

## Therapeutic Class Overview

Antiasthmatic – Monoclonal Antibodies

### INTRODUCTION

- Asthma is a chronic lung disease that inflames and narrows the airways, making it difficult to breathe. Asthma causes recurring periods of wheezing, chest tightness, shortness of breath, and coughing (*National Heart, Lung, and Blood Institute [NHLBI] 2014*).
- The exact cause(s) of asthma are unknown. A combination of factors such as genetics, certain respiratory infections during childhood, and contact with airborne allergens can contribute to its development (*NHLBI 2014*).
- The goal of asthma management – asthma control – can be described in the following domains (*NHLBI 2007*):
  - Reduction of impairment
    - Prevent chronic and troublesome symptoms (e.g., coughing or breathlessness in the daytime, at night, or after exertion)
    - Require infrequent use ( $\leq 2$  days a week) of short-acting beta-agonist (SABA) for quick relief of symptoms
    - Maintain (near) normal pulmonary function
    - Maintain normal activity levels (including exercise and other physical activity and attendance at work or school)
    - Meet patients' and families' expectations of and satisfaction with asthma care.
  - Reduction of risk
    - Prevent recurrent exacerbations of asthma and minimize the need for emergency department (ED) visits or hospitalizations
    - Prevent progressive loss of lung function; for children, prevent reduced lung growth
    - Provide optimal pharmacotherapy with minimal or no adverse effects.
- Current pharmacologic options for asthma management are categorized as: (1) long-term control medications to achieve and maintain control of persistent asthma, and (2) quick-relief medications used to treat acute symptoms and exacerbations.
  - Long-term control medications include:
    - Corticosteroids (inhaled corticosteroids [ICS] for long-term control; short courses of oral corticosteroids to gain prompt control of disease, long-term oral corticosteroids for severe persistent asthma)
    - Cromolyn sodium and nedocromil
    - Immunomodulators (e.g., omalizumab)
    - Leukotriene modulators
    - Long-acting  $\beta$ -agonists (LABAs)
    - Methylxanthines (i.e., theophylline)
  - Quick-relief medications include:
    - Anticholinergics (i.e., ipratropium bromide), as an alternative bronchodilator for those not tolerating a SABA
    - SABAs (therapy of choice for relief of acute symptoms and prevention of exercise-induced bronchospasm)
    - Systemic corticosteroids (not short-acting, but used for moderate and severe exacerbations) (*NHLBI 2007*)
- Approximately 5 to 10% of asthma patients have severe disease. Severe asthma includes various clinical phenotypes of poorly-controlled asthma characterized by frequent use of high-dose ICS and/or oral corticosteroids (*Chung et al 2014*).
- While there are currently no widely accepted definitions of specific asthma phenotypes, several strategies have been proposed to categorize severe asthma phenotypes based on characteristics such as patient age, disease onset, corticosteroid resistance, chronic airflow obstruction, or type of cellular infiltrate in the airway lumen or lung tissue (*Walford et al 2014*).
- Chronic idiopathic urticaria (CIU), also called chronic urticaria or spontaneous urticaria, is defined by the presence of hives on most days of the week for a period of 6 weeks or longer, with or without angioedema. The hives are circumscribed, raised, erythematous plaques, often with central pallor, and variable in size. No external allergic cause or contributing disease process can be identified in 80 to 90% of adults and children with CIU (*Khan 2016*).
- CIU affects up to 1% of the general population in the United States, and the prevalence is believed to be similar in other countries. The condition is more common in adults than children and typically begins in the third to fifth decades of life. CIU is a self-limited disorder in most patients although the condition generally has a prolonged duration of 1 to 5 years (*Khan 2016, Maurer et al 2013*).

- Non-sedating H<sub>1</sub>-antihistamines are the cornerstone of therapy for CIU. Limited courses of oral glucocorticoids are often used in combination with antihistamines for refractory symptoms. Other pharmacologic options for patients who do not respond to H<sub>1</sub>-antihistamines include the use of H<sub>2</sub>-antihistamines, leukotriene modifiers, cyclosporine, sulfasalazine, and dapsone (*Khan 2016, Maurer et al 2013*).
- This monograph describes the use of Cinqair (reslizumab), Nucala (mepolizumab), and Xolair (omalizumab).
  - Cinqair and Nucala are fully humanized monoclonal antibody interleukin-5 (IL-5) antagonists, each approved as an add-on maintenance treatment for patients with severe asthma with an eosinophilic phenotype. Eosinophils play a key role in the pathobiology of airway disorders by contributing to inflammation through release of leukotrienes and pro-inflammatory cytokines. Increases in eosinophils are often correlated with greater asthma severity. IL-5, a cytokine critical to eosinophil differentiation and survival, has been isolated as a potential target in eosinophilic asthma.
  - Xolair is a recombinant DNA-derived monoclonal antibody that selectively binds to human immunoglobulin E (IgE). Xolair, which reduces the allergic response mediators, is useful in a subset of patients with allergic asthma. In addition, Xolair has shown to improve symptoms in patients with CIU.
- Medispan class: Antiasthmatic – Monoclonal Antibodies

**Table 1. Medications Included Within Class Review**

Drug	Generic Availability
Cinqair (reslizumab)	--
Nucala (mepolizumab)	--
Xolair (omalizumab)	--

(*Drugs@FDA 2017, Orange Book: Approved Drug Products with Therapeutic Equivalence Evaluations 2017*)

## INDICATIONS

- Xolair is indicated for:
  - Patients 6 years of age and older with moderate to severe persistent asthma who have a positive skin test or *in vitro* reactivity to a perennial aeroallergen and whose symptoms are inadequately controlled with an ICS. Xolair has been shown to decrease the incidence of asthma exacerbations in these patients.
  - The treatment of adults and adolescents 12 years of age and older with chronic idiopathic urticaria who remain symptomatic despite H<sub>1</sub>-antihistamine treatment.

Limitations to the indications include the following:

- Xolair is not indicated for the relief of acute bronchospasm or status asthmaticus.
- Xolair is not indicated for treatment of other allergic conditions or other forms of urticaria.

- Nucala is indicated for the add-on maintenance treatment of patients with severe asthma aged 12 years and older, and with an eosinophilic phenotype.

Limitations to the indication include the following:

- Nucala is not indicated for treatment of other eosinophilic conditions.
- Nucala is not indicated for the relief of acute bronchospasm or status asthmaticus.

- Cinqair is indicated for the add-on maintenance treatment of patients with severe asthma aged 18 years and older with an eosinophilic phenotype.

Limitations to the indication include the following:

- Cinqair is not indicated for treatment of other eosinophilic conditions.
- Cinqair is not indicated for the relief of acute bronchospasm or status asthmaticus.

- Information on indications, mechanism of action, pharmacokinetics, dosing, and safety has been obtained from the prescribing information for the individual products, except where noted otherwise.

**CLINICAL EFFICACY SUMMARY****OMALIZUMAB**Asthma

- The original Food and Drug Administration (FDA) approval of omalizumab was based on the results of 3 randomized, double-blind, placebo-controlled, multicenter trials conducted in patients at least 12 years of age with moderate to severe asthma for at least 1 year and a positive skin test reaction to a perennial aeroallergen. All patients were required to have a baseline IgE between 30 and 700 international unit (IU)/mL and body weight not more than 150 kg. Patients were treated according to a dosing table to administer at least 0.016 mg/kg/IU (IgE/mL) of omalizumab or placebo over each 4-week period.
  - Each study was comprised of a run-in period to achieve a stable conversion to a common ICS, followed by randomization to omalizumab or placebo. Patients received omalizumab for 16 weeks with an unchanged ICS dose unless an acute exacerbation necessitated an increase. Patients then entered an ICS reduction phase of 12 (*Busse et al 2001*, *Solèr et al 2001*) and 16 weeks (*Holgate et al 2004*) during which ICS dose reduction was attempted in a step-wise manner.
  - In the 28-week study by Busse et al (N=525), during the steroid stable phase, patients treated with omalizumab had fewer mean exacerbations/subject (0.28 vs 0.54; P=0.006) and decreased mean duration of exacerbations (7.8 vs 12.7 days; P<0.001) compared with placebo-treated patients. Similarly, during the steroid reduction phase, omalizumab was associated with fewer exacerbations/subject (0.39 vs 0.66; P=0.003), and a shorter mean duration of exacerbations (9.4 vs 12.6 days; P=0.021) (*Busse et al 2001*).
  - In the 28-week study by Solèr et al (N=546), asthma exacerbations/patient, the primary endpoint, decreased more in the omalizumab group compared to placebo during both the stable steroid (0.28 vs 0.66; P<0.001) and steroid reduction phases (0.36 vs 0.75; P<0.001) (*Solèr et al 2001*).
  - In the 32-week study by Holgate et al (N=246), the percentage reduction in ICS dose, the primary endpoint, was greater among patients treated with omalizumab than among patients treated with placebo (median, 60 vs 50%; P=0.003). The percentages of patients with at least 1 asthma exacerbation were similar between omalizumab and placebo groups during both the stable steroid and steroid reduction phases (P value not reported). The absence of an observed treatment effect may be related to differences in the patient population compared with the first 2 studies, study sample size, or other factors (*Holgate et al 2004*).
- In July 2016, the FDA expanded the indication of omalizumab to patients 6 to 11 years of age with moderate to severe persistent asthma. The approval was based primarily on a 52-week, randomized, double-blind, placebo-controlled, multicenter trial. The study evaluated the safety and efficacy of omalizumab as add-on therapy in 628 pediatric patients ages 6 to <12 with moderate to severe asthma inadequately controlled despite the use of an ICS (*Lanier et al 2009*).
  - Over the 24-week fixed-steroid phase, omalizumab reduced the rate of clinically significant asthma exacerbations (worsening symptoms requiring doubling of baseline ICS dose and/or systemic steroids) by 31% vs placebo (0.45 vs 0.64; relative risk (RR), 0.69; P=0.007). Over a period of 52 weeks, the exacerbation rate was reduced by 43% (P<0.001). Other efficacy variables such as nocturnal symptom scores, beta-agonist use, and forced expiratory volume in 1 second (FEV<sub>1</sub>) were not significantly different in omalizumab-treated patients compared to placebo.
- A meta-analysis of 3 of the previously mentioned trials (*Busse et al 2001*, *Solèr et al 2001*, *Holgate et al 2004*) and their extension studies assessed the efficacy of omalizumab in a subgroup of 254 patients at high risk of serious asthma-related mortality and morbidity. Patients were defined as high-risk due to asthma histories that included the following: intubation history, emergency room visit within the last year, overnight hospitalization, or intensive care unit treatment. The primary outcome was an annualized rate of acute exacerbation episodes based on data from the initial 16-week stable steroid phase for high-risk patients. Two kinds of acute exacerbation episodes were considered as endpoints: significant acute exacerbation episodes and all acute exacerbation episodes (i.e., all episodes recorded by the investigator). Significant acute exacerbation episodes were defined as those requiring a doubling of baseline ICS dose (*Busse et al 2001*, *Solèr et al 2001*) or use of systemic steroids (all 3 studies). During the stable steroid phase, mean significant acute exacerbation episode rates were 1.56 and 0.69/patient-year, respectively, a reduction of 56% with omalizumab (P=0.007). Similar reductions in exacerbations in favor of omalizumab were observed for the whole study period and for all acute exacerbation episodes. The authors concluded that 113 significant acute exacerbation episodes were prevented for every 100 patients treated with omalizumab for 1 year (*Holgate et al 2001*).
- A Cochrane Review conducted in 2014 evaluated the efficacy of omalizumab in patients with allergic asthma. Treatment with omalizumab was associated with a significant reduction in the odds of a patient having an asthma exacerbation

(odds ratio [OR], 0.55; 95% confidence interval [CI], 0.42 to 0.6; 10 studies, 3,261 participants). This represents an absolute reduction from 26% for participants suffering an exacerbation on placebo to 16% on omalizumab, over 16 to 60 weeks. Additionally, in patients with moderate to severe asthma and in those who were receiving background ICS therapy, treatment with omalizumab resulted in a significant reduction in the odds of having an asthma exacerbation (OR, 0.50; 95% CI, 0.42 to 0.6; 7 studies, 1,889 participants). A significant benefit was noted for subcutaneous (SC) omalizumab vs placebo with regard to reducing hospitalizations (OR, 0.16, 95% CI, 0.06 to 0.42; 4 studies, 1,824 participants), representing an absolute reduction in risk from 3% with placebo to 0.5% with omalizumab over 28 to 60 weeks. The authors concluded that omalizumab was effective in reducing asthma exacerbations and hospitalizations as an adjunctive therapy to ICS and significantly more effective than placebo in increasing the numbers of participants who were able to reduce or withdraw their ICS. Omalizumab was generally well tolerated, although there were more injection site reactions with omalizumab. However, the clinical value of the reduction in steroid consumption has to be considered in light of the high cost of omalizumab (*Normansell et al 2014*).

- A systematic review of 8 randomized, placebo-controlled trials (N=3,429) published in 2010 evaluated the efficacy and safety of SC omalizumab as add-on therapy to corticosteroids in children and adults with moderate to severe allergic asthma. At the end of the steroid reduction phase, patients taking omalizumab were more likely to be able to withdraw corticosteroids completely compared with placebo (RR, 1.8; 95% CI, 1.42 to 2.28; P=0.00001). Omalizumab patients showed a decreased risk for asthma exacerbations at the end of the stable (RR, 0.57; 95% CI, 0.48 to 0.66; P=0.0001) and adjustable-steroid phases (RR, 0.55; 95% CI, 0.47 to 0.64; P=0.0001); post-hoc analysis suggests this effect was independent of duration of treatment, age, severity of asthma, and risk of bias. The frequency of serious adverse effects was similar between omalizumab (3.8%) and placebo (5.3%). However, injection site reactions were more frequent in the omalizumab patients (19.9 vs 13.2%). Omalizumab was not associated with an increased risk of hypersensitivity reactions, cardiovascular effects, or malignant neoplasms (*Rodrigo et al 2010*).
- The EXCELS study was a multicenter, observational cohort study to evaluate the clinical effectiveness and long-term safety of omalizumab in patients with moderate-to-severe allergic asthma. Patients were evaluated as part of 3 groups: non-omalizumab users, those newly-starting omalizumab, and those who were established users at study initiation.
  - Interim efficacy results demonstrated that at month 24, the ACT score increased in all 3 patient groups: from 18.4 to 20 in non-omalizumab users, from 15.2 to 19.4 in those newly-starting on omalizumab, and from 18.2 to 19.4 in established omalizumab users. For patients newly-starting omalizumab treatment, 54% achieved at least a minimally important difference, defined as a  $\geq 3$  point increase from baseline in ACT. The study demonstrated that established users of omalizumab maintained asthma control during the study period (*Eisner et al 2012*).
  - To investigate the relationship between omalizumab and malignant neoplasms, safety information from the EXCELS trial was analyzed. Similar rates of primary malignancies in omalizumab- and non-omalizumab-treated patients was found. However, study limitations preclude definitively ruling out a malignancy risk with omalizumab (*Long et al 2014*).
  - A higher incidence of overall cardiovascular and cerebrovascular serious adverse events was observed in omalizumab-treated patients compared to non-omalizumab-treated patients (*Iribarren et al 2017*). To further evaluate the risk, a pooled analysis of 25 randomized controlled trials was conducted. An increased risk of cardiovascular and cerebrovascular serious adverse events was not noted, but the low number of events, the young patient population, and the short duration of follow-up prevent a definite conclusion about the absence of a risk (*FDA 2014*).

### Chronic Idiopathic Urticaria

- The safety and efficacy of omalizumab for the treatment of CIU was assessed in 2 placebo-controlled, multiple-dose clinical studies. Patients received omalizumab 75, 150, or 300 mg or placebo by SC injection every 4 weeks in addition to their baseline level of H<sub>1</sub> antihistamine therapy for 24 or 12 weeks, followed by a 16-week washout observation period. In both studies, patients who received omalizumab 150 mg or 300 mg had greater decreases from baseline in weekly itch severity scores and weekly hive count scores than placebo at week 12. The 75 mg dose did not demonstrate consistent evidence of efficacy and is not approved for use (*Kaplan et al 2013, Maurer et al 2013*).
- Another randomized, double-blind, placebo-controlled study evaluated omalizumab as add-on therapy for 24 weeks in patients with CIU who remained symptomatic despite H<sub>1</sub> antihistamine therapy. Similar to previous studies, patients treated with omalizumab had significantly greater reductions in weekly itch severity score from baseline to week 12 compared to placebo (P $\leq$ 0.001) (*Saini et al 2014*).
- A meta-analysis of randomized clinical trials evaluating omalizumab for the treatment of CIU was published in 2016. The analysis included 7 randomized, placebo-controlled studies with 1,312 patients with CIU. Patients treated with omalizumab (75 to 600 mg every 4 weeks) had significantly reduced weekly itch and weekly wheal scores compared

with the placebo group. The effects of omalizumab were dose dependent, with the strongest reduction in weekly itch and weekly wheal scores observed with 300 mg. Rates of complete response were significantly higher in the omalizumab group ( $P < 0.00001$ ) and dose dependent, with the highest rates in the 300 mg group. Rates of patients with adverse events were similar in the omalizumab and placebo groups (*Zhao et al 2016*).

## **MEPOLIZUMAB**

### **Asthma**

- The safety and efficacy of mepolizumab were evaluated in 3 double-blind, placebo-controlled, multicenter, randomized controlled trials in adolescent and adult patients with severe refractory asthma and signs of eosinophilic inflammation. Generally, patients were eligible for enrollment in the trials if they had eosinophils  $\geq 150$  cells/ $\mu\text{L}$  in the peripheral blood at screening or  $\geq 300$  cells/ $\mu\text{L}$  at some time during the previous year. Patients also were required to be on a high-dose ICS as well as another controller medication (*Pavord et al 2012, Ortega et al 2014, Bel et al 2014*).
  - DREAM was a dose-ranging 52-week Phase 2b/3 study ( $N=621$ ) that compared annual asthma exacerbation frequency and improvements in clinical symptoms between patients receiving 75 mg, 250 mg, and 750 mg intravenous (IV) mepolizumab and placebo. Mepolizumab decreased clinically significant exacerbation rates across all doses compared to placebo, at a rate of 2.40 per patient per year in the placebo group, 1.24 in the 75 mg mepolizumab group ( $P < 0.0001$ ), 1.46 in the 250 mg mepolizumab group ( $P = 0.0005$ ), and 1.15 in the 750 mg mepolizumab group ( $P < 0.0001$ ). No significant improvements were found for secondary clinical symptom measures, which included change in pre-bronchodilator FEV<sub>1</sub> from baseline, or change in Asthma Control Questionnaire (ACQ) scores (*Pavord et al 2012*).
  - MENSA was a 32-week Phase 3 trial ( $N=576$ ) that compared annual asthma exacerbation frequency and improvements in clinical symptoms between patients receiving SC and IV mepolizumab vs placebo. Patients were selected on the basis of frequent exacerbations, treatment with high doses of ICS, and a defined blood eosinophil count. Both SC and IV mepolizumab significantly decreased clinically significant exacerbation rates compared to placebo, at a rate of 1.74 per patient per year in the placebo group, 0.93 per patient per year in the IV mepolizumab group ( $P < 0.001$ ), and 0.83 per patient per year in the SC mepolizumab group ( $P < 0.001$ ). In both the SC and IV mepolizumab-treated groups, the ACQ scores met thresholds for minimal clinically important change and were significantly improved compared to placebo ( $P < 0.001$ ) (*Ortega et al 2014*).
  - SIRIUS was a 24-week Phase 3 trial ( $N=135$ ) that compared oral corticosteroid requirements between patients receiving SC mepolizumab and placebo. The likelihood of a reduction in the daily oral glucocorticoid dose was 2.39 times higher in the mepolizumab group (95% CI, 1.25 to 4.56;  $P = 0.008$ ). The median reduction in daily oral corticosteroid dose was 50% (95% CI, 20 to 75) in the mepolizumab-treated group compared to 0% (95% CI, -20 to 33.3) in the placebo group ( $P = 0.007$ ) (*Bel et al 2014*).
- A post-hoc analysis of data from DREAM and MENSA was conducted to assess the relationship between baseline blood eosinophil counts and efficacy of mepolizumab. Of 1,192 patients, 846 received mepolizumab and 346 received placebo. The overall rate of mean exacerbations per person per year was reduced from 1.91 with placebo to 1.01 with mepolizumab (47% reduction; RR, 0.53; 95% CI, 0.44 to 0.62;  $P < 0.0001$ ). The exacerbation rate reduction with mepolizumab vs placebo increased progressively from 52% (RR, 0.48; 95% CI, 0.39 to 0.58) in patients with a baseline blood eosinophil count of  $\geq 150$  cells/ $\mu\text{L}$  to 70% (RR, 0.30; 95% CI, 0.23 to 0.40) in patients with a baseline count of  $\geq 500$  cells/ $\mu\text{L}$ . At a baseline count  $< 150$  cells/ $\mu\text{L}$ , predicted efficacy of mepolizumab was reduced. The authors concluded that the use of a baseline blood eosinophil count will help to select patients who are likely to achieve important asthma outcomes with mepolizumab (*Ortega et al 2016*).
- COSMOS was a 52-week, open-label extension study in patients who received mepolizumab or placebo in MENSA or SIRIUS. Patients received SC mepolizumab regardless of prior treatment allocation and continued to receive appropriate standard-of-care asthma therapy throughout. In total, 558 (86%; previous mepolizumab: 358; previous placebo: 200) and 94 (14%; previous mepolizumab: 58; previous placebo: 36) patients experienced on-treatment adverse events and serious adverse events, respectively. No fatal adverse events or instances of mepolizumab-related anaphylaxis were reported. Mepolizumab treatment was shown to exert a durable response, with patients who previously received mepolizumab in MENSA or SIRIUS maintaining reductions in exacerbation rate and oral corticosteroid dosing throughout COSMOS. Patients who previously received placebo in MENSA or SIRIUS demonstrated improvements in these endpoints following treatment with mepolizumab (*Lugogo et al 2016*).
- A 2016 systematic review and meta-analyses compared hospitalization or hospitalization and/or emergency room visit rates in patients with severe eosinophilic asthma treated with mepolizumab or placebo in addition to standard of care for

at least 24 weeks. Four studies (N=1,388) were eligible for inclusion. Mepolizumab significantly reduced the rate of exacerbations requiring hospitalization (RR, 0.49; 95% CI, 0.30 to 0.80; P=0.004) and hospitalization/emergency room visit (RR, 0.49; 95% CI, 0.33 to 0.73; P<0.001) vs placebo. Significant reductions of 45% and 38% were also observed for the proportion of patients experiencing 1 or more hospitalization and hospitalization and/or emergency room visit, respectively (Yancey et al 2016).

## **RESLIZUMAB**

### **Asthma**

- The safety and efficacy of reslizumab were evaluated in 4 double-blind, placebo-controlled, multicenter, randomized controlled trials. In all 4 studies, patients were required to be on at least a medium-dose ICS with or without additional controller medications (Bjermer et al 2016, Castro et al 2015, Corren et al 2016).
  - Studies 3082 and 3083 were 52-week studies (N=953) in patients with asthma who were required to have a blood eosinophil count  $\geq 400$  cells/ $\mu\text{L}$ , and at least 1 asthma exacerbation requiring systemic corticosteroid use over the past 12 months. These studies compared the asthma exacerbation rate and improvements in clinical symptoms between patients receiving reslizumab 3 mg/kg IV administered once every 4 weeks and placebo. In both studies, patients receiving reslizumab had a significant reduction in the frequency of asthma exacerbations (Study 3082: RR, 0.50; 95% CI, 0.37 to 0.67; Study 3083: RR, 0.41; 95% CI, 0.28 to 0.59; both P<0.0001) compared with those receiving placebo. In both trials, an improvement in FEV<sub>1</sub> was evident for reslizumab vs placebo by the first on-treatment assessment at week 4, which was sustained through week 52. Reslizumab treatment also resulted in significant improvements compared with placebo in AQLQ total score, ACQ-7 score, and Asthma Symptom Utility Index (ASUI) score (Castro et al 2015).
  - Study 3081 was a 16-week study (N=315) in patients who were required to have a blood eosinophil count  $\geq 400$  cells/ $\mu\text{L}$ . The study compared the change from baseline in FEV<sub>1</sub> and improvements in clinical symptoms between reslizumab 3 mg/kg vs placebo. Reslizumab 3 mg/kg significantly improved FEV<sub>1</sub> (difference vs placebo: 160 mL; 95% CI, 60 to 259; P=0.0018). Reslizumab also statistically significantly improved ACQ and AQLQ; however, the minimally important difference was only reached for AQLQ (Bjermer et al 2016).
    - Study 3084 was a 16-week study in 496 patients unselected for baseline blood eosinophil levels (approximately 80% of patients had a screening blood eosinophil count <400 cells/ $\mu\text{L}$ ). Patients were not allowed to be on maintenance oral corticosteroids. The study compared the change from baseline in FEV<sub>1</sub> and improvements in clinical symptoms between reslizumab 3 mg/kg vs placebo. In the subgroup of patients with baseline eosinophils <400 cells/ $\mu\text{L}$ , patients treated with reslizumab showed no significant improvement in FEV<sub>1</sub> compared with placebo. In the subgroup with eosinophils  $\geq 400$  cells/ $\mu\text{L}$ , however, treatment with reslizumab was associated with much larger improvements in FEV<sub>1</sub>, ACQ, and rescue SABA use compared with placebo (Corren et al 2016).

## **COMPARATIVE REVIEWS**

- In 2017, Cockle et al conducted a systematic review and indirect treatment comparison to assess the comparative effectiveness and tolerability of mepolizumab and omalizumab, as add-on therapy to standard of care, in patients with severe asthma. Studies included in the primary analysis were double-blind, randomized controlled trials,  $\geq 12$  weeks' duration enrolling patients with severe asthma with a documented exacerbation history and receiving a high-dose ICS plus  $\geq 1$  additional controller. Two populations were examined: patients potentially eligible for 1) both treatments (overlap population) and 2) either treatment (trial population) (Cockle et al 2017).
  - For the overlap population, no difference was found between mepolizumab and omalizumab. However, trends in favor of mepolizumab were observed, with median estimated RRs of 0.66 (95% credible interval [CrI], 0.37 to 1.19) for the rate of clinically significant exacerbations and 0.19 (95% CrI, 0.02 to 2.32) for the rate of exacerbations requiring hospitalization.
  - Results of the trial population analysis showed that mepolizumab was associated with an estimated median RR of 0.63 (95% CrI, 0.45 to 0.89) corresponding to a reduction of 37% in the rate of clinically significant exacerbations vs omalizumab. No difference between treatments was observed for the rate of exacerbations resulting in hospitalization; however, the median RR of 0.58 (95% CrI, 0.16 to 2.13) demonstrated a trend for mepolizumab over omalizumab.
  - Both treatments had broadly comparable effects on lung function, and similar tolerability profiles.

## CLINICAL GUIDELINES

### Asthma

- According to guidelines from the NHLBI/National Asthma Education and Prevention Program, pharmacologic therapy is based on a stepwise approach in which medications are increased until asthma is controlled and then decreased when possible to minimize side effects of treatments. The level of asthma control is based on (*NHLBI 2007*):
  - Reported symptoms over the past 2 to 4 weeks
  - Current level of lung function (FEV<sub>1</sub> and FEV<sub>1</sub>/forced vital capacity [FVC] values)
  - Number of exacerbations requiring oral corticosteroids per year.
- The NHLBI guidelines state that omalizumab is used as adjunctive therapy in patients 12 years and older who have allergies and severe persistent asthma that is not adequately controlled with the combination of high-dose ICS and LABA therapy (*NHLBI 2007*).
- In 2017, the Global Initiative for Asthma (GINA) published updated guidelines for asthma management and prevention. For patients with severe asthma uncontrolled on Step 4 treatment (e.g., 2 or more controllers plus as-needed reliever medication), phenotyping into categories such as severe allergic, aspirin-exacerbated or eosinophilic asthma is suggested. Anti-IgE treatment with omalizumab is recommended as the preferred option for the management of patients at Step 5 of treatment. Similarly, add-on anti-IL-5 therapy (i.e., mepolizumab, reslizumab) is recommended for patients aged ≥12 years with severe eosinophilic asthma that is uncontrolled on Step 4 treatment (*GINA 2017*).

### Chronic Idiopathic Urticaria

- Guidelines developed by the American Academy of Allergy, Asthma & Immunology, the American College of Allergy, Asthma & Immunology, and the Joint Council of Allergy, Asthma & Immunology recommend a stepwise treatment approach for CIU. Treatment with omalizumab is recommended in patients inadequately controlled with antihistamines and a leukotriene receptor antagonist (*Bernstein et al 2014*).
- Updated joint guidelines by the European Academy of Allergy and Clinical Immunology, the Global Allergy and Asthma European Network, the European Dermatology Forum, and the World Allergy Organization recommend treatment with omalizumab, cyclosporine, or a leukotriene receptor antagonist in patients with symptoms despite treatment with a 4-fold dose of modern second generation antihistamines (*Zuberbier et al 2013*).
- Recent guidelines published by the British Society for Allergy and Clinical Immunology similarly recommend omalizumab as a potential second-line agent in patients inadequately controlled on a 4-fold dose of a non-sedating antihistamine (*Powell et al 2015*).

## SAFETY SUMMARY

### Cinqair:

- Contraindication: History of hypersensitivity to Cinqair or excipients in the formulation.
- Boxed warning: Anaphylaxis has been observed with Cinqair infusion in 0.3% of patients in placebo-controlled clinical studies. Anaphylaxis was reported as early as the second dose of Cinqair. Patients should be observed for an appropriate period of time after Cinqair administration by a healthcare professional prepared to manage anaphylaxis.
- Key warning and precaution:
  - In placebo-controlled clinical studies, 6/1028 (0.6%) patients receiving 3 mg/kg Cinqair had ≥1 malignant neoplasm reported compared to 2/730 (0.3%) patients in the placebo group. The observed malignancies in Cinqair-treated patients were diverse in nature and without clustering of any particular tissue type.
- The most common adverse reaction (≥2%) includes oropharyngeal pain.

### Nucala:

- Contraindication: History of hypersensitivity to Nucala or excipients in the formulation.
- Key warnings and precautions:
  - Hypersensitivity reactions (e.g., anaphylaxis, angioedema, bronchospasm, hypotension, urticaria, rash) have occurred after administration of Nucala.
  - Herpes zoster infections have occurred in patients receiving Nucala. In controlled clinical trials, 2 serious adverse reactions of herpes zoster occurred in patients treated with Nucala compared with none in patients treated with placebo.
- The most common adverse reactions (≥5%) include headache, injection site reaction, back pain, and fatigue.

**Xolair:**

- **Contraindication:** Severe hypersensitivity reaction to Xolair or any ingredient of Xolair.
- **Boxed warning:** Anaphylaxis, presenting as bronchospasm, hypotension, syncope, urticaria, and/or angioedema of the throat or tongue, has been reported. Observe patients closely for an appropriate period of time after Xolair administration. Health care providers administering Xolair should be prepared to manage anaphylaxis that can be life-threatening.
  - Patients with a prior history of anaphylactic reactions to other causes may be at an increased risk for anaphylaxis. The frequency of anaphylaxis is reported to be between 0.1 to 0.2% and may occur immediately or up to a year post-treatment.
- **Key warnings and precautions:**
  - Malignant neoplasms were observed in a higher rate of Xolair-treated patients (0.5%) than control patients (0.2%) in clinical trials. A subsequent 5-year observational cohort study found similar rates of primary malignancies in Xolair- and non-Xolair-treated patients. However, study limitations preclude definitively ruling out a malignancy risk with Xolair (*Long et al 2014*).
  - Rarely, patients on therapy with Xolair may present with serious systemic eosinophilia which may present with features of vasculitis consistent with Churg-Strauss syndrome. These events usually have been associated with the reduction of oral corticosteroid therapy.
  - Some patients have reported signs and symptoms similar to serum sickness, including arthritis/arthralgia, rash, fever, and lymphadenopathy.
- **Adverse reactions in asthma studies:** In patients ≥12 years of age, the most commonly observed adverse reactions in clinical studies (≥1% in Xolair-treated patients and more frequently than reported with placebo) were arthralgia, pain (general), leg pain, fatigue, dizziness, fracture, arm pain, pruritus, dermatitis, and earache. In clinical studies with pediatric patients 6 to <12 years of age, the most common adverse reactions were nasopharyngitis, headache, pyrexia, upper abdominal pain, streptococcal pharyngitis, otitis media, viral gastroenteritis, arthropod bites, and epistaxis.
- **Adverse reactions in CIU studies:** Adverse reactions from 3 placebo-controlled, multiple-dose CIU studies that occurred in ≥2% of patients receiving Xolair and more frequently than in those receiving placebo included arthralgia, cough, headache, nasopharyngitis, nausea, sinusitis, upper respiratory tract infection, and viral upper respiratory tract infection.
- **Cardiovascular and cerebrovascular events in asthma studies:** In a 5-year observational cohort study, a higher incidence of overall cardiovascular and cerebrovascular serious adverse events was observed in Xolair-treated patients compared to non-Xolair-treated patients. To further evaluate the risk, a pooled analysis of 25 randomized, controlled, clinical trials was conducted. An increased risk of cardiovascular and cerebrovascular serious adverse events was not noted, but the low number of events, the young patient population, and the short duration of follow-up prevent a definite conclusion about the absence of a risk (*FDA 2014*).

**DOSING AND ADMINISTRATION**

**Table 3. Dosing and Administration**

Drug	Route	Usual Recommended Frequency	Comments
Cinqair (reslizumab)	IV	Every 4 weeks	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Administered by IV infusion over 20 to 50 minutes.</li> <li>• Safety and effectiveness in pediatric patients (aged 17 years and younger) have not been established.</li> </ul>
Nucala (mepolizumab)	SC	Every 4 weeks	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Safety and efficacy in pediatric patients younger than 12 years have not been established.</li> </ul>
Xolair (omalizumab)	SC	<u>Allergic asthma:</u> Every 2 to 4 weeks  <u>CIU:</u> Every 4 weeks	<u>Allergic asthma:</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The dose and frequency is determined by serum total IgE level (IU/mL), measured before the start of treatment, and body weight (kg).</li> <li>• Safety and efficacy in pediatric patients with asthma below 6 years of age have not been</li> </ul>



Drug	Route	Usual Recommended Frequency	Comments
			established.  <u>CIU:</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Dosing in CIU is not dependent on serum IgE level or body weight.</li> <li>• Safety and efficacy in pediatric patients with CIU below 12 years of age have not been established.</li> </ul>

See the current prescribing information for full details.

## CONCLUSION

- Xolair is a humanized monoclonal antibody that is FDA-approved for patients 6 years of age and older with moderate to severe persistent asthma who have a positive skin test or *in vitro* reactivity to a perennial aeroallergen and whose symptoms are inadequately controlled with an ICS. Xolair has been shown to decrease the incidence of asthma exacerbations in these patients.
- Although clinical trial results have been mixed and several trials had an open-label design, there is some evidence to indicate that Xolair may decrease asthma-related emergency visits and hospitalizations, as well as decreasing the dose of ICS and rescue medication and increasing symptom-free days (*Buhl et al 2002, Busse et al 2011, Holgate et al 2004, Lanier et al 2003, Solèr et al 2011*).
- Xolair is administered SC in a physician's office every 2 to 4 weeks in a dose that is determined by body weight and the levels of serum IgE. Xolair carries a boxed warning due to the risk of anaphylaxis, and thus must be administered under medical supervision.
- Although Xolair therapy is generally safe, analysis of a 5-year, observational cohort, epidemiological study (EXCELS) showed an increased number of cardiovascular and cerebrovascular adverse events in patients receiving Xolair compared to placebo (*Iribarren et al 2017*). However, a pooled analysis of 25 randomized, double-blind, placebo-controlled clinical trials did not find notable imbalances in the rates of cardiovascular and cerebrovascular serious adverse events (*FDA 2014*).
- Asthma guidelines generally recommend Xolair therapy in patients with severe allergic asthma that is inadequately controlled with a combination of high-dose ICS and LABA (*GINA 2017, NHLBI 2007*). Based on the limited place in therapy and the need for administration under medical supervision, Xolair is appropriate for a small percentage of patients with asthma.
- Xolair received FDA-approval for the treatment of adults and adolescents (12 years of age and above) with CIU who remain symptomatic despite H<sub>1</sub>-antihistamine treatment. Two randomized, placebo-controlled trials demonstrated its efficacy in reducing weekly itch severity scores and weekly hive count scores significantly greater than placebo at week 12. Xolair was well-tolerated, with a safety profile similar to that observed in asthma patients. In patients with CIU, Xolair is dosed at 150 or 300 mg SC every 4 weeks in a physician's office. Guidelines for the treatment of CIU generally recommend treatment with Xolair in patients that are inadequately controlled with a 4-fold dose of modern second generation antihistamines and, in some cases, a leukotriene receptor antagonist (*Bernstein et al 2014, Zuberbier et al 2013, Powell et al 2015*).
- Cinqair and Nucala are IL-5 antagonists approved as add-on treatment options for patients with severe eosinophilic asthma, with demonstrated effectiveness in reducing asthma exacerbations (*Bel et al 2014, Bjermer et al 2016, Castro et al 2015, Corren et al 2016, Pavord et al 2012, Ortega et al 2014*). Both provide a more targeted treatment option for patients with severe, refractory asthma and should be considered in those with an eosinophilic phenotype uncontrolled on conventional asthma therapy (*GINA 2017*).
- There are no head-to-head trials comparing Cinqair and Nucala. In addition, the patient populations evaluated in the Cinqair and Nucala pivotal trials differed. The inclusion criteria for the Nucala trials included current use of a high-dose ICS with another controller medication. Patients were also required to have a blood eosinophil count  $\geq 150$  cells/ $\mu$ L at screening or  $\geq 300$  cells/ $\mu$ L at some time during the previous year. In contrast, the Cinqair trials required that patients be on at least a medium-dose ICS with or without another controller medication. Patients were also required to have a blood eosinophil count  $\geq 400$  cells/ $\mu$ L.
- Compared to Nucala, Cinqair does have several limitations, including: an indication for patients aged 18 years and older (12 years and older for Nucala), IV administration (SC for Nucala), and a boxed warning for anaphylaxis.

## REFERENCES

- Bel EH, Wenzel SE, Thompson PJ, et al. Oral glucocorticoid-sparing effect of mepolizumab in eosinophilic asthma. *N Engl J Med*. 2014;371:1189-1197.
- Bernstein JA, Lang DM, Khan DA, et al. The diagnosis and management of acute and chronic urticaria: 2014 update. *J Allergy Clin Immunol*. 2014;133:1270-77.
- Bjermer L, Lemiere C, Maspéro J, Weiss S, Zangrilli J, Germinaro M. Reslizumab for inadequately controlled asthma with elevated blood eosinophil levels: a randomized phase 3 study. *Chest*. 2016;150(4):789-798.
- Buhl R, Solèr M, Matz J, et al. Omalizumab provides long-term control in patients with moderate-to-severe allergic asthma. *Eur Respir J*. 2002;20(1):73-8.
- Busse W, Corren J, Lanier BQ, et al. Omalizumab, anti-IgE recombinant humanized monoclonal antibody, for the treatment of severe allergic asthma. *J Allergy Clin Immunol*. 2001;108(2):184-90.
- Castro M, Zangrilli J, Wechsler ME, et al. Reslizumab for inadequately controlled asthma with elevated blood eosinophil counts: results from two multicentre, parallel, double-blind, randomised, placebo-controlled, phase 3 trials. *Lancet Respir Med*. 2015;3(5):355-366.
- Cinqair prescribing information. Teva Pharmaceutical Industries Ltd. Frazer, PA. May 2016.
- Chung KF, Wenzel SE, Brozek JL, et al. International ERS/ATS guidelines on definition, evaluation and treatment of severe asthma. *Eur Respir J*. 2014;43:343-373.
- Cockle SM, Stynes G, Gunsoy NB, et al. Comparative effectiveness of mepolizumab and omalizumab in severe asthma: An indirect treatment comparison. *Respir Med*. 2017;123:140-148.
- Corren J, Weinstein S, Janka L, Zangrilli J, Garin M. Phase 3 study of reslizumab in patients with poorly controlled asthma: effects across a broad range of eosinophil counts. *Chest*. 2016;150(4):799-810.
- DRUGS@FDA.com (database on the internet). Rockville (MD): U.S. Food and Drug Administration. Available from: <http://www.accessdata.fda.gov/scripts/cder/drugsatfda/index.cfm>. Accessed June 23, 2017.
- Eisner MD, Zazzali JL, Miller MK, et al. Longitudinal changes in asthma control with omalizumab: 2-year interim data from the EXCELS study. *J Asthma*. 2012;49:642-648.
- Food and Drug Administration press release. FDA Drug Safety Communication: FDA approves label changes for asthma drug Xolair, including describing slightly higher risk of heart and brain adverse events. Published online September 26, 2014. Available at: <http://www.fda.gov/Drugs/DrugSafety/ucm414911.htm>. Accessed June 23, 2017.
- Global Initiative for Asthma (GINA). Global Strategy for Asthma Management and Prevention (2017 update). 2017; [www.ginasthma.org](http://www.ginasthma.org). Accessed June 23, 2017.
- Holgate S, Bousquet J, Wenzel S, et al. Efficacy of omalizumab, an antiimmunoglobulin E antibody, in patients with allergic asthma at high risk of serious asthma-related morbidity and mortality. *Curr Med Res Opin*. 2001;17:233-40.
- Holgate ST, Chuchalin AG, Hébert J, et al. Efficacy and safety of a recombinant anti-immunoglobulin E antibody (omalizumab) in severe allergic asthma. *Clin Exp Allergy*. 2004;34(4):632-8.
- Iribarren C, Rahmaoui A, Long AA, et al. Cardiovascular and cerebrovascular events among patients receiving omalizumab: Results from EXCELS, a prospective cohort study of moderate-to-severe asthma. *J Allergy Clin Immunol*. 2017;139(5):1489-1495.e5.
- Kaplan A, Ledford D, Ashby M, et al. Omalizumab in patients with symptomatic chronic idiopathic/spontaneous urticaria despite standard combination therapy. *J Allergy Clin Immunol*. 2013;132:101-9.
- Khan DA. Chronic urticaria: treatment of refractory symptoms. In: UpToDate, Saini S (Ed), UpToDate, Waltham, MA. Accessed June 23, 2017.
- Lugogo N, Domingo C, Chanez P, et al. Long-term efficacy and safety of mepolizumab in patients with severe eosinophilic asthma: a multi-center, open-label, phase IIIb study. *Clin Ther*. 2016;38(9):2058-2070.
- Lanier B, Bridges T, Kulus M, Taylor AF, Berhane I, Vidaurre CF. Omalizumab for the treatment of exacerbations in children with inadequately controlled allergic (IgE-mediated) asthma. *J Allergy Clin Immunol*. 2009;124(6):1210-6.
- Lanier BQ, Corren J, Lumry W, et al. Omalizumab is effective in the long-term control of severe allergic asthma. *Ann Allergy Asthma Immunol*. 2003;91(2):154-9.
- Long A, Rahmaoui A, Rothman KJ, et al. Incidence of malignancy in patients with moderate-to-severe asthma treated with or without omalizumab. *J Allergy Clin Immunol*. 2014;134:560-567.
- Maurer M, Rosen K, Hsieh HJ, et al. Omalizumab for the treatment of chronic idiopathic or spontaneous urticaria. *N Engl J Med*. 2013;368:924-35.
- National Heart, Lung, and Blood Institute. Expert Panel Report 3: Guidelines for the diagnosis and management of asthma (guideline on the Internet). NHLBI 2007. Available from <http://www.nhlbi.nih.gov/guidelines/asthma/asthgdln.htm>. Accessed June 23, 2017.
- National Heart, Lung, and Blood Institute. What is Asthma? 2014. Available at: <http://www.nhlbi.nih.gov/health/health-topics/topics/asthma>. Accessed June 21, 2017.
- Normansell R, Walker S, Milan SJ, et al. Omalizumab for asthma in adults and children. *Cochrane Database Syst Rev*. 2014 Jan 13;(1):CD003559.
- Nucala prescribing information. GlaxoSmithKline LLC. Philadelphia, PA. February 2017.
- Ortega HG, Liu MC, Pavord ID, et al. Mepolizumab treatment in patients with severe eosinophilic asthma. *N Engl J Med*. 2014;371(13):1198-1207.
- Ortega HG, Yancey SW, Mayer B, et al. Severe eosinophilic asthma treated with mepolizumab stratified by baseline eosinophil thresholds: a secondary analysis of the DREAM and MENSA studies. *Lancet Respir Med*. 2016;4(7):549-56.
- Pavord ID, Korn S, Howarth P, et al. Mepolizumab for severe eosinophilic asthma (DREAM): a multicentre, double-blind, placebo-controlled trial. *Lancet*. 2012; 380:651-59.
- Powell RJ, Leech SC, Till S, et al. BSACI guideline for the management of chronic urticaria and angioedema. *Clin Exp Allergy*. 2015;45(3):547-65.
- Rodrigo GJ, Neffen H. Systematic review on the use of omalizumab for the treatment of asthmatic children and adolescents. *Pediatr Allergy Immunol*. 2015;26(6):551-6.
- Saini SS, Bindslev-Jensen C, Maurer M, et al. Efficacy and safety of omalizumab in patients with chronic idiopathic/spontaneous urticaria who remain symptomatic on H1 antihistamines: a randomized, placebo-controlled study. *J Invest Derm*. 2015;135:67-75.



- Solèr M, Matz J, Townley R, et al. The anti-IgE antibody omalizumab reduces exacerbations and steroid requirement in allergic asthmatics. *Eur Respir J*. 2001;18(2):254-61.
- Walford HH, Doherty TA. Diagnosis and management of eosinophilic asthma: a US perspective. *J Asthma and Allergy*. 2014;7:53-65.
- Xolair prescribing information. Genentech, Inc. South San Francisco, CA and Novartis Pharmaceuticals. East Hanover, NJ. July 2016.
- Yancey SW, Ortega HG, Keene ON, et al. Meta-analysis of asthma-related hospitalization in mepolizumab studies of severe eosinophilic asthma. *J Allergy Clin Immunol*. 2017;139(4):1167-1175.
- Zhao ZT, Ji CM, Yu WJ, et al. Omalizumab for the treatment of chronic spontaneous urticaria: A meta-analysis of randomized clinical trials. *J Allergy Clin Immunol*. 2016;137(6):1742-1750.
- Zuberbier T, Aberer W, Asero R, et al. The EAACI/GA/Len/EDF/WAO Guideline for the definition, classification, diagnosis, and management of urticaria: the 2013 revision and update. *Allergy*. 2014;69:868-887.

Publication Date: June 28, 2017