11231825	Recessive	0.328	0.75	1		
rs1128503	Recessive	0.6	0.75	1		
rs1130609	Recessive	0.576	0.75	1		
Monte Carlo	Fisher Approxin	nation (2x	3)			
SNP	Test	p-value				
rs1045642	Monte Carlo Fi	0.3543				
rs1048977	Monte Carlo Fi	0.0218				
rs11231825	Monte Carlo Fi	0.5749				
rs1128503	Monte Carlo Fi	0.763				
rs1130609	Monte Carlo Fi	0.192				



The role of CDA rs1048977 need more investigation

- cytidine deaminase (CDA) converts ara-C to the inactive metabolite uracil arabinoside (ara-U)
- CDA is the key inactivating enzyme in **cytarabine metabolic pathway**, its overexpression is commonly associated with treatment resistance and relapse
- c.435C>T (rs1048977)) were associated with **reduced enzyme activity**
- The association and the role of this SNPs and family cancer history or its inherited role need more investigation.





- Higher LDH level in De novo pediatric AML than secondary pediatric AML
- Diagnosis age in patient with family cancer history in order than those without family cancer history.
- LDH level was lower in patient with family cancer history than those without family cancer history
- Sepsis occurred more in patient with family cancer history.
- rs1048977 lower in patient without family cancer history group



Acknowledgement





