20 years after the first biologic in IBD What do we still need from drugs?







THE UNIVERSITY of EDINBURGH





CENTRE FOR GENOMIC & EXPERIMENTAL MEDICINE

Disclosures

Professor Lees is funded by a UKRI Future Leaders Fellowship

Additional research support from: Chief Scientist's Office, Cure Crohn's Colitis

Consultancy fees from:

Abbvie, Pfizer, Janssen, Gilead, Galapagos, BMS, Boehringer Ingelheim, Dr Falk, Trellus Health, Iterative Scopes and Vifor Pharma

Speaking fees and travel support from:

Abbvie, Pfizer, Janssen, Gilead, Galapagos, BMS, Sandoz, Novartis, Dr Falk, Ferring, Fresnius Kabi and Takeda

All cases presented with written consent of patients



OVERVIEW

Our patients and life without proper therapy

The different phases of IBD therapy

• IBD-1.0 through to IBD-2.0

Treatment strategies & drug sequencing with current therapies

- The importance of early effective therapy
- Anti-TNFs versus JAKi and the new biologics

The unmet need after we deploy the new therapies

And the solution?

• IBD-3.0



IBD-1.0 Drugs are ineffective

2003

2007

Steroids are prescribed liberally

Patients have a poor quality of life

Treatment targets are non-existent





New therapies are expensive

WE have no clue how to use them properly

Surgery, stomas, hospitalisations, gut failure are common

BGenetics











Based on clinician's own data

Lothian IBD Registry UPDATE

Colectomy for UC: temporal trends



How does IBD impact on a person's life?

Physical aspects

- diarrhoea, urgency, blood in stool and pain
- joint pains, eye problems, skin rashes and mouth ulcers
- night sweats and fevers; nausea and vomiting, loss of appetite and weight loss

Psychological aspects

• fatigue and mental exhaustion; anxiety and depression

Long-term complications of the disease

• hospitalisations for flares; surgical interventions; stoma formation

Everyday life

- spending more time in the bathroom
- impact on studies and work including absence and choice of job
- relationships and sex life, family planning and pregnancy
- food choices may be restricted to manage / avoid flares





The problem with TNF drugs



Multiple mechanisms for biologic failure



Modified from Atreya R, Neurath MF. Lancet Gastroenterol Hepatol 2018;3:790-802.



Kennedy NA et al Lancet Gastroenterol Hepatol. 2019 May;4(5):341-353. doi: 10.1016/S2468-1253(19)30012-3. Epub 2019 Feb 27.

Smoking and risk of immunogenicity



Kennedy NA et al Lancet Gastroenterol Hepatol. 2019 May;4(5):341-353. doi: 10.1016/S2468-1253(19)30012-3. Epub 2019 Feb 27.

Edinburgh IBD Unit USTE experience



Dose intensification

Drug persistence



Derikix L et al ECCO 2022

IBD-2.1









Turner D, et al. Gastroenterology 2021











Turner D, et al. Gastroenterology 2021











Jenkinson P et al Journal Crohn's Colitis 2020



Jenkinson P et al ECCO 2022 https://www.ecco-ibd.eu/publications/congress-abstracts/item/p489-temporal-trends-of-colectomy-for-ulcerative-colitis-in-the-multi-drug-era-a-population-basedcohort-study.html Accessed June 2022

Based on clinician's own data



Lothian IBD Registry UPDATE



10-year trends in hospitalisations in the Lothian IBD population





IBD-2.3



Steroid-free remission in Crohn's disease trials



ADA, adalimumab; CS, corticosteroid; EOW, every other week; IFX, infliximab; PBO, placebo; Q8W, every 8 weeks, RZB, risankizumab; SFR, steroid-free remission; USTE, ustekinumab; VDZ, vedolizumab. Figures adapted from 1. Hanauer SB, et al. *Lancet*. 2002;359;1541–9; 2. Colombel JF, et al. *Gastroenterology*. 2007;132:52–65; 3. Feagan BG, et al. *N Engl J Med*. 2016;375:1946–60; 4. Sandborn WJ, et al. *N Engl J Med*. 2013;369:711–21; 5. Schreiber S, et al. Presented at the 17th Congress of the European Crohn's and Colitis Organisation, Virtual: DOP82.

SEQUENCE: RZB versus UST in Crohn's disease



Mandatory steroid taper beginning at week 2

Key Eligibility Criteria



Moderate to severe Crohn's disease

CDAI 220-450

Average daily SF \geq 4 and/or average daily APS \geq 2 SES-CD \geq 6 (\geq 4 for isolated ileal disease)

Stratification Factors:

- Number of prior anti-TNF failure (1, > 1)
- Corticosteroid use at baseline (yes or no)]



Prior failure of ≥1 anti-TNF therapies



Mean time to discontinuation of study drug: RZB182.6 days versus UST 156.3 days

SEQUENCE: primary endpoints

RZB non-inferior to UST for clinical remission at week 24 and RZB superior to UST for endoscopic remission at week 48



SEQUENCE: ranked secondary endpoints (ITT)

RZB demonstrated superiority to UST for all secondary endpoints


IBD-2.3





JAK inhibitors in UC: clinical remission after induction

Note: This is not a head-to-head comparison of different therapies





UPA in UC: clinical response rates during induction

U-ACCOMPLISH **Clinical response (per partial Clinical response (per partial** adapted Mayo Score) over time¹ adapted Mayo Score) over time² 100 100-PBO (n=154[†]) • PBO (n=174[‡]) UPA 45 mg QD (n=319) UPA 45 mg QD (n=341[‡]) Clinical response at Week 2 is one of the *** 80 80 ranked secondary endpoints *** *** Patients, % 60 60 40 40 20 20 0 0 2 6 8 2 6 Δ Weeks Weeks

8

UPA in UC: symptom improvement in first days



UPA in UC: bowel urgency and fatigue during induction



Change from baseline in FACIT-F²

(CL)

JAK inhibitors in UC: clinical remission at 1 year

Note: This is not a head-to-head comparison of different therapies





UPA in Crohn's: co-primary data week 12





UPA in Crohn's: co-primary maintenance data U-ENDURE 7



PRAC Article 20

CHMP has endorsed the recommendations by the PRAC to miminise the risk of Serious side effects from JAK inhibitors used to treat multiple immune mediated diseases

These medicines (*) should only be used in the following patients where no other treatment options area available

- Aged 65 years or over
- Increased risk of major adverse cardiovascular outcomes
- Those who smoke or who have done for a long time in the past
- Use with caution in those with risk factors for clots in the lungs or deep veins (other than to those above)
- Doses should be decreased in those who are at risk for MACE, DVT or cancer where possible

* EMA concluded that the identified risk applies to all JAK inhibitors approved for the treatment of chronic inflammatory disorders



ECCO Standpoint on JAK inhibitors

When extrapolating findings from ORAL surveillance it is important to consider both differences in epidemiology and risk factors in UC vs RA patients

The pathogenesis of IBD and RA are different



than those with RA

Patients with IBD are less likely to have comorbidities such as hypertension and

diabetes



Patients with IBD have a lower active smoking habit is also very low (10-15%) and a lower baseline CV risk



No increased risk of MACE or malignancy was identified in the overall tofacitinib-treated UC population up to 7.8 years of follow-up

- All 3 JAKi differ in terms of selectivity, dose, cytokine inhibition, efficacy & safety profile
- Treatment decisions should be determined by patient profile, benefit-risk profile
- Positioning of JAKi's should be kept before or after biologics •



Network Meta-analysis of advanced therapies in UC: induction of clinical remission and endoscopic improvement¹

Upadacitinib	2.70	4.49	6.15	2.84	4.91	2.92	3.56	3.00	4.64	2.70	9.54
	(1.18-6.20)	(2.18-9.24)	(2.98-12.72)	(1.28-6.31)	(2.59-9.31)	(1.31-6.51)	(1.84-6.91)	(1.32-6.82)	(2.47-8.71)	(1.18-6.20)	(5.45-16.69)
3.01	Ozanimod	1.65	2.27	1.05	1.81	1.07	1.31	1.10	1.71	0.93	3.52
(1.59-5.67)		(0.77-3.55)	(1.05-4.89)	(0.45-2.41)	(0.91-3.60)	(0.46-2.49)	(0.65-2.67)	(0.47-2.61)	(0.87-3.37)	(0.47-1.85)	(1.91-6.49)
2.91	0.97	Filgotinib	1.37	0.63	1.09	0.65	0.79	0.66	1.03	0.56	2.12
(1.19-7.10)	(0.39-2.39)	200 mg	(0.71-2.62)	(0.30-1.31)	(0.63-1.89)	(0.31-1.35)	(0.44-1.41)	(0.31-1.42)	(0.60-1.77)	(0.32-0.97)	(1.34-3.35)
5.96	1.98	2.04	Filgotinib	0.46	0.79	0.47	0.57	0.48	0.75	0.41	1.54
(2.35-15.14)	(0.77-5.09)	(0.66-6.33)	100 mg	(0.22-0.95)	(0.45-1.39)	(0.22-0.99)	(0.32-1.03)	(0.22-1.03)	(0.43-1.30)	(0.23-0.71)	(0.97-2.45)
3.05 (1.68-5.51)	1.01 (0.55-1.86)	1.04 (0.43-2.50)	0.51 (0.20-1.27)	Tofacitinib	1.72 (0.90-3.29)	1.02 (0.45-2.30)	1.25 (0.64-2.45)	1.05 (0.46-2.41)	1.63 (0.86-3.08)	0.89 (0.46-1.69)	3.35 (1.90-5.91) 1.94 (1.42-2.64)
4.71	1.56	1.61	0.78	1.54	Etrolizumab	0.59	0.72	0.61	0.94	0.51	1.94
(2.83-7.83)	(0.92-2.66)	(0.71-3.65)	(0.33-1.86)	(0.96-2.48)		(0.31-1.14)	(0.48-1.08)	(0.31-1.21)	(0.69-1.29)	(0.36-0.72)	(1.42-2.64)
3.45	1.14	1.18	0.57	1.13	0.73	Ustekinumab	1.22	1.02	1.59	0.86	3.26
(1.90-6.24)	(0.62-2.11)	(0.49-2.83)	(0.23-1.44)	(0.64-1.99)	(0.45-1.18)		(0.62-2.39)	(0.44-2.35)	(0.83-3.02)	(0.45-1.66)	(1.83-5.79)
4.71	1.56	1.61	0.79	1.54	1.00	1.36	Vedolizumab	0.84	1.30	0.71	2.67
(2.68-8.28)	(0.87-2.81)	(0.68-3.79)	(0.32-1.93)	(0.90-2.63)	(0.64-1.55)	(0.79-2.33)		(0.41-1.68)	(0.96-1.74)	(0.45-1.10)	(1.87-3.80)
4.52 (2.55-8.01)	1.50 (0.83-2.72)	1.54 (0.65-3.65)	0.75 (0.30-1.86)	1.48 (0.86-2.55)	0.95 (0.61-1.51)	1.31 (0.76-2.26)	0.95 (0.57-1.60)	Golimumab	1.54 (0.79-3.01)	0.84 (0.43-1.65)	3.17 (1.74-5.79)
5.41	1.79	1.85	0.90	1.77	1.14	1.56	1.15	1.19	Adalimumab	0.54	2.05
(3.30-8.86)	(1.07-3.01)	(0.82-4.15)	(0.38-2.12)	(1.11-2.81)	(0.88-1.49)	(0.98-2.48)	(0.75-1.75)	(0.77-1.84)		(0.37-0.79)	(1.54-2.73)
2.75 (1.66-4.55)	0.91 (0.54-1.54)	0.94 (0.41-2.14)	0.46 (0.19-1.09)	0.90 (0.56-1.44)	0.58 (0.43-0.78)	0.79 (0.49-1.27)	0.58 (0.37-0.91)	0.60 (0.39-0.95)	0.51 (0.37-0.69)	Infliximab	3.76 (2.77-5.12)
8.23	2.74	2.82	1.38	2.71	1.74	1.74	1.74	1.82	1.52	3.00	Placebo
(5.32-12.75)	(1.72-4.34)	(1.30-6.12)	(0.60-3.14)	(1.81-4.02)	(1.34-2.26)	(1.34-2.26)	(1.22-2.49)	(1.25-2.63)	(1.21-1.92)	(2.33-3.82)	
Endoscopic improvement											

1. Lasa JS, et al. *Lancet Gastroenterol Hepatol.* 2022;7(2):161-170.

But are things actually getting better?









Raine and Danese *Gastro* 2022





Right drug, right person, right time



We still have a major PREDICTION problem



Stratification of patients

DISEASE BEHAVIOUR

• Aggressive vs quiescent disease

DRUG RESPONSE

- Predicting treatment response COMPLICATIONS
- Who gets complications of drugs / disease





These are the patients we risk over-treating

Approximately one-third of patients with IBD Predicting who they are at diagnosis is remarkably difficult



These are the patients we risk under-treating

At the very least, start a biologic at diagnosis for patients with:

- extensive small bowel disease, peri-anal disease, rectal involvement and deep ulcers

IFX plus AZA for higher risk; ADA monotherapy for others























Our decisions are driven by

- Cost
- Guidelines
- Local availability
- Experience / familiarity
- Limited head-to-head data
- The latest network meta—analysis
- Real world evidence with propensity matching
- And the hype from the latest conference / marketing

WE ARE PERSONALISING MEDICINE

BUT ... this is **not yet** precision medicine

What are the key decisions / unknowns

FIRST DRUG in Crohn's to induce and maintain remission for 5+ years

- anti-TNF (really?) versus USTE versus RISA versus UPA
- versus combo JAKi plus p19 or anti-integrin and maintenance

AFTER first TNF failure

- second anti-TNF or RISA or UPA

FIRST DRUG in UC?????????

- p40 versus p19
- anti-integrin versus S1P modulator
- JAKi versus JAKi

After JAKi failure – another JAKi or out of class



✓ Treat symptoms

- ✓ Control gut inflammation
- ✓ Minimise steroid exposure
- ✓ Keep patient out of hospital
- ✓ Prevent the disease from progressing
- ✓ Decrease surgery and stoma formation
- Minimise complications from drugs and disease



Where should we focus our efforts?

- 1. Building solid evidence
- 2. Fistula and stricture therapy
- 3. Microbial and dietary strategies
- 4. Rational combinations of therapies
- 5. Special populations: children especially
- 6. Delivery of high-quality care to all patients
- 7. Biomarker discovery to enable precision medicine
- 8. Psychological and holistic approaches to enhance care
- 9. Frictionless and passive monitoring that work for patients



Is this really a new life for our patients? "good progress, but more work to do"

