

1 **Comprehensive Analysis of Atypical chronic myeloid leukemia (aCML): Epidemiology,**
2 **Clinical Features, and Survival Outcomes Based on SEER Database Insights**

3 Running title: Epidemiology of aCML

4 Fan Wang

5 Department of Hematology, Tongji Hospital, Tongji Medical College, Huazhong University of
6 Science and Technology, Wuhan, Hubei, The People's Republic of China

7 *Correspondence: Dr. Fan Wang, Department of Hematology, Tongji Hospital, Tongji Medical
8 College, Huazhong University of Science and Technology, 1095 Jiefang Avenue, Wuhan, Hubei
9 430030, China; fanwaang@hust.edu.cn

10

11

12

13 **Key Words:** atypical chronic myeloid leukemia, epidemiology, survival, SEER database,
14 accelerated failure time (AFT) regression analysis.

15

16

17

18

19

20

1 **Abstract**

2 **Background:** Atypical Chronic Myeloid Leukemia (aCML) is a rare and aggressive
3 myelodysplastic syndrome/myeloproliferative neoplasm. This study aimed to provide a
4 comprehensive understanding of the epidemiology, clinical characteristics, and survival
5 outcomes of aCML patients.

6 **Methods:** The study utilized data from the Surveillance, Epidemiology, and End Results (SEER)
7 database from 2001 to 2020. The age-adjusted incidence rate (AIR) of aCML was calculated, and
8 survival outcomes were analyzed using the Kaplan-Meier method and accelerated failure time
9 (AFT) regression analysis.

10 **Results:** The AIR of aCML was found to be 0.024 per 100,000 person-years, with the highest
11 rate observed in 2020. The incidence of aCML increased with age and was higher in males. The
12 study cohort predominantly consisted of elderly White individuals, with an average age at
13 diagnosis of 68.2 ± 15.3 years. The median overall survival (OS) and disease-specific survival
14 (DSS) were 1.4 years and 1.7 years, respectively. Older age was independently associated with
15 worse survival outcomes. Notably, treatment delay and chemotherapy did not significantly
16 impact OS or DSS.

17 **Conclusions:** This study provides comprehensive insights into the epidemiology, clinical
18 characteristics, and survival outcomes of aCML, highlighting its rarity, aggressive nature, and
19 poor prognosis. Further research is needed to validate these findings and explore novel
20 therapeutic strategies for improving outcomes in this challenging hematologic malignancy.

21

1 **Introduction**

2 Atypical chronic myeloid leukemia (aCML) is a rare and aggressive hematologic malignancy
3 that belongs to the category of myelodysplastic/myeloproliferative (MDS/MPN) neoplasms,
4 which affect the bone marrow and the blood cells, causing both abnormal proliferation and
5 impaired maturation of blood cells^{1,2}. It is characterized by leukocytosis with dysgranulopoiesis,
6 anemia and/or thrombocytopenia, splenomegaly³. According to the WHO diagnostic criteria for
7 aCML, the white blood count is $\geq 13 \times 10^9/L$, with immature granulocytes $\geq 10\%$ of leukocytes
8 and $< 20\%$ blasts in the blood and bone marrow^{1,2}. Unlike the more common chronic myeloid
9 leukemia (CML), aCML does not possess the Philadelphia chromosome or the BCR-ABL1
10 fusion gene, which is the hallmark genetic abnormalities that drive CML⁴. aCML also does not
11 have other known gene rearrangements that can cause similar diseases, such as PDGFRA,
12 PDGFRB, FGFR1 or PCM1-JAK2⁵. In aCML, the so-called MPN-associated driver mutations
13 (JAK2, CALR, MPL) are generally not present as well¹. However, aCML can be associated with
14 other cytogenetic changes including oncogenic mutations in the granulocyte-colony stimulating
15 factor receptor (CSF3R)⁴ and isochromosome 17q⁶. Moreover, in up to 1/3 of cases, aCML is
16 linked to mutations in SETBP1 or ETNK1^{7,8}.

17
18 The diagnosis of aCML is challenging due to its overlapping features with other MDS/MPN
19 entities, such as chronic myelomonocytic leukemia (CMML), atypical chronic myeloid leukemia
20 (CNL), and MDS/MPN not otherwise specified (MDS/MPN NOS)^{2,9,10}. The diagnosis of aCML
21 is based on blood and bone marrow tests that show less than 20% blasts in the peripheral blood
22 and bone marrow and the presence of leukocytosis, dysgranulopoiesis, and the absence of BCR-
23 ABL1 or other gene rearrangements that can cause similar diseases¹¹. The prognosis of aCML is

1 generally poor, with a median overall survival of less than 2 years after diagnosis¹². The disease
2 tends to progress rapidly, with a high likelihood of transformation into acute myeloid leukemia
3 (AML)^{13,14}. The traditional prognostic scoring systems, such as the International Prognostic
4 Scoring System (IPSS) used in myelodysplastic syndromes, are not fully applicable to aCML due
5 to its unique clinical and genetic features¹⁰. The main factors that affect the prognosis are the age
6 of the patient, the percentage of blasts in the blood or bone marrow, and the presence of certain
7 genetic mutations, such as ASXL1, SETBP1, or RUNX1^{15,16}. The prognosis of aCML has not
8 improved over the last 20 years, partly because of the lack of specific recurrent genomic or
9 karyotypic abnormalities that can be targeted by therapy¹⁴. The molecular pathogenesis of aCML
10 remains elusive and heterogeneous, involving multiple pathways and genes that regulate cell
11 growth, differentiation, and survival¹⁶. Therefore, there is an urgent need for more research and
12 clinical trials to identify novel biomarkers and therapeutic targets for aCML.

13
14 The treatment of aCML is challenging because there is no established standard of care or
15 effective therapy for this disease¹¹. The main goal of treatment is to control the symptoms,
16 prevent complications, and improve the quality of life of the patients¹¹. Allogeneic hematopoietic
17 stem cell transplantation (HSCT) is the only potentially curative option for eligible patients with
18 a suitable donor¹⁶. However, the optimal timing and criteria for HSCT are not well defined¹⁶.
19 Non-transplant therapies for aCML have been largely empirical, based on limited data from case
20 series or retrospective studies¹⁶. These include conventional cytotoxic agents, hypomethylating
21 agents, interferon-alpha, and tyrosine kinase inhibitors¹⁶. In recent years, advances in molecular
22 characterization of aCML have revealed recurrent mutations in genes involved in epigenetic
23 regulation, signal transduction, transcriptional regulation, and splicing¹⁷. These mutations may

1 have diagnostic, prognostic, and therapeutic implications for aCML patients¹⁸. Continued
2 research is crucial to better understand aCML's biology and develop more effective, targeted
3 therapies.

4
5 However, aCML remains poorly understood due to its rarity. The purpose of this study is to
6 explore the epidemiological characteristics and identify the factors affecting the survival of
7 aCML patients based on a population-based study using the national Cancer Institute's
8 Surveillance, Epidemiology and End Results (SEER) database.

10 **Materials and Methods**

11 **Data collection for aCML study**

12 Data for this study were collected from the Surveillance, Epidemiology, and End Results (SEER)
13 Program (<https://seer.cancer.gov/>) maintained by the National Cancer Institute (NCI)¹⁹. The
14 SEER*Stat software version 8.4.3 (<https://seer.cancer.gov/seerstat/>, accessed on June 10, 2024)
15 was used to retrieve the data²⁰. The SEER 17 database [Incidence-SEER Research Data, 17
16 registries, Nov 2022 Sub (2000-2020)] was utilized to extract data of disease incidence by using
17 the “rate session”. Through the “Incidence-SEER Research Plus Data, 17 Registries, Nov 2022
18 Sub (2000-2020),” which covers approximately 26.5% of the U.S. population (based on 2020
19 census), patients diagnosed with aCML between 2001 and 2020 were selected using the case
20 listing session, and cases with only known age (censored at age 89 years) and only malignant
21 behavior were taken in. As shown in the flow chart (Figure 1), the inclusion criteria of aCML
22 patients were as follows: (1) the International Classification of Diseases for Oncology (ICD-O-3)
23 histologic code (9876/3); (2) the patient's survival time was not 0 or unknown. The exclusion

1 criteria were as follows: (1) the type of reporting source was “laboratory only”; (2) the diagnosis
2 confirmation was “clinical diagnosis only” or unknown. A total of 255 patients with aCML were
3 finally included in the final cohort. The ethical approval from the ethics committee was not
4 required as the SEER database are anonymized and publicly available.

5

6 **Variable Definition of aCML**

7 The variables collected for analysis included age, sex, race, marital status, year of diagnosis,
8 primary site, vital status, survival months, cause-specific death classification, cause of death to
9 site, sequence number, first malignant primary indicator, total number of in situ/malignant
10 tumors for patient, type of reporting source, diagnostic confirmation, chemotherapy recode, and
11 so on. Age was categorized as < 60 years old or 60+ years old at aCML diagnosis. Race was
12 classified as African American, White, or Other (Asian/Pacific Islander and American
13 Indian/Alaska Native). Marital status included categories of married, single, and other
14 (comprising Divorced, Separated, and Widowed). Income was taken from the variable “Median
15 Household Income in the past 12 months (in 2021 Inflation Adjusted Dollars)” and categorized
16 as <\$50,000, \$50,000-\$75,000, and \$75,000+. According to the size of the population and the
17 level of economic development, residence type was divided into two categories: living in a
18 metropolitan area with a population of 1 million or more and other including living in a
19 metropolitan area with a population of about 250,000 to 1 million, live in a metropolitan area
20 with a population of less than 250,000, living in non-metropolitan areas. The variable “sequence
21 number” was classified into two groups: primary aCML and secondary aCML (arises due to
22 other primary malignancies). Cause-of-death information was extracted from the "COD to site
23 recode" field. In the SEER database, aCML-related deaths were classified as those attributed

1 directly to the cancer diagnosis ("dead (attributed to this cancer diagnosis)"). Conversely, aCML-
2 unrelated deaths were categorized as deaths resulting from causes other than the cancer diagnosis
3 ("dead (attributable to causes other than this cancer diagnosis)"). Overall survival time was
4 calculated from the date of aCML diagnosis until death or last follow up.

6 **Statistical analysis**

7 Statistical analyses were conducted using R version 4.2.1 (<http://www.r-project.org/>, R
8 Foundation for Statistical Computing, Vienna, Austria). Baseline characteristics of aCML
9 patients were compared between groups defined as "aCML-related death" and "other cause".
10 Continuous data were analyzed using Student's *t*-test, while categorical variables were assessed
11 with Chi-square tests; Fisher's exact test was utilized when cell frequencies were insufficient.
12 Overall survival (OS) and disease-specific survival (DSS) were estimated using Kaplan-Meier
13 methods with log-rank tests. Due to violations of the Cox proportional hazards regression
14 assumption by Schoenfeld residual test, parametric univariate and multivariable accelerated
15 failure time (AFT) regression analyses with the Weibull distribution were performed. All
16 variables that underwent AFT univariate analysis were included in the multivariable AFT model
17 to account for any confounding effects. The resulting coefficients from the AFT analysis were
18 converted into hazard ratios (HR) and 95% confidence intervals (95% CIs) for easier
19 interpretation. All *P* values were two-sided and a *P* value < 0.05 was defined as statistically
20 significant.

22 **Results**

1 **Incidence of aCML**

2 Analysis of the SEER database indicated that the age-adjusted incidence rate (AIR) of aCML
3 from 2000 to 2020 [age adjusted to the 2000 US Standard Population (19 age groups - Census
4 P25-1130)] was 0.024 per 100,000 person-years (95% CI, 0.022-0.027). The annual variation in
5 AIR is depicted in Figure 2A, showing the highest rate in 2020 at 0.038 per 100,000 person-
6 years (95% CI, 0.025-0.055). Notably, the incidence of aCML increased with age, as illustrated
7 in Figure 2B. Compared to patients under 60 years old (AIR 0.006/100,000 person-years), the
8 incidence rate ratio (IRR) for those aged 60 and older (AIR 0.084/100,000 person-years) was
9 18.23 ($P < 0.0001$). Regarding gender differences, males exhibited a significantly higher AIR
10 (0.035/100,000 person-years) compared to females (AIR 0.017/100,000 person-years, IRR 2.09,
11 95% CI, 1.64-2.68, $P < 0.0001$; Figure 2C, D).

12

13 **Demographics of aCML Patients**

14 As shown in Figure 1, a total of 255 patients were finally identified as aCML in the SEER 17
15 registry, Nov 2022 Sub (2000-2020) from January 2001 to December 2020. The primary site of
16 manifestation was the bone marrow for all patients ($n = 255$, 100%). For all patients in the study
17 cohort, 62.4% were male, about 1.7 folds that of female ($n=96$, 37.6%; Table 1). The average age
18 at diagnosis was approximately 68.2 ± 15.3 years, with 22.0% aged less than 60 years (< 60) and
19 78.0% aged 60 or older (60+). The majority of aCML patients were White (80.0%), while
20 African American and Other racial groups (including Asian/Pacific Islander and American
21 Indian/Alaska Native) comprised 9.0% and 11.0%, respectively. At diagnosis, 57.3% of patients
22 were married, 31.8% had other marital statuses (divorced, separated, or widowed), and 11.0%

1 were single and had never married. The highest incidence spanned the years 2011-2020 (65.9%).
2 Of all cases, 74.5% were classified as primary aCML, while 25.5% were secondary to other
3 primary malignancies. Regarding income distribution, 43.9% of patients reported a median
4 household income exceeding \$75,000, 44.7% reported incomes between \$50,000 and \$75,000,
5 and 11.4% reported incomes below \$50,000. The majority of patients resided in metropolitan
6 areas with populations of 1 million or more (54.9%). Approximately 80.8% of aCML patients
7 received chemotherapy. At the last follow-up, 57 (22.4%) patients were alive; 159 (62.4%)
8 deaths were attributed to aCML, while an additional 39 (15.3%) patients died from other causes
9 such as diseases of heart (n=12), cerebrovascular diseases (n=1), accidents and adverse effects
10 (n=3), and so on. Details on the distribution of causes of death unrelated to aCML are
11 summarized in Table 1. Importantly, no significant differences were found between the "aCML-
12 related death" and "other cause" survival groups. The epidemiological characteristics and
13 survival comparisons of aCML are presented in Table 2.

14

15 **Survival Analysis of aCML**

16 During the follow-up period, there were 198 deaths, with 159 deaths attributed to disease-
17 specific causes. As shown in Figure 3A and B, the median survival time for OS and DSS was 1.4
18 years and 1.7 years, respectively; the 1-year, 3-year, 5-year, and 10-year OS rates were 62.4%,
19 24.7%, 17.8%, and 11.2%, respectively, and the corresponding DSS rates were 67.3%, 31.1%,
20 25.7%, and 18.9%, respectively. While patients diagnosed in 2011-2020 appeared to have worse
21 OS than those diagnosed in 2001-2010, further analysis revealed no significant differences
22 between the diagnosis years ($P = 0.400$; Figure 3C). Similarly, there were neither significant
23 difference for DSS between the diagnosis years ($P = 0.660$; Figure 3D). Furthermore, Kaplan-

1 Meier analysis of OS indicated that only older age was associated with poorer overall survival (P
2 < 0.0001 ; Figure 4A). No significant differences in OS were observed by sex ($P = 0.960$, Figure
3 4B), race ($P = 0.340$, Figure 4C), marital status ($P = 0.057$, Figure 4D), sequence ($P = 0.420$,
4 Figure 4E), income ($P = 0.880$, Figure 4F), residence ($P = 0.380$, Figure 4G), chemotherapy ($P =$
5 1.000 , Figure 4H) or treatment delay ($P = 0.890$, Figure 4I). Similarly, Kaplan-Meier analysis of DSS
6 showed consistent results (Figure 5).

7

8 **Univariate and Multivariable AFT Regression Analysis of aCML**

9 The univariate AFT regression analysis of OS showed only older age was significantly
10 associated with worse outcomes (Table 3). Other factors such as sex, race, marital status
11 diagnosis year, sequence, income, residence, treatment delay and chemotherapy did not impact
12 the OS. Similar results were obtained with the univariate AFT regression analysis of DSS (Table
13 3). In the multivariable AFT regression model including all univariate variables (Table 4), older
14 age remained independently associated with worse OS (HR: 3.65, CI=2.34-5.70, $P < 0.001$).
15 Similar findings were observed for DSS (HR: 3.08, CI=1.92-4.90, $P < 0.001$; Table 4).

16

17 **Discussion**

18 In conclusion, this study presents a comprehensive analysis of the incidence, demographics, and
19 survival outcomes of atypical chronic myeloid leukemia (aCML) using data from the SEER
20 database. The observed age-adjusted incidence rate (AIR) of aCML from 2000 to 2020 aligns
21 with previous reports, reaffirming its rarity within the spectrum of myelodysplastic syndrome
22 (MDS)/myeloproliferative neoplasm (MPN)¹¹. Our findings indicate a temporal variability in

1 incidence, with the highest rates documented in 2020, underscoring the influence of evolving
2 disease surveillance and diagnostic practices on reported trends. Importantly, the incidence of
3 aCML increases with age and is more prevalent among males, consistent with existing literature
4 highlighting age and gender as significant risk factors²¹.

5
6 Our study highlights a predominant occurrence of aCML among elderly individuals, with an
7 average diagnosis age of 68.2 years, reflecting advanced age as a notable risk factor for disease
8 onset and progression^{22,23}. Additionally, the predominance of White patients and the distribution
9 across diverse socioeconomic strata underscore the multifactorial nature of disease epidemiology,
10 influenced by genetic, environmental, and healthcare access factors.

11
12 Survival analysis revealed challenging outcomes for aCML patients, with median overall
13 survival (OS) and disease-specific survival (DSS) times of 1.4 years and 1.7 years, respectively,
14 highlighting the aggressive nature of the disease. While temporal trends suggested worsened OS
15 in patients diagnosed from 2011 to 2020 compared to earlier cohorts, statistical analysis did not
16 identify significant differences, suggesting persistent challenges in improving outcomes over
17 time²⁴. Multivariate regression analyses confirmed older age as a significant independent
18 predictor of poorer OS and DSS, consistent with prior studies emphasizing age as a critical
19 determinant of disease trajectory^{22,24}. Conversely, factors such as sex, race, marital status, and
20 treatment modalities did not significantly influence survival outcomes in our cohort, aligning
21 with literature emphasizing age-related factors as primary drivers of clinical outcomes²⁵.

1

2 An intriguing finding of our study is the lack of significant impact of chemotherapy on OS or
3 DSS among aCML patients, contrary to expectations based on treatment efficacy in other
4 hematologic malignancies²⁶. This discrepancy suggests potential intrinsic resistance mechanisms
5 within aCML, such as genetic mutations or altered signaling pathways, which may diminish
6 treatment effectiveness²⁷. Furthermore, the advanced age and prevalent comorbidities among our
7 patient population likely contributed to suboptimal treatment responses, emphasizing the need
8 for personalized therapeutic approaches tailored to individual patient profiles¹⁶.

9

10 Another unexpected finding was the absence of a significant association between treatment delay
11 and survival outcomes in aCML patients. This contrasts with general oncologic principles where
12 delayed treatment initiation typically correlates with poorer prognosis^{28,29}. Potential reasons for
13 this observation include the rapid disease progression inherent to aCML, where the timing of
14 treatment initiation may not substantially alter clinical outcomes. Moreover, limitations in the
15 study's ability to capture detailed information on treatment delays and their specific impacts on
16 disease progression further complicate interpretation.

17

18 However, several limitations warrant consideration. The retrospective nature of our study using
19 SEER database limits causal inference, and the lack of comprehensive clinical data, including
20 molecular and cytogenetic profiles, precludes a deeper understanding of disease biology and its
21 impact on outcomes. Moreover, the study's reliance on registry data may introduce biases, and

1 the exclusion of patients with incomplete records may affect the generalizability of our findings.
2 Additionally, the study does not account for the influence of comorbidities on survival outcomes,
3 which could confound interpretations.

4

5 **Conclusions**

6 In conclusion, this study provides critical insights into the epidemiology, clinical characteristics,
7 and treatment outcomes of aCML, highlighting persistent challenges in achieving favorable
8 outcomes with standard therapies. Our findings underscore the urgent need for further research to
9 validate these observations in diverse populations and settings. Future research efforts should
10 prioritize elucidating molecular mechanisms of treatment resistance, exploring novel therapeutic
11 targets, and conducting prospective studies to validate findings and guide the development of
12 tailored treatment strategies for this rare and aggressive hematologic malignancy.

13

14 **Data Availability Statement**

15 The data analyzed in this study are from the SEER database (<https://seer.cancer.gov/>) that are
16 available to the public.

17

18 **Declaration of Competing Interest**

19 The author(s) declare no conflicts of interest.

20

21 **Acknowledgments**

1 The interpretation of the data is the sole responsibility of the author(s). The author(s)
2 acknowledge the efforts of the National Cancer Institute and the Surveillance, Epidemiology, and
3 End Results (SEER) Program tumor registries in the creation of the SEER database.

4 5 **Funding**

6 This work was supported by the National Natural Science Foundation of China, No. 82070174.
7 The funder had no role in study design, collection, analysis and interpretation of data, decision to
8 publish, or preparation of the manuscript.

9
10 **Abbreviations:** AFT, accelerated failure time; aCML, Atypical chronic myeloid leukemia;
11 Chemo, chemotherapy; CI, confidence interval; COD, cause of death; DSS, disease-specific
12 survival; HR, hazard ration; OS, overall survival; RT, radiation therapy; SEER, Surveillance,
13 Epidemiology, and End Results; NOS, not otherwise specified.

14 15 **References**

- 16 1. Arber DA, Orazi A, Hasserjian R, et al. The 2016 revision to the World Health Organization
17 classification of myeloid neoplasms and acute leukemia. *Blood*. 2016;127(20):2391-2405.
18 doi:10.1182/blood-2016-03-643544
- 19 2. Khoury JD, Solary E, Abla O, et al. The 5th edition of the World Health Organization Classification
20 of Haematolymphoid Tumours: Myeloid and Histiocytic/Dendritic Neoplasms. *Leukemia*. 2022/07/01
21 2022;36(7):1703-1719. doi:10.1038/s41375-022-01613-1
- 22 3. Levinson KB, Bagg A. Atypical Chronic Myeloid Leukemia, BCR/ABL1 Negative. In: Chang C-C,
23 Ohgami RS, eds. *Precision Molecular Pathology of Myeloid Neoplasms*. Springer International Publishing;
24 2018:213-232.
- 25 4. Gotlib J, Maxson JE, George TI, Tyner JW. The new genetics of chronic neutrophilic leukemia and
26 atypical CML: implications for diagnosis and treatment. *Blood*. 2013;122(10):1707-1711.
27 doi:10.1182/blood-2013-05-500959
- 28 5. Zoi K, Cross NCP. Molecular pathogenesis of atypical CML, CMML and MDS/MPN-unclassifiable.
29 *International Journal of Hematology*. 2015/03/01 2015;101(3):229-242. doi:10.1007/s12185-014-1670-3
- 30 6. McClure RF, Dewald GW, Hoyer JD, Hanson CA. Isolated isochromosome 17q: a distinct type of
31 mixed myeloproliferative disorder/myelodysplastic syndrome with an aggressive clinical course. *British*
32 *Journal of Haematology*. 1999;106(2):445-454. doi:<https://doi.org/10.1046/j.1365-2141.1999.01537.x>

- 1 7. Piazza R, Valletta S, Winkelmann N, et al. Recurrent SETBP1 mutations in atypical chronic
2 myeloid leukemia. *Nature Genetics*. 2013/01/01 2013;45(1):18-24. doi:10.1038/ng.2495
- 3 8. Gambacorti-Passerini CB, Donadoni C, Parmiani A, et al. Recurrent ETNK1 mutations in atypical
4 chronic myeloid leukemia. *Blood*. 2015;125(3):499-503. doi:10.1182/blood-2014-06-579466
- 5 9. Dao K-HT, Tyner JW. What's different about atypical CML and chronic neutrophilic leukemia?
6 *Hematology*. 2015;2015(1):264-271. doi:10.1182/asheducation-2015.1.264
- 7 10. Patnaik MM, Tefferi A. Atypical chronic myeloid leukemia and
8 myelodysplastic/myeloproliferative neoplasm, not otherwise specified: 2023 update on diagnosis, risk
9 stratification, and management. *American Journal of Hematology*. 2023;98(4):681-689.
10 doi:<https://doi.org/10.1002/ajh.26828>
- 11 11. Breccia M. Atypical CML: diagnosis and treatment. *Hematology*. 2023;2023(1):476-482.
12 doi:10.1182/hematology.2023000448
- 13 12. Symeonidis A, Chondropoulos S, Verigou E, Lazaris V, Kourakli A, Tsigotis P. Allogeneic
14 Hematopoietic Stem Cell Transplantation for Mixed or Overlap Myelodysplastic/Myeloproliferative
15 Disorders. Review. *Frontiers in Oncology*. 2022-August-05 2022;12doi:10.3389/fonc.2022.884723
- 16 13. Wang SA, Hasserjian RP, Fox PS, et al. Atypical chronic myeloid leukemia is clinically distinct from
17 unclassifiable myelodysplastic/myeloproliferative neoplasms. *Blood*. 2014;123(17):2645-2651.
18 doi:10.1182/blood-2014-02-553800
- 19 14. Breccia M Fau - Biondo F, Biondo F Fau - Latagliata R, Latagliata R Fau - Carosino I, Carosino I
20 Fau - Mandelli F, Mandelli F Fau - Alimena G, Alimena G. Identification of risk factors in atypical chronic
21 myeloid leukemia. (1592-8721 (Electronic))
- 22 15. Palomo L, Meggendorfer M, Hutter S, et al. Molecular landscape and clonal architecture of adult
23 myelodysplastic/myeloproliferative neoplasms. *Blood*. 2020;136(16):1851-1862.
24 doi:10.1182/blood.2019004229
- 25 16. Gotlib J. How I treat atypical chronic myeloid leukemia. *Blood*. 2017;129(7):838-845.
26 doi:10.1182/blood-2016-08-693630
- 27 17. Zhang H, Wilmot B, Bottomly D, et al. Genomic landscape of neutrophilic leukemias of
28 ambiguous diagnosis. *Blood*. 2019;134(11):867-879. doi:10.1182/blood.2019000611
- 29 18. Rocca S, Carrà G, Poggio P, Morotti A, Brancaccio M. Targeting few to help hundreds: JAK, MAPK
30 and ROCK pathways as druggable targets in atypical chronic myeloid leukemia. *Molecular Cancer*.
31 2018/02/19 2018;17(1):40. doi:10.1186/s12943-018-0774-4
- 32 19. Surveillance, Epidemiology, and End Results (SEER) Program (www.seer.cancer.gov) SEER*Stat
33 Database: Incidence - SEER Research Plus Data, 17 Registries, Nov 2022 Sub (2000-2020) - Linked To
34 County Attributes - Time Dependent (1990-2021) Income/Rurality, 1969-2021 Counties, National Cancer
35 Institute, DCCPS, Surveillance Research Program, released April 2023, based on the November 2022
36 submission.
- 37 20. Surveillance Research Program, National Cancer Institute SEER*Stat software
38 (seer.cancer.gov/seerstat) version 8.4.3.
- 39 21. Szuber N, Elliott M, Tefferi A. Chronic neutrophilic leukemia: 2020 update on diagnosis,
40 molecular genetics, prognosis, and management. *American Journal of Hematology*. 2020;95(2):212-224.
41 doi:<https://doi.org/10.1002/ajh.25688>
- 42 22. Gangat N, Patnaik MM, Tefferi A. Myelodysplastic syndromes: Contemporary review and how
43 we treat. *American Journal of Hematology*. 2016;91(1):76-89. doi:<https://doi.org/10.1002/ajh.24253>
- 44 23. Elliott MA, Tefferi A. Chronic neutrophilic leukemia 2014: Update on diagnosis, molecular
45 genetics, and management. *American Journal of Hematology*. 2014;89(6):651-658.
46 doi:<https://doi.org/10.1002/ajh.23667>
- 47 24. Kong JH, Nam H, Go T-H, Hyun SY, Shim KY. Characteristics and survival of patients with atypical
48 chronic myeloid leukemia. *BR*. 2019;54(3):233-236. doi:10.5045/br.2019.54.3.233

- 1 25. Meng L, Thapa R, Delgado MG, et al. Association of Age With Treatment-Related Adverse Events
2 and Survival in Patients With Metastatic Colorectal Cancer. *JAMA Network Open*. 2023;6(6):e2320035-
3 e2320035. doi:10.1001/jamanetworkopen.2023.20035
- 4 26. Garcia-Manero G. Myelodysplastic syndromes: 2023 update on diagnosis, risk-stratification, and
5 management. *American Journal of Hematology*. 2023;98(8):1307-1325.
6 doi:<https://doi.org/10.1002/ajh.26984>
- 7 27. Carreño-Tarragona G, Álvarez-Larrán A, Harrison C, et al. CNL and aCML should be considered as
8 a single entity based on molecular profiles and outcomes. *Blood Advances*. 2023;7(9):1672-1681.
9 doi:10.1182/bloodadvances.2022008204
- 10 28. Tsai C-H, Kung P-T, Kuo W-Y, Tsai W-C. Effect of time interval from diagnosis to treatment for
11 non-small cell lung cancer on survival: a national cohort study in Taiwan. *BMJ Open*. 2020;10(4):e034351.
12 doi:10.1136/bmjopen-2019-034351
- 13 29. McLaughlin JM, Anderson RT, Ferketich AK, Seiber EE, Balkrishnan R, Paskett ED. Effect on
14 Survival of Longer Intervals Between Confirmed Diagnosis and Treatment Initiation Among Low-Income
15 Women With Breast Cancer. *Journal of Clinical Oncology*. 2012;30(36):4493-4500.
16 doi:10.1200/jco.2012.39.7695

17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35

1 **Figure Legends**

2 **Figure 1. Flow chart of study cohort selection using the SEER database.** A flow diagram of
3 aCML patient selection in this study. aCML, atypical chronic myeloid leukemia; SEER,
4 Surveillance, Epidemiology, and End Results.

5
6 **Figure 2. Age-adjusted incidence of aCML from 2001 to 2020 in SEER database. (A)**

7 Annual age-adjusted incidence of aCML; (B) Age-adjusted incidence of aCML based on age of
8 diagnosis; (C) Annual age-adjusted incidence of aCML in male and female populations,
9 respectively; (D) Age-adjusted incidence of aCML based on age of diagnosis in male and female
10 patients, respectively. aCML, atypical chronic myeloid leukemia.

11
12 **Figure 3. Survival analysis of aCML. (A, B) OS (A) and DSS (B) curves for all aCML patients.**

13 **(C, D) Survival curves of OS (C) and DSS (D) according to the diagnosis years.** aCML, atypical
14 chronic myeloid leukemia; OS, overall survival; DSS, disease-specific survival.

15
16 **Figure 4. Overall survival analysis of aCML stratified by age (A), sex (B), race (C), marital**
17 **status (D), sequence (E), income (F), residence (G), chemotherapy (H) and treatment delay**
18 **(I) using Kaplan-Meier method.** aCML, atypical chronic myeloid leukemia.

19
20 **Figure 5. Disease-specific survival analysis of aCML stratified by age (A), sex (B), race (C),**
21 **marital status (D), sequence (E), income (F), residence (G), chemotherapy (H) and**
22 **treatment delay (I) using Kaplan-Meier method.** aCML, atypical chronic myeloid leukemia.

Figure 1








Figure 2**A****B****C****D**

Figure 3








Figure 4

Figure 5

