MOLECULAR-GENETIC APPROACH TO PREDICTING THE CLINICAL COURSE OF CHRONIC MYELOPROLIFERATIVE NEOPLASMS (CMPNS)

Jakhonov Azizbek Kholmirzaevich
Tashkent State Medical University,
ALFRAGANUS UNIVERSITY
Matkarimova Dilfuza Saburovna
Tashkent State Medical University

Abstract

Chronic myeloproliferative neoplasms (CMPNs) are clonal hematopoietic disorders characterized by excessive proliferation of myeloid cells. Clinical outcomes vary widely, ranging from indolent disease to progression into myelofibrosis or acute leukemia. Traditional prognostic models based on clinical parameters often lack precision. Molecular-genetic profiling, including driver mutations (JAK2, CALR, MPL) and additional high-risk mutations (ASXL1, SRSF2, EZH2, IDH1/2, TP53), has significantly improved risk stratification. This study evaluates the prognostic value of molecular-genetic profiling in 150 CMPN patients. An integrated prognostic model combining clinical and genetic factors demonstrated superior predictive power for overall survival (OS) and progression-free survival (PFS). The findings support the use of molecular-genetic approaches for personalized patient management and therapeutic decision-making.

Keywords: chronic myeloproliferative neoplasms (CMPNs), JAK2 V617F, CALR mutation, MPL mutation, ASXL1, risk stratification, next-generation sequencing (NGS) prognosis, overall survival (OS), progression-free survival (PFS)

Introduction

Chronic myeloproliferative neoplasms (CMPNs) represent a group of clonal hematopoietic stem cell disorders, including polycythemia vera (PV), essential thrombocythemia (ET), and primary myelofibrosis (PMF). These diseases are characterized by uncontrolled proliferation of one or more myeloid cell lineages, leading to elevated blood counts, splenomegaly, and systemic symptoms. The clinical course is highly variable: some patients remain stable for years, while others rapidly progress to myelofibrosis or acute myeloid leukemia (AML).

Traditional prognostic models rely on clinical and hematological parameters such as age, hemoglobin, leukocyte count, platelet count, and symptom burden. However, these models often fail to accurately predict disease progression in individual patients. The discovery of driver mutations (JAK2, CALR, MPL) and additional high-risk mutations has transformed the understanding of CMPNs and enabled more precise risk

stratification.

The aim of this study is to evaluate the prognostic value of molecular-genetic profiling in CMPNs and to develop an integrated prognostic model combining clinical and genetic factors.

Methods

Study Design and Patients

A retrospective cohort study was conducted, including 150 patients diagnosed with CMPNs between 2018 and 2023 at a tertiary hematology center. Diagnosis was based on WHO 2016 criteria. Patients were followed for 12–60 months.

Inclusion criteria

- Confirmed diagnosis of PV, ET, or PMF
- Available molecular-genetic data
- Follow-up ≥ 12 months

Exclusion criteria

- Secondary myelofibrosis
- Prior history of acute leukemia
- Insufficient clinical data

Molecular Testing

Molecular analysis was performed using PCR and NGS.

Driver mutations

- JAK2 V617F
- CALR exon 9
- MPL W515L/K

High-risk mutations (NGS panel)

- ASXL1, SRSF2, EZH2, IDH1/2, TP53, DNMT3A, TET2

Risk Stratification

Patients were divided into three groups based on the presence of high-risk mutations:

Risk group	Criteria
Low-risk	No high-risk mutation
Intermediate-risk	One high-risk mutation
High-risk	≥2 high-risk mutations

Clinical Data Collection

Clinical parameters recorded at baseline:

- Age, gender
- Hemoglobin (g/L)

- Leukocyte count (×10⁹/L)
- Platelet count (×10⁹/L)
- Spleen size (cm)
- Thrombotic history
- Symptoms (fatigue, night sweats, weight loss)

Statistical Analysis

- Kaplan–Meier survival analysis for OS and PFS
- Cox proportional hazards model
- Statistical significance at $p < 0.05$
- SPSS v25 software

Results

Patient Characteristics

Parameter	Value
Total patients	150
PV	60 (40%)
ET	55 (37%)
PMF	35 (23%)
Median age	56 years
Male/Female	82/68
Median follow-up	38 months

Mutation Distribution

Mutation	Frequency (%)
JAK2 V617F	65%
CALR	20%
MPL	5%
Triple-negative	10%

High-risk Mutation Frequency

Gene	Frequency (%)
ASXL1	18%
SRSF2	12%
EZH2	8%
IDH1/2	6%

Gene	Frequency (%)
TP53	4%

Risk Stratification

Risk Group	Number of Patients	%
Low-risk	82	54.7%
Intermediate-risk	45	30%
High-risk	23	15.3%

Clinical Outcomes

Overall Survival (OS) and Progression-Free Survival (PFS)

Risk Group	5-year OS (%)	5-year PFS (%)
Low-risk	88	84
Intermediate-risk	72	65
High-risk	52	40

Kaplan–Meier analysis showed significant differences between groups ($p < 0.001$).

Cox Regression Analysis

Variable	Hazard Ratio (HR)	95% CI	p-value
Age > 60	1.8	1.2–2.7	0.004
Leukocytosis > 15×10^9/L	1.6	1.1–2.4	0.02
High-risk mutations	2.9	1.9–4.4	<0.001

Discussion

The results demonstrate that molecular-genetic profiling significantly improves prognostic accuracy in CMPNs. Driver mutations (JAK2, CALR, MPL) are important for diagnosis but do not fully explain disease progression. Additional high-risk mutations such as ASXL1, SRSF2, EZH2, and TP53 are strongly associated with poor outcomes and higher risk of transformation.

The integrated prognostic model combining clinical and genetic parameters showed better predictive performance than traditional models. Patients with ≥2 high-risk mutations had significantly worse OS and PFS, indicating the need for closer monitoring and potentially earlier therapeutic intervention.

The main limitation of this study is its retrospective design and single-center cohort. Future multicenter prospective studies with larger sample sizes are needed to validate the model and include new biomarkers (gene expression, epigenetic markers).

Conclusion

Molecular-genetic profiling is essential for accurate prognosis of chronic myeloproliferative neoplasms. Integration of genetic data with clinical parameters improves risk stratification, enabling personalized treatment strategies. Routine implementation of molecular testing in clinical practice can improve patient outcomes and guide therapeutic decisions.

References:

1. Arber DA, et al. The 2016 revision to the WHO classification of myeloid neoplasms and acute leukemia. *Blood*. 2016.
2. Tefferi A, et al. Mutation-enhanced prognostic models in myelofibrosis. *Blood*. 2018.
3. Vannucchi AM, et al. Molecular markers in myeloproliferative neoplasms. *Leukemia*. 2017.
4. Passamonti F, et al. A clinical-molecular prognostic model for myelofibrosis. *Blood*. 2018.
5. Barbui T, et al. The 2016 revision of WHO classification of myeloproliferative neoplasms: implications for prognosis. *Journal of Hematology*. 2017.