Title: Validation of the IMPEDE VTE Score for Prediction of Venous Thromboembolism in Multiple Myeloma: A Retrospective Cohort Study

Short Running Title: Validation of the IMPEDE VTE Score in Multiple Myeloma

Fahrettin Covut, M.D.¹, Ramsha Ahmed, M.D.¹, Sanchit Chawla, M.D.¹, Frank Ricaurte, B.A.¹, Christy J. Samaras, D.O.², Faiz Anwer, M.D.², Alex V. Mejia Garcia, M.D.², Dana E Angelini, M.D.², Sandra Mazzoni, D.O.², Beth Faiman, Ph.D.², Jason Valent, M.D.², Jack Khouri, M.D.²

¹ Department of Internal Medicine, Cleveland Clinic, Cleveland, OH

² Department of Hematology and Oncology, Taussig Cancer Institute, Cleveland Clinic, Cleveland, OH

Corresponding author:

Jack Khouri, MD

Email: khourij@ccf.org

Address: Cleveland Clinic, 9500 Euclid avenue, CA6, Cleveland, OH, 44195

Phone: 216-444-8360

Fax: 216-444-9464

Keywords: IMPEDE VTE, multiple myeloma, thrombosis, prophylaxis, anticoagulation

Abstract word count: 244

Text word count: 2551

Number of tables: 3

Number of figures: 2

Funding: This study was not funded by any source.

Conflict of interest disclosure: The authors do not have any related conflict of interest.

Ethics: This study was conducted according to the Declaration of Helsinki and approved by the institutional review board of Cleveland Clinic

Data sharing policy: Access to data can be granted on request to qualified investigators for appropriate use, in accordance with the institutional policy to protect patients' confidentiality.

ABSTRACT

Venous thromboembolism (VTE) is highly prevalent in Multiple Myeloma (MM) patients, however a reliable VTE prediction tool in MM remains under study. The IMPEDE VTE score has recently emerged as a novel risk prediction tool for VTE in MM but needs external validation in different cohorts. We conducted a retrospective cohort study to validate this score. We reviewed 839 patients who were newly diagnosed with MM between 2010 and 2015 at Cleveland Clinic and included 575 patients in final analysis. The 6-month cumulative incidence of VTE among all patients was 10.7% (95% CI: 8.2 – 13.2) and the c-statistic of the IMPEDE VTE score to predict VTE within 6 months of treatment start was 0.68 (95% CI: 0.61 – 0.75). The 6-month cumulative incidence of VTE was 5.0% (95% CI: 2.1 – 7.9) in the low risk group, compared to 12.6% (95% CI: 8.9% – 16.4%) and 24.1% (95% CI: 12.2 – 36.1) in the intermediate and high risk groups ($p < 0.001$ for both). In addition, a higher proportion of patients in the VTE cohort had ECOG performance status of ≥ 2 as compared to the no VTE cohort (33% vs. 16%, $p = 0.001$). Other MM characteristics such as stage, immunoglobulin subtype, and cytogenetics were not found to be predictors of VTE. In summary, we have validated the IMPEDE VTE score in our patient cohort and our findings suggest that it can be utilized as a VTE risk stratification tool in prospective studies looking into investigating VTE prophylaxis strategies in MM patients.

BACKGROUND

Venous thromboembolism (VTE) is an important cause of morbidity and mortality in cancer patients^{1,2}. Multiple Myeloma (MM) is the second most common hematological malignancy and associated with 9-fold increased risk of VTE compared to the general population^{3,4}. The higher risk of VTE in MM patients is multifactorial and related to patient-, MM- and treatment-related factors⁵. The monoclonal protein can lead to hyperviscosity in 2% to 6% of MM patients⁶, interfere with fibrin clot formation⁷, and act as a procoagulant antibody⁸. Elevated cytokine levels in MM patients such as interleukin-6, tumor necrosis factor alpha, and vascular endothelial growth factor further enhance the thrombosis risk⁹. Immobility due to increased incidence of bone fractures¹⁰, use of central venous catheter¹¹, and erythropoiesis-stimulating agents¹² are additional risk factors for VTE in MM. Several commonly used plasma cell directed drugs, such as dexamethasone, immunomodulatory drugs (IMiD), alkylating agents, and doxorubicin, alter hemostatic pathways and thus promote thrombogenesis¹³.

A majority of VTE events in MM patients occur within 6 months of treatment initiation¹⁴. In 2008, the International Myeloma Working Group (IMWG) recommended different VTE prophylaxis strategies based on a number of VTE risk factors; aspirin and low molecular weight heparin/warfarin were offered for patients with ≤ 1 and ≥ 2 risk factors, respectively¹⁵. These recommendations were based on consensus opinion and limited evidence¹⁵. Despite the implementation of those guidelines in the Myeloma XI trial, a phase III multicenter randomized clinical trial which included 4358 newly diagnosed MM patients, the cumulative incidence of VTE within 6 months of induction therapy was more than 10% in all study arms¹⁴. Importantly, only 55% of patients who had thrombotic events in this trial were in the high-risk group for VTE based on the IMWG criteria¹⁴. Sanfilippo et al. have recently developed the IMPEDE VTE score, a risk prediction tool for VTE in MM, using 4446 patients within the veterans administration central cancer registry and validated this using 4256 patients in the Surveillance, Epidemiology, End Results (SEER)-Medicare database¹⁶. Patients were stratified into three different risk groups based on the IMPEDE VTE score and the 6-month cumulative incidence of VTE were 15.2%, 8.3%, and 3.3% among patients in the high-risk, intermediate-risk, and low-risk groups at the time of induction, respectively¹⁶.

Therefore, the IMPEDE VTE score may provide a better risk stratification for VTE in newly diagnosed MM patients compared to current risk stratification strategies. Herein, we validated the IMPEDE VTE score in our patient cohort.

METHODS

Study design and patients

In this cohort study, we retrospectively reviewed all patients who were newly diagnosed with MM at Cleveland Clinic between January 2010 and August 2015. We included patients older than 18 years and received their induction therapy at our institution. We excluded patients who had another active malignancy

at diagnosis, did not receive plasma cell-directed therapy, had missing baseline data for calculation of the IMPEDE VTE score, were lost to follow-up within 6 months of treatment initiation and were diagnosed with VTE after MM diagnosis but before initiation of systemic therapy. This study was conducted according to the Declaration of Helsinki and approved by the institutional review board of Cleveland Clinic.

Study variables and assessments

We retrospectively collected the following data from electronic medical records of the patients; age, gender, race, body mass index (BMI), details of VTE, recent surgeries and fractures, performance status, MM subtype, prognostic stage, cytogenetics, extramedullary disease, laboratory values at diagnosis, use of erythropoietin or central venous catheter, induction regimens, treatment responses, antiplatelet and anticoagulant agents, autologous hematopoietic cell transplantation (AHCT) status, and survival data.

The IMPEDE VTE score at treatment initiation was calculated according to the following parameters: IMiD use (+4 points), BMI ≥ 25 kg/m² (+1 point), recent pelvic, hip, or femur fracture (+4 points), erythropoiesis-stimulating agent (+1 point), doxorubicin (+3 points), dexamethasone (+4 and +2 points for high- and low-dose, respectively), Asian/pacific islander race (-3 points), prior history of VTE (+5 points), central venous catheter (+2 points), therapeutic low molecular weight heparin or warfarin use (-4 points), prophylactic low molecular weight or aspirin use (-3 points) ¹⁶. Patients with IMPEDE VTE scores of ≤ 3 , 4-7, and ≥ 8 were considered to have low risk, intermediate risk, and high risk for developing VTE within 6 months of treatment initiation¹⁶.

High risk cytogenetics were defined as presence of del(13) on karyotype, t(4;14), t(14;16), t(14;20), del(17/17p), or gain(1q) ¹⁷. Recent surgery was defined as cardiovascular, orthopedic, abdominal, urologic, or neurologic surgery that occurred between 30 days prior to MM diagnosis and the start of systemic therapy ¹⁶. Similarly, a recent fracture was defined as pelvic, femur or hip fractures occurring between 30 days prior to MM diagnosis and the start of systemic therapy ¹⁶. If multiple baseline laboratory and BMI data were available, we recorded the values closest to the date of treatment initiation. High-dose and low-dose dexamethasone were defined as the total monthly dose of ≥ 160 mg and < 160 mg, respectively ¹⁸. Prophylactic and therapeutic enoxaparin doses were defined as 40 mg daily and 1 mg/kg twice daily, respectively ^{19,20}. In our practice, patients received VTE prophylaxis according to the IMWG guidelines ¹⁵, unless bleeding risk outweighed the benefit of VTE prophylaxis or patient preference otherwise. Response to first line of induction treatment was determined based on the IMWG criteria ²¹.

Statistical Analysis

No sample size calculations were performed. Descriptive analysis was performed to compare baseline characteristics of patients who were and were not diagnosed VTE within 6 months of treatment initiation. Continuous variables were reported as median with interquartile range (IQR) and medians of two groups were compared using Wilcoxon-Mann-Whitney test. Categorical variables were compared using chi-square or Fisher's exact test. Receiver Operating Characteristic curve analysis was performed and reported as c-

statistic to assess the discriminative power of IMPEDE VTE score to predict VTE within 6 months of treatment start. Cumulative incidence of VTE was calculated using Kaplan–Meier method, with death as competing risk, and compared using Gray's test²². Patients who underwent AHCT were censored at the time of transplant while calculating cumulative incidence of VTE. Overall survival (OS) and progression-free survival (PFS) were calculated from date of MM diagnosis. Multivariable Cox hazard analysis was performed to evaluate the effect of VTE within 6 months of treatment start on PFS and OS. All reported p values are two-sided and a p value of less than 0.05 was considered statistically significant. All statistical calculations were made using R statistical software version 3.4.0 (R Foundation for Statistical Computing, Vienna, Austria).

RESULTS

Baseline Characteristics of the Patients

We reviewed the electronic medical records of 839 MM patients, excluded 264 of them, and analyzed the final cohort of 575 patients. Figure 1 summarizes the patient selection process. Two hundred eighty-eight (50%) patients were male, 456 (79%) were white, 258 (45%) aged >65 years, and 409 (71%) had BMI of ≥ 25 kg/m². Median age and BMI at diagnosis were 64 years (IQR: 56 – 71) and 28.1 kg/m² (IQR: 24.4 – 32.6). Table 1 summarizes the baseline characteristics of 61 (10.6%) patients who developed VTE (VTE cohort) and 514 (89.4%) patients who did not develop VTE within 6 months upon treatment initiation (no VTE cohort).

Fifty-one (8.9%), 304 (52.9%), and 220 (38.3%) patients had IMPEDE VTE score of ≥ 8 (high risk), 4 to 7 (intermediate risk), and ≤ 3 (low risk) at treatment start. Fourteen (27%) patients were black in high risk group, compared to 67 (22%, $p=0.39$) and 35 (16%, $p=0.05$) patients in intermediate and low risk groups per IMPEDE VTE score, respectively. The median IMPEDE VTE score was 4 (IQR: 3 – 6) in all patients and 5 (IQR: 4 – 7) vs. 4 (IQR: 3 – 5) in the VTE vs. no VTE cohorts, respectively ($p<0.001$). MM patients in the VTE cohort were more likely to have a history of previous VTE (16% vs. 4%, $p<0.001$), a recent pathologic pelvic, hip, or femur fracture (10% vs. 2%, $p<0.001$), recent surgery (10% vs. 3%, $p=0.003$), and ECOG performance status of ≥ 2 (33% vs. 16%, $p=0.001$) compared to those in the no VTE cohort.

Treatment Characteristics and VTE prophylaxis.

Table 2 summarizes treatment data. Within 6 months of treatment initiation, there was no difference in the use of central venous catheters (25% vs. 17%, $p=0.13$), erythropoiesis-stimulating agents (3% vs. 6%, $p=0.56$), IMiD (75% vs. 67%, $p=0.17$), bortezomib (67% vs. 71%, $p=0.58$), melphalan (2% vs. 4%, $p=0.71$), cyclophosphamide (7% vs. 11%, $p=0.38$), and doxorubicin (0% vs. 1%, $p=1$) between the VTE and no VTE cohorts, respectively. High-dose dexamethasone was more frequently used in the VTE cohort as compared to the no VTE cohort (15% vs. 2%, $p<0.001$). Seventy-five percent of patients in the VTE cohort and 72% of patients in the no VTE cohort were on an anti-platelet or anticoagulant agent at treatment start ($p=0.55$).

Five (8%) and 32 (6%) patients in VTE and no VTE cohorts underwent AHCT within 6 months of treatment start (p=0.58).

Outcomes

The 6-month cumulative incidence of VTE among all patients was 10.7% (95% CI: 8.2 – 13.2). Each one point increase in the IMPEDE VTE score was associated with VTE within 6 months of treatment start (Cox hazard ratio: 1.25, 95% CI: 1.14 – 1.36, p<0.001). The c-statistic of the IMPEDE VTE score to predict VTE within 6 months of treatment start was 0.68 (95% CI: 0.61 – 0.75). The 6-month cumulative incidence of VTE according to the IMPEDE VTE score was 5.0% (95% CI: 2.1 – 7.9) in the low risk group, compared to 12.6% (95% CI: 8.9% – 16.4%) and 24.1% (95% CI: 12.2 – 36.1) in the intermediate and high risk groups (p<0.001 for both), respectively (Figure 2). The median follow-up of patients was 60.3 months (IQR: 25.9 – 78.5). On multivariable Cox hazard analysis, VTE within 6 months of treatment initiation was not a predictor of PFS (HR: 1.13, 95% CI: 0.80 – 1.61, p=0.49) and OS (HR: 1.31, 95% CI: 0.85 – 2.04, p=0.23) after adjusted for age, performance status, prognostic stage, cytogenetics, number of drugs used in initial induction, and AHCT (Table 3).

DISCUSSION

In this large cohort of newly diagnosed MM patients, we show that the IMPEDE VTE score successfully stratified patients into three distinct VTE risk groups. The discriminative power of this score in our cohort was similar to the original study¹⁶. Although poor performance status was not incorporated into the IMPEDE VTE score, it was significantly associated with VTE in our cohort. Though 72% of our patients received VTE prophylaxis with either antiplatelet or prophylactic enoxaparin, roughly 1 of 10 patients in the entire cohort were diagnosed with VTE within 6 months of treatment start, similar to the Myeloma XI trial¹⁴. The 6-month cumulative incidence of VTE was more than 10% among our patients in the intermediate and high risk groups according to the IMPEDE VTE score. Thus, one may infer that routine VTE prophylaxis is not enough for these patients. We have not identified any association between VTE and MM prognostic stage, immunoglobulin subtype, or cytogenetics. Disparities in outcomes of white and black MM patients were previously noted²³. Although we observed higher proportion of blacks in higher risk groups per IMPEDE VTE score, blacks and whites had similar rates of VTE. Patients who developed VTE had similar OS and PFS compared to patients in the no VTE cohort.

The rates of VTE in MM patients receiving therapy with IMiD or high-dose dexamethasone have been reported to be between 20% and 30% without VTE prophylaxis^{18,24}. Although routine VTE prophylaxis is the standard of care for these patients, there are a few prospective trials that have investigated the optimal choice and dose of thromboprophylaxis in this setting. In a phase 3 trial, 667 patients were randomized to receive low dose aspirin, low dose warfarin, or prophylactic enoxaparin for the first 6 months of thalidomide-based therapy and similar rates of thrombotic events, 5% to 8%, were seen in all arms²⁵. This study excluded patients with prior history of VTE and other cardiovascular risk factors²⁵. In another randomized

trial, 2.3% and 1.2% of patients who received lenalidomide-based therapy had thrombotic events within first 12 months in low dose aspirin and prophylactic enoxaparin arms, respectively ²⁶. Patients with a higher risk of VTE were also excluded from this study, including elderly patients (age >65 years), patients with previous VTE and other high-risk conditions ²⁶. The exclusion of patients with strong VTE risk factors from the clinical trials limits the applicability of these results in the real-world setting.

Although the current IMWG guidelines recommend warfarin or low-molecular-weight-heparin for patients at a higher risk of VTE, direct oral anticoagulants (DOACs) have also been found to be safe and effective in cancer patients. In 2019, two randomized controlled trials have assessed the utility of DOACs for prevention of VTE among ambulatory cancer patients undergoing chemotherapy. In the AVERT trial, apixaban was associated with a significantly lower incidence of VTE compared to placebo ²⁷. In the CASSINI trial, rivaroxaban was associated with a significantly lower incidence of VTE per-protocol analysis but not per intention-to-treat analysis compared to placebo ²⁸. Cumulative analysis of both trials has shown significant benefit of DOACs for the prevention of VTE, with a low incidence of major bleeding ²⁹. These trials used the Khorana score for VTE risk stratification which does not apply to MM patients ³⁰. Two trials have evaluated DOACs for VTE prophylaxis in MM patients. In a multicenter, non-randomized, phase 2 trial, 104 patients with newly diagnosed or relapsed MM received apixaban 2.5 mg twice daily during the first 6 months of IMiD-based therapy; only 2 patients had DVT and 1 patient had major bleeding ³¹. In a prospective proof-of-concept study, 50 MM patients received apixaban 2.5 mg twice daily for 6 months while receiving IMiD-based induction or maintenance therapy, and none of them had DVT or major bleeding ³². Overall, the safety and efficacy data in single arm trials using DOACs for VTE prophylaxis in MM patients look promising, but further prospective data is needed. A prospective randomized controlled trial of apixaban 2.5 mg twice daily vs. placebo in MM patients receiving IMiD-based therapy is ongoing (NCT02958969). The IMPEDE VTE score may be a useful risk stratification tool for future trials investigating the role of DOACs in MM patients.

To our knowledge, this is the first study that independently validates the IMPEDE VTE score in a large cohort of MM patients. We have shown that a poor performance status was associated with a higher incidence of VTE which, if considered, may strengthen the predictive power of the IMPEDE VTE score. Furthermore, despite following current IMWG VTE prophylaxis recommendations, patients in our cohort still had an VTE rate of >10%, suggesting these current strategies are not enough in this patient population. Some of the limitations of this study include its retrospective design and the exclusion of patients with missing baseline data or shorter follow-up which may have caused selection bias. Extrapolation of our findings may also be limited by the fact that the studied patient cohort was from a single center.

In summary, our findings suggest that the IMPEVE VTE score is a valid evidence-based risk stratification tool in newly diagnosed MM patients with potential to be implemented in future studies aimed at refining our approach to VTE prophylaxis in this patient population. Further validation is required in prospective studies.

Figure 1. Flow diagram of patient selection process

298 **Table 1. Baseline characteristics of the patients**

Characteristics	All patients (N = 575)	VTE in 6 months (N = 61)	No VTE in 6 months (N = 514)	P value
Age, year – median (IQR)	63.6 (56.4 – 71.2)	65.4 (57.3 – 71.5)	63.5 (56.4 – 71.2)	0.14
Age > 65 years – no. (%)	258 (44.9)	31 (50.8)	227 (44.2)	0.32
Male gender – no. (%)	288 (50.1)	32 (52.5)	256 (49.8)	0.70
Race – no. (%)				0.82
White	456 (79.3)	48 (78.7)	408 (79.4)	
Black	116 (20.2)	13 (21.3)	103 (20.0)	
Asian / pacific islander	3 (0.5)	0 (0)	3 (0.6)	
Body mass index, kg/m ² – median (IQR)	28.1 (24.4 – 32.6)	30.4 (26.7 – 34.0)	28.0 (24.4 – 32.3)	0.052
Body mass index ≥ 25 kg/m ² – no. (%)	409 (71.1)	47 (77.0)	362 (70.4)	0.29
History of venous thromboembolism – no. (%)	31 (5.4)	10 (16.4)	21 (4.1)	<0.001
Pathologic pelvic or femur fracture – no. (%)	16 (2.8)	6 (9.8)	10 (1.9)	<0.001
Surgery – no. (%)	19 (3.3)	6 (9.8)	13 (2.5)	0.003
ECOG performance status – no. (%)				0.001
< 2	475 (82.6)	41 (67.2)	434 (84.4)	
≥ 2	100 (17.4)	20 (32.8)	80 (15.6)	
Subtype of multiple myeloma – no. (%)				0.77
IgG	311 (54.1)	34 (55.7)	277 (53.9)	
IgA	122 (21.2)	10 (16.4)	112 (21.8)	
Light chain disease	128 (22.3)	15 (24.6)	113 (22.0)	
IgD, IgM, or Asecreatory disease	14 (2.4)	2 (3.3)	12 (2.3)	
International staging system – no. (%)				0.08
I	182 (31.7)	26 (42.6)	156 (30.4)	
II	177 (30.8)	16 (26.2)	161 (31.3)	
III	175 (30.4)	13 (21.3)	162 (31.5)	
Extramedullary disease – no. (%)	151 (26.3)	18 (29.5)	133 (25.9)	0.54
Cytogenetics at diagnosis * – no. (%)				
Del(13) on karyotype	42 (7.3)	7 (11.5)	35 (6.8)	0.19
Del(17/17p)	35 (6.1)	4 (6.6)	31 (6.0)	0.87
t(4;14)	46 (8.0)	3 (4.9)	43 (8.4)	0.73
t(11;14)	109 (19.0)	16 (26.2)	93 (18.1)	0.13
t(14;16)	22 (3.8)	2 (3.3)	20 (3.9)	0.81
t(14;20)	2 (0.3)	1 (1.6)	1 (0.2)	0.20
Gain(1q)	25 (4.3)	3 (4.9)	22 (4.3)	0.82
Laboratory tests at diagnosis – median (IQR)				
White blood cell count, 10 ⁶ /uL	5.8 (4.5 – 7.5)	5.9 (4.5 – 7.2)	5.8 (4.5 – 7.5)	0.61
Hemoglobin, g/dL	10.8 (9.1 – 12.1)	10.9 (9.3 – 11.9)	10.8 (9.0 – 12.2)	0.93
Platelet count, 10 ⁹ /uL	211 (158 – 268)	219 (168 – 271)	210 (155 – 267)	0.66
Beta-2-microglobulin, mg/L	3.8 (2.6 – 6.4)	3.2 (2.6 – 5.4)	3.9 (2.6 – 6.4)	0.11
Albumin, gm/dL	3.7 (3.2 – 4.1)	3.7 (3.2 – 4.2)	3.7 (3.2 – 4.1)	0.78
Creatinine, mg/dL	1.0 (0.8 – 1.5)	1.0 (0.8 – 1.4)	1.0 (0.8 – 1.5)	0.75
Lactate dehydrogenase, U/L	180 (150 – 220)	192 (172 – 239)	178 (149 – 219)	0.09

* Cytogenetic data were not available for 50 (9%) patients. In addition to karyotype analysis, FISH probes for del(17/17p), t(4;14), t(11;14), t(14;16), t(14;20), and gain(1q) were used in 326 (57%), 186 (32%), 255 (44%), 172 (30%), 24 (4%), and 70 (12%) patients, respectively.

Table 2. Treatment characteristics and outcomes of the patients

Characteristics	All patients (N = 575)	VTE in 6 months (N = 61)	No VTE in 6 months (N = 514)	P-value
Central venous catheter – no. (%)	101 (17.6)	15 (24.6)	86 (16.7)	0.13
Erythropoiesis-stimulating agent – no. (%)	34 (5.9)	2 (3.3)	32 (6.2)	0.56
Drugs used within 6 months of treatment start – no. (%)				
Thalidomide	22 (3.8)	2 (3.3)	20 (3.9)	1
Lenalidomide	373 (64.9)	44 (72.1)	329 (64.0)	0.21
Pomalidomide	3 (0.5)	0 (0)	3 (0.6)	1
Bortezomib	404 (70.3)	41 (67.2)	363 (70.6)	0.58
Melphalan	19 (3.3)	1 (1.6)	18 (3.5)	0.71
Cyclophosphamide	61 (10.6)	4 (6.6)	57 (11.1)	0.38
Doxorubicin	3 (0.5)	0 (0)	3 (0.6)	1
Dexamethasone in initial induction regimen – no. (%)				<0.001
Low-dose dexamethasone	544 (94.6)	50 (82.0)	494 (96.1)	
High-dose dexamethasone	21 (3.7)	9 (14.8)	12 (2.3)	
Not used	10 (1.7)	2 (3.3)	8 (1.6)	
Number of drugs in initial induction regimen – no. (%)				0.26
Single agent	6 (1.0)	2 (3.3)	4 (0.8)	
Doublet	335 (58.3)	34 (55.7)	301 (58.6)	
Triplet	223 (38.8)	23 (37.7)	200 (38.9)	
Quadruplet	11 (1.9)	2 (3.3)	9 (1.8)	
Anti-platelet or anticoagulant agents – no. (%)				
Not used	160 (27.8)	15 (24.6)	145 (28.2)	0.55
Aspirin or clopidogrel	357 (62.1)	37 (60.7)	320 (62.3)	0.81
Warfarin	40 (7.0)	6 (9.8)	34 (6.6)	0.35
Prophylactic enoxaparin	15 (2.6)	3 (4.9)	12 (2.3)	0.21
Direct oral anticoagulants	3 (0.5)	0 (0)	3 (0.6)	1
Best response to initial induction regimen – no. (%)				0.89
Very good partial response or better	266 (46.3)	28 (45.9)	238 (46.3)	
Partial response	171 (29.7)	20 (32.8)	151 (29.4)	
Stable or progressive disease	110 (19.1)	11 (18.0)	99 (19.3)	
Unknown	28 (4.9)	2 (3.3)	26 (5.1)	
Autologous hematopoietic cell transplantation – no. (%)	202 (35.1)	17 (27.9)	185 (36.0)	0.21
< 6 months after treatment initiation	37 (6.4)	5 (8.2)	32 (6.2)	0.58

Figure 2. Cumulative incidence of venous thromboembolism after initiation of treatment

Table 3. Multivariable Cox hazard analysis for progression-free and overall survival

Variables	Progression-free survival		Overall survival	
	Hazard ratio (95% CI)	P value	Hazard ratio (95% CI)	P value
Age at diagnosis				
Each 1-year increase	1.01 (1.00 – 1.02)	0.12	1.02 (1.00 – 1.03)	0.025
ECOG performance status				
Each 1 increase	1.32 (1.17 – 1.50)	<0.0001	1.48 (1.27 – 1.71)	<0.0001
International staging system				
Each increase in risk category	1.23 (1.07 – 1.42)	0.003	1.52 (1.27 – 1.81)	<0.0001
Cytogenetics				
High risk vs. standard risk	2.18 (1.70 – 2.79)	<0.0001	2.75 (2.06 – 3.66)	<0.0001
Number of drugs in initial induction regimen				
Each 1 increase	0.79 (0.65 – 0.96)	0.020	0.65 (0.50 – 0.84)	0.0008
Autologous hematopoietic cell transplantation				
Performed vs. not performed	0.73 (0.57 – 0.94)	0.014	0.62 (0.44 – 0.88)	0.007
VTE within 6 months of treatment start				
Yes vs. no	1.13 (0.80 – 1.61)	0.49	1.31 (0.85 – 2.04)	0.23

REFERENCES

1. Khorana AA, Francis CW, Culakova E, Kuderer NM, Lyman GH. Thromboembolism is a leading cause of death in cancer patients receiving outpatient chemotherapy. *J Thromb Haemost.* 2007;5(3):632-634.
2. Schoen MW, Luo S, Gage B, Carson KR, Sanfilippo KM. Association of venous thromboembolism with increased mortality in patients with multiple myeloma. *Journal of Clinical Oncology.* 2018;36(15_suppl):8051-8051.
3. Kristinsson SY, Pfeiffer RM, Bjorkholm M, et al. Arterial and venous thrombosis in monoclonal gammopathy of undetermined significance and multiple myeloma: a population-based study. *Blood.* 2010;115(24):4991-4998.
4. Kazandjian D. Multiple myeloma epidemiology and survival: A unique malignancy. *Semin Oncol.* 2016;43(6):676-681.
5. Swan D, Rocci A, Bradbury C, Thachil J. Venous thromboembolism in multiple myeloma - choice of prophylaxis, role of direct oral anticoagulants and special considerations. *Br J Haematol.* 2018;183(4):538-556.
6. Mehta J, Singhal S. Hyperviscosity syndrome in plasma cell dyscrasias. *Semin Thromb Hemost.* 2003;29(5):467-471.
7. Carr ME, Jr., Zekert SL. Abnormal clot retraction, altered fibrin structure, and normal platelet function in multiple myeloma. *Am J Physiol.* 1994;266(3 Pt 2):H1195-1201.
8. De Stefano V, Za T, Rossi E. Venous thromboembolism in multiple myeloma. *Semin Thromb Hemost.* 2014;40(3):338-347.
9. Mahindra A, Hideshima T, Anderson KC. Multiple myeloma: biology of the disease. *Blood Rev.* 2010;24 Suppl 1:S5-11.
10. Thorsteinsdottir S, Gislason G, Aspelund T, et al. Fractures and survival in multiple myeloma: results from a population-based study. *Haematologica.* 2020;105(4):1067-1073.
11. Gaddh M, Antun A, Yamada K, et al. Venous access catheter-related thrombosis in patients with cancer. *Leuk Lymphoma.* 2014;55(3):501-508.
12. Knight R, DeLap RJ, Zeldis JB. Lenalidomide and venous thrombosis in multiple myeloma. *N Engl J Med.* 2006;354(19):2079-2080.
13. Uaprasert N, Voorhees PM, Mackman N, Key NS. Venous thromboembolism in multiple myeloma: current perspectives in pathogenesis. *Eur J Cancer.* 2010;46(10):1790-1799.

- 393 14. Bradbury CA, Craig Z, Cook G, et al. Thrombosis in patients with myeloma treated in the
394 Myeloma IX and Myeloma XI phase 3 randomized controlled trials. *Blood*. 2020;136(9):1091-
395 1104.
- 396 15. Palumbo A, Rajkumar SV, Dimopoulos MA, et al. Prevention of thalidomide- and lenalidomide-
397 associated thrombosis in myeloma. *Leukemia*. 2008;22(2):414-423.
- 398 16. Sanfilippo KM, Luo S, Wang TF, et al. Predicting venous thromboembolism in multiple myeloma:
399 development and validation of the IMPEDE VTE score. *Am J Hematol*. 2019;94(11):1176-1184.
- 400 17. Sonneveld P, Avet-Loiseau H, Lonial S, et al. Treatment of multiple myeloma with high-risk
401 cytogenetics: a consensus of the International Myeloma Working Group. *Blood*.
402 2016;127(24):2955-2962.
- 403 18. Rajkumar SV, Jacobus S, Callander NS, et al. Lenalidomide plus high-dose dexamethasone versus
404 lenalidomide plus low-dose dexamethasone as initial therapy for newly diagnosed multiple
405 myeloma: an open-label randomised controlled trial. *Lancet Oncol*. 2010;11(1):29-37.
- 406 19. Samama MM, Cohen AT, Darmon JY, et al. A comparison of enoxaparin with placebo for the
407 prevention of venous thromboembolism in acutely ill medical patients. Prophylaxis in Medical
408 Patients with Enoxaparin Study Group. *N Engl J Med*. 1999;341(11):793-800.
- 409 20. Hyers TM, Agnelli G, Hull RD, et al. Antithrombotic therapy for venous thromboembolic disease.
410 *Chest*. 2001;119(1 Suppl):176S-193S.
- 411 21. Durie BG, Harousseau JL, Miguel JS, et al. International uniform response criteria for multiple
412 myeloma. *Leukemia*. 2006;20(9):1467-1473.
- 413 22. Fine JP, Gray RJ. A Proportional Hazards Model for the Subdistribution of a Competing Risk.
414 *Journal of the American Statistical Association*. 1999;94(446):496-509.
- 415 23. Covut F, Driscoll JJ, Cooper B, Gallogly M, De Lima M, Malek E. Racial and age-related disparities
416 in early mortality affect the outcomes of multiple myeloma patients. *Leukemia*. 2020.
- 417 24. Hicks LK, Haynes AE, Reece DE, et al. A meta-analysis and systematic review of thalidomide for
418 patients with previously untreated multiple myeloma. *Cancer Treat Rev*. 2008;34(5):442-452.
- 419 25. Palumbo A, Cavo M, Bringhen S, et al. Aspirin, warfarin, or enoxaparin thromboprophylaxis in
420 patients with multiple myeloma treated with thalidomide: a phase III, open-label, randomized
421 trial. *J Clin Oncol*. 2011;29(8):986-993.
- 422 26. Larocca A, Cavallo F, Bringhen S, et al. Aspirin or enoxaparin thromboprophylaxis for patients
423 with newly diagnosed multiple myeloma treated with lenalidomide. *Blood*. 2012;119(4):933-
424 939; quiz 1093.

- 425 27. Carrier M, Abou-Nassar K, Mallick R, et al. Apixaban to Prevent Venous Thromboembolism in
426 Patients with Cancer. *N Engl J Med*. 2019;380(8):711-719.
- 427 28. Khorana AA, Soff GA, Kakkar AK, et al. Rivaroxaban for Thromboprophylaxis in High-Risk
428 Ambulatory Patients with Cancer. *N Engl J Med*. 2019;380(8):720-728.
- 429 29. Agnelli G. Direct Oral Anticoagulants for Thromboprophylaxis in Ambulatory Patients with
430 Cancer. *N Engl J Med*. 2019;380(8):781-783.
- 431 30. Sanfilippo KM, Wang T-F, Luo S, et al. Predictive ability of the khorana score for venous
432 thromboembolism (VTE) in multiple myeloma (MM). *Journal of Clinical Oncology*.
433 2018;36(15_suppl):e18733-e18733.
- 434 31. Pegourie B, Karlin L, Benboubker L, et al. Apixaban for the prevention of thromboembolism in
435 immunomodulatory-treated myeloma patients: Myelaxat, a phase 2 pilot study. *Am J Hematol*.
436 2019;94(6):635-640.
- 437 32. Cornell RF, Goldhaber SZ, Engelhardt BG, et al. Apixaban for Primary Prevention of Venous
438 Thromboembolism in Patients With Multiple Myeloma Receiving Immunomodulatory Therapy.
439 *Front Oncol*. 2019;9:45.

440