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Unwanted immunogenicity - The most challenging issues

- It is impossible to predict
  - the incidence of unwanted immunogenicity
  - the characteristics of the immune response
  - the clinical consequences and significance of such immunogenicity

- THE ABOVE NEED TO BE ASSESSED IN APPROPRIATE STUDIES
Immunogenicity to therapeutic proteins

- Biologics have complex structures that are recognised by the human immune system

- Even when a monoclonal antibody (MoAb) has been fully humanised (all cDNA derived from humans) it may trigger an immune response

- Immune reactions may result in additional complexities in the use of biological products

- The relationship between dose, exposure, efficacy, as well as toxicity of these molecules

- A regulatory requirement for licensing applications of biologicals
Consequences of an immune reaction

• Administration of therapeutic proteins can induce anti-drug-antibodies - ADAs
  ➢ Transient ADAs
  ➢ Sustained ADAs

• High affinity ADAs produced in “high” amounts
• Affect PK-PD-efficacy and safety
  ➢ Establish a systematic strategy and well-defined criteria for measuring ADAs
Factors that may influence the development of an immune response

- **Patient- and disease-related factors**
  - Age-related factors
  - Disease-related factors
  - Concomitant treatment
  - Treatment-related factors
  - Pre-existing antibodies

- **Product-related factors**
  - Protein structure and post-translational mod.
  - Impurities
  - Aggregation
  - Formulation and packaging
Conclusions on immunogenicity

- Immunogenicity issues occur all along the life cycle of a product and particularly when
  - A new therapeutic protein is developed
  - A change is introduced, e.g. manufacturing, formulation, storage conditions
  - A biosimilar is proposed

- Assessment requires
  - an optimal antibody testing strategy
  - validated methodologies and reference standards
European guidance for immunogenicity of therapeutic proteins¹

  → revision ongoing

- Biosimilar guidelines
- Guidelines for coagulation factors
- Scientific advice

Concept paper

Concept paper on the revision of the guideline on immunogenicity assessment of biotechnology-derived therapeutic proteins (EMA/275542/2013)

• Requirements of data on antibody assays
• Role of non-clinical studies
• Clinical data to study the correlations of induced anti-drug antibodies to clinical symptoms and signs
• Comparative immunogenicity studies
  ➢ Biosimilars
  ➢ Post-manufacturing change products
• Post-licensing immunological studies
• Specific guidance for the presentation of immunogenicity data
• Risk-based approach to immunogenicity
Scope of the new guideline

- Guide to a systematic evaluation of the development of an unwanted immune response to a therapeutic protein

- The guideline applies to proteins, peptides, derivatives (fusion proteins, conjugates)

- Focus on biotechnology-derived proteins - therapeutic proteins

- Coagulation factors are excluded
Purpose of the Guideline

• Harmonisation of assessment
  ➢ Common standards throughout Europe
  ➢ Education of assessors

• Regulatory requirements for marketing authorisation
  - General principles
  - What regulators need to know
  - Presentation of the data

• Promotion of a multidisciplinary approach
Revised Guideline: Differences from original

- Condensed; much ‘general’ and background information removed/shortened
- Brought in line with the MoAb immunogenicity guideline
- Includes risk-based approach
- Takes account of experience gained with assessing immunogenicity of biotherapeutics over the past 10 years
- Contains a request for an integrated summary of immunogenicity
Essentials from the new guideline

- **Multidiciplinary** summary of immunogenicity

- **Risk assessment**
  - Justification of a risk based approach to immunogenicity

- From a regulatory point of view; the predictive value of in vivo animal studies is low

- **Assays**
  - The basis is the development of adequate screening and confirmatory assays
    - properly validated assays

- Clinical correlation
  - integrated analysis of immunological, PK, PD, clinical efficacy and safety data
  - clinical consequences
Strategy and Antibody Assays

A multi-tiered approach:

- **Screening assay** for identification of antibody positive samples/patients
- **Confirmatory assay** for minimising false positive results following the initial screen
  - Usually by addition of excess therapeutic and comparing spiked vs unspiked sample – reduction of positive signal for true positives
- Assay for the assessment of **the neutralising capacity** of antibodies
- Assays for measuring the **level of the product** and for **assessing clinical relevance** to products
  - assays for relevant biomarkers or PK
- In some cases, **cross-reactivity studies** with other products based on the same protein
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Data on antibody assays - requirements
issues to be considered

• **No ADAs → no immunogenicity:** true or not?
  - tolerance, pharmacological effect of the product or immunosuppression (concomitant medication)

  - The applicant has to show that the tolerance of the ADA assay to the therapeutic drug exceeds the levels of the therapeutic in the samples for ADA testing

• Neutralising antibodies (when not necessary, alternative ways, PK/PD)

• **When to do additional testing?**
  - Ig isotyping?
  - Epitopes, antigenic domains?
  - T-cell responses?

  - Impact of antibody formation on clinical outcome is important
Mitigation strategies

• Planning a proper immunogenicity program tailored to the substance in question
• The section 10, Summary of the immunogenicity program
  ➢ Includes a risk assessment:

The risk-based immunogenicity program
  ➢ Analysing risk factors
  ➢ Designing a program according to the factors in question

Conclusions on the risk(s) of immunogenicity:
  ➢ Impact on the benefit/risk
  ➢ Tools to manage the risk
  ➢ Address how to link adverse events to immunogenicity post-marketing
Summary of the immunogenicity program

Why??

- Difficult to find the relevant data in the dossier

Unnecessary questions by the assessors
Risk based approach to the chosen immunogenicity program

• Are we taking immunogenicity too seriously?
• More emphasis on the risks of immunogenicity?
• Always be studied?

• Is there a double standard?
  ➢ Difference between manufacturing changes and biosimilar development?

• Should neutralising ADAs always be measured?
• PK+ADA samples during phase III: analysed and reported routinely or just “in case”?
• Typing of ADAs and epitope mapping: a waste of time?
What is the basic immunogenicity package?

Low risk (e.g. etanercept)

- Frequent sampling only at the beginning
- Analysis at the end of a trial
- Shorter follow up
- Routine pharmaco-vigilance (for immunogenicity)

High risk (e.g. epoetin)

- More frequent sampling
- Real time analysis
- Longer follow up
- Cell-based neutralisation assay
- Intensified clinical monitoring
- Post-marketing immunogenicity study(ies)

**Incidence**

**Persistence**

**Titer**

**Neutralisation**

**Clinical impact**

**Risk management**
Conclusions

• Planning and assessment of immunogenicity studies requires multidisciplinary team work

• It is impossible to study immunogenicity without valid assays for ADAs

• Immunogenicity assessment needs to be integrated into PK/PD, safety and efficacy

• An integrated summary of the immunogenicity program benefits applicants and assessors
Thank you for your attention!
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