Reappraisal of cardiovascular risk factors in patients with chronic myeloproliferative neoplasms

Krečak, Ivan; Verstovsek, Srdan; Lucijanić, Marko

Reappraisal of cardiovascular risk factors in patients with chronic myeloproliferative neoplasms

Authors: Ivan Krecak, [1,2*], Srdan Verstovsek,[3] Marko Lucijanic [4,5]

Affiliations:

[1] Department of Internal Medicine, General Hospital of Sibenik-Knin County, Sibenik, Croatia

[2] Faculty of Medicine, University of Rijeka, Rijeka, Croatia

[3] Kartos Therapeutics, Redwood City, California, USA

[4] Divison of Hematology, University Hospital Dubrava, Zagreb, Croatia

[5] School of Medicine, University of Zagreb, Zagreb, Croatia

*Corresponding author
Ivan Krecak, MD, PhD
e-mail: krecak.ivan@gmail.com
Department of Internal Medicine
General Hospital of Sibenik-Knin County
Stjepana Radića 83, 22000 Sibenik, Croatia

Abstract word count: 94.
Word count: 3541.
References: 107.

Abstract

Cardiovascular (CV) risk factors are important contributors to thrombotic risk in the general population and in patients with chronic myeloproliferative neoplasms (MPNs). However, the role of CV risk factors is often masked by other disease features that have strong prognostic impact regarding thrombotic risk in MPN patients. In this review, we summarized contemporary knowledge and aspects that have not been addressed or lack consensus in the medical community. We propose multidisciplinary care for MPN patients with CV comorbidities and provide future directions which may be needed to appropriately manage CV risk factors in MPNs.

Introduction

Philadelphia-negative chronic myeloproliferative neoplasms (MPNs) are a group of bone marrow cancers comprising essential thrombocythemia (ET), polycythemia vera (PV) and myelofibrosis (MF). MPNs are characterized by excessive proliferation of one or more mature myeloid cell lineages, presence of mutually exclusive driver mutations in the Janus Kinase 2 (JAK2), calreticulin (*CALR*) or thrombopoetin receptor (*MPL*) genes, splenomegaly, constitutional symptoms, variable degrees of bone marrow fibrosis, and the propensity to progress to secondary (post-PV or post-ET) MF (SMF) and acute myeloid leukemia (AML) [1,2,3,4]. Besides increased myeloproliferation, constitutive activation and dysregulation of the JAK-signal transducer and activator of transcription (STAT) signaling pathway causes aberrant synthesis of various inflammatory cytokines; these cytokines are the driving force of the MPN clone expansion [5] and disease progression [6] and are partly responsible for the development of cardiovascular (CV) disease in MPN patients [7]. Higher blood viscosity, blood cell activation, formation of leukocyte-platelet complexes, increased synthesis of neutrophil extracellular traps and different procoagulant factors, endothelial dysfunction, and overproduction of microparticles and reactive oxygen species (ROS) are important factors associated with atherosclerosis and thrombosis in MPN patients [8-10]. However, the MPN clone may also produce cardioprotective cytokines [11].

The risk of thrombosis is significantly higher in MPN patients when compared to the general population [12], and up to one-third of MPN patients may experience a thrombotic event during the disease course [13]. The cumulative incidence of thrombotic events is estimated to be 3.5/100 person-years in PV, and 2.5/100 person-years in ET and MF patients [14]. For example, in the European Collaboration on Low-dose Aspirin (ECLAP) randomized clinical trial (RCT), the mortality due to CV events accounted for 45% of all deaths in PV patients [14]. In contrast to PV and ET where thrombotic risk is the mainstay of prognostication and treatment, thrombotic

risk in MF patients is often underappreciated. This is mostly attributed to the fact that prognostication and treatment strategies in MF are primarily directed at estimating and minimizing the risk of death, respectively; as a result, proper understanding of the incidence and risk factors for thrombosis may be obscured. Nevertheless, thrombotic risk in MF is not negligible, especially among post-PV MF patients, and may be associated with similar risk factors as in ET and PV [15-17]. Due to the tendency for CV complications and disease progression, overall survival (OS) in all MPN patients is worse than the age- and sex-matched general population [18,19]. This finding is of particular concern in the case of young MPN patients who are likely to develop disease- and therapy-related complications during their lifetime [20].

In this review, we summarize contemporary knowledge and aspects of CV disease that have not been addressed or consensus is lacking in the medical community, and propose future directions which may be needed to appropriately manage CV risk factors in MPNs.

Current risk stratification and treatment of MPNs

The most important prognostic factors of future thrombotic events in MPN patients are age >60 years and prior thrombotic events. PV patients presenting either one of these two factors are classified as "high-risk" [21]. In ET, the presence of JAK2 mutation is additionally used to construct four risk categories in the Revised International Prognostic Score of Thrombosis in Essential Thrombocythemia (R-IPSET): very low (age ≤60 years, no prior thrombosis, and the absence of JAK2 mutation), low (age ≤60 years, no prior thrombosis, with JAK2 mutation present), intermediate (age >60 years, without prior thrombosis and without JAK2 mutation) and high-risk (prior thrombosis or age >60 years with the presence of JAK2 mutation) [22,23]. Patients with MF are usually risk-stratified regarding the risk of death by applying the Dynamic

International Prognostic Scoring System (DIPSS). The DIPSS is a robust tool enabling risk prognostication of MF patients taking into consideration age, white blood cell count, hemoglobin, presence of constitutional symptoms, and peripheral blasts [24]. Although more recent prognostic systems for MF incorporate cytogenetic and molecular data [25-27], performance of these tests is costly, and the infrastructure may be unavailable at all clinical settings. With respect to CV risk, there seems to be an interaction between low-risk DIPSS and presence of JAK2 mutation, suggesting the necessity to intervene in lower risk MF patients [28]. The Myelofibrosis Secondary to Polycythemia and Thrombocythemia Prognostic Model (MYSEC-PM) is applied in post-PV and post-ET SMF patients for optimal prognostication [29].

Currently, the proposed risk-adapted therapy in MPNs includes low-dose aspirin for all PV and low- to high-risk ET patients, whereas cytoreduction, typically hydroxyurea (HU) or interferons (IFNs), is usually recommended in high-risk ET and PV patients only [1,30]. The use of aspirin in *CALR*-mutated low-risk ET patients is not recommended as it does not seem to mitigate the risk of thrombosis and may increase the risk of bleeding [31]. Patients with PV are also regularly phlebotomized to maintain hematocrit levels <45%, because achieving this level significantly lowered the risk of adverse CV events in the Cytoreductive Therapy for PV (CYTO-PV), a randomized controlled trial (RCT) [32]. It is not known if JAK2 mutated patients without PV should also be phlebotomized if they have hematocrit levels above 45%. Patients with MF classified as intermediate-2/high-risk are at high risk of death and are considered for allogeneic stem cell transplant. Treatment with JAK inhibitors, such as ruxolitinib, is usually recommended prior to the procedure and in elderly or unfit patients [33,34]. The benefits of JAK2 inhibitors may be more pronounced among patients with less advanced MF features [35,36]. In general, a different cytoreductive agent should be considered in cases of drug intolerance or lack of efficacy [37,38]. Ruxolitinib may be a reasonable choice in PV patients who have HU-

resistance/intolerance [39,40]. Even low-risk MPN patients may benefit from specific therapy if they present with symptoms and require frequent phlebotomies [21].

Former databases and contemporary definitions and treatments for cardiovascular comorbidities in MPNs

A variety of generic CV risk factors were extensively investigated in MPN pateints, including arterial hypertension (AH) [22,41-51], diabetes mellitus (DM) [14,32,41-43,45-47,49,50], smoking [42,43,45,46,49,50,52-56], hyperlipidemia [44], chronic kidney disease (CKD) [57-59], hyperuricemia [60,61], and obesity and cachexia [62]. They were evaluated either as individual entities, grouped with other CV risk factors, or as a cumulative comorbidity burden.

In contrast to R-IPSET[22,23], the original IPSET [63] included CV risk factors - AH, DM, and smoking,− and was validated in prefibrotic MF [64]. However, although the presence of CV risk factors [41-49] and the higher number of comorbidities [62] may increase the thrombotic risk and have the potential to reduce life expectancy in MPNs, these factors have not been formally included in the current risk prognostication systems. The absence of prognostic recognition of CV risk factors and other comorbidities is primarily attributed to inconsistent results [22,46,50], inclusion of patients from different diagnostic periods and follow-up times, heterogeneity in the definitions of CV risk factors and thrombotic events, inclusion of a small number of patients with specific CV risk factors, and different statistical approaches and other variables, which may be confounding factors in retrospective analyses.

The disadvantage of using large datasets from registries for evaluation of CV risk factors is the large timespan of evaluation and the consequent heterogeneity in patients considering the definition and treatment of CV comorbidities. Studies on cohorts of MPN patients that investigated the thrombotic risk included stored biological samples or baseline

clinical data with follow-up time spanning more than 30 years. Definitions, criteria and diagnostic cut-offs for all CV comorbidities profoundly changed during this extended period of time. These changes may affect the validity of the conclusions regarding the way that comorbidities (considered with the diagnostic criteria of that time) contributed to thrombotic risk compared to the present criteria. For example, in 1995, an RCT [65] set the threshold for DM as fasting glucose >7.8 mmol/L (140 mg/dL) and a high lipid profile when the total cholesterol >6.2 mmol/L (240 mg/dL); however, currently, these cut-off values are considered unacceptable. Also, more potent agents used to target different CV comorbidities, such as statins, proprotein convertase subtilisin/kexin type 9 (PCSK9) inhibitors, angiotensin converting enzyme (ACE) inhibitors and angiotensin receptor blockers, sodium-glucose cotransporter-2 (SGLT2) inhibitors, and others, were developed through the years and have profoundly changed the prognosis associated with specific comorbidities in the general population. Thus, we do not know whether conclusions about the efficacy and safety of specific drugs based on >20 year-old datasets are accurate in contemporary MPN cohorts when compared to "placebo plus best of care" according to today's standards.

Another issue with retrospective registries is that CV comorbidities were often been defined at *any time* during the follow-up period. In these cases, the patients included during later study periods had more detailed medical information whereas those with missing data were often coded as not having a comorbidity. This approach misclassifies patients bearing a comorbidity. The same may apply for mutation testing and exposure to specific drugs.

Ideally, firm evidence is generated from RCTs that enable prospective follow-up, pre-defined protocols, procedures, and outcomes. On the other hand, the main disadvantages of RCTs are the potential lack of representative patients from real life (who may not fulfill the predefined study inclusion/exclusion criteria but still need medical care), the short follow-up period needed to observe enough events to appropriately power the statistical analyses

(especially in low-risk patients), and the focus of the evaluation on selected outcomes. Additionally, major clinical outcomes, such as thrombotic events, were quite infrequent in MPN patients treated with contemporary cytoreductive treatments in more recent RCTs [33,40,66,67]; thus, limiting the statistical power to assess the potential antithrombotic effect of different cytoreductive treatments.

Due to the aforementioned reasons, the current MPN treatment guidelines do not recommend the presence of CV risk factors as an indication for cytoreductive treatment in otherwise low-risk patients. Nevertheless, aggressive control of generic CV risk factors in all MPN patients is recommended with administration of twice-daily aspirin and consideration of cytoreduction in low-risk patients with persistently high CV risk, provided that primary CV prevention strategies have already been implemented [21,37,38].

Lack of generalized traditional prognostic scores and the need for new surrogate markers of thrombotic risk

Retrospective analyses of registry datasets demonstrated that the prognostic scoring systems developed for CV prognostication in the general population, such as the CHA2DS2-VASC in atrial fibrillation (AF) or simplified Pulmonary Embolism Severity Index (sPESI) in pulmonary embolism, may perform suboptimally in MPN patients [68,69]. These scoring systems account for specific comorbidities and reflect the cumulative comorbidity burden in the final score. Instead, it appears that MPN-related factors may play a more important role during risk prognostication of MPN patients. For all the aforementioned reasons, it may not be the number of particular comorbidities *per se*, but the extent of their control that is more important on how these comorbidities contribute to the overall thrombotic risk [70].

A number of biologic biomarkers that were directly measured or derived have recently emerged as prognostically relevant in the prognosis of MPN patients. Parameters that can be easily obtained from the complete blood count analysis, such as red blood cell distribution width (RDW) [71-74], lymphocyte and neutrophil count and percentage, neutrophil-to-lymphocyte ratio (NLR), platelet-to-lymphocyte ratio (PLR) [75-77], estimated plasma volume status (ePVS) [78,79], are very useful. These are non-MPN specific variables, which bear prognostic importance regarding the thrombotic risk in persons with CV comorbidities from the general population [80]. However, caution regarding interpretation of the former biomarkers is needed given the large number of factors that may affect them and their substantial inter- and intra-individual variability [81]. Although it may be difficult to interpret what exactly these parameters represent biologically, they were consistently associated with undesirable clinical outcomes in multiple independent datasets. These observations were recently further supported by artificial intelligence through a machine-learning model identifying RDW, lymphocyte and neutrophil percentage as parameters with strong prognostic properties regarding thrombotic risk in HU-treated PV patients [82]. Nevertheless, additional research is still needed to fully understand whether clinical decisions can rely on these surrogates of thrombotic risk.

Aspirin: former and recent considerations

Aspirin is universally prescribed to PV patients as the primary prophylactic to prevent thrombotic events based on the results of the ECLAP RCT, which were published in 2004. [83] The ECLAP trial demonstrated lower cumulative rates of nonfatal myocardial infarction, nonfatal stroke, pulmonary embolism, major venous thrombosis, or death from CV causes with low-dose aspirin treatment (100 mg daily) in comparison to placebo. However, the same trial did not demonstrate significant benefit regarding overall or CV mortality as isolated outcomes.

Aspirin is currently recommended to all PV patients if not contraindicated [38]. Similarly, guidelines for ET treatment recommend aspirin to the majority of patients (to all except very low-risk patients defined by the R-IPSET) [84], based on extrapolated and retrospective data. Although there are no guidelines explicitly recommending aspirin, patients with MF are often treated with aspirin because it was initiated during earlier prefibrotic MPN stages or due to other comorbid conditions where aspirin is considered a standard of care. Per recent guidelines, PV and ET patients stratified to higher risk groups and those with CV comorbidities are considered candidates for aspirin twice daily [21]. These recommendations are based on the demonstration of more potent inhibition of platelets in MPN patients with twice and triple daily dosing of aspirin [85]. Nevertheless, these surrogate measurements of thrombotic risk did not translate into reduced thrombotic risk, and randomized or real-life data demonstrating its usefulness are still lacking. In MPN patients, aspirin is currently considered an agent that reduces thrombotic risk and does not have anti or pro-myeloproliferative activity. [86,87]

Aspirin has a definitive beneficial role in secondary prevention of thrombotic events and is strongly recommended in this context [88]. However, until recently, aspirin was widely used for the purpose of primary prevention of thrombotic events in the general population based on convincing early evidence, i.e., early RCTs of aspirin use in primary prevention of CV complications showed benefit in large populations with small increase in major bleeding risk [89]. Aspirin has analgesic properties, and there are a number of indirect indicators of its benefits (both regarding CV complications and malignant diseases) in the literature, mostly based on retrospective studies. Nevertheless, the role of aspirin in the context of primary prevention has been revisited in the last few years [90]. Thus, current recommendations for patients with DM suggest that aspirin should only be considered as a primary prevention strategy of CV complications in patients who are at increased CV risk but after a comprehensive discussion with the patient regarding the benefits versus the increased risk of bleeding [91].

Four large primary prevention trials performed in the last few years revealed additional considerations. The ASPREE RCT randomized a total of 19,114 healthy elderly patients to aspirin (100 mg daily) or placebo, which were administered to evaluate dementia-free and disability-free survival. The study did not find benefit in the outcomes but surprisingly, the investigators reported an increased mortality associated with aspirin use, driven by higher incidence of cancer-related death [92]. This was the first large scale RCT that evaluated the role of aspirin in elderly patients and profoundly questioned the properties of aspirin. The ASCEND RCT randomized 15,480 patients with DM to aspirin (100 mg daily) or placebo and showed lower rates of serious vascular events (myocardial infarction, stroke or transient ischemic attack, or death from any vascular cause) and higher rates of major bleeding, without survival benefit [93]. The ARRIVE RCT randomized 12,546 middle-aged and older adults at intermediate risk for atherosclerotic CV disease without DM and did not find a significant difference in the number of CV events or survival between the groups, but reported twofold increase in the gastrointestinal bleeding risk [94]. The TIPS-3 RCT randomized (using a 2x2x2 factorial design) 5,713 patients without CV disease but with elevated CV risk; the patients received a polypill containing statins and antihypertensive medications or placebo daily, aspirin (75 mg) or placebo daily, and vitamin D or placebo monthly. The study showed that the group treated with both the polypill plus aspirin had a lower CV risk, and improved survival and similar bleeding rates compared to the placebo; also, no significant differences were observed for aspirin only compared to placebo regarding CV outcomes, death, and bleeding [95]. In the aforementioned first three trials, concomitant use of statins and antihypertensive medications was high and smoking rates were low, suggesting that aspirin may not exert beneficial effects in patients potently treated for CV comorbidities.

Considering the new studies questioning the benefits of aspirin in prevention of diseases in the general population, the role and dosing of aspirin in preventing thrombotic events in

MPN patients should be critically re-evaluated as well. It is questionable if the ECLAP study would report similar conclusions regarding thrombotic endpoints in cohorts treated with novel therapies for MPNs and CV comorbidities.

Peculiarities of cardiovascular risk factors in MPN patients

The optimal management of CV risk factors in MPN patients is currently unknown and usually mirrors the experience from the general population. The underlying pathophysiological mechanisms of CV risk factors in MPN patients are also strongly affected by high cellular proliferation, increased metabolic turnover and significant inflammatory burden associated with MPNs. Therefore, the optimal treatment of CV risk factors in MPNs may also need to take into account these specificities. Here, we would like to briefly mention several important aspects regarding each CV risk factor in MPN patients.

AH in MPN patients has less variation during blood pressure measurements, higher occurrence of non-dipper phenotype and lower sympathetic nervous system activity [96,97]. On the other hand, AH may also diminish after the start of phlebotomies, even in non-MPN patients [98,99].

DM is either insufficiently recognized or is a less common CV comorbidity in MPNs. This is a particular concern due to detrimental effects of DM on CV health in the general population. Additionally, optimal levels of glycated hemoglobin (HbA1c) for the diagnosis and treatment of DM in MPN patients are still not established – HbA1c values may be affected by high cellular turnover, and other MPN specific features and therapies [100,101].

Smoking-induced inflammation and its carcinogenic potential may promote the development of MPNs [102], impair treatment responses, and negatively affect survival [103].

Many MPN patients have hypocholesterolemia, which is hypothesized to be a consequence of high lipid membrane utilization in the proliferating cells. Low-density lipoprotein (LDL) values of <1.8 mmol/L are associated with lower incidence of thrombotic events and may have the strongest discriminatory properties regarding thrombotic risk in PV and ET patients [44]. Interestingly, this cut-off value corresponds to that of target LDL levels for the treatment of high-risk persons in the general population [104].

CKD is highly prevalent among MPN patients and was shown to bear high trombotic risk for both arterial and venous thrombotic events in MPNs [57-59]. This is of particular interest due to its possible association with MPN-related glomerulopathy, the MPN manifestation at the level of glomeruli [105].

Hyperuricemia reflects higher cellular turnover, nutritional habits and kidney function, and is associated with the occurrence of gout and increased CV risk among MPN patients [60,61,106]. Due to lack of recognition by current treatment guidelines and the unknown optimal treatment target levels, urate-lowering therapies are usually prescribed to MPN patients on an individual basis.

Obesity and cachexia, on the different sides of body mass index (BMI) spectrum, bear specific risks in MPN patients. It is unclear whether more favorable outcomes associated with higher BMI may reflect the absence of cachexia or the so called "obesity paradox" [62]. Obesity induces inflammation and may promote carcinogenesis. Biomarkers associated with cachexia reflect negatively on outcomes of MPN patients [75,107] and can be reverted with specific therapies [35], calling for clinical trials specifically focusing on nutritional support in MPNs.

Conclusion and perspectives

Thrombotic risk dominates the MPN prognostication and treatment, and multidisciplinary care may be needed to adequately control CV comorbidities in MPN patients. Currently, CV risk factors are not included into the well established MPN-specific prognostic scores due to a variety of reasons which we have elaborated above. It should be pointed out, however, that CV comorbidities may share common pathophysiological mechanisms with MPNs and require simultaneous and focused medical care. Significant advances in the understanding of the molecular biology in MPNs have led to development of integrated clinical and molecular prognostic scores which have provided a more refined prognostication of MPNs. Introduction of targeted treatments in MPNs, such as JAK inhibitors (i.e., ruxolitinib, fedratinib, momelotinib), and more potent and less toxic IFNs (i.e., ropeginterferon-alfa2b) has revolutionized the therapeutic landscape in MPNs. Unfortunately, diagnostic and MPN-specific therapeutic progresses may have also caused CV comorbidities to occasionally leave the primary focus of hematologists.

Exploratory post hoc analyses of the current RCT where treatment responses and clinical outcomes of MPN patients are stratified according to particular CV risk factors would be a great way to start. Also, multi-institutional international collaborations ("big data") with the help of new technologies (i.e, artificial intelligence) may represent an exciting approach to create MPN-specific risk scores for particular CV comorbidities and to determine the optimal target values of different metabolic parameters (i.e., LDL, Hba1c, or serum uric acid) in MPN patients. Finally, RCT in MPN patients using contemporary and potent medications (i.e., statins, PCSK9 inhibitors, ACE inhibitors, SGLT2 inhibitors and others) for the treatment of different CV comorbidities (on top of MPN-specific treatments) may be needed to establish new standards of care.

References

1.   Krecak I, Lucijanic M, Verstovsek S. Advances in Risk Stratification and Treatment of Polycythemia Vera and Essential Thrombocythemia. *Curr Hematol Malig Rep*. 2022;17(5):155-169.

2.   Tefferi A. Primary myelofibrosis: 2023 update on diagnosis, risk-stratification, and management. *Am J Hematol*. 2023;98(5):801-821.

3.   Pasca S CH, Verstovsek S, Bose P. . Mutational landscape of blast phase myeloproliferative neoplasms (BP-MPN) and antecedent MPN. *Intern Rev Cell Mol Biol*. 2022;366:83-124.

4.   Shahin OA CH, Bose P, Masarova L, Verstovsek S. Accelerated phase of Myeloproliferative Neoplasms. *Acta Haematologica*. 2021;144(5):484-499.

5.   Fleischman AG, Aichberger KJ, Luty SB, et al. TNFα facilitates clonal expansion of JAK2V617F positive cells in myeloproliferative neoplasms. *Blood*. 2011;118(24):6392-6398.

6.   Gleitz HFE, Benabid A, Schneider RK. Still a burning question: the interplay between inflammation and fibrosis in myeloproliferative neoplasms. *Curr Opin Hematol*. 2021;28(5):364-371.

7.   Hasselbalch HC, Bjørn ME. MPNs as Inflammatory Diseases: The Evidence, Consequences, and Perspectives. *Mediators of Inflammation*. 2015;2015:102476.

8.   Cervantes F, Arellano-Rodrigo E, Alvarez-Larrán A. Blood cell activation in myeloproliferative neoplasms. *Haematologica*. 2009;94(11):1484-1488.

9.   Barbui T, Finazzi G, Falanga A. Myeloproliferative neoplasms and thrombosis. *Blood*. 2013;122(13):2176-2184.

10.   Leiva O, Hobbs G, Ravid K, Libby P. Cardiovascular Disease in Myeloproliferative Neoplasms: JACC: CardioOncology State-of-the-Art Review. *JACC CardioOncol*. 2022;4(2):166-182.

11.   Lucijanic M, Livun A, Tupek KM, et al. Heat shock protein 27 (HSP27/HSPB1) expression is increased in patients with primary and secondary myelofibrosis and may be affecting their survival. *Leuk Lymphoma*. 2017;58(10):2497-2500.

12.   Hultcrantz M, Björkholm M, Dickman PW, et al. Risk for Arterial and Venous Thrombosis in Patients With Myeloproliferative Neoplasms: A Population-Based Cohort Study. *Ann Intern Med*. 2018;168(5):317-325.

13.   Pemmaraju N, Gerds AT, Yu J, et al. Thrombotic events and mortality risk in patients with newly diagnosed polycythemia vera or essential thrombocythemia. *Leuk Res*. 2022;115:106809.

14.   Barbui T, Carobbio A, De Stefano V. Thrombosis in myeloproliferative neoplasms during cytoreductive and antithrombotic drug treatment. *Res Pract Thromb Haemost*. 2022;6(1):e12657.

15.   Lucijanic M, Krecak I, Soric E, et al. Patients with post polycythemia vera myelofibrosis might experience increased thrombotic risk in comparison to primary and post essential thrombocythemia myelofibrosis. *Leuk Res*. 2022;119:106905.

16.   Kc D, Falchi L, Verstovsek S. The underappreciated risk of thrombosis and bleeding in patients with myelofibrosis: a review. *Ann Hematol*. 2017;96(10):1595-1604.

17.   Barbui T, Carobbio A, Cervantes F, et al. Thrombosis in primary myelofibrosis: incidence and risk factors. *Blood*. 2010;115(4):778-782.

18.   Tefferi A, Rumi E, Finazzi G, et al. Survival and prognosis among 1545 patients with contemporary polycythemia vera: an international study. *Leukemia*. 2013;27(9):1874-1881.

19.   Tefferi A, Guglielmelli P, Larson DR, et al. Long-term survival and blast transformation in molecularly annotated essential thrombocythemia, polycythemia vera, and myelofibrosis. *Blood*. 2014;124(16):2507-2513; quiz 2615.

20.   Abu-Zeinah K, Saadeh K, Silver RT, Scandura JM, Abu-Zeinah G. Excess mortality in younger patients with myeloproliferative neoplasms. *Leuk Lymphoma*. 2023;64(3):725-729.

21.   Tefferi A, Barbui T. Polycythemia vera: 2024 update on diagnosis, risk-stratification, and management. *Am J Hematol*. 2023.

22.   Barbui T, Vannucchi AM, Buxhofer-Ausch V, et al. Practice-relevant revision of IPSET-thrombosis based on 1019 patients with WHO-defined essential thrombocythemia. *Blood Cancer J*. 2015;5(11):e369.

23.   Haider M, Gangat N, Lasho T, et al. Validation of the revised International Prognostic Score of Thrombosis for Essential Thrombocythemia (IPSET-thrombosis) in 585 Mayo Clinic patients. *Am J Hematol*. 2016;91(4):390-394.

24.   Passamonti F, Cervantes F, Vannucchi AM, et al. A dynamic prognostic model to predict survival in primary myelofibrosis: a study by the IWG-MRT (International Working Group for Myeloproliferative Neoplasms Research and Treatment). *Blood*. 2010;115(9):1703-1708.

25.   Tefferi A, Guglielmelli P, Nicolosi M, et al. GIPSS: genetically inspired prognostic scoring system for primary myelofibrosis. *Leukemia*. 2018;32(7):1631-1642.

26.   Guglielmelli P, Lasho TL, Rotunno G, et al. MIPSS70: Mutation-Enhanced International Prognostic Score System for Transplantation-Age Patients With Primary Myelofibrosis. *J Clin Oncol*. 2018;36(4):310-318.

27.   Mora B, Guglielmelli P, Kuykendall A, et al. Prediction of thrombosis in post-polycythemia vera and post-essential thrombocythemia myelofibrosis: a study on 1258 patients. *Leukemia*. 2022;36(10):2453-2460.

28. Barbui T, Ghirardi A, Carobbio A, et al. Increased risk of thrombosis in JAK2 V617F-positive patients with primary myelofibrosis and interaction of the mutation with the IPSS score. *Blood Cancer J*. 2022;12(11):156.

29. Passamonti F, Giorgino T, Mora B, et al. A clinical-molecular prognostic model to predict survival in patients with post polycythemia vera and post essential thrombocythemia myelofibrosis. *Leukemia*. 2017;31(12):2726-2731.

30. Krecak I, Skelin M, Verstovsek S. Evaluating ropeginterferon alfa-2b for the treatment of adults with polycythemia vera. *Expert Rev Hematol*. 2023;16(5):305-316.

31. Alvarez-Larrán A, Pereira A, Guglielmelli P, et al. Antiplatelet therapy versus observation in low-risk essential thrombocythemia with a CALR mutation. *Haematologica*. 2016;101(8):926-931.

32. Marchioli R, Finazzi G, Specchia G, et al. Cardiovascular events and intensity of treatment in polycythemia vera. *N Engl J Med*. 2013;368(1):22-33.

33. Verstovsek S, Mesa RA, Gotlib J, et al. A double-blind, placebo-controlled trial of ruxolitinib for myelofibrosis. *N Engl J Med*. 2012;366(9):799-807.

34. Harrison C, Kiladjian JJ, Al-Ali HK, et al. JAK inhibition with ruxolitinib versus best available therapy for myelofibrosis. *N Engl J Med*. 2012;366(9):787-798.

35. Lucijanic M, Galusic D, Soric E, et al. Ruxolitinib treatment improves muscle mass in patients with myelofibrosis. *Ann Hematol*. 2021;100(4):1105-1106.

36. Palandri F, Al-Ali HK, Guglielmelli P, Zuurman MW, Sarkar R, Gupta V. Benefit of Early Ruxolitinib Initiation Regardless of Fibrosis Grade in Patients with Primary Myelofibrosis: A Post Hoc Analysis of the Single-Arm Phase 3b JUMP Study. *Cancers (Basel)*. 2023;15(10).

37.   Barbui T, Tefferi A, Vannucchi AM, et al. Philadelphia chromosome-negative classical myeloproliferative neoplasms: revised management recommendations from European LeukemiaNet. *Leukemia*. 2018;32(5):1057-1069.

38.   Marchetti M, Vannucchi AM, Griesshammer M, et al. Appropriate management of polycythaemia vera with cytoreductive drug therapy: European LeukemiaNet 2021 recommendations. *Lancet Haematol*. 2022;9(4):e301-e311.

39.   Harrison CN, Nangalia J, Boucher R, et al. Ruxolitinib Versus Best Available Therapy for Polycythemia Vera Intolerant or Resistant to Hydroxycarbamide in a Randomized Trial. *J Clin Oncol*. 2023;41(19):3534-3544.

40.   Vannucchi AM, Kiladjian JJ, Griesshammer M, et al. Ruxolitinib versus standard therapy for the treatment of polycythemia vera. *N Engl J Med*. 2015;372(5):426-435.

41.   Mancuso S, Santoro M, Accurso V, et al. Cardiovascular Risk in Polycythemia Vera: Thrombotic Risk and Survival: Can Cytoreductive Therapy Be Useful in Patients with Low-Risk Polycythemia Vera with Cardiovascular Risk Factors? *Oncol Res Treat*. 2020;43(10):526-530.

42.   Cerquozzi S, Barraco D, Lasho T, et al. Risk factors for arterial versus venous thrombosis in polycythemia vera: a single center experience in 587 patients. *Blood Cancer J*. 2017;7(12):662.

43.   Sørensen AL, Knudsen TA, Skov V, et al. Smoking impairs molecular response, and reduces overall survival in patients with chronic myeloproliferative neoplasms: A retrospective cohort study. *Br J Haematol*. 2021;193(1):83-92.

44.   Krečak I, Holik H, Coha B, et al. Low-density lipoprotein (LDL) and the risk of thrombotic events in essential thrombocythemia and polycythemia vera. *Ann Hematol*. 2021;100(5):1335-1336.

45.   Lekovic D, Gotic M, Sefer D, Mitrovic-Ajtic O, Cokic V, Milic N. Predictors of survival and cause of death in patients with essential thrombocythemia. *Eur J Haematol*. 2015;95(5):461-466.

46.   Furuya C, Hashimoto Y, Morishita S, et al. Reevaluation of cardiovascular risk factors for thrombotic events in 580 Japanese patients with essential thrombocythemia. *J Thromb Thrombolysis*. 2023;55(2):263-272.

47.   Lekovic D, Gotic M, Milic N, et al. The importance of cardiovascular risk factors for thrombosis prediction in patients with essential thrombocythemia. *Med Oncol*. 2014;31(10):231.

48.   Horvat I, Boban A, Zadro R, et al. Influence of Blood Count, Cardiovascular Risks, Inherited Thrombophilia, and JAK2 V617F Burden Allele on Type of Thrombosis in Patients With Philadelphia Chromosome Negative Myeloproliferative Neoplasms. *Clin Lymphoma Myeloma Leuk*. 2019;19(1):53-63.

49.   Barbui T, Carobbio A, Rumi E, et al. In contemporary patients with polycythemia vera, rates of thrombosis and risk factors delineate a new clinical epidemiology. *Blood*. 2014;124(19):3021-3023.

50.   Krečak I, Morić Perić M, Zekanović I, et al. No Impact of the Increased Number of Cardiovascular Risk Factors on Thrombosis and Survival in Polycythemia Vera. *Oncol Res Treat*. 2021;44(4):201-203.

51.   Găman MA, Kipkorir V, Srichawla BS, Dhali A, Găman AM, Diaconu CC. Primary Arterial Hypertension and Drug-Induced Hypertension in Philadelphia-Negative Classical Myeloproliferative Neoplasms: A Systematic Review. *Biomedicines*. 2023;11(2).

52.   Landolfi R, Di Gennaro L, Barbui T, et al. Leukocytosis as a major thrombotic risk factor in patients with polycythemia vera. *Blood*. 2007;109(6):2446-2452.

53.   Watson KV, Key N. Vascular complications of essential thrombocythaemia: a link to cardiovascular risk factors. *Br J Haematol*. 1993;83(2):198-203.

54.   Randi ML, Fabris F, Cella G, Rossi C, Girolami A. Cerebral vascular accidents in young patients with essential thrombocythemia: relation with other known cardiovascular risk factors. *Angiology*. 1998;49(6):477-481.

55.   Jantunen R, Juvonen E, Ikkala E, Oksanen K, Anttila P, Ruutu T. The predictive value of vascular risk factors and gender for the development of thrombotic complications in essential thrombocythemia. *Ann Hematol*. 2001;80(2):74-78.

56.   Stein BL, Rademaker A, Spivak JL, Moliterno AR. Gender and Vascular Complications in the JAK2 V617F-Positive Myeloproliferative Neoplasms. *Thrombosis*. 2011;2011:874146.

57.   Krečak I, Holik H, Martina MP, Zekanović I, Coha B, Gverić-Krečak V. Chronic kidney disease could be a risk factor for thrombosis in essential thrombocythemia and polycythemia vera. *Int J Hematol*. 2020;112(3):377-384.

58.   Lucijanic M, Galusic D, Krecak I, et al. Reduced renal function strongly affects survival and thrombosis in patients with myelofibrosis. *Ann Hematol*. 2020;99(12):2779-2785.

59.   Gecht J, Tsoukakis I, Kricheldorf K, et al. Kidney Dysfunction Is Associated with Thrombosis and Disease Severity in Myeloproliferative Neoplasms: Implications from the German Study Group for MPN Bioregistry. *Cancers (Basel)*. 2021;13(16).

60.   Krecak I, Lucijanic M, Gveric-Krecak V, Durakovic N. Hyperuricemia might promote thrombosis in essential thrombocythemia and polycythemia vera. *Leuk Lymphoma*. 2020.

61.   Lucijanic M, Krecak I, Galusic D, et al. Higher serum uric acid is associated with higher risks of thrombosis and death in patients with primary myelofibrosis. *Wien Klin Wochenschr*. 2022;134(3-4):97-103.

62.   Benevolo G, Elli EM, Bartoletti D, et al. Impact of comorbidities and body mass index on the outcome of polycythemia vera patients. *Hematol Oncol*. 2021;39(3):409-418.

63.   Barbui T, Finazzi G, Carobbio A, et al. Development and validation of an International Prognostic Score of thrombosis in World Health Organization-essential thrombocythemia (IPSET-thrombosis). *Blood*. 2012;120(26):5128-5133; quiz 5252.

64.   Guglielmelli P, Carobbio A, Rumi E, et al. Validation of the IPSET score for thrombosis in patients with prefibrotic myelofibrosis. *Blood Cancer J*. 2020;10(2):21.

65.   Cortelazzo S, Finazzi G, Ruggeri M, et al. Hydroxyurea for patients with essential thrombocythemia and a high risk of thrombosis. *N Engl J Med*. 1995;332(17):1132-1136.

66.   Barbui T, Vannucchi AM, De Stefano V, et al. Ropeginterferon alfa-2b versus phlebotomy in low-risk patients with polycythaemia vera (Low-PV study): a multicentre, randomised phase 2 trial. *Lancet Haematol*. 2021;8(3):e175-e184.

67.   Kiladjian JJ, Klade C, Georgiev P, et al. Long-term outcomes of polycythemia vera patients treated with ropeginterferon Alfa-2b. *Leukemia*. 2022;36(5):1408-1411.

68.   Leiva O, Jenkins A, Rosovsky RP, Leaf RK, Goodarzi K, Hobbs G. Predictors of increased risk of adverse cardiovascular outcomes among patients with myeloproliferative neoplasms and atrial fibrillation. *J Cardiol*. 2023;81(3):260-267.

69.   Krečak I, Grohovac D, Vučenović Bašić N, et al. Clinical presentation, treatment patterns, and outcomes of pulmonary embolism in patients with chronic myeloproliferative neoplasms. *Thromb Res*. 2023.

70.   Krecak I, Sabljic A, Lucijanic M. Understanding and modifying thrombotic risk in patients with myeloproliferative neoplasms. *J Cardiol*. 2022.

71.   Lucijanic M, Pejsa V, Jaksic O, et al. The Degree of Anisocytosis Predicts Survival in Patients with Primary Myelofibrosis. *Acta Haematol*. 2016;136(2):98-100.

72. Krečak I, Krečak F, Gverić-Krečak V. High red blood cell distribution width might predict thrombosis in essential thrombocythemia and polycythemia vera. *Blood Cells Mol Dis*. 2020;80:102368.

73. Lucijanic M, Krecak I, Verstovsek S, et al. Higher red blood cell distribution width predicts thrombosis risk in primary and secondary myelofibrosis. *Ann Hematol*. 2022;101(6):1355-1357.

74. Verstovsek S, De Stefano V, Heidel FH, et al. US Optum Database Study in Polycythemia Vera Patients: Thromboembolic Events (TEs) with Hydroxyurea (HU) Vs Ruxolitinib Switch Therapy and Machine-Learning Model to Predict Incidence of Tes and HU Failure. *Blood*. 2019;134(Supplement_1):1659-1659.

75. Lucijanic M, Veletic I, Rahelic D, et al. Assessing serum albumin concentration, lymphocyte count and prognostic nutritional index might improve prognostication in patients with myelofibrosis. *Wien Klin Wochenschr*. 2018;130(3-4):126-133.

76. Lucijanic M, Cicic D, Stoos-Veic T, et al. Elevated Neutrophil-to-Lymphocyte-ratio and Platelet-to-Lymphocyte Ratio in Myelofibrosis: Inflammatory Biomarkers or Representatives of Myeloproliferation Itself? *Anticancer Res*. 2018;38(5):3157-3163.

77. Krečak I, Holik H, Morić Perić M, et al. Neutrophil-to-lymphocyte and platelet-to-lymphocyte ratios as prognostic biomarkers in polycythemia vera. *Int J Lab Hematol*. 2022;44(4):e145-e148.

78. Krečak I, Zekanović I, Holik H, Morić Perić M, Coha B, Gverić-Krečak V. Estimating plasma volume using the Strauss-derived formula may improve prognostication in polycythemia vera. *Int J Lab Hematol*. 2022;44(2):e69-e71.

79. Lucijanic M, Krecak I, Soric E, et al. Higher estimated plasma volume status is associated with increased thrombotic risk and impaired survival in patients with primary myelofibrosis. *Biochem Med (Zagreb)*. 2023;33(2):020901.

80.   Felker GM, Allen LA, Pocock SJ, et al. Red cell distribution width as a novel prognostic marker in heart failure: data from the CHARM Program and the Duke Databank. *J Am Coll Cardiol*. 2007;50(1):40-47.

81.   Lippi G, Plebani M. Red blood cell distribution width (RDW) and human pathology. One size fits all. *Clin Chem Lab Med*. 2014;52(9):1247-1249.

82.   Verstovsek S, Krečak I, Heidel FH, et al. Identifying Patients with Polycythemia Vera at Risk of Thrombosis after Hydroxyurea Initiation: The Polycythemia Vera—Advanced Integrated Models (PV-AIM) Project. *Biomedicines*. 2023;11(7):1925.

83.   Landolfi R, Marchioli R, Kutti J, et al. Efficacy and safety of low-dose aspirin in polycythemia vera. *N Engl J Med*. 2004;350(2):114-124.

84.   Tefferi A, Barbui T. Polycythemia vera and essential thrombocythemia: 2021 update on diagnosis, risk-stratification and management. *Am J Hematol*. 2020;95(12):1599-1613.

85.   Mainoli B, Duarte GS, Costa J, Ferreira J, Caldeira D. Once- versus Twice-Daily Aspirin in Patients at High Risk of Thrombotic Events: Systematic Review and Meta-Analysis. *Am J Cardiovasc Drugs*. 2021;21(1):63-71.

86.   Lucijanic M, Skelin M, Kusec R. Second primary malignancies in myeloproliferative neoplasms and the role of aspirin. *Leukemia*. 2019;33(10):2554.

87.   Barbui T, Ghirardi A, Vannucchi AM, Marchetti M, De Stefano V. Reply to: Second primary malignancies in myeloproliferative neoplasms and the role of aspirin. *Leukemia*. 2020;34(4):1208-1209.

88.   Arnett DK, Blumenthal RS, Albert MA, et al. 2019 ACC/AHA Guideline on the Primary Prevention of Cardiovascular Disease: A Report of the American College of Cardiology/American Heart Association Task Force on Clinical Practice Guidelines. *Circulation*. 2019;140(11):e596-e646.

89.   Davidson KW, Barry MJ, Mangione CM, et al. Aspirin Use to Prevent Cardiovascular Disease: US Preventive Services Task Force Recommendation Statement. *Jama*. 2022;327(16):1577-1584.

90.   Berger JS. Aspirin for Primary Prevention-Time to Rethink Our Approach. *JAMA Netw Open*. 2022;5(4):e2210144.

91.   10. Cardiovascular Disease and Risk Management: Standards of Medical Care in Diabetes-2022. *Diabetes Care*. 2022;45(Suppl 1):S144-s174.

92.   McNeil JJ, Nelson MR, Woods RL, et al. Effect of Aspirin on All-Cause Mortality in the Healthy Elderly. *New England Journal of Medicine*. 2018;0(0):null.

93.   Bowman L, Mafham M, Wallendszus K, et al. Effects of Aspirin for Primary Prevention in Persons with Diabetes Mellitus. *N Engl J Med*. 2018;379(16):1529-1539.

94.   Gaziano JM, Brotons C, Coppolecchia R, et al. Use of aspirin to reduce risk of initial vascular events in patients at moderate risk of cardiovascular disease (ARRIVE): a randomised, double-blind, placebo-controlled trial. *The Lancet*. 2018;392(10152):1036-1046.

95.   Yusuf S, Joseph P, Dans A, et al. Polypill with or without Aspirin in Persons without Cardiovascular Disease. *N Engl J Med*. 2021;384(3):216-228.

96.   Akdi A, Özeke Ö, Karanfil M, et al. Diurnal rhythm of blood pressure in patients with polycythemia vera. *Blood Press Monit*. 2020;25(2):69-74.

97.   Jóźwik-Plebanek K, Dobrowolski P, Lewandowski J, et al. Blood pressure profile, sympathetic nervous system activity, and subclinical target organ damage in patients with polycythemia vera. *Pol Arch Intern Med*. 2020;130(7-8):607-614.

98.   Zidek W, Tenschert W, Karoff C, Vetter H. Treatment of resistant hypertension by phlebotomy. *Klin Wochenschr*. 1985;63(16):762-764.

99.   Xiong XJ, Wang PQ, Li SJ. Blood-Letting Therapy for Hypertension: A Systematic Review and Meta-Analysis of Randomized Controlled Trials. *Chin J Integr Med*. 2019;25(2):139-146.

100.   Ren Q, Lv X, Yang L, et al. Erythrocytosis and Performance of HbA1c in Detecting Diabetes on an Oxygen-Deficient Plateau: A Population-based Study. *J Clin Endocrinol Metab*. 2020;105(4).

101.   Karsegard J, Wicky J, Mensi N, Caulfield A, Philippe J. Spurious glycohemoglobin values associated with hydroxyurea treatment. *Diabetes Care*. 1997;20(7):1211-1212.

102.   Hasselbalch HC. Smoking as a contributing factor for development of polycythemia vera and related neoplasms. *Leuk Res*. 2015.

103.   Daltro De Oliveira R, Soret-Dulphy J, Zhao L-P, et al. Interferon-Alpha (IFN) Therapy Discontinuation Is Feasible in Myeloproliferative Neoplasm (MPN) Patients with Complete Hematological Remission. *Blood*. 2020;136(Supplement 1):35-36.

104.   Mach F, Baigent C, Catapano AL, et al. 2019 ESC/EAS Guidelines for the management of dyslipidaemias: lipid modification to reduce cardiovascular risk. *Eur Heart J*. 2020;41(1):111-188.

105.   Lucijanic M, Krecak I, Kusec R. Renal disease associated with chronic myeloproliferative neoplasms. *Expert Rev Hematol*. 2022;15(2):93-96.

106.   Yu T, Weinreb N, Wittman R, Wasserman LR. Secondary gout associated with chronic myeloproliferative disorders. *Semin Arthritis Rheum*. 1976;5(3):247-256.

107.   Tefferi A, Nicolosi M, Penna D, et al. Development of a prognostically relevant cachexia index in primary myelofibrosis using serum albumin and cholesterol levels. *Blood Adv*. 2018;2(15):1980-1984.