Panel Based Error Corrected Next Generation Sequencing versus Flow Cytometry to Detect Measurable Residual Disease in Acute Myeloid Leukemia

Authors:

Nikhil Patkar[1,2*], Chinmayee Kakirde[1], Anam Fatima Shaikh[1], Rakhi Salve[1], Prasanna Bhanshe[1], Gaurav Chatterjee[1,2], Sweta Rajpal[1,2], Swapnali Joshi[1], Shruti Chaudhary[1], Rohan Kodgule[1], Sitaram Ghoghale[1], Nilesh Deshpande[1], Dhanalaxmi Shetty[3], Syed Hasan Khizer[2,4], Hasmukh Jain[2,4], Bhausaheb Bagal[2,4], Hari Menon[5], Navin Khattry[2,4], Manju Sengar[2,4], Prashant Tembhare[1,2], Papagudi Subramanian[1,2], Sumeet Gujral[1,2]

*Corresponding Author

Affiliations:

[1]*Haematopathology Laboratory, ACTREC, Tata Memorial Centre, Navi Mumbai, India*

[2] *Homi Bhabha National Institute (HBNI), Mumbai, India*

[3] *Dept of Cytogenetics, ACTREC, Tata Memorial Centre, Navi Mumbai, India*

[4] *Adult Haematolymphoid Disease Management Group, Tata Memorial Centre, Mumbai, India*

[5]*Haemato-Oncology, CyteCare Cancer Hospital, Bangalore, India*

Short Running Title: Error Corrected NGS based MRD in AML

Correspondence:

Dr Nikhil Patkar MD, DNB
Clinician Scientist & Associate Professor
Wellcome Trust – DBT Intermediate Fellow
Haematopathology Laboratory, CCE Building,
Advanced Centre for Treatment Research and Education in Cancer,
Tata Memorial Centre, Kharghar, Maharashtra, India, Pin: 410210
Email: nvpatkar@gmail.com; npatkar@actrec.gov.in
Phone: +91-22-27405000, Ext: 5773

Keywords:

Error Corrected Next Generation Sequencing, Measurable Residual Disease in AML, Unique Molecular Identifier based MRD Detection, Acute Myeloid Leukemia Risk of Relapse

Abstract:

A 35 gene error corrected next generation sequencing (NGS) panel was created using single molecule molecular inversion probes with applicability to 83% of acute myeloid leukemia (AML). We accrued 201 patients of adult AML treated with conventional therapy, in morphological remission and evaluated measurable residual disease using NGS (NGS-MRD) and multiparameter flow cytometry (FCM-MRD) at end of induction (PI) and consolidation (PC). A total of 344 mutations were detected (median VAF of 0.76%) during assessment of MRD. Nearly 71% of patients harbored PI NGS-MRD (and 40.9% harbored PC-MRD). Patients harboring NGS-MRD had a significantly higher cumulative incidence of relapse (CIR), inferior overall survival (OS) and relapse free survival (RFS) as compared to NGS-MRD negative patients at PI and PC time points. NGS-MRD was predictive of inferior outcome in intermediate cytogenetic risk and demonstrated potential in favorable cytogenetic risk AML. Patients who cleared PI NGS-MRD had a significantly improved survival as compared to patients who became negative subsequently indicating that kinetics of NGS-MRD clearance was of paramount importance. NGS-MRD identified over 80% of cases identified by flow cytometry at PI time point whereas FCM identified 49.3% identified by NGS. Only a fraction of cases were truly missed by NGS as compared to FCM-MRD. Both FCM and NGS MRD were important in predicting outcome however, PI NGS-MRD emerged as the most important independent prognostic factor predictive of inferior outcome. We demonstrate that panel based NGS-MRD is highly predictive of outcome and advantageous when compared to FCM-MRD in AML treated with conventional therapies.

Key Points:

- Panel based error corrected NGS-MRD assessment for acute myeloid leukemia is applicable to majority of AML
- NGS-MRD assessment in CR at early time-points in therapy is highly predictive for outcome

Introduction

Acute Myeloid Leukemia is a disease characterized by heterogeneous biology resulting in varying clinical outcomes including relapse. [1,2] There are limited novel treatment options such as targeted therapies using *FLT3* or *IDH2* inhibitors and most patients are treated based on the presumptive risk of relapse. [3,4] This risk adapted therapy typically considers standard cytogenetic and molecular variables as recommended by the European LeukemiaNet. [5] Based on this risk, patients are recommended treatment with conventional (induction and consolidation) regimens or offered intensive therapy such as allogeneic bone marrow transplantation (BMT) after achievement of remission. Amongst these, the largest group remains as intermediate risk AML characterized by non-uniform clinical outcomes.

The monitoring of a patient's response to chemotherapy, called, measurable residual disease (MRD) is one of the most important predictors of outcome in hematological malignancies. Several investigators have demonstrated the clinical utility of flow cytometry based MRD detection (FCM-MRD) in AML at early chemotherapy time points as well as in a pre-transplant setting.[6-14] Although universally applicable, FCM-MRD suffers from suboptimal ability to predict relapse in AML compared to precursor B lineage acute lymphoblastic leukemia. A diverse array of sensitive molecular methods have been used to detect MRD in AML such as real time PCR[15] and droplet digital PCR.[16] These are useful for monitoring of individual gene mutations such as AML with mutated *NPM1*[17] and chimeric gene fusions such as *RUNX1-RUNX1T1*.[18] Next generation sequencing (NGS) is a promising tool for sensitive MRD monitoring and has been used successfully to monitor *NPM1*[19,20] , *RUNX1*[21] and *FLT3*[22] mutations as well as chimeric gene fusions.[23,24] However, these methodologies can be utilized in only a subset of patients that harboured these mutations at diagnosis and this strategy discounts for clonal heterogeneity and evolution which are relevant to the pathogenesis of AML.

DNA based focussed target enrichment strategies (gene panels) are an attractive solution to detect MRD using NGS (NGS-MRD) in a mutation rich disease such as AML.[25,26-28] However, short read sequencers are inherently prone to base calling errors limiting variant calling at 3-5% variant allele

fraction (VAF).[29] Although acceptable for diagnostic molecular pathology, this is undesirable assay performance for the detection of MRD. Error corrected sequencing involves the physical incorporation of random oligonucleotides or unique molecular identifiers (UMI) at the library preparation stage prior to amplification of DNA. This allows us to tag individual DNA molecules with an unique molecular fingerprint.[30,31] Such approaches have been used for myelodysplastic syndromes[32] and for pre transplant MRD monitoring of AML as demonstrated by Thol and colleagues.[33] Thol utilized a sensitive patient specific mutation tracking approach using UMI based MRD detection. Although applicable to a broad spectrum of AML mutations, a tailored approach poses logistical and regulatory hurdles towards prospective MRD testing especially for early MRD timepoints.

In this study, we have evaluated the clinical utility of error corrected NGS to detect MRD in AML using single molecule molecular inversion probes (smMIPS).[30,34] Each smMIP contains an 8 bp UMI and binds to a single molecule of DNA. Using consensus sequence-based variant calling we can detect somatic mutations including small indels in a sensitive manner. We demonstrate that error corrected NGS-MRD at early timepoints in therapy is significantly predictive of outcome in patients of AML treated with conventional therapies. Furthermore, we systematically compare multicolour FCM-MRD with error corrected NGS-MRD and assess the clinical utility of these two assays in a cohort of AML.

Methods

1. PATIENTS

a. *Patient Accrual and Initial work up*: The study was approved by the institutional ethics committee (IEC-III project 163) and participants were accrued after informed consent. A total of 393 adult patients of AML, diagnosed as per 2008 WHO criteria, were accrued in this study over a period of six years (Feb 2013 to May 2019). Cytogenetic (FISH and karyotyping) workup was as previously described.[9,20] Somatic mutations at diagnosis were evaluated using a smMIPS based 50 gene myeloid panel as described previously by our group. [35] Of these, the smMIPS MRD panel (see below) was applicable to 83.2% patients [327 out of 393 AMLs, median 2 mutations per case (range 1 – 6 trackable mutations); Supplementary Figure 1]. Of those (n=319) achieving morphological CR, the smMIPS MRD panel was applicable to 266 (83.4%). MRD assessment could be performed in 201 adult patients of AML (enrolment flow chart in supplementary figure 2). A summary of the clinical and laboratory characteristics of these 201 patients can be seen in Table 1.

b. *Treatment of AML and MRD Sampling*: All patients were treated with conventional "3+7" induction chemotherapy and further treated with high dose cytarabine (HiDAC) or allogeneic bone marrow transplantation (aBMT), if feasible.[35] Only 15 patients received aBMT and their outcome was not different from the rest with respect to OS and RFS (p = not significant; supplementary figure 3) and are not considered separately. Sample for FCM-MRD was obtained from the bone marrow at end of induction (PI; n=200) and end of first consolidation cycle (PC, n=98). NGS MRD sample also obtained at the same time points (PI-196; PC-127) from the bone marrow (n=269; PI:181 and PC:88) or peripheral blood (n=51; PI:15 and PC:36).

c. *Evaluation of Treatment Outcome*: Overall Survival (OS) and Relapse Free Survival (RFS) were calculated as previously described.[9,20,35] The prognostic impact of NGS and FCM-MRD assays on OS and RFS was computed using the Kaplan-Meier method and

compared using log-rank test. Multivariate analysis was performed using the Cox proportional-hazards regression analysis that considered FCM-MRD and NGS-MRD. Separate models were constructed for post induction and post consolidation MRD time points. Grey test was used to compare the cumulative incidences of relapse (CIR) and non-relapse mortality (NRM) using "cmprsk" module in R.[36] The same module was used to generate representative graphs. Positive predictive value (PPV) and negative predictive value (NPV) were calculated as described.[33]

2. DETECTION OF MRD USING NGS

a. *smMIPS panel*: We created a 35 gene panel comprising of a pool of 302 smMIPS (as seen in Supplementary Table 1). In brief, this panel covers regions of 35 commonly mutated genes in AML (*ATM, BCOR, DNMT3A, EZH2, FLT3, GATA1, GATA2, IDH1, IDH2, JAK2, KDM6A, KIT, KMT2D, KRAS, NF1, NOTCH1, NOTCH2, NPM1, NRAS, PHF6, PTPN11, RAD21, RUNX1, SETBP1, SF3B1, SH2B3, SMC1A, SRSF2, STAG2, TET2, TP53, U2AF1, WT1, ZRSR2*). The panel was rebalanced (Supplementary Figure 4) to ensure uniform capture across regions. Approximately 600ng of genomic DNA was captured, treated with exonucleases and PCR amplified to create a sequencing ready library. Details pertaining to smMIPS design, assay standardization and sequencing are detailed in supplementary methods.

b. *Bioinformatics*: Reads were demultiplexed, trimmed, paired end assembled and mapped to the human genome (build hg19). Singleton reads (originating from one UMI) were discarded, and consensus family based variant calling performed using tools described in supplementary methods. We then created a site and mutation specific error model to ascertain the relevance of an observed variant at each site.[34] Criteria for variant calling using the smMIPS MRD assay are described in supplementary methods.

c. *MRD for FLT3-internal tandem duplications (ITD): FLT3*-ITD were detected using a novel one-step PCR based NGS assay (see Supplementary Table 3). Variants were detected using a recently described algorithm for the accurate detection of *FLT3*-ITD.[37]

d. *Orthogonal detection of MRD in NPM1 mutated AML*: *NPM1* mutations were additionally tracked using an ultrasensitive orthogonal *NPM1* MRD assay.[20]

3. DETECTION OF MRD IN USING MULTICOLOUR FLOW CYTOMETRY (FCM-MRD)

FCM-MRD was detected using a previously described 10 colour two tube MRD assay.[9,20,35,38] This approach uses a combination of leukemia associated immunophenotype and difference from normal approaches to detect MRD in AML.

Results

1. PATIENTS:

   The median follow-up of the cohort was 42.3 months. The median OS was 35.9 months (95%CI- 27.2 to 42.8) for the entire cohort. The median RFS was 21.6 months (95%CI- 17.0 to 28.9) months. Additional patient characteristics can be seen in Table 1.

2. NGS BASED AML MRD:

   a. *Assay Characteristics*:

      We describe an NGS-MRD approach that is applicable to 83.2% of all AML. For patients in morphological CR (n=319) this approach was applicable to 83.4% (n=266). Of these, MRD could be assessed in 201 cases. A co-occurrence plot indicating interactions of mutations tracked by NGS-MRD, prior to therapy, can be seen in Figure 1A. The applicability of this MRD panel, when patients (n=201) are classified by cytogenetic risk is seen in supplementary table 2.

   b. *Limit of Detection*:

      In a limit of detection experiment (supplementary figure 5), we demonstrated that we could detect leukemic clones till a lower limit of 0.05% (0.03% for *NPM1* mutation). Error modelling of normal samples indicated a higher prevalence of C>T and G>A changes consistent with oxidative DNA damage (supplementary figure 6).[34] *FLT3*-ITD could be detected at a limit of 0.002% VAF (supplementary figure 7). For smMIPS based MRD, samples were sequenced at a median coverage of 14,728x (11,363x consensus coverage) whereas, for *FLT3*-MRD assay, the median coverage was 1,396,366x. A total of 344 mutations could be detected in 323 samples (Figure 1B,C) with a median VAF of 0.95% [0.76% after exclusion of mutations in *DNMT3A, TET2, ASXL1* (DTA) genes]. Amongst positive patients, a median of 2 mutations could be detected per patient (range 1-4) at end of induction.

   c. *Clinical Relevance of NGS-MRD*:

Nearly 71% (n=139; 70.9%) of patients harboured MRD at the end of induction and 40.9% (n=52) at the end of consolidation. Patients harbouring MRD had a significantly higher CIR as compared to MRD negative patients at PI time point as seen in Figure 2A, Table 2. For patients who were PC NGS-MRD positive a similar observation for CIR was made (Figure 2B, Table 2). The presence of NGS-MRD at the end of induction was associated with inferior OS and RFS (Figure 2C,E) as detailed in Table 3. Similarly, the presence of NGS-MRD (n=52; 40.9%) was predictive of inferior OS and RFS at the end of consolidation (Figure 2D,F; Table 3).

i. Cytogenetics and NGS-MRD: We did not observe a significant distribution of MRD results when cases were distributed by cytogenetic risk. However, the presence of NGS-MRD was predictive of inferior outcome in intermediate cytogenetic risk (and a tendency in favorable risk) as seen in supplementary figure 8.

ii. Change in mutations over MRD time points: Amongst paired samples (n=122), 83 samples were positive at PI time point, of which 37 became negative at end of consolidation. For 46 patients in whom MRD persisted a change in MRD profile occurred in 18 patients (39.13%). This included a loss of mutation in most cases (n=14) and gain in the rest (supplementary figure 9). There were 5 patients who were negative at PI time point and became positive at end of consolidation. Of these, relapse was seen in two patients.

iii. Clinical relevance of the kinetics of NGS-MRD clearance: Patients who cleared NGS-MRD at end of induction (and persisted) had a significantly improved OS [HR- 0.45; 95% CI- 0.22 to 0.9; (p=0.02)] and RFS [HR- 0.49; 95% CI- 0.27 to 0.89; (p=0.01)] as compared to patients who became negative at end of consolidation (supplementary figure 10). Similarly, patients who persistently harboured MRD had a significantly inferior outcome as compared to patients who were MRD negative at both time points

(supplementary figure 11). There was no genetic difference observed between these two groups (supplementary figure 12).

d. *Orthogonal detection of NGS-MRD in NPM1 mutated AML*:

Orthogonal comparison of MRD detection in *NPM1* mutated AML was performed in 75 patients (23.2% of all MRD samples; Supplementary Methods, supplementary figure 13). There was a good correlation observed with *NPM1* NGS MRD assay (R^2=0.71). The PPV of smMIPS MRD assay for *NPM1* mutated AML was 58.5% (95%CI- 52.35 to 64.42%) as compared to a lower PPV of *NPM1* NGS MRD assay [50% (95%CI- 45.34% to 54.66%)]. The *NPM1* NGS MRD assay had a much lower specificity [11.11%(95%CI- 3.11 to 26.06%)] as compared to smMIPS MRD assay for MRD detection in *NPM1* mutated AML [46.58%(95%CI- 34.80 to 58.63%)].

3. FCM BASED AML- MRD:

The presence of FCM-MRD was associated with inferior OS, RFS and CIR at the end of induction and consolidation as detailed in Tables 2, 3 and supplementary figure 14.

4. COMPARISON OF FCM AND NGS MRD:

On incorporating results combining both the MRD modalities, patients that were positive by both techniques (FCM+ NGS+) had a significantly inferior outcome with respect to OS, RFS and CIR at any MRD time point as compared to patients negative by both modalities as seen in Table 2,3 (Figure 3). A comparison of the baseline mutational profiles between dual PI MRD positive and negative groups revealed a significantly higher (p=0.04) prevalence of *RUNX1* mutations in the dual MRD positive subset (supplementary figure 15).

a. *Clinico-pathological correlates of FCM MRD Positive NGS MRD Negative AML*:

A total of 20 patients were (FCM+NGS-) at assessed at PI and/or PC time points, of which 4 were detected at subsequent (or preceding) MRD time point. Of the remaining 16, in three patients a paired MRD sample was lacking. Amongst the rest, six patients (out of

13) had relapsed, three died due to non-relapse causes and four were alive at last follow up (supplementary table 5).

b. Accuracy of NGS-MRD in comparison with FCM-MRD:

The PPV and NPV metrics of end of induction NGS-MRD to predict relapse in AML were 70.5% and 57.89% respectively with an accuracy of 66.84%. FCM MRD metrics at end of induction were comparable for PPV (75%), NPV (48.2%) and accuracy to predict relapse(60%). At the PI time point, NGS-MRD correctly identified 80% (68 out of 85) of cases classified as MRD positive by FCM, whereas FCM identified just 68 out of 138 cases (49.3%) identified by NGS. A detailed comparison of PPV, NPM and accuracy of combinations of patients detected between these two assays can be seen in supplementary table 6.

5. MULTIVARIATE ANALYSIS:

Both FCM and NGS MRD were important in predicting outcome as seen in Table 3. However, PI NGS-MRD emerged as the most important independent prognostic factor predictive of inferior outcome for OS [HR- 1.94; 95% CI- 1.15 to 3.27; ($p<0.0001$)] as well as RFS [HR- 2.05; 95% CI- 1.30 to 3.23; ($p<0.0001$)].

Discussion

Recently, Hourigan and colleagues [39] performed ultradeep sequencing using a 13-gene panel to detect MRD in AML. In a pioneering effort, they demonstrated an advantage of myeloablative conditioning in preventing relapse in an AML cohort based on NGS MRD results. The authors, however, were unable to compare their results with other MRD assessment techniques. Here, we have assessed MRD at serial time points and have compared our results with 10 colour FCM-MRD, which is a widely used technique for the assessment of response to chemotherapy. We find that NGS-MRD is comparable in applicability and adds value, especially when a clear distinction of regenerating myeloid progenitors from leukemic blasts is absent. Advantages over FCM-MRD include potential for multi-institutional standardization, an ability to scale up operations and lack of requirement of expert operators. In our manuscript we demonstrate that NGS-MRD identified over 80% of cases identified by flow cytometry at PI time point. On evaluating 20 cases (from both PI and PC timepoints) missed by NGS-MRD (but detected by FCM), we observed that 20% of these were detected by NGS-MRD at a subsequent or preceding MRD time point. An additional 56.3% (n=9) are alive or have died due to causes other than relapse indicating that these could have been false positives. In that case, only a fraction of cases (n=7) are truly missed by NGS as compared to FCM-MRD. An additional novel insight gained is gained by studying the kinetics of MRD (supplementary figure 10). We demonstrate that patients who became negative at end of induction are likely to have a superior outcome as patients who turn negative at a subsequent time point.

Previously Jongen-Lavrencic have demonstrated clinical utility of NGS to detect MRD in AML by using computational error correction to mitigate sequencing errors.[26]Such an approach although easy to implement discounts for batch effects and variability that occurs because of library clustering and batch dependent PCR artefacts.[31] In that context, to the best of our knowledge, this is the first study to determine the clinical importance of (error corrected, panel based) NGS-MRD in AML treated with conventional therapies. Although our NGS-MRD strategy works in a majority of AML, we were curious about the genetic basis of cases (n=65 out of 393) in which this strategy *did not* work. The

cytogenetic and mutational landscape can be seen in supplementary figure 16. Nearly half of these patients did not harbour any mutation at diagnosis (n=29; 44.6%). Insight into rest of the cases revealed *ASXL2* as a recurrently mutated gene (n=8,12.3%). Incorporation of *ASXL2* in future iterations of our panel will as well as other UMI based RNA sequencing approaches[23,24] to monitor chimeric gene fusions will help in increasing the breadth of our approach.

Consistent with previous reports, we find that in some patients, mutations in DTA genes are present at high VAF at MRD time points (Figure 1) indicating an origin from an ancestral clone possibly originating from clonal haematopoesis.[26,33,39] We are in agreement with Thol and colleagues who indicated that mutations in *TET2* could reliably be used as MRD markers, at least in a fraction of cases. [33] Unlike amplicon based[27,33] approaches, the advantage of a smMIPS based capture includes a stable panel which can be used across a spectrum of cases and no susceptibility to allelic skew or PCR induced errors prior to incorporation of the UMI barcode. Disadvantages of smMIPs include poor performance for GC rich genes such as *CEBPA* gene and inability to capture low yield or poor quality of DNA (a problem not infrequently seen with MRD samples). The library preparation process, is relatively low cost in nature and the overall process has a realistic, turnaround time of five to seven days. Our observation is that sensitivity in the clinic for most mutations is close to 0.1% VAF. A lower can be obtained for complex indels such as *NPM1* and *FLT3*-ITD. Improvements with sensitivity may be possible through duplex sequencing based methods albeit at a much higher cost of sequencing. [29] Lastly, based on this data we find that mutations in *NPM1, FLT3, NRAS, KIT, IDH1, IDH2, WT1, RUNX1, GATA2, U2AF1* and *PHF6* were most helpful in making an positive NGS-MRD call. (supplementary figure 17).

To conclude, we demonstrate that panel based error corrected NGS-MRD is clinically relevant and possibly advantageous when compared to FCM-MRD based AML MRD.

Acknowledgements:

This work was supported by the Wellcome Trust/DBT India Alliance Fellowship [grant number IA/CPHI/14/1/501485] awarded to Dr Nikhil Patkar.

We are grateful for the training imparted to Dr Nikhil Patkar in the field genome sequencing technologies by Dr David Wu, Dr Stephen Salipante and Dr Brent Wood in the Department of Laboratory Medicine, University of Washington, USA & Salipante Lab, University of Washington. We are greatful to Dr Jay Shendure (Department of Genome Sciences, University of Washington) for agreeing to be an the external sponsor for Wellcome Trust/DBT India Alliance Fellowship. We are also greatful to Dr Christopher Hourigan for critically reviewing this manuscript and providing very helpful comments and suggestions.

Authorship and conflict-of-interest statements:

NP designed the study, conducted research, analyzed, interpreted the data, and wrote the manuscript. AFS, CK, RS, PB, SR, SJ, SC, RK conducted research conducted research and analyzed data. DS, SG, GC, ND, PT, PGS, SG conducted research and analyzed data. BB, HM, NK, MS recruited patients and analyzed data.

The author(s) declare no competing financial interests.

Agreement to Share Publication-Related Data and Data Sharing Statement:

Dr Nikhil Patkar, Haematopathology Laboratory, CCE Building, Advanced Centre for Treatment Research and Education in Cancer, Tata Memorial Centre, Kharghar, Maharashtra, India, Pin: 410210. Email: nvpatkar@gmail.com; npatkar@actrec.gov.in. Phone: +91-22-27405000, Ext: 5773

References

1. Estey E, Dohner H. Acute myeloid leukaemia. *Lancet*. 2006;368(9550):1894-1907.
2. Papaemmanuil E, Gerstung M, Bullinger L, et al. Genomic Classification and Prognosis in Acute Myeloid Leukemia. *N Engl J Med*. 2016;374(23):2209-2221.
3. Stone RM, Mandrekar SJ, Sanford BL, et al. Midostaurin plus Chemotherapy for Acute Myeloid Leukemia with a FLT3 Mutation. *N Engl J Med*. 2017;377(5):454-464.
4. Stein EM, DiNardo CD, Pollyea DA, et al. Enasidenib in mutant IDH2 relapsed or refractory acute myeloid leukemia. *Blood*. 2017;130(6):722-731.
5. Dohner H, Estey E, Grimwade D, et al. Diagnosis and management of AML in adults: 2017 ELN recommendations from an international expert panel. *Blood*. 2017;129(4):424-447.
6. Kern W, Bacher U, Haferlach C, Schnittger S, Haferlach T. The role of multiparameter flow cytometry for disease monitoring in AML. *Best Pract Res Clin Haematol*. 2010;23(3):379-390.
7. Walter RB, Gooley TA, Wood BL, et al. Impact of pretransplantation minimal residual disease, as detected by multiparametric flow cytometry, on outcome of myeloablative hematopoietic cell transplantation for acute myeloid leukemia. *J Clin Oncol*. 2011;29(9):1190-1197.
8. Loken MR, Alonzo TA, Pardo L, et al. Residual disease detected by multidimensional flow cytometry signifies high relapse risk in patients with de novo acute myeloid leukemia: a report from Children's Oncology Group. *Blood*. 2012;120(8):1581-1588.
9. Patkar N, Kakirde C, Bhanshe P, et al. Utility of Immunophenotypic Measurable Residual Disease in Adult Acute Myeloid Leukemia-Real-World Context. *Front Oncol*. 2019;9:450.
10. San Miguel JF, Vidriales MB, Lopez-Berges C, et al. Early immunophenotypical evaluation of minimal residual disease in acute myeloid leukemia identifies different patient risk groups and may contribute to postinduction treatment stratification. *Blood*. 2001;98(6):1746-1751.
11. Freeman SD, Virgo P, Couzens S, Grimwade D, Russell N, Hills RK. Prognostic relevance of treatment response measured by flow cytometric residual disease detection in older patients with acute myeloid leukemia. *J Clin Oncol*. 2013;31.
12. Buccisano F, Maurillo L, Spagnoli A, et al. Cytogenetic and molecular diagnostic characterization combined to postconsolidation minimal residual disease assessment by flow cytometry improves risk stratification in adult acute myeloid leukemia. *Blood*. 2010;116(13):2295-2303.
13. Venditti A, Buccisano F, Del Poeta G, et al. Level of minimal residual disease after consolidation therapy predicts outcome in acute myeloid leukemia. *Blood*. 2000;96(12):3948-3952.
14. Terwijn M, Putten WLJ, Kelder A, Velden VHJ, Brooimans RA, Pabst T. High prognostic impact of flow cytometric minimal residual disease detection in acute myeloid leukemia: data from the HOVON/SAKK AML 42A study. *J Clin Oncol*. 2013;31.
15. Gabert J, Beillard E, van der Velden VH, et al. Standardization and quality control studies of 'real-time' quantitative reverse transcriptase polymerase chain reaction of fusion gene transcripts for residual disease detection in leukemia - a Europe Against Cancer program. *Leukemia*. 2003;17(12):2318-2357.
16. Mencia-Trinchant N, Hu Y, Alas MA, et al. Minimal Residual Disease Monitoring of Acute Myeloid Leukemia by Massively Multiplex Digital PCR in Patients with NPM1 Mutations. *J Mol Diagn*. 2017;19(4):537-548.
17. Ivey A, Hills RK, Simpson MA, et al. Assessment of Minimal Residual Disease in Standard-Risk AML. *N Engl J Med*. 2016;374(5):422-433.
18. Rucker FG, Agrawal M, Corbacioglu A, et al. Measurable residual disease monitoring in acute myeloid leukemia with t(8;21)(q22;q22.1): results from the AML Study Group. *Blood*. 2019;134(19):1608-1618.
19. Salipante SJ, Fromm JR, Shendure J, Wood BL, Wu D. Detection of minimal residual disease in NPM1-mutated acute myeloid leukemia by next-generation sequencing. *Mod Pathol*. 2014;27(11):1438-1446.

20. Patkar N, Kodgule R, Kakirde C, et al. Clinical impact of measurable residual disease monitoring by ultradeep next generation sequencing in NPM1 mutated acute myeloid leukemia. *Oncotarget*. 2018;9(93):36613-36624.
21. Kohlmann A, Nadarajah N, Alpermann T, et al. Monitoring of residual disease by next-generation deep-sequencing of RUNX1 mutations can identify acute myeloid leukemia patients with resistant disease. *Leukemia*. 2014;28(1):129-137.
22. Levis MJ, Perl AE, Altman JK, et al. A next-generation sequencing-based assay for minimal residual disease assessment in AML patients with FLT3-ITD mutations. *Blood Adv*. 2018;2(8):825-831.
23. Dillon LW, Hayati S, Roloff GW, et al. Targeted RNA-sequencing for the quantification of measurable residual disease in acute myeloid leukemia. *Haematologica*. 2019;104(2):297-304.
24. Patkar N, Bhanshe P, Rajpal S, et al. NARASIMHA: Novel Assay based on Targeted RNA Sequencing to Identify ChiMeric Gene Fusions in Hematological Malignancies. *Blood Cancer J*. 2020;10(5):50.
25. Kim T, Moon JH, Ahn JS, et al. Next-generation sequencing-based posttransplant monitoring of acute myeloid leukemia identifies patients at high risk of relapse. *Blood*. 2018;132(15):1604-1613.
26. Jongen-Lavrencic M, Grob T, Hanekamp D, et al. Molecular Minimal Residual Disease in Acute Myeloid Leukemia. *N Engl J Med*. 2018;378(13):1189-1199.
27. Press RD, Eickelberg G, Froman A, et al. Next-generation sequencing-defined minimal residual disease before stem cell transplantation predicts acute myeloid leukemia relapse. *Am J Hematol*. 2019;94(8):902-912.
28. Klco JM, Miller CA, Griffith M, et al. Association Between Mutation Clearance After Induction Therapy and Outcomes in Acute Myeloid Leukemia. *Jama*. 2015;314(8):811-822.
29. Schmitt MW, Kennedy SR, Salk JJ, Fox EJ, Hiatt JB, Loeb LA. Detection of ultra-rare mutations by next-generation sequencing. *Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A*. 2012;109(36):14508-14513.
30. Hiatt JB, Pritchard CC, Salipante SJ, O'Roak BJ, Shendure J. Single molecule molecular inversion probes for targeted, high-accuracy detection of low-frequency variation. *Genome Res*. 2013;23(5):843-854.
31. Yoest JM, Shirai CL, Duncavage EJ. Sequencing-Based Measurable Residual Disease Testing in Acute Myeloid Leukemia. *Front Cell Dev Biol*. 2020;8:249.
32. Duncavage EJ, Jacoby MA, Chang GS, et al. Mutation Clearance after Transplantation for Myelodysplastic Syndrome. *N Engl J Med*. 2018;379(11):1028-1041.
33. Thol F, Gabdoulline R, Liebich A, et al. Measurable residual disease monitoring by NGS before allogeneic hematopoietic cell transplantation in AML. *Blood*. 2018;132(16):1703-1713.
34. Waalkes A, Penewit K, Wood BL, Wu D, Salipante SJ. Ultrasensitive detection of acute myeloid leukemia minimal residual disease using single molecule molecular inversion probes. *Haematologica*. 2017;102(9):1549-1557.
35. Patkar N, Shaikh AF, Kakirde C, et al. A novel machine-learning-derived genetic score correlates with measurable residual disease and is highly predictive of outcome in acute myeloid leukemia with mutated NPM1. *Blood Cancer J*. 2019;9(10):79.
36. Scrucca L, Santucci A, Aversa F. Competing risk analysis using R: an easy guide for clinicians. *Bone Marrow Transplant*. 2007;40(4):381-387.
37. Blatte TJ, Schmalbrock LK, Skambraks S, et al. getITD for FLT3-ITD-based MRD monitoring in AML. *Leukemia*. 2019;33(10):2535-2539.
38. Shaikh AF, Kakirde C, Dhamne C, et al. Machine learning derived genomics driven prognostication for acute myeloid leukemia with RUNX1-RUNX1T1. *Leuk Lymphoma*. 2020:1-7.
39. Hourigan CS, Dillon LW, Gui G, et al. Impact of Conditioning Intensity of Allogeneic Transplantation for Acute Myeloid Leukemia With Genomic Evidence of Residual Disease. *J Clin Oncol*. 2020;38(12):1273-1283.

Figure legends

Figure 1: **Somatic mutations in AML detected at diagnosis and during therapy**. Figure 1A: The interaction of mutations at baseline is demonstrated here using Fisher's Exact test. Co-occurrence is indicated in grey colour and mutual exclusivity is indicated in red. Figure 1B: The total number of mutations detected per patient and the number of such patients in the cohort is displayed. The total number of mutations in *DNMT3A-TET2-ASXL1* genes is indicated here as a fraction. Figure 1C: Variant allele frequencies of mutations detected at MRD time points for patients of AML in morphological remission. The bars indicate median values with interquartile ranges.

Figure 2: **Clinical relevance of error corrected NGS-MRD**. Presence of NGS MRD at post induction (A) and post consolidation time points (B) is associated with a higher cumulative incidence of relapse (CIR). Kaplan Meyer plots indicate the clinical relevance of NGS-MRD with respect to OS and RFS at post induction (C,E) and post consolidation time points (D,F).

Figure 3: **Comparison between FCM and NGS-MRD.** The clinical relevance of positive or negative results for detection of MRD during complete remission when measured by FCM or error corrected NGS at post induction (A,B) and post consolidation time points (C,D).

Parameter	Observation (%)
Demographics:	
Age	Range: 18-63 years Median: 36 years
Sex	Male : Female : 1.48 : 1
Clinical Characteristics:	
Total Number of Patients Accrued	201
Remission Characteristics:	
Complete remission (CR)	31
CR with incomplete hematologic recovery (CRi)	170
Bone Marrow Transplantation:	
Patients who underwent BMT	15
Laboratory Characteristics:	
Blood Counts at Presentation	
1. More than 50,000/mm^3	49
2. Less than 50,000/mm^3	152
Classification according to Cytogenetic Risk:	
Favorable Risk	48 (23.9%)
Intermediate Risk	136 (67.7%)
Poor Risk	17 (8.5%)
Post Induction Flow MRD (n=200):	
MRD Positive	88 (44.0%)
MRD Negative	112 (56.0%)
Post Consolidation Flow MRD (n=98):	
MRD Positive	21 (21.4%)
MRD Negative	77 (78.6%)
Post Induction NGS MRD (n=196):	
MRD Positive	139 (70.9%)
MRD Negative	57 (29.1%)
Post Consolidation NGS MRD (n=127):	
MRD Positive	52 (40.9%)
MRD Negative	75 (59.1%)
Comparative Analysis of FCM MRD and NGS MRD (Post Induction; n=195)	
NGS MRD+ FCM MRD+	68 (34.9%)
NGS MRD+ FCM MRD-	70 (35.9%)
NGS MRD- FCM MRD+	17 (8.7%)
NGS MRD- FCM MRD-	40 (20.5%)
Comparative Analysis of FCM MRD and NGS MRD (Post Consolidation; n=87)	
NGS MRD+ FCM MRD+	09 (10.3%)
NGS MRD+ FCM MRD-	28 (32.2%)
NGS MRD- FCM MRD+	08 (9.2%)
NGS MRD- FCM MRD-	42 (48.3%)

Table 1: Summary of clinical, laboratory and MRD characteristics of patients accrued in this study.

Cumulative Incidence of Relapse						
Post Induction NGS MRD	**Cumulative Incidence of Relapse (CIR)**			**Non-Relapse Mortality (NRM)**		
	HR	**3-year CIR (95% CI)**	**P-value**	**HR**	**3-year Cumulative Incidence (95% CI)**	**P-value**
MRD Negative	1	25.7 % (14.9 to 37.9)	***0.003***	1	18.7 % (9.5 to 30.3)	0.333
MRD Positive	8.81	47.5 % (38.7 to 55.8)		0.93	23.4 % (16.6 to 30.8)	
Post Consolidation NGS MRD	**Cumulative Incidence of Relapse**			**Non-Relapse Mortality**		
	HR	**3-year CIR (95% CI)**	**P-value**	**HR**	**3-year Cumulative Incidence (95% CI)**	**P-value**
MRD Negative	1	36.2 % (25.1 to 47.4)	***0.03***	1	16.6 % (9.0 to 26.1)	0.532
MRD Positive	4.79	52.8 % (37.8 to 65.7)		0.39	19.2 % (9.8 to 31.0)	
Post Induction FCM MRD	**Cumulative Incidence of Relapse**			**Non-Relapse Mortality**		
	HR	**3-year CIR (95% CI)**	**P-value**	**HR**	**3-year Cumulative Incidence (95% CI)**	**P-value**
MRD Negative	1	33.6 % (24.7 to 42.7)	***0.008***	1	19.8 % (12.7 to 28.0)	0.321
MRD Positive	6.97	49.8 % (38.6 to 59.9)		0.98	25.2 % (16.6 to 34.8)	
Post Consolidation FCM MRD	**Cumulative Incidence of Relapse**			**Non-Relapse Mortality**		
	HR	**3-year CIR (95% CI)**	**P-value**	**HR**	**3-year Cumulative Incidence (95% CI)**	**P-value**
MRD Negative	1	35.9 % (25.1 to 46.9)	***0.01***	1	19.9 % (11.7 to 29.7)	0.632
MRD Positive	6.03	61.9 % (36.3 to 79.7)		0.22	23.8 % (8.2 to 43.9)	
Comparative Analysis of FCM MRD and NGS MRD (Post Induction)	**Cumulative Incidence of Relapse**			**Non-Relapse Mortality**		
	HR	**3-year CIR (95% CI)**	**P-value**	**HR**	**3-year Cumulative Incidence (95% CI)**	**P-value**
NGS MRD- FCM MRD-	1	18.7 % (8.0 to 32.7)	***0.003***	1	13.8 % (4.8 to 27.3)	0.425
NGS MRD+ FCM MRD-	-	41.9 % (29.6 to 53.7)		-	23.7 % (14.2 to 34.6)	
NGS MRD- FCM MRD+	-	41.2 % (17.5 to 63.6)		-	29.4 % (9.8 to 52.4)	
NGS MRD+ FCM MRD+	14.01	52.5 % (39.6 to 63.9)		2.78	23.5 % (14.2 to 34.2)	
Comparative Analysis of FCM MRD and NGS MRD (Post Consolidation)	**Cumulative Incidence of Relapse**			**Non-Relapse Mortality**		
	HR	**3-year CIR (95% CI)**	**P-value**	**HR**	**3-year Cumulative Incidence (95% CI)**	**P-value**
NGS MRD- FCM MRD-	1	24.8 % (12.6 to 39.0)	***0.0003***	1	22.0 % (10.7 to 35.9)	0.398
NGS MRD+ FCM MRD-	-	50.0 % (29.9 to 67.1)		-	17.8 % (6.3 to 34.1)	
NGS MRD- FCM MRD+	-	87.5 % (17.2 to 98.9)		-	0.0 % (-)	
NGS MRD+ FCM MRD+	18.81	55.5 % (14.7 to 83.5)		2.95	33.3 % (5.7 to 65.6)	
Dual Timepoint NGS MRD	**Cumulative Incidence of Relapse**			**Non-Relapse Mortality**		
	HR	**3-year CIR (95% CI)**	**P-value**	**HR**	**3-year Cumulative Incidence (95% CI)**	**P-value**
MRD Negative	1	27.8 % (13.5 to 44.0)	***0.04***	1	15.9 % (5.6 to 31.1)	0.834
Either MRD Positive	-	44.7 % (28.6 to 59.7)		-	19.0 % (8.8 to 32.2)	
MRD Positive	6.46	52.9 % (37.0 to 66.6)		0.36	17.4 % (8.0 to 29.7)	

Table 2: Prognostic influence of NGS-MRD, FCM-MRD and a combination of these modalities on the cumulative incidence of relapse (CIR).

Univariate Cox Analysis				
Post Induction FCM MRD	**Overall Survival (OS)**		**Relapse Free Survival (RFS)**	
	HR (95% CI)	**P**	**HR (95% CI)**	**P**
MRD Negative	1	***0.0002***	1	***0.0008***
MRD Positive	2.1 (1.40 to 3.13)		1.8 (1.26 to 2.60)	
Post Induction FCM MRD	**Overall Survival (OS)**		**Relapse Free Survival (RFS)**	
	HR (95% CI)	**P**	**HR (95% CI)**	**P**
MRD Negative	Mean OS: 58.0 months; 95% CI (51.2 to 64.8 months), Median OS: Not Reached	***0.0002***	Mean RFS: 47.0 months; 95% CI (40.2 to 53.8 months), Median RFS: 32.2 months 95% CI (22.4 to 42.0 months)	***0.0008***
MRD Positive	Mean OS: 36.3 months; 95% CI (29.6 to 43.0 months), Median OS: 18.4 months; 95% CI (15.1 to 33.9 months)		Mean RFS: 28.4 months; 95% CI (22.6 to 34.3 months), Median RFS: 15.4 months; 95% CI (12.7 to 20.1 months)	
Post Consolidation FCM MRD	**Overall Survival (OS)**		**Relapse Free Survival (RFS)**	
	HR (95% CI)	**P**	**HR (95% CI)**	**P**
MRD Negative	1	***0.04***	1	***0.001***
MRD Positive	1.9 (0.90 to 3.91)		2.4 (1.17 to 4.81)	
Post Consolidation FCM MRD	**Overall Survival (OS)**		**Relapse Free Survival (RFS)**	
	HR (95% CI)	**P**	**HR (95% CI)**	**P**
MRD Negative	Mean OS: 52.6 months; 95% CI (44.6 to 60.7 months), Median OS: Not Reached	***0.04***	Mean RFS: 45.4 months; 95% CI (37.5 to 53.3 months), Median RFS: 31.9 months 95% CI (19.1 to 38.9 months)	***0.001***
MRD Positive	Mean OS: 28.7 months; 95% CI (18.7 to 38.7 months), Median OS: 16.5 months; 95% CI (11.2 to 33.9 months)		Mean RFS: 19.4 months; 95% CI (11.6 to 27.2 months), Median RFS: 11.8 months; 95% CI (9.6 to 20.1 months)	
Post Induction NGS MRD	**Overall Survival (OS)**		**Relapse Free Survival (RFS)**	
	HR (95% CI)	**P**	**HR (95% CI)**	**P**
MRD Negative	1	***0.001***	1	***0.0002***
MRD Positive	2.2 (1.47 to 3.42)		2.3 (1.58 to 3.31)	
Post Induction NGS MRD	**Overall Survival (OS)**		**Relapse Free Survival (RFS)**	
	HR (95% CI)	**P**	**HR (95% CI)**	**P**
MRD Negative	Mean OS: 63.2 months; 95% CI (54.4 to 72.0 months), Median OS: Not Reached	***0.001***	Mean OS: 54.9 months; 95% CI (45.7 to 64.2 months), Median OS: Not Reached	***0.0002***
MRD Positive	Mean OS: 32.9 months; 95% CI (28.9 to 36.9 months), Median OS: 27.0 months; 95% CI (17.9 to 42.8 months)		Mean OS: 26.1 months; 95% CI (22.4 to 29.6 months), Median OS: 16.7 months; 95% CI (14.5 to 22.4 months)	
Post Consolidation NGS MRD	**Overall Survival (OS)**		**Relapse Free Survival (RFS)**	
	HR (95% CI)	**P**	**HR (95% CI)**	**P**
MRD Negative	1	***0.008***	1	***0.004***

MRD Positive	1.9 (1.14 to 3.22)		1.9 (1.18 to 3.06)	
Post Consolidation NGS MRD	**Overall Survival (OS)**		**Relapse Free Survival (RFS)**	
	HR (95% CI)	**P**	**HR (95% CI)**	**P**
MRD Negative	Mean OS: 55.5 months; 95% CI (47.2 to 63.7 months), Median OS: Not Reached	***0.008***	Mean OS: 46.9 months; 95% CI (38.8 to 54.9 months), Median OS: 33.0 months; 95% CI (21.4 to 42.0 months)	***0.004***
MRD Positive	Mean OS: 30.1 months; 95% CI (23.7 to 36.5 months), Median OS: 18.1 months; 95% CI (16.1 to 36.5 months)		Mean OS: 24.6 months; 95% CI (18.7 to 30.6 months), Median OS: 15.4 months; 95% CI (11.2 to 17.5 months)	
Dual Timepoint NGS MRD	**Overall Survival (OS)**		**Relapse Free Survival (RFS)**	
	HR (95% CI)	**P**	**HR (95% CI)**	**P**
MRD Negative	1	***0.03***	1	***0.01***
Either MRD Positive	1.2 (0.66 to 2.28)		1.2 (0.71 to 2.21)	
MRD Positive	2.5 (1.33 to 4.61)		2.5 (1.45 to 4.48)	
Dual Timepoint NGS MRD	**Overall Survival (OS)**		**Relapse Free Survival (RFS)**	
	HR (95% CI)	**P**	**HR (95% CI)**	**P**
MRD Negative	Mean OS: 63.2 months; 95% CI (52.0 to 74.4 months), Median OS: Not Reached	***0.03***	Mean OS: 55.8 months; 95% CI (44.1 to 67.5 months), Median OS: Not Reached	***0.01***
Either MRD Positive	Mean OS: 34.4 months; 95% CI (27.4 to 41.4 months), Median OS: 40.2 months; 95% CI (15.1 to 42.8 months)		Mean OS: 28.4 months; 95% CI (22.1 to 34.6 months), Median OS: 19.6 months; 95% CI (14.0 to 38.9 months)	
MRD Positive	Mean OS: 31.5 months; 95% CI (24.6 to 38.4 months), Median OS: 18.4 months; 95% CI (16.1 to 36.5 months)		Mean OS: 25.4 months; 95% CI (18.9 to 31.9 months), Median OS: 15.4 months; 95% CI (11.0 to 26.0 months)	
Comparative Analysis of FCM MRD and NGS MRD (Post Induction)	**Overall Survival (OS)**		**Relapse Free Survival (RFS)**	
	HR (95% CI)	**P**	**HR (95% CI)**	**P**
NGS MRD- FCM MRD-	1	***0.0002***	1	***0.0001***
NGS MRD+ FCM MRD-	1.6 (0.96 to 2.61)		1.4 (0.87 to 2.12)	
NGS MRD- FCM MRD+	1.3 (0.58 to 2.74)		1.3 (0.63 to 2.52)	
NGS MRD+ FCM MRD+	4.7 (2.71 to 8.00)		4.0 (2.51 to 6.47)	
Comparative Analysis of FCM MRD and NGS MRD (Post Induction)	**Overall Survival (OS)**		**Relapse Free Survival (RFS)**	
	HR (95% CI)	**P**	**HR (95% CI)**	**P**
NGS MRD- FCM MRD-	Mean OS: 71.5 months; 95% CI (62.4 to 80.7 months), Median OS: Not Reached	***0.0002***	Mean OS: 63.7 months; 95% CI (53.5 to 73.8 months), Median OS: Not Reached	***0.0001***
NGS MRD+ FCM MRD-	Mean OS: 37.7 months; 95% CI (31.8 to 43.5 months), Median OS: 42.8 months; 95% CI (19.8 to 42.8 months)		Mean OS: 29.2 months; 95% CI (23.8 to 34.5 months), Median OS: 19.1 months; 95% CI (14.9 to 33.1 months)	

NGS MRD- FCM MRD+	Mean OS: 32.7 months; 95% CI (22.2 to 43.0 months), Median OS: 21.0 months; 95% CI (14.1 to 33.8 months)		Mean OS: 27.0 months; 95% CI (17.5 to 36.5 months), Median OS: 19.6 months; 95% CI (11.8 to 33.0 months)	
NGS MRD+ FCM MRD+	Mean OS: 28.7 months; 95% CI (23.4 to 34.0 months), Median OS: 17.5 months; 95% CI (13.5 to 35.9 months)		Mean OS: 18.4 months; 95% CI (18.4 to 27.7 months), Median OS: 15.4 months; 95% CI (11.7 to 18.9 months)	
Comparative Analysis of FCM MRD and NGS MRD (Post Consolidation)	**Overall Survival (OS)**		**Relapse Free Survival (RFS)**	
	HR (95% CI)	**P**	**HR (95% CI)**	**P**
NGS MRD- FCM MRD-	1	***0.02***	1	***0.001***
NGS MRD+ FCM MRD-	2.2 (0.60 to 7.83)		2.2 (0.64 to 7.65)	
NGS MRD- FCM MRD+	2.0 (0.43 to 9.34)		1.6 (0.35 to 7.02)	
NGS MRD+ FCM MRD+	3.7 (1.07 to 13.0)		4.1 (1.27 to 13.70)	
Comparative Analysis of FCM MRD and NGS MRD (Post Consolidation)	**Overall Survival (OS)**		**Relapse Free Survival (RFS)**	
	HR (95% CI)	**P**	**HR (95% CI)**	**P**
NGS MRD- FCM MRD-	Mean OS: 33.5 months; 95% CI (29.2 to 37.8 months), Median OS: Not Reached	***0.02***	Mean OS: 30.9 months; 95% CI (26.6 to 35.1 months), Median OS: 38.9 months; 95% CI (26.5 to 38.9 months)	***0.001***
NGS MRD+ FCM MRD-	Mean OS: 34.6 months; 95% CI (26.1 to 43.2 months), Median OS: 20.5 months; 95% CI (17.3 to 36.5 months)		Mean OS: 28.3 months; 95% CI (20.1 to 36.4 months), Median OS: 16.7 months; 95% CI (15.1 to 35.5 months)	
NGS MRD- FCM MRD+	Mean OS: 43.9 months; 95% CI (20.7 to 367.1 months), Median OS: 21.0 months; 95% CI (11.7 to 33.9 months)		Mean OS: 24.9 months; 95% CI (8.3 to 41.5 months), Median OS: 14.1 months; 95% CI (10.1 to 32.6 months)	
NGS MRD+ FCM MRD+	Mean OS: 18.2 months; 95% CI (8.04 to 28.4 months), Median OS: 12.6 months; 95% CI (5.60to 27.0 months)		Mean OS: 13.4 months; 95% CI (5.1 to 21.8 months), Median OS: 9.6 months; 95% CI (4.7 to 15.4 months)	
Multivariate Cox Analysis				
Post Induction Timepoint	**Overall Survival (OS)**		**Relapse Free Survival (RFS)**	
	HR (95% CI)	**P**	**HR (95% CI)**	**P**
NGS MRD Positive	1.94 (1.15 to 3.27)	***<0.0001***	2.05 (1.30 to 3.23)	***<0.0001***
FCM MRD Positive	1.88 (1.21 to 2.84)		1.61 (1.12 to 2.31)	
Post Consolidation Timepoint	**Overall Survival (OS)**		**Relapse Free Survival (RFS)**	
	HR (95% CI)	**P**	**HR (95% CI)**	**P**
NGS MRD Positive	1.82 (1.09 to 3.29)	***0.02***	1.82 (1.06 to 3.11)	***0.002***
FCM MRD Positive	2.03 (1.05 to 3.94)		2.46 (1.34 to 4.47)	

Table 3: Difference in OS and RFS between FCM-MRD, NGS-MRD and comparative analysis between the two modalities at post Induction and post consolidation timepoints. OS: Overall Survival, RFS: Relapse Free Survival, CI: confidence interval.


A
NPM1
FLT3
NRAS
IDH2
WT1
IDH1
KIT
TET2
DNMT3A
KRAS
PTPN11
RUNX1
GATA2
U2AF1
* P < 0.05
· P < 0.1
-log10(P-value)
>3 (Co-occurence)
> 3 (Mutually exclusive)
B
Mutations in DTA Genes
Total Number of Patients
3
65
5
49
12
63
9
19
4
5
1 MUTATION
2 MUTATIONS
3 MUTATIONS
4 MUTATIONS
>5 MUTATIONS
C
Variant Allele Frequency (%)
100
10
1
0.1
0.01
0.001
DNMT3A
FLT3-ITD
FLT3-TKD
GATA2
IDH1
IDH2
JAK2
KIT
KRAS
NPM1
NRAS
PHF6
PTPN11
RAD21
RUNX1
TET2
U2AF1
WT1
Genes



Number at risk

Group: NGS MRD Positive				
139	54	19	0	0
Group: NGS MRD Negative				
57	39	21	3	1



Number at risk

Group: NGS MRD Positive				
52	14	6	0	0
Group: NGS MRD Negative				
75	44	20	2	1



Number at risk

Group: NGS MRD Positive				
139	69	28	0	0
Group: NGS MRD Negative				
57	44	23	5	1



Number at risk

Group: NGS MRD Positive				
52	22	8	0	0
Group: NGS MRD Negative				
75	50	24	3	1



Number at risk

Group: NGS MRD Positive				
139	59	20	0	0
Group: NGS MRD Negative				
57	40	21	3	1



Number at risk

Group: NGS MRD Positive				
52	16	6	0	0
Group: NGS MRD Negative				
75	46	21	2	1



Number at risk

Group: FCM MRD+ NGS MRD+					
68	31	11	0	0	0
Group: FCM MRD- NGS MRD+					
70	38	17	0	0	0
Group: FCM MRD+ NGS MRD-					
17	10	3	1	1	0
Group: FCM MRD- NGS MRD-					
40	34	20	4	0	0



Number at risk

Group: FCM MRD+ NGS MRD+					
68	25	7	0	0	0
Group: FCM MRD- NGS MRD+					
70	34	13	0	0	0
Group: FCM MRD+ NGS MRD-					
17	8	3	1	1	0
Group: FCM MRD- NGS MRD-					
40	32	18	2	0	0



Number at risk

Group: FCM MRD+ NGS MRD+					
9	3	1	0	0	0
Group: FCM MRD- NGS MRD+					
28	15	6	0	0	0
Group: FCM MRD+ NGS MRD-					
8	5	1	1	1	0
Group: FCM MRD- NGS MRD-					
42	31	16	1	0	0



Number at risk

Group: FCM MRD+ NGS MRD+					
9	2	1	0	0	0
Group: FCM MRD- NGS MRD+					
28	11	4	0	0	0
Group: FCM MRD+ NGS MRD-					
8	3	1	1	1	0
Group: FCM MRD- NGS MRD-					
42	29	14	0	0	0