

Report of the Skin Research Workgroups from the GRAPPA 2017 Annual Meeting

Alice Bendix Gottlieb, Laura C Coates, Leonieke JJ van Mens,

April W Armstrong, Joseph F Merola

ABSTRACT: At the 2017 annual meeting of the Group for Research and Assessment of Psoriasis and Psoriatic Arthritis (GRAPPA), the International Dermatology Outcome Measures (IDEOM) psoriasis working group presented an overview of its cutaneous domain of psoriatic arthritis projects. First, the group presented an overview of IDEOM's work to establish psoriasis outcome measures that satisfy the needs of all stakeholders. Second, the group discussed replacements for the Psoriasis Area and Severity Index (PASI) that can be used in clinical practice, including data that support the use of the physician global assessment (PGA) x body surface area measurement (BSA) score as a PASI surrogate. Third, the group discussed the contribution of skin disease to composite measures of psoriatic arthritis. Last, the group summarized the National Psoriasis Foundation's efforts to establish treat-to-target strategies for psoriasis care.

Key Indexing Terms: Psoriatic Arthritis, Psoriasis, GRAPPA, IDEOM, Psoriasis Outcomes, Minimal Disease Activity

Source of Support: None

Author Information: AB Gottlieb, Department of Dermatology, New York Medical College, Metropolitan Hospital, New York, New York, USA, gottlieba@nychhc.org; LC Coates, Leeds Institute of Rheumatic and Musculoskeletal Medicine, University of Leeds, Leeds, and Nuffield Department of Orthopaedics, Rheumatology and Musculoskeletal Sciences, University of Oxford, Oxford, United Kingdom, laura.coates@ndorms.ox.ac.uk; LJJ van Mens, MD, Department of Clinical Immunology and Rheumatology, Amsterdam Rheumatology and

Immunology Center, Academic Medical Center/University of Amsterdam, Amsterdam, The Netherlands, l.j.vanmens@amc.uva.nl; AW Armstrong, Department of Dermatology, Keck School of Medicine, University of Southern California, Los Angeles, California, USA, aprilarmstrong@post.harvard.edu; J Merola, Department of Dermatology, Harvard Medical School, Brigham and Women's Hospital, Boston, Massachusetts, USA, joseph.merola@gmail.com

Corresponding Author: Alice Bendix Gottlieb, MD, PhD, Professor of Dermatology, New York Medical College at Metropolitan Hospital, 1901 First Avenue, New York, New York 10029, USA; phone 212 423 7467; fax 212 423 6737; email gottlieba@nychhc.org

Running Footline: Skin Research Report: 2017

Word count: 2,927 words, including abstract (133), text (2,077), and references (717, n=21), but excluding title page

International Dermatology Outcomes Measures Group

The International Dermatology Outcomes Measures (IDEOM) group is a nonprofit organization whose mission is to establish patient-centered measurements to enhance research and treatment for those with dermatologic disease.(1-5) From the onset in 2013, IDEOM's efforts have included perspectives of patients, health economists, payers, physicians, and regulatory agencies. The FDA's dermatology division has also been involved in these efforts and regularly attends IDEOM's annual meetings. IDEOM's goal is to establish validated and standardized outcome measures that satisfy all stakeholders' needs and that can be applied to clinical research and practice.

At the 2017 Group for Research and Assessment of Psoriasis and Psoriatic Arthritis (GRAPPA) annual meeting in Amsterdam, The Netherlands, selected deliverables to date were discussed.(5) The domains for psoriasis clinical trials were presented. These had been selected by a process akin to that used by Outcome Measures in Rheumatology (OMERACT) for rheumatologic outcomes. The core domains were skin manifestations (primary: body surface area (BSA)/erythema/induration/scale), location of skin lesions (palmar-plantar and scalp psoriasis), investigator global, psoriasis and psoriatic arthritis (PsA) symptoms, patient global, treatment satisfaction, and health-related quality of life. Important, but not required, were the skin manifestations of nail, inverse, genital, guttate psoriasis, and secondary symptoms. The research agenda included PsA signs (because it was felt that dermatologists would not be able to or desire to assess these), economic impact, work productivity and participation, and cardiovascular disease. In collaboration with the Hidradentis Suppurativa Core Outcomes Set International Collaboration (HISTORIC), an international consortium of hidradenitis suppurativa (HS) health care providers and patients, HS clinical trial domains that were selected via an iterative Delphi process were briefly mentioned as HS has been associated with seronegative spondyloarthropathies.(6)

Because PsA symptoms and psoriasis treatment satisfaction were selected, as stated above, to be in the core set of domains to be measured in all psoriasis clinical trials, and because these domains have not routinely been studied in psoriasis clinical trials, two workgroups were formed to select or develop outcome measures for these domains.(3) Results from these two workgroups are anticipated by the next annual GRAPPA meeting in 2018.

IDEOM is proceeding to develop psoriasis outcome measures that are useful for clinical practice. The need is urgent because, at least in the United States, payers are making judgements on physicians and making access decisions that do not base disease clearance as a major criterion. Additionally, treat-to-target (T2T) strategies and registries for clinical practice require practical and brief outcome measures that are compatible with major electronic medical record systems. In the United States, payers want universally accepted, published outcome measures that are useful in clinical practice and mandated to perform by published guidelines that are issued by major professional societies. They want clinically meaningful outcome measures, i.e., it is not enough to be better than placebo. Outcomes should justify the cost given the benefit and risk aspects of a given drug. They would like outcomes that measure how the overall cost of care decreases by treatment intervention and how work productivity increases by treatment intervention. Outcomes should be applied universally in clinical practice to reduce variability in practice and make costs more predictable. Lastly, they would like to see a measure that looks like a diagnostic test (e.g., HbA1c or blood pressure measurement) so that a solid connection can be made between the clinical outcome and a therapeutic decision.(7)

Summarizing IDEOM's ongoing motivation, drug regulatory agency approval and publications are only the beginning. The true finish line is when patients get to the right doctors and treatments and their disease has minimal to no impact on their quality of life.

PGAxBSA as a PASI Proxy

There is an unmet need for practical psoriasis outcome measures. While the Psoriasis Area and Severity Index (PASI) has been a gold standard assessment, it is not practical in the clinical setting and involves complex non-linear scoring. In addition, its absolute values are poorly understood by clinicians and patients, and there is poor sensitivity to change with poor discrimination at lower score ranges. The product of the physician's global assessment (PGA) and body surface area measurement (BSA %) represents a highly feasible measure that captures both the severity and extent of psoriasis, has demonstrated sensitivity to change, correlates with PASI, and has the potential for use both in the clinical trials' setting, as well as the clinical practice setting.(8, 9) Further, the PGAxBSA measure can be easily understood by providers, patients, regulators, and payers. It has multiple potential uses beyond clinical documentation, including Physician Quality Reporting System (PQRS) reporting, registry use, and prior authorization documentation. In addition to the PGAxBSA product, each number individually offers a quick glance into the nature of the disease from a plaque severity, as well as area of involvement perspective.

The clinical response and correlation with a "minimal disease activity" (MDA) target was reported at the 2017 GRAPPA annual meeting based upon data analysis from the Efficacy and Safety Trial Evaluating the Effects of Apremilast in Psoriasis (ESTEEM) phase 3 trials of apremilast in psoriasis.(9, 10) In the ESTEEM data, subjects had moderate to severe plaque psoriasis with PASI \geq 12, BSA \geq 10%, Static Physician's Global Assessment (sPGA) \geq 3. Primary endpoints were measured at week 16 with a maintenance phase to week 32 and a week 32-52 randomized withdrawal phase. A 5-point PGA was used, and other relevant outcomes including Dermatology Life Quality Index (DLQI), BSA, and PASI were collected. Specific baseline demographics and other results are outside the scope of this report and will be reported separately in a future publication.(9) A few highlights of the data presented included PGAxBSA scores as they correlated with PASI response categories at week 16, as well as correlation with

a proposed MDA criterion definition of PASI90 + DLQI =0 or 1. The percent of patients achieving response at week 16 by PASI or PGABSA in two ESTEEM trials (ESTEEM1 and 2) were presented and demonstrated best correlation of > PASI 90 with PGABSA scores of 0 to 1 and 0 to 1.5.(9, 10)

One current limitation is that several versions of the sPGA/Investigator's Global Assessment (IGA) of psoriasis exist. IDEOM is actively addressing this gap with a planned consensus project to drive the use of a single sPGA in clinical trials and practice.

In conclusion, PGABSA has been shown to be a feasible measure that is sensitive to change in disease severity in apremilast-treated patients with moderate to severe psoriasis. Also, PGABSA bands can aid measurement and interpretation of meaningful clinical response, including MDA in patients with psoriasis. Ongoing work includes looking at PsA data in a population of low PASI baseline subjects to compare with PASI outcome data. The potential for a PGABSA cutoff as a potential T2T goal with validation in a real-world clinical trial is also being considered.(10)

Composite Scores for PsA: The Role of Cutaneous Disease in Composite PsA Measures

There is increasing interest in treating to an objective target in PsA as discussed in the European League Against Rheumatism (EULAR) treatment recommendations(11) and the National Psoriasis Foundation (NPF) published guidance on T2T in PsA and psoriasis.(12) The new T2T recommendations for spondyloarthritis state that either the Disease Activity in PsA (DAPSA) remission/low disease activity or very low disease activity (VLDA)/MDA criteria are recommended.(13) DAPSA focuses on articular disease incorporating joint counts, patient pain, global, and C reactive protein.(14) VLDA/MDA are composite measures that incorporate more PsA domains with 7 different cutpoints: tender joint count (TJC) ≤ 1 ; swollen joint count (SJC) ≤ 1 ; PASI ≤ 1 ; patient pain visual analog scale (VAS) ≤ 15 mm; patient global VAS ≤ 20 mm; Health Assessment Questionnaire (HAQ) ≤ 0.5 ; tender enthesal points ≤ 1 .(15) To be in VLDA, patients must meet all 7 cutpoints, while to achieve MDA, patients must meet 5 of 7 cutpoints.(16)

DAPSA does not include a measure of skin disease. VLDA requires a PASI of ≤ 1 ; MDA only requires that 5 cutpoints be met, with only one cutpoint measuring psoriasis. Thus, it is possible for a patient to meet MDA but have psoriasis activity. Therefore, different modifications of MDA have been tested that mandate joint counts, skin criteria, or both. Data were presented from two post hoc analyses that investigated these criteria. The first analysis was from the Psoriasis Randomized Etanercept Study in Subjects with PsA (PRESTA), a large randomized controlled trial (RCT) in patients with severe psoriasis (mean baseline PASI 20) and PsA.(17, 18) The second analysis was from a clinical cohort of 250 patients.(19, 20) These studies showed good control of disease activity with all definitions but highlighted potential issues, particularly with psoriasis. In VLDA or MDA with skin mandated, the PASI needed to be ≤ 1 so skin control was assured. However, in MDA without skin mandated, residual skin disease could be present despite meeting 5 cutpoints, which is particularly common in cohorts with severe skin disease. In DAPSA, as skin disease is not measured at all, residual skin disease could be present to a significant extent. Even in the clinic, with more modest skin disease (baseline median PASI 0.3), people meeting DAPSA remission with a PASI ≥ 2 had a significantly poorer quality of life.

Reassuringly, the T2T recommendations state that “validated measures of musculoskeletal disease activity and assessment of cutaneous... manifestations should be used in clinical practice to define the target and to guide treatment decisions”.(13) If physicians are aiming for a target of VLDA, then skin would be assessed and treatment escalated in cases with active psoriasis. Caution should be exercised when using MDA, and domains with residual disease activity including skin should be addressed even if the minimum 5 domain cutpoints are met. If rheumatologists use a peripheral joint-focused measure such as DAPSA, it is imperative that additional measures of other important domains in PsA (e.g., skin and enthesitis) be assessed within a target of treatment.

United States Treatment Targets for Psoriasis Patients

At the 2017 annual GRAPPA meeting, Dr. April Armstrong (Los Angeles, California, USA) discussed a pivotal effort to establish treatment targets for psoriasis patients in the United States.⁽¹²⁾ This effort, which was organized by the NPF, was the first to establish treatment goals for those with plaque psoriasis. NPF is a United States-based nonprofit organization whose mission is to drive efforts to cure psoriatic disease and improve the lives of those affected.

There is a critical need in the United States to establish treatment goals for psoriasis patients. NPF used a rigorous process to arrive at consensus for treatment goals. The NPF process consisted of literature review, elicitation of patient input in the creation of the Delphi survey, and a multi-round Delphi consensus-building procedure involving experts in providing psoriasis care. The key principles of the Delphi consensus-building process are anonymity and transparency. In this process, the anonymity of individual responses prevents a participant's authority, personality, and reputation from dominating others. This also minimizes "bandwagon effect" and fostered self-critique.

The consensus-building process results showed that the most preferred instrument to assess treatment goals was BSA, and 3 months was the most preferred time for evaluating patient response after starting new therapies. Two levels of response, acceptable response and target response, were defined at 3 months post-treatment initiation. Acceptable response was either BSA 3% or less or BSA improvement 75% or more from baseline. The target response was BSA 1% or less. During the maintenance period, the target response should be BSA 1% or less at every 6 month evaluation interval.

The NPF treatment target publication explicitly states that the treatment targets are to be used to increase access to therapies and never to limit treatment options.⁽¹²⁾ The treatment targets provide the start point where clinicians and patients can evaluate their current regimen and determine if

changes are necessary to achieve treatment goals. Specifically, the treatment targets encourage clinicians and patients to monitor disease progression and evaluate patient treatment response.

Discussion at the 2017 GRAPPA annual meeting centered on the clinical application of these treatment targets and what would be recommended if treatment targets are not met. If treatment goals are not met, providers and patients have an opportunity to reevaluate the patient's disease state, comorbidities, and current treatments. Any therapeutic decision making would need to be based on a patient's comorbidities, which is a part of a thorough benefit-risk assessment. Ways to help patients achieve treatment targets include, but are not limited to, current therapy dose escalation, combination therapy, or switching the primary treatment. It is also important to ensure that the primary therapy has had enough time to achieve its optimal therapeutic effect before changing treatments.

REFERENCES:

1. Gottlieb AB, Armstrong AW. Psoriasis outcome measures: a report from the GRAPPA 2012 annual meeting. *J Rheumatol* 2013;40:1428-33
2. Gottlieb AB SR. IDEOM: International Dermatology Outcomes Measures: A Call to Action. *Psoriasis Forum* 2013;19:107-9
3. Elman SA, Merola JF, Armstrong AW, Duffin KC, Latella J, Garg A, et al. The International Dermatology Outcome Measures (IDEOM) Initiative: A Review and Update. *J Drugs Dermatol* 2017;16:119-24
4. Gottlieb AB, Levin AA, Armstrong AW, Abernethy A, Duffin KC, Bhushan R, et al. The International Dermatology Outcome Measures Group: formation of patient-centered outcome measures in dermatology. *J Am Acad Dermatol* 2015;72:345-8
5. Perez-Chada LM, Singh S, Callis-Duffin K, Garg A, Gottlieb AB, Latella J, et al. International Dermatology Outcome Measures (IDEOM) Group 2016 New York Meeting: Meeting Summary and Data from the Psoriasis Working Group. *Journal of drugs in dermatology : JDD* 2017;16:770-7
6. Thorlacius L, Ingram JR, Garg A, Villumsen B, Esmann S, Kirby JS, et al. Protocol for the development of a core domain set for hidradenitis suppurativa trial outcomes. *BMJ Open* 2017;7:e014733
7. Greb JE, Merola J, Garg A, Latella J, Howard L, Acharya N, et al. The Psoriatic Disease Payer Advisory Panel. *J Drugs Dermatol* 2016;15:641-4
8. Walsh JA, McFadden M, Woodcock J, Clegg DO, Helliwell P, Dommasch E, et al. Product of the Physician Global Assessment and body surface area: a simple static measure of psoriasis severity in a longitudinal cohort. *J Am Acad Dermatol* 2013;69:931-7
9. Duffin KC, Papp KA, Bagel J, Levi E, Chen R, Gottlieb AB. Evaluation of the Physician Global Assessment and Body Surface Area Composite Tool for Assessing Psoriasis Response to Apremilast Therapy: Results from ESTEEM 1 and ESTEEM 2. *J Drugs Dermatol* 2017;16:147-53
10. Gottlieb AB, Merola JF, Chen R, Levi E, Duffin KC. Assessing clinical response and defining minimal disease activity in plaque psoriasis with the Physician Global Assessment and body surface area (PGA x BSA) composite tool: An analysis of apremilast phase 3 ESTEEM data. *J Am Acad Dermatol* 2017;77:1178-80
11. Gossec L, Smolen JS, Ramiro S, de Wit M, Cutolo M, Dougados M, et al. European League Against Rheumatism (EULAR) recommendations for the management of psoriatic arthritis with pharmacological therapies: 2015 update. *Ann Rheum Dis* 2016;75:499-510
12. Armstrong AW, Siegel MP, Bagel J, Boh EE, Buell M, Cooper KD, et al. From the Medical Board of the National Psoriasis Foundation: Treatment targets for plaque psoriasis. *J Am Acad Dermatol* 2017;76:290-8
13. Smolen JS, Schols M, Braun J, Dougados M, FitzGerald O, Gladman DD, et al. Treating axial spondyloarthritis and peripheral spondyloarthritis, especially psoriatic arthritis, to target: 2017 update of recommendations by an international task force. *Ann Rheum Dis* 2018;77:3-17
14. Schoels M, Aletaha D, Funovits J, Kavanaugh A, Baker D, Smolen JS. Application of the DAREA/DAPSA score for assessment of disease activity in psoriatic arthritis. *Ann Rheum Dis* 2010;69:1441-7
15. Coates LC, Fransen J, Helliwell PS. Defining minimal disease activity in psoriatic arthritis: a proposed objective target for treatment. *Ann Rheum Dis* 2010;69:48-53
16. Coates LC, Helliwell PS. Defining Low Disease Activity States in Psoriatic Arthritis using Novel Composite Disease Instruments. *J Rheumatol* 2016;43:371-5

17. Sterry W, Ortonne JP, Kirkham B, Brocq O, Robertson D, Pedersen RD, et al. Comparison of two etanercept regimens for treatment of psoriasis and psoriatic arthritis: PRESTA randomised double blind multicentre trial. *BMJ* 2010;340:c147
18. Coates L, Aikman L, Szumski A, Chhabra A. Comparison of different remission targets in patients with psoriatic arthritis and evaluation of their prognostic value. *Ann Rheum Dis* 2017;76:939
19. van Mens LJJ, Turina MC, van de Sande MGH, Nurmohamed MT, van Kuijk AWR, Baeten DLP. Residual disease activity in psoriatic arthritis: discordance between the rheumatologist's opinion and minimal disease activity measurement. *Rheumatology (Oxford)* 2018;57:283-90
20. van Mens LJJ, van de Sande MGH, van Kuijk AWR, Baeten D, Coates LC. Ideal target for psoriatic arthritis? Comparison of remission and low disease activity states in a real-life cohort. *Ann Rheum Dis* 2018;77:251-7