Ruxolitinib Cream Demonstrates Maintenance of Disease and Symptom Control With As-Needed Use in Adults and Adolescents With Atopic Dermatitis: Pooled Analysis From the Long-Term Safety Periods of Two Phase 3 Studies
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Introduction

- Atopic dermatitis (AD) is a highly pruritic inflammatory skin disease
- Quality of life in patients with AD can be significantly reduced by itch and sleep disturbances
- Ruxolitinib cream is a topical formulation of ruxolitinib, a selective inhibitor of Janus kinase (JAK) 1 and JAK2, approved for the treatment of AD in patients 12 years of age and older
- In two phase 3 randomized studies of identical design (TRuE-AD1 [NCT03745638] and TRuE-AD2 [NCT03745651]), ruxolitinib cream demonstrated anti-inflammatory activity, with antipruritic action and substantial improvement in itch and sleep vs vehicle, and was well tolerated during the 8-week vehicle-controlled (VC) period in patients with AD
- During the 8-week vehicle-controlled (VC) period in patients with AD
  - During the 44-week long-term safety (LTS) period, ruxolitinib cream was well tolerated and demonstrated effective disease and symptom control (ie, itch and sleep disturbance) with as-needed use

Objective

To evaluate long-term maintenance of disease and symptom control in adolescent and adult patients with AD applying ruxolitinib cream as needed using pooled data from the LTS periods of two phase 3 studies

Patients and Study Design

- Eligible patients were aged ≥12 years with AD for ≥2 years and had an Investigator’s Global Assessment (IGA) score of 2 or 3 and 3%–20% affected body surface area, excluding scalp
- TRuE-AD1 and TRuE-AD2 had identical study designs (Figure 1)
  - In both studies, patients were randomized (2:2:1) to either of 2 ruxolitinib cream strength regimens (0.75% twice daily [BID], 1.5% BID) or vehicle cream BID for 8 weeks of double-blind continuous treatment (VC period); patients were instructed to continue treating lesions even if they improved
  - Patients initially randomized to ruxolitinib cream subsequently remained on their regimen for the 44-week LTS period (as-needed treatment); patients initially randomized to vehicle were rerandomized 1:1 (blinded) to either ruxolitinib cream strength
    - During the LTS period, patients were instructed to treat skin areas with active AD only and to stop treatment 3 days after clearance of lesions; patients were to restart treatment with ruxolitinib cream at the first sign of recurrence
    - No concomitant or rescue treatments were permitted at any time during the study
    - Only patients who applied ruxolitinib cream since Day 1 were included in the analysis
Assessments

- The percentage of patients who achieved IGA score of 0 or 1 (clear or almost clear skin) or score ≥2 (2, mild; 3, moderate; 4, severe) was assessed at baseline and each visit (every 4 weeks) during the LTS period.
- Mean percentage of visits with patients reporting IGA 0 or 1 was reported for patients with ≥1 visit in the LTS period, with an additional sensitivity analysis in patients with ≥2 visits in the LTS period.

Figure 1. Study Design

Methods (cont.)

- Sleep disturbance was assessed by the percentage of patients reporting 0, 1–2, or ≥3 nights of disturbed sleep per question 2 of the POEM (POEM Q2) at Weeks 8, 12, 24, and 52.
  - Patients reported the number of nights of disturbed sleep due to eczema in the past week.
- Safety and tolerability assessments included frequency of treatment-emergent adverse events (AEs), treatment-related AEs, serious AEs, and AEs leading to treatment discontinuation.

Statistical Analyses

- Data were summarized using descriptive statistics, reported as observed.
- All patients who applied ≥1 dose of study drug were included in the safety analysis.

Results

Patients

- Of 1249 randomized patients, 1072 (85.8%) continued into the LTS period; 837 (67.0%) who applied ruxolitinib cream since Day 1 were evaluated for disease and symptom control in the LTS period (0.75% ruxolitinib cream, n=409; 1.5% ruxolitinib cream, n=428).
  - A majority (~75%) completed the LTS period, with 11 (1.3%) discontinuing due to AE and 15 (1.8%) discontinuing due to lack of efficacy.
- Baseline demographics and clinical characteristics are summarized in Table 1 and are similar to those in the overall study population.
Table 1. Patient Demographics and Baseline Clinical Characteristics Among Patients Who Applied Ruxolitinib Cream Since Day 1 and Continued Into the LTS Period

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Characteristic</th>
<th>0.75% Ruxolitinib cream (n=409)</th>
<th>1.5% Ruxolitinib cream (n=428)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Age, median (range) y</td>
<td>36.0 (12–85)</td>
<td>31.0 (12–85)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>12 – &lt;18 y, n (%)</td>
<td>89 (21.8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female, n (%)</td>
<td>252 (61.6)</td>
<td>263 (61.4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Race, n (%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>291 (71.1)</td>
<td>302 (70.6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>91 (22.2)</td>
<td>97 (22.7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>15 (3.7)</td>
<td>19 (4.4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>12 (2.9)</td>
<td>10 (2.3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BSA affected, mean (SD), %</td>
<td>9.9 (5.3)</td>
<td>9.6 (5.2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EASI score, mean (SD)</td>
<td>8.2 (5.1)</td>
<td>8.0 (4.8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IGA score, n (%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>100 (24.4)</td>
<td>100 (23.4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>309 (75.6)</td>
<td>328 (76.6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Itch NRS score, mean (SD)</td>
<td>5.1 (2.4)</td>
<td>5.2 (2.4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Duration of disease, median (range), y</td>
<td>14.2 (0.1–66.8)</td>
<td>15.5 (0–69.2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facial involvement, n (%)</td>
<td>172 (42.1)</td>
<td>181 (42.3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of flares in last 12 mo, mean (SD)*</td>
<td>5.1 (7.0)</td>
<td>5.1 (7.2)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

BSA, body surface area; EASI, Eczema Area and Severity Index; IGA, Investigator’s Global Assessment; LTS, long-term safety; NRS, numerical rating scale.

* Patient reported.

Results (cont.)

Maintenance of Disease Control in the LTS Period

- The mean (SD) cumulative number of days with no treatment due to lesion clearance was 116.5 (85.9) and 133.8 (89.8) days with 0.75% ruxolitinib cream and 1.5% ruxolitinib cream, respectively.
  - The median (range) cumulative time with no treatment due to lesion clearance as a proportion of the LTS duration (approximately 44 weeks) was 38% (1%–99%) and 44% (1%–97%), with 0.75% ruxolitinib cream and 1.5% ruxolitinib cream, respectively.
- Based on observed data, the percentage of patients who applied 0.75/1.5% ruxolitinib cream and achieved IGA 0/1 was 61.8%/67.1% at Week 8 and 76.8%/77.8% at Week 52.
- With each consecutive visit, the majority of patients in either treatment group maintained IGA 0/1 (Figure 2).
  - 80%–90% of patients maintained or improved their response between subsequent visits.

Figure 2. Change in IGA Scores with As-Needed Treatment with 1.5% Ruxolitinib Cream During the LTS Period

IGA, Investigator’s Global Assessment; LTS, long-term safety. All patients were IGA 2/3 at baseline.
Patients applying 0.75%/1.5% ruxolitinib cream achieved IGA 0/1 for a mean (95% CI) of 68.3% (65.0%, 71.6%; n=396)/73.6% (70.6%, 76.7%; n=414) of all visits, respectively, among those with ≥1 visit in the LTS period, and 69.1% (65.9%, 72.4%; n=384)/73.5% (70.4%, 76.5%; n=400) among those with ≥2 visits in the LTS period.

**Maintenance of Symptom Control in the LTS Period**

- Based on observed data, itch for 0 days in the past week was reported in 27.7%/32.7% of patients applying 0.75%/1.5% ruxolitinib cream at Week 8 and in 28.0%/36.2% at Week 52.
- Itch for 1–2 days in the past week was reported in 33.2%/35.1% at Week 8 and in 37.9%/33.2% at Week 52.

**Figure 3. Change in POEM Q1 Scores with As-Needed Treatment with 1.5% Ruxolitinib Cream During the LTS Period**

- The majority of patients maintained or demonstrated improvements in symptom control of itch (ie, reporting itch for 0 or 1–2 days in the past week) between consecutive assessments (Figure 3).
- Based on observed data, sleep disturbance for 0 days in the past week was reported in 64.9%/71.8% of patients applying 0.75%/1.5% ruxolitinib cream at Week 8 and in 74.5%/74.5% at Week 52.
  - Sleep disturbance for 1–2 days in the past week was reported in 23.2%/19.7% at Week 8 and in 15.9%/17.1% at Week 52.
- The majority of patients maintained or demonstrated improvements in sleep (ie, reporting sleep disturbance for 0 or 1–2 days in the past week) between consecutive assessments (Figure 4).

**Figure 4. Change in POEM Q2 Scores with As-Needed Treatment with 1.5% Ruxolitinib Cream During the LTS Period**

- Safety: Ruxolitinib cream was well tolerated during the 52-week study, confirming 8-week VC data.

---

LTS, long-term safety; POEM Q1, Patient-Oriented Eczema Measure question 1. commonslide.
Conclusions

● Ruxolitinib cream demonstrated maintenance of disease and symptom control with as-needed use over a 44-week period in adults and adolescents with AD
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