

The NEW ENGLAND JOURNAL of MEDICINE

ESTABLISHED IN 1812

AUGUST 13, 2020

VOL. 383 NO. 7

Azacitidine and Venetoclax in Previously Untreated Acute Myeloid Leukemia

C.D. DiNardo, B.A. Jonas, V. Pullarkat, M.J. Thirman, J.S. Garcia, A.H. Wei, M. Konopleva, H. Döhner, A. Letai, P. Fenaux, E. Koller, V. Havelange, B. Leber, J. Esteve, J. Wang, V. Pejsa, R. Hájek, K. Porkka, Á. Illés, D. Lavie, R.M. Lemoli, K. Yamamoto, S.-S. Yoon, J.-H. Jang, S.-P. Yeh, M. Turgut, W.-J. Hong, Y. Zhou, J. Potluri, and K.W. Pratz

ABSTRACT

BACKGROUND

Older patients with acute myeloid leukemia (AML) have a dismal prognosis, even after treatment with a hypomethylating agent. Azacitidine added to venetoclax had promising efficacy in a previous phase 1b study.

METHODS

We randomly assigned previously untreated patients with confirmed AML who were ineligible for standard induction therapy because of coexisting conditions, because they were 75 years of age or older, or both to azacitidine plus either venetoclax or placebo. All patients received a standard dose of azacitidine (75 mg per square meter of body-surface area subcutaneously or intravenously on days 1 through 7 every 28-day cycle); venetoclax (target dose, 400 mg) or matching placebo was administered orally, once daily, in 28-day cycles. The primary end point was overall survival.

RESULTS

The intention-to-treat population included 431 patients (286 in the azacitidine-venetoclax group and 145 in the azacitidine-placebo [control] group). The median age was 76 years in both groups (range, 49 to 91). At a median follow-up of 20.5 months, the median overall survival was 14.7 months in the azacitidine-venetoclax group and 9.6 months in the control group (hazard ratio for death, 0.66; 95% confidence interval, 0.52 to 0.85; $P < 0.001$). The incidence of complete remission was higher with azacitidine-venetoclax than with the control regimen (36.7% vs. 17.9%; $P < 0.001$), as was the composite complete remission (complete remission or complete remission with incomplete hematologic recovery) (66.4% vs. 28.3%; $P < 0.001$). Key adverse events included nausea of any grade (in 44% of the patients in the azacitidine-venetoclax group and 35% of those in the control group) and grade 3 or higher thrombocytopenia (in 45% and 38%, respectively), neutropenia (in 42% and 28%), and febrile neutropenia (in 42% and 19%). Infections of any grade occurred in 85% of the patients in the azacitidine-venetoclax group and 67% of those in the control group, and serious adverse events occurred in 83% and 73%, respectively.

CONCLUSIONS

In previously untreated patients who were ineligible for intensive chemotherapy, overall survival was longer and the incidence of remission was higher among patients who received azacitidine plus venetoclax than among those who received azacitidine alone. The incidence of febrile neutropenia was higher in the venetoclax-azacitidine group than in the control group. (Funded by AbbVie and Genentech; VIALE-A ClinicalTrials.gov number, NCT02993523.)

The authors' full names, academic degrees, and affiliations are listed in the Appendix. Address reprint requests to Dr. DiNardo at the University of Texas M.D. Anderson Cancer Center, 1515 Holcombe Blvd., Unit 428, Houston, TX 77030, or at cdinardo@mdanderson.org.

This article was updated on August 13, 2020, at [NEJM.org](https://www.nejm.org).

N Engl J Med 2020;383:617-29.

DOI: 10.1056/NEJMoa2012971

Copyright © 2020 Massachusetts Medical Society.

 A Quick Take is available at [NEJM.org](https://www.nejm.org)

ACUTE MYELOID LEUKEMIA (AML) IS PRIMARILY a disease of older adults, with a median age of 68 years at diagnosis.^{1,2} Standard curative treatment for AML consists of intensive induction chemotherapy followed by consolidation chemotherapy, allogeneic stem-cell transplantation, or both.^{3,4} However, because of advanced age, coexisting conditions, and a high incidence of unfavorable genomic features, older patients are frequently ineligible for or have disease that is refractory to standard chemotherapy. Instead, such patients often receive less intensive regimens, including hypomethylating agents (azacitidine or decitabine) and low-dose cytarabine.⁵ Among untreated patients with AML who are at least 65 years of age, azacitidine monotherapy has been associated with an incidence of remission of 30% or less and survival of less than 1 year.⁶

B-cell lymphoma 2 (BCL2) family proteins play an important role in the intrinsic mitochondrial apoptotic response.^{7,8} Increased expression of BCL2 family proteins in AML blasts has been reported, and a majority of AML stem cells express aberrantly high levels of BCL2 and are dependent on BCL2 for survival.⁹⁻¹¹ Furthermore, high expression of BCL2 has been associated with an inferior response to chemotherapy and poor survival among patients with AML.^{10,12,13} Venetoclax, a selective small-molecule BCL2 inhibitor, has been shown in preclinical studies to induce apoptosis in malignant cells that are dependent on BCL2 for survival. Single-agent venetoclax has had modest activity in AML.^{14,15} Through downregulation of myeloid-cell leukemia 1 (MCL1) and induced expression of the prodeath proteins NOXA and PUMA, azacitidine may synergistically inhibit the prosurvival proteins MCL1 and BCL-XL, thereby increasing the dependence of leukemia cells on BCL2. Azacitidine and venetoclax have been shown to induce cell death in AML-derived cell lines in preclinical studies.^{16,17}

A previous phase 1b study of the combination of azacitidine and venetoclax showed promising efficacy, with a combined incidence of complete remission and **complete remission with incomplete hematologic recovery** of 71% and a **median duration of response** of 21.2 months in previously untreated patients with AML who were ineligible for chemotherapy.¹⁸ At a median follow-up of 14.9 months, the **median overall survival was 16.9 months**.¹⁹

This confirmatory trial (VIALE-A) was designed to evaluate the efficacy and safety of the azacitidine–venetoclax combination regimen as compared with a control regimen of azacitidine and placebo in previously untreated patients with AML who were ineligible for intensive induction therapy.

METHODS

PATIENTS

Key **eligibility criteria** included an age of 18 years or older and a confirmed diagnosis of previously untreated AML according to World Health Organization criteria. Patients were considered to be **ineligible for standard induction therapy if they were 75 years of age or older or if they had at least one of the following coexisting conditions precluding intensive chemotherapy**: a history of **congestive heart failure** for which treatment was warranted or an **ejection fraction of 50% or less or chronic stable angina, a diffusing capacity of the lung for carbon monoxide of 65% or less or a forced expiratory volume in 1 second of 65% or less, and an Eastern Cooperative Oncology Group performance-status score of 2 or 3 (on a 5-point scale, with higher numbers indicating greater disability)**. Previous receipt of any **hypomethylating agent, venetoclax, or chemotherapy for myelodysplastic syndrome was exclusionary**. Patients with a **favorable cytogenetic risk according to the AML National Comprehensive Cancer Network (NCCN) guidelines were also excluded**. Molecular mutations were assessed at a central laboratory. Full eligibility criteria are listed in the Supplementary Appendix, available with the full text of this article at [NEJM.org](https://www.nejm.org).

TRIAL DESIGN AND REGIMENS

This phase 3, multicenter, randomized, double-blind, placebo-controlled trial was conducted to evaluate the efficacy and safety of azacitidine plus venetoclax, as compared with azacitidine plus placebo (the control regimen). Eligible patients were assigned, in a 2:1 ratio, either to the azacitidine–venetoclax group or to the control group. All the patients were hospitalized on or before day 1 of cycle 1 and for at least 24 hours after receiving the final dose of venetoclax in order to receive prophylaxis against the tumor lysis syndrome and for monitoring. All the patients received an agent to reduce the level of

uric acid as well as oral hydration, intravenous hydration, or both, and all the patients underwent scheduled laboratory assessments.

Venetoclax was administered orally, once daily, with food. For mitigation of the tumor lysis syndrome during cycle 1, the dose of venetoclax was 100 mg on day 1 and 200 mg on day 2; on day 3, the target dose of 400 mg was reached and continued until day 28. In all subsequent 28-day cycles, the dose of venetoclax was initiated at 400 mg daily. Patients in the control group received an oral venetoclax placebo according to the same schedule. Patients in both groups received azacitidine at a dose of 75 mg per square meter of body-surface area, subcutaneously or intravenously, on days 1 through 7 every 28-day cycle. To mitigate cytopenia and related clinical consequences, venetoclax was interrupted between cycles for recovery of blood counts after clearance of leukemia from the bone marrow, and dose modifications related to prophylactic anti-infective agents for venetoclax dose equivalency were implemented. The criteria for dose modifications are summarized in Tables S1 and S2 in the Supplementary Appendix.

END POINTS AND ASSESSMENTS

The primary trial end point was overall survival. The secondary end points were composite complete remission (complete remission or complete remission with incomplete hematologic recovery), complete remission with or without partial hematologic recovery, complete remission by the initiation of cycle 2, red-cell and platelet transfusion independence, composite complete remission and overall survival in molecular and cytogenetic subgroups, event-free survival, measurable residual disease by flow cytometry, and quality of life according to patient-reported outcomes.

Overall survival was defined as the number of days from randomization to the date of death; event-free survival was defined as the number of days from randomization to disease progression, treatment failure (failure to achieve complete remission or <5% bone marrow blasts after at least six cycles of treatment), confirmed relapse, or death. Data for each patient were censored at the date of the last visit or the date on which the patient was last known to be alive. Bone marrow assessments were performed at screening, at the end of cycle 1, and every three cycles thereafter until two consecutive samples confirmed a com-

plete remission or a complete remission with incomplete hematologic recovery. Disease assessments were performed with the use of the modified International Working Group response criteria for AML.²⁰

Complete remission was defined as an absolute neutrophil count of more than 1000 cells per cubic millimeter, a platelet count of more than 100,000 per cubic millimeter, red-cell transfusion independence, and bone marrow with less than 5% blasts. Complete remission with incomplete hematologic recovery was defined as all the criteria for complete remission, except for neutropenia (absolute neutrophil count, ≤1000 per cubic millimeter) or thrombocytopenia (platelet count, ≤100,000 per cubic millimeter). Complete remission with partial hematologic recovery was defined as all the criteria for complete remission, except that both the neutrophil and platelet counts were lower than the threshold designated for complete recovery (for neutropenia >500 per cubic millimeter and a platelet count of more than >50,000 per cubic millimeter). Progressive disease was defined according to the recommendations of the European LeukemiaNet.³ Cytogenetic risk was evaluated by the investigators according to the NCCN guidelines for AML, version 2.2016. Transfusion independence was defined as the absence of a red-cell or platelet transfusion for at least 56 days between the first and last day of treatment. In patients who had composite complete remission, measurable residual disease was assessed by flow cytometry, with negativity defined according to European LeukemiaNet guidelines as less than 1000 aberrant blasts.²¹ Quality of life was assessed with the use of the Patient-Reported Outcomes Measurement Information System Fatigue SF7a patient questionnaire and the Core Quality of Life Questionnaire of the European Organization for Research and Treatment of Cancer C30.

All patients who received at least one dose of either azacitidine or venetoclax were included in the safety analysis. Treatment-related adverse events were defined as those that occurred from the first dose until 30 days after the discontinuation of treatment. The severity of adverse events was graded according to the National Cancer Institute Common Terminology Criteria for Adverse Events, version 4.03.²²

Patients continued to receive treatment until they had disease progression or unacceptable

toxic effects, until they withdrew consent, or until they met any protocol-defined criteria. Except for patients who withdrew consent, all patients who discontinued a trial regimen were followed for survival.

TRIAL OVERSIGHT

AbbVie and Genentech, the sponsors, provided financial support for the trial and participated in the design, trial conduct, analysis, and interpretation of the data. All the authors had full access to the data, signed confidentiality agreements with the sponsors regarding the data, and vouch for the completeness and accuracy of the data and analyses and for the fidelity of the trial to the protocol, available at NEJM.org. The first draft of the manuscript was written by the first author and a medical writer employed by AbbVie, with input from all the authors. All the authors critically reviewed and provided feedback on all subsequent versions of the manuscript. The trial was conducted in accordance with the Declaration of Helsinki and the Good Clinical Practice guidelines of the International Council for Harmonisation. The protocol and related documents were approved by the applicable regional review boards, ethics committees, or both, and all the patients provided written informed consent. An independent data and safety monitoring committee reviewed unblinded safety data and provided recommendations for continuation or termination of the trial.

STATISTICAL ANALYSIS

The clinical data cutoff date was January 4, 2020. The intention-to-treat population included all 431 patients who underwent randomization. For the primary end point of overall survival, we estimated that 360 deaths among 400 patients would provide 86.7% power to detect a hazard ratio of 0.70 with the use of a log-rank test at a two-sided significance level of 0.04.

In March 2020, the trial was declared to be successful (i.e., the trial showed efficacy of azacitidine plus venetoclax as compared with the control) at the recommendation of the independent data and safety monitoring committee, which reviewed the prespecified interim efficacy analysis of overall survival after 75% of the target number of deaths had occurred. Efficacy analyses were performed in the intention-to-treat

population. The distribution of overall survival was estimated for each treatment group with the use of the Kaplan–Meier method and compared with the use of the log-rank test stratified according to age and cytogenetic risk. The hazard ratio between the treatment groups was estimated with the Cox proportional-hazards model with the same stratification factors. Composite complete remission was compared between the treatment groups with the use of the Cochran–Mantel–Haenszel test with the same stratification factors.

RESULTS

PATIENTS

From February 6, 2017, through May 31, 2019, a total of 579 patients underwent screening, 433 underwent randomization, and 431 were included in the intention-to-treat population from 134 sites across 27 countries (Fig. 1 and Table S3). With 2:1 randomization, 286 patients were assigned to azacitidine plus venetoclax and 145 were assigned to azacitidine plus placebo. In both groups, the median age was 76 years, and 60% of the patients were male. Secondary AML was reported in 25% of the patients in the azacitidine–venetoclax group and in 24% of the patients in the control group, and poor cytogenetic risk was reported in 36% and 39%, respectively. Nearly half the patients (141 [49%] in the azacitidine–venetoclax group and 65 [45%] in the control group) had at least two reasons for ineligibility for intensive therapies. Key baseline and clinical characteristics are summarized in Table 1.

The most common reason for trial discontinuation during the follow-up for survival was death (in 161 patients [56%] in the azacitidine–venetoclax group and 109 patients [75%] in the control group) (Table S4). Death was related to disease progression in 27% of the patients in the azacitidine–venetoclax group (78 patients) and in 44% of the patients in the control group (64 patients).

EFFICACY

Primary End Point

The median duration of follow-up was 20.5 months (range, <0.1 to 30.7). At the time of the analysis, 77 of the patients in the azacitidine–venetoclax group (27%) and 18 of the patients in

the control group (12%) were receiving treatment (Fig. 2). The median overall survival was 14.7 months (95% confidence interval [CI], 11.9 to 18.7) in the azacitidine–venetoclax group and 9.6 months (95% CI, 7.4 to 12.7) in the control group (hazard ratio for death, 0.66; 95% CI, 0.52 to 0.85; $P < 0.001$).

Secondary End Points

Composite complete remission was achieved in 66.4% (95% CI, 60.6 to 71.9) of the patients in the azacitidine–venetoclax group and 28.3% (95% CI, 21.1 to 36.3) of the patients in the control group ($P < 0.001$); composite complete remission before the initiation of cycle 2 was achieved in 43.4% (95% CI, 37.5 to 49.3) and in 7.6% (95% CI, 3.8 to 13.2), respectively ($P < 0.001$). The median time to first response (either complete remission or complete remission with incomplete hematologic recovery) was 1.3 months (range, 0.6 to 9.9) and 2.8 months (range, 0.8 to 13.2), respectively. The median duration of composite complete remission was 17.5 months (95% CI, 13.6 to not reached [NR]) in the azacitidine–venetoclax group and 13.4 months (95% CI, 5.8 to 15.5) in the control group. Complete remission was achieved in 36.7% and 17.9% of the patients, respectively ($P < 0.001$), and the duration of complete remission was 17.5 months (95% CI, 15.3 to NR) and 13.3 months (95% CI, 8.5 to 17.6).

Similarly, complete remission plus complete remission with partial hematologic recovery was achieved in 64.7% (95% CI, 58.8 to 70.2) of the patients in the azacitidine–venetoclax group and in 22.8% (95% CI, 16.2 to 30.5) of those in the control group ($P < 0.001$); this end point was reached before the beginning of cycle 2 in 39.9% (95% CI, 34.1 to 45.8) and 5.5% (95% CI, 2.4 to 10.6), respectively ($P < 0.001$). The median time to first response was 1.0 month (range, 0.6 to 14.3) and 2.6 months (range, 0.8 to 13.2), and the duration of response was 17.8 months (95% CI, 15.3 to NR) and 13.9 months (95% CI, 10.4 to 15.7), respectively. The incidence of postbaseline transfusion independence was higher among patients in the azacitidine–venetoclax group than among those in the control group. Red-cell transfusion independence occurred in 59.8% (95% CI, 53.9 to 65.5) of the patients in the azacitidine–venetoclax group and in 35.2% (95% CI, 27.4 to 43.5) of those in the control group ($P < 0.001$),




Figure 1. Randomization and Treatment.

Two of the 433 patients who underwent randomization were not stratified according to cytogenetic risk. They were excluded from the efficacy analysis but included in the safety analysis. Six patients who did not receive treatment were excluded from the safety analysis. Two patients who were assigned to receive azacitidine plus venetoclax and 1 patient who was assigned to receive azacitidine plus placebo did not receive any treatment because of worsening of preexisting medical illness. Patients who discontinued azacitidine or venetoclax were followed for survival, but patients who discontinued the trial were no longer observed for survival follow-up. Two patients in the azacitidine–venetoclax group and 1 patient in the azacitidine–placebo group underwent transplantation after discontinuing azacitidine–venetoclax or azacitidine–placebo.

and platelet transfusion independence occurred in 68.5% (95% CI, 62.8 to 73.9) and 49.7% (95% CI, 41.3 to 58.1) ($P < 0.001$), respectively.

In the analysis of the molecular subgroups, the combination of azacitidine plus venetoclax was associated with a significantly higher inci-

Table 1. Baseline Demographic and Clinical Characteristics of the Patients.*		
Characteristic	Azacitidine–Venetoclax Group (N=286)	Azacitidine–Placebo Group (N=145)
Age		
Median (range) — yr	76 (49–91)	76 (60–90)
≥75 yr — no. (%)	174 (61)	87 (60)
Male sex — no. (%)	172 (60)	87 (60)
AML type — no (%)		
De novo	214 (75)	110 (76)
Secondary	72 (25)	35 (24)
Secondary AML — no./total no. (%)		
History of myelodysplastic syndrome or CMML	46/72 (64)	26/35 (74)
Therapy-related AML	26/72 (36)	9/35 (26)
ECOG performance-status score — no. (%)†		
0–1	157 (55)	81 (56)
2–3	129 (45)	64 (44)
Bone marrow blast count — no. (%)		
<30%‡	85 (30)	41 (28)
≥30 to <50%	61 (21)	33 (23)
≥50%	140 (49)	71 (49)
AML with myelodysplasia-related changes — no. (%)	92 (32)	49 (34)
Cytogenetic risk category — no. (%)§		
Intermediate	182 (64)	89 (61)
Normal karyotype — no.	128	62
Trisomy 8; +8 alone — no.	13	10
Poor	104 (36)	56 (39)
7 or 7q deletion — no.	20	11
5 or 5q deletion — no.	46	22
Complex, ≥3 clonal abnormalities — no.	75	36
Somatic mutations — no./total no. (%)		
<i>IDH1</i> or <i>IDH2</i>	61/245 (25)	28/127 (22)
<i>FLT3</i> ITD or TKD	29/206 (14)	22/108 (20)
<i>NPM1</i>	27/163 (17)	17/86 (20)
<i>TP53</i>	38/163 (23)	14/86 (16)
Baseline cytopenia grade ≥3¶		
Anemia — no. (%)	88 (31)	52 (36)
Neutropenia — no./total no. (%)	206/286 (72)	90/144 (62)
Thrombocytopenia — no. (%)	145 (51)	73 (50)
Baseline transfusion dependence — no. (%)		
Red cells	144 (50)	76 (52)
Platelets	68 (24)	32 (22)
≥2 Reasons for ineligibility to receive intensive therapy — no. (%)	141 (49)	65 (45)

* AML denotes acute myeloid leukemia, CMML chronic myelomonocytic leukemia, HMA hypomethylating agent, ITD internal tandem duplications, and TKD tyrosine kinase domain.

† Eastern Cooperative Oncology Group (ECOG) performance-status scores range from 0 to 5, with 0 indicating no symptoms and higher scores indicating greater disability.

‡ These bone marrow blast counts were between 20 and 29%.

§ Only cytogenetic risks of interest are shown.

¶ Cytopenia was graded according to the Common Terminology Criteria for Adverse Events.

|| Baseline transfusion dependence was transfusion within 8 weeks before the first dose of azacitidine–venetoclax or azacitidine–placebo or randomization.

dence of composite complete remission than the control regimen. In patients with *IDH1* or *IDH2* mutations, the incidence of composite remission was 75.4% (95% CI, 62.7 to 85.5) in the azacitidine–venetoclax group and 10.7% (95% CI, 2.3 to 28.2) in the control group ($P<0.001$); in those with *FLT3* mutations, the incidence was 72.4% (95% CI, 52.8 to 87.3) and 36.4% (95% CI, 17.2 to 59.3), respectively ($P=0.02$); in those with *NPM1*, 66.7% (95% CI, 46.0 to 83.5) and 23.5% (95% CI, 6.8 to 49.9), respectively ($P=0.012$); and in those with *TP53*, 55.3% (95% CI, 38.3 to 71.4) and 0%, respectively ($P<0.001$). Responses according to key prognostic features at baseline are shown in Figure S1. In patients with composite complete remission, measurable residual disease negativity occurred in 23.4% (95% CI, 18.6 to 28.8) of the patients who received azacitidine plus venetoclax and in 7.6% (95% CI, 3.8 to 13.2) of those in the control group.

The median overall survival among patients with de novo AML (i.e., in those with no history of myelodysplastic syndrome, myeloproliferative disorder, or exposure to potentially leukemogenic agents) was 14.1 months (95% CI, 10.7 to 19.3) in the azacitidine–venetoclax group and 9.6 months (95% CI, 6.8 to 13.0) in the control group (hazard ratio, 0.67; 95% CI, 0.51 to 0.90), and the median overall survival among patients with secondary AML was 16.4 months (95% CI, 9.7 to 24.4) and 10.6 months (4.9 to 13.2), respectively (hazard ratio, 0.56; 95% CI, 0.35 to 0.91). Among patients with an intermediate cytogenetic risk, the median overall survival was 20.8 months (95% CI, 16.4 to NR) in the azacitidine–venetoclax group and 12.4 months (95% CI, 9.1 to 15.8) in the control group (hazard ratio for death, 0.57; 95% CI, 0.41 to 0.79), whereas in those with a poor cytogenetic risk, the median overall survival was 7.6 months (95% CI, 5.3 to 9.9) and 6.0 months (95% CI, 3.6 to 10.7), respectively (hazard ratio, 0.78; 95% CI, 0.54 to 1.1).

The median event-free survival was 9.8 months (95% CI, 8.4 to 11.8) in the azacitidine–venetoclax group and 7.0 months (95% CI, 5.6 to 9.5) in the control group (hazard ratio for death, 0.63; 95% CI, 0.50 to 0.80; $P<0.001$) (Fig. S2). In patients with composite complete remission who had measurable residual disease of less than 1 residual blast per 1000 leukocytes, overall




Figure 2. Overall Survival.

The distributions were estimated for each treatment group with the use of the Kaplan–Meier method and were compared with the log-rank test stratified according to age (18 to <75 years or ≥ 75 years) and cytogenetic risk (intermediate risk or poor risk). The hazard ratio for death was estimated with the use of the Cox proportional-hazards model with the same stratification factors used in the log-rank test. The data included are subject to a cutoff date of January 4, 2020. The dashed line indicates 50% overall survival probability, and the tick marks indicate censored data.

survival at 24 months was 73.6% in the azacitidine–venetoclax group and 63.6% in the control group.

The results of a subgroup analysis with respect to overall survival are shown in Figure 3. In patients with *IDH1* or *IDH2* mutations at baseline, overall survival at 12 months was 66.8% among those in the azacitidine–venetoclax group, as compared with 35.7% among those in the control group (hazard ratio for death, 0.35; 95% CI, 0.20 to 0.60; $P<0.001$).

SAFETY

Overall, 427 patients were included in the safety analysis (283 in the azacitidine–venetoclax group and 144 in the control group). Patients in the azacitidine–venetoclax group received a median of 7.0 treatment cycles (range, 1.0 to 30.0), as compared with 4.5 treatment cycles (range, 1.0 to 26.0) in the control group. All patients had at least one adverse event; 235 patients in the azacitidine–venetoclax group (83%) and 105 of those in the control group (73%) had a serious




Figure 3. Subgroup Analysis of Overall Survival.

The hazard ratio for death was estimated with the unstratified Cox proportional-hazards model. Data included are subject to a cutoff date of January 4, 2020. The dashed vertical line represents a hazard ratio of 1.0. Eastern Cooperative Oncology Group (ECOG) performance-status scores range from 0 to 5, with 0 indicating no symptoms and higher scores indicating greater disability. *TP53* and *NPM1* data are from the central laboratory and were determined with the use of the MyAML assay. *IDH1* or *IDH2* and *FLT3* data were determined with the use of the CDx assay.

adverse event. Common adverse events are summarized in Table 2. The most frequently reported hematologic adverse events of grade 3 or higher in the azacitidine–venetoclax and control groups included thrombocytopenia (in 45% and 38%, respectively), neutropenia (in 42% and 28%), febrile neutropenia (in 42% and 19%), anemia (in 26% and 20%), and leukopenia (in 21% and 12%). Gastrointestinal adverse events of any grade were common and predominantly included nausea (in 44% of the patients in the azacitidine–venetoclax group and 35% of those

**Table 2. Adverse Events.***

Event	Azacitidine–Venetoclax Group (N=283)		Azacitidine–Placebo Group (N=144)	
	All Grades†	≥Grade 3‡	All Grades†	≥Grade 3‡
	<i>number of patients (percent)</i>			
All adverse events	283 (100)	279 (99)	144 (100)	139 (97)
Hematologic adverse events	236 (83)	233 (82)	100 (69)	98 (68)
Thrombocytopenia	130 (46)	126 (45)	58 (40)	55 (38)
Neutropenia	119 (42)	119 (42)	42 (29)	41 (28)
Febrile neutropenia	118 (42)	118 (42)	27 (19)	27 (19)
Anemia	78 (28)	74 (26)	30 (21)	29 (20)
Leukopenia	58 (21)	58 (21)	20 (14)	17 (12)
Nonhematologic adverse events				
Nausea	124 (44)	5 (2)	50 (35)	1 (1)
Constipation	121 (43)	2 (1)	56 (39)	2 (1)
Diarrhea	117 (41)	13 (5)	48 (33)	4 (3)
Vomiting	84 (30)	6 (2)	33 (23)	1 (1)
Hypokalemia	81 (29)	30 (11)	41 (28)	15 (10)
Peripheral edema	69 (24)	1 (<1)	26 (18)	0
Pyrexia	66 (23)	5 (2)	32 (22)	2 (1)
Fatigue	59 (21)	8 (3)	24 (17)	2 (1)
Decreased appetite	72 (25)	12 (4)	25 (17)	1 (1)
Infections	239 (84)	180 (64)	97 (67)	74 (51)
Pneumonia	65 (23)	56 (20)	39 (27)	36 (25)
Serious adverse events§	235 (83)	232 (82)	105 (73)	102 (71)
Febrile neutropenia	84 (30)	84 (30)	15 (10)	15 (10)
Anemia	14 (5)	14 (5)	6 (4)	6 (4)
Neutropenia	13 (5)	13 (5)	3 (2)	3 (2)
Atrial fibrillation	13 (5)	10 (4)	2 (1)	2 (1)
Pneumonia	47 (17)	46 (16)	32 (22)	31 (22)
Sepsis	16 (6)	16 (6)	12 (8)	12 (8)

* The safety population included all patients who received at least one dose of azacitidine–venetoclax or azacitidine–placebo.

† Adverse events reported in at least 20% of patients in either treatment group are listed.

‡ Adverse events of grade 3 or higher that were reported in at least 10% of patients in either treatment group are listed.

§ Serious adverse events that were reported in at least 5% of patients in either treatment group are listed.

in the control group), constipation (in 43% and 39%, respectively), diarrhea (in 41% and 33%), and vomiting (in 30% and 23%). Notable serious adverse events (grade ≥3) were febrile neutropenia (in 30% of the patients in the azacitidine–venetoclax group and 10% of those in the control group) and pneumonia (in 16% and 22%). Tumor lysis syndrome was reported during the ramp-up period (on days 1 through 3 when the

dose of venetoclax was increased) in 3 patients (1%) in the azacitidine–venetoclax group and in none of the patients in the control group; all 3 patients had transient biochemical changes that resolved with uricosuric agents and calcium supplements without interruption of azacitidine–venetoclax or azacitidine–placebo.

The percentages of patients who discontinued azacitidine–venetoclax or azacitidine–placebo ow-

ing to adverse events were similar in the two groups (24% in the azacitidine–venetoclax group and 20% in the control group). The interruption of azacitidine–venetoclax or azacitidine–placebo between cycles owing to adverse events occurred in 72% of the patients in the azacitidine–venetoclax group and 57% of the patients in the control group, and reduction in the dose of azacitidine–venetoclax or azacitidine–placebo owing to adverse events occurred in 3% and 4% of the patients, respectively; these dose interruptions and reductions were primarily because of neutropenia (in 19% and 10%), febrile neutropenia (in 20% and 4%), and thrombocytopenia (in 10% and 4%). Dose interruptions, including delays between treatment cycles and reductions in the duration of treatment from 28 to 21 days per cycle for count recovery after leukemia clearance from bone marrow, occurred in 53% of the patients in the azacitidine–venetoclax group and 28% of the patients in the control group; at least two interruptions for count recovery occurred in 15% and 2% of the patients, respectively. Mortality at 30 days was similar in the two groups (7% [21 patients] in the azacitidine–venetoclax group and 6% [9 patients] in the control group). No differences were observed between the two treatment groups with respect to quality-of-life measures.

DISCUSSION

In this phase 3 trial involving patients with AML who had not received treatment previously and who were either elderly or otherwise ineligible to receive intensive chemotherapy, combination treatment with azacitidine plus venetoclax was superior to azacitidine alone. The median overall survival among patients who were randomly assigned to azacitidine plus venetoclax was 14.7 months, as compared with 9.6 months with azacitidine alone (hazard ratio for death, 0.66; $P < 0.001$).

The incidence of composite complete remission was 66.4% among the patients who received azacitidine plus venetoclax; this incidence was more than twice as high as that among those who received azacitidine alone. This higher incidence of remission resulted in significant increases in the incidence of transfusion independence.^{6,23-25} Responses were both rapid and durable. Nearly half (43%) of the patients who received

azacitidine plus venetoclax had a first response (either complete remission or complete remission with incomplete hematologic recovery) before the initiation of cycle 2 and a median duration of remission of 17.5 months. The incidence of composite complete remission was notably improved across all AML genomic risk groups, including patients with adverse cytogenetic risk, secondary AML, and high-risk molecular mutations. These improvements in responses also translated into an increased overall survival in many of the evaluated subgroups, most notably among patients with either de novo or secondary AML, intermediate cytogenetic risk, and *IDH1* or *IDH2* mutations.

Interpretation of these findings should be tempered by the fact that the number of patients in each of these subgroups was not large. Ongoing and future analyses are needed to more comprehensively evaluate the efficacy of azacitidine plus venetoclax according to detailed genomic characteristics and to suggest potential agents or mechanisms to further increase the durations of response in the higher-risk subgroups, such as those involving patients with poor cytogenetic risk, the presence of *TP53* mutations, or both. Limitations to the generalizability of the results of this trial include the exclusion of patients with core-binding factor AML and patients who had previously received a hypomethylating agent.

The safety profile of azacitidine plus venetoclax was consistent with the known side-effect profiles of both agents, and adverse events were consistent with expectations for an older AML population; no differences between the two treatment groups with respect to quality-of-life measures were seen. The most common adverse events in both groups were gastrointestinal and hematologic, with a higher frequency of neutropenia and febrile neutropenia in the azacitidine–venetoclax group; these findings are consistent with those in previous studies.²⁶ We observed a higher incidence of dose interruptions (but not discontinuations of treatment or reductions in doses) to allow for hematologic recovery in patients with a response in the azacitidine–venetoclax group than in the control group. Early bone marrow assessments to determine response, most importantly after the completion of cycle 1, promote the appropriate application of interrup-

tions in venetoclax between treatment cycles to augment hematologic recovery. The majority of patients who received azacitidine–venetoclax (53%) had modifications to the duration of venetoclax, and 32% also received granulocyte colony-stimulating factor during remission. In addition, good supportive care such as the incorporation of prophylactic antimicrobial agents (i.e., antibiotic, antiviral, and antifungal therapy) is recommended for patients who are receiving azacitidine plus venetoclax.^{27,28}

The prognosis in older patients with AML who are ineligible to receive intensive chemotherapy has been dismal. The combination of azacitidine plus venetoclax in this challenging patient population in this trial was an effective treatment regimen that led to significant improvements in the incidence of composite complete remission and overall survival. Unlike monitoring of patients who receive azacitidine alone, ongoing attentiveness to the monitoring and management of myelosuppression is key for patient safety with this combination therapy.



Supported by AbbVie and Genentech.

Dr. DiNardo reports receiving grant support, consulting fees, and honoraria from AbbVie, Agios Pharmaceuticals, Celgene, ImmuneOnc Therapeutics, and Daiichi Sankyo, grant support and honoraria from Novartis, honoraria from Bayer, Jazz Pharmaceuticals, and MedImmune, grant support from Calithera Biosciences, and advisory board fees from Notable Labs; Dr. Jonas, receiving grant support, paid to his institution, consulting fees, advisory board fees, and travel support from AbbVie, consulting fees and travel support from Amgen, grant support, paid to his institution, and consulting fees from Celgene and Pharmacyclics, grant support, paid to his institution, consulting fees, fees for serving on a steering committee, and travel support from GlycoMimetics, grant support, paid to his institution, consulting fees, and advisory board fees from Jazz Pharmaceuticals, consulting fees and fees for serving on an end-point adjudication committee from Tolero Pharmaceuticals, consulting fees and advisory board fees from Treadwell Therapeutics, and grant support, paid to his institution, from Accelerated Medical Diagnostics, Arog, Daiichi Sankyo, F. Hoffmann–La Roche, Forma Therapeutics, Genentech–Roche, Hanmi Pharmaceutical, Incyte, LP Therapeutics, Pfizer, and Sigma Tau Pharmaceuticals; Dr. Pullarkat, receiving advisory board fees and fees for serving on a speakers bureau from AbbVie, Genentech, Pfizer, Jazz Pharmaceuticals, Novartis, Servier, and Amgen; Dr. Thirman, receiving grant support, consulting fees, advisory board fees, and fees for expert testimony from AbbVie and Roche–Genentech, grant support, consulting fees, and advisory board fees from Janssen Pharmaceutica and Pharmacyclics, grant support from Gilead Sciences, Merck, Syndax Pharmaceuticals, TG Therapeutics, and Tolero Pharmaceuticals, and consulting fees and advisory board fees from AstraZeneca and Celgene; Dr. Garcia, receiving grant support and advisory board fees from AbbVie and grant support from Genentech, Pfizer, and Eli Lilly; Dr. Wei, receiving grant support, advisory board fees, and advisory fees from AbbVie, Celgene, and Servier, advisory fees and advisory board fees from Genentech, Pfizer, Janssen Pharma-

ceutica, and Amgen, grant support, advisory fees, and honoraria from Novartis, grant support from AstraZeneca, advisory board fees from Astellas Pharma, and royalties from the Walter and Eliza Hall Institute of Medical Research; Dr. Konopleva, receiving grant support and consulting fees from AbbVie, Genentech, F. Hoffmann–La Roche, Stemline Therapeutics, Forty Seven, and Kisoji Biotechnology, consulting fees from Amgen, grant support from Eli Lilly, Cellectis, Calithera Biosciences, Ablynx, Agios Pharmaceuticals, Ascentage Pharma, AstraZeneca, Rafael Pharmaceuticals, and Sanofi, and royalties and stock options from Reata Pharmaceuticals, and holding and receiving royalties for a patent (US 7,795,305 B2) on 2-cyano-3,12-dioxooleana-1,9(11)-dien-28-oic acid (CDDO) compounds and combination therapies, licensed to Reata Pharmaceuticals; Dr. Döhner, receiving advisory fees from AbbVie, Agios Pharmaceuticals, Astellas Pharma, Astex Pharmaceuticals, AstraZeneca, Janssen Pharmaceutica, Helsinn, Oxford Biomedical Technologies, and Roche, grant support and advisory fees from Amgen, Celgene, Jazz Pharmaceuticals, and Novartis, and grant support from Bristol Myers Squibb, Pfizer, and Arog; Dr. Letai, receiving grant support from Novartis, consulting fees from AbbVie and AstraZeneca, advisory board fees from Zentalis, Flash Therapeutics, and Dialectic, and lecture fees from Chugai Pharmaceutical; Dr. Fenaux, receiving grant support from AbbVie, Celgene–Bristol Myers Squibb, Janssen Pharmaceutica, and Agios Pharmaceuticals; Dr. Koller, receiving grant support, consulting fees, and advisory board fees from AbbVie and consulting fees and advisory board fees from Novartis, Daiichi Sankyo, Celgene, Astellas Pharma, and Pfizer; Dr. Havelange, receiving advisory board fees from Amgen and Incyte; Dr. Leber, receiving advisory board fees, consulting fees, and lecture fees from AbbVie, Celgene–Bristol Myers Squibb, Novartis, and Pfizer, advisory board fees and lecture fees from Amgen and Astellas Pharma, and advisory board fees from Astex Pharmaceuticals, Janssen Pharmaceutica, Jazz Pharmaceuticals, Roche, and Treadwell Therapeutics; Dr. Esteve, receiving grant support and advisory fees from Novartis and Celgene and advisory fees from AbbVie, Astellas Pharma, Jazz Pharmaceuticals, Daiichi Sankyo, Roche, and Amgen; Dr. Wang, receiving advisory fees from AbbVie and grant support from Celgene; Dr. Pejsa, receiving advisory board fees, lecture fees, and consulting fees from AbbVie, Janssen Pharmaceutica, and Amgen, advisory board fees and lecture fees from Takeda, Roche, Pliva, and Sandoz, and lecture fees from Alvogen and Oktal Pharma; Dr. Hájek, receiving grant support, lecture fees, consulting fees, and advisory board fees from Takeda, Amgen, and Janssen Pharmaceutica, lecture fees and consulting fees from Celgene, grant support and consulting fees from Bristol Myers Squibb, grant support from Novartis, and lecture fees, consulting fees, and advisory board fees from Sanofi; Dr. Porkka, receiving grant support from AbbVie and Novartis; Dr. Illés, receiving grant support from AbbVie; Dr. Lavie, receiving grant support from AbbVie; Dr. Lemoli, receiving advisory fees from AbbVie, Janssen Pharmaceutica, Jazz Pharmaceuticals, Daiichi Sankyo, Servier, and Novartis and grant support from Celgene; Dr. Yamamoto, receiving grant support, consulting fees, and lecture fees from AbbVie, Celgene, Chugai Pharmaceutical, Eisai, Merck Sharp and Dohme, Mundipharma, and Takeda, grant support and consulting fees from AstraZeneca, consulting fees from Daiichi Sankyo, HUYA Bioscience International, Ono Pharmaceutical, and Stemline Therapeutics, consulting fees and lecture fees from Meiji Seika Pharma and Otsuka Pharmaceutical, grant support from Bayer, Gilead Sciences, IQVIA–Incyte, Solasia Pharma, SymBio Pharmaceuticals, and Yakult Pharmaceutical Industry, grant support and lecture fees from Nippon Shinyaku, Novartis, and Nippon Zenyaku Kogyo, lecture fees from Bristol Myers Squibb, Kyowa Kirin, Mochida, Pfizer, Sanofi, and Sumitomo Dainippon, and consulting fees and lecture fees from Janssen Pharmaceutica; Dr.

Yoon, receiving consulting fees from Amgen, Astellas Pharma, Celgene, Chugai Pharmaceutical, Janssen Pharmaceutica, and Takeda, consulting fees, lecture fees, and advisory board fees from Novartis, and grant support from Kyowa Kirin, Roche-Genentech, and Yuhon Pharmaceutical; Dr. Jang, receiving grant support from AbbVie; Dr. Yeh, receiving advisory board fees from AbbVie, Amgen, Janssen Pharmaceutica, Astellas Pharma, Astex Pharmaceuticals, and Takeda; Dr. Turgut, receiving grant support, advisory board fees, lecture fees, and consulting fees from AbbVie; Dr. Hong, being employed by and owning stock and stock options in Genentech; Dr. Zhou, being employed by

and owning stock in AbbVie; Dr. Potluri, being employed by and owning stock and stock options in AbbVie; and Dr. Pratz, receiving grant support and advisory board fees from AbbVie, grant support from Agios Pharmaceuticals, Daiichi Sankyo, and Millennium Pharmaceuticals, and advisory board fees from Astellas Pharma, Boston Biomedical, and Celgene. No other potential conflict of interest relevant to this article was reported.

Disclosure forms provided by the authors are available with the full text of this article at NEJM.org.

A data sharing statement provided by the authors is available with the full text of this article at NEJM.org.

APPENDIX

The authors' full names and academic degrees are as follows: Courtney D. DiNardo, M.D., Brian A. Jonas, M.D., Ph.D., Vinod Pullarkat, M.D., Michael J. Thirman, M.D., Jacqueline S. Garcia, M.D., Andrew H. Wei, M.B., B.S., Ph.D., Marina Konopleva, M.D., Ph.D., Hartmut Döhner, M.D., Anthony Letai, M.D., Ph.D., Pierre Fenaux, M.D., Ph.D., Elizabeth Koller, M.D., Violaine Havelange, M.D., Ph.D., Brian Leber, M.D., Jordi Esteve, M.D., Ph.D., Jianxiang Wang, M.D., Vlatko Pejisa, M.D., Ph.D., Roman Hájek, M.D., Ph.D., Kimmo Porkka, M.D., Ph.D., Árpád Illés, M.D., D.Sci., David Lavie, M.D., Roberto M. Lemoli, M.D., Kazuhito Yamamoto, M.D., Ph.D., Sung-Soo Yoon, M.D., Ph.D., Jun-Ho Jang, M.D., Su-Peng Yeh, M.D., Mehmet Turgut, M.D., Wan-Jen Hong, M.D., Ying Zhou, Ph.D., Jalaja Potluri, M.D., and Keith W. Pratz, M.D.

The authors' affiliations are as follows: the Department of Leukemia, Division of Cancer Medicine, University of Texas M.D. Anderson Cancer Center, Houston (C.D.D., M.K.); the Department of Internal Medicine, Division of Hematology and Oncology, University of California Davis School of Medicine, Sacramento (B.A.J.), the Department of Hematology and Hematopoietic Cell Transplantation and Gehr Family Center for Leukemia Research, City of Hope Comprehensive Cancer Center, Duarte (V. Pullarkat), and Genentech, South San Francisco (W.-J.H.) — all in California; the Section of Hematology and Oncology, Department of Medicine, University of Chicago Medicine, Chicago (M.J.T.), and AbbVie, North Chicago (Y.Z., J.P.) — both in Illinois; the Department of Medical Oncology, Dana-Farber Cancer Institute, Harvard Medical School, Boston (J.S.G., A.L.); the Australian Centre for Blood Diseases, Alfred Hospital and Monash University, Melbourne, VIC (A.H.W.); the Department of Internal Medicine III, Ulm University Hospital, Ulm, Germany (H.D.); Hôpital St. Louis, Assistance Publique-Hôpitaux de Paris and Université de Paris, Paris (P.F.); the Third Medical Department for Hematology and Oncology, Hanusch Hospital, Vienna (E.K.); the Department of Hematology, Cliniques Universitaires Saint-Luc, Brussels (V.H.); the Department of Medicine, McMaster University, Hamilton, ON, Canada (B.L.); the Department of Hematology, Hospital Clinic, August Pi i Sunyer Biomedical Research Institute, Barcelona (J.E.); the Institute of Hematology and Hospital of Blood Disease, Chinese Academy of Medical Sciences, Peking Union Medical College, Tianjin, China (J.W.); the Department of Hematology, University Hospital Dubrava, University of Zagreb School of Medicine, Zagreb, Croatia (V. Pejisa); the Department of Clinic Subjects, University Hospital Ostrava-Poruba, Ostrava, Czech Republic (R.H.); Helsinki University Hospital Comprehensive Cancer Center, University of Helsinki, Helsinki (K.P.); the Faculty of Medicine, Department of Hematology, University of Debrecen, Debrecen, Hungary (A.I.); Hadassah Medical Center, Jerusalem (D.L.); the Clinic of Hematology, Department of Internal Medicine, University of Genoa, and San Martino Hospital IRCCS — both in Genoa, Italy (R.M.L.); the Department of Hematology and Cell Therapy, Aichi Cancer Center, Nagoya, Japan (K.Y.); the Department of Internal Medicine, Seoul National University College of Medicine (S.-S.Y.), and the Department of Hematology-Oncology, Samsung Medical Center, Sungkyunkwan University School of Medicine (J.-H.J.) — both in Seoul, South Korea; the Department of Internal Medicine, China Medical University Hospital, Taichung, Taiwan (S.-P.Y.); the Faculty of Medicine, Department of Internal Medicine, Division of Hematology, Ondokuz Mayıs University, Samsun, Turkey (M.T.); and Abramson Cancer Center, University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia (K.W.P.).

REFERENCES

- Howlader N, Noone AM, Krapcho M, et al. eds. SEER cancer statistics review, 1975-2016. Bethesda, MD: National Cancer Institute, 2019.
- Song X, Peng Y, Wang X, et al. Incidence, survival, and risk factors for adults with acute myeloid leukemia not otherwise specified and acute myeloid leukemia with recurrent genetic abnormalities: analysis of the Surveillance, Epidemiology, and End Results (SEER) database, 2001-2013. *Acta Haematol* 2018;139:115-27.
- Döhner H, Estey E, Grimwade D, et al. Diagnosis and management of AML in adults: 2017 ELN recommendations from an international expert panel. *Blood* 2017; 129:424-47.
- Richard-Carpentier G, DiNardo CD, Venetoclax for the treatment of newly diagnosed acute myeloid leukemia in patients who are ineligible for intensive chemotherapy. *Ther Adv Hematol* 2019;10: 2040620719882822.
- DiNardo CD, Pratz K, Pullarkat V, et al. Venetoclax combined with decitabine or azacitidine in treatment-naïve, elderly patients with acute myeloid leukemia. *Blood* 2019;133:7-17.
- Dombret H, Seymour JF, Butrym A, et al. International phase 3 study of azacitidine vs conventional care regimens in older patients with newly diagnosed AML with >30% blasts. *Blood* 2015;126:291-9.
- Adams CM, Clark-Garvey S, Porcu P, Eischen CM. Targeting the Bcl-2 family in B cell lymphoma. *Front Oncol* 2019;8:636.
- Pan R, Hogdal LJ, Benito JM, et al. Selective BCL-2 inhibition by ABT-199 causes on-target cell death in acute myeloid leukemia. *Cancer Discov* 2014;4:362-75.
- Lagadinou ED, Sach A, Callahan K, et al. BCL-2 inhibition targets oxidative phosphorylation and selectively eradicates quiescent human leukemia stem cells. *Cell Stem Cell* 2013;12:329-41.
- Campos L, Rouault JP, Sabido O, et al. High expression of bcl-2 protein in acute myeloid leukemia cells is associated with poor response to chemotherapy. *Blood* 1993;81:3091-6.
- Konopleva M, Contractor R, Tsao T, et al. Mechanisms of apoptosis sensitivity and resistance to the BH3 mimetic ABT-737 in acute myeloid leukemia. *Cancer Cell* 2006;10:375-88.
- Karakas T, Miething CC, Maurer U,

- et al. The coexpression of the apoptosis-related genes bcl-2 and wt1 in predicting survival in adult acute myeloid leukemia. *Leukemia* 2002;16:846-54.
13. Mehta SV, Shukla SN, Vora HH. Overexpression of Bcl2 protein predicts chemoresistance in acute myeloid leukemia: its correlation with FLT3. *Neoplasma* 2013;60:666-75.
14. Souers AJ, Levenson JD, Boghaert ER, et al. ABT-199, a potent and selective BCL-2 inhibitor, achieves antitumor activity while sparing platelets. *Nat Med* 2013;19:202-8.
15. Konopleva M, Pollyea DA, Potluri J, et al. Efficacy and biological correlates of response in a phase II study of venetoclax monotherapy in patients with acute myelogenous leukemia. *Cancer Discov* 2016;6:1106-17.
16. Jin S, Cojocari D, Purkal JJ, et al. 5-Azacitidine induces NOXA to prime AML cells for venetoclax-mediated apoptosis. *Clin Cancer Res* 2020;26:3371-83.
17. Bogenberger JM, Delman D, Hansen N, et al. Ex vivo activity of BCL-2 family inhibitors ABT-199 and ABT-737 combined with 5-azacytidine in myeloid malignancies. *Leuk Lymphoma* 2015;56:226-9.
18. DiNardo CD, Pratz KW, Letai A, et al. Safety and preliminary efficacy of venetoclax with decitabine or azacitidine in elderly patients with previously untreated acute myeloid leukaemia: a non-randomised, open-label, phase 1b study. *Lancet Oncol* 2018;19:216-28.
19. Pollyea DA, Parts KW, Jonas BA, et al. Venetoclax in combination with hypomethylating agents induces rapid, deep, and durable responses in patients with AML ineligible for intensive therapy. *Blood* 2018;132:Suppl 1:285. abstract.
20. Cheson BD, Bennett JM, Kopecky KJ, et al. Revised recommendations of the International Working Group for diagnosis, standardization of response criteria, treatment outcomes, and reporting standards for therapeutic trials in acute myeloid leukemia. *J Clin Oncol* 2003;21:4642-9.
21. Schuurhuis GJ, Heuser M, Freeman S, et al. Minimal/measurable residual disease in AML: a consensus document from the European LeukemiaNet MRD Working Party. *Blood* 2018;131:1275-91.
22. National Cancer Institute. Common Terminology Criteria for Adverse Events (CTCAE), version 4.03 (https://ctep.cancer.gov/protocolDevelopment/electronic_applications/ctc.htm).
23. Fenaux P, Mufti GJ, Hellström-Lindberg E, et al. Azacitidine prolongs overall survival compared with conventional care regimens in elderly patients with low bone marrow blast count acute myeloid leukemia. *J Clin Oncol* 2010;28:562-9.
24. Cortes JE, Heidel FH, Hellmann A, et al. Randomized comparison of low dose cytarabine with or without glasdegib in patients with newly diagnosed acute myeloid leukemia or high-risk myelodysplastic syndrome. *Leukemia* 2019;33:379-89.
25. Krauss AC, Gao X, Li L, et al. FDA approval summary: (daunorubicin and cytarabine) liposome for injection for the treatment of adults with high-risk acute myeloid leukemia. *Clin Cancer Res* 2019;25:2685-90.
26. Levenson JD, Phillips DC, Mitten MJ, et al. Exploiting selective BCL-2 family inhibitors to dissect cell survival dependencies and define improved strategies for cancer therapy. *Sci Transl Med* 2015;7:279ra40.
27. DiNardo CD, Wei AH. How I treat acute myeloid leukemia in the era of new drugs. *Blood* 2020;135:85-96.
28. Jonas BA, Pollyea DA. How we use venetoclax with hypomethylating agents for the treatment of newly diagnosed patients with acute myeloid leukemia. *Leukemia* 2019;33:2795-804.

Copyright © 2020 Massachusetts Medical Society.