ARTICLE IN PF

International Immunopharmacology xxx (2015) xxx-xxx



Review

1

Contents lists available at ScienceDirect

International Immunopharmacology



journal homepage: www.elsevier.com/locate/intimp

Upcoming biological therapies in systemic lupus erythematosus Q2 Savino Sciascia^{a,b}, Eva Talavera-Garcia^c, Dario Roccatello^a, Simone Baldovino^a, Q3 Elisa Mengatti^d, Maria Jose Cuadrado^{b,*} 4 ^a Centro di Ricerche di Immunologia Clinica ed Immunopatologia e Documentazione su Malattie Rare (CMID), Department of Clinical and Biological Sciences, Università di Torino, Italy ^b Louise Coote Lupus Unit, Guy's and St Thomas' NHS Foundation Trust, St Thomas' Hospital, London, UK 6 ^c Internal Medicine Department, University Hospital "Reina Sofia", Cordoba, Spain ^d Experimental Medicine and Clinical Pathology Unit, Department of Clinical and Biological Sciences, Università di Torino, Italy 8 ARTICLE INFO ABSTRACT 9 10 Article history: Systemic lupus erythematosus (SLE) is a chronic autoimmune condition with unpredictable course, intermingled 20 Received 3 February 2015 11 with flares and periods of remission. Although the prognosis of the disease has improved in the past decades, cur-21 12 Received in revised form 12 April 2015 rent therapies are still associated with treatment-related complications. Recently, there has been major progress 22 Accepted 24 April 2015 13 in the understanding of the pathogenesis of SLE, paving the way for the development of new biological agents, 23 14 Available online xxxx potentially revolutionizing the treatment of SLE. This review summarizes available data on novel biological therapies for SLE, focusing on recent results from 25 15 Keywords: clinical trials. 16 Systemic lupus erythematosus As a result of treatment strategies based upon an individualized therapeutic approach, it is hoped that the clinical 27 Biological agents 17 view of SLE will change from a severe autoimmune disease to a condition in which significant damage, mortality 28 18 Rituximab 19Belimumab and treatment related complications can be prevented in the majority of SLE patients. © 2015 Published by Elsevier B.V. 30 32 33 Contents 39 37 1. Introduction B-cell targeted therapies 38 1.1. 1.1.1. Ocrelizumab 39 40 1.2. Anti-CD22 1.2.1. 41 122 B lymphocyte stimulator (BLyS) and a proliferation inducing ligand 4243 1.3. 44 1.3.1. Edratide 1.3.2. Rigerimod (Lupuzor) 451.3.3. Laquinimod 4647 1.4. Toleragen molecule . . . 1.4.1. 48 491.4.2. Targeting proteasomes . . 50 1.4.3 Cytokine blockade targeted therapies 51Discussion • 52References . . 531. Introduction

Q6

24

26

29

0

0

0

0

0

Λ

0

0

0

0

0

0

0

0

0

0

* Corresponding author at: Louise Coote Lupus Unit, Guy's and St Thomas', NHS Foundation Trust, St Thomas' Hospital, St Thomas' Hospital, London SE1 7EH, UK. Tel.: +44 02071883568; fax: +44 02076202658.

E-mail address: mjcuadrado@yahoo.com (M.J. Cuadrado).

http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.intimp.2015.04.049 1567-5769/© 2015 Published by Elsevier B.V.

04

Systemic lupus erythematosus (SLE) is an autoimmune condition 55 heterogeneous from clinical and immunological point of view, with 56 variable and unpredictable course, intermingled with periods of flares 57 and remission. For decades, the therapy for SLE has been based on 58 glucocorticosteroids, hydroxychloroquine, and immunosuppressive Q7 agents [1]. These approaches have been related to a remarkable 60

S. Sciascia et al. / International Immunopharmacology xxx (2015) xxx-xxx

2

66

61 improvement in the prognosis of SLE. However, the occurrence of re-62 fractory disease and adverse effects related to conventional therapies such as glucocorticoids and cytotoxic agents still represent a challenge 63 08 for physicians, requiring the development of more efficacious treatments with a higher safety profile in SLE. 65

Rituximab and, more recently, belimumab are the most extensively 67 used biological agents in SLE.

68 Although the results of two randomized controlled trials suggest 69 that the use of rituximab in SLE may be controversial, it is still extensive-70ly used "off label", especially in refractory cases to standard treatment. Belimumab has been the first biological agent approved by the Food 71and Drug agency (FDA) for the treatment of active SLE in addition to 72standard of care [1,2]. Despite the initial enthusiasm related to the 73 approval of a tailored approach for SLE treatment, there are still uncer-74 tainties on the selection of the ideal patient that might benefit from this 75 76 agent and the optimal duration of therapy [3,4].

In the last years, an increasing number of new biological therapies 77 have been tested in SLE with heterogeneous results. 09

The current goal of development of novel biological agents for SLE is 79 to identify therapies that are potentially more effective than conven-80 tional approaches and at the same time are able to reduce the risk of 81 organ damage and therapy-induced side effects. This review summa-82 83 rizes available data on novel upcoming biological therapies for SLE, beyond rituximab and belimumab, focusing on recent results from clinical 84 trials (Table 1). 85

86 1.1. B-cell targeted therapies

B cells can be selectively targeted for depletion either via direct B cell 87 surface molecules such as CD19 and CD20 (rituximab and ocrelizumab) **O10** and CD22 (Epratuzumab) or by inhibition of B cell survival factors BLyS 89 90 (belimumab) and APRIL (atacicept) [3].

It is out of the scope of this review to explore the clinical efficacy of 91rituximab in SLE since this has been extensively discussed elsewhere 92[5]. However, this topic is worthy of some considerations. 93

94 The use of rituximab in patients with SLE has been investigated in two randomized controlled trials, EXPLORER (the exploratory Phase II/ 95 III SLE evaluation of rituximab) [6] and LUNAR (lupus nephritis assess-96 ment with rituximab) [7] with negative results regarding superiority to 97 conventional treatment. However, before concluding that rituximab is 98 99 not effective in SLE, a critical evaluation of the design of the EXPLORER and LUNAR trials is required. Firstly, a high percentage of patients includ-100 101 ed were likely to have had mild to moderate SLE (especially in the 102 EXPLORER trial) with no history of poor response to conventional

Table 1 t1.1

Mechanism	Agent
Targeting surface molecules	Ocrelizumab (fully humanized anti-CD20)
on B cells	Epratuzumab (fully humanized anti-CD22
Targeting B cell growth and	Atacicept
survival factors	Blisibimod
	Tabalumab
Toleragen molecule	Abetimus sodium
Proteasome inhibition	Bortezomib
Targeting co-stimulatory	AMG 557 (against B7RP-1, an inducible
molecules	co-stimulator ligand)
Targeting T cells	Edratide
	Rigerimod
	Laquinimod
Targeting cytokines — IL 6	Tocilizumab
	Sirukumab
Targeting cytokines — type I	Sifalimumab
interferons	Rontalizumab

therapies. This fact, in itself, may potentially justify why rituximab was 103 not superior to the other therapies in this setting. 104

Secondly, considering concomitant therapies, we allowed very high 011 doses of corticosteroids in both arms of these trials, leading to signifi- 106 cant differences not being evident in a short-term follow-up. Thirdly, 107 some authors have speculated a possible synergistic effect of rituximab 108 in combination with immunosuppressive agents (cyclophosphamide or 109 mycophenolate) [8] but this aspect was not analyzed in these RCTs. 110 Fourthly, LUNAR and EXPLORE included different subsets of patients 111 (mainly North and Central-South American patients) when compared 112 to the majority of patients from uncontrolled studies (European). This 113 observation about ethnicity might be considered as a variable therapeu- 114 tic response to the different immunosuppressive agents [9]. 115

Finally, and most importantly, aiming to prove the superiority of 116 rituximab over current first-line therapies in SLE (corticosteroids, cyclo- 117 phosphamide, and mycophenolate) does not reflect the use of rituxi- 118 mab in clinical practice, where rituximab is mainly considered in 119 refractory cases to these therapies. 120

1.1.1. Ocrelizumab

Ocrelizumab is a humanized anti-CD20 monoclonal antibody. When 122 compared to rituximab, ocrelizumab may have a safer profile in terms of 123 immunogenicity and complement activation, theoretically leading to a 124 reduced frequency of adverse infusion reactions and the development 125 of drug neutralizing antibodies. 126

BEGIN and renal BELONG are two Phase III RCTs investigating the ef- 127 ficacy of ocrelizumab in non-renal SLE and renal SLE respectively [10]. Q12 Ocrelizumab was given at different doses (400 or 1000 mg intravenous- 129 ly) on day 1 and day 15. 130

A repeat single dosing was administered every 4 months. The BEGIN 131 study was interrupted early when the decision was made that 132 ocrelizumab was not likely to benefit patients with active SLE. In the 133 BELONG study, a total of 381 patients were recruited to investigate the Q13 efficacy of ocrelizumab in patients with proliferative lupus nephritis 135 (class III/IV) on top of high-dose glucocorticoids and either MMF or 136 CYC (according to the Euro-lupus protocol). The trial was terminated 137 early because of the higher rate of serious infections in patients receiv- 138 ing ocrelizumab compared to placebo (mainly in those receiving 139 ocrelizumab and MMF). However, in patients who had passed the 140 32-week treatment point (223/381), the overall renal response in the 141 ocrelizumab arm was (67%) not significantly higher than that of placebo Q14 (67% vs. 55%) [11]. 143

1.2. Anti-CD22

144

145

121

1.2.1. Epratuzumab

Epratuzumab is a humanized monoclonal antibody targeting the 146 CD22 surface receptor on mature B cells [12]. 147

Two randomized placebo-controlled trials (ALLIVIATE 1 and 148 ALLIVIATE 2, 14 and 90 recruited patients, respectively) investigating 149 the use of epratuzumab in addition to the standard of care in SLE pa- 150 tients with moderate to severe activity reported a clinical improvement 151 compared to placebo [13]. Epratuzumab was well tolerated without se- 152 vere adverse events. However, these studies were terminated because 153 of the disruption of drug supply [14]. 154

Subsequently, ENBLEM, a more recent Phase IIb RCT (trial not 155 powered for significance) including 227 SLE patients with moderate 156 to severe disease activity (excluding severe neuropsychiatric and 157 renal disease) showed that the proportion of responders was higher 158 in all epratuzumab groups than in the placebo group. A post hoc analy- 159 ses showed that a cumulative dose of 2400 mg of epratuzumab was as- 160 sociated with a significantly clinical improvement. The frequencies of 161 AEs and SAEs, including infusion reactions, were not different across 162 all groups of patients [15]. 163

These promising results have led to two Phase III RCTs (EMBODY 1 164 and 2), aiming to investigate the clinical efficacy of epratuzumab in 165

Please cite this article as: S. Sciascia, et al., Upcoming biological therapies in systemic lupus erythematosus, Int Immunopharmacol (2015), http:// dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.intimp.2015.04.049

Download English Version:

https://daneshyari.com/en/article/5832502

Download Persian Version:

https://daneshyari.com/article/5832502

Daneshyari.com