

Clinically significant improvements in patient-reported outcomes (PROs) in patients with a generalized pustular psoriasis (GPP) flare treated with spesolimab

Alexander A. Navarini¹, Manuelle Viguier², Tsen-Fang Tsai³, Akimichi Morita⁴, Jörg C. Prinz⁵, Ming Tang⁶, Mogana Sivalingam⁷, Christian Thoma⁸, Mark G. Lebwohl⁹

¹Department of Dermatology, University Hospital Basel, Basel, Switzerland; ²Department of Dermatology, Venereology, National Taiwan University Hospital and National Taiwan University College of Medicine, Taipei, Taiwan; ⁴Department of Geriatric and Environmental Dermatology, Nagoya City University Graduate School of Medical Sciences, Nagoya, Japan; ⁵Department of Dermatology and Allergology, Ludwig-Maximilian-University Munich, Munich, Germany; ⁶Boehringer Ingelheim (China) Investment Co., Ltd, Shanghai, China; ⁷Boehringer Ingelheim International GmbH, Ingelheim, Germany; Boehringer Ingelheim International GmbH, Biberach, Germany; Icahn School of Medicine at Mount Sinai, New York, NY, USA



In Effisayil 1, patients with a GPP flare who were treated with IV spesolimab 900 mg had clinically significant improvements from baseline, as assessed by MCIDs, in the PROs of pain, fatigue, overall QoL, and cutaneous symptoms

PURPOSE

To determine the impact of spesolimab on the achievement of MCIDs in PROs for patients with a GPP flare in the Effisayil 1 study.

INTRODUCTION

- GPP is a rare and potentially life-threatening skin disease characterized by recurrent flares of sterile, visible pustules, that can occur with or without systemic inflammation^{1–3}
- In the multicenter, randomized, double-blind, placebo-controlled Effisayil 1 study (NCT03782792) in patients presenting with a GPP flare, treatment with spesolimab, an anti-IL-36 receptor antibody, led to rapid pustular and skin clearance within 1 week compared with placebo⁴
- Primary endpoint (GPPGA pustulation subscore of 0; no visible pustules): 54% vs 6% (one-sided p<0.001)
- Key secondary endpoint (GPPGA total score of 0 or 1; clear or almost clear skin): 43% vs 11% (one-sided p=0.0118)
- Symptoms of GPP flares can be severe, and include pain, itching, and fatigue that can impact overall patient QoL^{5,6}
- Here, we assess the proportion of patients in Effisayil 1 who achieved pre-defined MCIDs in pain VAS, FACIT-Fatigue, DLQI, and PSS, after treatment with IV spesolimab 900 mg

CONCLUSIONS

- In Effisayil 1, patients who received spesolimab treatment for GPP flares achieved clinically significant improvements from baseline in the PROs of pain, fatigue, overall QoL, and cutaneous symptoms
- Patients in the placebo arm demonstrated similar improvements in all PROs to patients in the spesolimab arm after receiving an optional dose of OL IV spesolimab 900 mg at Day 8
- These results support the use of spesolimab for the treatment of patients with a GPP flare

METHODS

- All four PROs were measured on Day 1, Day 8, and Weeks 2–4, 8, and 12 to monitor changes in these outcomes over time. PSS scores were also measured on Day 2 and Day 3
- Scan the QR code at the bottom of this poster to see full details of the Effisayil 1 study design^{4,11}

RESULTS

PRO survey multiple-choice answers, their corresponding scores, and definitions of MCIDs

Pain VAS

- Measures intensity of pain
- Score is determined by measuring the distance (mm) on the 100 mm line between the 'no pain' anchor and the patient's mark, with a higher score indicating greater pain intensity
- MCID defined as a 30-point decrease from baseline⁷
- Recall period: current pain

No pain

0

100 mm

FACIT-Fatigue

- 13-item auestionnaire
- Measures self-reported fatigue and its impact on daily activities and function
- Each answer is based on a 5-point scale; when totalled gives a score range of 0–52
- MCID defined as a 4-point improvement from baseline⁸
- Recall period: 1 week

High impact	Low
-------------	-----

DLQI

- 10-item questionnaire
- Assesses six domains of QoL: symptoms and feelings, daily activities, leisure, work and school, personal relationships, and treatment
- Calculated by summing the scores of each question, resulting in a total score range of 0–30
- MCID defined as a 4-point decrease from baseline⁹
- Recall period: 1 week

No effec	Small t effect	Moderate effect	Very large effect	Extremely large e
0				
0–1	2–5	6–10	11–20	21–30

PSS

- 4-item questionnaire
- Measures severity of pain, redness, itching, and burning
- Symptom severity assessed using a 5-point scale ranging from 0 (none) to 4 (very severe); when totalled gives a score range of 0–16
- MCID defined as a 2-point decrease from baseline¹⁰
- Recall period: 24 hours

Less severe	More
0 <	

High total PRO scores indicate a large impairment or intense severity, except for FACIT-Fatigue, for which a higher score represents less fatigue. MCIDs are defined based on the literature

Disclosures & Acknowledgements

Abbreviations CL confidence interval: DLQL Dermatology Life Quality Index: FACIT-Fatigue, Functional Assessment of Chronic Illness Therapy – Fatigue: FDA, US Food and Drug Administration GPP, generalized pustular psoriasis; GPPGA, Generalized Pustular Psoriasis Physician Global Assessment; IL-36, interleukin-36; ITT, intention-to-treat; IV, intravenous; MCID, minimal clinically important difference; OL, open label; pain VAS, pain visual analog scale; PRO, patient-reported outcome; PSS, Psoriasis Symptom Scale; QoL, quality of life.

References

1. Navarini AA, et al. J Eur Acad Dermatol Venereol 2017;31:1792–1799; 2. Bachelez H. Acta Derm Venereol 2020;100:adv00034; 3. Ryan TJ and Baker H. Br J Dermatol 1971;85:407– 411; 4. Bachelez H, et al. N Engl J Med 2021;85:2431-2440; 5. Choon SE, et al. Int J Dermatol 2014;53:676-684; 6. Strober B, et al. J Med 2021;85:8431-2440; 5. Choon SE, et al. Int J Dermatol 2014;53:676-684; 6. Strober B, et al. J Med 2021;85:2431-2440; 5. Choon SE, et al. J Rheumatol 2005;32:811–819; 9. Basra MK, et al. Dermatology 2015;230:27–33; 10. Rentz AM, et al. J Dermatolog Treat 2020;31:460-469; 11. Choon SE, et al. BMJ Open 2021;11:e043666.

blimab is an investigational drug and is currently undergoing Priority Review by the FDA for the treatment of GPP flares. The study was supported and funded by Boehringer Ingelheim. Speciality of a link subject and of the first of the firs Education in Dermatology, Helsinn, LEO Pharma, Meiji, Mindera, Pfizer, and Verrica, and research grants from AbbVie, Amgen, Arcutis, Avotres, Boehringer Ingelheim, Dermatologics, Regeneron, and UCB. The authors met criteria for authorship as recommended by the International Committee of Medical Journal Editors (ICMJE). The authors did not receive payment related to the development of the poster. Boehringer Ingelheim was given the opportunity to review the poster for medical and scientific accuracy, as well as intellectual property considerations. Geetha Vilventhraraja of OPEN Health Communications (London, UK) provided writing, editorial, and formatting support, which was contracted and funded by Boehringer Ingelheim.







Scan QR code for an interactive, electronic, device-friendly copy of this poster https://bit.lv/3aLFO7m





