Intracellular ara-CTP in circulating blasts post-treatment predicts remission status in patients with Acute Myeloid Leukaemia.

Elizabeth Anderson^a, Barbara Rees^a, Jonathon Hull^a, Jonathan Heywood^b, Andrea Preston^b, Rachel Protheroe^b, Emily Foulstone^b, Rosemary Greenwood^b, Vyv Salisbury^a, Priyanka Mehta^b.

^aUniversity of the West of England, Bristol, United Kingdom; ^bBristol Haematology and Oncology Centre, University Hospital Bristol NHS Foundation Trust, Bristol, United Kingdom. Corresponding author: Dr. Elizabeth Anderson PhD, University of the West of England, Coldharbour Lane, Bristol BS16 1QY, UK. Tel: (+44)117 3287627. E-mail: <u>elizabeth3.anderson@uwe.ac.uk</u>

Category: Clinical Investigation

Word count: 1500

Keywords: Cytarabine, *in vivo* pharmacokinetics, acute myeloid leukaemia, leukaemiaassociated immunophenotype (LAIP), obesity

Introduction

Prediction of response to therapy and risk stratification is a major goal in the early treatment of acute myeloid leukaemia (AML). Whilst complete remission (CR) rates have greatly improved in younger patients with AML, high relapse rates and poor disease-free survival still pose a significant challenge (Bose et al., 2017). The backbone of AML therapy is cytarabine (ara-C), given at one of three dosing levels, depending on stage of disease (induction or relapse) and patient fitness (intensive or non-intensive therapy). Due to rapid commencement of therapy after diagnosis, often prior to prognostic information being available, early assessment predicting response to cytarabine could be an important clinical decision-making tool. The relationship between intracellular ara-CTP accumulation and disease response has long been controversial, with some studies advocating a link (Rustum and Preisler, 1979; Karp et al., 1987) and others dismissing it (Koehl et al., 2007; Gruber et al., 1995). This single-centre, observational study used previously validated biosensor technology (Anderson et al., 2014) to assess in vivo intracellular ara-CTP concentration in circulating blasts over the initial 72 hours post-treatment. This was used to predict remission status in AML patients (n=26) after treatment with low-, standard- and high-dose (LD, SD, HD) cytarabine.

Materials and Methods

Patient samples and dosing

Samples were gathered under informed consent (15/WM/0415) from non-M3 AML participants (\geq 18 years) receiving cytarabine therapy (n=26) (Table 1). Patients received one of three dosing levels as judged by the Consultant Haematologist according to current UK guidelines (SD: 200 mg/m² infused in divided doses twice daily; HD: 1.5-3 g/m² infused in divided doses twice daily; LD: 20 mg twice daily by subcutaneous injection) (Milligan *et al.*, 2006). Fresh peripheral blood samples (\leq 4 mL) were collected pre-treatment (t=0) and post-treatment commencement (t=2, 4, 8, 12, 24, 48, 72 hours ±30 mins), with standard-of-care assessment of remission/non-remission status (CR/NR) performed at day 28 as per current UK guidelines. Where a sampling time-point coincided with an infusion time-point, the blood sample was removed pre-infusion.

Isolation of primary AML blasts & lysate preparation

Peripheral blood mononuclear cells (PBMC) fractions were isolated from whole blood samples by density gradient centrifugation (Histopaque[®]-1077, Sigma-Aldrich, Gillingham, UK) within 1 hour of withdrawal. PBMCs were pelleted at 300xg (5 mins), washed in RPMI 1640 medium (10 mL), re-suspended in red cell lysis buffer (0.15 mM ammonium chloride, 0.01 mM potassium bicarbonate, 0.001 mM EDTA, pH7.2-7.4) for 5 mins, and washed in RPMI 1640 medium (without phenol red) (10 mL). Lysates were prepared and stored at -80°C until biosensor analysis as per Alloush *et al.* (2010).

Flow cytometry

Leukaemia-associated immunophenotype (LAIP)-positive absolute counts were determined on baseline peripheral blood, and every 24 hours thereafter for 72 hours. Clearance of peripheral blasts was calculated by conversion of daily blast count to logarithmic scale, and subtraction from baseline.

Preparation of ara-CTP standard curves

Ara-CTP stock solution (10 mM, Jena Biosciences, Jena, Germany) was diluted (0-0.5 μ M) in cell lysate as per Alloush *et al.* (2010). Limits of detection (LOD) and quantitation (LOQ) were calculated from the standard deviation of the blank (*n*=6) as per Shrivastava *et al.* (2011). Results indistinguishable from background were reported as <LOD and removed from the analysis.

Statistical Analysis

Analysis performed used GraphPad Prism 7[®] (USA) including two-way ANOVA with Tukey's (Figure 1A) and Sidak's (Figure 2B) post-hoc tests, and analysis of co-variance (ANCOVA) of body mass index (BMI) versus sensitivity index (SI%). Linear regression of log_{10} reduction in day 28 bone marrow (BM) blast burden versus diagnostic BM (flow cytometry) compared to SI% values, with Pearson coefficient (r) calculated at each time-point assessable (SD cohort). Feasibility calculated as the percentage of samples successfully taken versus patients (n) in the group. Any patient suffering treatment-related mortality was removed from subsequent feasibility assessments.

	Regimen						
Patient	LD	SD	HD				
n	7	13	6				
Median age (years, range)	77 (63-79)	67 (47-76)	41 (22-55)				
Gender							
Male	6	10	1				
Female	1	3	5				
Ethnicity							
White, British	6	11	4				
White, non-British	0	0	2				
not known	1	2	0				
FAB							
M0-M1	3	2	2				
M2	1	4	3				
M4-5	0	3	1				
M6-7	0	0	0				
MDS/therapy-related MDS	2	1	0				
Not known	1	3	0				
Cytogenetic risk group							
Favourable	1	1	3				
Intermediate	6	6	1				
Adverse	0	5	2				
Not known	0	1	0				
Prior MDS (n)	4	3	0				
Presenting WBC count (x10 ⁹ /L)	8.89 (2.26-88.4)	8.76 (0.63-118.52)	9.175 (2.98-24.48)				
Dose (mg per day) (range)	40 (40-40)	200 (160-220)	4100 (3900-4600)				
Relevant co-medication							
Daunorubicin		13/13					
Mylotarg		12/13	5/6				
FLAG-IDA			6/6				
Tosedostat	2/7						
Lenalidomide	2/7						
BSA (m ²) (median, range)	2.11 (1.74-2.26)	2.02 (1.64-2.22)	2.02 (1.74-2.31)				
BM burden at day 0 (%median, range)	24.7 (3.8-91.8)	42 (21.3-90.0)	65.3 (11.0-85.0)				
Peripheral blasts at day 0 (%median, range)	8.6 (0.2-97.1)	25.3 (0.7-88.0)	54.2 (30-78.4)				
Day 28 BM burden (%median, range) [n assessed]	10.75 (0.1-72) [6]	0.90 (0.12-60) [12]	1.75 (0.4-2.5) [5]				
Treatment-related mortality (n)	0	0	1				

Table 1: Patient characteristics. LD, low-dose cytarabine; SD, standard-dose cytarabine; HD, high-dose cytarabine; FLAG-IDA, fludarabine, cytarabine, GM-CSF, idarubicin; FAB, French-American-British classification; WBC, white cell count; BM, bone marrow; MDS, myelodysplastic syndrome; BSA, body surface area.

Results and Discussion

Measurement of circulating blast intracellular ara-CTP concentration post-treatment (expressed as SI%) was possible in all treatment groups over the initial 24 hours (Figure 1A), with the greatest discrimination observed between HD (max n=6) and SD (max n=11) patients (p<0.05 at all time-points collected). Peripheral LAIP counts were sufficient for ara-CTP analysis from a single vacutainer (4 mL, $\ge 2x10^6$ blasts) in all patient groups over the initial 24 hours (LD:100%; SD:77%; HD:80%) (Figure A.1A), with a dose-dependent decrease in LAIP over the initial 72 hours of therapy (Figure 1B). Limitations to assessment were: high rates of night-time sampling across all treatment groups; decreasing peripheral burden in HD patients (Figure 1B); a high proportion of LD patients with results below the limit of detection of the assay (4/7); and discharge of LD patients at 48 hours (1/7) and 72 hours (2/7) (Figure A.1A), as these patients can self-administer cytarabine once stabilised.

For a proportion of patients (SD: max n=9; HD: max n=6), it was possible to calculate the intracellular ara-CTP concentration (ng/mL) (Figure 1C) using a standard curve across a therapeutically-achievable ara-CTP range (0-500 nM) (Figure A.1B). The LOD for the assay was 1.58 ng/mL, and the LOQ was 4.81 ng/mL. HD patients achieved C_{ss} of ara-CTP from t=4 hours post-infusion, with t_{max} at 4 hours, and 111-fold higher area-under-the-curve (AUC) compared to SD patients (Figure 1D). In comparison, SD patients achieved C_{ss} 2 hours earlier but with a less prolonged duration (HD, 4 hours; SD, 2 hours) and 27-fold lower concentration than HD patients (Figure 1C). These results show similar trends and timings to previous assessment of ara-CTP by HPLC-MS/MS (Liang *et al.*, 2014), but required 1/10th cell density necessary for HPLC analysis, albeit lower concentrations of ara-CTP (ng/mL) were observed herein. This represents the first quantitative analysis of post-treatment intracellular ara-CTP levels in AML patients using the biosensor, conducted within a working clinical environment.



Fig. 1: (A) Assessment of intracellular ara-CTP (expressed as sensitivity index SI% on log₁₀ axis) in patients undergoing three different regimens (SD max n=11, HD max n=6, LD max n=3) (for n per time-point see Figure A.2-4), (B) leukaemia-associated immunophenotype cells (LAIP) over time by dose assessed at 24, 48 and 72 hours post-commencement of treatment (SD max n=7, HD max n=2, LD max n=5), (C) peripheral blast intracellular ara-CTP concentration (ng/mL) by dosing regimen (SD max n=9, HD max n=6), (D) pharmacokinetic parameters over initial 12 hours post-commencement of infusion with ara-C. Arrowheads indicate timing of SD and HD dosing. Mean SI% and 95% CI are shown for each regimen throughout. SD versus HD: **p*<0.05, ****p*<0.001. LAIP, leukaemia-associated immunophenotype assessed by flow cytometry (% of total nucleated cells). C_{ss}, steady-state concentration; A, absorption; E, elimination; AUC, area under the curve; C_{max}, maximum concentration; T_{max} , time to maximum concentration. *HD AUC_{0-12hrs} (*n*=5) (Figure A.3).

Initial analysis of prediction of outcome at day 28 versus ara-CTP accumulation was performed at each time-point for the SD cohort (Figure 2A-E). The most striking correlation was observed at t=4 hours post-treatment commencement, where a higher SI% correlated with day 28 log₁₀ bone marrow blast reduction (Figure 2B) (n=6, p=0.0113). Correlation was only possible in 6/7 patients at this time-point as one patient was not assessable for burden at day 28 (Figure A.2). A significant relationship was notable at t=8 hours (n=4, p=0.0280) (Figure 2C), however the *n*-value limits interpretation. No significant correlation was observed with t=2 (Figure 2A) or t=12 hours post-treatment commencement SI% (Figure 2D) or AUC₀₋₁₂ hours (Figure 2E). For any future study, infusion time +4 hours may derive the most predictive time-point as the majority of SD patients showed declining ara-CTP levels after the 4 hour time-point (Figure 1C). Concurrent LAIP assessment (0-72 hours) versus day 28 outcome performed in SD patients (n=7) (Figure 2F) replicated previous findings from day 14 outcome correlation versus circulating blast burden decline over the initial days post-treatment

(Gianfaldoni *et al.*, 2006; Elliott *et al.*, 2007). Herein, non-standard flow sampling (t=24, 48 & 72 hours) suffered <50% mean completion rate (Figure A.1A), limiting correlation notably for HD and LD cohorts. Intervention with additional training of night-staff improved the completion rate substantially after interim identification of the issue (0% versus 62.5%).

Recruitment exceeded targets in all treatment groups (Figure A.5A), with no patients electing to withdraw from the study, however sampling was dependent on both time of treatment start (Figure A.5B), and consequently the proportion of sampling by day- versus night-staff (Figure A.5C). As expected, LD patients showed the highest proportion of start times between 7am-7pm, as advance notice of treatment commencement was possible (typically 1 week). Unexpectedly, the majority of SD and HD patients commenced treatment between 7pm-1am (~50%), with a significant proportion starting between 1am-7am (SD:8%; HD:16%). This led to a high rate of night sampling (Figure A.5C), and challenges associated with training and continuity of night-staff. As well as affecting sampling rates for flow cytometry, the presence of analytical staff frequently prompted sampling by clinical night-staff, potentially inflating the true feasibility of peripheral sampling at night. A further study investigating key time-points is planned, benefiting from the feasibility observations reported herein.

Interestingly high median body surface area (BSA) of patients was noted in this study (Table 1), with BMI indicating a large proportion of patients in the overweight or obese categories (Figure A.5D). Whilst no significant association was observed between BMI and SI% herein, a higher BMI was associated with lower initial intracellular ara-CTP accumulation in SD patients (p=0.0169, n=10). No association was observed in LD (n=3) or HD (n=6) cohorts. This is an interesting finding given the argument for dose-capping in obese patients (Tavitian *et al.*, 2016).

Inter-individual variation in ara-CTP levels has previously been identified as attributing to clinical variability in response (Lamba, 2009). Previous groups have attempted to retrospectively predict response using expression analysis of key genes (e.g. hENT1, deoxycytidine kinase) involved in cytarabine uptake, metabolism and mitochondrial signalling (Lamba *et al.*, 2011, Abraham *et al.*, 2015, Yan *et al.*, 2017). Whilst valuable prediction tools, a phenotypic assessment of post-treatment ara-CTP accumulation, incorporating systemic and intracellular handling of cytarabine, could allow more rapid and specific treatment tailoring, identifying both those at risk of adverse reaction, and treatment failure.



Fig. 2: Correlation between day 28 bone marrow log_{10} reduction and post-treatment commencement intracellular ara-CTP (expressed as sensitivity index SI%) at t=2 (*n*=10) (A), t=4 (*n*=6) (B), t=8 hour (*n*=4) (C), t=12 hour (*n*=8) (D) and area under the curve 0-12 hours (AUC) (*n*=5) (E), and (F) peripheral blast log_{10} reduction per treatment day in day 28 complete remission (CR) (*n*=5) and residual disease (RD) patients (*n*=2). SI% calculated as per Alloush *et al.* (2010). Peripheral blast burden assessed by flow cytometry every 24 hours post commencement of treatment. Day 28 log_{10} reduction calculated versus diagnostic flow sample. Mean and 95% CI are shown, ns, not significant; **p*<0.05.

Acknowledgements

The authors would like to thank participants and staff at the Bristol Haematology & Oncology Centre for the operational management of this work. Patient samples were gathered under informed consent from participants at University Hospitals Bristol NHS Foundation Trust (15/WM/0415), approved by the West Midlands, South Birmingham Research Ethics Committee (UK). *Escherichia coli* HA1 whole-cell biosensor is protected under patent (PCT/GB2009/00196) held jointly by Randox Laboratories Ltd (Belfast) and UWE. This work was funded by a charitable grant from Above & Beyond (UK).

References

Abraham A, Varatharajan S, Karathedath S, *et al.* (2015) RNA expression of genes involved in cytarabine metabolism and transport predicts cytarabine response in acute myeloid leukemia. *Pharmacogenomics*. 16(8):877-90. doi: 10.2217/pgs.15.44

Alloush HM, Anderson E, Martin AD, *et al*. (2010) A bioluminescent microbial biosensor for in vitro pretreatment assessment of cytarabine efficacy in leukemia. *Clinical Chemistry*. 56(12):1862-70. doi: 10.1373/clinchem.2010.145581

Anderson E, Conway M, Alloush H, *et al.* (2014) Investigation and verification of a bioluminescent biosensor for the quantitation of ara-CTP generation: a biomarker for cytosine arabinoside sensitivity in acute myeloid leukaemia. *Biosensors & Bioelectronics*. 52:345-53. doi: 10.1016/j.bios.2013.09.014

Bose P, Vachhani P, Cortes JE. (2017) Treatment of Relapsed/Refractory Acute Myeloid Leukemia. *Current Treatment Options in Oncology*. 18(3):17. doi: 10.1007/s11864-017-0456-2

Elliott MA, Litzow MR, Letendre LL, *et al*. (2007) Early peripheral blood blast clearance during induction chemotherapy for acute myeloid leukemia predicts superior relapse-free survival. *Blood*. 15;110(13):4172-4. doi: 10.1182/blood-2007-07-104091

Gianfaldoni G, Mannelli F, Baccini M, Antonioli E, Leoni F, Bosi A. (2006) Clearance of leukaemic blasts from peripheral blood during standard induction treatment predicts the bone marrow response in acute myeloid leukaemia: a pilot study. *British Journal of Haematology*. 134(1):54-7. doi: 10.1111/j.1365-2141.2006.06100.x

Gruber A, Liliemark E, Tidefelt U, *et al.* (1995) Pharmacokinetics of mitoxantrone, etoposide and cytosine arabinoside in leukemic cells during treatment of acute myelogenous leukemia-relationship to treatment outcome and bone marrow toxicity. *Leukemia Research*. 19(10):757-61.

Karp JE, Donehower RC, Dole GB, Burke PJ. (1987) Correlation of drug-perturbed marrow cell growth kinetics and intracellular 1-B-D-arabinofuranosylcytosine metabolism with clinical response in adult acute myelogenous leukemia. *Blood*. 69(4):1134-40.

Koehl U, Hollatz G, Rohrbach E, *et al.* (2007) Pharmacology of intracellular cytosinearabinoside-5'-triphosphate in malignant cells of pediatric patients with initial or relapsed leukemia and in normal lymphocytes. *Cancer Chemotherapy Pharmacology*. 60(4):467-77. doi: 10.1007/s00280-006-0386-3 Lamba JK. (2009) Genetic factors influencing cytarabine therapy. *Pharmacogenomics*. 10(10):1657-74. doi: 10.2217/pgs.09.118

Lamba JK, Crews KR, Pounds SB, *et al.* (2011) Identification of predictive markers of cytarabine response in AML by integrative analysis of gene-expression profiles with multiple phenotypes. *Pharmacogenomics.* 12(3): 327–339. doi: 10.2217/pgs.10.191

Liang D, Wang W, Jiang X, Yin S. (2014) Simultaneous determination of 1- β -d-Arabinofuranosylcytosine and two metabolites, 1- β -d-Arabinofuranosyluracil and 1- β -d-Arabinofuranosylcytosine triphosphate in leukemic cell by HPLC-MS/MS and the application to cell pharmacokinetics. *Journal of Chromatography B.* 962:14–19. doi: 10.1016/j.jchromb.2014.05.003

Milligan DW, Grimwade D, Cullis JO *et al.* (2006) Guidelines on the management of acute myeloid leukaemia in adults. *British Journal of Haematology*. 135(4):450-74. doi: 10.1111/j.1365-2141.2006.06314.x

Poynter JN, Richardson M, Blair CK, *et al.* (2016) Obesity over the life course and risk of acute myeloid leukemia and myelodysplastic syndromes. *Cancer Epidemiology*. 40:134-40. doi: 10.1016/j.canep.2015.12.005

Rustum YM, Preisler HD. (1979) Correlation between leukemic cell retention of 1-beta-Darabinofuranosylcytosine 5'-triphosphate and response to therapy. *Cancer Research*. 39(1):42-9.

Shrivastava A, Saxena P, Gupta VB. (2011) Spectrophotometric estimation of tamsulosin hydrochloride by acid-dye method. *Pharm Methods*. 2(1): 53–60.

Tavitian S, Denis A, Vergez F, *et al.* (2016) Impact of obesity in favorable-risk AML patients receiving intensive chemotherapy. *American Journal of Hematology*. 91(2):193-8. doi: 10.1002/ajh.24228

Yan H, Wen L, Tan D, *et al.* (2017) Association of a cytarabine chemosensitivity related gene expression signature with survival in cytogenetically normal acute myeloid leukemia. *Oncotarget*. 8(1): 1529–1540. doi: 10.18632/oncotarget.13650

Authorship contributions

EA, AP, VS, RP & PM designed the research. EA, BR, EF, JH¹ & JH² performed the research. EA, RG & PM analysed the data. EA wrote the paper.

Conflicts of interest

This work was funded by a charitable grant from Above and Beyond, Bristol.

Abbreviations: ara-C, cytosine arabinoside/cytarabine; ara-CTP, cytosine arabinoside triphosphate; SI%, sensitivity index; hENT, human equilibrative nucleoside transporter; CR, complete remission (day 28); RD, residual disease; C_{ss}, steady-state concentration; AUC, areaunder-the-curve; A, absorption; E, elimination; LD, low-dose cytarabine; SD, standard-dose cytarabine; HD, high-dose cytarabine; LAIP, leukaemia-associated immunophenotype.

Appendix

Additional Supporting Information may be found in the online version of this article:



Figure A.1: (A) Feasibility of standard-of care and LAIP assessments per time-point (as % of total cohort), and (B) example ara-CTP standard curve for biosensor HA1. (A) Haematology, clinical chemistry and day 28 flow cytometry were standard-of-care. LAIP, leukaemia-associated immunophenotype assessed by flow cytometry (% of total nucleated cells). (B) Ara-CTP standard curve produced as per Methods section (equivalent to 0-242 ng/mL).

		Quantitation	Flow cytometry (day 0 vs 28)						
Patient ID	t=2	t=4	t=8	t=12	t=24	t=48	t=72	AUC	log10 reduction
2	1	1	1	1	1	1	0	1	1
3	1*	1*	1*	1*	1	1*	1*	0	1
7	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	1
10	1	1	1 (<lod)< td=""><td>1</td><td>1</td><td>1</td><td>0</td><td>curve failed</td><td>1</td></lod)<>	1	1	1	0	curve failed	1
11	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	0
13	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
14	1	0	0	1	1	1	0	0	1
16	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
17	1	1	1	1	0	0	0	1	1
19	1	1 (<lod)< td=""><td>1 (<lod)< td=""><td>1</td><td>1</td><td>1 (<lod)< td=""><td>1 (<lod)< td=""><td>0</td><td>1</td></lod)<></td></lod)<></td></lod)<></td></lod)<>	1 (<lod)< td=""><td>1</td><td>1</td><td>1 (<lod)< td=""><td>1 (<lod)< td=""><td>0</td><td>1</td></lod)<></td></lod)<></td></lod)<>	1	1	1 (<lod)< td=""><td>1 (<lod)< td=""><td>0</td><td>1</td></lod)<></td></lod)<>	1 (<lod)< td=""><td>0</td><td>1</td></lod)<>	0	1
21	1	1 (<lod)< td=""><td>1 (<lod)< td=""><td>1 (<lod)< td=""><td>1 (<lod)< td=""><td>1 (<lod)< td=""><td>1 (<lod)< td=""><td>0</td><td>1</td></lod)<></td></lod)<></td></lod)<></td></lod)<></td></lod)<></td></lod)<>	1 (<lod)< td=""><td>1 (<lod)< td=""><td>1 (<lod)< td=""><td>1 (<lod)< td=""><td>1 (<lod)< td=""><td>0</td><td>1</td></lod)<></td></lod)<></td></lod)<></td></lod)<></td></lod)<>	1 (<lod)< td=""><td>1 (<lod)< td=""><td>1 (<lod)< td=""><td>1 (<lod)< td=""><td>0</td><td>1</td></lod)<></td></lod)<></td></lod)<></td></lod)<>	1 (<lod)< td=""><td>1 (<lod)< td=""><td>1 (<lod)< td=""><td>0</td><td>1</td></lod)<></td></lod)<></td></lod)<>	1 (<lod)< td=""><td>1 (<lod)< td=""><td>0</td><td>1</td></lod)<></td></lod)<>	1 (<lod)< td=""><td>0</td><td>1</td></lod)<>	0	1
22	1	0	1 (<lod)< td=""><td>1</td><td>1</td><td>1</td><td>1</td><td>1</td><td>1</td></lod)<>	1	1	1	1	1	1
23	1 (<lod)< td=""><td>1 (<lod)< td=""><td>1 (<lod)< td=""><td>1 (<lod)< td=""><td>1 (<lod)< td=""><td>1 (<lod)< td=""><td>1 (<lod)< td=""><td>0</td><td>1</td></lod)<></td></lod)<></td></lod)<></td></lod)<></td></lod)<></td></lod)<></td></lod)<>	1 (<lod)< td=""><td>1 (<lod)< td=""><td>1 (<lod)< td=""><td>1 (<lod)< td=""><td>1 (<lod)< td=""><td>1 (<lod)< td=""><td>0</td><td>1</td></lod)<></td></lod)<></td></lod)<></td></lod)<></td></lod)<></td></lod)<>	1 (<lod)< td=""><td>1 (<lod)< td=""><td>1 (<lod)< td=""><td>1 (<lod)< td=""><td>1 (<lod)< td=""><td>0</td><td>1</td></lod)<></td></lod)<></td></lod)<></td></lod)<></td></lod)<>	1 (<lod)< td=""><td>1 (<lod)< td=""><td>1 (<lod)< td=""><td>1 (<lod)< td=""><td>0</td><td>1</td></lod)<></td></lod)<></td></lod)<></td></lod)<>	1 (<lod)< td=""><td>1 (<lod)< td=""><td>1 (<lod)< td=""><td>0</td><td>1</td></lod)<></td></lod)<></td></lod)<>	1 (<lod)< td=""><td>1 (<lod)< td=""><td>0</td><td>1</td></lod)<></td></lod)<>	1 (<lod)< td=""><td>0</td><td>1</td></lod)<>	0	1
n (lysate)	12	10	10	11	10	10	7		
Feasibility (%)	92	77	77	85	77	77	54		
n (lysate SI%>LOD)	11	7	5	9	8	7	6		
n (correlation)	10	6	4	8	7	6	5	5	12
n (quantitation)	9	5	4	7					

Figure A.2 Feasibility data (standard dose patients). 1, lysate produced; 0, no lysate produced; <LOD, below limit of detection; *below limit of quantitation.

	Lysate produced (1) or no lysate produced (0)								Flow cytometry (day 0 vs 28)
Patient ID	t=2	t=4	t=8	t=12	t=24	t=48	t=72	AUC	log10 reduction
5	1	1	1	1	1	0	0	1	1
8	1	1	1	1	w.d.	w.d.	w.d.	1	0
9	1	1	1	0	0	0	0	n.c.	1
15	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
18	1	1	1	1	1	0	0	1	1
20	1	1	1	1	1	0	0	1	1
n (lysate)	6	6	6	5	4	1	1		
Feasibility (%)	100	100	100	83	80	20	20		
n (lysate SI%>LOD)	6	6	6	5	4	1	1		
n (correlation)	5	5	5	4	4	1	1	5	5
n (quantitation)	6	6	6	5					

Figure A.3 Feasibility data (high dose patients). 1, lysate produced; 0, no lysate produced; <LOD, below limit of detection; n.c., not calculable (no 12 hour result); w.d., withdrawn/no longer able to verbally consent (removed from feasibility assessment).

	Lysate produced (1) or no lysate produced (0)								Quantitation	Flow cytometry (day 0 vs 28)
Patient ID	Diagnosis	t=2	t=4	t=8	t=12	t=24	t=48	t=72	AUC	log10 reduction
1	AML	1	1	1	0	1	1 (<lod)< td=""><td>0</td><td>0</td><td>1</td></lod)<>	0	0	1
6	MDS	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	0	0
24	AML	1 (<lod)< td=""><td>1 (<lod)< td=""><td>1 (<lod)< td=""><td>1 (<lod)< td=""><td>1 (<lod)< td=""><td>0</td><td>0</td><td>0</td><td>1</td></lod)<></td></lod)<></td></lod)<></td></lod)<></td></lod)<>	1 (<lod)< td=""><td>1 (<lod)< td=""><td>1 (<lod)< td=""><td>1 (<lod)< td=""><td>0</td><td>0</td><td>0</td><td>1</td></lod)<></td></lod)<></td></lod)<></td></lod)<>	1 (<lod)< td=""><td>1 (<lod)< td=""><td>1 (<lod)< td=""><td>0</td><td>0</td><td>0</td><td>1</td></lod)<></td></lod)<></td></lod)<>	1 (<lod)< td=""><td>1 (<lod)< td=""><td>0</td><td>0</td><td>0</td><td>1</td></lod)<></td></lod)<>	1 (<lod)< td=""><td>0</td><td>0</td><td>0</td><td>1</td></lod)<>	0	0	0	1
25	AML	1	1	1	1	1	0	1	0	1
26	MDS	1 (<lod)< td=""><td>1 (<lod)< td=""><td>1 (<lod)< td=""><td>1 (<lod)< td=""><td>1 (<lod)< td=""><td>0*</td><td>0*</td><td>0</td><td>1</td></lod)<></td></lod)<></td></lod)<></td></lod)<></td></lod)<>	1 (<lod)< td=""><td>1 (<lod)< td=""><td>1 (<lod)< td=""><td>1 (<lod)< td=""><td>0*</td><td>0*</td><td>0</td><td>1</td></lod)<></td></lod)<></td></lod)<></td></lod)<>	1 (<lod)< td=""><td>1 (<lod)< td=""><td>1 (<lod)< td=""><td>0*</td><td>0*</td><td>0</td><td>1</td></lod)<></td></lod)<></td></lod)<>	1 (<lod)< td=""><td>1 (<lod)< td=""><td>0*</td><td>0*</td><td>0</td><td>1</td></lod)<></td></lod)<>	1 (<lod)< td=""><td>0*</td><td>0*</td><td>0</td><td>1</td></lod)<>	0*	0*	0	1
27	AML	1 (<lod)< td=""><td>1 (<lod)< td=""><td>1 (<lod)< td=""><td>1 (<lod)< td=""><td>1 (<lod)< td=""><td>1 (<lod)< td=""><td>1 (<lod)< td=""><td>0</td><td>1</td></lod)<></td></lod)<></td></lod)<></td></lod)<></td></lod)<></td></lod)<></td></lod)<>	1 (<lod)< td=""><td>1 (<lod)< td=""><td>1 (<lod)< td=""><td>1 (<lod)< td=""><td>1 (<lod)< td=""><td>1 (<lod)< td=""><td>0</td><td>1</td></lod)<></td></lod)<></td></lod)<></td></lod)<></td></lod)<></td></lod)<>	1 (<lod)< td=""><td>1 (<lod)< td=""><td>1 (<lod)< td=""><td>1 (<lod)< td=""><td>1 (<lod)< td=""><td>0</td><td>1</td></lod)<></td></lod)<></td></lod)<></td></lod)<></td></lod)<>	1 (<lod)< td=""><td>1 (<lod)< td=""><td>1 (<lod)< td=""><td>1 (<lod)< td=""><td>0</td><td>1</td></lod)<></td></lod)<></td></lod)<></td></lod)<>	1 (<lod)< td=""><td>1 (<lod)< td=""><td>1 (<lod)< td=""><td>0</td><td>1</td></lod)<></td></lod)<></td></lod)<>	1 (<lod)< td=""><td>1 (<lod)< td=""><td>0</td><td>1</td></lod)<></td></lod)<>	1 (<lod)< td=""><td>0</td><td>1</td></lod)<>	0	1
28	AML	1 (<lod)< td=""><td>1 (<lod)< td=""><td>1 (<lod)< td=""><td>1 (<lod)< td=""><td>1 (<lod)< td=""><td>1 (<lod)< td=""><td>0*</td><td>0</td><td>1</td></lod)<></td></lod)<></td></lod)<></td></lod)<></td></lod)<></td></lod)<>	1 (<lod)< td=""><td>1 (<lod)< td=""><td>1 (<lod)< td=""><td>1 (<lod)< td=""><td>1 (<lod)< td=""><td>0*</td><td>0</td><td>1</td></lod)<></td></lod)<></td></lod)<></td></lod)<></td></lod)<>	1 (<lod)< td=""><td>1 (<lod)< td=""><td>1 (<lod)< td=""><td>1 (<lod)< td=""><td>0*</td><td>0</td><td>1</td></lod)<></td></lod)<></td></lod)<></td></lod)<>	1 (<lod)< td=""><td>1 (<lod)< td=""><td>1 (<lod)< td=""><td>0*</td><td>0</td><td>1</td></lod)<></td></lod)<></td></lod)<>	1 (<lod)< td=""><td>1 (<lod)< td=""><td>0*</td><td>0</td><td>1</td></lod)<></td></lod)<>	1 (<lod)< td=""><td>0*</td><td>0</td><td>1</td></lod)<>	0*	0	1
n (lysate)		7	7	7	6	7	4	3		
Feasibility (%)		100	100	100	86	100	57	43		
n (lysate SI%>LOD)		3	3	3	2	3	1	2		
n (correlation)		2	2	2	1	2	0	1	0	6

Figure A.4 Feasibility data (low dose patients). 1, lysate produced; 0, no lysate produced; <LOD, result below limit of detection; *patient discharged from hospital; MDS, myelodysplastic syndrome; AML, acute myeloid leukaemia.



Figure A.5: (A) Patient recruitment to multiple peripheral sampling study (n=26), (B) treatment commencement time, (C) percentage of recruited patients sampled by timepoint (LD n=7, SD n=13, HD n=6), and (D) body mass index (BMI) of patient cohorts against WHO criteria for obesity. (B) Time of therapy commencement as percentage of total cohort per dose category. (C) Patients treated with 20 mg/m² (LD), 200 mg/m² (SD) or 1.5 g/m² (HD) cytarabine-containing regimens were sampled at t=0, 2, 4, 8, 12, 24, 48 and 72 hours post– treatment commencement. Error bars represent range. (D) BMI classification as described by Poynter *et al.* (2016).