

Dear Author

Here are the proofs of your article.

- You can submit your corrections **online** or by **fax**.
- For **online** submission please insert your corrections in the online correction form. Always indicate the line number to which the correction refers.
- Please return your proof together with the permission to publish confirmation.
- For **fax** submission, please ensure that your corrections are clearly legible. Use a fine black pen and write the correction in the margin, not too close to the edge of the page.
- Remember to note the journal title, article number, and your name when sending your response via e-mail, fax or regular mail.
- Check the metadata sheet to make sure that the header information, especially author names and the corresponding affiliations are correctly shown.
- **Check** the questions that may have arisen during copy editing and insert your answers/corrections.
- **Check** that the text is complete and that all figures, tables and their legends are included. Also check the accuracy of special characters, equations, and electronic supplementary material if applicable. If necessary refer to the *Edited manuscript*.
- The publication of inaccurate data such as dosages and units can have serious consequences. Please take particular care that all such details are correct.
- Please **do not** make changes that involve only matters of style. We have generally introduced forms that follow the journal's style.

 Substantial changes in content, e.g., new results, corrected values, title and authorship are not allowed without the approval of the responsible editor. In such a case, please contact the Editorial Office and return his/her consent together with the proof.
- If we do not receive your corrections within 48 hours, we will send you a reminder.

Please note

Your article will be published **Online First** approximately one week after receipt of your corrected proofs. This is the **official first publication** citable with the DOI. **Further changes are, therefore, not possible.**

After online publication, subscribers (personal/institutional) to this journal will have access to the complete article via the DOI using the URL:

```
http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/s00277-010-1028-8
```

If you would like to know when your article has been published online, take advantage of our free alert service. For registration and further information, go to: http://www.springerlink.com.

Due to the electronic nature of the procedure, the manuscript and the original figures will only be returned to you on special request. When you return your corrections, please inform us, if you would like to have these documents returned.

The **printed version** will follow in a forthcoming issue.



To: Springer Customer Support 1

E-mail: CorrAdmin1@spi-bpo.com

Fax: +1-703-5621873

SPi

Re: SPi Building, Sacsac Bacong

Oriental Negros 6216

Philippines

Annals of Hematology DOI 10.1007/s00277-010-1028-8

Asymptomatic immunoglobulin light chain amyloidosis (AL) at the time of diagnostic bone marrow biopsy in newly diagnosed patients with multiple myeloma and smoldering myeloma. A series of 144 cases and a review of the literature central kyle respectively. Lust witzig Lacy Zeidenrust Russell · Hayman · Buadi · Kumar · Dingli · Dispenzieri

Permission to publish

I have checked the proofs of my article and
☐ I have no corrections. The article is ready to be published without changes.
☐ I have a few corrections. I am enclosing the following pages:
☐ I have made many corrections. Enclosed is the complete article.
Date / signature:



Metadata of the article that will be visualized in OnlineFirst

1	Article Title	Asymptomatic immunoglobulin light chain amyloidosis (AL) at the time of diagnostic bone marrow biopsy in newly diagnosed patients with multiple myeloma and smoldering myeloma. A series of 144 cases and a review of the literature				
2	Article Sub- Title					
3	Article Copyright - Year	Springer-Verlag 2010 (This will be the copyright line in the final PDF)				
4	Journal Name	Annals of Hematol	ogy			
5		Family Name	Siragusa			
6		Particle				
7		Given Name	Sergio			
8	Corresponding	Suffix				
9	Author	Organization	Azienda Ospedaliera Universitaria Policlinico di Palermo			
10		Division	Cattedra ed U.O. di Ematologia con trapianto			
11		Address	via del Vespro 127, Palermo 90127, Italy			
12		e-mail	sergio.siragusa@unipa.it			
13		Family Name	Morice			
14		Particle				
15		Given Name	William			
16	Author	Suffix				
17	Author	Organization	Mayo Clinic Rochester			
18		Division	Division of Pathology			
19		Address	Rochester , MN, USA			
20		e-mail				
21		Family Name	Gertz			
22		Particle				
23		Given Name	Morie A.			
24	A	Suffix				
25	Author	Organization	Mayo Clinic Rochester			
26		Division	Division of Hematology			
27		Address	Rochester , MN, USA			
28		e-mail				
29		Family Name	Kyle			
30		Particle				
31		Given Name	Robert A.			
32		Suffix				

33		Organization	Mayo Clinic Rochester
34	A (1	Division	Division of Hematology
35	Author	Address	Rochester , MN, USA
36		e-mail	
37		Family Name	Greipp
38		Particle	
39		Given Name	Philip R.
40	A	Suffix	
41	Author	Organization	Mayo Clinic Rochester
42		Division	Division of Hematology
43		Address	Rochester , MN, USA
44		e-mail	
45		Family Name	Lust
46		Particle	
47		Given Name	John A.
48	A	Suffix	
49	Author	Organization	Mayo Clinic Rochester
50		Division	Division of Hematology
51		Address	Rochester , MN, USA
52		e-mail	
53		Family Name	Witzig
54		Particle	
55		Given Name	Thomas E.
56	Acuttana	Suffix	
57	Author	Organization	Mayo Clinic Rochester
58		Division	Division of Hematology
59		Address	Rochester , MN, USA
60		e-mail	
61		Family Name	Lacy
62		Particle	
63		Given Name	Martha Q.
64	A cuttle a co	Suffix	
65	Author	Organization	Mayo Clinic Rochester
66		Division	Division of Hematology
67		Address	Rochester , MN, USA
68		e-mail	
69		Family Name	Zeldenrust
70		Particle	
71		Given Name	Steven R.

72		Suffix	
73		Organization	Mayo Clinic Rochester
74	Author	Division	Division of Hematology
75	Autiloi	Address	Rochester , MN, USA
76		e-mail	reconcert, with Cort
77		Family Name	Rajkumar
78		Particle	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·
79		Given Name	S. Vincent
80		Suffix	
81	Author	Organization	Mayo Clinic Rochester
82		Division	Division of Hematology
83		Address	Rochester , MN, USA
84		e-mail	, ,
85		Family Name	Russell
86		Particle	
87		Given Name	Stephen J.
88		Suffix	
89	Author	Organization	Mayo Clinic Rochester
90		Division	Division of Hematology
91		Address	Rochester , MN, USA
92		e-mail	
92 93		e-mail Family Name	Hayman
			Hayman
93		Family Name	Hayman Suzanne R.
93 94	Author	Family Name Particle	
93 94 95	Author	Family Name Particle Given Name	
93 94 95 96	Author	Family Name Particle Given Name Suffix	Suzanne R.
93 94 95 96 97	Author	Family Name Particle Given Name Suffix Organization	Suzanne R. Mayo Clinic Rochester
93 94 95 96 97 98	Author	Family Name Particle Given Name Suffix Organization Division	Suzanne R. Mayo Clinic Rochester Division of Hematology
93 94 95 96 97 98 99	Author	Family Name Particle Given Name Suffix Organization Division Address e-mail Family Name	Suzanne R. Mayo Clinic Rochester Division of Hematology
93 94 95 96 97 98 99 100 101	Author	Family Name Particle Given Name Suffix Organization Division Address e-mail	Suzanne R. Mayo Clinic Rochester Division of Hematology Rochester , MN, USA
93 94 95 96 97 98 99 100 101 102 103	Author	Family Name Particle Given Name Suffix Organization Division Address e-mail Family Name	Suzanne R. Mayo Clinic Rochester Division of Hematology Rochester , MN, USA
93 94 95 96 97 98 99 100 101 102 103 104		Family Name Particle Given Name Suffix Organization Division Address e-mail Family Name Particle	Suzanne R. Mayo Clinic Rochester Division of Hematology Rochester , MN, USA Buadi
93 94 95 96 97 98 99 100 101 102 103 104 105	Author	Family Name Particle Given Name Suffix Organization Division Address e-mail Family Name Particle Given Name Suffix Organization	Suzanne R. Mayo Clinic Rochester Division of Hematology Rochester , MN, USA Buadi
93 94 95 96 97 98 99 100 101 102 103 104 105 106		Family Name Particle Given Name Suffix Organization Division Address e-mail Family Name Particle Given Name Suffix Organization Division	Suzanne R. Mayo Clinic Rochester Division of Hematology Rochester , MN, USA Buadi Francis
93 94 95 96 97 98 99 100 101 102 103 104 105 106		Family Name Particle Given Name Suffix Organization Division Address e-mail Family Name Particle Given Name Suffix Organization	Suzanne R. Mayo Clinic Rochester Division of Hematology Rochester , MN, USA Buadi Francis Mayo Clinic Rochester
93 94 95 96 97 98 99 100 101 102 103 104 105 106 107		Family Name Particle Given Name Suffix Organization Division Address e-mail Family Name Particle Given Name Suffix Organization Division Address e-mail	Suzanne R. Mayo Clinic Rochester Division of Hematology Rochester , MN, USA Buadi Francis Mayo Clinic Rochester Division of Hematology
93 94 95 96 97 98 99 100 101 102 103 104 105 106 107 108 109		Family Name Particle Given Name Suffix Organization Division Address e-mail Family Name Particle Given Name Suffix Organization Division Address e-mail Family Name	Suzanne R. Mayo Clinic Rochester Division of Hematology Rochester , MN, USA Buadi Francis Mayo Clinic Rochester Division of Hematology
93 94 95 96 97 98 99 100 101 102 103 104 105 106 107		Family Name Particle Given Name Suffix Organization Division Address e-mail Family Name Particle Given Name Suffix Organization Division Address e-mail	Suzanne R. Mayo Clinic Rochester Division of Hematology Rochester , MN, USA Buadi Francis Mayo Clinic Rochester Division of Hematology Rochester , MN, USA

			Shaji K.			
112		Suffix	·			
113		Organization	Mayo Clinic Rochester			
114	Author	Division	Division of Hematology			
115		Address	Rochester , MN, USA			
116		e-mail				
117		Family Name	Dingli			
118		Particle				
119		Given Name	David			
120		Suffix				
121	Author	Organization	Mayo Clinic Rochester			
122		Division	Division of Hematology			
123		Address	Rochester , MN, USA			
124		e-mail				
125		Family Name	Dispenzieri			
126		Particle				
127		Given Name	Angela			
128		Suffix				
129	Author	Organization	Mayo Clinic Rochester			
130		Division	Division of Hematology			
131		Address	Rochester , MN, USA			
132		e-mail				
133		Received	5 June 2010			
134	Schedule	Revised				
135		Accepted	30 June 2010			
136	Abstract	The rate of asymptomatic amyloidosis (AL) among patients with newly diagnosed multiple myeloma (MM) or smoldering multiple myeloma (SMM) is unknown. We evaluated number and clinical significance of asymptomatic AL ir consecutive MM and SMM patients, not having recognition of symptomatic AL at the time of their diagnostic bone marrow biopsy. Bone marrow biopsies were stained with Congo red and considered diagnostic for AL in case of positive Congo red staining with apple-green birefringence. Biopsies from 144 patients were evaluated: 77 had a diagnosis of MM and 67 of SMM. The median age was 59 (range 26–84) years; the median follow-up was 76 months (range 0–216). Immunoglobulin isotypes were 96/144 (67%), IgG; 23/144 (16%), IgA; 12/144 (8%), light chain only; 1/77 (1%), IgD; and biclonal or indeterminate, 12/144 (8%). Fifty-eight percent (84/144) were κ restricted. The presence of amyloid was found in two cases (1%, 95% CI –0.6 to 3.2), one in MM, and one in SMM group, and none had or developed signs or symptoms suggestive of organ involvement by amyloid. Among the 142 other patients without amyloid deposition in their index bone marrow, one (0.7%, 95% CI –0.6 to 2.0) developed symptomatic AL after 119 months.				
137	Keywords separated by ' - '	Amyloid - Multiple marrow biopsy	myeloma - Smoldering myeloma - Asymptomatic - Bone			
138	Foot note information					

ORIGINAL ARTICLE

Asymptomatic immunoglobulin light chain amyloidosis (AL) at the time of diagnostic bone marrow biopsy in newly diagnosed patients with multiple myeloma and smoldering myeloma. A series of 144 cases and a review of the literature

- Sergio Siragusa · William Morice · Morie A. Gertz · Robert A. Kyle ·
- 9 Philip R. Greipp · John A. Lust · Thomas E. Witzig · Martha Q. Lacy ·
- 10 Steven R. Zeldenrust · S. Vincent Rajkumar · Stephen J. Russell ·
- 11 Suzanne R. Hayman Francis Buadi Shaji K. Kumar David Dingli •
- 12 Angela Dispenzieri

Received: 5 June 2010 / Accepted: 30 June 2010

© Springer-Verlag 2010

14 15 16

17

18

19

20

21

22

2324

25

26

27

28

29

30

31

Abstract The rate of asymptomatic amyloidosis (AL) among patients with newly diagnosed multiple myeloma (MM) or smoldering multiple myeloma (SMM) is unknown. We evaluated number and clinical significance of asymptomatic AL in consecutive MM and SMM patients, not having recognition of symptomatic AL at the time of their diagnostic bone marrow biopsy. Bone marrow biopsies were stained with Congo red and considered diagnostic for AL in case of positive Congo red staining with apple-green birefringence. Biopsies from 144 patients were evaluated: 77 had a diagnosis of MM and 67 of SMM. The median age was 59 (range 26-84) years; the median follow-up was 76 months (range 0-216). Immunoglobulin isotypes were 96/144 (67%), IgG; 23/144 (16%), IgA; 12/ 144 (8%), light chain only; 1/77 (1%), IgD; and biclonal or indeterminate, 12/144 (8%). Fifty-eight percent (84/144)

S. Siragusa (⋈)
Cattedra ed U.O. di Ematologia con trapianto,
Azienda Ospedaliera Universitaria Policlinico di Palermo,
via del Vespro 127,

90127 Palermo, Italy e-mail: sergio.siragusa@unipa.it

W. Morice

Division of Pathology, Mayo Clinic Rochester, Rochester, MN, USA

M. A. Gertz · R. A. Kyle · P. R. Greipp · J. A. Lust · T. E. Witzig · M. Q. Lacy · S. R. Zeldenrust · S. V. Rajkumar · S. J. Russell · S. R. Hayman · F. Buadi · S. K. Kumar · D. Dingli · A. Dispenzieri
Division of Hematology, Mayo Clinic Rochester,
Rochester, MN, USA

were κ restricted. The presence of amyloid was found in two cases (1%, 95% CI -0.6 to 3.2), one in MM, and one in SMM group, and none had or developed signs or symptoms suggestive of organ involvement by amyloid. Among the 142 other patients without amyloid deposition in their index bone marrow, one (0.7%, 95% CI -0.6 to 2.0) developed symptomatic AL after 119 months.

KeywordsAmyloid · Multiple myeloma ·39Smoldering myeloma · Asymptomatic ·40Bone marrow biopsy41

Introduction 42

Multiple myeloma (MM), smoldering multiple myeloma (SMM), immunoglobulin light chain amyloidosis (AL), and monoclonal gammopathy of undetermined significance (MGUS) represent a spectrum of plasma cells disorders (PCDs). AL is a rare and serious disorder characterized by the deposition of amyloid fibrils in different tissues with more than 80% of patients dead within 2 years of diagnosis [1, 2]

Immunoglobulin light chain amyloidosis may coexist with any of the other PCDs [2, 3]. It has been reported that approximately 10% of patients with AL may have MM at the time of diagnosis [2], while only a minority will develop delayed MM [4]. Conversely, it has been reported that up to 30% of MM patients may have subclinical amyloid deposits (in subcutaneous fat aspirate, bone marrow biopsy, or biopsies of other vital organs) [5–8],



32

33 **Q1**

34

35

36

37

38

43

44

45

46

47

48

49

50

51

52

53

54

55

56

57

59

60 61

62

63

64

65

66

67

68

69

70

71

72

73

74

75

76

77

78

79

80

81

82

83

84

85

86

87

88

89

90

91

92

93

94

95

96

97 98

99

100

101

102

103

104

105

106

107

108

109

110

111

112

113

114

115

116

117

118

119

120

121

122

123

124

125

126

127

128

129

130

131

132

133

134

135

136

137

138

139

140

141

142

143

144

145

146

147

148

149

150

151

152

and in up to 15% of all MM patients, a clinically overt AL appears during the course of index MM [3, 5]).

The rate of asymptomatic amyloidosis (asymp-amyloid) in patients with MM or SMM as well as its clinical impact is uncertain. This topic is significant because unrecognized AL can be associated with significant mortality and morbidity. In the case of patients with SMM, no treatment will be directed against the plasma cell clone, potentially allowing for unbridled progression of the AL. Unrecognized AL in patients diagnosed with MM is also significant because of the potential for higher rates of treatment-related morbidity and mortality in patients with occult visceral involvement with AL. However, at the present we deal with discordant information. Some authors found out MMassociated asymp-amyloid in up to 26% of patients at the time of diagnosis [8]; this was also an independent highrisk prognostic factor for MM patients, thus suggesting need for searching amyloid and need for aggressive treatment. Others believe that AL deposits, even if not rare, are clinically inconsequential and should not influence MM therapy, so active screening is unnecessary [6, 9].

Systemic AL can be a devastating disease with an insidious onset, and its early recognition may improve clinical outcomes and patients' management. The objective of the present investigation was therefore that of evaluating the rate of asymp-amyloid in MM and SMM patients at the moment of first diagnostic bone marrow (BM) biopsy.

Design and methods

Patients

Study population was selected from the Mayo Clinic Dysproteinemia database (Division of Hematology, Rochester MN, USA) by a computerized search of the medical records of consecutive patients with diagnosis of MM and SM during the period January 1, 1993 to December 31, 2003: Diagnosis was made upon criteria on the International Myeloma Study Group [10]. All patients with monoclonal gammopathy seen in the Dysproteinemia Clinic are routinely screened for symptoms and signs of amyloidosis. Congo red staining of the bone marrow is not routinely done unless there is clinical suspicion of amyloidosis. For the purpose of this study, the medical records of these patients were reviewed to discern whether there had been coexisting signs or symptoms suggestive for symptomatic AL at the time of diagnostic BM for MM or SMM. Permission to perform a retrospective chart review was granted by the Institutional Review Board of the Mayo Foundation in accordance with federal regulations.

During the same time period, there were 691 cases of AL diagnosed at Mayo within 30 days of their initial diagnosis.

Of them, 39 (5.6%) had more than 10% bone marrow plasmacytosis, consistent with coexisting multiple myeloma. Of these, only 18 (46.1% of patients with >10% of BM plasma cells) or 2.6% of the entire AL population had symptoms consistent with myeloma, i.e., bone lesions, anemia (Hb<11 g/dL), calcium greater than 10.5 mg/dL, or myeloma-related kidney disease, which was defined as a creatinine greater than 1.5 mg/dL and a 24-h urinary M-protein to 24-h urinary total protein ratio of greater than 0.5.

Diagnosis of asymptomatic AL

Bone marrow biopsies were reviewed and examined for Congo red staining. A patient was considered to have amyloid if the stain was positive, and apple-green birefringence was found on polarized microscopy. Posterior superior iliac crest was the preferred biopsy site, and the specimens were obtained with a modified Jamshidi needle as an outpatient procedure. Following decalcification, the bone marrows were paraffin embedded and H&E stained, and Congo red stained sections were reviewed by a single author (WB). Amyloid deposits were detected by examination at 200× under polarized light. Only data from patients with an adequate follow-up period were considered in the final analysis. In addition, serum samples were obtained at diagnosis to determine LDH, \(\beta 2\) microglobulin, albumin, calcium, phosphorus, creatinine, and liver function tests. Serum and urine electrophoresis and immunofixation, as well as bone marrow aspiration and bone X-ray studies, were taken at diagnosis.

Statistical analysis

Baseline differences between groups were assessed by the Chi-square test (Fisher's exact test) for categorical variables and univariate analysis of variance (ANOVA test) or Mann—Whitney U statistic test for parametric and nonparametric analyses. Survival was estimated using the method of Kaplan and Meier.

Results

Overall characteristics of MM and SMM patients

Of the 1,180 patients with a diagnosis of MM (959) or SMM (221) seen at Mayo Clinic within 30 days of their diagnosis, biopsies were available from 144 (F 59, M 84). Among the patients evaluated, 77 had a diagnosis of MM and 67 of SM. Characteristics of MM and SM patients at time of diagnosis are reported in Table 1. One hundred thirty-six (95.8%) patients had a positive serum M-spike before diagnostic BM. Median serum M-spike at the time

AUTHOR'S PROOF!

Ann Hematol

t1.1

Table 1	Baseline	patients' of	characteristics
---------	----------	--------------	-----------------

t1.2	Characteristics	MM population $(n=77)$	SM population ($n=67$)
t1.3	Median months from biopsy to last follow-up (range)	65 (10.4–169.2)	64.6 (0-210)
t1.4	Such fatigue (%)	13 (16.8)	5 (7.4)
t1.5	Pain (%)	42 (54.5)	1 (1.5)
t1.6	Paresthesia (%)	1 (1.3)	3 (4.4)
t1.7	Bleeding (%)	0	1 (1.5)
t1.8	Edema (%)	0	1 (1.5)
t1.9	Dyspnea (%)	6 (7.8)	1 (1.5)
t1.10	Median age, years (range)	55. 5 (33–70)	63 (26–84)
t1.11	Hemoglobin (g/dL), median (range)	11.0 (7.6–15.3)	12.5 (7.6–14.8)
t1.12	Platelets (×10 ⁹ /L), median (range)	222.0 (8–399)	224.0 (65–786)
t1.13	Serum protein (g/dL), median (range)	8.0 (6–16.1)	8.4 (6.3–11.8)
t1.14	Urine protein (g/24 h)	0.13 (0.01–10.7)	0.1 (0.01–2.7)
t1.15	Serum albumin, median (range)	3.64 (2.3–5.7)	3.60 (2.3-4.7)
t1.16	Alkaline phosphate (U/L), median (range)	175.5 (53–1199)	155.0 (62–480)
t1.17	Creatinine (mg/dL), median (range)	1.1 (0.7–2.2)	1.1 (0.9–6.6)

BM bone marrow, FU follow-up

of diagnostic BM biopsy was 2.93 (range 0.6–9.5). At a median follow-up of living patients of 76.2 months (range 0.–215.9), 46 (31.9%) patients were alive, 93 (64.5%) dead, and 5 (3.4%) lost to follow-up. The overall median survival was 70.4 months (Fig. 1).

At presentation, SMM patients were older, less anemic, had higher creatinine and urine protein, but lower urine M-spike levels than MM patients. These last patients were more likely to have fatigue and pain, while SMM patients had more frequently paresthesia (Table 1).

Patients with asymptomatic amyloid deposit at presentation

Amyloid was retrospectively detected in the index bone marrow biopsy of two of the 144 cases (1.38%, 95% CI -0.6 to 3.2), one in MM, and one in SMM group, respectively. The first (OE, female, 66 years old) was diagnosed having MM; at presentation, she had moderate anemia (Hg 9.4 g/l), pain, multiple fractures but not hypercalcemia, renal, or liver tests alteration. No measurable M-spike was identified on electrophoresis, but there was a monoclonal kappa light chain detectable in the serum by immunofixation. Urine protein electrophoresis showed a total urine protein of 280 mg with an M-spike of 249 mg/24 h that was confirmed to be kappa light chain. Quantitative immunoglobulins were not done. The bone marrow biopsy revealed plasma cells comprising 30% of the total cellularity. Beta-2-microglobulin was elevated at 2.28 µg/mL. Cytogenetic studies by FISH did not show IGH translocation, monosomy, or deletion 13, deletion of p53 or trisomy 3, 7, 9, 11, 13, 15, or 17. Cytogenetics studies of BM showed a normal karyotype (46, XX). The second patient (RW, male, 77 years old) was diagnosed with SMM (IgG-к).

He had a history of weight loss and severe chronic obstructive pulmonary disease. At presentation, physical exam did not reveal any abnormalities. The BM biopsy revealed plasma cells up to 25% of the total cellularity; $\beta 2\text{-microglobulin}$ was 1.52 $\mu g/\text{mL}$. Bone survey was negative for metastases or myeloma. Clinical and laboratory characteristics are listed in Table 2. After more than 7 years of follow-up, neither of these patients had or developed during their disease signs or symptoms suggestive for organ involvement by amyloid.

Patients without bone marrow amyloid deposition at presentation but subsequent systemic amyloidosis

There was one patient (RJ, male, 51 years old) who was diagnosed having MGUS (IgG- λ) in 1992 followed by SMM in 1993. Clinical and laboratory characteristics at presentation are listed in Table 2. At the presentation, physical examination was normal. He did not have weakness, fatigue, bleeding, or increased bruising, not bone pain, change in his voice or tongue, steatorrhea, paresthesia, claudication, or weight loss. He developed symptomatic AL after 72.6 months (February 1999) from initial diagnosis of SMM. He was treated with melphalan/prednisone. At the time of last contact in 2002, he considered himself to be in good health.

Discussion

Rate and clinical impact of asymp-amyloid in patients with MM or SMM is uncertain. While asymptomatic amyloid



t2.1 **Table 2** Characteristics of two patients with detection of amyloid deposit at presentation and one patient without amyloid deposit but subsequent systemic amyloidosis

Clinical/laboratory characteristics at diagnosis	Patients with amyloid deposit at presentation		Patient without amyloid deposit at presentation but subsequent AL	
	MM patient	SM patient		
Months from biopsy to last follow-up	86.4	87.6	72.6	
Age (year)	66	77	51	
Hg (g/dL)	9.4	13	12.3	1
Platelets $(n \times 10^9/L)$	328	201	446	1
Pro-thrombin time (s)	10.1	NA	NA	t
Serum protein (g/dL)	NA	7.4	6.9	t
Urine protein (mg/dL)	280	8	13	t
Serum Albumin (g/dL)	2.9	3.6	3.5	t
Alkaline phosphate (U/L)	NA	145	152	t
Creatinine (mg/100 mL)	0.8	1.1	0.9	t
B2-microglobulin (μg/mL)	2.28	1.56	1.5	t
C-reactive protein level (mg/dL)	NA	NA	0.59	t
Serum light chain isotype	Kappa	Kappa	Lambda	t

NA not available

Q3 225

deposits have been reported to coexist at the time of MM diagnosis in up to 30% of patients [1, 5], less information is available in patients with established MM or SMM who are seen at a facility at which an extensive amyloid directed review of systems and signs is the norm. This issue is topical since unrecognized AL can be associated with significant mortality and morbidity, and its early detection could change the management of MM and SMM patients.

We found that only 1.4% of patients with retrospective Congo red staining of their bone marrow had amyloid present on their presenting bone marrow. This may be a limitation of the present investigation, since it is well known that the sensitivity of bone marrow biopsy is only about 50% in comparison to that of abdominal fat aspirate with a sensitivity of about 80% of confirmed amyloidosis [1, 14]. It is possible that our approach yielded a low estimate. For example, the one patient, whose initial bone marrow was negative for amyloidosis but who was diagnosed with AL 6 years later, might have had a positive fat aspirate at the time of his earlier bone marrow; if so, he would have had very indolent amyloidosis.

Our data, which may appear to conflict with prior reports, would suggest that a careful amyloid-specific review at the time of diagnosis of SMM or MM misses only 1–2% of cases even with a 6.4 person-years of follow-up and therefore abrogates the need to do routine amyloid staining on all cases of SMM or MM. It also supports the Mayo Clinic practice of having a low threshold for amyloidosis screening if non-specific symptoms are present in a patient with a monoclonal gammopathy.

Table 3 puts our findings into the context of prior reports. One of the first reports addressing this question was

by Desikan et al. [6], who prospectively evaluated fat pad aspirate and BM biopsy for amyloid deposit in a cohort of 84 MM patients. Amyloid was detected in 38% of patients; fat pad aspirate was positive in 25% and BM in 10% of cases and other organ sites in seven patients. MM or SMM patients did not differ in disease characteristics, and particularly, no λ predominance was found. The median overall and event-free survival of the entire cohort is 66+ and 52 months respectively; the median overall (59+ months vs 66+ months, p=0.9) and event-free survival (59+ vs 52+ months, p=0.9) were similar in cohort with and without amyloid, respectively. These authors concluded, therefore, that although the incidence of light chain asymptomatic AL in MM patients is high, it does not influence the outcome of these patients treated with autologous transplantation.

Vela-Ojeda et al. evaluated 201 consecutive patients with de novo MM in whom a fat pad biopsy needle aspiration (stained with Congo red) was performed [8]. Overall, 68 patients (34%) were diagnosed having concomitant AL; 16 (8%) had symptoms consistent with amyloidosis at the time of MM diagnosis, while in 52 (25.8%), fat pad aspiration was useful to detect incidental asymptomatic AL. The median follow-up was 36 months (range 12-199). Among patients without AL at the time of diagnostic BM for MM, 69% of them became symptomatic for AL after a median follow-up of 14 months (range 6 to 30). Even excluding 16 patients with obvious symptoms of AL at diagnosis, overall survival was worse in patients who developed late AL (13 vs 64 months of those without AL). Cox regression model for overall survival detected three variables having independent prognostic significance: the presence of AL (RR 3.4, p < 0.004), serum albumin levels <3.5 g/dL (RR 3.2, p <

Springer

Ann Hematol

t3.1

Table 3 Studies considering relationship between asymptomatic AL in myeloma patients

Autho	or [ref]	MM cases, n	AL cases, <i>n</i> (%)	AL cases, n		Tissues stained for amyloid	Prognostic factor?	Comments
MM (cases wit	h inciden	tal amyloid	osis				
Desik [6]	can	84	32 (30.8)			Subcutaneous abdominal fat aspirate (SAFA) in 25, bone marrow in 8, and other organ sites in 7 patients	No	
Vela-([8]	Ojeda	201	68 (34) ^a			SAFA	Yes	
Petruz [12]	ziello]	166	67 (40.3)			Cytological techniques in bone marrow smears	No	
Prese	nt study 1	77	1 (1.3)			Bone marrow	No	
Prese	nt study M	67	1 (1.5)			Bone marrow	No	
AL c	ases with	asympto	matic MM					
Kyle [2]				474				
AL c	ases with	sympton	natic MM					
Rajku [4]	ımar			1,596	6 (0.3)	Biopsy-proven AL		No laboratory or clinical evidence of MM at the diagnosis of AL. MM developed 10–81 months hereafter

^a Sixteen were symptomatic for AL

0.005), and patients not achieving complete remission or very good partial remission (RR 2.9, p<0.02). The authors then concluded that MM-associated AL represents a poorer prognosis of disease even in the absence of symptoms at diagnosis, and this specific association may be considered as an independent high-risk prognostic factor. Thus, authors concluded that routine study of peri-umbilical fat pad tissue should be mandatory in all patients with MM.

Petruzziello et al. (2009) evaluated retrospectively the bone marrow smears of 166 unselected patients affected by MM (126 at diagnosis and 40 after treatment); no data were reported about the presence of signs or symptoms suggestive for concomitant systemic AL [12]. All samples were stained with Congo red and studied by transmission and birefringence microscopy. Both focal and diffuse involvements were considered positive. Overall, 67 patients were positive for AL, and 99 were negative to Congo red and apple-green birefringence. In particular, 51 of the 126 patients studied at diagnosis and 16 of the 40 patients with advanced disease were positive. Authors failed to find correlations between bone marrow amyloid deposits and immunoglobulin type, disease stage, plasma cells percentage, hemoglobin, calcium, creatinine, albumin, or β2-microglobulin.

Although the main objective of our investigation was to evaluate the rate of asymp-amyloid at the time of first BM, we were able to look at the clinical outcome of our cohort who had a median follow-up of 6 years. Neither of the patients who were retrospectively found to have

amyloid in their index bone marrows developed symptomatic AL, and their survival did not differ from the other patients. Among Congo red negative patients, we detected one (SMM patient) who developed symptomatic AL during a follow-up of 72.6 months. He had serum λ light chain, an isotype frequently reported in patients with AL [13].

One potential caveat in studies looking at the detection of asymp-amyloid relies on patients' selection. In fact, AL requires a high index of suspicion, and most of AL cases are often misdiagnosed with other PCDs, mainly with MM (The UK Myeloma Forum AL Amyloidosis Guidelines Working Group, 2004). It is not unlikely that the true occurrence of asymptomatic AL has been previously overestimated. Because of the high level of suspicion for amyloid at our Amyloid Center, we are confident that all patients evaluated did not have (even subclinical) AL at the time of diagnostic BM for MM or SM. Therefore, evaluation of adequate specimens in experienced laboratories is necessary to maintain high diagnostic sensitivity and specificity.

In conclusion, we evaluated rates and clinical significance of amyloid deposit at the time of first diagnostic BM biopsy in newly diagnosed MM and SMM. Our findings show that fewer than 2% of patients in both groups have asymp-amyloid, thus discouraging any specific search for amyloid deposit when careful evaluation of clinical presentation and patient's history are not suggestive for systemic AL.

Q4

References

334

335

336

337

338

339

340

341

342

343

344

345

346

347

348

349

350

351

352

353

376

- 1. Gertz MA, Lacy MQ, Dispenzieri A (1999) Amyloidosis. Hematol Oncol Clin North Am 13:1211-1233
- 2. Kyle RA, Gertz MA (1995) Primary systemic amyloidosis: clinical and laboratory features in 474 cases. Semin Hematol 32:45-59
- 3. Rajkumar SV, Dispenzieri A, Kyle RA (2006) Monoclonal gammopathy of undetermined significance, Waldenström macroglobulinemia, AL amyloidosis, and related plasma cell disorders: diagnosis and treatment. Mayo Clin Proc 81(5):693-703
- 4. Rajkumar SV, Gertz MA, Kyle RA (1998) Primary systemic amyloidosis with delayed progression to multiple myeloma. Cancer 82:1501-1505
- 5. Kyle RA (1995) Multiple myeloma and other plasma cell disorders. In: Hoffman R, Benz EJ, Shattil SJ, Cohen FB, LE HJ S (eds) Hematology, basic principles and practice, 2nd edn. Churchill Livingstone, New York, pp 1354-1374
- 6. Desikan KR, Dhodapkar MV, Hough A et al (1997) Incidence and impact of light chain associated (AL) amyloidosis on the prognosis of patients with multiple myeloma treated with autologous transplantation. Leuk Lymphoma 27:315-319

- 7. Bahlis NJ, Lazarus HM (2006) Multiple myeloma-associated AL amyloidosis: is a distinctive therapeutic approach warranted? Bone Marrow Transplant 38(1):7-15
- 8. Vela-Ojeda J, García-Ruiz Esparza MA, Padilla-González Y et al (2009) Multiple myeloma-associated amyloidosis is an independent high-risk prognostic factor. Ann Hematol 88 (1):59-66
- 9. The UK Myeloma Forum AL Amyloidosis Guidelines Working Group (2004) Guidelines on the diagnosis and management of AL amyloidosis. Br J Haematol 125:681-700
- 10. Kyle RA, Remstein ED, Therneau TM et al (2007) Clinical course and prognosis of smoldering (asymptomatic) multiple myeloma. N Engl J Med 356(25):2582-2590
- 11. Duston MA, Skinner M, Shraham T et al (1987) Diagnosis of amyloidosis by abdominal fat aspiration: analysis of 4 years experience. Am J Med 82:412-414
- 12. Petruzziello F, Zeppa P, Catalano L et al (2010) Amyloid in bone marrow smears of patients affected by multiple myeloma. Ann Hematol 89(5):469-474
- 13. Solomon A, Weiss DT, Kattine AA et al (1991) Nephrotoxic potential of Bence Jones proteins. N Engl J Med 324(26):1845-

365 366 367 **Q5**

354

355 356

357

358

359

360

361

362

363

364

368 369 370

371 372 373



AUTHOR'S PROOF!

AUTHOR QUERIES

AUTHOR PLEASE ANSWER ALL QUERIES.

- Q1. "-0.6 to 3.2" was changed to "-0.6 to 3.2." Please check if appropriate.
- Q2. Figure 1 was cited, but no caption and image provided. Please check.
- Q3. Reference 14 given here is cited in the text but is missing from the reference list. Please provide details in the list or remove the reference citation from the text.
- Q4. Please check changes made to the tables if appropriate.
- .ovide a cit. Q5. Reference [11] was not cited anywhere in the text. Please provide a citation. Alternatively, delete the item from the list.