Characteristics of MS Patients Treated With PR-Fampridine in a Real-world Setting Based on the NeuroTransData Network in Germany



P633



Braune S¹, Grimm S², van Hövell P², Heer Y², Meergans M³, Hyde R³, Bergmann A¹, **NTD Study Group**¹

¹NeuroTransData, Neuburg, Germany; ²PricewaterhouseCoopers AG, Zürich, Switzerland; ³Biogen, Baar, Switzerland

Introduction

- In controlled clinical trials, treatment with prolonged-release fampridine (PR-FAM) resulted in clinically meaningful improvements in self-reported walking ability vs. placebo in patients with all subtypes of multiple sclerosis (MS).¹⁻⁴
- During the past 7 years, real-world data of PR-FAM have accrued and may inform on patient characteristics, treatment persistence and effectiveness in the in-label (Expanded Disability Status Scale [EDSS] score 4–7)⁵ post-approval setting.
- NeuroTransData (NTD) is a German network of office-based neurologists documenting in-depth practice-based data for patients with MS and constitutes the first analysis of a multicentre real-world

Table 1. Baseline characteristics

	All PR-FAM-	By PR-FAM res	ponder status
Characteristic ^a	treated patients N=1163	Non-responder N=341	Responder N=822
Mean (SD) age, y	50.9 (10.9)	52.2 (11.8)	50.3 (10.4)
Female, %	66.2	66.3	66.2
Mean (SD) time since first symptoms, mo	190.4 (120.1)	189.9 (129.4)	190.7 (116.1)
Mean (SD) no. of relapses in prior 12 months	0.34 (0.66)	0.35 (0.66)	0.33 (0.67)
No. of relapses in 12 months before fampridine, %			
0	74.3	72.4	75.1
1	19.9	21.7	19.2
2	4.3	4.7	4.1
3	1.0	0.6	1.2
4+	0.4	0.6	0.4
MS subtype, %			
PPMS	9.5	9.7	9.5
RRMS	59.1	60.7	58.4
SPMS	31.4	29.6	32.1
Prior DMT, %			
0	49.3	49.6	49.1
1	26.5	25.2	27.0
2	14.1	14.4	14.0
3	6.7	7.9	6.2
4+	3.4	2.9	3.6
Background DMT, %			
Interferon/GA	29.3	29.0	29.4
Oral	13.9	14.1	13.9
High efficacy	7.7	7.0	8.0
No DMT	49.0	49.9	48.7
Physiotherapy, yes, %	66.0	67.2	65.5
Sustained 12-week EDSS progression in 24 months before PR-FAM, yes, %	23.6	25.2	23.0
Mean (SD) EDSS score (within ±12 weeks)	4.8 (1.4)	4.8 (1.5)	4.9 (1.4)
Mean (SD) MSSS score since first MS symptoms	1.0 (11.8)	1.8 (20.3)	0.7 (4.9)

Table 2. Baseline characteristics used to generate propensity scores in the matching process of PR-FAM responders and non-responders (post-matching characteristics)

Characteristic ^a	PR-FAM non-responder N=160	PR-FAM responder N=160	Standardised difference	<i>P</i> value
Mean (SD) age, y	53.4 (12.5)	51.8 (10.4)	0.139	.337
Sex, %			0.026	.907
Male	34.4	35.6		
Female	65.6	64.4		
Mean (SD) time since first		106 7 (112 2)	0 4 2 2	200

data cohort for PR-FAM.

Objectives

- The primary objectives of this observational study were to characterise patients with MS exposed to PR-FAM and investigate persistence with PR-FAM, including predictors, in a descriptive manner.
- The secondary objective was to compare change in EDSS ambulation score over time between propensity score-matched responders and non-responders in a descriptive manner.

Methods

- Patient data were captured prospectively by NTD centres during out-patients visits.
- Patients were included in this analysis based on the availability of baseline data (e.g., MS subtype, background disease-modifying therapy, EDSS score, use of physiotherapy and PR-FAM exposure).

Populations Analysed

- All PR-FAM-treated patients with data as of 1 July 2018 (N=1163).
- A subset of patients with an EDSS score of 4–7 and systematic capturing of total EDSS and EDSS ambulation at baseline and Month 6 was selected for the propensity score–matched analysis of responders vs. non-responders (N=495).
- Responders were defined as patients who persisted on PR-FAM treatment for \geq 3 months (3 months is the most prevalent frequency of assessment in the NTD network database and the earliest potential documentation of such status);
- Non-responders were defined as patients stopping PR-FAM within 3 months due to any reason.

Outcomes

- A univariate Cox regression was performed in the cohort of PR-FAM-treated patients with no missing data for candidate predictors (n=1104) to assess the influence of potential baseline predictors on PR-FAM discontinuation due to lack of effectiveness. A similar analysis was performed examining discontinuation due to adverse events (data not shown).
- Propensity score matching was conducted to compare PR-FAM responders and non-responders.
- aling abaracteristics about in Table 2 including EDSS

PR-FAM = prolonged-release tampridine; RRMS = relapsing-remitting multiple scierosis; SPMS = secondary progressive multiple sclerosis ^aAt PR-FAM initiation unless otherwise specified

symptoms, mo 202.8 (128.9) 186.7 (113.3) 0.133.399 0.062 .713 Relapse in prior 3 months, % 90.6 88.8 0 11.2 9.4 Sustained 12-week EDSS 0.028 progression in prior 24 months, % .9 73.8 72.5 No Yes 26.2 27.5 MS subtype, % 0.102 .662 PPMS 12.5 9.4 RRMS 56.9 58.1 SPMS 30.6 32.5 -0.01 .764 Mean (SD) no. of prior DMTs 0.93 (1.14) 0.94 (1.27) Mean (SD) 1 (0–7) Median (range) 1 (0–6) Prior DMT type, % 0.114 .793 Interferon/GA 31.2 34.4 Oral 12.5 13.8 High efficacy 9.4 8.1 No DMT 48.1 42.5 Physiotherapy, % 0.109 .404 22.5 18.1 No 77.5 81.9 Yes Mean (SD) EDSS score 5.21 (1.00) 5.27 (1.01) -0.059 (within ±12 weeks) .611 EDSS ambulation score, % 0.102 .843 11.9 13.8 0 58.1 53.1 1-4 26.2 5–6 23.8 6.9 6.2 C-statistic^b 0.569 Median (IQR) follow-up time, mo 11.5 (2.2–36.6) 21.6 (9.7–55.1) DMT = disease-modifying therapy; EDSS = Expanded Disability Status Scale; GA = glatiramer acetate; IQR = interquartile range; MS = multiple sclerosis; PPMS = primary progressive multiple sclerosis; PR-FAM = prolonged-release fampridine; RRMS = relapsing-remitting multiple sclerosis; SPMS = secondary progressive multiple sclerosis; standardised difference = Cohen's d (effect size) ^aAt PR-FAM initiation unless otherwise specified

^bC-statistic is a measure of balance in matched data and ranges from 0.5–1.0, with the minimum value indicating that the propensity score model is perfectly balanced and has no ability to discriminate between the cohorts after matching

Figure 1. Candidate predictors of PR-FAM discontinuation due to LoE^a

Less likely to discontinue due to LoF

- All baseline characteristics shown in Table 2, including EDSS				
and EDSS ambulation scores, were used in the derivation of the propensity score analysis			HR (95% CI)	<i>P</i> value ^c
properisity score analysis.	Age	•	1.008 (0.995–1.021)	.239
 Longitudinal analyses were conducted to describe the clinical course, including EDSS ambulation scores. 	Female vs. male ^b		0.783 (0.595–1.031)	.081
 For the analysis, EDSS assessments have been assigned to baseline (defined as PR-FAM initiation), Month 6 and Month 12. 	SPMS vs. PPMS ^b RRMS vs. PPMS ^b	•	1.189 (0.719–1.967) 1.032 (0.636–1.675)	.592
 Change in EDSS ambulation score was assessed from baseline (from PR-FAM initiation) and a roving baseline (as adapted from 	ARR 12 months before PR-FAM ARR 24 months before PR-FAM		 → 0.999 (0.814−1.227) → 1.116 (0.869−1.432) 	.996 .39
 Kappos <i>et al.</i>⁶). Proportions of patients with at least a 1-point score improvement 	Sustained 12-week EDSS progression in prior 24 months (yes vs. no ^b)		1.142 (0.841–1.549)	.395
(from baseline) vs. patients who did not improve (were stable	Months being followed before PR-FAM initiation	•	1 (0.999–1.002)	.942
or progressed) in EDSS ambulation score (not confirmed) were analysed using a generalised estimating equations logistic	Months since first symptom manifestations	•	1 (0.999–1.001)	.655
regression model.	Physiotherapy (vs. no physiotherapy ^b)		— 1.37 (1.013–1.852)	.041
 Odds ratios (ORs) were used as a measure of treatment effect. 	EDSS at PR-FAM initiation within ±12 weeks		 1.094 (0.995–1.203) 	.063
Results	High efficacy DMT (vs. interferon/GA ^b) Oral DMT (vs. interferon/GA ^b) No DMT (vs. interferon/GA ^b)		0.741 (0.415–1.323) 0.896 (0.573–1.4) 1.028 (0.753–1.404)	.66
 As of 1 July 2018, 1163 patients were exposed to PR-FAM in 	≥1 prior DMT (yes vs. no♭)		0.987 (0.754-1.291)	.921
63 NTD centres.	No. of previous DMTs (unique count)		- 0.98 (0.871–1.103)	.738
 Baseline characteristics are described for the whole cohort and by responder status (Table 1). 	MSSS		0.998 (0.981–1.014)	.786
 In all PR-FAM—treated patients, 70.7% (822/1163) were responders and 29.3% (341/1163) were non-responders. 	C).1 HR (95%	% CI)	10

ARR = annualised relapse rate; DMT = disease-modifying therapy; EDSS = Expanded Disability Status Scale; GA = glatiramer acetate; HR = hazard ratio; LoE = lack of effectiveness; MSSS = Multiple Sclerosis Severity Score; PPMS = primary progressive multiple sclerosis; PR-FAM = prolonged-release fampridine; RRMS = relapsing-remitting multiple sclerosis; SPMS = secondary progressive multiple sclerosis ^aIncludes 1104 patients with available data for all candidate predictors ^bReference category ^cP values based on Wald test

months for non-responders. - The demographics of the different groups are representative of the overall population initially treated with PR-FAM.

The median (interquartile range [IQR]) exposure to PR-FAM

32.9 (14.6–59.2) months for responders and 0.6 (0.5–1.4)

was 17.4 (2.0–48.2) months for all PR-FAM-treated patients,

- Based on 1104 patients with available data for all candidate predictors, a univariate prediction model for FAM discontinuation due to lack of effectiveness found that response to PR-FAM was independent of baseline disease characteristics (Figure 1).
- A sensitivity analysis based on a multivariable Cox regression was performed and revealed consistent results (data not shown).
- Four hundred ninety-five patients (responders, n=335 [68%]; non-responders, n=160 [32%]) had EDSS and EDSS ambulation scores fitting the inclusion criteria. Propensity score matching resulted in 160 responder and non-responder pairs with similar post-matched baseline characteristics and treatment history

Figure 2. Propensity score distribution (A) before and (B) after matching



Figure 3. Change in EDSS ambulation score at Months 6 and 12 in propensity score-matched PR-FAM responders and non-responders from (A) baseline (PR-FAM initiation) and (B) roving baseline



(Table 2, Figure 2).

- The C-statistic was 0.569.
- Median (IQR) follow-up time was greater in responders vs. nonresponders (21.6 [9.7–55.1] months vs. 11.5 [2.2–36.6] months).
- A greater percentage of PR-FAM responders demonstrated improvement in EDSS ambulation score compared with nonresponders at Months 6 and 12 (Figure 3).
- All included patients had a Month 6 EDSS ambulation measurement but there were patients with missing values at Month 12.
- Reasons for missing patients at Month 12 included: insufficient follow-up time (responders 6.9% [11/160]; non-responders, 21.9% [35/160]) and DMT/physiotherapy change (responders 17.5% [28/160]; non-responders, 22.5% [36/160]).
- Responders were more likely than non-responders to show improvement vs. no improvement (stable or progressed) from baseline on EDSS ambulation score at Month 6 (OR [95% CI], 1.69 [0.81–3.52]) and Month 12 (OR [95% CI], 2.55 [1.19–5.46]; Figure 3A).
- The percentage of patients with progression in EDSS ambulation score (not confirmed) at Month 6 was similar between responders and non-responders. At Month 12, a slightly greater percentage of nonresponders progressed; however, these results should be interpreted with caution due to the observed imbalance of missing data.

Limitations

- The degree to which changes in EDSS ambulation score reflect changes in conventional measures of walking speed used in the randomised clinical trial setting (e.g., Timed 25-Foot Walk) is not yet known.
- The impact of the decrease in available patients at Month 12 may limit the interpretation of these analyses.
- Future analyses will investigate confirmed measures of ambulation improvement, stability and progression.

30.0 18.2 20.0 13.1 11.2 8.3 8.1 6.7 10.0-5.6 5.6 0.0 (n=138)(n=130) (n=13) (n=21) (n=10) (n=10) (n=73) (n=89) (n=6) (n=22) (n=9) (n=9) Stable Improved Progressed Stable Progressed Improved Month 6 Month 12 EDSS ambulatory score change from baseline (B) OR (95% CI), OR (95% CI), 1.69 (0.81-3.52) 2.91 (1.11-4.72) *P*=.150 100.0_{1} *P*=.002 90.0 86.2 84.3 81.2 76.9 80.0 | _% 70.01 60.0 Patients, 50.0 40.0 30.0 20.7 20.0 13.1 9.0 8.1 5.6 10.0 5.6 2.5 0.0 (n=138) (n=130) (n=13) (n=21) (n=75) (n=93) (n=9) (n=9) (n=6) (n=3) (n=8) (n=25) Stable Improved Stable Progressed Improved Progressed Month 6 Month 12 EDSS ambulatory score change from roving baseline

EDSS = Expanded Disability Status Scale; OR = odds ratio; PR-FAM = prolonged-release fampridine

Conclusions

- In this study of PR-FAM-treated patients in a real-world setting, 71% persisted on PR-FAM treatment for ≥3 months with a median (IQR) exposure of 32.9 (14.6–59.2) months for the responders group.
- PR-FAM discontinuation due to lack of effectiveness was not significantly associated with baseline disease characteristics; thus, PR-FAM has the potential to provide benefits across a broad range of MS populations.
- Responders were more likely than non-responders to show improvement vs. no improvement (stable or progressed) from baseline on EDSS ambulation score at Month 6 (OR [95% CI], 1.69 [0.81–3.52]) and Month 12 (OR [95% CI], 2.55 [1.19–5.46]).

References 1. Goodman AD, et al.; Fampridine MS-F203 Investigators. Lancet. 2009;373(9665):732-738. 2. Goodman AD, et al. Hult Scler. 2016;22(2):212-221. 4. Hobart J, et al. Prolonged-release fampridine induces sustained clinically meaningful improvements in walking ability in people with multiple sclerosis: results from the ENHANCE trial. Presented at: 69th Annual Meeting of the American Academy of Neurology; April 22–28, 2017; Boston, MA. 5. European Medicines Agency. Fampyra 10 mg prolonged-release tablets [summary of product_Information/human/002097/WC500109956.pdf. Accessed September 28, 2018. 6. Kappos L, et al.; Tysabri® Observational Program (TOP) Investigators. *Mult Scler*. 2018;24(7):963-973. **Disclosures** SB: honoraria from Kassenärztliche Vereinigung Bayern and HMOs for patient care; honoraria/expense compensation as board member of NeuroTransData; SG, PvH and YH: employees of PricewaterhouseCoopers and contracted to perform statistical projects for NeuroTransData; MM and RH: employees of and hold stock/stock options in Biogen; AB: consulting fees from and advisory board/speaker/other activities for NeuroTransData; project management/clinical studies for and travel expenses from Novartis and Servier. Acknowledge Anna Drewek and Martin Kretzer for their contributions to this work; both are employees of PricewaterhouseCoopers and are contracted to perform statistical projects for NeuroTransData. This study was sponsored by Biogen (Cambridge, MA, USA). Writing and editorial support for the preparation of this poster was provided by Excel Scientific Solutions (Southport, CT, USA): funding was provided by Biogen.