National Comprehensive Cancer Network®

NCCN Clinical Practice Guidelines in Oncology (NCCN Guidelines®)

Hodgkin Lymphoma

Version 2.2013

NCCN.org

Continue

NCCN Guidelines Version 2.2013 Panel Members
Hodgkin Lymphoma

NCCN Guidelines Index
Hodgkin Table of Contents
Discussion

* Richard T. Hoppe, MD/Chair §
Stanford Cancer Institute

Ranjana Hira Advani, MD †
Stanford Cancer Institute

Weiyun Z. Ai, MD ‡
UCSF Helen Diller Family Comprehensive Cancer Center

Richard F. Ambinder, PhD, MD †
The Sidney Kimmel Comprehensive Cancer Center at John Hopkins

Patricia Aoun, MD, MPH ≠
City of Hope Comprehensive Cancer Center

Celeste M. Bello, MD, MSPH †
Moffitt Cancer Center

Cecil M. Benitez, BS ¥
Stanford Cancer Institute

Philip J. Bierman, MD † ‡ ξ
UNMC Eppley Cancer Center at The Nebraska Medical Center

Kristie A. Blum, MD ‡
The Ohio State University Comprehensive Cancer Center - James Cancer Hospital and Solove Research Institute

Robert Chen, MD ‡ ξ
City of Hope Comprehensive Cancer Center

Bouthaina Dabaja, MD §
The University of Texas M. D. Anderson Cancer Center

Andres Forero, MD † ‡
University of Alabama at Birmingham Comprehensive Cancer Center

Leo I. Gordon, MD ‡
Robert H. Lurie Comprehensive Cancer Center of Northwestern University

Francisco J. Hernandez-Ilizaliturri, MD †
Roswell Park Cancer Institute

Ephraim P. Hochberg, MD †
Massachusetts General Hospital Cancer Center

David G. Maloney, MD, PhD † ‡
Fred Hutchinson Cancer Research Center/Seattle Cancer Care Alliance

David Mansur, MD §
Siteman Cancer Center at Barnes-Jewish Hospital and Washington University School of Medicine

Peter M. Mauch, MD §
Dana-Farber/Brigham and Women's Cancer Center

Monika Metzger, MD €
St. Jude Children's Research Hospital/ University of Tennessee Health Science Center

Joseph O. Moore, MD †
Duke Cancer Institute

David Morgan, MD † ‡ ξ
Vanderbilt-Ingram Cancer Center

Craig H. Moskowitz, MD † Þ
Memorial Sloan-Kettering Cancer Center

Matthew Poppe, MD §
Huntsman Cancer Institute at the University of Utah

Barbara Pro, MD † Þ
Fox Chase Cancer Center

Jane N. Winter, MD ‡
Robert H. Lurie Comprehensive Cancer Center of Northwestern University

Joachim Yahalom, MD §
Memorial Sloan-Kettering Cancer Center

NCCN
Kristina Gregory, RN, MSN, OCN
Hema Sundar, PhD

§ Radiation oncology
† Medical oncology
‡ Hematology/Hematology oncology
ξ Bone marrow transplantation
€ Pediatric oncology
≠ Pathology
Þ Internal medicine
¥ Patient advocacy

Continue

NCCN Guidelines Panel Disclosures

NCCN Guidelines Version 2.2013 Table of Contents
Hodgkin Lymphoma

NCCN Hodgkin Lymphoma Panel Members
Summary of Guidelines Updates
Diagnosis and Workup (HODG-1)
Primary Treatment

- Classical Hodgkin Lymphoma:
  CS IA-IIA Favorable (HODG-2)
  CS I-II Unfavorable (Bulky disease) (HODG-4)
  CS I-II Unfavorable (Non-bulky disease) (HODG-9)
  CS III-IV (HODG-11)
- Lymphocyte-Predominant Hodgkin Lymphoma:
  CS I-IV (HODG-14)

Follow-up After Completion of Treatment
and Monitoring For Late Effects (HODG-15)
Refractory Classical Hodgkin Lymphoma (HODG-16)
Suspected Relapse of Classical Hodgkin Lymphoma (HODG-17)
Refractory or Relapsed Lymphocyte-Predominant Hodgkin Lymphoma (HODG-18)
Unfavorable Factors (localized and advanced disease) (HODG-A)
Principles of Systemic Therapy (HODG-B)
Principles of Radiation Therapy (HODG-C)
Deauville PET Criteria (HODG-D)
Principles of Second-line Chemotherapy (HODG-E)
Staging (ST-1)

Clinical Trials: NCCN believes that the best management for any cancer patient is in a clinical trial. Participation in clinical trials is especially encouraged.

To find clinical trials online at NCCN Member Institutions, click here: nccn.org/clinical_trials/physician.html.

NCCN Categories of Evidence and Consensus: All recommendations are category 2A unless otherwise specified.

See NCCN Categories of Evidence and Consensus.

NCCN Guidelines Version 2.2013 Updates
Hodgkin Lymphoma

NCCN Guidelines Index
Hodgkin Table of Contents
Discussion

Summary of the changes in the 2.2013 version of the NCCN Guidelines for Hodgkin Lymphoma from the 1.2013 version include:

MS-1 - The discussion section was updated to reflect the changes in the algorithm.

Summary of the changes in the 1.2013 version of the NCCN Guidelines for Hodgkin Lymphoma from the 2.2012 version include:

HODG-1

Diagnosis

- Immunohistochemistry *evaluation* ~~highly recommended for Hodgkin lymphoma~~.
- Footnote "b" modified: "Typical immunophenotype for Classical Hodgkin lymphoma: CD15+, CD30+, *PAX-5+ (weak)*; CD3-, CD20- *(majority), CD45-, CD79a-. Typical immunophenotype for* Lymphocyte-predominant Hodgkin lymphoma: CD20+, CD45+, *CD79a+, BCL6+, PAX-5+;* CD3-, CD15-, CD30-. An expanded panel of markers may be required especially if equivocal diagnosis. See NHL Guidelines.

Workup

- HIV test moved from "Essential" to "Useful in selected cases" and "encouraged" added.
- Neck CT: "if neck RT contemplated" added.
- "Fertility preservation" added to "Useful in selected cases" with footnote "e": "Fertility preservation options include: Semen cryopreservation, if chemotherapy or pelvic RT contemplated. IVF or ovarian tissue or oocyte cryopreservation. Oophoropexy in pre-menopausal women if pelvic RT is contemplated."

HODG-2

Primary treatment

- Combined modality therapy (ABVD x 2-4 cycles + *involved-site RT (ISRT) (category 1)* or Stanford V x 8 weeks) ~~+ involved field RT [IFRT]) (category 1)~~
- ABVD alone changed from a category 2B recommendation to a category 2A recommendation.
- Restaging modified: Restage after chemotherapy with *PET-CT* ~~CT through regions of initial disease~~.
- Deauville criteria added to determine further treatment options.
- Deauville 1-3: recommendation after ISRT changed to "Observe."
- Deauville 4: Biopsy added as an option.

HODG-2

- Footnote "h" modified: *Excludes the* NCCN Unfavorable Factors for stage I-II disease: bulky mediastinal or >10 cm disease, B symptoms, ESR >50, >3 sites of disease (see Unfavorable Factors HODG-A).
- Previous footnote "m" deleted: "Patients with elevated ESR or >3 sites of disease may be managed with Stanford V per this algorithm."
- Footnote "o" added with link to Deauville PET criteria.
- Footnote "r" modified: Biopsy to confirm ~~no change in~~ histology. Clinical circumstances may warrant additional treatment even in face of negative biopsy. (also applies to HODG-3 through HODG-13, HODG-16)
- Footnote "s" added: "Deauville 3 should have short interval follow-up including PET-CT." (also applies to HODG-3, HODG-10, HODG-13 HODG-16 through HODG-18)

HODG-3

- Restaging modified: Restage after chemotherapy with *PET-CT* ~~CT through regions of initial disease~~
- Deauville criteria added to determine further treatment options.
- Footnote "o" added with link to Deauville PET criteria.
- Pathway for stable disease removed.

HODG-4

- Primary treatment: ABVD changed from 4 cycles to "2-4 cycles" and listed as a category 1 recommendation.
- Primary treatment: BEACOPP x 2 + ABVD x 2 + RT added as a treatment option.
- Deauville criteria added to determine further treatment options.
- Footnote "o" added with link to Deauville PET criteria.
- Deauville 1-3 after restaging: ABVD changed from 2 cycles to "2-4 cycles" and IFRT removed as a treatment option.
- Deauville 4 after restaging: ABVD changed from 2 cycles to "2-4 cycles."
- Deauville 4: Restaging after 4-6 cycles of ABVD moved to page HODG-5.

NCCN Guidelines Version 2.2013 Updates
Hodgkin Lymphoma

NCCN Guidelines Index
Hodgkin Table of Contents
Discussion

Summary of the changes in the 1.2013 version of the NCCN Guidelines for Hodgkin Lymphoma from the 2.2012 version include:

HODG-5
- Deauville criteria added to determine further treatment options.
- Footnote "o" added with link to Deauville PET criteria.
- Deauville 4 restaging after ISRT: Observation removed as a treatment option.

HODG-6
- Footnote "v" modified: "The Stanford V regimen is used in this fashion for patients with bulky mediastinal disease or >10 cm disease and/or B symptoms. Patients with elevated ESR, or >3 sites *in absence of bulky disease* are treated according to the Stanford V algorithm on HODG-2."
- Deauville criteria added to determine further treatment options.
- Footnote "o" added with link to Deauville PET criteria.
- Deauville 1-3 after restaging: RT to residual PET positive sites removed.

HODG-7 and **HODG-8**
- Treatment algorithm added for BEACOPP.

HODG-9
- ABVD changed from 4 cycles to 2-4 cycles.
- ABVD as primary treatment, Deauville 1-2 after restaging: IFRT removed as a treatment option.
- Primary treatment: BEACOPP x 2 + ABVD x 2 + RT added as a treatment option.
- Deauville criteria added to determine further treatment options.
- Footnote "o" added with link to Deauville PET criteria.
- Footnote "x" added: "If observation, total 6 cycles of ABVD recommended."

HODG-10
- Deauville criteria added to determine further treatment options.
- Footnote "o" added with link to Deauville PET criteria.

HODG-11
- Primary treatment: criteria of IPS ≥4 removed from escalated BEACOPP.
- Deauville criteria added to determine further treatment options.
- Footnote "o" added with link to Deauville PET criteria.
- Previous footnote "x" deleted: "If being used for relapsed LPHL, consider the addition of rituximab."

HODG-11
- Previous footnote "y" deleted: "If stable disease after 2 cycles of ABVD, consider a total of 4 cycles of ABVD before proceeding to biopsy."

HODG-12
- Deauville criteria added to determine further treatment options.
- Footnote "o" added with link to Deauville PET criteria.
- Deauville 1-3 after restaging: RT to residual PET positive sites removed.
- Previous footnote "u" deleted: "The Stanford V regimen is used in this fashion for patients with bulky mediastinal disease >10 cm and/or B symptoms. Patients with elevated ESR, or >3 sites are treated according to the Stanford V algorithm on HODG-2."

HODG-13
- Deauville criteria added to determine further treatment options.
- Footnote "o" added with link to Deauville PET criteria.
- Deauville 1-3 after restaging: "baseline" BEACOPP changed to "escalated" BEACOPP.
- RT recommendation modified, "RT to ~~initial~~ *residual* sites ~~>5~~ *2.5* cm *PET positive*."
- Deauville 4-5 after restaging, negative biopsy: 4 cycles of escalated BEACOPP changed to 2 cycles of escalated BEACOPP.

HODG-14
- Deauville criteria added to determine further treatment options.
- Footnote "o" added with link to Deauville PET criteria.
- Clinical stage IA, IIA: "Observe" added as a treatment option with footnote "z": "Observation may be an option for stage IA patients with a completely excised solitary lymph node."
- Clinical stages IB, IIB, IIIB, IVB: Single-agent rituximab removed as a treatment option.
- Clinical stages III, IV: Footnote "bb" added to "restage": "Consider biopsy of persistent or new subdiaphragmatic sites to rule out transformation."
- Previous footnote "aa" removed: "In some patients treated with rituximab alone, maintenance rituximab may be considered for 2 years."

NCCN Guidelines Version 2.2013 Updates
Hodgkin Lymphoma

NCCN Guidelines Index
Hodgkin Table of Contents
Discussion

Summary of the changes in the 1.2013 version of the NCCN Guidelines for Hodgkin Lymphoma from the 2.2012 version include:

HODG-15

- Follow-up after completion of treatment clarified with "up to 5 years."
  - Chest imaging recommendations modified: Chest x-ray or CT every 6-12 mo during first 2-*3* ~~5~~ y, *then chest x-ray optional.*
- Monitoring for late effects after 5 years
  - Revaccination time interval modified to 5-7 y.
  - "Consider carotid ultrasound, especially if neck irradiation" added.
  - Chest imaging recommendations modified: "~~Annual~~ *Consider* chest imaging ~~(chest x-ray or chest CT)~~ for patients at increased risk for lung cancer."
  - Breast screening recommendations modified: "The *NCCN Hodgkin Lymphoma Guidelines Panel* recommends breast MRI in addition to mammography for women who received irradiation to the chest between ages 10 and 30 y, *which is consistent with the American Cancer Society Guidelines*."

HODG-16

- Deauville criteria added to determine further treatment options.
- Footnote "o" added with link to Deauville PET criteria.
- Progressive disease changed to Refractory disease.
- RT removed as a treatment option in second-line therapy.
- CR: the following clarification added to "observe": "if HDT/ASCR contraindicated."
- CR/PR after treatment for PD: the following clarification added to "observe," "if CR and HDT/ASCR contraindicated."
- Previous footnote "ee" deleted, as there is a new page to address relapsed/refractory disease for LPHL: "Patients with LPHL may be managed according to the same algorithm; however, some patients with LPHL have a chronic indolent course that may not require aggressive re-treatment. These symptomatic patients may be observed. At relapse, patients should be considered for re-biopsy because of risk of transformation." (also applies to HODG-17)

HODG-17

- Deauville criteria added to determine further treatment options.
- Footnote "o" added with link to Deauville PET criteria.
- In the restaging section, bone marrow biopsy modified with the addition of "±"
- "Consider marrow cytogenetics for MDS markers prior to transplant" removed as a recommendation.
- Rebiopsy positive: in the consideration of second-line therapy, the descriptions of previous therapy were removed. Treatment options are based on initial stage of disease.
- Observation clarified as "in selected cases."

HODG-18

- New page addressing the treatment options for relapsed or refractory LPHL.

HODG-A

- Footnote "**" added: "The EORTC definition of nodal sites differs from the Ann Arbor System in that the infraclavicular region is included with the ipsilateral axilla and the bilateral hila is included with the mediastinum."

HODG-B 1 of 2

- Footnote "*" added: "Cyclophosphamide may be used as an alternate to nitrogen mustard."
- References updated.

HODG-C

- Principles of Radiation Therapy extensively revised.

HODG-D

- Revised Response Criteria for Hodgkin Lymphoma (Cheson) replaced with Deauville PET Criteria (Barrington).

HODG-E 2 of 2

- References updated.

NCCN Guidelines Version 2.2013
Hodgkin Lymphoma

NCCN Guidelines Index
Hodgkin Table of Contents
Discussion

DIAGNOSIS

- Excisional biopsy (recommended)
- Core needle biopsy may be adequate if diagnostic[a]
- Immunohisto-chemistry evaluation

WORKUP

Essential:
- H&P including: B symptoms, alcohol intolerance, pruritus, fatigue, performance status, exam lymphoid regions, spleen, liver
- CBC, differential, platelets
- Erythrocyte sedimentation rate (ESR)
- LDH, LFT, albumin
- BUN, creatinine
- Pregnancy test: women of childbearing age
- Chest x-ray
- Diagnostic chest/abdominal/pelvic CT[c]
- PET-CT scan[d]
- Adequate bone marrow biopsy in stage IB, IIB and stage III-IV
- Evaluation of ejection fraction for doxorubicin-containing regimens
- Counseling: Fertility, smoking cessation, psychosocial (see NCCN Guidelines for Distress Management)

Useful in selected cases:
- Fertility preservation[e]
- Neck CT, if neck RT contemplated
- Pulmonary function tests (PFTs incl. DLCO) if ABVD or BEACOPP are being used
- Pneumococcal, H-flu, meningococcal vaccines, if splenic RT contemplated
- HIV test (encouraged)

CLINICAL STAGING

Classical Hodgkin lymphoma[f]

- Stage IA, IIA Favorable[h] → See Primary Treatment (HODG-2)[i]
- Stage I-II Unfavorable[h] (Bulky disease) → See Primary Treatment (HODG-4)[i]
- Stage I-II Unfavorable[h] (Non-bulky disease) → See Primary Treatment (HODG-9)[i]
- Stage III-IV → See Primary Treatment (HODG-11)[i]

Lymphocyte-predominant Hodgkin lymphoma (LPHL)[g] → See Primary Treatment (HODG-14)[i]

[a] FNA alone is to be avoided and only considered to be adequate if called diagnostic of Hodgkin lymphoma by a hematopathologist or cytopathologist.

[b] Typical immunophenotype for classical Hodgkin lymphoma: CD15+, CD30+, PAX-5+ (weak); CD3-, CD20- (majority), CD45-, CD79a-. Typical immunophenotype for lymphocyte-predominant Hodgkin lymphoma: CD20+, CD45+, CD79a+, BCL6+, PAX-5+; CD3-, CD15-, CD30-. An expanded panel of markers may be required especially if equivocal diagnosis. See NHL Guidelines.

[c] A separate diagnostic CT does not need to be done if it was part of the integrated PET-CT scan.

[d] In cases of PET positivity where sites of disease are inconsistent with usual presentation of Hodgkin lymphoma or if an unusual disease presentation (ie, HIV), additional clinical evaluation may be required to upstage patient. See (ST-1).

[e] Fertility preservation options include: Semen cryopreservation, if chemotherapy or pelvic RT contemplated; IVF or ovarian tissue or oocyte cryopreservation; and oophoropexy in pre-menopausal women if pelvic RT is contemplated.

[f] Classical Hodgkin lymphoma (HL) includes nodular sclerosis (NSHL), mixed cellularity (MCHL), lymphocyte-depleted (LDHL), and lymphocyte-rich (LRHL).

[g] Lymphocyte-predominant Hodgkin lymphoma (LPHL) has a different natural history and response to therapy than classical Hodgkin lymphoma, especially stages I-II. For that reason, separate guidelines are presented for LPHL.

[h] Excludes the NCCN Unfavorable Factors for stage I-II disease: bulky mediastinal or >10 cm disease, B symptoms, ESR >50, >3 sites of disease (see Unfavorable Factors HODG-A).

[i] Treatment recommendations for postadolescent Hodgkin lymphoma.

Note: All recommendations are category 2A unless otherwise indicated.
Clinical Trials: NCCN believes that the best management of any cancer patient is in a clinical trial. Participation in clinical trials is especially encouraged.

CLINICAL PRESENTATION:
Classical Hodgkin lymphoma[f]
Stage IA, IIA Favorable

PRIMARY TREATMENT[j]



[f] Classical Hodgkin lymphoma (HL) includes nodular sclerosis (NSHL), mixed cellularity (MCHL), lymphocyte-depleted (LDHL), and lymphocyte-rich (LRHL).

[h] Excludes the NCCN Unfavorable Factors for stage I-II disease: bulky mediastinal or >10 cm disease, B symptoms, ESR >50, >3 sites of disease. (see Unfavorable Factors HODG-A).

[j] Individualized treatment may be necessary for older patients and patients with concomitant disease.

[k] See Principles of Systemic Therapy (HODG-B).

[l] 4 cycles of ABVD unless patient fulfills strict criteria of the GHSG with only 2 sites of disease and no extralymphatic lesions in which case 2 cycles is sufficient.

[m] See Principles of Radiation Therapy (HODG-C).

[o] See Deauville PET Criteria (HODG-D).

[p] Recommend ABVD x 4 cycles (total) before proceeding to ISRT or biopsy.

[q] An integrated PET-CT or a PET with a diagnostic CT is recommended.

[r] Biopsy to confirm histology. Clinical circumstances may warrant additional treatment even in face of negative biopsy.

[s] Deauville 3 should have short interval follow-up including PET-CT.

Note: All recommendations are category 2A unless otherwise indicated.
Clinical Trials: NCCN believes that the best management of any cancer patient is in a clinical trial. Participation in clinical trials is especially encouraged.

CLINICAL PRESENTATION:
Classical Hodgkin lymphoma[f]
Stage IA, IIA Favorable
(Continued from HODG-2)
PRIMARY TREATMENT[j]
ABVD alone[k]



[f]Classical Hodgkin lymphoma (HL) includes nodular sclerosis (NSHL), mixed cellularity (MCHL), lymphocyte-depleted (LDHL), and lymphocyte-rich (LRHL).
[j]Individualized treatment may be necessary for older patients and patients with concomitant disease.
[k]See Principles of Systemic Therapy (HODG-B).
[m]See Principles of Radiation Therapy (HODG-C).
[o]See Deauville PET Criteria (HODG-D).
[q]An integrated PET-CT or a PET with a diagnostic CT is recommended.
[r]Biopsy to confirm histology. Clinical circumstances may warrant additional treatment even in face of negative biopsy.
[t]Consider PFTs after 4 cycles of ABVD.

Note: All recommendations are category 2A unless otherwise indicated.
Clinical Trials: NCCN believes that the best management of any cancer patient is in a clinical trial. Participation in clinical trials is especially encouraged.

CLINICAL PRESENTATION:
Classical Hodgkin lymphoma[f]
Stage I-II Unfavorable[u] (Bulky)
Planned Combined Modality Therapy

PRIMARY TREATMENT[j]



[f]Classical Hodgkin lymphoma (HL) includes nodular sclerosis (NSHL), mixed cellularity (MCHL), lymphocyte-depleted (LDHL), and lymphocyte-rich (LRHL).

[j]Individualized treatment may be necessary for older patients and patients with concomitant disease.

[k]See Principles of Systemic Therapy (HODG-B).

[m]See Principles of Radiation Therapy (HODG-C).

[o]See Deauville PET Criteria (HODG-D).

[q]An integrated PET-CT or a PET with a diagnostic CT is recommended.

[r]Biopsy to confirm histology. Clinical circumstances may warrant additional treatment even in face of negative biopsy.

[t]Consider PFTs after 4 cycles of ABVD.

[u]NCCN Unfavorable Factors for stage I-II disease: bulky mediastinal or >10 cm disease, B symptoms, ESR >50, >3 sites of disease (see Unfavorable Factors HODG-A).

[v]The value of interim PET imaging is unclear for many clinical scenarios. All measures of response should be considered in the context of management decisions.

Note: All recommendations are category 2A unless otherwise indicated.
Clinical Trials: NCCN believes that the best management of any cancer patient is in a clinical trial. Participation in clinical trials is especially encouraged.

CLINICAL PRESENTATION:
Classical Hodgkin lymphoma[f]
Stage I-II Unfavorable[u] (Bulky)
Planned Combined Modality Therapy
PRIMARY TREATMENT[j]
(continued from HODG-4)



[f]Classical Hodgkin lymphoma (HL) includes nodular sclerosis (NSHL), mixed cellularity (MCHL), lymphocyte-depleted (LDHL), and lymphocyte-rich (LRHL).
[j]Individualized treatment may be necessary for older patients and patients with concomitant disease.
[m]See Principles of Radiation Therapy (HODG-C).
[o]See Deauville PET Criteria (HODG-D).
[q]An integrated PET-CT or a PET with a diagnostic CT is recommended.
[r]Biopsy to confirm histology. Clinical circumstances may warrant additional treatment even in face of negative biopsy.
[u]NCCN Unfavorable Factors for stage I-II disease: bulky mediastinal or >10 cm disease, B symptoms, ESR >50, >3 sites of disease (see Unfavorable Factors HODG-A).

Note: All recommendations are category 2A unless otherwise indicated.
Clinical Trials: NCCN believes that the best management of any cancer patient is in a clinical trial. Participation in clinical trials is especially encouraged.

CLINICAL PRESENTATION:
Classical Hodgkin lymphoma[f]
Stage I-II Unfavorable[u] (Bulky or Non-bulky)
PRIMARY TREATMENT[j]
(continued from HODG-4)



[f] Classical Hodgkin lymphoma (HL) includes nodular sclerosis (NSHL), mixed cellularity (MCHL), lymphocyte-depleted (LDHL), and lymphocyte-rich (LRHL).

[j] Individualized treatment may be necessary for older patients and patients with concomitant disease.

[k] See Principles of Systemic Therapy (HODG-B).

[m] See Principles of Radiation Therapy (HODG-C).

[o] See Deauville PET Criteria (HODG-D).

[q] An integrated PET-CT or a PET with a diagnostic CT is recommended.

[r] Biopsy to confirm histology. Clinical circumstances may warrant additional treatment even in face of negative biopsy.

[u] NCCN Unfavorable Factors for stage I-II disease: bulky mediastinal or >10 cm disease, B symptoms, ESR >50, >3 sites of disease (see Unfavorable Factors HODG-A).

[w] The Stanford V regimen is used in this fashion for patients with bulky mediastinal disease or >10 cm disease and/or B symptoms. Patients with elevated ESR, or >3 sites in absence of bulky disease are treated according to the Stanford V algorithm on HODG-2.

Note: All recommendations are category 2A unless otherwise indicated.
Clinical Trials: NCCN believes that the best management of any cancer patient is in a clinical trial. Participation in clinical trials is especially encouraged.

CLINICAL PRESENTATION:
Classical Hodgkin lymphoma[f]
Stage I-II Unfavorable[u]
PRIMARY TREATMENT[j]
(continued from HODG-4 and HODG-9)



[f]Classical Hodgkin lymphoma (HL) includes nodular sclerosis (NSHL), mixed cellularity (MCHL), lymphocyte-depleted (LDHL), and lymphocyte-rich (LRHL).
[j]Individualized treatment may be necessary for older patients and patients with concomitant disease.
[k]See Principles of Systemic Therapy (HODG-B).
[m]See Principles of Radiation Therapy (HODG-C).
[o]See Deauville PET Criteria (HODG-D).
[q]An integrated PET-CT or a PET with a diagnostic CT is recommended.
[r]Biopsy to confirm histology. Clinical circumstances may warrant additional treatment even in face of negative biopsy.
[u]NCCN Unfavorable Factors for stage I-II disease: bulky mediastinal or >10 cm disease, B symptoms, ESR >50, >3 sites of disease (see Unfavorable Factors HODG-A).
[v]The value of interim PET imaging is unclear for many clinical scenarios. All measures of response should be considered in the context of management decisions.
[x]Recommend PET-CT if prior PET was Deauville 3.

Note: All recommendations are category 2A unless otherwise indicated.
Clinical Trials: NCCN believes that the best management of any cancer patient is in a clinical trial. Participation in clinical trials is especially encouraged.

CLINICAL PRESENTATION:
Classical Hodgkin lymphoma[f]
Stage I-II Unfavorable[u]
PRIMARY TREATMENT[j]
(continued from HODG-7)



[f]Classical Hodgkin lymphoma (HL) includes nodular sclerosis (NSHL), mixed cellularity (MCHL), lymphocyte-depleted (LDHL), and lymphocyte-rich (LRHL).
[j]Individualized treatment may be necessary for older patients and patients with concomitant disease.
[m]See Principles of Radiation Therapy (HODG-C).
[o]See Deauville PET Criteria (HODG-D).
[q]An integrated PET-CT or a PET with a diagnostic CT is recommended.
[r]Biopsy to confirm histology. Clinical circumstances may warrant additional treatment even in face of negative biopsy.
[u]NCCN Unfavorable Factors for stage I-II disease: bulky mediastinal or >10 cm disease, B symptoms, ESR >50, >3 sites of disease (see Unfavorable Factors HODG-A).

Note: All recommendations are category 2A unless otherwise indicated.
Clinical Trials: NCCN believes that the best management of any cancer patient is in a clinical trial. Participation in clinical trials is especially encouraged.

CLINICAL PRESENTATION:
Classical Hodgkin lymphoma[f]
Stage I-II Unfavorable[u] (Non-bulky)

PRIMARY TREATMENT[j]



[f]Classical Hodgkin lymphoma (HL) includes nodular sclerosis (NSHL), mixed cellularity (MCHL), lymphocyte-depleted (LDHL), and lymphocyte-rich (LRHL).
[j]Individualized treatment may be necessary for older patients and patients with concomitant disease.
[k]See Principles of Systemic Therapy (HODG-B).
[m]See Principles of Radiation Therapy (HODG-C).
[o]See Deauville PET Criteria (HODG-D).
[q]An integrated PET-CT or a PET with a diagnostic CT is recommended.
[r]Biopsy to confirm histology. Clinical circumstances may warrant additional treatment even in face of negative biopsy.
[t]Consider PFTs after 4 cycles of ABVD.
[u]NCCN Unfavorable Factors for stage I-II disease: bulky mediastinal or >10 cm disease, B symptoms, ESR >50, >3 sites of disease (see Unfavorable Factors HODG-A).
[v]The value of interim PET imaging is unclear for many clinical scenarios. All measures of response should be considered in the context of management decisions.
[y]If observation, total 6 cycles of ABVD recommended.

Note: All recommendations are category 2A unless otherwise indicated.
Clinical Trials: NCCN believes that the best management of any cancer patient is in a clinical trial. Participation in clinical trials is especially encouraged.

CLINICAL PRESENTATION:
Classical Hodgkin lymphoma[f]
Stage I-II Unfavorable[u] (Non-bulky)
PRIMARY TREATMENT[j]
(continued from HODG-9)



[f]Classical Hodgkin lymphoma (HL) includes nodular sclerosis (NSHL), mixed cellularity (MCHL), lymphocyte-depleted (LDHL), and lymphocyte-rich (LRHL).
[j]Individualized treatment may be necessary for older patients and patients with concomitant disease.
[m]See Principles of Radiation Therapy (HODG-C).
[o]See Deauville PET Criteria (HODG-D).
[q]An integrated PET-CT or a PET with a diagnostic CT is recommended.
[r]Biopsy to confirm histology. Clinical circumstances may warrant additional treatment even in face of negative biopsy.
[s]Deauville 3 should have short interval follow-up including PET-CT.
[u]NCCN Unfavorable Factors for stage I-II disease: bulky mediastinal or >10 cm disease, B symptoms, ESR >50, >3 sites of disease (see Unfavorable Factors HODG-A).
[v]The value of interim PET imaging is unclear for many clinical scenarios. All measures of response should be considered in the context of management decisions.

Note: All recommendations are category 2A unless otherwise indicated.
Clinical Trials: NCCN believes that the best management of any cancer patient is in a clinical trial. Participation in clinical trials is especially encouraged.

CLINICAL PRESENTATION:
Classical Hodgkin lymphoma[f]
Stage III-IV

PRIMARY TREATMENT[j]



[f]Classical Hodgkin lymphoma (HL) includes nodular sclerosis (NSHL), mixed cellularity (MCHL), lymphocyte-depleted (LDHL), and lymphocyte-rich (LRHL).

[j]Individualized treatment may be necessary for older patients and patients with concomitant disease.

[k]See Principles of Systemic Therapy (HODG-B).

[m]See Principles of Radiation Therapy (HODG-C).

[o]See Deauville PET Criteria (HODG-D).

[q]An integrated PET-CT or a PET with a diagnostic CT is recommended.

[r]Biopsy to confirm histology. Clinical circumstances may warrant additional treatment even in face of negative biopsy.

[t]Consider PFTs after 4 cycles of ABVD.

[v]The value of interim PET imaging is unclear for many clinical scenarios. All measures of response should be considered in the context of management decisions.

[z]See International Prognostic Score (IPS) (HODG-A).

Note: All recommendations are category 2A unless otherwise indicated.
Clinical Trials: NCCN believes that the best management of any cancer patient is in a clinical trial. Participation in clinical trials is especially encouraged.

CLINICAL PRESENTATION:
Classical Hodgkin lymphoma[f]
Stage III-IV

PRIMARY TREATMENT[j]
(continued from HODG-11)



[f] Classical Hodgkin lymphoma (HL) includes nodular sclerosis (NSHL), mixed cellularity (MCHL), lymphocyte-depleted (LDHL), and lymphocyte-rich (LRHL).
[j] Individualized treatment may be necessary for older patients and patients with concomitant disease.
[k] See Principles of Systemic Therapy (HODG-B).
[m] See Principles of Radiation Therapy (HODG-C).
[o] See Deauville PET Criteria (HODG-D).
[q] An integrated PET-CT or a PET with a diagnostic CT is recommended.
[r] Biopsy to confirm histology. Clinical circumstances may warrant additional treatment even in face of negative biopsy.

Note: All recommendations are category 2A unless otherwise indicated.
Clinical Trials: NCCN believes that the best management of any cancer patient is in a clinical trial. Participation in clinical trials is especially encouraged.

CLINICAL PRESENTATION:
Classical Hodgkin lymphoma[f]
Stage III-IV
PRIMARY TREATMENT[j]
(continued from HODG-11)



[f]Classical Hodgkin lymphoma (HL) includes nodular sclerosis (NSHL), mixed cellularity (MCHL), lymphocyte-depleted (LDHL), and lymphocyte-rich (LRHL).

[j]Individualized treatment may be necessary for older patients and patients with concomitant disease.

[k]See Principles of Systemic Therapy (HODG-B).

[m]See Principles of Radiation Therapy (HODG-C).

[o]See Deauville PET Criteria (HODG-D).

[q]An integrated PET-CT or a PET with a diagnostic CT is recommended.

[r]Biopsy to confirm histology. Clinical circumstances may warrant additional treatment even in face of negative biopsy.

[s]Deauville 3 should have short interval follow-up including PET-CT.

Note: All recommendations are category 2A unless otherwise indicated.
Clinical Trials: NCCN believes that the best management of any cancer patient is in a clinical trial. Participation in clinical trials is especially encouraged.

CLINICAL PRESENTATION: **PRIMARY TREATMENT**

Lymphocyte-predominant Hodgkin lymphoma[g]



[g] Lymphocyte-predominant Hodgkin lymphoma (LPHL) has a different natural history and response to therapy than classical Hodgkin lymphoma, especially stages I-II. For that reason, separate guidelines are presented for LPHL.

[m] See Principles of Radiation Therapy (HODG-C).

[o] See Deauville PET Criteria (HODG-D).

[aa] Observation may be an option for stage IA patients with a completely excised solitary lymph node.

[bb] See Principles of Systemic Therapy (HODG-B 2 of 2).

[cc] Consider biopsy of persistent or new subdiaphragmatic sites to rule out transformation.

Note: All recommendations are category 2A unless otherwise indicated.
Clinical Trials: NCCN believes that the best management of any cancer patient is in a clinical trial. Participation in clinical trials is especially encouraged.

FOLLOW-UP AFTER COMPLETION OF TREATMENT AND MONITORING FOR LATE EFFECTS

- It is recommended that the patient be provided with a treatment summary at the completion of his/her therapy.
- Follow-up with an oncologist is recommended, especially during the first 5-y interval to detect recurrence, and then annually due to the risk of late complications including second cancers and cardiovascular disease.[dd,ee] Late relapse or transformation to large cell lymphoma may occur in LPHL.
- The frequency and types of tests may vary depending on clinical circumstances: age and stage at diagnosis, social habits, treatment modality, etc. There are few data to support specific recommendations; these represent the range of practice at NCCN Member Institutions.

Follow-up After Completion of Treatment up to 5 Years

- Interim H&P:
  Every 2-4 mo for 1-2 y, then every 3-6 mo for next 3-5 y
  - Annual influenza vaccine
- Laboratory studies:
  - CBC, platelets, ESR (if elevated at time of initial diagnosis), chemistry profile every 2-4 mo for 1-2 y, then every 3-6 mo for next 3-5 y
  - Thyroid-stimulating hormone (TSH) at least annually if RT to neck
- Chest x-ray or CT every 6-12 mo during first 2-3 y, then chest x-ray optional
- Abdominal/pelvic CT every 6-12 mo for first 2-3 y
- Counseling:
  Reproduction, health habits, psychosocial, cardiovascular, breast self-exam, skin cancer risk, end-of-treatment discussion.
- Surveillance PET should not be done routinely due to risk for false positives. Management decisions should not be based on PET scan alone; clinical or pathologic correlation is needed.

Suspected Relapse CHL (HODG-17) or LPHL (HODG-18)

Monitoring for Late Effects After 5 Years[dd,ee]

- Interim H&P: Annually
  - Annual blood pressure, aggressive management of cardiovascular risk factors
  - Pneumococcal, meningococcal, and H-flu revaccination after 5-7 y, if patient treated with splenic RT or previous splenectomy
  - Annual influenza vaccine
- Consider baseline stress test/echocardiogram at 10 y, especially if chest irradiation
- Consider carotid ultrasound, especially if neck irradiation
- Laboratory studies:
  - CBC, platelets, chemistry profile annually
  - TSH at least annually if RT to neck
  - Annual lipids
- Consider chest imaging for patients at increased risk for lung cancer[ff]
- Annual breast screening:
  Initiate 8-10 y post-therapy, or at age 40, whichever comes first, if chest or axillary radiation. The NCCN Hodgkin Lymphoma Guidelines Panel recommends breast MRI in addition to mammography for women who received irradiation to the chest between ages 10 and 30 y, which is consistent with the American Cancer Society Guidelines.
- Counseling:
  Reproduction, health habits, psychosocial, cardiovascular, breast self-exam, skin cancer risk.
- Cardiovascular symptoms may emerge at a young age.
- Treatment summary and consideration of transfer to PCP.

[dd] Mauch P, Ng A, Aleman B, et al. Report from the Rockefeller Foundation sponsored International Workshop on reducing mortality and improving quality of life in long-term survivors of Hodgkin's disease: July 9-16, 2003, Bellagio, Italy. Eur J Haematol 2005;75(s66).

[ee] Appropriate medical management should be instituted for any abnormalities.

[ff] Chest imaging optional after 5 y if patient treated with a non-alkylating agent, no RT to the chest, and no other risk factors are present.

Note: All recommendations are category 2A unless otherwise indicated.
Clinical Trials: NCCN believes that the best management of any cancer patient is in a clinical trial. Participation in clinical trials is especially encouraged.



[m] See Principles of Radiation Therapy (HODG-C).
[r] Biopsy to confirm histology. Clinical circumstances may warrant additional treatment even in face of negative biopsy.
[o] See Deauville PET Criteria (HODG-D).
[s] Deauville 3 should have short interval follow-up including PET-CT.
[gg] There are no data to support a superior outcome with any of the treatment modalities. Individualized treatment is recommended.
[hh] See Principles of Second-Line Chemotherapy (HODG-E).
[ii] Conventional-dose chemotherapy may precede high-dose therapy. Timing of RT may vary.
[jj] Radiation therapy recommended when sites have not been previously irradiated. In a radiation-naive patient, TLI may be an appropriate component of HDT.
[kk] Allotransplant is an option in select patients as a category 3 recommendation.
[ll] Brentuximab vedotin is a treatment option for patients who have failed HDT/ASCR or at least 2 prior multi-agent chemotherapy regimens.

Note: All recommendations are category 2A unless otherwise indicated.
Clinical Trials: NCCN believes that the best management of any cancer patient is in a clinical trial. Participation in clinical trials is especially encouraged.

CLASSICAL HODGKIN LYMPHOMA
SUSPECTED RELAPSE



[m] See Principles of Radiation Therapy (HODG-C).
[o] See Deauville PET Criteria (HODG-D).
[s] Deauville 3 should have short interval follow-up including PET-CT.
[gg] There are no data to support a superior outcome with any of the treatment modalities. Individualized treatment is recommended.
[hh] See Principles of Second-Line Chemotherapy (HODG-E).
[ii] Conventional-dose chemotherapy may precede high-dose therapy. Timing of RT may vary.
[jj] Radiation therapy recommended when sites have not been previously irradiated. In a radiation-naive patient, TLI may be an appropriate component of HDT.
[kk] Allotransplant is an option in select patients as a category 3 recommendation.
[mm] Clinical circumstances may warrant additional treatment even in face of negative biopsy.
[nn] For select patients with long disease-free interval and other favorable features; selection of chemotherapy should be individualized.

Note: All recommendations are category 2A unless otherwise indicated.
Clinical Trials: NCCN believes that the best management of any cancer patient is in a clinical trial. Participation in clinical trials is especially encouraged.



[m] See Principles of Radiation Therapy (HODG-C).
[o] See Deauville PET Criteria (HODG-D).
[s] Deauville 3 should have short interval follow-up including PET-CT.
[gg] There are no data to support a superior outcome with any of the treatment modalities. Individualized treatment is recommended.
[hh] See Principles of Second-Line Chemotherapy (HODG-E).
[nn] Some patients with LPHL have a chronic indolent course that may not require aggressive re-treatment. These asymptomatic patients may be observed. At relapse, patient should be considered for re-biopsy because of risk for transformation.
[mm] In some patients treated with rituximab alone, maintenance rituximab may be considered for 2 years.

Note: All recommendations are category 2A unless otherwise indicated.
Clinical Trials: NCCN believes that the best management of any cancer patient is in a clinical trial. Participation in clinical trials is especially encouraged.

Examples of Unfavorable Risk Factors for Stage I-II Hodgkin Disease

Risk Factor	GHSG	EORTC	NCIC	NCCN
Age		≥50	≥40	
Histology			MC or LD	
ESR and B symptoms	>50 if A; >30 if B	>50 if A; >30 if B	>50 or any B sx	>50 or any B sx
Mediastinal mass	MMR > .33	MTR > .35	MMR > .33 or > 10 cm	MMR > .33
# Nodal sites	>2*	>3**	>3	>3
E lesion	any			
Bulky				>10 cm

GHSG = German Hodgkin Study Group
EORTC = European Organization for the Research and Treatment of Cancer
NCIC = National Cancer Institute, Canada
MC = Mixed cellularity
LD = Lymphocyte depleted
MMR = Mediastinal mass ratio, maximum width of mass/maximum intrathoracic diameter
MTR = Mediastinal thoracic ratio, maximum width of mediastinal mass/intrathoracic diameter at T5-6

*The GHSG definition of nodal sites differs from the Ann Arbor System in that the infraclavicular region is included with the ipsilateral cervical/supraclavicular, the bilateral hila are included with the mediastinum, and the abdomen is divided into 2 regions, upper (spleen hilum, liver hilum, celiac) and lower.

**The EORTC definition of nodal sites differs from the Ann Arbor System in that the infraclavicular region is included with the ipsilateral axilla and the bilateral hila is included with the mediastinum.

International Prognostic Score (IPS) 1 point per factor (advanced disease)[1]

- **Albumin < 4 g/dL**
- **Hemoglobin < 10.5 g/dL**
- **Male**
- **Age ≥45 years**
- **Stage IV disease**
- **Leukocytosis (white blood cell count at least 15,000/mm^3)**
- **Lymphocytopenia (lymphocyte count less than 8% of white blood cell count, and/or lymphocyte count less than 600/mm^3)**

[1] Derived from Hasenclever D, Diehl V. A prognostic score for advanced Hodgkin's disease: International Prognostic Factors Project on Advanced Hodgkin's Disease. N Engl J Med 1998;339:1506-1514.

Note: All recommendations are category 2A unless otherwise indicated.
Clinical Trials: NCCN believes that the best management of any cancer patient is in a clinical trial. Participation in clinical trials is especially encouraged.

PRINCIPLES OF SYSTEMIC THERAPY (1 of 2)

Classical Hodgkin Lymphoma

- **The most common variants of chemotherapy used at NCCN Member Institutions include ABVD and Stanford V. Routine use of growth factors is not recommended. Leukopenia is not a factor for delay of treatment or reduction of dose intensity (except for escalated BEACOPP).**

Regimens and References

ABVD (doxorubicin, bleomycin, vinblastine, and dacarbazine) ± RT

Eich HT, Diehl V, Gorgen H, et al. Intensified chemotherapy and dose-reduced involved-field radiotherapy in patients with early unfavorable Hodgkin's lymphoma: final analysis of the German Hodgkin Study Group HD 11 trial. J Clin Oncol 2010;28:4199-4206.

Engert A, Plutschow A, Eich HT, et al. Reduced treatment intensity in patients with early-stage Hodgkin's lymphoma. N Engl J Med 2010;363:640-652.

Meyer RM, Gospodarowicz MK, Connors JM, et al. Randomized comparison of ABVD chemotherapy with a strategy that includes radiation therapy in patients with limited-stage Hodgkin's lymphoma: National Cancer Institute of Canada Clinical Trials Group and the Eastern Cooperative Oncology Group. J Clin Oncol. 2005;23(21):4634-4642.

Bonadonna G, Bonfante V, Viviani S, Di Russo A, Villani F, Valagussa P. ABVD plus subtotal nodal versus involved-field radiotherapy in early-stage Hodgkin's disease: Long-Term Results. J Clin Oncol 2004;22(14):2835-2841.

Duggan DB, Petroni GR, Johnson JL, et al. Randomized comparison of ABVD and MOPP/ABV hybrid for the treatment of advanced Hodgkin's disease: Report of an Intergroup Trial. J Clin Oncol. 2003;21(4):607-614.

Stanford V (doxorubicin, vinblastine, mechlorethamine, etoposide, vincristine, bleomycin, and prednisone)*

Gordon LI, Hong F, Fisher RI, et al. Randomized Phase III Trial of ABVD Versus Stanford V With or Without Radiation Therapy in Locally Extensive and Advanced-Stage Hodgkin Lymphoma: An Intergroup Study Coordinated by the Eastern Cooperative Oncology Group (E2496). J Clin Oncol 2013;31:684-691.

Advani RH, Hoppe RT, Baer D, et al. Efficacy of abbreviated Stanford V chemotherapy and involved-field radiotherapy in early-stage Hodgkin lymphoma: mature results of the G4 trial. Ann Oncol 2013;24:1044-1048.

Edwards-Bennett SM, Jacks LM, Moskowitz CH, et al. Stanford V program for locally extensive and advanced Hodgkin lymphoma: the Memorial Sloan-Kettering Cancer Center experience. Ann Oncol 2010;21:574-581.

Horning SJ, Hoppe RT, Breslin S, Bartlett NL, Brown BW, Rosenberg SA. Stanford V and radiotherapy for locally extensive and advanced Hodgkin's disease: mature results of a prospective clinical trial. J Clin Oncol. 2002;20(3):630-637.

BEACOPP (bleomycin, etoposide, doxorubicin, cyclophosphamide, vincristine, procarbazine, and prednisone)

Engert A, Diehl V, Franklin J, et al. Escalated-dose BEACOPP in the treatment of patients with advanced-stage Hodgkin's lymphoma: 10 years of follow-up of the GHSG HD9 study. J Clin Oncol 2009;27:4548-4554.

BEACOPP followed by ABVD with RT

von Tresckow B, Plutschow A, Fuchs M, et al. Dose-intensification in early unfavorable Hodgkin's lymphoma: Final analysis of the German Hodgkin Study Group HD14 Trial. J Clin Oncol 2012:30:907-913.

*Cyclophosphamide may be used as an alternate to nitrogen mustard.

See Principles of Chemotherapy for LPHL (HODG-B 2 of 2)

See Principles of Second-line Chemotherapy (HODG-E)

Note: All recommendations are category 2A unless otherwise indicated.
Clinical Trials: NCCN believes that the best management of any cancer patient is in a clinical trial. Participation in clinical trials is especially encouraged.

PRINCIPLES OF SYSTEMIC THERAPY (2 of 2)

Lymphocyte-Predominant Hodgkin Lymphoma[1]

- **The most common chemotherapies used at NCCN Member Institutions for LPHL are listed below.**

Regimens and References

ABVD (doxorubicin, bleomycin, vinblastine, dacarbazine) ± rituximab

Savage KJ, Skinnider B, Al-Mansour M, et al. Treating limited stage nodular lymphocyte predominant Hodgkin lymphoma similarly to classical Hodgkin lymphoma with ABVD may improve outcome. Blood 2011;118:4585-4590.

Canellos GP, Mauch P. What is the appropriate systemic chemotherapy for lymphocyte-predominant Hodgkin's Lymphoma? J Clin Oncol 2010;28:e8.

CHOP (cyclophosphamide, doxorubicin, vincristine, prednisone) ± rituximab

Fanale MA, Lai C-M, McLaughlin P, et al. Outcomes of Nodular Lymphocyte Predominant Hodgkin's Lymphoma (NLPHL) Patients Treated with R-CHOP. ASH Annual Meeting Abstracts 2010;116:2812.

CVP (cyclophosphamide, vincristine, prednisone) ± rituximab

EPOCH (cyclophosphamide, doxorubicin, etoposide, vincristine, prednisone) ± rituximab

Single-agent rituximab

Ekstrand BC, Lucas JB, Horwitz SM, et al. Rituximab in lymphocyte-predominant Hodgkin disease: results of a phase 2 trial. Blood. 2003;101(11):4285-4289.

Schulz H, Rehwald U, Morschhauser F, et al. Rituximab in relapsed lymphocyte-predominant Hodgkin lymphoma: long-term results of a phase 2 trial by the German Hodgkin Lymphoma Study Group (GHSG). Blood 2008;111(1):109-111.

Horning SJ, Bartlett NL, Breslin S, et al. Results of a Prospective Phase II Trial of Limited and Extended Rituximab Treatment in Nodular Lymphocyte Predominant Hodgkin's Disease (NLPHD). ASH Annual Meeting Abstracts. 2007;110:644.

Eichenauer DA, Fuchs M, Pluetschow A, et al. Phase 2 study of rituximab in newly diagnosed stage IA nodular lymphocyte-predominant Hodgkin lymphoma: a report from the German Hodgkin Study Group. Blood 2011;118:4363-4365.

[1] Ongoing clinical trials will help to clarify the role of a watch-and-wait strategy or systemic therapy, including anthracycline (epirubicin or doxorubicin), bleomycin, and vinblastine-based chemotherapy or antibody-based approaches, in the treatment of these patients.

Note: All recommendations are category 2A unless otherwise indicated.
Clinical Trials: NCCN believes that the best management of any cancer patient is in a clinical trial. Participation in clinical trials is especially encouraged.

PRINCIPLES OF RADIATION THERAPY

Treatment with photons, electrons, or protons may all be appropriate, depending on clinical circumstances.

Fields: Radiation oncologists have begun to endorse the concept of "involved site" radiation therapy (ISRT) as an alternative to "involved field" radiation therapy (IFRT).

- **Planning for ISRT requires modern CT-based simulation and planning capabilities. The incorporation of other additional imaging techniques, such as PET and MRI, often enhances treatment planning.**
- **ISRT targets the site of the originally involved lymph node(s) and possible extranodal extension. The field encompasses the pre-chemotherapy and/or surgical volume, yet it spares adjacent uninvolved organs (such as lungs, bone, muscle, or kidney) when lymphadenopathy regresses following chemotherapy.**
- **The pre-chemotherapy or pre-biopsy gross tumor volume (GTV) provides the basis for determining the clinical target volume (CTV). Concerns for questionable subclinical disease and uncertainties in original imaging accuracy or localization may lead to expansion of the CTV and are determined individually based upon clinical judgment. Possible movement of the target by respiration as determined by 4D-CT or fluoroscopy (internal target volume, ITV) should also influence the final CTV.**
- **The planning target volume (PTV) is an additional expansion of the CTV that accounts only for setup variations (see ICRU definitions).**
- **Organs at risk (OARs) should be outlined for optimizing treatment plan decisions.**
- **The treatment plan is designed using conventional, 3-D conformal, or IMRT techniques using clinical treatment planning considerations of coverage and dose reductions for OAR.**

Dose:
Combined Modality Therapy
Non-bulky disease (stage I-II): 20*-30 Gy (if treated with ABVD), 30 Gy (if treated with Stanford V)
Non-bulky disease (stage IB-IIB): 30-36 Gy
Bulky disease sites (all stages): 30-36 Gy

RT Alone (uncommon, except for LPHL):
Involved regions: 30-36 Gy (the dose of 30 Gy is mainly used for LPHL)
Uninvolved regions: 25-30 Gy

***A dose of 20 Gy following ABVD x 2 is sufficient if the patient has non-bulky stage I-IIA disease with an ESR < 50, no extralymphatic lesions, and only one or two lymph node regions involved. See HODG-A for definition of nodal sites according to GHSG.**

Note: All recommendations are category 2A unless otherwise indicated.
Clinical Trials: NCCN believes that the best management of any cancer patient is in a clinical trial. Participation in clinical trials is especially encouraged.

DEAUVILLE PET CRITERIA

Score	PET/CT scan result
1	No uptake above background
2	Uptake ≤ mediastinum
3	Uptake > mediastinum but ≤ liver
4	Uptake moderately increased compared to the liver at any site
5	Uptake markedly increased compared to liver at any site
X	New areas of uptake unlikely to be related to lymphoma

With kind permission from Springer Science + Business Media: Barrington SF, Qian W, Somer EJ, et al. Concordance between four European centres of PET reporting criteria designed for use in multicentre trials in Hodgkin lymphoma. Eur J Nucl Med Mol Imaging 2010:37:1824-1833.

Note: All recommendations are category 2A unless otherwise indicated.
Clinical Trials: NCCN believes that the best management of any cancer patient is in a clinical trial. Participation in clinical trials is especially encouraged.

PRINCIPLES OF SECOND-LINE CHEMOTHERAPY (1 of 2)

- **The selection of second-line chemotherapy regimens depends on the pattern of relapse and the agents previously used.**
- **Some studies have suggested that patients with minimal disease burden at relapse (not refractory) may not need additional treatment prior to high-dose chemotherapy with stem-cell rescue.[1-3] However, patients tend to have an improved outcome when transplanted in a minimal disease state.[4] Thus, cytoreduction with chemotherapy before high-dose chemotherapy with stem-cell rescue may be beneficial. In addition, second-line chemotherapy serves as a test for drug sensitivity and to facilitate the harvest of stem cells.**
  Nitrogen mustard, procarbazine, carmustine, and melphalan may adversely affect both quality and quantity of stem-cell collection.
- **Rituximab should be considered with all regimens for relapsed LPHL.**

See Regimens and References (HODG-E 2 of 2)

[1] Sweetenham JW, Taghipour G, Milligan D, et al. High-dose therapy and autologous stem cell rescue for patients with Hodgkin's disease in first relapse after chemotherapy: results from the EBMT. Lymphoma Working Party of the European Group for Blood and Marrow Transplantation. 1997;20(9):745-52.

[2] Bierman PJ, Anderson JR, Freeman MB, et al. High-dose chemotherapy followed by autologous hematopoietic rescue for Hodgkin's disease patients following first relapse after chemotherapy. Ann Oncol 1996;7(2):151-6.

[3] Chopra R, McMillan AK, Linch DC, et al. The place of high-dose BEAM therapy and autologous bone marrow transplantation in poor-risk Hodgkin's disease. A single-center eight-year study of 155 patients. Blood 1993;81:1137-45.

[4] Stewart DA, Guo D, Gluck S, et al. Double high-dose therapy for Hodgkin's disease with dose-intensive cyclophosphamide, etoposide, and cisplatin (DICEP) prior to high-dose melphalan and autologous stem cell transplantation. Bone Marrow Transplant 2000;26(4):383-8.

Note: All recommendations are category 2A unless otherwise indicated.
Clinical Trials: NCCN believes that the best management of any cancer patient is in a clinical trial. Participation in clinical trials is especially encouraged.

PRINCIPLES OF SECOND-LINE CHEMOTHERAPY (2 of 2)
Regimens and References
(listed in alphabetical order)

Bendamustine
Moskowitz AJ, Hamlin PA, Perales M-A, et al. Phase II study of bendamustine in relapsed and refractory Hodgkin lymphoma. J Clin Oncol. 2013;31:456-460.

Brentuximab
Younes A, Bartlett NL, Leonard JP, et al. Brentuximab Vedotin (SGN-35) for Relapsed CD30-Positive Lymphomas. N Engl J Med 2010;363:1812-1821.
Younes A, Gopal AK, Smith SE, et al. Results of a Pivotal Phase II Study of Brentuximab Vedotin for Patients With Relapsed or Refractory Hodgkin's Lymphoma. J Clin Oncol 2012;30:2183-2189.

ChlVPP (chlorambucil, vinblastine, procarbazine, prednisone)
The International ChlVPP Treatment Group. ChlVPP therapy for Hodgkin's disease: Experience of 960 patients. Ann Oncol 1995;6(2):167-172.

C-MOPP (cyclophosphamide, vincristine, procarbazine, prednisone)
Takenaka T, Mikuni C, Miura A, et al. Alternating Combination Chemotherapy C-MOPP (Cyclophosphamide, Vincristine, Procarbazine, Prednisone) and ABVD (Adriamycin, Bleomycin, Vinblastine, Dacarbazine) in Clinical Stage II-IV Hodgkin's Disease: a Multicenter Phase II Study (JCOG 8905). Jpn J Clin Oncol 2000;30(3):146-152.
Montoto S, Camos M, Lopez-Guillermo A, et al. Hybrid chemotherapy consisting of cyclophosphamide, vincristine, procarbazine, prednisone, doxorubicin, bleomycin, and vinblastine (C-MOPP/ABV) as first-line treatment Hodgkin disease. Cancer 2000;88(9):2142-2148.

DHAP (dexamethasone, cisplatin, high-dose cytarabine)
Josting A, Rudolph C, Reiser M, et al. Time-intensified dexamethasone/cisplatin/cytarabine: an effective salvage therapy with low toxicity in patients with relapsed and refractory Hodgkin's disease. Ann Oncol 2002;13(10):1628-1635.
Abali H, Urün Y, Oksüzoğlu B, Budakoğlu B, et al. Comparison of ICE (ifosfamide-carboplatin-etoposide) versus DHAP (cytosine arabinoside-cisplatin-dexamethasone) as salvage chemotherapy in patients with relapsed or refractory lymphoma. Cancer Invest 2008;26(4):401-406.

ESHAP (etoposide, methylprednisolone, high-dose cytarabine and cisplatin)
Aparicio J, Segura A, Garcera S, et al. ESHAP is an active regimen for relapsing Hodgkin's disease. Ann Oncol 1999;10(5):593-595.
Akhtar S, Abdelsalam M, El Weshi A, et al. High-dose chemotherapy and autologous stem cell transplantation for Hodgkin's lymphoma in the kingdom of Saudi Arabia: King Faisal specialist hospital and research center experience. Bone Marrow Transplant 2008;42 Suppl 1:S37-S40.
Fernández de Larrea C, Martínez C, et al. Salvage chemotherapy with alternating MINE-ESHAP regimen in relapsed or refractory Hodgkin's lymphoma followed by autologous stem cell transplantation. Ann Oncol 2010;21(6):1211-1216.

GCD (gemcitabine, carboplatin, dexamethasone)
Gopal AK, Press OW, Shustov AR, et al. Efficacy and safety of gemicitabine, carboplatin, dexamethasone, and rituximab in patients with relapsed/refractory lymphoma: a prospective multi-center phase II study by Puget Sound Oncology Consortium. Leuk Lymphoma 2010;51:1523-1529.

GVD (gemcitabine, vinorelbine, liposomal doxorubicin)
Bartlett N, Niedzwiecki D, Johnson J, et al. Gemcitabine, vinorelbine, and pegylated liposomal doxorubicin (GVD), a salvage regimen in relapsed Hodgkin's lymphoma: CALGB 59804. Ann Oncol 2007;18(6):1071-1079.

ICE (ifosfamide, carboplatin, etoposide)
Moskowitz CH, Nimer SD, Zelenetz AD, et al. A 2-step comprehensive high-dose chemoradiotherapy second-line program for relapsed and refractory Hodgkin disease: analysis by intent to treat and development of a prognostic model. Blood 2001;97(3):616-623.
Abali H, Urün Y, Oksüzoğlu B, Budakoğlu B, et al. Comparison of ICE (ifosfamide-carboplatin-etoposide) versus DHAP (cytosine arabinoside-cisplatin-dexamethasone) as salvage chemotherapy in patients with relapsed or refractory lymphoma. Cancer Invest 2008;26(4):401-406.

IGEV (ifosfamide, gemcitabine, vinorelbine)
Santoro A, Magagnoli M, Spina M, et al. Ifosfamide, gemcitabine, and vinorelbine: a new induction regimen for refractory and relapsed Hodgkin's lymphoma. Haematologica 2007;92(1):35-41.

Mini-BEAM (carmustine, cytarabine, etoposide, melphalan)
Colwill R, Crump M, Couture F, et al. Mini-BEAM as salvage therapy for relapsed or refractory Hodgkin's disease before intensive therapy and autologous bone marrow transplantation. J Clin Oncol 1995;13:396-402.
Martín A, Fernández-Jiménez MC, Caballero MD, et al. Long-term follow-up in patients treated with Mini-BEAM as salvage therapy for relapsed or refractory Hodgkin's disease. Br J Haematol 2001;113(1):161-171.

MINE (etoposide, ifosfamide, mesna, mitoxantrone)
Rodriguez MA, Cabanillas FC, Hagemeister FB, et al. A phase II trial of mesna/ifosfamide, mitoxantrone and etoposide for refractory lymphoms. Ann Oncol 1995;6(6):609-611.

VIM-D (etoposide, ifosfamide, mitoxantrone, and dexamethasone).
Phillips JK, Spearing RL, Davies JM, et al. VIM-D salvage chemotherapy in Hodgkin's disease. Cancer Chemother Pharmacol 1990;27(2):161-3.

Note: All recommendations are category 2A unless otherwise indicated.
Clinical Trials: NCCN believes that the best management of any cancer patient is in a clinical trial. Participation in clinical trials is especially encouraged.

Table 1

Definitions of Stages in Hodgkin's Disease[1]

Stage I Involvement of a single lymph node region (I) or localized involvement of a single extralymphatic organ or site (I_E).

Stage II Involvement of two or more lymph node regions on the same side of the diaphragm (II) or localized involvement of a single associated extralymphatic organ or site and its regional lymph node(s), with or without involvement of other lymph node regions on the same side of the diaphragm (II_E).

Note: The number of lymph node regions involved may be indicated by a subscript (eg, II_3).

Stage III Involvement of lymph node regions on both sides of the diaphragm (III), which may also be accompanied by localized involvement of an associated extralymphatic organ or site (IIIE), by involvement of the spleen (III_S), or by both (III_{E+S}).

Stage IV Disseminated (multifocal) involvement of one or more extralymphatic organs, with or without associated lymph node involvement, or isolated extralymphatic organ involvement with distant (nonregional) nodal involvement.

A No systemic symptoms present
B Unexplained fevers >38°C; drenching night sweats; or weight loss >10% of body weight (within 6 months prior to diagnosis)

Adapted from **Carbone PP, Kaplan HS, Musshoff K, et al. Report of the Committee on Hodgkin's Disease Staging Classification. Cancer Res 1971;31(11):1860-1.**

[1] PET scans are useful for upstaging in Stage I-II disease. If there is PET positivity outside of disease already identified, further clinical investigation is recommended to confirm or refute the observation. PET scans are usually positive in patients with HIV infection, even in the absence of Hodgkin lymphoma.

Discussion

NCCN Categories of Evidence and Consensus

Category 1: Based upon high-level evidence, there is uniform NCCN consensus that the intervention is appropriate.

Category 2A: Based upon lower-level evidence, there is uniform NCCN consensus that the intervention is appropriate.

Category 2B: Based upon lower-level evidence, there is NCCN consensus that the intervention is appropriate.

Category 3: Based upon any level of evidence, there is major NCCN disagreement that the intervention is appropriate.

All recommendations are category 2A unless otherwise noted.

Table of Contents

Overview **2**

Staging and Prognosis **2**

Response Criteria **3**

Role of PET Scans **4**

Interim PET Scans 4

Stage IA-IIA (Favorable Disease) *5*

Stage I-II (Unfavorable Disease) and Stage III-IV Disease *6*

Principles of Radiation Therapy **7**

Treatment Guidelines **8**

Diagnosis 8

Workup 8

Classical Hodgkin Lymphoma 9

Stage I-II Favorable Disease *9*

Stage I-II Unfavorable Disease *12*

Stage III-IV *15*

Lymphocyte-Predominant Hodgkin Lymphoma 18

Follow-up after Completion of Treatment 21

Monitoring for Late Effects 22

Secondary Cancers *22*

Cardiovascular Disease *22*

Hypothyroidism *22*

Myelosuppression *23*

Pulmonary Toxicity *23*

Refractory or Relapsed Disease 23

Classical Hodgkin Lymphoma *23*

Lymphocyte-Predominant Hodgkin Lymphoma *26*

Summary **26**

References **28**

Overview

Hodgkin lymphoma (HL) is an uncommon malignancy involving lymph nodes and the lymphatic system. Most patients are diagnosed between 15 and 30 years of age, followed by another peak in adults aged 55 years or older. In 2013, an estimated 9,290 people will be diagnosed with HL in the United States and 1,180 people will die from the disease.[1]

The WHO classification divides HL into 2 main types: lymphocyte-predominant Hodgkin lymphoma (LPHL) and classical Hodgkin lymphoma (CHL).[2] CHL is divided into 4 subtypes: nodular sclerosis CHL (NSCHL); mixed cellularity CHL (MCCHL); lymphocyte-depleted CHL (LDCHL); and lymphocyte-rich CHL (LRCHL). In Western countries, CHL accounts for 95% and LPHL accounts for 5% of all HL.

CHL is characterized by the presence of Reed-Sternberg cells in an inflammatory background, whereas LPHL lacks Reed-Sternberg cells but it is characterized by the presence of lymphocyte-predominant cells, sometimes termed *popcorn cells*. LPHL can have a nodular or diffuse pattern. The nodular subtype has lymphocyte-predominant cells embedded in a background predominantly composed of B lymphocytes, whereas the diffuse subtype has a background consisting mainly of T-cells.

The past few decades have seen a significant progress in the management of patients with HL; it is now curable in at least 80% of patients. The advent of more effective treatment options has improved the 5-year survival rates that are unmatched in any other cancer over the past 4 decades. Every patient with newly diagnosed HL has an overwhelming likelihood of being cured with the appropriate treatment. In fact, cure rates for HL have increased so markedly that overriding of treatment considerations often relate to long-term toxicity, especially for patients with early- or intermediate-stage disease. Clinical trials still emphasize improvement in cure rates for patients with advanced disease, but the potential long-term effects of treatment remain an important consideration.

The NCCN Guidelines discuss the clinical management of patients with CHL and LPHL, focusing exclusively on patients from post adolescence through the seventh decade of life who do not have serious intercurrent disease. The guidelines do not address HL in pediatric or older patients or those with unusual situations, such as HIV positivity or pregnancy. Individualized treatment may be necessary for older patients and those with concomitant disease. Consistent with NCCN philosophy, participation in clinical trials is always encouraged.

Staging and Prognosis

Staging for HL is based on the Ann Arbor staging system. Patients with HL are usually classified into 3 groups: early-stage favorable (stage I-II with no unfavorable factors); early-stage unfavorable (stage I-II with any of the unfavorable factors such as large mediastinal adenopathy, B symptoms; numerous sites of disease; or significantly elevated erythrocyte sedimentation rate [ESR]), and advanced-stage disease (stage III-IV). Each stage is subdivided into A and B categories. “A” indicates that no systemic symptoms are present and “B” is assigned to patients with unexplained weight loss of more than 10% of their body weight, unexplained fevers, or drenching night sweats.[3]

Mediastinal bulk is an unfavorable prognostic factor in patients with early-stage HL. Mediastinal bulk on chest radiograph is measured most commonly using the mediastinal mass ratio (MMR).[4] The MMR is the ratio of the maximum width of the mass and the maximum intrathoracic diameter. Any mass with MMR greater than 0.33 is defined as bulky

disease. Another definition of bulk is any single node or nodal mass that is 10 cm or greater in diameter. According to the Cotsworld modification of the Ann Arbor staging system, bulky disease is defined as a mediastinal mass exceeding one third of the internal transverse diameter of the thorax at the T5-T6 interspace on a posteroanterior chest radiograph.[5]

Other unfavorable prognostic factors for patients with stage I and stage II disease include the presence of B symptoms, more than 2 to 3 nodal sites of disease, or an ESR of 50 or more. These factors are based largely on the definition of unfavorable prognostic groups from the clinical trials conducted by the EORTC, German Hodgkin Study Group (GHSG), and the National Cancer Institute of Canada (NCIC).[6,7] The NCCN unfavorable factors for stage I-II disease include bulky mediastinal disease (MMR greater than 0.33) or bulky disease greater than 10 cm, B symptoms, ESR greater than 50, and more than 3 nodal sites of disease.

An international collaborative effort evaluating more than 5000 patients with advanced HL (stage III-IV) identified 7 adverse prognostic factors, each of which reduced survival rates by 7% to 8% per year:[8]

- Age 45 years or older
- Male gender
- Stage IV disease
- Albumin level below 4 g/dL
- Hemoglobin level below 10.5 g/dL
- Leucocytosis (white blood cell count more than 15,000/mm^3)
- Lymphocytopenia (lymphocyte count less than 8% of the white blood count and/or lymphocyte count less than 600/mm^3)

The International Prognostic Score (IPS) is defined by the number of adverse prognostic factors present at diagnosis.[8] IPS helps to determine the clinical management and predict prognosis for patients with stage III-IV disease. For instance, selected patients with IPS <3 and advanced disease could be treated with Stanford V (doxorubicin, vinblastine, mechlorethamine, etoposide, vincristine, bleomycin, and prednisone) while escalated-dose BEACOPP (bleomycin, etoposide, doxorubicin, cyclophosphamide, vincristine, procarbazine, and prednisone), or ABVD (doxorubicin bleomycin, vinblastine, and dacarbazine) may be more appropriate for all other patients with stage III-IV disease.

Response Criteria

Clinical management of patients with HL involves initial treatment with chemotherapy or combined modality therapy, followed by restaging at the completion of chemotherapy to assess treatment response. Assessment of response to initial treatment is essential because the need for additional treatment is based on the treatment response.

The International Working Group (IWG) published the guidelines for response criteria in 1999.[9] These criteria are based on the size reduction of enlarged lymph nodes as measured on CT scan, and the extent of bone marrow involvement determined using bone marrow aspirate and biopsy. The original response criteria included CRu (complete response uncertain), indicating that it was not possible to determine whether residual masses identified on CT scan represented residual HL, scarring, or some other nonmalignant process.

In 2007, the IWG guidelines were revised by the International Harmonization Project (IHP) to incorporate immunohistochemistry, flow cytometry, and PET scans in the definition of response.[10,11] The revised guidelines eliminated CRu based partly on the ability of PET scans to

further characterize residual masses detected with CT. Using the revised system, response is categorized as complete response (CR), partial response (PR), stable disease, relapsed disease, or progressive disease.[10] The IHP response criteria were initially developed for the interpretation of PET scans at the completion of treatment. In recent years, these criteria have also been used for interim response assessment.[12]

In 2009, the Deauville criteria were defined for the interpretation of interim and end-of-treatment PET scans based on the visual assessment of FDG uptake in the involved sites. These criteria use a 5-point scale to determine the FDG uptake in the involved sites relative to that of the mediastinum and the liver.[13,14] PET scans with a score of 1 or 2 are considered "negative" and PET scans with a score of 4 and 5 are considered "positive".[15] In some situations, a score of 3 may be considered negative", however, for de-escalation of therapy based on interim PET scans, a threshold for positivity that includes Deauville 3 using the mediastinal blood pool uptake as the reference is appropriate (ie. PET scans with a score of Deauville 1-2 are considered negative and PET scans with a score of Deauville 3-5 are considered positive).[16] The Deauville 5-point criteria are being validated in international multicenter trials for PET-guided interim response assessment and risk-adapted therapy in patients with HL.[16,17]

Role of PET Scans

PET imaging and, more recently, integrated PET and CT (PET/CT, hereafter referred to as PET) has become an important tool for initial staging and response assessment at the completion of treatment in patients with HL.[12] In a recent meta-analysis, PET scans showed high positivity and specificity when used to stage and restage patients with lymphoma.[18] PET positivity at the end of treatment has been shown to be a significant adverse risk factor in patients with early-stage as well as advanced-stage disease.[19-21] In a study of 73 patients (the majority of whom had stage I-IIA disease), Sher et al reported that the actuarial 2-year failure-free survival (FFS) rate was 95% for those who were PET-negative at the end of chemotherapy, and 69% for the PET-positive group.[21] In the HD15 trial, positive PET after chemotherapy with BEACOPP was associated with a higher risk of subsequent treatment failure. The progression-free-survival (PFS) at 48 months was 92.6% and 82.6%, respectively, for PET-negative and PET-positive patients (P = .022).[22] In this study, PET-positive patients received radiation therapy (RT) to the PET-positive sites.

The NCCN PET/CT Task Force and the NCCN Guidelines recommend PET scans for initial staging and for evaluating residual masses at the end of treatment.[23] An integrated PET scan plus a diagnostic CT is recommended, although a separate diagnostic CT is not needed if it was part of the integrated PET scan.

PET scans are not recommended for routine surveillance due to the risk of false positives.[24-26] The role of PET in post-therapy surveillance remains controversial, and further studies are needed to determine its role.

Interim PET Scans

PET scans are increasingly being used to assess treatment response during therapy. Interim PET scans after completion of chemotherapy are essential for RT planning in patients receiving combined modality therapy and they may also be useful to identify a subgroup of patients with early-stage disease that can be treated with chemotherapy alone.[27,28] The NCCN Guidelines emphasize that the value of interim PET scans remains unclear for many clinical scenarios and all

measures of response should be considered in the context of management decisions.

Stage IA-IIA (Favorable Disease)

Available evidence, primarily from retrospective studies, suggests that interim PET imaging is not of prognostic significance in patients with early-stage disease.

Hutchings et al reported that five of seven (71%) patients with stage I-II disease who had a positive interim PET scan remained in remission at a median follow-up of 3 years, whereas all patients with advanced disease (stage III-IV) with a positive PET scan had relapsed within 2 years.[29]

In another study that included a majority of patients with stage I-IIA disease (43 out of 73), the actuarial 2-year FFS rate was 95% for those who were PET-negative at the end of chemotherapy, and was 69% for the PET-positive group.[21] However, among the 46 patients who underwent interim PET imaging after 2 or 3 cycles of chemotherapy, 20 patients had positive interim PET scans and 13 of these 20 patients (65%) had negative PET scans at the completion of chemotherapy. The actuarial 2-year FFS rate was 92% for this group compared to 96% for patients with negative PET scans during and after completion of chemotherapy.

Barnes et al also showed that interim PET scans did not predict outcome in patients with non-bulky stage I-II disease. The 4-year PFS rate was 91% for those with a negative interim PET scan and 87% for those with a positive interim PET (P = .57).[30]

In a recent prospective study (CALGB 50203), Straus et al reported that although both interim and end-of-treatment PET scans were predictive of outcome in patients with stage I-II non-bulky disease treated with doxorubicin, vinblastine and gemcitabine (AVG), the difference in the 2-year PFS was greater between the PET-positive and PET-negative patients after 6 cycles of AVG chemotherapy (27% and 89%, respectively) than after 2 cycles (50% and 90%, respectively).[31]

More recent reports have confirmed the prognostic significance of interim PET scans after 2 or 3 cycles of chemotherapy in patients with early-stage disease.[32,33]

In a retrospective analysis that included 147 patients with early-stage disease, Zinzani et al recently reported the best predictive value for interim PET scans after 2 cycles of ABVD (PET-2) in patients with early-stage favorable disease.[32] At a median follow-up of 45 months, 97.6% of patients with a negative PET-2 scan remained in CR, whereas only 21% of patients with a positive PET-2 scan remained in CR at a median follow-up of 28 months. The 9-year PFS rate was also significantly higher for patients with a negative PET-2 scan than those with a positive PET-2 scan (94.7% and 31.3%, respectively). The corresponding 9-year overall survival (OS) rates were 100% and 85.2%, respectively (P = .0001) for the 2 groups.

In the recent update from the CALGB 50203 study, interim PET scan after 2 cycles of AVG chemotherapy (PET-2) based on IHP and the Deauville criteria was predictive of PFS in patients with stage I-II non-bulky disease.[33] After a median follow-up of 3.3 years, the 2-year PFS rates were significantly different between the PET-2-negative and PET-2-positive groups. By the IHP criteria, the 2-year PFS rates were 88% and 54%, respectively, for the PET-2-negative and PET-2-positve groups (P = .0009). The corresponding PFS rates were 85% and 50%, respectively, for the 2 groups using the Deauville criteria. This study also showed that the combined PET/CT scans after 2 cycles had a better predictive value for PFS compared to either test alone.

NCCN Recommendations

Initial results from retrospective analyses failed to demonstrate the prognostic significance of interim PET scans in patients with stage I-II favorable disease.[21,29-31] More recent reports suggest that interim response assessment with PET/CT after 2 or 3 cycles of chemotherapy based on the Deauville criteria is a good prognostic indicator in patients with early-stage disease.[32,33]

Based on these recent findings, the panel consensus was to incorporate the Deauville criteria for interim response assessment with PET scans after 2 to 4 cycles of ABVD for patients receiving combined modality therapy and after 2 cycles of ABVD for patients receiving chemotherapy alone.

Stage I-II (Unfavorable Disease) and Stage III-IV Disease

Early interim PET imaging after chemotherapy has been shown to be a sensitive prognostic indicator of treatment outcome in patients with advanced stage disease (stage II disease with unfavorable risk factors [with or without bulky disease] or stage III-IV disease).[34,35]

In two prospective studies, the PET scan after 2 cycles of standard ABVD chemotherapy was a strong and independent prognostic factor of PFS in patients with advanced stage and extranodal disease.[36,37] In a combined report from these two prospective studies (190 patients with stage IIB-IVB; 70 patients with stage IIA with adverse prognostic factors), the 2-year PFS was significantly better for patients with negative PET after 2 cycles of ABVD than for those with positive PET (95% vs.13%).[38]

Cerci et al reported similar findings in a recent prospective study of102 patients with stage II-IV disease (35% had stage IV disease; 58% had bulky disease; and 63.5% had B symptoms). The 3-year event-free survival (EFS) rate was 53% for patients with positive PET after 2 cycles of ABVD and 90.5% for those with negative PET ($P < .001$).[39]

A retrospective International Validation Study in HL confirmed that interim response assessment (based on the Deauville criteria) after 2 cycles of ABVD was predictive of FFS in patients with stage IIB – IVB disease.[40] Among 260 of 440 enrolled patients with an interim PET scan of diagnostic quality, the 3-year FFS was 95% for patients with a negative PET scan (Deauville 1-3) and 28% for those with a positive PET scan (Deauville 4-5).

In a retrospective analysis of 81 patients with stage I/II (non-bulky or bulky mediastinal disease) and stage III/IV disease treated with the Stanford V regimen, Advani and colleagues showed that PET positivity after 8 and 12 weeks of chemotherapy was a significant predictor of PFS even after controlling for bulky disease and IPS > 2. At a median follow-up of 4 years, the freedom from progression (FFP) was 96% in those with negative PET scans compared with 33% in those with positive PET scans at the completion of chemotherapy.[41]

Markova and colleagues demonstrated that interim PET scans after 4 cycles of BEACOPP (PET-4) is a strong prognostic marker for PFS in patients with early-stage unfavorable (stages IIB with large mediastinal mass or extranodal disease) or advanced-stage (stage III and IV) disease.[42] At a median follow-up of 55 months, the 4-year PFS for PET-4 negative (n = 51) and PET-4 positive (n = 18) patients was 96% and 78%, respectively ($P = .016$). PET scans at 3 months after the completion of chemotherapy was of limited value when the interim PET-4 was negative.

The Israeli Study group has evaluated the utility of interim PET scans to develop risk-adapted and/or response-adapted treatment in small

cohorts of patients with early-stage unfavorable and advanced-stage disease.[43-45] Avigdor and colleagues evaluated response-adapted de-escalation of therapy (escalated-dose BEACOPP followed by ABVD) in patients with advanced-stage disease and IPS ≥3.[43] Forty-five patients were initially treated with 2 cycles of escalated-dose BEACOPP followed by interim PET scan. Patients with a negative interim PET scan received 4 cycles of ABVD, and those with a positive interim PET scan were removed from the study and considered for salvage therapy. After a median follow-up of 48 months, the PFS and OS rates were 78% and 95%, respectively, for patients who completed 4 cycles of ABVD. The 4-year PFS for PET-negative patients (n = 31) and PET-positive patients (n = 13) were 87% and 53%, respectively (*P* = .01). Dann and colleagues evaluated a risk-adapted approach with BEACOPP based on the results of interim PET scan for patients with early-stage unfavorable and advanced-stage disease (n = 124).[44,45] Patients with advanced disease (stage I-II bulky with B symptoms and stage III-IV) with an IPS ≥ 3 were treated with 2 cycles of escalated-dose BEACOPP, and those with an IPS ≤ 2 received 2 cycles of standard-dose BEACOPP followed by restaging. Those with a positive interim PET scan received 4 additional cycles of escalated-dose BEACOPP, whereas 4 cycles of standard-dose BEACOPP were given to patients with a negative interim PET scan. The 10-year PFS rate was 83% for patients with a positive interim PET and 93% for those with a negative interim PET scan.[45]

Risk- and/or response-adapted approach based on interim PET scans is being investigated in several large ongoing studies.[16]

NCCN Recommendations

Although the prognostic significance of interim PET scans has been established in patients with advanced disease, the timing of the interim PET scans is still unclear. In one of the prospective studies, there was no significant difference between the prognostic value of interim PET scans after 2 and 4 cycles of chemotherapy.[37] In a recent prospective study, interim PET imaging after 2 cycles of ABVD was highly predictive of treatment success in patients with stage I-II unfavorable disease and stage III-IV disease; the difference in 3-year EFS was significant for patients with stage III-IV disease (*P* < .001) and for those with stage I-II disease (*P* = .002).[39]

Based on the recent findings, the panel consensus was to incorporate the Deauville criteria for interim response assessment with PET scans for patients with stage I-II (unfavorable, bulky, or non-bulky disease) and patients with stage III-IV disease. The guidelines recommend interim response assessment with PET after 2 to 4 cycles of ABVD or 2 to 4 cycles of escalated-dose BEACOPP. In patients receiving Stanford V regimen, interim response assessment is usually performed after completion of chemotherapy (8 or 12 weeks) prior to the initiation of RT. The panel also acknowledges that guiding therapy based on the results of interim PET scans is considered investigational and is not recommended outside the context of a clinical trial.

Principles of Radiation Therapy

RT can be delivered with photons or protons. Preliminary results from single institution studies have shown that significant dose reduction to organs at risk (OAR; eg, lung, heart, breasts) can be achieved with proton beam RT, which can reduce the risk of late effects.[46,47] Long-term follow-up is needed to confirm the efficacy of proton beam RT.

Involved-field RT (IFRT) refers to treatment of the involved lymph node regions only.[48] Involved-site RT (ISRT) and involved-node RT (INRT) are being used as alternatives to IFRT, in an effort to restrict the size of the RT fields and to further minimize the radiation exposure to adjacent

uninvolved organs and the potential long-term toxicities associated with higher doses of RT.[49]

ISRT targets the originally involved nodal sites and possible extranodal extensions (based on a modified involved field that is smaller than the one used in IFRT).[50] The treatment planning for ISRT requires the use of modern CT-based simulation. The incorporation of additional imaging techniques such as PET and MRI often enhances the treatment planning. The optimized treatment plan for ISRT is designed using conventional, 3-D conformal RT or intensity-modulated RT (IMRT) techniques using clinical treatment planning considerations of coverage and dose reductions for OAR. The gross tumor volume (GTV) defined by PET-CT imaging prior to chemotherapy or surgery provides the basis for determining the clinical target volume (CTV). The planning treatment volume (PTV) is an additional expansion of the CTV to account for any set-up variations and internal organ motion. PTV margins should be defined individually for each disease site.

In combined modality therapy, the panel recommends an RT dose of 30 to 36 Gy when combined with ABVD or 36 Gy with Stanford V for patients with bulky disease (all stages).[51,52] In patients with stage I-II non-bulky disease, the recommended RT dose is 20 to 30 Gy following ABVD and 30 Gy after Stanford V. [53,52] The recommended RT dose with BEACOPP is 30 to 36 Gy.

The panel recommends that high cervical regions in all patients and axillae in women be excluded from radiation fields, if those regions are uninvolved.

Treatment Guidelines

Diagnosis

Core needle biopsy may be adequate for diagnosis, but the panel recommends excisional lymph node biopsy generally be performed. Although fine-needle aspiration (FNA) is widely used in the diagnosis of malignant neoplasms, its role in the diagnosis of lymphoma is still controversial and a diagnosis of lymphoma cannot be ruled out by a negative FNA.[54-56] FNA biopsy should be avoided and is considered to be adequate only when it is called diagnostic of HL by an expert hematopathologist or cytopathologist.

Immunohistochemistry evaluation is recommended. The Reed-Sternberg cells of CHL express CD15 and CD30 in the majority of patients and are usually negative for CD3 and CD45. CD20 is negative in the majority of patients and may be detectable in less than 40% of patients. Immunostaining for CD3, CD15, CD20, CD30, and CD45 is recommended for CHL. LPHL cells are usually CD45+ and CD20+, do not express CD3 or CD15, and rarely express CD30. In addition, LPHL cells also express epithelial membrane antigen, which is usually not present in CHL. For LPHL, the guidelines recommend staining for CD3, CD15, CD20, CD21, CD30, and CD57. An expanded panel of markers may be required, especially for equivocal diagnosis.

Workup

Workup should include a thorough history and physical examination (including determination of B symptoms, alcohol intolerance, pruritus, fatigue, and performance status, and examination of the lymphoid regions, spleen, and liver), standard laboratory tests (CBC, differential, platelets, ESR, serum lactate dehydrogenase, albumin, and liver and renal function tests), chest radiograph, and diagnostic CT scans of the chest, abdomen and pelvis. The NCCN Guidelines recommend using

PET scans to define the extent of disease, especially if the CT scan is equivocal. PET scans are often positive in sites of infection or inflammation, even in the absence of HL. In patients with PET-positive sites outside of the disease already identified, or if the PET-positive sites are inconsistent with the usual presentation of HL, additional clinical or pathologic evaluation is recommended.

An adequate bone marrow biopsy should be performed for patients with B symptoms or stage III-IV disease. Evaluation of ejection fraction is recommended for most patients undergoing doxorubicin-based chemotherapy. HIV testing should be encouraged for patients with risk factors for HIV or unusual disease presentations. Pulmonary function tests (PFTs) including the test of the diffusion capacity of the lungs for carbon monoxide (DLCO) are recommended for patients receiving bleomycin-based chemotherapy. H-flu, pneumococcal, and meningococcal vaccines are recommended if splenic RT is contemplated. A neck CT scan is also recommended for patients in whom RT to the neck is planned.

A pregnancy test should be performed before women of childbearing age undergo treatment. Chemotherapy with alkylating agents is associated with a higher risk of premature ovarian failure than chemotherapy with non-alkylating agents.[57] The guidelines recommend fertility preservation (semen cryopreservation in male patients, ovarian tissue or oocyte cryopreservation in female patients) prior to the initiation of chemotherapy with alkylating agents or pelvic RT.[58,59] Oophoropexy should be considered to preserve ovarian function in pre-menopausal women if pelvic RT is contemplated.[60]

Classical Hodgkin Lymphoma

Patients are divided into the following groups after initial diagnosis and workup:

- Stage I-II
- Stage III-IV

Patients with stage I-II are further classified into the following subgroups depending on the presence or absence of NCCN unfavorable factors:

- Stage IA-IIA (favorable)
- Stage I-II (unfavorable with bulky disease)
- Stage I-II (unfavorable with non-bulky disease)

Stage I-II Favorable Disease

RT alone was a standard treatment option for patients with early-stage HL for many decades.[61] However, the potential long-term toxicity of high-dose, large-field irradiation includes an increased risk for heart disease, pulmonary dysfunction, and secondary cancers.[62] With the incorporation of chemotherapy regimens routinely used in advanced disease (ABVD and Stanford V) into the management of patients with early-stage disease, combined modality therapy (chemotherapy and RT) has replaced RT alone for the treatment of patients with early-stage, favorable disease.

The ABVD regimen was developed as an alternative to MOPP (mechlorethamine, vincristine, prednisone, and procarbazine) and is associated with lower rates of sterility and leukemia.[51] The Stanford V regimen is a brief but dose-intensive regimen with significantly less cumulative doses of doxorubicin and bleomycin than those used in ABVD, alternating MOPP/ABVD, BEACOPP or other hybrid regimens, thereby reducing the risks for chemotherapy-related infertility, secondary neoplasms, and cardiac and pulmonary toxicity.[63,64] RT is an integral part of the Stanford V regimen.[65]

Bonadonna and colleagues initially established the safety and efficacy of ABVD (4 cycles) followed by 36 Gy IFRT as the standard treatment for patients with early-stage disease.[51] The HD10 trial from the GHSG investigated the reduction of the number of cycles of ABVD as well as the IFRT dose in patients with stage I-II disease with no risk factors.[53] Patients were not eligible if they had 3 or more sites of disease, any E-lesions, bulky mediastinal adenopathy, ESR >50, or ESR > 30 in conjunction with B symptoms. In this trial, 1370 patients were randomized to one of the 4 treatment groups: 4 cycles of ABVD followed by 30 Gy or 20 Gy of IFRT; 2 cycles of ABVD followed by 30 Gy or 20 Gy of IFRT.[53] The final analysis of this trial showed that (with a median follow-up of 79-91 months), there was no significant differences between 4 and 2 cycles of ABVD in terms of 5-year OS (97.1% and 96.6%), FFTF (93.0% vs. 91.1%) and PFS (93.5% vs. 91.2%). With respect to the dose of IFRT, the OS (97.7% vs. 97.5%), FFTF (93.4% vs. 92.9%) and PFS (93.7% vs. 93.2%) were also not significantly different between 30 Gy and 20 Gy IFRT.[53] More importantly there were also no significant differences in OS, PFS and FFTF among the four treatment arms. The results of the HD10 study confirms that 2 cycles of ABVD with 20 Gy of IFRT is an effective primary treatment for patients with a very favorable presentation of early stage disease with no risk factors, thereby minimizing the risk of late effects.

The G4 study conducted by the Stanford Group evaluated the efficacy of abbreviated the Stanford V chemotherapy (8 weeks or 2 cycles) followed by IFRT (30 Gy) in patients with non-bulky stage IA or IIA disease.[52] Among the 87 patients included in the study, unfavorable risk factors according to GHSG criteria (more than 2 nodal sites, ESR ≥ 50 or extranodal involvement) were present in 42 patients (48%) and 33 patients (33%) had unfavorable characters defined by EORTC criteria (more than 3 nodal sites, ESR ≥ 50, mixed cellularity and age 50 years or older). At a median follow-up of 10.6 years, the estimated 10-year FFP, disease-specific survival and OS rates were 94%, 99% and 94% respectively. Among patients with GHSG criteria, FFP was 100% for patients with favorable disease and 88% for those with unfavorable non-bulky disease. The FFP was 98% and 88%, respectively, for patients with favorable and unfavorable disease according to EORTC criteria. No patient developed secondary AML or myelodysplastic syndrome (MDS). No late cardiac or pulmonary toxicities have been observed.

Chemotherapy with ABVD alone has also been investigated as a treatment option for patients with early-stage non-bulky disease (stage I-II or IIIA).[27,28,66,67]

In the Memorial Sloan-Kettering Cancer Center (MSKCC) study, 152 patients with stages I, II, and IIIA non-bulky disease were prospectively randomized to ABVD (6 cycles) followed by RT (36 Gy) or ABVD (6 cycles) alone. At 60-month follow-up, there were no significant differences in CR duration (91% vs. 87%, respectively; P = .61), FFP (86% vs. 81%, respectively; P = .61), and OS (97% vs. 90%, respectively, P = .08), among patients treated with ABVD plus radiation and those treated with ABVD alone.[67]

In the multicenter study conducted by the NCIC Clinical Trials Group, patients with stage IA or IIA HL were randomized to receive ABVD (4-6 cycles) or subtotal nodal RT with or without ABVD.[27] In patients assigned to RT, those who had a favorable risk profile received subtotal nodal RT alone, and those with any of the adverse prognostic factors (high ESR, age > 39, mixed cellularity or lymphocyte depleted histology, or ≥ 4 nodal sites) were treated with 2 cycles of ABVD followed by subtotal nodal RT. At a median follow-up of 12 years, OS rate was higher among patients treated with ABVD alone than those

treated with subtotal nodal RT with or without ABVD (94% vs. 87%; *P* = .04).[28] However, ABVD alone was associated with a lower rate of FFP than subtotal nodal RT with or without ABVD (87% vs. 92%; *P* = .05), and there were no significant differences in the EFS rates between the two groups (85% and 80%, respectively; *P* = .60). In the subset analysis of patients with a favorable disease, there were no significant differences between any outcome, for patients randomly assigned to subtotal nodal RT alone and those assigned to ABVD alone.[28] Among patients with unfavorable risk factors, the 12-year estimated OS rate was higher among patients in the ABVD-only group than among the patients who received subtotal nodal RT plus ABVD (92% vs. 81% respectively; *P* =.04), whereas the rate of FFP was lower in the ABVD only group (86% vs. 94%; *P* = .006) and there was no significant difference in the 12-year EFS rate (83% vs. 78%; *P* = .74) between the groups.[28] This study, however, was closed prematurely since the results of the EORTC H8-F study demonstrated excellent outcomes for patients with stage I-II favorable disease treated with chemotherapy and IFRT.[68]

Combined modality therapy (ABVD or Stanford V chemotherapy plus IFRT) is the preferred treatment for patients with stage I-II favorable disease. ABVD alone could be a reasonable choice of treatment, especially for younger patients who are in CR after 2 cycles of ABVD (as documented by CT scan), in order to avoid the long-term risks of RT.

NCCN Recommendations

Combined modality therapy (ABVD plus ISRT [category 1] [53] or Stanford V chemotherapy) or chemotherapy (ABVD alone)[27,28] are included as treatment options for patients with stage IA to IIA favorable disease.

In combined modality therapy, ABVD is generally administered for 4 cycles with 30 Gy ISRT to involved lymphoid sites only.[51] In patients who fulfill the GHSG criteria for favorable disease (ESR less than 50, no extralymphatic lesions, and only two lymph node regions involved), 2 cycles of ABVD followed by 20 Gy ISRT may be sufficient.[53] Stanford V regimen is administered for 8 weeks with 30 Gy ISRT.[52] Consolidative RT is optimally instituted within 3 weeks.

The guidelines recommend interim restaging with PET after 4 cycles of ABVD (after 2 cycles for patients who fulfill the GHSG criteria for favorable disease) or after 8 weeks of Stanford V chemotherapy. ISRT followed by observation is recommended for all patients with a score of Deauville 1-3. Biopsy or ISRT followed by another restaging is recommended if the interim PET score was Deauville 4. No further treatment is necessary if the final PET is Deauville 1-3. Patients with persistent residual disease on final PET (Deauville 4-5) should be managed as described for refractory disease.

There are two studies from Europe evaluating the value of interim PET scans in defining the need for RT in patients with stage I-II favorable disease (the UK RAPID trial and the EORTC H10 trial).[69,70] However, these trials come to somewhat different conclusions and both have been published only as abstracts. Therefore, the panel members feel that longer follow-up data are needed and that the omission of RT is not recommended at this time for patients with stage IA-IIA disease based on the results of interim PET scans.

Among patients treated with chemotherapy alone, ABVD is initially administered for 2 cycles followed by interim restaging with PET. In the NCIC study, patients assigned to ABVD alone were restaged with CT after 2 cycles. The FFP was superior in patients with stage I-II favorable non-bulky disease who achieved a CR (vs. those who did not, based on

CT criteria) after 2 cycles of ABVD and who then went on to receive 2 more cycles of ABVD (4 total) without any RT; patients who were not in CR received a total of 6 cycles of ABVD.[27,28] The guidelines recommend 2 additional cycles of ABVD (total of 4) for patients with a score of Deauville 1-2 on interim PET scan, followed by close observation. Patients with a score of Deauville 3-4 on interim PET scan are treated with 4 additional cycles (total of 6) of ABVD followed by another restaging. No further treatment is necessary if the final PET scan is Deauville 1-2 (after 6 cycles of ABVD). ISRT or biopsy is recommended for patients with persistent residual disease (Deauville 3-5) after 6 cycles of ABVD.[27,28]

All patients with a score of Deauville 5 after initial therapy should be managed as described for refractory disease.

Stage I-II Unfavorable Disease

The HD8 trial from the GHSG is the largest that investigated the efficacy of IFRT vs. extended-field RT (EFRT) in the context of combined modality therapy for patients with early-stage unfavorable HL with one or more risk factors (large mediastinal mass; extranodal disease; splenic involvement; elevated ESR with or without B symptoms and more than two lymph node areas of involvement).[71] This trial randomized 1204 patients to 4 cycles of chemotherapy (COPP [cyclophosphamide, vincristine, procarbazine, and prednisone] plus ABVD) followed by EFRT or IFRT. RT (30 Gy plus 10 Gy to bulky sites in both arms) was initiated after chemotherapy for all patients without progressive disease. At 5-years of follow-up, freedom from treatment failure (FFTF; 85.8% for EFRT and 84.2% for IFRT) and OS (90.8% vs. 92.4%) were similar for the two groups. In contrast, acute side effects, including thrombocytopenia, leukopenia, and gastrointestinal toxicity were more frequent in the EFRT group. The 10-year follow-up results confirmed the non-inferiority of IFRT in terms of FFTF (79.8% vs. 79.7%), PFS (79.8% vs. 80.0%), and OS (86.4% vs. 87.3%).[72] IFRT was also associated with less acute toxicity and secondary malignancies.

The results of the prospective study conducted by the Stanford group demonstrated the efficacy of Stanford V regimen and IFRT for patients with locally extensive and advanced-stage disease.[73] In this study, 142 patients with locally extensive mediastinal stage I or II disease or stage III or IV disease were treated with Stanford V chemotherapy (12 weeks) followed by RT (36 Gy) to initial bulky sites (≥ 5 cm) or macroscopic splenic disease. With a median follow-up of 5.4 years, the 5-year FFP and OS rates were 89% and 96%, respectively. No patient progressed during treatment and there were no treatment-related deaths or secondary leukemia. Among 16 patients who relapsed, the freedom from second relapse was 69% at 5 years.

A randomized Italian study reported that ABVD and MOPPEBVCAD (mechlorethamine, vincristine, procarbazine, prednisone, epidoxorubicin, bleomycin, vinblastine, lomustine, doxorubicin, and vindesine) were superior to the Stanford V regimen in response rate, FFS, and PFS in patients with intermediate-stage and advanced-stage HL.[74] However, interpretation of these results was difficult because the timing of response evaluation was different among the arms (8 and 12 weeks for Stanford V, 16 weeks for ABVD, and 24 weeks for MOPPEBVCAD). In addition, modifications of the RT protocol in the Stanford V arm were substantial, including limitation of the number of sites irradiated (no more than 2) and a different definition of bulky disease.

Other investigators, however, have confirmed that the Stanford V regimen is highly effective for locally extensive and advanced HL with a low toxicity profile, when RT is administered according to Stanford V

protocol guidelines.[75-77] In the MSKCC study, 126 patients with either locally extensive or advanced disease were treated with the 12-week Stanford V chemotherapy regimen followed by 36 Gy IFRT to bulky sites (5 cm or larger) and/or to macroscopic splenic disease.[76] The 5- and 7-year OS rates were 90% and 88%, respectively. Fifty-eight percent of the patients for whom the Stanford V regimen failed underwent successful second-line therapy with high-dose therapy with autologous stem cell rescue (HDT/ASCR). Aversa and colleagues from another Italian study group also reported similar findings in patients with bulky or advanced disease.[75] The randomized trial conducted by the United Kingdom National Cancer Research Institute Lymphoma Group (Study ISRCTN 64141244) also showed that the efficacies of Stanford V and ABVD were comparable in terms of overall response rate (ORR), the 5-year PFS and OS rates in patients with stage I to IIA with bulky disease, or other adverse features, stage IIB, III, or IV disease, . RT was administered in both arms to sites of previous bulky sites (> 5 cm) and to splenic deposits.[77] At the median follow-up of 4.3 years, the ORR, 5-year PFS, and 5-year OS rates were 91%, 76%, and 90%, respectively, for ABVD. The corresponding rates were 92%, 74%, and 92%, respectively, for Stanford V.

The phase III intergroup trial (E2496) also confirmed that there were no significant differences between ABVD and Stanford V in terms of response rates, FFS, OS, and toxicity in patients with locally extensive (stage I-IIA/B and bulky mediastinal disease) and stage III-IV disease.[78] In this trial, 854 patients were randomized to ABVD (n = 428; 6-8 cycles plus 36 Gy RT only for patients with bulky mediastinal disease) or Stanford V (n = 426; 12 weeks of chemotherapy plus 36 Gy RT for sites larger than 5 cm or for macroscopic splenic disease). The primary endpoint was FFS, defined as the time from randomization to progression, relapse, or death, whichever occurred first. With a median follow-up of 6.4 years, there was no difference in ORR (clinical CR rates were 72.7% for ABVD and 68.7% for Stanford V), OS (88% at 5 years for both ABVD and Stanford V; *P* = .86), or FFS (74% for ABVD and 71% for Stanford V at 5 years; *P* = .32) between the two arms. Toxicity was also similar in both groups. The planned subgroup analysis showed that the outcome of patients with locally extensive disease was significantly better than that of patients with stage III-IV disease.[78] The 3-year and 5-year FFS rates were 82% for patients with locally extensive disease. The corresponding survival rates were 71% and 67%, respectively, for patients with stage III-IV disease (*P* = .001). The 5-year OS rates were 94% and 85%, respectively (*P* < .001).

The BEACOPP regimen was developed by the GHSG to improve treatment results through dose escalation and time intensification.[79] However, in the HD11 multicenter trial from the GHSG, intensified chemotherapy with BEACOPP did not significantly improve outcome of patients with early-stage unfavorable disease compared to ABVD.[80] In this study, 1395 patients were randomized to either ABVD (4 cycles followed by 30 Gy or 20 Gy IFRT) or standard-dose BEACOPP (4 cycles followed by 30 Gy or 20 Gy IFRT). BEACOPP was more effective than ABVD when followed by 20 Gy IFRT (5-year FFTF and PFS rates were 86.8% and 87%, respectively, for BEACOPP. The corresponding rates were 81% and 82%, respectively, for ABVD). However, there was no difference between the 2 regimens when followed by 30 Gy of IFRT (5-year FFTF and PFS were 87% and 88%, respectively, for BEACOPP. The corresponding rates were 85% and 87%, respectively for ABVD). BEACOPP was also associated with more toxicity than ABVD.

The HD14 trial demonstrated that BEACOPP followed by ABVD and IFRT significantly improved tumor control and PFS in patients with early-stage unfavorable disease (stage IA, IB, or IIA with at least one of

the following risk factors: bulky mediastinal mass; extranodal involvement; ESR of 50 or more without B symptoms; ESR 30 or more with B symptoms; or 3 or more involved lymph nodes) and stage IIB disease with either of the latter two risk factors.[81] In this trial, 1528 patients were randomized to 4 cycles of ABVD (n = 765) or 2 cycles of escalated-dose BEACOPP followed by 2 cycles of ABVD (n = 763). Chemotherapy was followed by 30 Gy of IFRT in both arms. At a median follow-up of 43 months, the 5-year FFTF rate was 94.8% compared to 87.7% for ABVD (*P* < .001). The 5-year PFS rate was 95.4% and 89.1%, respectively (*P* < .001). The 5-year OS rate was not significantly different between the 2 arms (97.2% and 96.8%, respectively; *P* = .731). The rate of progression or relapse was also lower in patients treated with BEACOPP followed by ABVD (2.5% vs. 8.4%; *P* < .001).

These results suggest that ABVD plus 30 Gy IFRT remains the standard of care for patients for patients with early-stage unfavorable disease. Stanford V (when given as described with RT) or BEACOPP followed by ABVD are acceptable alternatives for some patients.

NCCN Recommendations: Stage I to II (Unfavorable Bulky Disease)
ABVD followed by IFRT (category1) [71] or Stanford V[73,78] or BEACOPP (2 cycles) followed by ABVD (2 cycles) and RT[81] are included as options for patients with stage I-II unfavorable disease. Treatment with chemotherapy alone is not recommended.

ABVD is initially administered for 2 to 4 cycles followed by interim restaging with PET.[71,78] Patients with a score of Deauville 1-3 are treated with additional cycles of ABVD (total of 4-6) followed by ISRT, and those with a score of Deauville 4 are treated with 4 additional cycles of ABVD (total of 6) followed by another restaging. ISRT followed by observation is recommended if the repeat PET scan is Deauville 1-3. Biopsy or ISRT followed by restaging is recommended for patients with a score of Deauville 4. No further treatment is necessary if the final PET is Deauville 1-3.

All patients with a score of Deauville 4 (with a positive biopsy) after completion of ISRT or Deauville 5 after initial therapy should be managed as described for refractory disease.

Stanford V is administered for 12 weeks (3 cycles) plus IFRT (36 Gy) to patients with stage I-II bulky mediastinal disease or bulky disease more than 10 cm and/or B symptoms.[73,78] Patients are restaged with PET at the completion of chemotherapy. RT (36 Gy) for initial sites larger than 5 cm as well as for residual PET-positive sites is recommended for all patients with a score of Deauville 1-3 or Deauville 4. Consolidative RT should be instituted within 3 weeks of completion of chemotherapy. Biopsy is included as an option for patients with a score of Deauville 4 prior to the initiation of IFRT. Restaging with CT or PET/CT after 3 months is recommended for patients whose interim PET scan was Deauville 3 or 4. All patients with a score of Deauville 5 after chemotherapy should be managed as described for refractory disease.

Patients receiving BEACOPP and ABVD are restaged with PET after 2 cycles of BEACOPP. ABVD (2 cycles) followed by ISRT is recommended for patients with a score of Deauville 1-3. Biopsy or ABVD (2 cycles) followed by another restaging is recommended for patients with a score of Deauville 4. ISRT is recommended if repeat PET after completion of ABVD is Deauville 1-2. Biopsy or ISRT followed by restaging is recommended if repeat PET is Deauville 3. No further treatment is necessary for patients with a PET score of Deauville 1-2 after completion of ISRT.

All patients who are PET positive after completion of chemotherapy or ISRT should be managed as described for refractory disease.

NCCN Recommendations: Stage I to II (Unfavorable Non-bulky Disease)

Restaging and additional treatment for patients treated with ABVD are similar to that described above for patients with stage I to II (unfavorable bulky disease).[71,78] Since the multicenter study conducted by the NCIC Clinical Trials Group included some patients who had elevated ESR or >3 disease sites,[27,28] the guidelines have included observation as an option for patients with a PET score of Deauville 1-2 or Deauville 3-4 with a negative biopsy after 6 cycles of ABVD.

All patients with a score of Deauville 5 after chemotherapy should be managed as described for refractory disease.

Stanford V is administered for 12 weeks (3 cycles) plus IFRT (30 Gy) for patients with stage I-II unfavorable non-bulky disease based upon presence of B symptoms.[78] Patients with other criteria for unfavorable disease (elevated ESR or more than 3 sites of disease) are treated with 8 weeks of Stanford V plus 30 Gy IFRT followed by restaging as described for stage IA-IIA favorable disease.[52] Patients are restaged with PET at the completion of chemotherapy as described above for patients with stage I to II (unfavorable bulky disease).

Restaging and additional treatment for patients treated with BEACOPP followed by ABVD are similar to that described above for patients with stage I to II (unfavorable bulky disease).

Stage III-IV

While chemotherapy is always used for patients with advanced-stage disease, combined modality therapy is an effective treatment for patients with large mediastinal masses.[82,83] MOPP was the first successful regimen for HL, with a response rate of 84% and a 66% disease-free survival (DFS) of more than 10 years from end of treatment.[84] However, in addition to other long-term toxicities, MOPP is associated with loss of fertility (mostly in men) and myelodysplasia.

The landmark randomized trial by the CALGB showed that ABVD alone or alternating with MOPP was superior to MOPP alone in patients with newly diagnosed advanced Hodgkin's disease (stage III-IV).[85] ABVD also was less myelotoxic than MOPP, or ABVD alternating with MOPP. These results were confirmed in a large Intergroup study, which compared ABVD with a MOPP/ABV hybrid regimen in 856 patients with advanced HL.[86] The rates of complete remission (76% vs. 80%), 5-year FFS (63% vs. 66%), and OS (82% vs. 81%) rates were similar for ABVD and MOPP/ABV, respectively. However, MOPP/ABV was associated with a greater risk for acute pulmonary and hematologic toxicity, MDS, and leukemia.

Another randomized controlled trial from the United Kingdom Lymphoma Group (LY09 trial) also confirmed that there was no significant difference in EFS and OS between ABVD and other multidrug regimens in patients with advanced HL. Multidrug regimens were more toxic than ABVD and were associated with poorer outcomes in older patients.[87] Updated results with a median follow-up of 83 months were consistent with the early results.[88]

ABVD has since been the standard treatment for patients with stage III-IV disease. Stanford V and BEACOPP are the other two regimens developed to improve the outcome of patients with advanced disease.

The results from prospective studies conducted by the Stanford group and other investigators have demonstrated the efficacy of Stanford V and IFRT in patients with advanced-stage disease.[73,75-77] The recently

completed phase III intergroup trial (E2496) also showed that there was no significant difference between ABVD and Stanford V (with RT, when indicated, according to Stanford V protocol guidelines) in ORR, FFS, OS, and toxicity in patients with stage III-IV disease.[78] However, among patients with high-risk disease (IPS ≥ 3), the 5-year FFS rate was significantly better for ABVD than Stanford V (67% vs. 57%; *P* = .02), but there was no significant difference in 5-year OS rate (84% vs. 77%; *P* = .15).

The efficacy of BEACOPP in patients with advanced disease was demonstrated in two phase III randomized trials conducted by the GHSG.[89,90] In the HD9 study, 1196 patients with stage IIB and IIIA disease with risk factors or stage IIIB and IV disease were randomized to undergo 8 cycles of COPP-ABVD, 8 cycles of standard-dose BEACOPP, or 8 cycles of escalated-dose BEACOPP.[89] Each regimen was followed by RT to initial sites of disease greater than 5 cm. The majority of patients in each treatment arm had stage III-IV disease. At 5-year analysis, escalated-dose BEACOPP showed better tumor control and OS than COPP-ABVD and significantly lower rates of early progression than COPP-ABVD or standard-dose BEACOPP. The 10-year analysis confirmed that escalated-dose BEACOPP was significantly better than standard-dose BEACOPP or COPP-ABVD in terms of FFTF (82%, 70%, and 64%, respectively) and OS rates (86%, 80%, and 75%, respectively). Escalated-dose BEACOPP was significantly better than standard-dose BEACOPP in terms of FFTF (*P* < .0001) and OS (*P* = .0053).[90]

The final results of the HD12 study (n = 1670) that compared escalated-dose BEACOPP (8 cycles) with 4 cycles of escalated-dose BEACOPP followed by 4 cycles of standard-dose BEACOPP, with or without RT also confirmed the efficiency of escalated-dose BEACOPP for patients with advanced-stage HL who have risk factors, as reported in the HD9 trial.[91] In this study, at 5 years, the FFTF (86.4% and 84.8%, respectively) and PFS (87.5% and 85%, respectively) were better (although the difference was non-significant) for 8 cycles of escalated-dose BEACOPP compared to 4 cycles of escalated-dose BEACOPP followed by 4 cycles of standard-dose BEACOPP. The 5-year OS rate, however, was not different (92% and 90.3%, respectively).[91]

Results from two Italian studies that have compared escalated-dose BEACOPP with standard-dose BEACOPP or ABVD failed to show an OS advantage for escalated-dose BEACOPP, although it resulted in better tumor control in patients with advanced disease.[92,93] However, these studies were not sufficiently powered to determine differences in OS due to small patient numbers.

The final analysis of the HD15 trial recently reported by Engert et al showed that 6 cycles of escalated-dose BEACOPP followed by PET-guided RT resulted in significantly superior OS and tumour control than 8 cycles of escalated-dose BEACOPP in patients with advanced-stage disease (stage IIB with large mediastinal mass or stage III-IV).[22] In this study, 2182 patients were randomly assigned to one of the 3 treatment groups: 8 cycles of escalated-dose BEACOPP (n = 728), 6 cycles of escalated-dose BEACOPP (n = 726), or 8 cycles of a time-intensified standard-dose BEACOPP (n = 728). RT (30 Gy) was restricted to patients with PET-positive residual sites (2.5 cm or more) after chemotherapy. The 5-year FFTF rates were 84.4%, 89.3%, and 85.4%, respectively, for the 3 groups. The corresponding OS rates were 91.9%, 95.3%, and 94.5%, respectively, and was significantly better with 6 cycles of escalated-dose BEACOPP than with 8 cycles of escalated-dose BEACOPP (*P* = .019). Escalated-dose BEACOPP was also associated with less treatment-related mortality (TRM) (4.6% vs. 7.5% for 8 cycles of escalated-dose BEACOPP and 5.2% for 8 cycles

of time-intensified standard-dose BEACOPP) and fewer secondary cancers (2.4% compared to 4.7% and 3.1%, respectively, for 8 cycles of escalated-dose BEACOPP and 8 cycles of time-intensified standard-dose BEACOPP). These results confirm that 6 cycles of escalated-dose BEACOPP followed by PET-guided RT is an acceptable treatment for patients with advanced-stage disease.

The ongoing EORTC 20012 trial is evaluating BEACOPP (4 cycles of escalated-dose and 4 cycles of standard-dose) and ABVD (8 cycles) in high-risk patients with stage III-IV disease. The preliminary results showed that there was no improvement in OS (86.7% and 90.3, respectively, at 4 years; *P* = .208) or EFS (63.7% and 69.3%, respectively, at 4 years; *P* =.312), although the PFS was significantly better with BEACOPP (83.4% vs. 72.8% for ABVD; *P* = .005).The median follow-up was 3.8 yrs.[94] Long-term follow-up is necessary to confirm these preliminary findings.

Several trials have addressed the role of consolidative RT after completion of chemotherapy in patients with stage III to IV disease.

The Southwest Oncology Group multicenter study showed no improvement in OS rates for patients who underwent low-dose IFRT after MOP-BAP (mechlorethamine, vincristine, prednisone plus bleomycin, doxorubicin, and procarbazine), but the remission duration was prolonged in several subgroups, especially patients with bulky nodular sclerosis.[95] In the randomized trial (EORTC 20884 trial) that assessed the role of consolidation RT following MOPP-ABV chemotherapy in patients with advanced disease, 739 patients with untreated stage III to IV disease received 6 to 8 cycles of MOPP-ABV. Patients with a CR after chemotherapy were randomized to no further treatment or IFRT, and those with a PR received IFRT to involved nodal areas and extranodal sites.[96] The 8-year OS and EFS rates in the PR group were 76% and 84%, respectively. These outcomes were not significantly different in patients with a CR (with or without IFRT), suggesting that consolidative IFRT is beneficial for patients experiencing PR after chemotherapy.

In the randomized controlled trial from the United Kingdom Lymphoma Group (LY09 trial) that compared ABVD with two other multidrug regimens, IFRT was recommended for incomplete response to chemotherapy or bulk disease at presentation.[88] PFS was superior for patients who received RT (5-year PFS was 71% without RT and 86% with RT) and a similar advantage was also seen for OS. The final results of the HD12 trial also showed that consolidation RT was beneficial for patients with residual disease after escalated-dose BEACOPP (FFTF was 90.4% and 87%, respectively), whereas this effect was not seen in patients with initial bulk disease who were in CR after chemotherapy.[91] In contrast, Laskar and colleagues reported a survival advantage for consolidative RT in patients experiencing CR after initial chemotherapy, particularly in patients younger than 15 years and in patients with B symptoms and bulky and advanced disease.[97] However, this study included patients with a different distribution of histologic subtypes of HL than those included in Western studies, and most patients had early-stage HL.

In the HD15 trial, RT (30 Gy) after BEACOPP chemotherapy was restricted to those patients in PR with PET-positive residual disease (2.5 cm or more). PET-negative patients received no additional RT.[22] Of the 739 qualified patients with residual disease (2.5 cm or more) after 6 to 8 cycles of BEACOPP, 548 patients (74%) were PET-negative; 191 patients (26%) were PET-positive and received consolidative RT. The final analysis showed that the prognosis of patients in PR with a PET-negative persistent residual disease after chemotherapy was

similar to those who were in CR as measured by conventional CT (4-year PFS was 92.1%), suggesting that consolidative RT could be omitted in patients with a PET-negative PR.[22]

Two recent European trials evaluated the role of HDT/ASCR as a consolidative therapy for patients with advanced-stage and unfavorable HL that responded to initial chemotherapy.[98,99] Neither trial showed an advantage for HDT/ASCR over conventional chemotherapy for patients with unfavorable and advanced HL experiencing complete or partial remission after an initial course of doxorubicin-based chemotherapy. Instead, additional courses of the same conventional chemotherapy used as initial treatment produced equivalent or better outcomes than HDT/ASCR.

NCCN Recommendations

ABVD, Stanford V (selected patients with IPS less than 3), or escalated-dose BEACOPP are included as options for primary treatment for patients with advanced disease.[22,76,78,86]

ABVD is initially administered for 2 to 4 cycles followed by restaging with PET. Patients with a score of Deauville 1-2 are treated with an additional 2 to 4 cycles (total of 6). Patients with a score of Deauville 3-4 can undergo biopsy or complete 6 cycles of ABVD followed by another restaging. Consistent with the results of the E2496 study, observation or RT to the mediastinum (if bulky mediastinal disease was initially present) are included as options for patients with a PET score of Deauville 1-2 after 6 cycles of ABVD.[78] All patients with a score of Deauville 3-5 after end of treatment restaging and those who are Deauville 5 after initial therapy should be managed as described for refractory disease.

Stanford V is administered for 12 weeks (3 cycles). Consolidative irradiation is instituted within 3 weeks (30 Gy to initial sites for stage IB-IIB; 36 Gy to initial bulky sites of 5 cm or larger and spleen if focal nodules are present initially).[76,77] Restaging and additional treatment for patients treated with the Stanford V regimen are similar to stage I to II unfavorable disease.

Escalated-dose BEACOPP is administered for 4 cycles followed by restaging with PET. Two more cycles of escalated-dose BEACOPP followed by another restaging with PET is recommended for patients with a score of Deauville 1-3.

Biopsy is recommended for patients with a score of Deauville 4-5. Patients with a negative biopsy are treated with 2 more cycles of escalated-dose BEACOPP followed by another restaging, whereas those with a positive biopsy should be managed as described for refractory disease. No further treatment is necessary if the repeat PET is Deauville 1-3 after completion of 6 cycles of BEACOPP. Based on the final results of the HD 12 and HD 15 trials, RT (30-40 Gy) to residual PET-positive sites greater than 2.5 cm is recommended for patients with a score of Deauville 1-3 after 6 cycles of BEACOPP.[91,22]

Patients who are Deauville 4-5 after 4 or 6 cycles of BEACOPP should be managed as described for refractory disease.

Lymphocyte-Predominant Hodgkin Lymphoma

LPHL is characterized by an indolent course and occasional late relapse. It has a different natural history and response to therapy compared with CHL.[100] The GHSG has reported a comprehensive description of natural history, clinical presentation, and outcomes for LPHL.[101] In a retrospective analysis that included 394 patients with LPHL, 63% had early-stage favorable, 16% had early-stage

unfavorable, and 21% had advanced-stage disease. At a median follow-up of 50 months, FFTF (88% vs. 82%) and OS (96% vs. 92%) were better for LPHL compared with CHL.[101] Among patients with LPHL, FFTF was better for early favorable disease (93%) compared with early unfavorable (87%) and advanced-stage disease (77%).

The European Task Force on Lymphoma also reported favorable FFTF for early-stage disease (85% for stage I; 71% for stage II) compared with those with stage III (62%) or stage IV (24%) disease.[102] In the GHSG study, adverse prognostic factors for FFTF included advanced stage, low hemoglobin, and lymphopenia; age (≥ 45 years), advanced stage, and low hemoglobin were the negative prognostic factors for OS.

Early-stage favorable LPHL has a better prognosis than CHL and its management is different. RT alone or in combination with chemotherapy has been an efficient treatment for patients with stage I to II LPHL.[103-110] In a retrospective analysis, Schlembach and colleagues reported favorable 5-year relapse-free survival (RFS; 95%) and OS (100%) for patients with stage IA LPHL treated with IFRT and regional RT alone.[104] There was no evidence of secondary solid tumors even after long-term follow-up (11.6 years for IFRT and 5.5 years for regional RT). Longer follow-up is needed to define the risks for cardiac toxicity; however, mediastinal treatment is infrequently required in LPHL. Another retrospective study from the Australasian Radiation Oncology Lymphoma Group reported longer follow-up in patients with stage I to II LPHL treated with RT alone, including mantle and total lymphoid irradiation (TLI).[107] At 15 years, FFP was 84% for patients with stage I disease and 73% for those with stage II disease. Recently, Chen and colleagues reported the long-term outcome of 113 patients with LPHL treated at the author's institution with a median follow-up of 136 months.[108] Ninety-three patients received RT alone, 13 received RT with chemotherapy, and 7 received chemotherapy alone. The 10-year PFS rates were 85% (stage I) and 61% (stage II); OS rates were 94% and 97% for stages I and II, respectively. The addition of chemotherapy to RT did not improve PFS or OS compared with RT alone and six of seven patients who received chemotherapy alone developed early disease progression.

The GHSG retrospectively compared 3 treatment options, including EFRT, IFRT, and combined modality treatment in patients with stage IA LPHL.[103] Median follow-up was 78 months for EFRT, 40 months for combined modality, and 17 months for IFRT. Complete remissions were observed in 98% after EFRT, 95% after combined modality, and 100% after IFRT, and no significant differences were seen in FFTF, suggesting that IFRT is equally effective as EFRT and combined modality treatment. However, in a subgroup analysis of 64 patients with LPHL included in the GHSG HD7 trial, a trend was seen toward better 7-year FFTF for the combined modality group (96%) compared with the EFRT group (83%).[111] The MD Anderson study that evaluated RFS, OS, and patterns of first recurrence in patients with stage I-II LPHL treated with RT alone or with chemotherapy followed by RT showed that the RFS (77% and 68%, respectively) and OS (90% and 100%, respectively) were similar in the 2 treatment groups at 9.3 years and that chemotherapy did not reduce the recurrence outside the RT field.[106] Additional data and longer-term follow-up are required to define the best treatment for early-stage favorable LPHL.

Patients with advanced-stage LPHL have a worse prognosis than those with early-stage favorable disease, and can be treated with chemotherapy. In the European Task Force on Lymphomas study, the 8-year disease-specific survival and FFTF were 94% and 62%, respectively, for stage III disease and 41% and 24%, respectively, for stage IV disease.[102] Most of these patients (80%-95%) were treated with chemotherapy (MOPP- or ABVD-like regimens) with or without RT.

In the absence of randomized trials comparing different chemotherapy regimens, no preferred chemotherapy regimen exists for LPHL, although ABVD is often used based on the data for patients with CHL. Savage et al from British Columbia Cancer Agency have reported that ABVD chemotherapy with (n=89) or without (n=11) RT was associated with superior outcomes compared to a historical cohort of patients treated with RT alone for stage IA, IB or IIA NLPHL.[112] With a median follow-up of 6.4 years, patients treated with ABVD-like chemotherapy with or without RT had a superior 10-year TTP (98% vs. 76%), PFS (91% vs. 65%), and OS and OS (93% vs. 84%) compared to those treated with RT alone. On the other hand, an analysis of the combined data from the CALGB trials and Dana-Farber Cancer Institute trials that included patients with stage III-IV LPHL treated with chemotherapy alone, showed that the failure rate was 75% for the 12 patients treated with ABVD or EVA (etoposide, vinblastine, and doxorubicin) while it was only 32% for the 25 patients treated with alkylating agent-containing regimens (MOPP or MOPP/ABVD).[113] Some investigators have also reported good response rates with CHOP (cyclophosphamide, doxorubicin, vincristine, and prednisone) plus rituximab [114,115] or CVP (cyclophosphamide, vincristine, and prednisone) in patients with early-stage or advanced disease.[116]

Because LPHL cells consistently express CD20 antigen, clinical studies have explored the efficacy of rituximab, an anti-CD20 antibody for patients with newly diagnosed and relapsed or refractory LPHL.[117-122]

In a prospective phase II trial conducted by the Stanford group, previously treated (n =10) and untreated (n =12) patients with stage I to IV LPHL received 4 weekly doses of rituximab at 375 mg/m^2. The ORR was 100% (41% CR, 54% PR, and 5% CRu). At a median follow-up of 13 months, 9 patients had relapsed and the estimated median FFP was 10.2 months.[117] The estimated probability of disease progression at 10.2 months was 52%. The protocol was later modified to repeat 4 weekly 375 mg/m^2 doses at 6-month intervals for 2 years.[118] Rituximab was well tolerated, with few adverse side effects. At a median follow-up of 60 months, extended rituximab treatment was associated with better CR rates and median FFP than limited rituximab. The rate of CR and CRu was 88% and 56%, respectively, for patients treated with extended rituximab and limited rituximab (P = .08). The estimated FFP at 30 months was 88% and 52%, respectively.

In a GHSG phase II study that investigated rituximab in patients with newly diagnosed stage IA LPHL (n=28), the ORR was 100% (complete and partial remission were achieved in 86% and 14% of patients, respectively). At a median follow-up of 43 months, the OS rate was 100%; the PFS rate at 12, 24, and 36 months was 96%, 85%, and 81%, respectively.[119] However, the relapse rate was 25%.

Rituximab followed by rituximab maintenance has also been evaluated in patients with newly diagnosed and relapsed or refractory LPHL. In a study conducted by the Stanford group in newly diagnosed patients (n =19), Advani et al reported an ORR of 100% (10 patients achieved CR/Cru and 7 patients had PR) at the end of initial therapy with rituximab alone.[120] The estimated PFS rates at 5 and 10 years were 51.7% and 35.4%, respectively. The corresponding estimated OS rates were 93.3% and 76%, respectively. Rituximab as initial treatment was also associated with a pattern of late relapse with transformation to aggressive diffuse large B-cell lymphoma (DLBCL) at a median of 4.2 years. Rituximab maintenance for 2 years was associated with a non-significant increase in median PFS compared to rituximab alone (67 months and 50 months, respectively; P = .7). In the GHSG phase II study that evaluated rituximab in patients with relapsed or refractory CD20-positive LPHL (n = 15), the ORR was 94% (8 patients with CR and 6 patients with PR). At a median follow-up of 63 months, median

time to progression was 33 months and the median OS was not reached.[121]

Collectively, the above data suggest that rituximab alone or in combination with chemotherapy has activity in the management of patients with newly diagnosed as well as those with relapsed LPHL. However, single-agent rituximab was associated with higher relapse rates when used as initial therapy for newly diagnosed patients.[117,119,120] At the present time, single-agent rituximab or rituximab maintenance is not recommended as initial therapy for newly diagnosed patients.

NCCN Recommendations

IFRT (30-36 Gy) is recommended for all patients with stage IA or IIA disease. Observation may be an option for highly selected patients with stage IA disease with a completely excised solitary node. Chemotherapy with or without rituximab or IFRT is recommended for patients with stage IB or IIB or stage III-IV disease. Alternatively, asymptomatic patients with stage IIIA-IVA disease can either be observed (category 2B) or treated with local RT for palliation.

Restaging with PET occurs after completion of initial therapy. Observation is recommended for all patients with a score of Deauville 1-3. Although patients who fail to achieve a score of Deauville 1-3 may require additional therapy, some have a chronic indolent course that may not require aggressive retreatment. These asymptomatic patients may be observed or treated with local RT (if not received previously).

Rituximab may be used in combination with ABVD or other chemotherapy regimens that are most commonly used at NCCN Member Institutions (CHOP, CVP or EPOCH [etoposide, prednisone, vincristine, cyclophosphamide, and doxorubicin]). Ongoing clinical trials may clarify the role of observation, rituximab, or combination chemotherapy options for patients with LPHL.

Follow-up after Completion of Treatment

Recommendations included in the guidelines are based largely on the clinical practices at NCCN Member Institutions and are not supported by high-level evidence, since there are very little data available on the follow-up and monitoring of late effects in patients with HL, after completion of treatment.[123]

The follow-up schedule should be individualized, depending on clinical circumstances such as patient's age, stage of the disease, and initial treatment modality. The panel overwhelmingly agrees that, given the long-term risks of the therapies for HL, patients should be followed up by oncologists who are aware of these risks and complications, especially during the first five years and then annually because of the risk for late complications, including secondary cancers and cardiovascular disease.

Interim physical examinations and blood tests (CBC, platelets, ESR if elevated at initial diagnosis and chemistry profile) are performed every 2 to 4 months up to 2 years and then every 3 to 6 months for the next 3 to 5 years. An annual influenza vaccination is recommended for all patients. Repeat imaging studies of initially involved sites are important, as are surveillance studies of the chest and abdomen.[124] Chest imaging (chest X-ray or chest CT) and abdominal or pelvic CT should be performed every 6 to 12 months during the first 2 to 3 years. PET scans are not recommended for routine surveillance due to the risk of false positives.[24-26] Patients should be encouraged to undergo counseling on issues regarding survivorship, long-term treatment effects (secondary cancers, cardiac disease, and reproduction), health habits, and psychosocial issues.

Monitoring for Late Effects

Secondary cancers, cardiovascular disease, hypothyroidism, and fertility issues are the most serious late effects in long-term survivors of HL. The incidence of these late effects increases with longer follow-up time. The risk may be less with current treatment programs compared to those used more than 10 years ago.

Secondary Cancers

Solid tumors are the most common secondary cancers and most develop more than 10 years after the completion of treatment. The risk of developing secondary cancers is highest when RT is used as a component of first-line treatment. Recent meta-analysis by Franklin and colleagues showed that the risk of developing secondary cancers was lower with combined modality treatment than with RT alone as the initial treatment.[125] The risk was marginally higher with combined modality treatment when compared with chemotherapy alone as initial treatment. No significant differences in the risk of developing secondary cancers were seen with IFRT vs. EFRT, although the risk of developing breast cancer was substantially higher for EFRT. Risks for secondary lung cancer, NHL, and leukemia were significantly higher after treatment with chemotherapy alone, whereas combined modality therapy was associated with a higher risk for these and several other cancers.[126] Lung cancer and breast cancer are the most common secondary cancers in patients with HL.

Surveillance chest imaging should be considered for patients at increased risk for lung cancer (patients treated with chest irradiation or alkylating agent chemotherapy, and those with a smoking history).[124] Chest imaging is optional after 5 years for patients who were treated with nonalkylating agent chemotherapy, did not undergo RT, and have no other risk factors.

Annual breast screening [mammography or MRI] beginning no later than 8 to 10 years after completion of therapy or at the age of 40 (whichever occurs earlier) is recommended for women who have received chest or axillary irradiation.[124] They should also be encouraged to perform monthly self-breast examination and undergo yearly breast examination by a health care professional. The guidelines recommend breast MRI in addition to mammography for women who received irradiation to the chest between 10 and 30 years of age, which is consistent with the recommendation of the American Cancer Society Guidelines.[127]

Cardiovascular Disease

Mediastinal irradiation and anthracycline-based chemotherapy are the highest risk factors for developing cardiac disease, which may be asymptomatic.[128-130] RT-induced cardiotoxicity is observed usually more than 5 to 10 years after completion of treatment. However, cardiovascular symptoms may emerge at any age. Based on data regarding increased long-term risk of cardiac disease, annual blood pressure monitoring (even in asymptomatic individuals) and aggressive management of cardiovascular risk factors is recommended. [124] A baseline stress test or echocardiogram at 10 years after treatment (for patients treated with chest irradiation) and carotid ultrasound (for patients treated with neck RT) should be considered.

Hypothyroidism

Abnormal thyroid function, mostly hypothyroidism, is reported in about 50% of long-term survivors, especially those patients who received neck or upper mediastinal irradiation.[123] A careful thyroid examination should be a part of the physical exam. Thyroid function tests should be done at least annually to rule out hypothyroidism, especially in patients treated with RT to the neck.

Myelosuppression

Myelosuppression is the most common side effect of chemotherapy and is associated with increased risk of infections. It is uncommon for myelosuppression to continue for very long beyond completion of the primary treatment program. However, patients who undergo HDT/ASCR or allogeneic hematopoietic stem cell transplant (HSCT) as salvage therapy may be at continued risk for infection. Pneumococcal, meningococcal, and H-flu revaccination is recommended every 5 years for patients treated with splenic RT or splenectomy.

Pulmonary Toxicity

Bleomycin induced pulmonary toxicity (BPT) is well documented in patients with HL treated with bleomycin-containing chemotherapy regimens. Risk factors include older age, cumulative bleomycin dose, pulmonary irradiation, and prior history of lung disease. Some reports have suggested that the use of growth factors increases the incidence of pulmonary toxicity. Martin and colleagues reported that BPT significantly decreases the 5-year OS rate, especially in patients 40 years or older.[131] They also showed that the use of growth factor with chemotherapy significantly increases the incidence of BPT (26% vs. 9%). Recently, two separate studies confirmed that ABVD chemotherapy can be safely administered at the full-dose intensity without any growth factor support.[132,133] Five-year EFS (87.4% vs. 80%, respectively) and OS (94.1% vs. 91.3%, respectively) rates in patients who received ABVD with no growth factors were comparable to those in patients who received prophylactic growth factor support with the ABVD regimen.[133]

Leukopenia is not a risk factor for reduction of dose intensity. The NCCN Guidelines do not recommend the routine use of growth factors.

Refractory or Relapsed Disease

Classical Hodgkin Lymphoma

Two randomized phase III studies performed by the British National Lymphoma Investigation[134] and the GHSG/European Bone Marrow Transplantation Group[135] have compared HDT/ASCR with conventional chemotherapy in patients with relapsed or refractory HL. Both studies showed significant improvement in EFS and PFS and FFTF (with no difference in OS) for patients with relapsed or refractory HL who underwent HDT/ASCR compared with conventional chemotherapy alone. HDT/ASCR is the best option for patients with HL that is not cured with primary treatment, even though it does not improve OS.

Allogeneic HSCT with myeloablative conditioning has been associated with lower relapse rate in patients with relapsed or refractory disease; however, TRM was more than 50%. Allogeneic HSCT with reduced-intensity conditioning has been reported to have decreased rates of TRM.[136,137] However, this approach remains investigational. The panel has included allogeneic HSCT with a category 3 recommendation for patients with refractory or relapsed disease.

Several investigators have developed prognostic models to predict the outcome in patients with relapsed or refractory disease undergoing HDT/ASCR. Brice and colleagues used end-of-treatment to relapse interval (12 months or less) and extranodal disease at relapse as adverse prognostic factors to predict outcome of 280 patients undergoing HDT/ASCR.[138] The PFS rates were 93%, 59%, and 43%, respectively, for patients with 0, 1, or 2 of these risk factors. In a prospective study, Moskowitz and colleagues identified extranodal sites, CR duration of less than 1 year, primary refractory disease, and B symptoms as adverse prognostic factors associated with poor survival after HDT/ASCR.[139] In patients with none or one factor, 5-year EFS and OS were 83% and 90%, respectively, which decreased to 10% and

25% if all factors were present. This prognostic model has been used for the risk-adapted augmentation of salvage treatment in patients with relapsed or refractory disease to improve EFS in poorer risk patients.[140] In a retrospective analysis of 422 patients with relapsed disease, Josting and colleagues from the GHSG identified time to relapse, clinical stage at relapse, and anemia at relapse as independent risk factors to develop a prognostic score that classified patients into four subgroups with significantly different freedom from second failure and OS.[141] More recently, investigators of the GEL/TAMO group identified bulky disease at diagnosis, a short duration of first CR (less than one year), detectable disease at transplant, and the presence of more than one extranodal site as adverse factors for OS.[142] Other groups have identified extent of prior chemotherapy,[143] short time from diagnosis to transplant,[144] and disease status at transplantation[145] as significant prognostic factors for OS and PFS. Pretransplant functional imaging status has also been identified as an independent predictor of outcome in patients with recurrent/refractory HL.[146-149]

The main potential of these prognostic factor studies is to facilitate comparison of outcomes at different centers, where the preparatory regimens may vary.

Several studies have shown the importance of cytoreduction with second-line chemotherapy before HDT/ASCR.[139,150-156] Newer regimens, such as GVD (gemcitabine, vinorelbine, and pegylated liposomal doxorubicin),[157] IGEV (ifosfamide, gemcitabine, and vinorelbine),[158] and GCD (gemcitabine, carboplatin and dexamethasone)[159] have also been effective for relapsed or refractory HL. However, none of these regimens has been studied in randomized trials.

Some studies have suggested that patients with CR to second-line therapy prior to HDT/ASCR or those with chemosensitive disease to second-line chemotherapy have improved outcomes following HDT/ASCR compared to those with resistant disease.[160,161] Moskowitz et al reported that the EFS, PFS, and OS were significantly better for patients responding to second-line chemotherapy (60%, 62%, and 66%, respectively) compared to those who had a poor response (19%, 23%, and 17%, respectively) ($P < .001$).[160] More recently Sirohi et al also reported similar findings; the 5-year OS rate was 79%, 59%, and 17%, respectively, for patients who were in CR, PR, or those with resistant disease at the time of HDT/ASCR ($P < .0001$), and the 5-year PFS rate was 69%, 44%, and 14%, respectively ($P < .001$).[161]

Bendamustine, an alkylating agent, has shown substantial activity in the treatment of patients with relapsed or refractory non-Hodgkin's lymphomas and is approved by the FDA for the treatment of patients with chronic lymphocytic leukemia and rituximab-refractory indolent NHL.[162] In an ongoing phase II trial, bendamustine was well tolerated and highly active in heavily pre-treated patients (including those who had failed HDT/ASCR) with relapsed or refractory disease, resulting in an ORR of 56% among evaluable patients (34 out of 36 patients enrolled).[163] The ORR by intent-to-treat analysis was 53% (33% CR and 19% PR). The median response duration was 5 months.

Brentuximab vedotin, a CD30-directed antibody-drug conjugate, has demonstrated activity in patients with relapsed or refractory CD30-positive lymphomas.[164] In a pivotal phase II multicenter study of 102 patients with relapsed or refractory HL after HDT/ASCR, brentuximab vedotin induced objective responses and complete remissions in 75% and 34% of patients, respectively, with a median follow-up of more than 1.5 years. The median PFS and duration of CR for all patients was 5.6 months and 20.5 months, respectively.[165] Based

on the results of this study, the FDA approved brentuximab vedotin for the treatment of patients with Hodgkin's lymphoma after failure of HDT/ASCR or at least two prior chemotherapy regimens in patients who are not candidates for HDT/ASCR.

Josting and colleagues from the GHSG reported that second-line RT may be effective in a select subset of patients with relapsed or refractory disease.[166] The 5-year FFTF and OS rates were 28% and 51%, respectively. B symptoms and stage at the time of disease progression or relapse were identified as significant prognostic factors for OS. Moskowitz and colleagues have demonstrated the efficacy and feasibility of second-line RT with chemotherapy in patients with relapsed and refractory disease.[139] At a median follow-up of 43 months, the response rate to ICE and IFRT was 88% and the EFS rate for patients who underwent HDT/ASCR was 68%. Second-line RT may be effective in patients in good performance status with limited-stage late relapses and without B symptoms. It may be a very effective salvage regimen for patients with initial favorable stage I-II disease who are treated with chemotherapy alone and relapse in initially involved sites.

Individualized treatment is recommended for patients with progressive or relapsed disease since there are no data available to support a superior outcome with any of the treatment modalities.

NCCN Recommendations for Refractory Disease

Histologic confirmation with biopsy is recommended before initiating treatment for refractory disease. Although further cytoreduction and HDT/ASCR (with RT if not previously given) are often appropriate, occasional clinical circumstances may warrant the use of RT or chemotherapy with or without RT. Conventional-dose second-line chemotherapy may precede HDT/ASCR. RT is recommended when the sites of relapse have not been previously irradiated. In radiation-naïve patients, TLI may be an appropriate component of HDT/ASCR.

Second-line chemotherapy with or without RT followed by response assessment with PET is recommended for all patients. Patients with a score of Deauville 1-3 should be treated with HDT/ASCR or observation, if HDT/ASCR is contraindicated. HDT/ASCR or additional second-line therapy (RT or second-line chemotherapy with or without RT) followed by another restaging is recommended for patients with a PET score of Deauville 4. If the PET score is Deauville 1-4, HDT/ASCR or observation (only if the patient has achieved CR and HDT/ASCR is contraindicated) is recommended. If the PET remains Deauville 5, patients should be retreated with RT or second-line chemotherapy with or without RT. Brentuximab vedotin is included as an option for patients with a score of Deauville 4 or Deauville 5 following second-line chemotherapy with or without RT. The consensus of the panel was that patients who are refractory to second-line chemotherapy should not proceed to HDT/ASCR and patients with refractory disease who are not chemosensitive after 2 second-line chemotherapy regimens should be given a trial of brentuximab vedotin prior to HDT/ASCR even though they may be candidates for transplant. Therefore, the panel has included brentuximab vedotin as an option for patients who have failed HDT/ASCR or at least two prior chemotherapy regimens, regardless of their eligibility for HDT/ASCR.

NCCN Recommendations for Relapsed Disease

While second-line chemotherapy is an appropriate treatment for any patient with relapsed disease, regardless of the length of initial remission,[167] some studies have also suggested that second-line chemotherapy may not be essential before proceeding to HDT/ASCR for patients with minimal residual disease at relapse.[168] In selected

patients with long disease-free intervals and other favorable features, the selection of second-line chemotherapy should be individualized.

Suspected relapse should be confirmed with biopsy. Observation is appropriate if biopsy is negative; however, clinical circumstances may warrant additional therapy even if the biopsy is negative. Restaging, with or without bone marrow biopsy is recommended for patients with positive biopsy. Second-line chemotherapy with or without RT is recommended for all patients experiencing disease relapse after initial treatment with chemotherapy or combined modality therapy. Patients with stage IA to IIA disease who underwent chemotherapy alone and experienced failure at the initial sites should be treated with RT or second-line chemotherapy, with or without RT followed by restaging. Patients with a score of Deauville 1-3 should be treated with HDT/ASCR or observation (in selected patients). Those with a score of Deauville 4-5 should be managed as described above for refractory disease.

Lymphocyte-Predominant Hodgkin Lymphoma

LPHL patients with refractory or relapsed disease can be managed with second-line therapy as described below. However, some patients have a chronic indolent disease and may not require aggressive treatment.

Individualized treatment is recommended for patients with progressive or relapsed disease since there are no data available to support a superior outcome with any of the treatment modalities.

NCCN Recommendations for Refractory Disease

Asymptomatic patients should be observed whereas symptomatic patients should be treated with second-line therapy followed by restaging with PET. No further treatment is necessary if the PET score is Deauville 1-3. Patients with a score of Deauville 5 should be retreated with second-line therapy. Chemotherapy, rituximab, and RT are included as options (alone or in combination) for second-line therapy. Maintenance rituximab for 2 years is included as an option for patients treated with rituximab alone.[118]

NCCN Recommendations for Relapsed Disease

Late relapse or transformation to DLBCL has been reported in patients with LPHL.[169-171] In a study of 95 patients diagnosed with LPHL, with a median follow-up of 6.5 years, transformation to aggressive lymphoma was seen in 13 (14%) patients and the actuarial risk at 10 and 20 years was 7% and 30%, respectively.[171]

At relapse, re-biopsy should be considered to rule out transformation to aggressive lymphoma. Abdominal involvement has been associated with the risk of transformation to an aggressive B cell lymphoma.[120] Biopsy of new subdiaphragmatic sites should be considered for patients with stage III or IV disease. Patients with a negative biopsy can be observed and those with confirmed relapsed LPHL should be managed as described above for refractory disease. Patients with disease transformation to DLBCL should be managed as discussed in the NCCN Guidelines for Non-Hodgkin Lymphomas.

Summary

HL is an uncommon malignancy involving lymph nodes and the lymphatic system. The WHO classification divides HL into 2 main types: CHL and LPHL. CHL is characterized by the presence of Reed-Sternberg cells in an inflammatory background, whereas LPHL is characterized by the presence of lymphocytic and histiocytic cells.

Current management of HL involves initial treatment with chemotherapy or combined modality therapy, followed by restaging with PET/CT to assess treatment response using the Deauville response criteria. The

value of interim PET scans remains unclear and the panel emphasizes that all measures of response should be considered in the context of management decisions.

Combined modality therapy (ABVD or Stanford V and IFRT) is the preferred treatment for patients with stage IA or IIA favorable CHL. ABVD alone in included as an option with a category 2B recommendation. Chemotherapy (ABVD [category 1] or Stanford V or BEACOPP plus ABVD) followed by consolidative IFRT is recommended for patients with stage I-II unfavorable disease. Chemotherapy with ABVD or Stanford V or escalated-dose BEACOPP is recommended for patients with stage III-IV disease.

HDT/ASCR is the best treatment option for patients with refractory or relapsed CHL, although it does not improve OS. Second-line therapy (RT or conventional-dose second-line chemotherapy with or without RT) may be given prior to HDT/ASCR. The panel has included brentuximab vedotin as an option for patients with progressive disease after HDT/ASCR or at least two prior chemotherapy regimens for all patients regardless of their eligibility for HDT/ASCR.

LPHL has a different natural history and response to therapy compared with CHL. IFRT alone or observation is recommended for patients with stage IA or IIA disease. Chemotherapy with or without rituximab or IFRT is recommended for patients with stage IB or IIB or symptomatic stage III-IV disease. Observation may be an option for selected patients with stage IA or stage IIIA-IVA disease. Patients with refractory or relapsed LPHL can be managed with second-line therapy. However, some patients have a chronic indolent disease and may not require aggressive treatment, unless they are symptomatic. Maintenance rituximab for 2 years is included as an option for patients treated with refractory disease treated with rituximab alone.

HL is now curable in most patients because of the introduction of more effective and less toxic regimens. However, survivors may experience late treatment-related side effects. For this reason, long-term follow-up by an oncologist is essential after completion of treatment. Counseling about issues of survivorship and careful monitoring for late treatment-related side effects should be an integral part of follow-up. Consistent with NCCN philosophy, participation in clinical trials is always encouraged.

References

1. Siegel R, Naishadham D, Jemal A. Cancer statistics, 2013. CA Cancer J Clin 2013;63:11-30. Available at: http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/23335087.

2. WHO classification of tumours of haematopoietic and lymphoid tissues. In: Swerdlow SH, Campo E, Harris NL, et al., eds (ed 4). Lyon, France: IARC; 2008.

3. Carbone PP, Kaplan HS, Musshoff K, et al. Report of the committee on hodgkin's disease staging classification. Cancer Res 1971;31:1860-1861. Available at: http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/5121694.

4. Mauch P, Goodman R, Hellman S. The significance of mediastinal involvement in early stage Hodgkin's disease. Cancer 1978;42:1039-1045. Available at: http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/698907.

5. Lister TA, Crowther D, Sutcliffe SB, et al. Report of a committee convened to discuss the evaluation and staging of patients with Hodgkin's disease: Cotswolds meeting. J Clin Oncol 1989;7:1630-1636. Available at: http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/2809679.

6. Henry-Amar M, Friedman S, Hayat M, et al. Erythrocyte sedimentation rate predicts early relapse and survival in early-stage Hodgkin disease. The EORTC Lymphoma Cooperative Group. Ann Intern Med 1991;114:361-365. Available at: http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/1992877.

7. Tubiana M, Henry-Amar M, Hayat M, et al. Prognostic significance of the number of involved areas in the early stages of Hodgkin's disease. Cancer 1984;54:885-894. Available at: http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/6378359.

8. Hasenclever D, Diehl V. A prognostic score for advanced Hodgkin's disease. International Prognostic Factors Project on Advanced Hodgkin's Disease. N Engl J Med 1998;339:1506-1514. Available at: http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/9819449.

9. Cheson BD, Horning SJ, Coiffier B, et al. Report of an international workshop to standardize response criteria for non-Hodgkin's lymphomas. NCI Sponsored International Working Group. J Clin Oncol 1999;17:1244-1244. Available at: http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/10561185.

10. Cheson BD, Pfistner B, Juweid ME, et al. Revised response criteria for malignant lymphoma. J Clin Oncol 2007;25:579-586. Available at: http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/17242396.

11. Juweid ME, Stroobants S, Hoekstra OS, et al. Use of positron emission tomography for response assessment of lymphoma: consensus of the Imaging Subcommittee of International Harmonization Project in Lymphoma. J Clin Oncol 2007;25:571-578. Available at: http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/17242397.

12. Cheson BD. Role of functional imaging in the management of lymphoma. J Clin Oncol 2011;29:1844-1854. Available at: http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/21482982.

13. Meignan M, Gallamini A, Haioun C, Polliack A. Report on the Second International Workshop on interim positron emission tomography in lymphoma held in Menton, France, 8-9 April 2010. Leuk Lymphoma 2010;51:2171-2180. Available at: http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/21077737.

14. Meignan M, Gallamini A, Itti E, et al. Report on the Third International Workshop on Interim Positron Emission Tomography in Lymphoma held in Menton, France, 26-27 September 2011 and Menton 2011 consensus. Leuk Lymphoma 2012;53:1876-1881. Available at: http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/22432519.

15. Barrington SF, Qian W, Somer EJ, et al. Concordance between four European centres of PET reporting criteria designed for use in multicentre trials in Hodgkin lymphoma. Eur J Nucl Med Mol Imaging

2010;37:1824-1833. Available at: http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/20505930.

16. Dann EJ. PET/CT adapted therapy in Hodgkin disease: current state of the art and future directions. Curr Oncol Rep 2012;14:403-410. Available at: http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/22700011.

17. Gallamini A, Kostakoglu L. Interim FDG-PET in Hodgkin lymphoma: a compass for a safe navigation in clinical trials? Blood 2012;120:4913-4920. Available at: http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/22932799.

18. Isasi CR, Lu P, Blaufox MD. A metaanalysis of 18F-2-deoxy-2-fluoro-D-glucose positron emission tomography in the staging and restaging of patients with lymphoma. Cancer 2005;104:1066-1074. Available at: http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/16047335.

19. de Wit M, Bohuslavizki KH, Buchert R, et al. 18FDG-PET following treatment as valid predictor for disease-free survival in Hodgkin's lymphoma. Ann Oncol 2001;12:29-37. Available at: http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/11249046.

20. Guay C, Lepine M, Verreault J, Benard F. Prognostic value of PET using 18F-FDG in Hodgkin's disease for posttreatment evaluation. J Nucl Med 2003;44:1225-1231. Available at: http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/12902411.

21. Sher DJ, Mauch PM, Van Den Abbeele A, et al. Prognostic significance of mid- and post-ABVD PET imaging in Hodgkin's lymphoma: the importance of involved-field radiotherapy. Ann Oncol 2009;20:1848-1853. Available at: http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/19541793.

22. Engert A, Haverkamp H, Kobe C, et al. Reduced-intensity chemotherapy and PET-guided radiotherapy in patients with advanced stage Hodgkin's lymphoma (HD15 trial): a randomised, open-label, phase 3 non-inferiority trial. The Lancet 2012;379:1791-1799. Available at: http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/22480758.

23. Podoloff DA, Advani RH, Allred C, et al. NCCN task force report: positron emission tomography (PET)/computed tomography (CT) scanning in cancer. J Natl Compr Canc Netw 2007;5 Suppl 1:S1-S22; quiz S23-22. Available at: http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/17509259.

24. Mocikova H, Obrtlikova P, Vackova B, Trneny M. Positron emission tomography at the end of first-line therapy and during follow-up in patients with Hodgkin lymphoma: a retrospective study. Ann Oncol 2010;21:1222-1227. Available at: http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/19901011.

25. Goldschmidt N, Or O, Klein M, et al. The role of routine imaging procedures in the detection of relapse of patients with Hodgkin lymphoma and aggressive non-Hodgkin lymphoma. Ann Hematol 2011;90:165-171. Available at: http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/20706721.

26. El-Galaly T, Mylam KJ, Brown P, et al. PET/CT surveillance in patients with Hodgkin lymphoma in first remission is associated with low positive predictive value and high costs. Haematologica 2012 97:931-936. Available at: http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/22207683.

27. Meyer RM, Gospodarowicz MK, Connors JM, et al. Randomized comparison of ABVD chemotherapy with a strategy that includes radiation therapy in patients with limited-stage Hodgkin's lymphoma: National Cancer Institute of Canada Clinical Trials Group and the Eastern Cooperative Oncology Group. J Clin Oncol 2005;23:4634-4642. Available at: http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/15837968.

28. Meyer RM, Gospodarowicz MK, Connors JM, et al. ABVD Alone versus Radiation-Based Therapy in Limited-Stage Hodgkin's

Lymphoma. N Engl J Med 2012;366:399-408. Available at: http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/22149921.

29. Hutchings M, Mikhaeel NG, Fields PA, et al. Prognostic value of interim FDG-PET after two or three cycles of chemotherapy in Hodgkin lymphoma. Ann Oncol 2005;16:1160-1168. Available at: http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/15939713.

30. Barnes JA, LaCasce AS, Zukotynski K, et al. End-of-treatment but not interim PET scan predicts outcome in nonbulky limited-stage Hodgkin's lymphoma. Ann Oncol 2011;22:910-915. Available at: http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/20952598.

31. Straus DJ, Johnson JL, LaCasce AS, et al. Doxorubicin, vinblastine, and gemcitabine (CALGB 50203) for stage I/II nonbulky Hodgkin lymphoma: pretreatment prognostic factors and interim PET. Blood 2011;117:5314-5320. Available at: http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/21355087.

32. Zinzani PL, Rigacci L, Stefoni V, et al. Early interim 18F-FDG PET in Hodgkin's lymphoma: evaluation on 304 patients. Eur J Nucl Med Mol Imaging 2012;39:4-12. Available at: http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/21894546.

33. Kostakoglu L, Schoder H, Johnson JL, et al. Interim [(18)F]fluorodeoxyglucose positron emission tomography imaging in stage I-II non-bulky Hodgkin lymphoma: would using combined positron emission tomography and computed tomography criteria better predict response than each test alone? Leuk Lymphoma 2012;53:2143-2150. Available at: http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/22421007.

34. Gallamini A, Hutchings M, Avigdor A, Polliack A. Early interim PET scan in Hodgkin lymphoma: where do we stand? Leuk Lymphoma 2008;49:659-662. Available at: http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/18398732.

35. Terasawa T, Lau J, Bardet S, et al. Fluorine-18-fluorodeoxyglucose positron emission tomography for interim response assessment of advanced-stage Hodgkin's lymphoma and diffuse large B-cell lymphoma: a systematic review. J Clin Oncol 2009;27:1906-1914. Available at: http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/19273713.

36. Gallamini A, Rigacci L, Merli F, et al. The predictive value of positron emission tomography scanning performed after two courses of standard therapy on treatment outcome in advanced stage Hodgkin's disease. Haematologica 2006;91:475-481. Available at: http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/16585014.

37. Hutchings M, Loft A, Hansen M, et al. FDG-PET after two cycles of chemotherapy predicts treatment failure and progression-free survival in Hodgkin lymphoma. Blood 2006;107:52-59. Available at: http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/16150944.

38. Gallamini A, Hutchings M, Rigacci L, et al. Early interim 2-[18F]fluoro-2-deoxy-D-glucose positron emission tomography is prognostically superior to international prognostic score in advanced-stage Hodgkin's lymphoma: a report from a joint Italian-Danish study. J Clin Oncol 2007;25:3746-3752. Available at: http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/17646666.

39. Cerci JJ, Pracchia LF, Linardi CC, et al. 18F-FDG PET after 2 cycles of ABVD predicts event-free survival in early and advanced Hodgkin lymphoma. J Nucl Med 2010;51:1337-1343. Available at: http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/20720036.

40. Biggi A, Gallamini A, Chauvie S, et al. International Validation Study for Interim PET in ABVD-Treated, Advanced-Stage Hodgkin Lymphoma: Interpretation Criteria and Concordance Rate Among Reviewers. J Nucl Med 2013. Available at: http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/23516309.

41. Advani R, Maeda L, Lavori P, et al. Impact of positive positron emission tomography on prediction of freedom from progression after Stanford V chemotherapy in Hodgkin's disease. J Clin Oncol 2007;25:3902-3907. Available at: http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/17664458.

42. Markova J, Kahraman D, Kobe C, et al. Role of [18F]-fluoro-2-deoxy-d-glucose positron emission tomography in early and late therapy assessment of patients with advanced Hodgkin lymphoma treated with bleomycin, etoposide, adriamycin, cyclophosphamide, vincristine, procarbazine and prednisone. Leuk Lymphoma 2012;53:64-70. Available at: http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/21740300.

43. Avigdor A, Bulvik S, Levi I, et al. Two cycles of escalated BEACOPP followed by four cycles of ABVD utilizing early-interim PET/CT scan is an effective regimen for advanced high-risk Hodgkin's lymphoma. Ann Oncol 2010;21:126-132. Available at: http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/19608615.

44. Dann EJ, Bar-Shalom R, Tamir A, et al. Risk-adapted BEACOPP regimen can reduce the cumulative dose of chemotherapy for standard and high-risk Hodgkin lymphoma with no impairment of outcome. Blood 2007;109:905-909. Available at: http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/17018856.

45. Dann EJ, Blumenfeld Z, Bar-Shalom R, et al. A 10-year experience with treatment of high and standard risk Hodgkin disease: six cycles of tailored BEACOPP, with interim scintigraphy, are effective and female fertility is preserved. Am J Hematol 2012;87:32-36. Available at: http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/21956220.

46. Li J, Dabaja B, Reed V, et al. Rationale for and preliminary results of proton beam therapy for mediastinal lymphoma. Int J Radiat Oncol Biol Phys 2011;81:167-174. Available at: http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/20643518.

47. Hoppe BS, Flampouri S, Su Z, et al. Effective dose reduction to cardiac structures using protons compared with 3DCRT and IMRT in mediastinal Hodgkin lymphoma. Int J Radiat Oncol Biol Phys 2012;84:449-455. Available at: http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/22386373.

48. Yahalom J, Mauch P. The involved field is back: issues in delineating the radiation field in Hodgkin's disease. Ann Oncol 2002;13 Suppl 1:79-83. Available at: http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/12078908.

49. Specht L, Yahalom J, Illidge T, et al. Modern radiotherapy for hodgkin lymphoma – field and dose guidelines from the International Lymphoma Radiation Oncology Group (ILROG) Int J Radiat Oncol Biol Phys.:In press. Available at:

50. Hoskin PJ, Diez P, Williams M, et al. Recommendations for the use of radiotherapy in nodal lymphoma. Clin Oncol (R Coll Radiol) 2013;25:49-58. Available at: http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/22889569.

51. Bonadonna G, Bonfante V, Viviani S, et al. ABVD plus subtotal nodal versus involved-field radiotherapy in early-stage Hodgkin's disease: long-term results. J Clin Oncol 2004;22:2835-2841. Available at: http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/15199092.

52. Advani RH, Hoppe RT, Baer D, et al. Efficacy of abbreviated Stanford V chemotherapy and involved-field radiotherapy in early-stage Hodgkin lymphoma: mature results of the G4 trial. Ann Oncol 2013;24:1044-1048. Available at: http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/23136225.

53. Engert A, Plutschow A, Eich HT, et al. Reduced treatment intensity in patients with early-stage Hodgkin's lymphoma. N Engl J Med 2010;363:640-652. Available at: http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/20818855.

54. Caraway NP. Strategies to diagnose lymphoproliferative disorders by fine-needle aspiration by using ancillary studies. Cancer 2005;105:432-442. Available at: http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/16222688.

55. Hehn ST, Grogan TM, Miller TP. Utility of fine-needle aspiration as a diagnostic technique in lymphoma. J Clin Oncol 2004;22:3046-3052. Available at: http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/15284254.

56. Meda BA, Buss DH, Woodruff RD, et al. Diagnosis and subclassification of primary and recurrent lymphoma. The usefulness and limitations of combined fine-needle aspiration cytomorphology and flow cytometry. Am J Clin Pathol 2000;113:688-699. Available at: http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/10800402.

57. van der Kaaij MA, Heutte N, Meijnders P, et al. Premature ovarian failure and fertility in long-term survivors of Hodgkin's lymphoma: a European Organisation for Research and Treatment of Cancer Lymphoma Group and Groupe d'Etude des Lymphomes de l'Adulte Cohort Study. J Clin Oncol 2012;30:291-299. Available at: http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/22184372.

58. Sieniawski M, Reineke T, Nogova L, et al. Fertility in male patients with advanced Hodgkin lymphoma treated with BEACOPP: a report of the German Hodgkin Study Group (GHSG). Blood 2008;111:71-76. Available at: http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/17890456.

59. van der Kaaij MA, van Echten-Arends J, Simons AH, Kluin-Nelemans HC. Fertility preservation after chemotherapy for Hodgkin lymphoma. Hematol Oncol 2010;28:168-179. Available at: http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/20232475.

60. Terenziani M, Piva L, Meazza C, et al. Oophoropexy: a relevant role in preservation of ovarian function after pelvic irradiation. Fertil Steril 2009;91:935 e915-936. Available at: http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/18951125.

61. Duhmke E, Franklin J, Pfreundschuh M, et al. Low-dose radiation is sufficient for the noninvolved extended-field treatment in favorable early-stage Hodgkin's disease: long-term results of a randomized trial of radiotherapy alone. J Clin Oncol 2001;19:2905-2914. Available at: http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/11387364.

62. Gustavsson A, Osterman B, Cavallin-Stahl E. A systematic overview of radiation therapy effects in Hodgkin's lymphoma. Acta Oncol 2003;42:589-604. Available at: http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/14596517.

63. Bartlett NL, Rosenberg SA, Hoppe RT, et al. Brief chemotherapy, Stanford V, and adjuvant radiotherapy for bulky or advanced-stage Hodgkin's disease: a preliminary report. J Clin Oncol 1995;13:1080-1088. Available at: http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/7537796.

64. Koontz MZ, Horning SJ, Balise R, et al. Risk of Therapy-Related Secondary Leukemia in Hodgkin Lymphoma: The Stanford University Experience Over Three Generations of Clinical Trials. J Clin Oncol 2013;31:592-598. Available at: http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/23295809.

65. Abuzetun JY, Loberiza F, Vose J, et al. The Stanford V regimen is effective in patients with good risk Hodgkin lymphoma but radiotherapy is a necessary component. Br J Haematol 2009;144:531-537. Available at: http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/19055670.

66. Rueda Dominguez A, Marquez A, Guma J, et al. Treatment of stage I and II Hodgkin's lymphoma with ABVD chemotherapy: results after 7 years of a prospective study. Ann Oncol 2004;15:1798-1804. Available at: http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/15550585.

67. Straus DJ, Portlock CS, Qin J, et al. Results of a prospective randomized clinical trial of doxorubicin, bleomycin, vinblastine, and dacarbazine (ABVD) followed by radiation therapy (RT) versus ABVD alone for stages I, II, and IIIA nonbulky Hodgkin disease. Blood 2004;104:3483-3489. Available at: http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/15315964.

68. Ferme C, Eghbali H, Meerwaldt JH, et al. Chemotherapy plus involved-field radiation in early-stage Hodgkin's disease. N Engl J Med 2007;357:1916-1927. Available at: http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/17989384.

69. Radford J, Barrington S, Counsell N, et al. Involved Field Radiotherapy Versus No Further Treatment in Patients with Clinical Stages IA and IIA Hodgkin Lymphoma and a 'Negative' PET Scan After 3 Cycles ABVD. Results of the UK NCRI RAPID Trial [abstract]. Blood 2012;120:Abstract 547. Available at: http://abstracts.hematologylibrary.org/cgi/content/abstract/ashmtg;120/21/547.

70. Andre MP, Reman O, Federico M, et al. Interim Analysis of the Randomized Eortc/Lysa/Fil Intergroup H10 Trial On Early PET-Scan Driven Treatment Adaptation in Stage I/II Hodgkin Lymphoma. ASH Annual Meeting Abstracts 2012;120:549-. Available at: http://abstracts.hematologylibrary.org/cgi/content/abstract/120/21/549.

71. Engert A, Schiller P, Josting A, et al. Involved-field radiotherapy is equally effective and less toxic compared with extended-field radiotherapy after four cycles of chemotherapy in patients with early-stage unfavorable Hodgkin's lymphoma: results of the HD8 trial of the German Hodgkin's Lymphoma Study Group. J Clin Oncol 2003;21:3601-3608. Available at: http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/12913100.

72. Sasse S, Klimm B, Görgen H, et al. Comparing long-term toxicity and efficacy of combined modality treatment including extended- or involved-field radiotherapy in early-stage Hodgkin's lymphoma. Annals of Oncology 2012;23:2953-2959. Available at: http://annonc.oxfordjournals.org/content/23/11/2953.abstract.

73. Horning SJ, Hoppe RT, Breslin S, et al. Stanford V and radiotherapy for locally extensive and advanced Hodgkin's disease: mature results of a prospective clinical trial. J Clin Oncol 2002;20:630-637. Available at: http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/11821442.

74. Chisesi T, Bellei M, Luminari S, et al. Long-Term Follow-Up Analysis of HD9601 Trial Comparing ABVD Versus Stanford V Versus MOPP/EBV/CAD in Patients With Newly Diagnosed Advanced-Stage Hodgkin's Lymphoma: A Study From the Intergruppo Italiano Linfomi. J Clin Oncol 2011;29:4227-4233. Available at: http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/21990405.

75. Aversa SM, Salvagno L, Soraru M, et al. Stanford V regimen plus consolidative radiotherapy is an effective therapeutic program for bulky or advanced-stage Hodgkin's disease. Acta Haematol 2004;112:141-147. Available at: http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/15345896.

76. Edwards-Bennett SM, Jacks LM, Moskowitz CH, et al. Stanford V program for locally extensive and advanced Hodgkin lymphoma: the Memorial Sloan-Kettering Cancer Center experience. Ann Oncol 2010;21:574-581. Available at: http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/19759185.

77. Hoskin PJ, Lowry L, Horwich A, et al. Randomized comparison of the stanford V regimen and ABVD in the treatment of advanced Hodgkin's Lymphoma: United Kingdom National Cancer Research Institute Lymphoma Group Study ISRCTN 64141244. J Clin Oncol 2009;27:5390-5396. Available at: http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/19738111.

78. Gordon LI, Hong F, Fisher RI, et al. Randomized Phase III Trial of ABVD Versus Stanford V With or Without Radiation Therapy in Locally Extensive and Advanced-Stage Hodgkin Lymphoma: An Intergroup Study Coordinated by the Eastern Cooperative Oncology Group (E2496). J Clin Oncol 2013;31:684-691. Available at: http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/23182987.

79. Diehl V, Sieber M, Ruffer U, et al. BEACOPP: an intensified chemotherapy regimen in advanced Hodgkin's disease. The German Hodgkin's Lymphoma Study Group. Ann Oncol 1997;8:143-148. Available at: http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/9093722.

80. Eich HT, Diehl V, Görgen H, et al. Intensified chemotherapy and dose-reduced involved-field radiotherapy in patients with early unfavorable hodgkin's lymphoma: final analysis of the German Hodgkin

Study Group HD11 trial. J Clin Oncol 2010;28:4199-4206. Available at: http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/20713848.

81. von Tresckow B, Plutschow A, Fuchs M, et al. Dose-Intensification in Early Unfavorable Hodgkin's Lymphoma: Final Analysis of the German Hodgkin Study Group HD14 Trial. J Clin Oncol 2012;30:907-913. Available at: http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/22271480.

82. Behar RA, Horning SJ, Hoppe RT. Hodgkin's disease with bulky mediastinal involvement: effective management with combined modality therapy. Int J Radiat Oncol Biol Phys 1993;25:771-776. Available at: http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/7683016.

83. Longo DL, Russo A, Duffey PL, et al. Treatment of advanced-stage massive mediastinal Hodgkin's disease: the case for combined modality treatment. J Clin Oncol 1991;9:227-235. Available at: http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/1988570.

84. DeVita VT, Jr., Simon RM, Hubbard SM, et al. Curability of advanced Hodgkin's disease with chemotherapy. Long-term follow-up of MOPP-treated patients at the National Cancer Institute. Ann Intern Med 1980;92:587-595. Available at: http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/6892984.

85. Canellos GP, Anderson JR, Propert KJ, et al. Chemotherapy of advanced Hodgkin's disease with MOPP, ABVD, or MOPP alternating with ABVD. N Engl J Med 1992;327:1478-1484. Available at: http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/1383821.

86. Duggan DB, Petroni GR, Johnson JL, et al. Randomized comparison of ABVD and MOPP/ABV hybrid for the treatment of advanced Hodgkin's disease: report of an intergroup trial. J Clin Oncol 2003;21:607-614. Available at: http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/12586796.

87. Johnson PWM, Radford JA, Cullen MH, et al. Comparison of ABVD and alternating or hybrid multidrug regimens for the treatment of advanced Hodgkin's lymphoma: results of the United Kingdom Lymphoma Group LY09 Trial (ISRCTN97144519). J Clin Oncol 2005;23:9208-9218. Available at: http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/16314615.

88. Johnson PWM, Sydes MR, Hancock BW, et al. Consolidation radiotherapy in patients with advanced Hodgkin's Lymphoma: survival data from the UKLG LY09 randomized controlled trial (ISRCTN97144519). . J Clin Oncol 2010:3352-3359. Available at: http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/20498402.

89. Diehl V, Franklin J, Pfreundschuh M, et al. Standard and increased-dose BEACOPP chemotherapy compared with COPP-ABVD for advanced Hodgkin's disease. N Engl J Med 2003;348:2386-2395. Available at: http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/12802024.

90. Engert A, Diehl V, Franklin J, et al. Escalated-dose BEACOPP in the treatment of patients with advanced-stage Hodgkin's lymphoma: 10 years of follow-up of the GHSG HD9 study. J Clin Oncol 2009;27:4548-4554. Available at: http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/19704068.

91. Borchmann P, Haverkamp H, Diehl V, et al. Eight Cycles of Escalated-Dose BEACOPP Compared With Four Cycles of Escalated-Dose BEACOPP Followed by Four Cycles of Baseline-Dose BEACOPP With or Without Radiotherapy in Patients With Advanced-Stage Hodgkin's Lymphoma: Final Analysis of the HD12 Trial of the German Hodgkin Study Group. J Clin Oncol 2011;29:4234-4242. Available at: http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/21990399.

92. Federico M, Luminari S, Iannitto E, et al. ABVD compared with BEACOPP compared with CEC for the initial treatment of patients with advanced Hodgkin's lymphoma: results from the HD2000 Gruppo Italiano per lo Studio dei Linfomi Trial. J Clin Oncol 2009;27:805-811. Available at: http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/19124807

93. Viviani S, Zinzani PL, Rambaldi A, et al. ABVD versus BEACOPP for Hodgkin's lymphoma when high-dose salvage is planned. N Engl J Med 2011;365:203-212. Available at: http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/21774708.

94. Carde PP, Karrasch M, Fortpied C, et al. ABVD (8 cycles) versus BEACOPP (4 escalated cycles => 4 baseline) in stage III-IV high-risk Hodgkin lymphoma (HL): First results of EORTC 20012 Intergroup randomized phase III clinical trial [abstract]. J Clin Oncol Abstracts 2012;30:Abstract 8002. Available at: http://meeting.ascopubs.org/cgi/content/abstract/30/15_suppl/8002.

95. Fabian CJ, Mansfield CM, Dahlberg S, et al. Low-dose involved field radiation after chemotherapy in advanced Hodgkin disease. A Southwest Oncology Group randomized study. Ann Intern Med 1994;120:903-912. Available at: http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/8172436.

96. Aleman BM, Raemaekers JM, Tomisic R, et al. Involved-field radiotherapy for patients in partial remission after chemotherapy for advanced Hodgkin's lymphoma. Int J Radiat Oncol Biol Phys 2007;67:19-30. Available at: http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/17097834.

97. Laskar S, Gupta T, Vimal S, et al. Consolidation radiation after complete remission in Hodgkin's disease following six cycles of doxorubicin, bleomycin, vinblastine, and dacarbazine chemotherapy: is there a need? J Clin Oncol 2004;22:62-68. Available at: http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/14657226.

98. Carella AM, Bellei M, Brice P, et al. High-dose therapy and autologous stem cell transplantation versus conventional therapy for patients with advanced Hodgkin's lymphoma responding to front-line therapy: long-term results. Haematologica 2009;94:146-148. Available at: http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/19001284.

99. Proctor SJ, Mackie M, Dawson A, et al. A population-based study of intensive multi-agent chemotherapy with or without autotransplant for the highest risk Hodgkin's disease patients identified by the Scotland and Newcastle Lymphoma Group (SNLG) prognostic index. A Scotland and Newcastle Lymphoma Group study (SNLG HD III). Eur J Cancer 2002;38:795-806. Available at: http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/11937314.

100. Lee AI, LaCasce AS. Nodular lymphocyte predominant Hodgkin lymphoma. Oncologist 2009;14:739-751. Available at: http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/19605845.

101. Nogova L, Reineke T, Brillant C, et al. Lymphocyte-predominant and classical Hodgkin's lymphoma: a comprehensive analysis from the German Hodgkin Study Group. J Clin Oncol 2008;26:434-439. Available at: http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/18086799.

102. Diehl V, Sextro M, Franklin J, et al. Clinical presentation, course, and prognostic factors in lymphocyte-predominant Hodgkin's disease and lymphocyte-rich classical Hodgkin's disease: report from the European Task Force on Lymphoma Project on Lymphocyte-Predominant Hodgkin's Disease. J Clin Oncol 1999;17:776-783. Available at: http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/10071266.

103. Nogova L, Reineke T, Eich HT, et al. Extended field radiotherapy, combined modality treatment or involved field radiotherapy for patients with stage IA lymphocyte-predominant Hodgkin's lymphoma: a retrospective analysis from the German Hodgkin Study Group (GHSG). Ann Oncol 2005;16:1683-1687. Available at: http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/16093276.

104. Schlembach PJ, Wilder RB, Jones D, et al. Radiotherapy alone for lymphocyte-predominant Hodgkin's disease. Cancer J 2002;8:377-383. Available at: http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/12416895.

105. Tsai HK, Mauch PM. Nodular lymphocyte-predominant hodgkin lymphoma. Semin Radiat Oncol 2007;17:184-189. Available at: http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/17591565.

106. Wilder RB, Schlembach PJ, Jones D, et al. European Organization for Research and Treatment of Cancer and Groupe d'Etude des Lymphomes de l'Adulte very favorable and favorable, lymphocyte-predominant Hodgkin disease. Cancer 2002;94:1731-1738. Available at: http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/11920535.

107. Wirth A, Yuen K, Barton M, et al. Long-term outcome after radiotherapy alone for lymphocyte-predominant Hodgkin lymphoma: a retrospective multicenter study of the Australasian Radiation Oncology Lymphoma Group. Cancer 2005;104:1221-1229. Available at: http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/16094666.

108. Chen RC, Chin MS, Ng AK, et al. Early-stage, lymphocyte-predominant Hodgkin's lymphoma: patient outcomes from a large, single-institution series with long follow-up. J Clin Oncol 2010;28:136-141. Available at: http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/19933914.

109. Feugier P, Labouyrie E, Djeridane M, et al. Comparison of initial characteristics and long-term outcome of patients with lymphocyte-predominant Hodgkin lymphoma and classical Hodgkin lymphoma at clinical stages IA and IIA prospectively treated by brief anthracycline-based chemotherapies plus extended high-dose irradiation. Blood 2004;104:2675-2681. Available at: http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/15231567.

110. Jackson C, Sirohi B, Cunningham D, et al. Lymphocyte-predominant Hodgkin lymphoma—clinical features and treatment outcomes from a 30-year experience. Ann Oncol 2010;21:2061-2068. Available at: http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/20332141.

111. Engert A, Franklin J, Eich HT, et al. Two cycles of doxorubicin, bleomycin, vinblastine, and dacarbazine plus extended-field radiotherapy is superior to radiotherapy alone in early favorable Hodgkin's lymphoma: final results of the GHSG HD7 trial. J Clin Oncol 2007;25:3495-3502. Available at: http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/17606976.

112. Savage KJ, Skinnider B, Al-Mansour M, et al. Treating limited stage nodular lymphocyte predominant Hodgkin lymphoma similarly to classical Hodgkin lymphoma with ABVD may improve outcome. Blood 2011;118:4585-4590. Available at: http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/21873543.

113. Canellos GP, Mauch P. What is the appropriate systemic chemotherapy for lymphocyte-predominant Hodgkin's Lymphoma? . J Clin Oncol 2010;28:e8. Available at: http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/19933898.

114. Unal A, Sari I, Deniz K, et al. Familial nodular lymphocyte predominant Hodgkin lymphoma: successful treatment with CHOP plus rituximab Leuk Lymphoma 2005;46:1613-1617. Available at: http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/16236615.

115. Fanale MA, Lai C-M, McLaughlin P, et al. Outcomes of Nodular Lymphocyte Predominant Hodgkin's Lymphoma (NLPHL) Patients Treated with R-CHOP [abstract]. Blood 2010;116:Abstract 2812. Available at: http://abstracts.hematologylibrary.org/cgi/content/abstract/116/21/2812.

116. Shankar A, Hall GW, Gorde-Grosjean S, et al. Treatment outcome after low intensity chemotherapy [CVP] in children and adolescents with early stage nodular lymphocyte predominant Hodgkin's lymphoma - an Anglo-French collaborative report. Eur J Cancer 2012;48:1700-1706. Available at: http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/22093944.

117. Ekstrand BC, Lucas JB, Horwitz SM, et al. Rituximab in lymphocyte-predominant Hodgkin disease: results of a phase 2 trial. Blood 2003;101:4285-4289. Available at: http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/12586628.

118. Horning SJ, Bartlett NL, Breslin S, et al. Results of a prospective phase II Trial of limited and extended rituximab treatment in nodular lymphocyte predominant Hodgkin's disease (NLPHD) [abstract]. Blood 2007;110:Abstract 644. Available at: http://abstracts.hematologylibrary.org/cgi/content/abstract/110/11/644.

119. Eichenauer DA, Fuchs M, Pluetschow A, et al. Phase 2 study of rituximab in newly diagnosed stage IA nodular lymphocyte-predominant Hodgkin lymphoma: a report from the German Hodgkin Study Group. Blood 2011;118:4363-4365. Available at: http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/21828141.

120. Advani RH, Horning SJ, Hoppe RT, et al. Frontline therapy of nodular lymphocyte predominant hodgkin lymphoma with rituximab: the Stanford University experience [abstract]. Blood 2011;118:Abstract 2686. Available at: http://abstracts.hematologylibrary.org/cgi/content/abstract/ashmtg;118/21/2686.

121. Schulz H, Rehwald U, Morschhauser F, et al. Rituximab in relapsed lymphocyte-predominant Hodgkin lymphoma: long-term results of a phase 2 trial by the German Hodgkin Lymphoma Study Group (GHSG). Blood 2008;111:109-111. Available at: http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/17938252.

122. Azim HA, Jr., Pruneri G, Cocorocchio E, et al. Rituximab in lymphocyte-predominant Hodgkin disease. Oncology 2009;76:26-29. Available at: http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/19033694.

123. Mauch P, Ng A, Aleman B, et al. Report from the Rockefellar Foundation sponsored international workshop on reducing mortality and improving quality of life in long-term survivors of Hodgkin's disease. Eur J Haematol Suppl 2005:68-76. Available at: http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/16007872.

124. Ng A, Constine LS, Advani R, et al. ACR Appropriateness Criteria: follow-up of Hodgkin's lymphoma. Curr Probl Cancer 2010;34:211-227. Available at: http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/20541059.

125. Franklin J, Pluetschow A, Paus M, et al. Second malignancy risk associated with treatment of Hodgkin's lymphoma: meta-analysis of the randomised trials. Ann Oncol 2006;17:1749-1760. Available at: http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/16984979.

126. Swerdlow AJ, Higgins CD, Smith P, et al. Second cancer risk after chemotherapy for Hodgkin's lymphoma: a collaborative British cohort study. J Clin Oncol 2011;29:4096-4104. Available at: http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/21969511.

127. Saslow D, Boetes C, Burke W, et al. American Cancer Society guidelines for breast screening with MRI as an adjunct to mammography. CA Cancer J Clin 2007;57:75-89. Available at: http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/17392385.

128. Heidenreich PA, Hancock SL, Lee BK, et al. Asymptomatic cardiac disease following mediastinal irradiation. J Am Coll Cardiol 2003;42:743-749. Available at: http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/12932613.

129. Adams MJ, Lipsitz SR, Colan SD, et al. Cardiovascular status in long-term survivors of Hodgkin's disease treated with chest radiotherapy. J Clin Oncol 2004;22:3139-3148. Available at: http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/15284266.

130. Aleman BM, van den Belt-Dusebout AW, De Bruin ML, et al. Late cardiotoxicity after treatment for Hodgkin lymphoma. Blood 2007;109:1878-1886. Available at: http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/17119114.

131. Martin WG, Ristow KM, Habermann TM, et al. Bleomycin pulmonary toxicity has a negative impact on the outcome of patients with Hodgkin's lymphoma. J Clin Oncol 2005;23:7614-7620. Available at: http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/16186594.

132. Boleti E, Mead GM. ABVD for Hodgkin's lymphoma: full-dose chemotherapy without dose reductions or growth factors. Ann Oncol 2007;18:376-380. Available at: http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/17071938.

133. Evens AM, Cilley J, Ortiz T, et al. G-CSF is not necessary to maintain over 99% dose-intensity with ABVD in the treatment of Hodgkin lymphoma: low toxicity and excellent outcomes in a 10-year

analysis. Br J Haematol 2007;137:545-552. Available at: http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/17459049.

134. Linch DC, Winfield D, Goldstone AH, et al. Dose intensification with autologous bone-marrow transplantation in relapsed and resistant Hodgkin's disease: results of a BNLI randomised trial. Lancet 1993;341:1051-1054. Available at: http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/8096958.

135. Schmitz N, Pfistner B, Sextro M, et al. Aggressive conventional chemotherapy compared with high-dose chemotherapy with autologous haemopoietic stem-cell transplantation for relapsed chemosensitive Hodgkin's disease: a randomised trial. Lancet 2002;359:2065-2071. Available at: http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/12086759.

136. Alvarez I, Sureda A, Caballero MD, et al. Nonmyeloablative stem cell transplantation is an effective therapy for refractory or relapsed hodgkin lymphoma: results of a spanish prospective cooperative protocol. Biol Blood Marrow Transplant 2006;12:172-183. Available at: http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/16443515.

137. Sureda A, Robinson S, Canals C, et al. Reduced-intensity conditioning compared with conventional allogeneic stem-cell transplantation in relapsed or refractory Hodgkin's lymphoma: an analysis from the Lymphoma Working Party of the European Group for Blood and Marrow Transplantation. J Clin Oncol 2008;26:455-462. Available at: http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/18086796.

138. Brice P, Bouabdallah R, Moreau P, et al. Prognostic factors for survival after high-dose therapy and autologous stem cell transplantation for patients with relapsing Hodgkin's disease: analysis of 280 patients from the French registry. Societe Francaise de Greffe de Moelle. Bone Marrow Transplant 1997;20:21-26. Available at: http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/9232251.

139. Moskowitz CH, Nimer SD, Zelenetz AD, et al. A 2-step comprehensive high-dose chemoradiotherapy second-line program for relapsed and refractory Hodgkin disease: analysis by intent to treat and development of a prognostic model. Blood 2001;97:616-623. Available at: http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/11157476.

140. Moskowitz CH, Yahalom J, Zelenetz AD, et al. High-dose chemo-radiotherapy for relapsed or refractory Hodgkin lymphoma and the significance of pre-transplant functional imaging. Br J Haematol 2010;148:890-897. Available at: http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/20085577.

141. Josting A, Franklin J, May M, et al. New prognostic score based on treatment outcome of patients with relapsed Hodgkin's lymphoma registered in the database of the German Hodgkin's lymphoma study group. J Clin Oncol 2002;20:221-230. Available at: http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/11773173.

142. Sureda A, Constans M, Iriondo A, et al. Prognostic factors affecting long-term outcome after stem cell transplantation in Hodgkin's lymphoma autografted after a first relapse. Ann Oncol 2005;16:625-633. Available at: http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/15737986.

143. Stiff PJ, Unger JM, Forman SJ, et al. The value of augmented preparative regimens combined with an autologous bone marrow transplant for the management of relapsed or refractory Hodgkin disease: a Southwest Oncology Group phase II trial. Biol Blood Marrow Transplant 2003;9:529-539. Available at: http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/12931122.

144. Wheeler C, Eickhoff C, Elias A, et al. High-dose cyclophosphamide, carmustine, and etoposide with autologous transplantation in Hodgkin's disease: a prognostic model for treatment outcomes. Biol Blood Marrow Transplant 1997;3:98-9106. Available at: http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/9267670.

145. Horning SJ, Chao NJ, Negrin RS, et al. High-dose therapy and autologous hematopoietic progenitor cell transplantation for recurrent or refractory Hodgkin's disease: analysis of the Stanford University results

and prognostic indices. Blood 1997;89:801-813. Available at: http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/9028311.

146. Jabbour E, Hosing C, Ayers G, et al. Pretransplant positive positron emission tomography/gallium scans predict poor outcome in patients with recurrent/refractory Hodgkin lymphoma. Cancer 2007;109:2481-2489. Available at: http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/17497648.

147. Mocikova H, Pytlik R, Markova J, et al. Pre-transplant positron emission tomography in patients with relapsed Hodgkin lymphoma. Leuk Lymphoma 2011;52:1668-1674. Available at: http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/21699377.

148. Smeltzer JP, Cashen AF, Zhang Q, et al. Prognostic significance of FDG-PET in relapsed or refractory classical Hodgkin lymphoma treated with standard salvage chemotherapy and autologous stem cell transplantation. Biol Blood Marrow Transplant 2011;17:1646-1652. Available at: http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/21601641.

149. Moskowitz CH, Matasar MJ, Zelenetz AD, et al. Normalization of pre-ASCT, FDG-PET imaging with second-line, non–cross-resistant, chemotherapy programs improves event-free survival in patients with Hodgkin lymphoma. Blood 2012;119:1665-1670. Available at: http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/22184409.

150. ChlVPP therapy for Hodgkin's disease: experience of 960 patients. The International ChlVPP Treatment Group. Ann Oncol 1995;6:167-172. Available at: http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/7786824.

151. Aparicio J, Segura A, Garcera S, et al. ESHAP is an active regimen for relapsing Hodgkin's disease. Ann Oncol 1999;10:593-595. Available at: http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/10416011.

152. Colwill R, Crump M, Couture F, et al. Mini-BEAM as salvage therapy for relapsed or refractory Hodgkin's disease before intensive therapy and autologous bone marrow transplantation. J Clin Oncol 1995;13:396-402. Available at: http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/7844600.

153. Josting A, Rudolph C, Reiser M, et al. Time-intensified dexamethasone/cisplatin/cytarabine: an effective salvage therapy with low toxicity in patients with relapsed and refractory Hodgkin's disease. Ann Oncol 2002;13:1628-1635. Available at: http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/12377653.

154. Montoto S, Camos M, Lopez-Guillermo A, et al. Hybrid chemotherapy consisting of cyclophosphamide, vincristine, procarbazine, prednisone, doxorubicin, bleomycin, and vinblastine (C-MOPP/ABV) as first-line treatment for patients with advanced Hodgkin disease. Cancer 2000;88:2142-2148. Available at: http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/10813727.

155. Phillips JK, Spearing RL, Davies JM, et al. VIM-D salvage chemotherapy in Hodgkin's disease. Cancer Chemother Pharmacol 1990;27:161-163. Available at: http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/2249334.

156. Ferme C, Bastion Y, Lepage E, et al. The MINE regimen as intensive salvage chemotherapy for relapsed and refractory Hodgkin's disease. Ann Oncol 1995;6:543-549. Available at: http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/8573532.

157. Bartlett NL, Niedzwiecki D, Johnson JL, et al. Gemcitabine, vinorelbine, and pegylated liposomal doxorubicin (GVD), a salvage regimen in relapsed Hodgkin's lymphoma: CALGB 59804. Ann Oncol 2007;18:1071-1079. Available at: http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/17426059.

158. Santoro A, Magagnoli M, Spina M, et al. Ifosfamide, gemcitabine, and vinorelbine: a new induction regimen for refractory and relapsed Hodgkin's lymphoma. Haematologica 2007;92:35-41. Available at: http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/17229633.

159. Gopal AK, Press OW, Shustov AR, et al. Efficacy and safety of gemcitabine, carboplatin, dexamethasone, and rituximab in patients with relapsed/refractory lymphoma: a prospective multi-center phase II study by the Puget Sound Oncology Consortium. Leuk Lymphoma 2010;51:1523-1529. Available at: http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/20578815.

160. Moskowitz CH, Kewalramani T, Nimer SD, et al. Effectiveness of high dose chemoradiotherapy and autologous stem cell transplantation for patients with biopsy-proven primary refractory Hodgkin's disease. Br J Haematol 2004;124:645-652. Available at: http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/14871252.

161. Sirohi B, Cunningham D, Powles R, et al. Long-term outcome of autologous stem-cell transplantation in relapsed or refractory Hodgkin's lymphoma. Ann Oncol 2008;19:1312-1319. Available at: http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/18356139.

162. Rummel MJ, Gregory SA. Bendamustine's emerging role in the management of lymphoid malignancies. Semin Hematol 2011;48 Suppl 1:S24-36. Available at: http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/21530769.

163. Moskowitz AJ, Hamlin PA, Perales M-A, et al. Phase II Study of Bendamustine in Relapsed and Refractory Hodgkin Lymphoma. J Clin Oncol 2013;31:456-460. Available at: http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/23248254.

164. Younes A, Bartlett NL, Leonard JP, et al. Brentuximab Vedotin (SGN-35) for Relapsed CD30-Positive Lymphomas. N Engl J Med 2010;363:1812-1821. Available at: http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/21047225.

165. Younes A, Gopal AK, Smith SE, et al. Results of a Pivotal Phase II Study of Brentuximab Vedotin for Patients With Relapsed or Refractory Hodgkin's Lymphoma. J Clin Oncol 2012;30:2183-2189. Available at: http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/22454421.

166. Josting A, Nogova L, Franklin J, et al. Salvage radiotherapy in patients with relapsed and refractory Hodgkin's lymphoma: a retrospective analysis from the German Hodgkin Lymphoma Study Group. J Clin Oncol 2005;23:1522-1529. Available at: http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/15632410.

167. Sweetenham JW, Taghipour G, Milligan D, et al. High-dose therapy and autologous stem cell rescue for patients with Hodgkin's disease in first relapse after chemotherapy: results from the EBMT. Lymphoma Working Party of the European Group for Blood and Marrow Transplantation. Bone Marrow Transplant 1997;20:745-752. Available at: http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/9384476.

168. Bierman PJ, Anderson JR, Freeman MB, et al. High-dose chemotherapy followed by autologous hematopoietic rescue for Hodgkin's disease patients following first relapse after chemotherapy. Ann Oncol 1996;7:151-156. Available at: http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/8777171.

169. Miettinen M, Franssila KO, Saxen E. Hodgkin's disease, lymphocytic predominance nodular. Increased risk for subsequent non-Hodgkin's lymphomas. Cancer 1983;51:2293-2300. Available at: http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/6850508.

170. Huang JZ, Weisenburger DD, Vose JM, et al. Diffuse large B-cell lymphoma arising in nodular lymphocyte predominant Hodgkin lymphoma: a report of 21 cases from the Nebraska Lymphoma Study Group. Leuk Lymphoma 2004;45:1551-1557. Available at: http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/15370206.

171. Al-Mansour M, Connors JM, Gascoyne RD, et al. Transformation to aggressive lymphoma in nodular lymphocyte-predominant Hodgkin's lymphoma. J Clin Oncol 2010;28:793-799. Available at: http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/20048177.

