

# Is it the end of the road for abatacept treatment in Sjögren's syndrome?

Fisher, Benjamin

DOI:

[10.1016/S2665-9913\(20\)30002-3](https://doi.org/10.1016/S2665-9913(20)30002-3)

License:

Creative Commons: Attribution-NonCommercial-NoDerivs (CC BY-NC-ND)

*Document Version*

Peer reviewed version

*Citation for published version (Harvard):*

Fisher, B 2020, 'Is it the end of the road for abatacept treatment in Sjögren's syndrome?', *The Lancet Rheumatology*, vol. 2, no. 3, pp. e125-e126. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S2665-9913\(20\)30002-3](https://doi.org/10.1016/S2665-9913(20)30002-3)

[Link to publication on Research at Birmingham portal](#)

## General rights

Unless a licence is specified above, all rights (including copyright and moral rights) in this document are retained by the authors and/or the copyright holders. The express permission of the copyright holder must be obtained for any use of this material other than for purposes permitted by law.

- Users may freely distribute the URL that is used to identify this publication.
- Users may download and/or print one copy of the publication from the University of Birmingham research portal for the purpose of private study or non-commercial research.
- User may use extracts from the document in line with the concept of 'fair dealing' under the Copyright, Designs and Patents Act 1988 (?)
- Users may not further distribute the material nor use it for the purposes of commercial gain.

Where a licence is displayed above, please note the terms and conditions of the licence govern your use of this document.

When citing, please reference the published version.

## Take down policy

While the University of Birmingham exercises care and attention in making items available there are rare occasions when an item has been uploaded in error or has been deemed to be commercially or otherwise sensitive.

If you believe that this is the case for this document, please contact [UBIRA@lists.bham.ac.uk](mailto:UBIRA@lists.bham.ac.uk) providing details and we will remove access to the work immediately and investigate.

# End of the road for abatacept in Sjögren's syndrome?

*Benjamin A. Fisher<sup>1,2</sup>*

1. Institute of Inflammation and Ageing, College of Medical and Dental Sciences, University of Birmingham (UK)
2. National Institute for Health Research (NIHR) Birmingham Biomedical Research Centre and Department of Rheumatology, University Hospitals Birmingham NHS Foundation Trust, Birmingham, UK.

Correspondence:

Dr Benjamin Fisher ([b.fisher@bham.ac.uk](mailto:b.fisher@bham.ac.uk)),

Rheumatology Research Group,

Institute of Inflammation and Ageing,

University of Birmingham, Birmingham B15 2TT, UK

Sjögren's syndrome (SS) is an autoimmune disease characterised by focal lymphocytic infiltration of moisture-producing glands, leading to oral, ocular and vaginal dryness, fatigue and systemic manifestations. SS has been under-researched in comparison with rheumatoid arthritis (RA) and has no licensed systemic immunomodulatory drug. Abatacept inhibits an important co-stimulation pathway that promotes T cell activation and three open-label studies have reported benefit in primary SS.[1] van Nimwegen et al now report the results of a single-centre 80 patient double-blind randomised controlled trial of abatacept in SS.[1] Disappointingly, no difference was observed in the primary endpoint, the EULAR Sjögren's syndrome disease activity index (ESSDAI), which is a measure of systemic disease activity across 12 domains. They report some differences in secondary clinical outcomes at week 24, namely EULAR patient reported index (ESSPRI) responders and female sexual function index. Physician global, ESSDAI scores and DAS28(CRP) were different between arms at week 12 but not week 24. These findings need to be interpreted cautiously in light of a large number of statistical comparisons. Furthermore, the ESSDAI difference at week 12 was less than the minimal clinically important difference (MCID). There is no defined DAS28 MCID for SS but the difference is less than the MCID in RA and no difference was observed in DAS28(ESR). Given that symptoms make an important contribution to impaired health-related quality of life in SS[2], a difference in ESSPRI responders [23 (58%) versus 8 (21%) at week 24, defined as those reaching the MCID of  $\geq 1$  point or 15%], ought to be of interest, yet the authors report no difference in baseline-adjusted ESSPRI scores. How are we to interpret this? Continuous outcomes are more sensitive than dichotomous, so assuming no subgroup in the actively treated arm became worse in response to treatment, the most likely explanation is that many patients in the placebo treated arm had a change in scores just under the 1 point threshold, with similar numbers of patients just over it in the abatacept arm. If abatacept were more than modestly improving symptoms compared to placebo, then one might also expect a difference in more stringent response criteria. Therefore in future studies, we advocate use of multiple response criteria– 1, 2 and 3 points for ESSPRI and 3, 5 and 7 for ESSDAI – analogous to having multiple levels of ACR response in RA. Notably, the negative findings from this study are confirmed by a larger unpublished multicentre RCT.[3]

This raises important questions as to why these studies failed to show a positive result. The authors highlight deficiencies in the ESSDAI. Development of the ESSDAI as a validated outcome measure in SS has been an important advance and facilitated an upsurge in SS trials. It is true, however, that some ESSDAI domains are awkward to assess, may lack sensitivity to change, and exhibit floor or ceiling effects. Although it is physician assessed, measurement of change in some domains could be made dependent on patient report, enhancing the effect of placebo responses. It is possible that this, and

not just regression to the mean, may have contributed to the larger than expected improvement in the placebo arm in this and other recent studies. An important ramification is that single-arm open-label efficacy studies in SS that rely on these clinical outcome measures should be avoided. Nevertheless, although the ESSDAI is an outcome measure in need of refinement, it has differentiated between treatment arms in other recent RCTs.[4-6]

In the authors' previous open-label study of abatacept,[7] no change in any histological parameters was observed, with the exception of a non-statistically significant reduction in ectopic germinal centres and an increase in IgM plasma cells/mm<sup>2</sup>. [8] In another open-label abatacept trial, the only statistically significant change on biopsy was a relative reduction in Tregs.[9] The histological data from the current trial are eagerly awaited, but based on these previous data it remains possible that abatacept may simply lack efficacy in SS, or that the reduction in Treg number observed with abatacept may have a greater consequence in SS when compared with RA. Concordance between clinical and histological outcomes in the current study would reassure and may encourage use of tissue-based outcomes to support early go/no go decisions,[10] whereas discordance may raise further questions about the ESSDAI. Two other factors may be of importance. Firstly, in RA, disease duration is a predictor of response to abatacept, however in SS, there is a well-recognised delay in diagnosis. Although entry criteria required a time since diagnosis of  $\leq 7$  years, the median duration of symptoms was 11 years. Efficacy in very early SS cannot therefore be excluded. Secondly, in common with most other repurposing studies, no dose-finding was employed and the selected abatacept dose was based upon experience in RA, the licensed indication. It therefore remains unknown if higher trough plasma concentrations may have efficacy in SS; higher doses may be associated with greater efficacy of abatacept in psoriasis, for example.[11] It also remains unknown if abatacept may be a better first-line biologic than anti-TNF, for RA patients with concomitant SS.

Unless future analyses reveal clear histological improvement or subgroups enriched for abatacept response, it is hard to see a way forward for abatacept in SS. However, abatacept targets only one of many immune co-stimulation pathways. Given the importance of T cell activation and B-T cell interactions in SS, these alternative pathways should be actively explored.[5]

## **Acknowledgements**

BAF has received support from the NIHR Birmingham Biomedical Research Centre. The views expressed in this publication are those of the author and not necessarily those of the NHS, the National Institute for Health Research or the Department of Health.

## Conflict of Interest

B Fisher paid instructor/consultant for: Novartis, Roche, BMS, Servier

## References

1. van Nimwegen, J.F.M., E; van Zuiden, G.S.; Wijnsma, R.F.; Delli, K.; Stel, A.J.; van der Vegt, B.; Haacke, E.A.; Olie, L.; Los, L.I.; Verstappen, G.M.; Pringle, S.A.; Spijkervet, F.K.L.; Kroese, F.G.M; Vissink, A.; Arends, S.; Bootsma, H., *Abatacept treatment of patients with early active primary Sjögren's syndrome – randomized, placebo-controlled ASAP III study*. *Lancet Rheumatology*.
2. Miyamoto, S.T., V. Valim, and B.A. Fisher, *Health-related quality of life and costs in Sjogren's syndrome*. *Rheumatology (Oxford)*, 2019.
3. Baer A., G.J.E., St. Clair E.W., Sumida T., Takeuchi T., Seror R., Foulks G., Nys M., Johnsen A., Wong R., Ray N., Bootsma H., IM101-603 study team, *EFFICACY AND SAFETY OF ABATACEPT IN ACTIVE PRIMARY SJÖGREN'S SYNDROME: RESULTS OF A RANDOMISED PLACEBO-CONTROLLED PHASE III TRIAL*. *Ann Rheum Dis*, 2019. **78**: p. A89.
4. Bowman S, F.R., Dörner T, Mariette X, Papas A, Grader-Beck T, Fisher BA, Barcelos F, De Vita S, Schulze-Koops H, Moots RJ, Junge G, Woznicki J, Sopala M, Luo WN and Hueber W., *Ianalumab (VAY736), a Dual Mode of Action Biologic Combining BAFF Receptor Inhibition with B Cell Depletion, for Treatment of Primary Sjögren's Syndrome: Results of an International Randomized, Placebo Controlled Dose Range Finding Study in 190 Patients [abstract]*. *Arthritis Rheumatol*, 2019. **71 (suppl 10)**.
5. Fisher BA, S.A., Ng WF, Bombardieri M, Posch MG, Papas AS, Farag AM, Daikeler T, Bannert B, Kyburz D, Kivitz AJ, Carsons SE, Isenberg DA, Barone F, Bowman SJ, Espié P, Floch D, Dupuy C, Ren X, Faerber PM, Wright AM, Hockey HU, Rotte M, Milojevic J, Avrameas A, Valentin MA, Rush JS, Gergely P, *Safety, tolerability, efficacy, and pharmacokinetics of the anti-CD40 antibody iscalimab in patients with primary Sjögren's syndrome: a multi-center, randomised, double-blind, placebo-controlled, parallel group proof-of-concept study* *Lancet Rheumatology*, 2020.
6. Radstake TRDJ, v.d.H.E., Moret FM, Hillen MR, Lopes AP, Rosenberg T, Janssen N, Kruize AA, van Roon JAG., *Clinical Efficacy of Leflunomide/Hydroxychloroquine Combination Therapy in Patients with Primary Sjogren's Syndrome: Results of a Placebo-Controlled Double-Blind Randomized Clinical Trial [abstract]*. *Arthritis Rheumatol*, 2018. **70 (suppl 10)**.
7. Meiners, P.M., et al., *Abatacept treatment reduces disease activity in early primary Sjogren's syndrome (open-label proof of concept ASAP study)*. *Ann Rheum Dis*, 2014. **73(7)**: p. 1393-6.
8. Haacke, E.A., et al., *Abatacept treatment of patients with primary Sjogren's syndrome results in a decrease of germinal centres in salivary gland tissue*. *Clin Exp Rheumatol*, 2017. **35(2)**: p. 317-320.
9. Adler, S., et al., *Evaluation of histologic, serologic, and clinical changes in response to abatacept treatment of primary Sjogren's syndrome: a pilot study*. *Arthritis Care Res (Hoboken)*, 2013. **65(11)**: p. 1862-8.
10. Fisher, B.A., et al., *Standardisation of labial salivary gland histopathology in clinical trials in primary Sjogren's syndrome*. *Ann Rheum Dis*, 2017. **76(7)**: p. 1161-1168.
11. Abrams, J.R., et al., *CTLA4Ig-mediated blockade of T-cell costimulation in patients with psoriasis vulgaris*. *J Clin Invest*, 1999. **103(9)**: p. 1243-52.