The outcome of patients with all stages of Hodgkin’s lymphoma has improved dramatically over the past few decades. This is mainly due to the use of risk-adapted therapies using intensive polychemotherapeutic regimens in combination with other modalities. Patients with early favourable or unfavourable (intermediate) stage disease receive two or four cycles of chemotherapy, respectively, followed by involved-field radiotherapy (20–30 Gy). Advanced stage Hodgkin’s lymphoma is treated more aggressively using six to eight cycles of chemotherapy but the effectiveness of consolidative radiotherapy for patients who show a complete response after chemotherapy alone is still unknown. The main challenge in the near future will be the development of strategies that decrease late morbidity and mortality but retain the same efficacy of current regimens. In this paper we review current diagnostic techniques and management strategies used to treat Hodgkin’s lymphoma, and the range of new modalities being used to improve long-term outcome and patient quality of life.

The management of Hodgkin’s lymphoma (figure 1) has undergone a paradigm shift over the past few years with the use of combined chemotherapy and involved-field radiation in early-stage disease and effective drug regimens capable of inducing high remissions in advanced disease (figure 2). Moreover, the introduction of effective salvage high-dose chemotherapy with peripheral stem-cell transplantation for relapsed disease, a better understanding of prognostic factors, and a more sensitive realisation of the magnitude of late treatment morbidity and mortality has further improved management of the disease.

Diagnosis and staging
An excisional biopsy of a suspicious lymph node should be done for the initial diagnosis of Hodgkin’s lymphoma. The extent of disease is assessed with the four-stage Cotswolds modification of the Ann Arbor classification. Information about prognostic factors such as mediastinal mass, other bulky nodal disease, and the extent of subdiaphragmatic involvement is included in this classification (table 1).

Two-thirds of patients with newly diagnosed Hodgkin’s lymphoma have radiographical evidence of intrathoracic involvement. A large mediastinal mass has been arbitrarily defined as a ratio greater than a third between the largest transverse diameter of the mediastinal mass and the transverse diameter of the thorax.

PET is used in some instances to improve staging at initial diagnosis. PET may also be used in patients with residual tumour masses to discriminate between active lymphoma and fibronecrotic tissue. Several, mostly monocentric, studies were done showing that PET has a negative predictive value ranging from 85% to 100%, which indicates that patients with a negative PET result will not suffer from a relapse in most instances. By contrast, the positive predictive value of PET for residual lesions after completion of therapy is not validated for routine clinical use because it varies by about 60%, indicating that in some instances only half of patients with positive PET images will experience treatment failure in the future. Therefore, the exact role of PET for patients with residual lesions after treatment for Hodgkin’s lymphoma has yet to be determined.
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Choice of treatment

Prognostic factors and treatment groups

Despite an enormous effort to define clinically relevant and generally acceptable prognostic factors, stage and systemic B-cell symptoms are still the two major determinants for stratifying patients with Hodgkin’s lymphoma. Bulky disease (>10 cm) has recently emerged as a third prognostic factor that meets general acceptance. In the USA, most centres treat patients according to the traditional classifications of early stages (I–IIA or B) and advanced stages (III–IVA or B; I–IIB with bulky disease). Further prognostic factors are often used to assign stage I–II patients to a more unfavourable group. In Europe, the European Organization for Research and Treatment of Cancer (EORTC) and the German Hodgkin’s Lymphoma Study Group (GHSG) have defined stage I–II patients as unfavourable or intermediate if any of the adverse factors listed in table 2 are present.

Prognostic factors for advanced-stage disease

The International Prognostic Score (IPS) was developed to identify patients with advanced-stage disease either for treatment intensification or for treatment reduction (table 3). Several study groups are currently tailoring treatment strategies at first diagnosis depending on the risk for treatment failure (IPS 0–2 and 3–7), but stratification of patients on the basis of the IPS score is still an experimental approach. By contrast, the three-level scheme of division of Hodgkin’s lymphoma into early favourable, early unfavourable (intermediate), and advanced-stage disease is a robust instrument to tailor risk-adapted therapy.

Early-stage Hodgkin’s lymphoma

Early-stage favourable disease

Until recently, early-stage favourable Hodgkin’s lymphoma was treated with extended-field irradiation without chemotherapy. However, due to the high incidence of relapse (about 25–30%) and fatal long-term effects (secondary neoplasms or cardiac toxicity), extended-field radiotherapy is now being abandoned by most study groups in favour of combined therapy, consisting of a short-duration chemotherapy (eg, two cycles of doxorubicin, bleomycin, vinblastine, and dacarbazine; ABVD) and involved-field irradiation (20–30 Gy). An improvement in overall survival is unlikely to show in future study generations because of already excellent long-term results obtained with combined modality treatment (ie, a 10-year overall survival of about 95%). Thus, many of the ongoing and recently completed studies were developed in an attempt to reduce the long-term...
complications of treatment without increasing mortality from Hodgkin’s lymphoma. In these trials, intensity of irradiation and chemotherapy is varied and radiation is even omitted within some controlled studies.

**Treatment recommendations**

Fortunately, death from Hodgkin’s lymphoma in patients with early-stage disease with a favourable prognosis is rare and, therefore, overall survival is not a useful parameter to evaluate mid-term results. Current trials should be judged by freedom from first recurrence rates, acute, and long-term morbidity and mortality, and by novel criteria such as quality-of-life and cost-effectiveness. In summary, radiotherapy alone is no longer the treatment of choice in most centres in Europe and the USA. Combinations of chemotherapy and involved-field radiotherapy is the most common treatment strategy; 2–4 cycles of ABVD are considered the international gold standard for early-stage Hodgkin’s lymphoma in combination with 20–30 Gy involved-field radiotherapy. Whether chemotherapy alone is sufficient to control disease, has yet to be determined.

**Early-stage unfavourable disease**

It is generally accepted that patients with early-stage unfavourable (intermediate) Hodgkin’s lymphoma qualify for combined modality therapy. However, the prognostic effect of a single risk factor and the optimum chemotherapy and radiation regimens are topics for debate.

In contrast to favourable prognosis stage I–II disease, less toxic and less intense chemotherapy regimens (eg, epirubicin, bleomycin, vinblastine, and prednisone, EBVP) have not been shown to be as effective as ABVD or combinations containing ABVD. Therefore, ABVD has become the standard regimen for unfavourable stage I–II disease (with risk factors), but 5% of patients progress during therapy and 15% relapse early, many of whom seem to be resistant to salvage therapy. This evidence led to the development of novel more intense regimens (eg, BEACOPP or Stanford V), which are being evaluated in ongoing studies in combination with involved-field radiotherapy (20–30 Gy).

The effectiveness of involved-field radiation with extended-field radiation has been shown recently along with evidence that involved-field radiation is sufficient to control occult disease when combined with chemotherapy. Acute and long-term toxic effects are a major issue in patients with stage I–II disease and involved-field radiation shows equivalent results but has less toxicity compared with extended field radiotherapy. Whether radiotherapy is necessary at all in unfavourable patients is currently being determined in a trial by the National Cancer Institute of Canada; patients with unfavourable stage I–II disease are randomly assigned to receive combined modality therapy (two cycles ABVD and extended-field irradiation) or chemotherapy alone (four to six cycles of ABVD).

**Advanced-stage Hodgkin’s lymphoma**

The pioneers: MOPP and ABVD

A few decades ago, patients with advanced stages of Hodgkin’s lymphoma were incurable. De Vita and colleagues at the National Cancer Institute achieved a 50% cure rate in patients with advanced-stage disease with a drug combination called MOPP (mechlorethamine, vincristine, procarbazine, and prednisone). The same regimen with chlorambucil or cyclophosphamide in place of mechlorethamine showed similar efficacy and was associated with less acute toxicity. The British National Lymphoma Investigation (BNLI) compared MOPP with the same regimen but with lomustine in place of

**Table 2. Definition of treatment groups according to the EORTC and GHSG**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Risk factors</th>
<th>EORTC</th>
<th>GHSG</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A large mediastinal mass</td>
<td>A large mediastinal mass</td>
<td>A large mediastinal mass</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B age ≥50 years</td>
<td>B age ≥50 years</td>
<td>B age ≥50 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C elevated ESR*</td>
<td>C elevated ESR*</td>
<td>C elevated ESR*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D ≥4 involved regions</td>
<td>D ≥4 involved regions</td>
<td>D ≥3 involved regions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Early-stage favourable</td>
<td>CS I-II without risk factors (Supradiaphragmatic)</td>
<td>CS I-II without risk factors (Supradiaphragmatic)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Early-stage unfavourable (intermediate)</td>
<td>CS I-II with ≥1 risk factors (Supradiaphragmatic)</td>
<td>CS I, CSIA with ≥1 risk factors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advanced Stage</td>
<td>CS III-IV</td>
<td>CS IIB with C/D but without A/B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CS IIB with A/B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CS III-IV</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

GHSG, German Hodgkin’s Lymphoma Study Group; EORTC, European Organization for Research and Treatment of Cancer. *ESR, Erythrocyte sedimentation rate (≥50 without B symptoms or ≥30 with B symptoms).

**Table 3. Final cox regression model of the International Prognostic Score**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>Log hazard ratio</th>
<th>Relative risk</th>
<th>p value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Serum albumin &lt;4g/dL</td>
<td>0.40±0.10</td>
<td>1.49</td>
<td>&lt;0.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Haemoglobin &lt;10.5 g/dL</td>
<td>0.30±0.11</td>
<td>1.35</td>
<td>0.006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>0.30±0.09</td>
<td>1.35</td>
<td>0.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stage IV disease</td>
<td>0.23±0.09</td>
<td>1.26</td>
<td>0.011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age ≥45 years</td>
<td>0.33±0.10</td>
<td>1.39</td>
<td>0.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White-cell count ≥15 000/mm³</td>
<td>0.34±0.11</td>
<td>1.41</td>
<td>0.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lymphocyte count &lt;800/mm³ or &lt;8% of white-cell count</td>
<td>0.31±0.10</td>
<td>1.38</td>
<td>0.002</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
mechlorethamine in a randomised trial and found no significant differences.\textsuperscript{11}

The efforts to improve the efficacy and reduce the toxicity of the original MOPP regimen did not result in higher cure rates, but possibly achieved less acute gastrointestinal and neurological toxic effects.

Despite the great accomplishments with MOPP and MOPP-like regimens, 15–30% of patients did not reach complete remission and only about 50% of the patients could be cured, leading to the introduction of the ABVD regimen.\textsuperscript{13}

A pivotal trial of patients with advanced Hodgkin’s lymphoma compared MOPP, ABVD, and alternating MOPP/ABVD without additive radiotherapy and showed equal therapeutic results for ABVD and MOPP/ABVD (progression-free survival and overall survival).\textsuperscript{14} Other large multicentre trials tested the efficacy of hybrid regimens and showed that the MOPP/ABV hybrid was equally effective as alternating MOPP/ABVD, but more effective than sequential MOPP and ABVD.\textsuperscript{15,16} One main advantage of ABVD is the relatively low incidence of long-term toxic effects compared with alkylating-agent-based regimens. MOPP, for example, induces infertility in almost all men\textsuperscript{17} and in women over 30 years of age.\textsuperscript{18} Moreover, patients treated with MOPP and radiotherapy have a 3% lifetime risk of developing acute leukaemia.\textsuperscript{19} By contrast, ABVD has the advantage of fewer acute toxic effects, particularly sterility and secondary leukaemias or myelodysplastic syndromes. Nevertheless, there are cardiotoxicity and pulmonary side-effects with six to eight courses of ABVD, which are even more common with the addition of radiotherapy. ABVD is the accepted standard chemotherapy used in combined modality regimens against which all experimental drug combinations should be tested in the future.\textsuperscript{20}

**Dose-intensified chemotherapy regimens**

In the early 1990s, clinical trials addressing dose-intensity were initiated. Most of the trials introduced etoposide as a novel chemotherapeutic agent and used higher doses than in ABVD.

Stanford V is a seven-drug regimen (mechlorethamine, doxorubicin, vinblastine, vincristine, bleomycin, etoposide, prednisone, and granulocyte colony-stimulating factor)\textsuperscript{21} that was given weekly for a total of 12 weeks in combination with consolidative radiotherapy to sites of initial bulky disease. In a phase II single-centre trial of 142 patients\textsuperscript{22} the 5-year freedom from progression was 89% and the overall survival was 96% at a median of 5.4 years. Few mid-term toxic effects were reported and fertility could be preserved in both men and women.

Similarly, the Manchester group developed the abbreviated, 11-week chemotherapy regimen vincristine, doxorubicin, prednisolone, etoposide, cyclophosphamide, and bleomycin (VAPEC-B) and compared it with chomambucil, vinblastine, procarbazine, prednisolone, etoposide, vincristine, and doxorubicin (ChlVPP/EVA) with radiotherapy for previous bulky disease or residual disease (n=282).\textsuperscript{23,24} After a median follow-up of 4.9 years freedom from progression, event-free survival, and overall survival were significantly better with ChlVPP/EVA than with VAPEC-B.

In 1992, the GHSG did a series of comprehensive phase II and III trials of patients with advanced Hodgkin’s lymphoma to find out whether increasing dose density could improve the outcome of patients with advanced disease. The BEACOPP regimen was devised on the basis of the COPP/ABVD regimen—without vinblastine and dacarbazine but with the addition of etoposide. Baseline BEACOPP included equivalent doses, but was given in a 22-day cycle rather than a 29-day cycle, and this standard combination was also given with escalating doses.\textsuperscript{25} After a series of pilot studies, the GHSG designed the HD9 trial, comparing COPP/ABVD, baseline BEACOPP, and increasing doses of BEACOPP in patients with advanced Hodgkin’s lymphoma.\textsuperscript{26} About two-thirds of patients received consolidative radiotherapy. The freedom from treatment failure rate was 87% for escalated BEACOPP, 76% for baseline BEACOPP, and 69% for COPP/ABVD at 5 years. A major difference was also observed in the rate of primary progressive disease during initial therapy, which was significantly lower with escalated BEACOPP (2%), baseline BEACOPP (8%), or COPP/ABVD (12%, p<0.001). The

![Figure 3. Kaplan-Meier analysis showing overall survival for patients with advanced-stage Hodgkin’s lymphoma, according to the International Prognostic Score (IPS), treated with four cycles of COPP/ABVD (a) or eight cycles of escalated BEACOPP (b).](http://oncology.thelancet.com)
overall survival rates were 83% for COPP/ABVD, 88% for baseline BEACOPP, and 91% for escalated BEACOPP; the survival difference between COPP/ABVD and escalated BEACOPP was significant (p<0.002).

When the IPS is applied to patients with advanced-stage Hodgkin’s lymphoma, the superioritiy of the escalated BEACOPP regimen over COPP/ABVD is shown for all risk groups. It is most pronounced in patients with poor prognosis (IPS 4–7) with a significant difference in overall survival of 15% (82% and respectively 67%; figure 3). On the basis of these results, the GHSG decided to give increased doses of BEACOPP to patients with low-risk disease.

Hodgkin’s lymphoma is becoming a highly curable disease and treatment-associated toxic effects—particularly fertility and quality of life—are becoming increasingly important issues especially in younger patients (panel). About 80% of men treated with escalated BEACOPP will suffer from sterility at the end of chemotherapy, whereas patients treated with ABVD will have no lifelong problems with fertility. Nevertheless, modern techniques in reproductive medicine mean that most male patients can be offered the chance to have healthy children, and most young men agree to cryopreservation of their sperm before start of therapy.

BEACOPP is also associated with a higher rate of haematological toxic effects. Furthermore, there is a higher occurrence of acute myeloid leukaemia (AML) and myelodysplastic syndrome (MDA): escalated BEACOPP, 9 cases of AML/MDS reported; BEACOPP baseline, 4 cases of AML/MDS reported; and COPP/ABVD, 1 case of AML/MDS reported. However, the total rate of secondary neoplasia, including the development of other lymphomas, was highest in patients treated with COPP/ABVD. The death rate at 5 years, including all acute and late causes of deaths, was 18.8% for COPP/ABVD, 13% for baseline BEACOPP, and 8.5% for escalated BEACOPP. So at a median follow-up of 5 years, ten more patients out of 100 treated with COPP/ABVD had died. This evidence highlights the importance of overall survival as the ultimate denominator for determining the benefit of a treatment strategy for advanced Hodgkin’s lymphoma.

Role of radiotherapy

An important issue in the treatment of advanced Hodgkin’s lymphoma is the added efficacy and late toxicity of adjuvant radiotherapy after anthracycline-containing chemotherapy. In a recently published EORTC trial,9 patients who had showed complete responses after six to eight cycles of MOPP/ABV were randomly assigned to receive involved-field radiation or no further treatment. An analysis of the 739 patients showed that involved-field irradiation did not improve relapse-free survival or overall survival in patients who already achieved a complete response with MOPP/ABV. Remarkably, those who had a partial response and were treated with additional radiotherapy, had an overall 5-year survival rate of about 85–90%, which is comparable to patients who showed complete remission after chemotherapy alone.

From that study it is concluded, that only patients with a partial remission after effective chemotherapy may benefit from involved-field radiotherapy, whereas patients who show complete remission after chemotherapy alone do not benefit from consolidative radiotherapy. This finding has large implications for the treatment of advanced disease because many treatment-associated long-term toxic effects can be attributed to radiotherapy. Although techniques and strategies have changed during the past few decades, it has not been shown whether reduced doses, field sizes, and improved ionisation sources are less harmful in combination with polychemotherapy. Overall, the risk of developing a secondary cancer (mostly solid tumours) after radiation for Hodgkin’s lymphoma is 25% after 25 years and there is still no limit in the incidence of secondary tumours.24 Moreover, there exists a dose-risk association for the development of radiation-induced tumours for breast cancer and this risk increases linearly from 4 Gy to 40 Gy.25 Interestingly, a risk reduction for breast cancer was shown when chemotherapy was added to radiotherapy which is possibly associated with menopausal age, suggesting that tumorigenesis after radiation is promoted by ovarian hormones.

Long-term toxic effects after treatment for Hodgkin’s lymphoma

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Minor</th>
<th>Serious</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Endocrine dysfunctions (hypothyroidism, hypoa-a-menorhea, decreased libido)</td>
<td>Lung fibrosis from radiation plus bleomycin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Long-term immunosuppression</td>
<td>Myocardial damage from anthracyclines and radiation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Viral infections (Herpes simplex, Varicella zoster, papillomaviruses, warts virus)</td>
<td>Sterility in men and women</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Growth abnormalities in children and adolescents</td>
<td>Opportunistic infections</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psychological problems</td>
<td>Psychosocial disturbances</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fatigue</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Potentially fatal
- Acute myeloid leukaemia/myelodysplastic syndrome
- Non-Hodgkin lymphomas
- Solid tumours (lung, breast, and colon cancer, sarcomas)
- Overwhelming bacterial sepsis after splenectomy or spleen irradiation (OPS)

Psychological problems
- Depression
- Anxiety
- Insomnia

Opportunistic infections
- Pneumocystis carinii pneumonia
- Herpes zoster
- Varicella zoster
- Toxoplasma gondii
- Candida albicans
- Other fungi
- Viral infections
- Bacterial infections

Growth abnormalities in children and adolescents
- Short stature
- Delayed puberty
- Growth retardation

Sterility in men and women
- Male infertility
- Female infertility
- Reduced fertility

Myocardial damage from anthracyclines and radiation
- Cardiomyopathy
- Congestive heart failure
- Myocardial infarction

Lung fibrosis from radiation plus bleomycin
- Pulmonary fibrosis
- Pulmonary hypertension
- Respiratory failure

Psychosocial disturbances
- Depression
- Anxiety
- Insomnia

Serious
- Cardiac failure
- Renal failure
- Neurological complications
- Seizures

Minor
- Fatigue
- Nausea and vomiting
- Hair loss
- Oral mucositis
- Dermatitis
- Alopecia

Treatment recommendations

The progress made in clinical research during the past 40 years has highlighted the pertinent question of how extended and intense treatment and long-term side-effects should be balanced against high success rates at the onset of treatment.

ABVD with or without consolidative radiotherapy is widely considered the gold standard for the treatment of advanced Hodgkin’s lymphoma. Whether this strategy is justified on the basis of existing data has to be evaluated by each individual doctor. Whether escalated BEACOPP is superior over ABVD is the subject of a recently initiated global study comparing six to eight courses of ABVD with four courses of escalated BEACOPP and four courses of baseline BEACOPP with or without radiation for all risk groups and for high-risk patients only (IPS ≥ 4). Because escalated BEACOPP is significantly superior to COPP/ABVD for primary progression and freedom from treatment failure,
the GHSG recommends escalated BEACOPP in all patients independent of IPS-defined risk factors. This practise results in a 10–20% higher freedom-from-progression rate and an overall survival benefit of about 8% over ABVD or C(M)OPP/ABVD at 5 years. However, there is a higher initial burden of toxic effects and a higher rate of acute myeloid leukaemia and myelodysplastic syndrome and infertility with the use of the escalated regimen.

Primary progressive and relapsed Hodgkin's lymphoma
Depending on the initial treatment used, patients with refractory or relapsed disease have various treatment options. Conventional chemotherapy is the treatment of choice for patients who relapse after initial radiotherapy for early-stage disease. The survival of these patients is at least equal to that of patients with advanced-stage disease initially treated with chemotherapy. By contrast, the therapeutic options for individuals with relapsed disease after initial chemotherapy include salvage radiotherapy, salvage chemotherapy, and high-dose chemotherapy followed by autologous stem-cell transplant, or even allogeneic stem-cell transplant.

Prognostic factors in patients relapsing after primary chemotherapy
It was first noted in 1979 that the length of remission to first-line chemotherapy had a marked effect on the success of subsequent salvage treatment. Thus, failure of chemotherapy can be used to classify disease as primary progressive Hodgkin's lymphoma (patients who never achieved a complete remission), early relapses (within 12 months of complete response), and late relapses (relapse more than 12 months after the end of therapy). Prognosis of patients according to these risk factors is shown in figure 4. In patients with primary progressive disease treated with conventional chemotherapy, virtually no patient survives more than 8 years. By contrast, the projected 20-year survival for patients with early relapse or late relapse was 11% and 22%, respectively.

Treatment of primary progressive and relapsed disease
Patients who relapse after a first complete response can achieve a second complete response with salvage treatment including radiotherapy for localised relapse in previously non-irradiated areas, or conventional chemotherapy. The optimum treatment for recurrence after primary chemotherapy is less clear. High-dose chemotherapy followed by autologous stem-cell transplant has been shown to produce 30–65% long-term disease-free survival in selected patients with refractory and relapsed disease.

The most compelling evidence for the superiority of high-dose chemotherapy and autologous stem-cell transplant in relapsed Hodgkin's disease comes from two reports from the BNLI and the GHSG/European Group for Blood and Marrow Transplantation (EBMT).

In the BNLI trial, patients with relapsed or refractory Hodgkin's lymphoma were treated with conventional-dose mini-BEAM (carmustine, etoposide, cytosine arabinoside, and melphalan) or high-dose BEAM with autologous stem-cell transplant. The actuarial 3-year event-free survival was significantly better in patients who received high-dose chemotherapy (53% vs 10%).

The largest randomised, multicentre trial was done by the GHSG/EBMT. Patients who relapsed after chemotherapy were randomly assigned to four cycles of Dexa-BEAM (addition of dexamethasone) or two cycles of Dexam-BEAM followed by BEAM and autologous stem-cell transplant. The final analysis showed freedom from treatment failure in the high-dose chemotherapy group was 55% vs 34% for patients receiving an additional two cycles of chemotherapy. Overall survival was not significantly different.

Sequential high-dose chemotherapy
In 1997, a multicentre phase II trial with a high-dose sequential chemotherapy and a final myeloablative course was initiated for patients with relapsed or primary progressive Hodgkin's lymphoma. After two cycles of DHAP (dexamethasone, cytosine arabinoside, cisplatin), patients with partial response or complete response received sequential high-dose chemotherapy consisting of cyclophosphamide, methotrexate plus vinristine, and etoposide followed by BEAM and autologous stem-cell transplant. Freedom-from-treatment-failure rates and overall survival suggest a high efficacy of this regimen in patients with relapsed disease. Thus, the GHSG, EORTC, and EBMT began a prospective randomised study to compare the effectiveness of standard high-dose chemotherapy (BEAM) with a sequential high-dose chemotherapy.
chemotherapy after initial cytoreduction with two cycles of DHAP for patients with early or late relapsed disease, and for patients in second relapse who have had no previous high-dose chemotherapy.

**Lymphocyte-predominant Hodgkin’s lymphoma**

Nodular lymphocyte-predominant Hodgkin’s lymphoma is a rare subtype with an annual incidence in developed countries of about 0·1–0·3 per 100 000 inhabitants. The clinical manifestation is indolent, with predominantly peripheral lymph nodes. About 75% of the patients have stage IA disease and organ involvement seldom occurs. The disease tends to relapse frequently, even after 10–15 years of remission. Development of secondary non-Hodgkin’s lymphoma is not uncommon. However, current treatment strategies should take into account the favourable prognosis and avoid late effects such as cardiac and pulmonary complications, and development of secondary lymphomas.

Caution is indicated when identifying patients who might benefit from a reduction of treatment intensity. First, immunostaining is needed for a reliable differential diagnosis between lymphocyte-predominant Hodgkin’s lymphoma, classic Hodgkin’s lymphoma, and certain non-Hodgkin’s lymphoma variants. Second, patients with advanced-stage lymphocyte-predominant disease (20–25%) show a substantially worse overall survival and tumour-free survival than patients with early-stage lymphocyte-predominant disease which is similar to advanced-stage classic Hodgkin’s lymphoma. This evidence implies that thorough staging and eventually aggressive treatment is needed irrespective of histological subtype. The EORTC and the GHSG at present recommend that patients with stage I–IIA disease should be treated with involved-field radiation (30 Gy). Recently, the anti-CD20 antibody, rituximab, was used for treatment of lymphocyte-predominant Hodgkin’s lymphoma at first diagnosis or relapse. Remissions were observed in up to 80% of cases, but follow-up is still short and the use of rituximab must be considered experimental.

**Experimental therapies**

Promising experimental therapeutic strategies for patients with Hodgkin’s lymphoma are currently not available, unlike the situation for individuals with non-Hodgkin’s lymphoma. However, current approaches include passive immunotherapy with antibody-based regimens for specific targeting of malignant cells (eg, anti-CD30 antibodies) as well as active immunotherapy with modulation of the cellular immune response using cytokines, tumour vaccines, or gene transfer. The combination of experimental strategies with chemotherapy are potential future treatments.

**Conclusion**

The rationale behind treatment of patients with Hodgkin’s lymphoma is to classify patients as having early favourable, unfavourable (intermediate), or advanced-stage disease according to anatomic stage and B-symptoms (and possibly prognostic factors, such as the IPS). Patients with early favourable disease should be treated with a moderate chemotherapy (typically two to four cycles of ABVD) and involved-field radiation (20–30 Gy). Patients with early unfavourable disease should receive four cycles of ABVD followed by involved-field radiation (20–30 Gy). Patients with advanced-stage disease should be treated more aggressively with six to eight cycles of chemotherapy. The role of consolidative radiation for patients with advanced-stage disease who showed complete remission after chemotherapy has been questioned recently. Patients who show complete responses after six to eight courses of anthracyclin-containing chemotherapy seem not to benefit from consolidative radiation but for patients with partial responses, consolidative radiation is beneficial. For patients with progressive or relapsing disease, depending on previous treatment, therapeutic options include radiotherapy, chemotherapy, and autologous stem-cell transplantation, which has been shown to be superior to standard chemotherapy in two clinical trials. In summary, Hodgkin’s lymphoma has become a highly curable disease over the past few decades because of the introduction of effective polychemotherapy and the use of risk-adapted radiotherapy using reductions in dose and field size. For doctors treating newly diagnosed patients it is imperative that early complete remission is achieved with the most effective treatment strategy and the least long-term toxic side-effects.
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Treatement of Hodgkin's lymphoma


Eukaryotic organisms depend on an intricate and evolutionarily conserved cell cycle to control cell division. The cell cycle is regulated by a number of important protein families which are common targets for mutational inactivation or overexpression in human tumours. The cyclin D and E families and their cyclin-dependent kinase partners initiate the phosphorylation of the retinoblastoma tumour suppressor protein and subsequent transition through the cell cycle. Cyclin/cdk activity and therefore control of cell division is restrained by two families of cyclin dependent kinase inhibitors. A greater understanding of the cell cycle has led to the development of a number of compounds with the potential to restore control of cell division in human cancers. This review will introduce the protein families that regulate the cell cycle, their aberrations in malignant progression and pharmacological strategies targeting this important process.


Eukaryotic cell division occurs in four phases of the cell cycle (figure 1). The cell is prepared for DNA replication in G1 phase, then chromosomes are replicated during S phase. A gap period, G2, allows preparation for mitosis, before chromosome segregation and cytokinesis in M phase (mitosis). During development, differentiation, or growth-factor withdrawal, cells can enter an inactive period G0, before returning to G1.

Cell-cycle checkpoints ensure faithful chromosome replication and separation, thereby maintaining genetic stability. Failure of these checkpoints to arrest the cell after appropriate stimuli is a hallmark of cancer. One checkpoint, the restriction point, occurs in mid-G1; after this point, cells become independent of growth factors and commit to cell division. Genetic aberrations of regulators of restriction-point passage occur at high frequency in human tumours.

This review discusses the cyclin/cyclin-dependent kinase (cdk) complex and the cdk inhibitors (CKIs) that coordinate restriction-point passage. The discussion covers phase I and II data on agents that target cyclin/cdk activity, such as flavopiridol, UCN-01, and inhibitors of proteosomes and histone deacetylase.

Cell-cycle controversies and the continuum model

Although majority opinion accepts the restriction point as an important model on which to base the interpretation of current cell-cycle data, challenges have been raised to the concepts of restriction point, G0 phase, and cellular checkpoints, based on criticisms of experimental methods used to synchronise cell cultures. Rather than proposing that cells arrest at the restriction point on withdrawal of growth factor, the continuum model predicts that, although cells are arrested with a G1 phase amount of DNA, they are not arrested at any defined point in the cell cycle. When growth-factor restimulation occurs, cells do not enter S phase synchronously, as might be expected from the restriction-point model, but in a sequence determined by their order before growth-factor withdrawal. For the purposes of this review, however, discussion is based on the widely accepted restriction-point model.

Cell-cycle regulators and restriction-point control

Disruption of restriction-point control is a common biological feature in human cancer. Cell-cycle progression is regulated by two protein classes, the cyclins and their kinase partners, the cyclin-dependent kinases (cdks). Restriction-point passage is coordinated by two families of cyclins, the cyclin D family (D1, D2, and D3) and the cyclin E family (E1 and E2). The D-type cyclins bind to and activate cdks 4 and 6, and cyclins E1 and E2 interact with and activate cdk2. The
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Figure 1. Fluorescent light micrograph of human HeLa cells in M phase of the cell cycle.