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 (*Centers for Disease Control and Prevention [CDC] 2019*).
- 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 (*CDC 2019*).
- The goal of asthma management – asthma control – can be described in the following domains (*National Heart, Lung, and Blood Institute [NHLBI] 2007*):
  - Reduction of impairment
    - Prevent chronic and troublesome symptoms (eg, coughing or breathlessness in the daytime, at night, or after exertion)
    - Require infrequent use (≤ 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 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 (eg, omalizumab)
    - Leukotriene modulators
    - Long-acting beta-agonists (LABAs)
    - Methylxanthines (ie, theophylline)
  - Quick-relief medications include:
    - Anticholinergics (ie, 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*). The most recent guideline from the Global Initiative for Asthma (GINA) on severe or difficult-to-treat asthma recommends assessing for Type 2 inflammation through blood and sputum eosinophil levels, exhaled nitric oxide level and allergic triggers to asthma (*GINA 2019b*)
- 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 2019, Saini 2018*).

- 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 2 to 5 years (*Saini 2018*).
- Non-sedating H_1-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_1-antihistamines include the use of H_2-antihistamines, leukotriene modifiers, cyclosporine, sulfasalazine, and dapsone (*Khan 2019, Maurer et al 2013*).
- Eosinophilic granulomatosis with polyangiitis (EGPA), previously called Churg-Strauss syndrome, is a systemic necrotizing vasculitis that affects small-to-medium-sized vessels. It is typically associated with eosinophilia and severe asthma (*Groh et al 2015, Schwartz et al 2016).*
- EGPA is a rare condition with a prevalence of approximately 13 cases per 1 million persons and an annual incidence of approximately 7 new cases per 1 million persons. It has a higher incidence in patients with asthma (*Groh et al 2015*).
- Systemic glucocorticoids are the mainstay of treatment for EGPA. For refractory EGPA, the addition of cyclophosphamide, azathioprine, methotrexate, rituximab, or intravenous immunoglobulins (IVIG) can be considered *(Groh et al 2015).* In more than 85% of patients with EGPA, remission can be achieved with glucocorticoids with or without an immunosuppressant; however, relapses occur in more than 33% of patients (*Pagnoux and Groh 2016*).
- Atopic dermatitis (AD) is a chronic inflammatory skin condition characterized by dry skin, erythema, oozing, crusting, and severe pruritus exacerbated by various environmental stimuli. It is associated with increased immunoglobulin E (IgE) levels and a history of atopy (asthma, allergic rhinitis, or eczema). A genetic defect that leads to dysfunction of the epidermal skin barrier along with an impaired immune response to microbial entry through the epidermis are believed to be the underlying causes of the condition (*Weston and Howe 2019a*).
- AD affects up to 25% of children and 2 to 3% of adults. It can manifest at different sites depending on the age at onset. The prevalence appears to be increasing especially in Western societies (*Sidbury et al 2014, Weston and Howe 2019a*).
- Topical emollients and topical corticosteroids are first-line treatments for AD. Topical calcineurin inhibitors are generally reserved as a second-line treatment option. The use of systemic therapies is reserved for patients with moderate to severe disease and can include phototherapy, oral cyclosporine, or other systemic immunosuppressants (*Weston and Howe 2019b*).
- This monograph describes the use of Cinqair (reslizumab), Dupixent (dupilumab), Fasenra (benralizumab), Nucala (mepolizumab), and Xolair (omalizumab).
  - Cinqair, Fasenra, and Nucala are humanized monoclonal antibody interleukin-5 (IL-5) antagonists. The mechanism of action of Fasenra is slightly different, in that it binds to the IL-5 receptor on immune effector cells, whereas Cinqair and Nucala bind to the IL-5 cytokine. 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. Nucala is also approved for the treatment of adult patients with EGPA.
  - Xolair is a recombinant DNA-derived monoclonal antibody that selectively binds to human IgE. Xolair, which reduces the allergic response mediators, is useful in a subset of patients with allergic asthma. In addition, Xolair has been shown to improve symptoms in patients with CIU.
  - Dupixent is a human monoclonal antibody that inhibits signaling of IL-4 and IL-13. This results in reduction of release of inflammatory mediators including cytokines, chemokines, nitric oxide and IgE. These actions are useful for eosinophilic asthma and controlling symptoms of moderate to severe AD.
- Medispan class: Antiasthmatic – Monoclonal Antibodies

Table 1. Medications Included Within Class Review

Drug	Generic Availability
Cinqair (reslizumab)	--
Dupixent (dupilumab)	--
Fasenra (benralizumab)	--
Nucala (mepolizumab)	--
Xolair (omalizumab)	--

(Drugs@FDA 2019, Purple Book: Lists of Licensed Biological Products with Reference Product Exclusivity and Biosimilarity or Interchangeability Evaluations 2019)

INDICATIONS

Table 2: Food and Drug Administration Approved Indications*

Indication	Cinqair[†] (reslizumab)	Dupixent (dupilumab)	Fasenra[†] (benralizumab)	Nucala (mepolizumab)	Xolair[‡] (omalizumab)
Moderate to severe persistent asthma in patients 6 years of age and older with a positive skin test or in vitro reactivity to a perennial aeroallergen and symptoms that are inadequately controlled with ICS					✔
Add-on maintenance treatment for patients 12 years of age and older with severe asthma with an eosinophilic phenotype			✔	✔	
Add-on maintenance treatment for patients 12 years of age and older with moderate-to-severe asthma with an eosinophilic phenotype or with oral corticosteroid dependent asthma		✔			
Add-on maintenance treatment for patients 18 years of age and older with severe asthma with an eosinophilic phenotype	✔				
Treatment of adult patients with eosinophilic granulomatosis with polyangiitis (EGPA)				✔	
The treatment of adults and adolescents 12 years of age and older with CIU who remain symptomatic despite H_1-antihistamine treatment.					✔
Treatment of patients 12 years of age and older with moderate-to-severe AD not adequately controlled with topical prescription therapies or when those therapies are not advisable		✔			

*None of the agents are indicated for the relief of acute bronchospasm or status asthmaticus.
†Not indicated for treatment of other eosinophilic conditions
‡Not indicated for other allergic conditions or other forms of urticaria

(*Prescribing information: Cinqair 2019, Dupixent 2019, Fasenra 2017, Nucala 2019, Xolair 2019*)

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 ≥ 12 years of age with moderate to severe asthma for ≥ 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 stepwise 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 ≥ 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*).
- A meta-analysis of 3 of the previously mentioned trials (*Busse et al 2001, Holgate et al 2004, Solèr et al 2001*) 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 (ie, 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; 3261 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; 1889 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; 1824 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 = 3429) 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 (relative risk [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 2011*).

- 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 6 to < 12 years of age 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; rate ratio, 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_1) were not significantly different in omalizumab-treated patients compared to placebo.

- A 2017 systematic review of 3 randomized, placebo-controlled trials and 5 observational studies evaluated the safety and efficacy of omalizumab in children and adolescents. Omalizumab reduced exacerbations compared with placebo or baseline in all studies that included this outcome. The randomized controlled trials did not identify significant differences in FEV_1; however, 3 of the 4 observational studies that included this outcome did find significant FEV_1 improvement with omalizumab. Generally, ICS and rescue medication use were reduced with omalizumab in the studies. The authors concluded that the evidence strongly supports omalizumab safety and efficacy in patients 6 to 11 years (*Corren et al 2017*).

- 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 ≥ 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 were 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*).

o Patients from the EXCELS study were eligible for the XPORT trial, a 52-week, randomized, placebo-controlled trial evaluating the persistence of response to omalizumab in patients who discontinued omalizumab therapy after long-term use. Patients were randomized to continue their omalizumab therapy or to omalizumab discontinuation. More patients who continued omalizumab did not have an exacerbation compared to those who discontinued therapy (67.0% vs 47.7%; absolute difference, 19.3%; 95% CI, 5.0 to 33.6). The authors concluded that continuation of omalizumab after long-term use results in sustained benefit *(Ledford et al 2017)*.

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_1 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_1 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 ≤ 0.001) *(Saini et al 2015)*.

- 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 1312 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)*.

- A Phase 4 randomized clinical trial evaluated the effect of omalizumab in 205 patients with antihistamine-resistant CIU/chronic spontaneous urticaria. After an initial 24-week period of open-label treatment with omalizumab 300 mg every 4 weeks, patients randomized to continue omalizumab for another 24 weeks of double-blind therapy experienced a significantly lower rate of clinical worsening compared with patients randomized to double-blind placebo (21.0% vs 60.4%; p < 0.0001). No new safety signals were detected over the 48-week omalizumab treatment period *(Maurer et al 2018)*.

BENRALIZUMAB

Asthma

- The safety and efficacy of benralizumab were evaluated in a 52-week dose-ranging exacerbation trial, 3 confirmatory trials, and a 12-week lung function trial *(Bleecker et al 2016, Castro et al 2014, Ferguson et al 2017, Fitzgerald et al 2016, Nair et al 2017)*.

  o In a randomized, controlled, double-blind, dose-ranging Phase 2b study, 324 adults with uncontrolled eosinophilic asthma were randomly assigned to placebo (n = 80), benralizumab 2 mg (n = 81), benralizumab 20 mg (n = 81), or benralizumab 100 mg (n = 82) and 285 adults with non-eosinophilic asthma were randomized to benralizumab 100 mg (n = 142) or placebo (n = 143) *(Castro et al 2014)*. Treatments were given as 2 SC injections every 4 weeks for the first 3 doses, then every 8 weeks, for 1 year. Among adults with eosinophilic asthma, benralizumab 100 mg reduced exacerbation rates as compared to placebo (0.34 vs 0.57; rate reduction, 41%; 80% CI, 11 to 60; p = 0.096). A significant reduction in exacerbation rates was not seen with benralizumab 2 mg or 20 mg as compared to placebo in these patients. In patients with a baseline blood eosinophil count of ≥ 300 cells/μL, exacerbation rates were lower than in the placebo group for the benralizumab 20 mg (0.30 vs 0.68; rate reduction, 57%; 80% CI, 33 to 72; p = 0.015) and 100 mg (0.38 vs 0.68; rate reduction, 43%; 80% CI, 18 to 60; p = 0.049) groups.

  o SIROCCO was a randomized, multicenter, double-blind, placebo-controlled, 48-week, Phase 3 trial (N = 1205) involving patients with severe asthma with eosinophilia uncontrolled with high-dose ICS and LABAs *(Bleecker et al 2016)*. Enrolled patients were randomly assigned to placebo (n = 407), benralizumab 30 mg every 4 weeks (n = 400), or benralizumab 30 mg every 8 weeks (n = 398). Compared with placebo, benralizumab reduced the annual asthma exacerbation rate over 48 weeks when administered every 4 weeks (rate ratio, 0.55; 95% CI, 0.42 to 0.71; p < 0.0001) or every 8 weeks (rate ratio, 0.49; 95% CI, 0.37 to 0.64; p < 0.0001). Both doses of benralizumab also

significantly improved pre-bronchodilator FEV_1 in patients at week 48 vs placebo. Asthma symptoms were improved with benralizumab every 8 weeks, but not every 4 weeks, as compared to placebo.

- CALIMA was a randomized, multicenter, double-blind, placebo-controlled, 56-week, Phase 3 trial that assessed benralizumab as add-on therapy (to high-dose ICS and LABA) for patients with severe, uncontrolled asthma and elevated blood eosinophil counts (*Fitzgerald et al 2016*). A total of 1306 patients were randomly assigned to benralizumab 30 mg every 4 weeks (n = 425), benralizumab 30 mg every 8 weeks (n = 441) or placebo (n = 440). When compared to placebo, significant reductions in annual exacerbation rates were seen with benralizumab every 4 weeks (rate ratio, 0.64; 95% CI, 0.49 to 0.85; p = 0.0018) and every 8 weeks (rate ratio, 0.72; 95% CI, 0.54 to 0.95; p = 0.0188). Benralizumab was also associated with significantly improved pre-bronchodilator FEV_1 and total asthma symptom scores vs placebo.
- Patients enrolled in the SIROCCO and CALIMA trials who completed treatment were eligible for the BORO Phase 3 safety extension trial. This was a randomized, double-blind study that randomized patients to received benralizumab 30 mg every 4 or 8 weeks. Adult patients received treatment for 52 weeks and adolescents (12 to 17 years of age) were treated for 108 weeks. A total of 1576 patients were included in the full-analysis set with safety assessed at 56 weeks. Treatment discontinuation due to any adverse event occurred in approximately 2% of patients in each group. The most common adverse events were viral upper respiratory tract infections and worsening asthma. Serious adverse events included worsening asthma (3% in the every-8-week dosing group and 4% in the every-4-week dosing group), pneumonia (< 1% in both groups) and pneumonia caused by bacterial infection (< 1% in the every-4-week dosing group and 1% in the every-8-week dosing group). New malignancy occurred in 12 (1%) of the 1,576 patients. Hypersensitivity related to treatment occurred in 3 patients. For the secondary efficacy outcome, patients with elevated blood eosinophil levels had similar exacerbation rates to that observed during the first year of treatment in the SIROCCO and CALIMA trials (*Busse et al 2018*).
- BISE was a randomized, multicenter, double-blind, placebo-controlled, 12-week, Phase 3 trial that evaluated benralizumab therapy for patients with mild to moderate persistent asthma (*Ferguson et al 2017*). Patients (N = 211) had been receiving either low- to medium-dose ICS or low-dose ICS plus LABA therapy and were randomized to benralizumab 30 mg every 4 weeks (n = 106) or placebo (n = 105). Benralizumab resulted in an 80 mL (95% CI, 0 to 150; p = 0.04) greater improvement in pre-bronchodilator FEV_1 after 12 weeks as compared to placebo. Despite this improvement, this lung function result does not warrant the use of benralizumab in mild to moderate asthma because it did not reach the minimum clinically important improvement of 10%.
- ZONDA was a randomized, multicenter, double-blind, placebo-controlled, 28-week trial that primarily assessed whether or not benralizumab was effective as an oral glucocorticoid-sparing therapy in patients on oral steroids to manage severe asthma associated with eosinophilia (*Nair et al 2017*). Of the enrolled patients, 220 were randomly assigned to benralizumab 30 mg every 4 weeks (n = 72), benralizumab 30 mg every 8 weeks (n = 73), or placebo (n = 75). Results revealed that the 2 benralizumab dosing regimens significantly reduced the median final oral glucocorticoid doses from baseline by 75% vs a 25% reduction seen with placebo (p < 0.001 for both comparisons). Additionally, benralizumab administered every 4 weeks resulted in an annual exacerbation rate that was 55% lower than that seen with placebo (marginal rate, 0.83 vs 1.83; p = 0.003) and benralizumab administered every 8 weeks resulted in a 70% lower rate than that seen with placebo (marginal rate, 0.54 to 1.83; p < 0.001).

- Fitzgerald et al conducted a study exploring the efficacy of benralizumab for patients with different baseline blood eosinophil thresholds and exacerbation histories. This study was a pooled analysis (n = 2295 patients) of the results from the SIROCCO and CALIMA phase 3 studies. The annual exacerbation rate among patients with baseline blood eosinophil counts of ≥ 0 cells/μL was 1.16 (95% CI, 1.05 to 1.28) in patients who received placebo vs 0.75 (0.66 to 0.84) in patients who received benralizumab every 8 weeks (RR, 0.64; 0.55 to 0.75; p < 0.0001). In patients who received benralizumab every 4 weeks who had eosinophil counts of ≥ 0 cells/μL, the annual exacerbation rate was 0.73 (0.65 to 0.82); RR vs placebo was 0.63 (0.54 to 0.74; p < 0.0001). The extent to which exacerbation rates were reduced increased with increasing blood eosinophil thresholds and with greater exacerbation history in patients in the every-4-week and every-8-week benralizumab groups. Greater improvements in the annual exacerbation rate were seen with benralizumab compared with placebo for patients with a combination of high blood eosinophil thresholds and a history of more frequent exacerbations *(FitzGerald et al 2018).*
- A 2017 meta-analysis evaluated the therapeutic efficacy and safety of benralizumab in patients with eosinophilic asthma. A total of 7 articles (n = 2321) met the inclusion criteria of the systematic review. The pooled analysis found that benralizumab significantly reduced exacerbations (RR, 0.63; 95% CI, 0.52 to 0.76; p < 0.00001) compared to placebo. There was no statistical trend for improvement in FEV_1 or asthma control indices such as Quality of Life Assessment (AQLQ) and Asthma Control Questionnaire score in benralizumab-treated patients. In addition, safety data indicated that

benralizumab administration resulted no increasing incidence of adverse events and was well tolerated (RR, 1.00; 95% CI, 0.95 to 1.05; p = 0.96) *(Tien et al 2017)*.

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 ≥ 150 cells/μL in the peripheral blood at screening or ≥ 300 cells/μL at some time during the previous year. Patients also were required to be on a high-dose ICS as well as another controller medication *(Bel et al 2014, Ortega et al 2014, Pavord et al 2012)*.
  - 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_1 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 1192 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; rate ratio, 0.53; 95% CI, 0.44 to 0.62; p < 0.0001). The exacerbation rate reduction with mepolizumab vs placebo increased progressively from 52% (rate ratio, 0.48; 95% CI, 0.39 to 0.58) in patients with a baseline blood eosinophil count of ≥ 150 cells/μL to 70% (rate ratio, 0.30; 95% CI, 0.23 to 0.40) in patients with a baseline count of ≥ 500 cells/μL. At a baseline count < 150 cells/μL, 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)*.
- COLUMBA was an open-label extension study of patients enrolled in the DREAM trial who received mepolizumab 100 mg every 4 weeks plus standard of care until criterion for discontinuation was met (safety profile not positive for patient, patient withdrawn by their physician, patient withdrew consent, or drug became commercially available). There were 347 patients enrolled who received treatment for a mean of 3.5 years. Adverse events most frequently reported were

respiratory tract infection (67%), headache (29%), bronchitis (21%), and worsening asthma (27%). Although 6 deaths occurred, none were considered related to study treatment. No anaphylaxis reactions were reported. Malignancy was reported in 2% (n = 6) of patients. The exacerbation rate for patients on treatment for 156 weeks or longer was 0.74 events/year, which was a 56% reduction from the off-treatment period between the 2 studies (*Khatri et al 2018*).

- A systematic review and meta-analysis 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 ≥ 24 weeks. Four studies (N = 1388) were eligible for inclusion. Mepolizumab significantly reduced the rate of exacerbations requiring hospitalization (relative rate, 0.49; 95% CI, 0.30 to 0.80; p = 0.004) and hospitalization/emergency room visit (relative rate, 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 2017*).

Eosinophilic Granulomatosis with Polyangiitis

- A 52-week, randomized, placebo-controlled, double-blind, parallel-group, multicenter, Phase 3 trial assessed the efficacy and safety of mepolizumab as add-on therapy (to glucocorticoid treatment, with or without immunosuppressive therapy) for patients with relapsing or refractory EGPA (*Wechsler et al 2017*). A total of 136 patients were randomly assigned to mepolizumab 300 mg every 4 weeks (n = 68) or placebo (n = 68). Results demonstrated the following for the mepolizumab and placebo groups, respectively:
  - Percentage of patients with ≥ 24 weeks of accrued remission: 28% vs 3% (OR, 5.91; 95% CI, 2.68 to 13.03; p < 0.001).
  - Percentage of patients in remission at both week 36 and week 48: 32% vs 3% (OR, 16.74; 95% CI, 3.61 to 77.56; p < 0.001).
  - Annualized relapse rate: 1.14 vs 2.27 (rate ratio, 0.50; 95% CI, 0.36 to 0.70; p < 0.001).
  - Percentage of patients able to reduce their daily dose of concomitant prednisone or prednisolone to 4 mg or less (average of weeks 48 to 52): 44% vs 7% (OR, 0.20; 95% CI, 0.09 to 0.41; p < 0.001).

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 ≥ 400 cells/μL, and ≥ 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: rate ratio, 0.50; 95% CI, 0.37 to 0.67; Study 3083: rate ratio, 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_1 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 ≥ 400 cells/μL. The study compared the change from baseline in FEV_1 and improvements in clinical symptoms between reslizumab 3 mg/kg vs placebo. Reslizumab 3 mg/kg significantly improved FEV_1 (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/μL). Patients were not allowed to be on maintenance oral corticosteroids. The study compared the change from baseline in FEV_1 and improvements in clinical symptoms between reslizumab 3 mg/kg vs placebo. In the subgroup of patients with baseline eosinophils < 400 cells/μL, patients treated with reslizumab showed no significant improvement in FEV_1 compared with placebo. In the subgroup with eosinophils ≥ 400 cells/μL, however, treatment with reslizumab was associated with much larger improvements in FEV_1, ACQ, and rescue SABA use compared with placebo (*Corren et al 2016*).
  - An open-label, non-randomized extension study of these placebo-controlled trials continued treatment of patients with eosinophilic asthma with reslizumab 3 mg/kg every 4 weeks for up to 24 months to assess the drug's safety. Patients

initially randomized to placebo also received active drug. A total of 1051 patients were included (n = 480 reslizumab-naive and n = 571 reslizumab-treated patients). Of these, 740 patients received treatment for 12 months or longer and 249 patients received treatment for 24 months or longer. Worsening asthma and nasopharyngitis were the most common adverse events. Serious adverse events occurred in 7% of patients and treatment discontinuation due to an adverse event occurred in 2% of patients. No deaths (n = 3) were related to treatment. Malignancy occurred in 15 (1%) of patients. Patients previously on reslizumab maintained asthma control and those naive to treatment demonstrated improvement in asthma control and lung function. The authors concluded that reslizumab maintained asthma control for up to 2 years in patients with moderate-to-severe eosinophilic asthma (*Murphy et al 2017*).

- A 2017 meta-analysis of 5 randomized controlled trials comparing reslizumab to placebo (N = 1366) revealed improvements in exacerbations, FEV_1, and ACQ score with reslizumab. Asthma exacerbations occurred less frequently in reslizumab patients vs placebo (OR, 0.46; 95% CI, 0.35 to 0.59; $p < 0.00001$). FEV_1 also improved with reslizumab compared to placebo (mean difference, 0.16; 95% CI, 0.10 to 0.23; $p < 0.00001$). Finally, ACQ score improved with reslizumab compared to placebo (mean difference, -0.26; 95% CI, -0.36 to -0.16; $p < 0.00001$). All studies included in the meta-analysis were of limited duration of 15 or 16 weeks (*Li et al 2017*).

DUPILUMAB
AD
- The efficacy and safety of dupilumab compared to placebo in adults with moderate-to-severe AD was evaluated in two Phase 3 trials, SOLO 1 (n = 671) and SOLO 2 (n = 708). Adults who did not have an adequate response to topical treatments were included. Patients were randomized to either placebo, dupilumab 300 mg SC weekly or every other week for 16 weeks. The proportion of patients with an Investigator's Global Assessment (IGA) score of 0 or 1 (indicating clear or almost clear skin) and a reduction of 2 points or more in the score from baseline at week 16 was the primary outcome. In both studies between 36% and 38% of patients who received either regimen of dupilumab achieved the primary outcome compared to 8% to 10% of patients who received placebo ($p < 0.001$ for all comparisons). Significantly more patients who received dupilumab had ≥ 75% improvement from baseline on the Eczema Area and Severity Index (EASI-75) compared to those who received placebo ($p < 0.001$). Pruritus and quality of life measures were also significantly improved with dupilumab. The most common adverse effects with dupilumab compared to placebo were conjunctivitis and injection-site reactions (*Simpson et al 2016*).
- The long-term efficacy and safety of dupilumab was compared to placebo in 740 patients with moderate to severe AD not adequately controlled with topical corticosteroids in the LIBERTY AD CHRONOS study. Patients received either dupilumab 300 mg once weekly, once every 2 weeks, or placebo for 52 weeks. The co-primary endpoints were proportion of patients achieving an IGA score of 0 or 1 and ≥ 2 point improvement from baseline and EASI-75 at week 16. At week 16, 39% of patients in both dupilumab groups achieved an IGA score of 0 or 1 compared to 12% of patients who received placebo. EASI-75 was achieved in 64% and 69% of the dupilumab groups vs 23% in the placebo group ($p < 0.0001$). Similar efficacy results were reported at week 52. At 1 year, the most common adverse events associated with dupilumab were injection-site reactions and conjunctivitis. Localized herpes simplex infections were more common with dupilumab while herpes zoster and eczema herpeticum was more common in the placebo group (*Blauvelt et al 2017*).
- The efficacy of dupilumab compared to placebo was evaluated in 251 patients 12 to 17 years of age with moderate-to-severe AD in a double-blind, multicenter, randomized controlled trial. Patients < 60 kg received dupilumab 400 mg initially then 200 mg every 2 weeks and patients ≥ 60 kg received 600 mg initially then 300 mg every 2 weeks for 16 weeks. The primary endpoint (proportion of patients achieving an IGA score of 0 or 1 and ≥ 2 point improvement from baseline to week 16) was achieved in 24% of dupilumab patients compared to 2% of placebo patients. EASI-75 was achieved by 42% of dupilumab and 8% of placebo patients (*Dupixent prescribing information 2019*).

Asthma
- A 52-week randomized, double-blind, placebo-controlled study evaluated the efficacy of dupilumab in patients ≥ 12 years of age with moderate-to-severe asthma uncontrolled with a medium-to-high dose ICS plus up to 2 additional controller medications (LABA and/or leukotriene receptor antagonist). Approximately 1900 patients were randomized to add-on therapy with dupilumab (200 mg or 300 mg every 2 weeks) or matching placebo for 52 weeks. The annual rate of severe exacerbations during the 52-week study period and the absolute change in FEV_1 at week 12 were the primary endpoints. A subgroup analysis of patients with an elevated blood eosinophil count of $300/mm^3$ was also planned. Both doses of dupilumab resulted in a reduced rate (46% and 47.7%, respectively) of asthma exacerbation compared to placebo ($p < 0.0001$). Patients with higher blood eosinophil levels had greater than 65% reduction in the annual

exacerbation rate compared to placebo. The change in FEV_1 was also significantly improved with both doses of dupilumab compared to placebo and even more pronounced in patients with elevated blood eosinophil levels. Adverse events more common with dupilumab compared to placebo included injection-site reactions and eosinophilia (*Castro et al 2018*).

- A total of 210 patients ≥ 12 years of age with oral glucocorticoid-dependent severe asthma were randomized to receive add-on therapy with dupilumab 300 mg or placebo every other week for 24 weeks. Glucocorticoid doses were tapered from week 4 to week 20 and then maintained at a stable dose for 4 weeks. The percentage in glucocorticoid dose reduction at week 24 was the primary outcome. The percentage change in glucocorticoid dose was -70.1% with dupilumab vs -41.9% with placebo (p < 0.001). A dose reduction of ≥ 50% was observed in 80% of dupilumab-treated patients compared to 50% of placebo patients. Almost 70% of patients in the dupilumab group achieved a glucocorticoid dose of less than 5 mg compared to 33% in patients who received placebo. The exacerbation rate was 59% lower with dupilumab compared to placebo. Injection site reactions and eosinophilia were more common with dupilumab compared to placebo (*Rabe et al 2018*).
- A meta-analysis and systematic review of 4 RCTs evaluated the safety and efficacy of dupilumab compared to placebo in approximately 3000 patients with uncontrolled asthma. The rate of severe asthma exacerbation was significantly reduced with dupilumab compared to placebo (RR 0.44; 95% CI, 0.35 to 0.055; p < 0.01). FEV_1 was also significantly increased with dupilumab with a mean difference of 0.14 L (95% CI, 0.12 to 0.17; p < 0.01). With respect to adverse events, the risk of injection site reactions was higher with dupilumab compared to placebo (RR 1.91; 95% CI, 1.14 to 2.59; p < 0.01) (*Zayed et al 2018*).

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, ≥12 weeks' duration enrolling patients with severe asthma with a documented exacerbation history and receiving a high-dose ICS plus ≥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 rate ratios 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 rate ratio 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 rate ratio 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.
- Another 2017 systematic review was unable to detect differences in efficacy when comparing add-on therapy with mepolizumab or omalizumab in asthma patients who were not well controlled on ICS therapy. The analysis included both randomized controlled trials and cohort studies with duration of ≥12 weeks. A total of 18 omalizumab studies (N = 4854) and 4 mepolizumab studies (N = 1620) were included. Network meta-analysis did not find a significant difference in FEV_1 between groups (mean difference, 9.3 mL in favor of mepolizumab; 95% CI, -67.7 to 86.3). Both omalizumab and mepolizumab reduced the annualized rates of asthma exacerbations by approximately 50% compared with placebo. Although the authors were unable to identify significant differences in efficacy there was high heterogeneity among the clinical trials and major differences in study inclusion criteria *(Nachef et al 2018)*.
- A systematic review of the IL-5 antagonists, mepolizumab, reslizumab, and benralizumab, included 13 studies (N = 6000) conducted in patients with asthma poorly controlled by ICS. The majority of patients had severe eosinophilic asthma. All of the IL-5 antagonists reduced asthma exacerbations by approximately 50% and improved FEV_1 by 0.08 L to 0.11 L. Overall, there was not an increase in serious adverse events with any IL-5 antagonist; however, more patients discontinued benralizumab (36/1599) than placebo (9/998) due to adverse events *(Farne et al 2017)*.
- A 2019 network meta-analysis of 11 studies aimed to indirectly compare the efficacy (n = 1855) and safety (n = 3462) of reslizumab with benralizumab in patients with eosinophilic asthma. The efficacy analysis compared a benralizumab subgroup with blood eosinophils ≥ 300 cells/μL (n = 1537) to a reslizumab subgroup in GINA step 4/5 with 2 or more

previous exacerbations and blood eosinophils ≥ 400 cells/μL. Reslizumab was found to have significantly greater improvement in the ACQ and AQLQ scores compared to benralizumab. No significant difference between the groups was observed in clinical asthma exacerbation, but a sensitivity analysis with the overall study population suggested a significantly greater reduction in exacerbations with reslizumab. There were fewer discontinuations due to adverse events with reslizumab; however, the frequency and types of adverse events were not significantly different between treatment groups (*Casale et al 2019).*

- A 2019 network meta-analysis of 11 studies compared efficacy of licensed doses of mepolizumab, benralizumab, and reslizumab in patients with severe eosinophilic asthma based on eosinophil levels. Mepolizumab reduced clinically significant exacerbations compared to benralizumab for patients with blood eosinophils ≥ 150 cells/μL (rate ratio, 0.66; 95% CI, 0.49 to 0.89), ≥ 300 cells/μL (rate ratio, 0.61; 95% CI, 0.37 to 0.99), and ≥ 400 cells/μL (rate ratio, 0.55; 95% CI, 0.35 to 0.87) and with mepolizumab compared to reslizumab for patients with blood eosinophils ≥ 400 cells/μL (rate ratio, 0.55; 95% CI, 0.36 to 0.85). Additionally, change from baseline in ACQ score was greater with mepolizumab compared to benralizumab in patients with baseline blood eosinophils ≥ 150 cells/μL (difference, -0.33; 95% CI, -0.54 to -0.11), ≥ 300 cells/μL (-0.40; 95% CI, -0.76 to -0.03), and ≥ 400 cells/μL (difference, -0.36; 95% CI, -0.66 to -0.05) and compared to reslizumab with blood eosinophils ≥ 400 cells/μL (difference, -0.39; 95% CI, -0.66 to -0.12). There was no difference between reslizumab and benralizumab in clinically significant exacerbations or ACQ scores in patients with blood eosinophils ≥ 400 cells/μL *(Busse et al 2019).*
- Additional meta-analyses have not found significant differences in asthma exacerbation rates between mepolizumab and reslizumab or between benralizumab and mepolizumab *(Bourdin et al 2018, Henriksen et al 2018).*
- The magnitude of treatment effect of biologic agents (including benralizumab, reslizumab, dupilumab, mepolizumab, lebrikizumab [investigational], and tralokinumab [investigational]) in patients with eosinophilic asthma was evaluated in a network meta-analysis. The outcomes evaluated were change in FEV_1, ACQ score and AQLQ score. Event rates for asthma exacerbation and associated rate ratios were determined for each drug. A total of 26 studies were included in the analysis (n = 7 benralizumab, n = 2 dupilumab, n = 4 lebrikizumab, n = 7 mepolizumab, n = 4 reslizumab, n = 2 tralokinumab) with a total of 8444 patients (n = 4406 on active treatment, n = 4038 in control groups). The duration of treatment ranged from 12 to 56 weeks. Increase in FEV_1, reduction in ACQ score and increase in AQLQ score was observed with all treatments except tralokinumab. Compared to placebo, the greatest FEV_1 increase was with dupilumab (0.16 L; 95% CI, 0.08 to 0.24), followed by reslizumab (0.13 L; 95% CI, 0.10 to 0.17), and benralizumab (0.12 L; 95% CI, 0.08 to 0.17). Mepolizumab and lebrikizumab both had an increase of 0.09 L (95% CI, 0.03 to 0.15 with mepolizumab, 0.04 to 0.15 with lebrikizumab). Reduction in ACQ score (indicating better asthma control) in order of greatest to least reduction was mepolizumab, dupilumab, benralizumab, and reslizumab. The investigational agents had the least impact on the ACQ score. Quality of life scores were similarly increased with the 4 agents while the investigational agents had the least impact on quality of life. Compared to placebo, the calculated rate ratio for annualized asthma exacerbation was significant only for dupilumab (rate ratio, 0.37; 95% CI, 0.17 to 0.80) and reslizumab (rate ratio, 0.64; 95% CI, 0.53 to 0.78). Comparisons between treatments did not show any significant difference for change in FEV_1, asthma control or quality of life except for superiority of mepolizumab to the 2 investigational agents in ACQ score reduction (*Iftikhar et al 2018*).

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_1 and FEV_1/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 2019, the Global Initiative for Asthma (GINA) published updated guidelines for asthma management and prevention. In April 2019, GINA updated a guideline on diagnosis and management of difficult-to-treat and severe asthma. Criteria for establishing a diagnosis of severe asthma was included, which requires multiple interventions before a diagnosis can be made. For patients with a diagnosis of severe asthma, uncontrolled on Step 4 treatment (eg, 2 or more controllers or

taking maintenance oral corticosteroids), phenotyping for Type 2 inflammation into categories such as severe allergic, aspirin-exacerbated, allergic bronchopulmonary aspergillosis, chronic rhinosinusitis and nasal polyposis, atopic dermatitis, or eosinophilic asthma is recommended. Treatment with a biologic agent should be considered in patients who are uncontrolled despite a high dose ICS/LABA or need maintenance oral corticosteroids. Anti-IgE treatment with omalizumab is recommended for patients ≥ 6 years of age with severe allergic asthma. Similarly, add-on anti-IL-5 therapy (ie, benralizumab, mepolizumab) is recommended for patients ≥ 12 years of age or reslizumab for patients ≥ 18 years of age with severe eosinophilic asthma. Anti-IL4 receptor therapy (ie, dupilumab) is recommended for patients ≥ 12 years of age with severe eosinophilic/Type 2 asthma or patients taking oral corticosteroids. Prior to initiation of these agents, several factors are recommended to consider including cost, insurance eligibility criteria, evaluation of predictors of response, delivery route, dosing frequency and patient preference. (*GINA 2019a, GINA 2019b*).

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*).
- 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 in patients with symptoms despite treatment with a 4-fold dose of modern second generation antihistamines. This is a change from previous guidelines in which use of either omalizumab or cyclosporine after failure of high-dose antihistamines was recommended. However, due to adverse effects and the lack of an approved indication, the new recommendation was that cyclosporine should only be considered if omalizumab does not provide an adequate response. (*Zuberbier et al 2018*).
- 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*).

Eosinophilic Granulomatosis with Polyangiitis
- Both the EGPA (Churg-Strauss) Consensus Task Force recommendations and the American Society for Apheresis guideline recommend glucocorticoids alone for patients without life- and/or organ-threatening EGPA. For patients with life- and/or organ-threatening EGPA, both glucocorticoids and an immunosuppressant are recommended, as well as maintenance therapy with azathioprine or methotrexate. IVIG can be considered for refractory EGPA or for treatment during pregnancy (*Groh et al 2015, Schwartz et al 2016*).
  - These guidelines have not been updated to include the place in therapy for mepolizumab; however, the EGPA Consensus Task Force recommendations notes that mepolizumab hold promise for this condition based on the pilot studies available at the time of guideline development (*Groh et al 2015*).

AD
  - According to the American Academy of Dermatology, interventions that provide effective control of AD for a majority of patients include non-pharmacologic interventions with emollients, topical treatment with corticosteroids and calcineurin inhibitors, and avoidance of environmental triggers. Phototherapy is the next option for children and adults with moderate to severe AD not controlled with the first-line interventions. A third-line treatment recommended for patients who fail phototherapy is treatment with systemic immunomodulators, such as cyclosporine and methotrexate. The guidelines did not provide a recommendation on use of biologic agents due to limited data available at the time of publication (*Sidbury et al 2014*)
  - 2017 guidance from the International Eczema Council provides clinicians with similar guidance as the American Academy of Dermatology as well as additional steps to be taken before initiation of systemic treatment. These include consideration of an alternative diagnosis, ensuring patient compliance with topical treatment, a trial of intensive topical therapy, treatment of infection, identification and avoidance of all potential triggers, and use of phototherapy if possible. The guidance does not comment on use of biologic agents due to limited data (*Simpson et al 2017*). The International Eczema Council also published a position statement on conjunctivitis in atopic dermatitis with and without dupilumab therapy based on an opinion survey and round table discussion of its members. Based on expert opinion, a consensus was reached that patients should be informed about possible conjunctivitis with dupilumab prior

==to treatment, patients with new-onset conjunctivitis during dupilumab therapy should be referred to ophthalmologists, and treatment should be continued after referral to an ophthalmologist *(Thyssen et al 2019).*==
○ A 2018 European consensus guideline from a variety of organizations on treatment of atopic eczema includes dupilumab as a treatment option for patients with moderate-to-severe disease in whom an adequate response is not achieved with topical treatments and for whom other systemic treatments are not available. Concomitant use of emollients is recommended and combination with topical agents may be needed. No specific information on use of pediatrics was provided due to lack of data. (*Wollenberg et al 2018*).

SAFETY SUMMARY

- All agents are contraindicated in patients with a history of hypersensitivity to the specific agent or excipients in its formulation.
- Abrupt discontinuation of systemic, topical or inhaled corticosteroids is not recommended when treatment with any of these agents are initiated. If appropriate, the corticosteroid dosage should be reduced gradually.

Cinqair:
- 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 warnings and precautions:
  ○ 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.
  ○ Pre-existing helminth infections should be treated before therapy with Cinqair. If patients become infected while receiving Cinqair and do not respond to anti-helminth treatment, Cinqair should be discontinued until the parasitic infection resolves.
- The most common adverse reaction (≥ 2%) included oropharyngeal pain.

Dupixent:
- Key warnings and precautions:
  ○ Hypersensitivity reactions (eg, anaphylaxis, erythema nodosum, serum sickness, urticaria, and rash) have occurred after administration of Dupixent. Dupixent should be discontinued in the event of a hypersensitivity reaction.
  ○ For patients with AD, conjunctivitis and keratitis has occurred more often when compared to placebo in clinical trials evaluating Dupixent. New or worsening eye symptoms should be reported to a healthcare provider.
  ○ For patients with asthma, cases of eosinophilic pneumonia and vasculitis consistent with EGPA have been reported. Occurrence of vasculitic rash, worsening pulmonary symptoms, and/or neuropathy, especially upon reduction of oral corticosteroids should be monitored.
  ○ Pre-existing helminth infections should be treated before therapy with Dupixent. If a patient becomes infected while receiving Dupixent and does not respond to anti-helminth treatment, Dupixent should be discontinued until the parasitic infection resolves.
- Most common adverse reactions in patients with AD included injection site reactions, conjunctivitis, blepharitis, oral herpes, keratitis, eye pruritus, other herpes simplex virus infection, and dry eye.
- Most common adverse reactions in patients with asthma included injection site reactions, oropharyngeal pain, and eosinophilia.

Fasenra:
- Key warnings and precautions:
  ○ Hypersensitivity reactions (eg, anaphylaxis, angioedema, bronchospasm, hypotension, urticaria, rash) have occurred after administration of Fasenra. Fasenra should be discontinued in the event of a hypersensitivity reaction.
  ○ Pre-existing helminth infections should be treated before therapy with Fasenra. If patients become infected while receiving Fasenra and do not respond to anti-helminth treatment, Fasenra should be discontinued until the parasitic infection resolves.
- The most common adverse reactions (≥ 5%) included headache and pharyngitis.

![OPTUMRx logo]

Nucala:
- Key warnings and precautions:
  - Hypersensitivity reactions (eg, anaphylaxis, angioedema, bronchospasm, hypotension, urticaria, rash) have occurred after administration of Nucala.
  - Herpes zoster infections have occurred in patients receiving Nucala. <mark>Vaccination should be considered if clinically appropriate.</mark>
  - Pre-existing helminth infections should be treated before therapy with Nucala. If patients become infected while receiving Nucala and do not respond to anti-helminth treatment, Nucala should be discontinued until the parasitic infection resolves.
- The most common adverse reactions (≥ 5%) included headache, injection site reaction, back pain, and fatigue.

Xolair:
- Boxed warning: Anaphylaxis, presenting as bronchospasm, hypotension, syncope, urticaria, and/or angioedema of the throat or tongue, has been reported. Patients should be observed 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	- Administered by IV infusion over 20 to 50 minutes. - Safety and effectiveness in pediatric patients ≤ 17 years of age have not been established.

![OPTUMRx logo]

Drug	Route	Usual Recommended Frequency	Comments
			• ==Cinqair should be administered by a healthcare professional.==
Dupixent (dupilumab)	SC	AD: every other week Asthma: every other week	• ==AD and Asthma: Safety and efficacy in pediatric patients < 12 years of age have not been established.== • ==Dupixent may be self-administered.==
Fasenra (benralizumab)	SC	Every 4 weeks for first 3 doses, followed by every 8 weeks	• Safety and efficacy in pediatric patients < 12 years of age have not been established. • ==Fasenra should be administered by a healthcare professional.==
Nucala (mepolizumab)	SC	Asthma: every 4 weeks EGPA: every 4 weeks	• Safety and efficacy in pediatric patients < 12 years of age have not been established. • Safety and efficacy in pediatric patients other than those with asthma have not been established. • ==Nucala for injection (ie, powder for reconstitution) should be reconstituted and administered by a healthcare professional.== • ==The Nucala auto injector and pre-filled safety syringe may be self-administered after the healthcare provider determines it is appropriate.==
Xolair (omalizumab)	SC	Allergic asthma: Every 2 or 4 weeks CIU: Every 4 weeks	• ==Xolair should be administered by a healthcare professional.== Allergic asthma: • The dose and frequency is determined by serum total IgE level (IU/mL), measured before the start of treatment, and body weight. • Safety and efficacy in pediatric patients with asthma < 6 years of age have not been established. CIU: • Dosing in CIU is not dependent on serum IgE level or body weight. • Safety and efficacy in pediatric patients with CIU < 12 years of age have not been established.

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 2019a, GINA 2019b, 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_1-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 recommend treatment with Xolair in patients who are inadequately controlled with a 4-fold dose of modern second generation antihistamines. Although previous guidelines suggested the use of omalizumab after a leukotriene receptor antagonist, the most recent guideline from the European Academy of Allergy and Clinical Immunology, the Global Allergy and Asthma European Network, the European Dermatology Forum, and the World Allergy Organization state that a recommendation regarding use of a leukotriene receptor antagonist cannot be made due to a low level of evidence. Additionally, use of Xolair is recommended before treatment with cyclosporine (*Bernstein et al 2014, Zuberbier et al 2018, Powell et al 2015*).
- Cinqair, Fasenra, 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, Bleecker et al 2016, Fitzgerald et al 2016*). The mechanism of action of Fasenra is slightly different, in that it binds to the IL-5 receptor on immune effector cells, whereas Cinqair and Nucala bind to the IL-5 cytokine. All of these agents 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 after confirmation of severe disease, along with individual patient factors (*GINA 2019a, GINA 2019b*).
- Dupixent is an IL-4/IL-13 antagonist with 2 FDA-approved indications: treatment of patients ≥ 12 years of age with moderate-to-severe AD, and treatment of patients ≥ 12 years of age with severe asthma of the eosinophilic type or dependent on oral corticosteroids. Its use in AD should be determined by its approved indication and clinician judgment. According to the most recent GINA guideline on treatment of severe asthma, the use of Dupixent for severe asthma with an eosinophilic phenotype can be considered for patients with severe eosinophilic/Type 2 asthma or patients taking oral corticosteroids.
- Nucala is the only IL-5 antagonist approved for the treatment of adult patients with EGPA.
- There are no head-to-head trials comparing Cinqair, Fasenra, Dupixent and Nucala. However, a systematic review of the IL-5 antagonists conducted in patients with asthma poorly controlled by ICS revealed that all of the IL-5 antagonists reduced asthma exacerbations by approximately 50% and improved FEV_1 by 0.08 L to 0.11 L. Overall, there was not an increase in serious adverse events with any IL-5 antagonist; however, more patients discontinued benralizumab (36/1599) than placebo (9/998) due to adverse events (*Farne et al 2017*). A network meta-analysis of IL-4, IL-5 and IL-13 antagonists demonstrated that all agents reduced FEV_1 and improved ACQ and AQLQ scores, except for the investigational agent, tralokinumab. The only 2 agents that demonstrated a significant reduction in asthma exacerbation rates compared to placebo were reslizumab and dupilumab (*Iftikhar et al 2018*).
- Compared to Nucala and Fasenra, Cinqair does have several limitations, including: an indication for patients ≥ 18 years of age (vs ≥ 12 years of age with Nucala and Fasenra), IV administration (SC for Nucala and Fasenra), and a boxed warning for anaphylaxis. Dupixent is indicated for treatment of patients ≥ 12 years of age with both severe asthma and AD.

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;133:1270-1277.
- Bjermer L, Lemiere C, Maspero 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.
- Blauvelt A, de Bruin-Weller M, Gooderham M, et al. Long-term management of moderate-to-severe atopic dermatitis with dupilumab and concomitant topical corticosteroids (LIBERTY AD CHRONOS): a 1-year, randomised, double-blinded, placebo-controlled, phase 3 trial. *Lancet*. 2017;389 (10086):2287-2303. doi: 10.1016/S0140-6736(17)31191-1.
- Bleecker ER, Fitzgerald JM, Chanez P, et al. Efficacy and safety of benralizumab for patients with severe asthma uncontrolled with high-dosage inhaled corticosteroids and long-acting β2-agonists (SIROCCO): a randomized, multicenter, placebo-controlled phase 3 trial. *Lancet*. 2016;388(10056):2115-2127.
- Bourdin A, Husereau D, Molinari N, et al. Matching-adjusted indirect comparison of benralizumab versus interleukin-5 inhibitors for the treatment of severe asthma: a systematic review. *Eur Respir J*. 2018;52(5). doi: 10.1183/13993003.01393-2018.
- 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):73-78.
- Busse W, Chupp G, Nagase H, et al. Anti-IL-5 treatments in patients with severe asthma by blood eosinophil thresholds: Indirect treatment comparison. *J Allergy Clin Immunol*. 2019;143(1):190-200.e20. doi: 10.1016/j.jaci.2018.08.031.
- 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.
- Busse WW, Bleecker ER, FitzGerald JM, et al; BORA study investigators. Long-term safety and efficacy of benralizumab in patients with severe, uncontrolled asthma: 1-year results from the BORA phase 3 extension trial. Lancet Respir Med. 2019;7(1):46-59. doi: 10.1016/S2213-2600(18)30406-5. Epub 2018 Nov 8.
- Casale TB, Pacou M, Mesana L, et al. Reslizumab compared with benralizumab in patients with eosinophilic asthma: a systematic literature review and network meta-analysis. *J Allergy Clin Immunol Pract*. 2019;7(1):122-130.e1. doi: 10.1016/j.jaip.2018.08.036. Epub 2018 Sep 11.
- Castro M, Wenzel SE, Bleecker ER, et al. Benralizumab, an anti-interleukin 5 receptor α monoclonal antibody, versus placebo for uncontrolled eosinophilic asthma: a phase 2b randomized dose-ranging study. *Lancet Respir Med*. 2014;2(11):879-890.
- 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.
- Castro M, Corren J, Pavord ID, et al. Dupilumab efficacy and safety in moderate-to-severe uncontrolled asthma. *N Engl J Med*. 2018;378(26):2486-2496. doi: 10.1056/NEJMoa1804092.
- Centers for Disease Control and Prevention. Learn how to control asthma. https://www.cdc.gov/asthma/faqs.htm. Accessed May 13, 2019.
- Cinqair [package insert], information. Frazer, PA: Teva Pharmaceutical Industries Ltd.; January 2019.
- 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.
- Corren J, Kavati A, Ortiz B, et al. Efficacy and safety of omalizumab in children and adolescents with moderate-to-severe asthma: a systematic literature review. *Allergy Asthma Proc*. 2017;38(4):250-263.
- Drugs@FDA: FDA approved drug products. Food and Drug Administration Web site. https://www.accessdata.fda.gov/scripts/cder/daf/. Accessed June 10, 2019.
- Dupixent [package insert], Bridgewater, NJ: Sanofi-Aventis US, LLC and Tarrytown, NY: Regeneron Pharmaceuticals, Inc.; March 2019.
- 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.
- Farne HA, Wilson A, Powell C, Bax L, Milan SJ. Anti-IL5 therapies for asthma. *Cochrane Database Syst Rev*. 2017 Sep 21;9:CD010834.
- Fasenra [package insert], Wilmington, DE: AstraZeneca Pharmaceuticals.; November 2017.
- Ferguson GT, Fitzgerald JM, Beecker ER, et al. Benralizumab for patients with mild to moderate, persistent asthma (BISE): a randomized, double-blind, placebo-controlled, phase 3 trial. *Lancet Respir Med*. 2017;5(7):568-576.
- FitzGerald JM, Bleecker ER, Menzies-Gow A, et al. Predictors of enhanced response with benralizumab for patients with severe asthma: pooled analysis of the SIROCCO and CALIMA studies. *Lancet Respir Med*. 2018;6(1):51-64.
- Fitzgerald JM, Bleecker ER, Nair P, et al. Benralizumab, an anti-interleukin-5 receptor α monoclonal antibody, as add-on treatment for patients with severe, uncontrolled, eosinophilic asthma (CALIMA): a randomized, double-blind, placebo-controlled phase 3 trial. *Lancet*. 2016;388(10056):2128-2141.
- 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. Accessed May 13, 2019.
- Groh M, Pagnoux C, Baldini C, et al. Eosinophilic granulomatosis with polyangiitis (Churg-Strauss) (EGPA) Consensus Task Force recommendations for evaluation and management. *Eur J Intern Med*. 2015;26(7):545-553.
- Global Initiative for Asthma (GINA). Pocket guide for asthma management and prevention (for adults and children older than 5 years). 2019a; www.ginasthma.org. Accessed May 13, 2019.
- Global Initiative for Asthma (GINA). Difficult-to-treat and severe asthma in adolescent and adult patients: diagnosis and management. 2019b; www.ginasthma.org. Accessed May 13, 2019.

- Henriksen DP, Bodtger U, Sidenius K, et al. Efficacy, adverse events, and inter-drug comparison of mepolizumab and reslizumab anti-IL-5 treatments of severe asthma - a systematic review and meta-analysis. *Eur Clin Respir J.* 2018;5(1):1536097. doi: 10.1080/20018525.2018.1536097.
- 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(4):233-240.
- 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.
- Iftikhar IH, Schimmel M, Bender W, et al. Comparative efficacy of anti IL-4, IL-5 and IL-13 drugs for treatment of eosinophilic asthma: a network meta-analysis. *Lung.* 2018;196(5):517-530. doi: 10.1007/s00408-018-0151-5.
- 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 spontaneous urticaria: treatment of refractory symptoms. UpToDate Web site. https://www.uptodate.com. Updated May 10, 2019. Accessed June 10, 2019.
- Khatri S, Moore W, Gibson PG, et al. Assessment of the long-term safety of mepolizumab and durability of clinical response in patients with severe eosinophilic asthma. *J Allergy Clin Immunol.* 2018. pii: S0091-6749(18)31479-9. doi: 10.1016/j.jaci.2018.09.033. [Epub ahead of print]
- 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.
- Ledford D, Busse W, Trzaskoma B, et al. A randomized multicenter study evaluating Xolair persistence of response after long-term therapy. *J Allergy Clin Immunol.* 2017;140(1):162-169.e2.
- Li J, Wang F, Lin C, et al. The efficacy and safety of reslizumab for inadequately controlled asthma with elevated blood eosinophil counts: a systematic review and meta-analysis. *J Asthma.* 2017;54(3):300-307.
- 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.
- 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.
- Maurer M, Rosen K, Hsieh HJ, et al. Omalizumab for the treatment of chronic idiopathic or spontaneous urticaria. *N Engl J Med.* 2013;368:924-935.
- Maurer M, Kaplan A, Rosen K, et al. The XTEND-CIU study: long term use of omalizumab in chronic idiopathic urticaria. *J Allergy Clin Immunol.* 2018;141(3):1138-1139.e7.
- Murphy K, Jacobs J, Bjermer L, et al. Long-term safety and efficacy of reslizumab in patients with eosinophilic asthma. *J Allergy Clin Immunol Pract.* 2017;5(6):1572-1581.e3. doi: 10.1016/j.jaip.2017.08.024.
- Nachef Z, Krishnan A, Mashtare T, Zhuang T, Mador MJ. Omalizumab versus mepolizumab as add-on therapy in asthma patients not well controlled on at least an inhaled corticosteroid: a network meta-analysis. *J Asthma.* 2018;55(1):89-100.
- Nair P, Wenzel S, Rabe KF, et al. Oral glucocorticoid-sparing effect of benralizumab in severe asthma. *N Engl J Med.* 2017;376(25):2448-2458.
- National Heart, Lung, and Blood Institute. Expert Panel Report 3: Guidelines for the diagnosis and management of asthma (guideline on the Internet). NHLBI 2007. http://www.nhlbi.nih.gov/guidelines/asthma/asthgdln.htm. Accessed May 13, 2019.
- 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 [package insert], Philadelphia, PA: GlaxoSmithKline LLC; June 2019.
- 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):549-556.
- Pagnoux C, Groh M. Optimal therapy and prospects for new medicines in eosinophilic granulomatosis with polyangiitis (Churg-Strauss syndrome). *Expert Rev Clin Immunol;*2016;12(10):1059-1067.
- Pavord ID, Korn S, Howarth P, et al. Mepolizumab for severe eosinophilic asthma (DREAM): a multicentre, double-blind, placebo-controlled trial. *Lancet.* 2012;380:651-659.
- Powell RJ, Leech SC, Till S, et al. BSACI guideline for the management of chronic urticaria and angioedema. *Clin Exp Allergy.* 2015;45(3):547-565.
- Purple Book: Lists of licensed biological products with reference product exclusivity and biosimilarity or interchangeability evaluations. Food and Drug Administration Web site. https://www.fda.gov/drugs/biosimilars/purple-book-lists-licensed-biological-products-reference-product-exclusivity-and-biosimilarity-or. Accessed May 13, 2019.
- Rabe KF, Nair P, Brusselle G, et al. Efficacy and safety of dupilumab in glucocorticoid-dependent severe asthma. *N Engl J Med.* 2018;378(26):2475-2485. doi: 10.1056/NEJMoa1804093.
- Rodrigo GJ, Neffen H, Castro-Rodriguez JA. Efficacy and safety of subcutaneous omalizumab vs placebo as add-on therapy to corticosteroids for children and adults with asthma: a systematic review. *Chest.* 2011;139(1):28-35.
- Saini S. Chronic spontaneous urticaria: clinical manifestations, diagnosis, pathogenesis, and natural history. UpToDate Web site. https://www.uptodate.com. Updated October 25, 2018. Accessed June 10, 2019.
- 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.
- Schwartz J, Padmanabhan A, Aqui N, et al. Guidelines on the use of therapeutic apheresis in clinical practice-evidence-based approach from the Writing Committee of the American Society for Apheresis: The seventh special issue. *J Clin Apher.* 2016;31(3):149-162.
- Sidbury R, Davis DM, Cohen DE, Cordoro KM, Berger TG, Bergman JN, et al. Guidelines of care for the management of atopic dermatitis: section 3. Management and treatment with phototherapy and systemic agents. *J Am Acad Dermatol.* 2014;71(2):327-49. doi: 10.1016/j.jaad.2014.03.030
- Simpson EL, Bruin-Weller M, Flohr C, et al. When does atopic dermatitis warrant systemic therapy? Recommendations from an expert panel of the International Eczema Council. *J Am Acad Dermatol.* 2017;77(4):623-633. doi: 10.1016/j.jaad.2017.06.042.

- Simpson EL, Bieber T, Guttman-Yassky E, SOLO 1 and SOLO 2 Investigators, et al. Two phase 3 trials of dupilumab versus placebo in atopic dermatitis. *N Engl J Med*. 2016;375(24):2335-2348.doi:10.1056/NEJMoa1610020.
- 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.
- Thyssen JP, de Bruin-Weller MS, Paller AS, et al. Conjunctivitis in atopic dermatitis patients with and without dupilumab therapy - international eczema council survey and opinion. *J Eur Acad Dermatol Venereol*. 2019. doi: 10.1111/jdv.15608. [Epub ahead of print]
- Tian BP, Zhang GS, Lou J, Zhou HB, Cui W. Efficacy and safety of benralizumab for eosinophilic asthma: A systematic review and meta-analysis of randomized controlled trials. *J Asthma*. 2017. [Epub ahead of print]
- Walford HH, Doherty TA. Diagnosis and management of eosinophilic asthma: a US perspective. J Asthma and Allergy. 2014;7:53-65.
- Wechsler ME, Akuthota P, Jayne D, et al. Mepolizumab or placebo for eosinophilic granulomatosis with polyangiitis. *N Engl J Med*. 2017;376(20):1921-1932.
- Weston WL, Howe W. Atopic dermatitis (eczema): pathogenesis, clinical manifestations, and diagnosis. UpToDate website. http://uptodate.com. Updated May 16, 2019a. Accessed June 10, 2019.
- Weston WL, Howe W. Treatment of atopic dermatitis (eczema). UpToDate website. http://uptodate.com. Updated April 23, 2019b. Accessed June 10, 2019.
- Wollenberg A, Barbarot S, Bieber T, et al. Consensus-based European guidelines for treatment of atopic eczema (atopic dermatitis) in adults and children: part II. *J Eur Acad Dermatol Venereol*. 2018;32(6):850-878. doi: 10.1111/jdv.14888.
- Xolair [package insert], South San Francisco, CA: Genentech, Inc. and East Hanover, NJ:Novartis Pharmaceuticals; May 2019.
- 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.
- Zayed Y, Kheiri B, Banifadel M, et al. Dupilumab safety and efficacy in uncontrolled asthma: a systematic review and meta-analysis of randomized clinical trials. *J Asthma*. 2018:1-10. doi: 10.1080/02770903.2018.1520865.
- 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. *Allergy*. 2018;73(7):1393-1414.doi: 10.1111/all.13397.

Publication Date: June 10, 2019