Prucalopride The drug pipeline is flush with new drug options for chronic constipation

Jonathan Mailman BSc(Pharm), ACPR PharmD Student (first) Seminar Thursday 29 Nov 2012

Functional Constipation

Women > men
 Characterized by any of:

 Persistent difficult
 Seemingly incomplete defecation
 Infrequent BM (once ≤ Q3-4d)

Rome II

Modified Rome II criteria

- > \leq 2 spontaneous bowel movements/week
- hard stools,
- sensation of incomplete evacuation, and
- > straining on at least 25% BM

Treatment options

• Lifestyle: increase

- > Dietary fiber
- > Fluid intake
- > Exercise

- Laxatives
 - > Bulking agents:
 - Methylcellulose
 - Psyllium
 - > Stool softeners:
 - Docusate
 - Osmotic:
 - Lactulose
 - PEG
 - MOM
 - > Stimulant:
 - Senna
 - Bisacodyl

Dissatisfaction with Laxatives

• 44–50% lack of efficacy

50–67% inadequate symptom relief

 44–68% not satisfied with QOL improvement

Johanson JF, Kralstein J. Chronic constipation: a survey of the patient perspective. Aliment Pharmacol Ther 2007;25:599–608

Pharmacologic Options

Oisapride
Tegaserod
Prucalopride (RESOTRAN[™])
Lubiprostone
Linaclotide

Pharmacologic Options

• Cisapride

Tegaserod

Prucalopride (RESOTRANTM)
 Lubiprostone
 Linaclotide

Pharmacologic Options

Cisapride
Tegaserod
Prucalopride (RESOTRANTM)
Lubiprostone
Linaclotide



5-HT₄ agonist

- > Enhances peristaltic reflex
- > Propulsive motor patterns

• Effects:

- Increases motility
 - Proximal colonic & gastroduodenal
- > Improves gastric emptying
- Induces giant migrating contractions

Delay to market

- MESH Term : 2000
 Toxicology Review 1999 2003
 - Cisapride
 - Human ether-a-go-go-related gene (hERG)
 - QT prolongation & ventricular arrhythmias
 - Tegaserod
 - $5-HT_1 = CV$ ischemic events
- Sale from J&J to Movetis 2003 2006

Movetis bought by Shire 2010

Drug licensed to Janssen for NA sales
NOC : 2011 (Europe since 2009)

Clinical Question

Ρ	Adults with chronic constipation who have failed previous laxative therapy
I.	Prucalopride
С	Placebo
0	Efficacy -# Spontaneous Complete Bowel Movements -Mean Change SCBM -Patient satisfaction Safety

Search Strategy

Databases	Pubmed, Google, Google Scholar, Embase, IPA, Cochrane
Search	Prucalopride AND chronic constipation
Limits	English, Human, Adult
Results	RCT 12 • Excluded 2 for opioid/CNS etiology • Remainder included in SR Systematic Review 5 • Include 1 Meta-analysis, 1 review • Excluded 2 expert opinion 1 CNS etiology

Prucalopride for the treatment of women with chronic constipation in whom standard laxative regimens have failed to provide adequate relief

M Pennant,* R Orlando, P Barton, S Bayliss, K Routh
and C MeadsHealth Technology Assessment 2011; Vol. 15: Suppl. 1

NHS Review

Design	License application (9 studies)
Ρ	Adult women with laxative refractory constipation
I.	Prucalopride
С	Placebo
0	Efficacy - Proportion ≥3 SCBM/week - Economic evaluation

PAC-QOL

Table 1 | Patient Assessment of Constipation-Quality of Life satisfaction scale

Item

- 1) Fewer bowel movements than you would like
- 2) Satisfied with how often you have a bowel movement
- 3) Satisfied with the regularity of your bowel movements
- Satisfied with the time it takes for food to pass through the intestines
- 5) Satisfied with your treatment

Likert Score (0-4)

Score 4 indicating not at all/none of the time satisfied Score 3 indicating a little bit/a little bit of the time satisfied Score 2 indicating moderately/some of the time satisfied Score 1 indicating quite a bit/most of the time satisfied

Score O indicating extremely/all of the time satisfied

Score Range 0-4

MCSD = 0.5
 > Trials use 1

- Baseline
 - > Overall
 - 2.1 2.3
 - Satisfaction
 - 3.1 3.4

Results

	Prucalopride	Placebo	Abs	NNT
	n (%)	n (%)	Diff	BL
Patients with ≥3 SCBM/week	181 (25.4)	87 (12.2)	13.2	8
Patients with increase ≥1 SCBM/week	308 (45)	177 (24.4)	19.5	5
Mean change SCBM / week	1.9	1.2	0.7	0-1 = 60% 1-3 = 30%
Overall mean PAC-QOL score	1.33	1.68	0.35	2.1 – 2.3

Critique

 No evidence of efficacy in "target population"

- > 2 trials recruited refractory patients
- > 17% of patients in "pivotal trial"
- Included opioid induced constipation
- 2 trials report out to 18 months, "high attrition of >60%" so not included

Summary

20% of patients had at least 1 more SCBM/week
Drop in efficacy comparing
1-4 weeks (32%) vs 1-12 weeks (26%)

?Clinically significant
PAC-QOL satisfaction score same ~2.44
-0.96 from baseline

Did not address ADE

Effect of laxatives and pharmacological therapies in chronic idiopathic constipation: systematic review and meta-analysis

Gut 2011;60:209-218.

Alexander C Ford,^{1,2} Nicole C Suares¹

Ford 2011

Design	SR & MA of RCT (7 trials for prucalopride)					
Ρ	Chronic Idiopathic Constipation					
I.	Prucalopride 0.5, 1, 2, 4mg					
С	Placebo					
0	Efficacy • P: Tx failure OR Mean stools per week • S: effects on individual CIC Sx	Toxicity • ADE due to therapy				

Ford 2011

Medline, Embase, Cochrane
RCT, CIC, vs placebo
Used ROME I, II, or III
7 trials total for prucalopride
6 trials allowed rescue laxatives
2 trials recruited patients resistant or dissatisfied with laxatives

Rrimary Endpoint ≥3 SCBM

	Prucalopride Pla		Placebo		Risk Ratio			Risk Ratio
Study or Subgroup	Events	Total	Events	Total	Weight	M-H, Random, 95% CI	Year	M-H, Random, 95% Cl
Miner 1999	121	183	40	46	12.9%	0.76 [0.65, 0.89]	1999	-8-
Emmanuel 2002	10	39	27	38	1.5%	0.36 [0.20, 0.64]	2002	
Coremans 2003	17	27	21	26	3.8%	0.78 [0.55, 1.10]	2003	
Camilleri 2008	289	411	184	209	21.9%	0.80 [0.74, 0.87]	2008	
Quigley 2009	331	429	187	212	23.3%	0.87 [0.81, 0.94]	2009	-
Tack 2009	374	476	217	240	24.5%	0.87 [0.82, 0.92]	2009	=
Muller-Lissner 2010	146	231	55	72	12.0%	0.83 [0.70, 0.97]	2010	-
Total (95% CI)		1796	n G	843	100.0%	0.82 [0.76, 0.88]		•
Total events 1288 731 Heterogeneity: Tau ² = 0.00; Chi ² = 14.98, df = 6 (P = 0.02); I ² = 60% Test for overall effect: Z = 5.36 (P < 0.00001)						‰	ı	0.1 0.2 0.5 1 2 5 10 avours prucalopride Favours placebo

• NNT 6

Sensitivity Analysis

Table 4 Sensitivity	analyses of e	efficacy of pr	rucalopride in (chronic idiopa	thic const	ipation.	
			RR of failure			Number	
	Number of studies	Number of subjects	to respond to therapy	95% CI	l ² value	needed to treat	95% CI
All studies	7	2639	0.82	0.76 to 0.88	60%	6	5 to 9
Risk of bias of trials							
Low	3	1564	0.84	0.79 to 0.89	29%	7	5 to 10
High	4	1075	0.75	0.61 to 0.92	77%	5	3 to 11
Definition of CIC							
Rome II criteria	6	2562	0.84	0.81 to 0.88	13%	7	6 to 9
Other criteria	1	77	0.36	0.20 to 0.64	N/A	2	1.5 to 4
Duration of therapy							
≤4 weeks	4	662	0.73	0.60 to 0.90	64%	4	3 to 10
>4 weeks	3	1977	0.85	0.81 to 0.90	42%	8	6 to 11
Definition of response to	therapy						
≥3 CSBMs per week	5	2509	0.84	0.80 to 0.88	28%	7	6 to 9
Other definition	2	130	0.55	0.24 to 1.25	84%	N/A	N/A
Dose of prucalopride used							
1 mg od	3	319	0.68	0.46 to 1.00	82%	N/A	N/A
2 mg od	5	1560	0.85	0.80 to 0.90	18%	8	6 to 11
4 mg od	6	1615	0.83	0.77 to 0.90	52%	6	5 to 11

N/A, not applicable; CIC, chronic idiopathic constipation; CSBM, complete spontaneous bowel movement; od, once daily.

≥1 SCBM over baseline

	Prucalo	oride	Place	bo		Risk Ratio	Risk	Ratio
Study or Subgroup	Events	Total	Events	Total	Weight	M-H, Random, 95% CI	M-H, Rand	om, 95% Cl
1999 Miner	121	183	40	46	16.9%	0.76 [0.65, 0.89]		
2002 EMMANUEL	10	39	27	38	1.7%	0.36 [0.20, 0.64]		
2003 Cormans	17	27	21	26	4.4%	0.78 [0.55, 1.10]		-
2008 Camilleri	220	411	153	209	22.5%	0.73 [0.65, 0.83]	+	
2009 Quigley	229	413	150	207	22.8%	0.77 [0.68, 0.86]	+	
2009 Tack	259	439	185	234	27.3%	0.75 [0.67, 0.83]	+	
2010 MULLER-LISSNER	60	231	31	72	4.4%	0.60 [0.43, 0.85]		
Total (95% CI)		1743		832	100.0%	0.73 [0.68, 0.79]	•	
Total events	916		607					
Heterogeneity: Tau ² = 0.00; Chi ² = 8.31, df = 6 (P = 0.22); I ² = 28%				3%	0102 05			
Test for overall effect: $Z = 8.03$ (P < 0.00001)						Favours Prucalopride	Favours Placebo	

● NNT = 5

Mean Change from Baseline SCBM/week

• Prucalopride = 2.2

\odot Placebo = 1.1

Adverse Events

ADE	RR	CI (95%)	NNH	Baseline
Overall	1.14	1.05 – 1.24	10	
Headache	1.70	1.25 – 2.31	8	
Nausea	1.98	1.39 – 2.82	6	
Diarrhea	2.72	1.80 - 4.13	3	
Serious	0.88	0.58 – 1.34		2.7%

Critique

"2 or 4 mg is optimal dose"
Pool all doses together
Only assessed primary outcome
≥ 3 SCBM
? ≥ 1 SCBM
? Mean change SCBM

Summary

 2 trials recruited patients previously failed conventional therapy

NNT 5 : ≥1 SCBM/week
NNH 10 : All Adverse effects

Overall Summary

EFFICACY					
# SCBM	$\geq 3 = NNT 6$				
	\geq I = NNI 5				
Patient satisfaction	PAC-QOL score decreased from 3.25 to 2.55				
Mean change	2 for prucalopride				
SCBM/week	1 for placebo				
	SAFETY (NNH)				
Overall	10				
Headache	8				
Nausea	6				
Diarrhea	3				

Overall Summary

Tachyphylaxis not seen

Re-treatment possible for responders

Trials showed efficacy after 4 week
 If not effective by then, stop

Overall Critique

Trials industry funded Funnel plot

Itrials recruited patients who failed conventional therapy

?evidence to support

Health Canada Indication

Chronic idiopathic constipation in
 Adult <u>female</u> patients
 In whom laxatives failed to provide adequate relief

* "There were an insufficient number of male patients in the clinical trials to demonstrate efficacy"

Place in therapy

Conventional therapy available

• Uncomfortable condition

Expensive treatment

 Bottom line: Use in patients that have failed conventional therapy

Future Study and Other applications

- Efficacy in males
- Prucalopride for bowel prep
- Use in Palliative Care
- Non-cancer opioid induced constipation
- Spinal Cord Injury associated constipation
- Ochrane Review for Chronic Constipation
- Pediatrics

