touchCLINICAL PERSPECTIVES

Migraine prevention in the real world: Exploring the role of anti-CGRP antibodies



Disclaimer

- Unapproved products or unapproved uses of approved products may be discussed by the faculty; these situations may reflect the approval status in one or more jurisdictions
- The presenting faculty have been advised by touchIME to ensure that they disclose any such references made to unlabelled or unapproved use
- No endorsement by touchIME of any unapproved products or unapproved uses is either made or implied by mention of these products or uses in touchIME activities
- touchIME accepts no responsibility for errors or omissions



Using anti-CGRP antibodies for migraine prevention: Key learnings

Prof. Simona Sacco

Professor of Neurology University of L'Aquila Italy





What are your key takeaways from this touchCLINICAL PERSPECTIVES activity?



Overview of the course content

Module 1

Introduction to the course

Module 2

 Patient perspective on migraine burden
Real-world data for anti-CGRP antibodies in migraine prevention

х х х х

Module 3

- Treatment failure in migraine and what to do
- Practical guidance on using anti-CGRP antibodies for migraine prevention

Module 4

 Recap and key updates from the International Headache Congress 2023

Current module



In the past few months, have there been any interesting updates to our understanding of anti-CGRP antibodies for migraine prevention in the real world?



Real-world, long-term effects of switching between anti-CGRP antibodies for migraine prevention

Long-term, real-world, prospective analysis of data from two large tertiary referral headache centres in the UK and Italy

Treatment-refractory

chronic migraine (N=39)

Did not achieve a meaningful sustained response to erenumab and were switched to fremanezumab* Primary outcome Patients (%) with ≥30% decrease in MMDs by month 3 vs posterenumab baseline



Responses sustained at month 6; 33.3% responded after last treatment[‡] Secondary outcomes and safety/tolerability

	Baseline (post-erenumab)	Month 3 (N=39)	Month 6 (n=21)	treatment [‡] (n=16)
Monthly painkiller use (median)	8.6	0.0 (p≤0.001)	9.6 (p=0.201)	5.4 (p=0.033)
HIT-6 score (median)	66.0	68.5	66.0	62.0
TRAEs [†]		8	4	3

Approximately one third of patients with treatment-refractory chronic migraine who had a suboptimal response to erenumab and switched to fremanezumab, obtained a meaningful and sustained improvement in migraine burden

*Patients treated with erenumab (70 mg or 140 mg) for ≥3 months who either did not respond, or obtained a minimal but not meaningful enough benefit, or who initially responded but in whom the effectiveness wore off over time, were switched to fremanezumab 225 mg/month after a variable interval period; [†]Side effects were generally rated as mild; [‡]Up to 18 months. CGRP, calcitonin gene-related peptide; HIT-6, Head Impact Test-6; MMD, monthly migraine day; TRAE, treatment-related adverse event. Lambru G, et al. *Neurotherapeutics*. 2023;20:1284–93.



Real-world data on long-term outcomes with anti-CGRP antibodies for migraine prevention

RE-DO: Long-term, real-world, multicentre, prospective, observational cohort study in 10 Italian headache centres



Erenumab, galcanezumab and fremanezumab were associated with persistent effectiveness through first and the second years of use

*Anti-CGRPr vs anti-CGRP p<0.001; ¹The Italian Medicines Agency requires mandatory drug withdrawal for ≥1 month, following one continuous year of treatment. CGRP, calcitonin gene-related peptide; CM, chronic migraine; HFEM, high-frequency episodic migraine; MMD, monthly migraine day; r, receptor; RE-DO, RE-treating migraine patients in the seconD year with mOnoclonal antibodies anti-CGRP pathway. Vernieri F, et al. J. Neurol. 2023:doi: 10.1007/s00415-023-11872-2. Online ahead of print.



What were the highlights from IHC 2023 regarding real-world use of anti-CGRP antibodies for migraine prevention?



Real-world insights from the CaMEO-I study: Patient-reported, migraine-related burden and stigma

CaMEO-I: Cross-sectional cohort study conducted in the USA, Canada, UK, Germany, France and Japan¹⁻³



31.5%: others do not understand the pain or impact of migraine

5.4–9.5% had ≥15 MHD¹

N=14.492¹⁻³

17.5%: others view migraine as the patient's fault

Frequently experienced^{*} stigma¹

16.5%: felt less of themselves, ashamed and/or guilty



15.9%: others view migraine as a way to get out of work or activities



Globally, migraine is associated with a substantial burden, including stigma, QoL, cognition and work/activity impairments¹⁻³

*Occurring often or very often.

CaMEO-I, Chronic Migraine Epidemiology and Outcomes – International; MHD, monthly headache day; QoL, quality of life.

1. Shapiro RE, et al. Presented at: IHC 2023, Seoul, South Korea. 14–17 September 2023. Abstr IHC23-DP-043; 2. Lipton RB, et al. Presented at: IHC 2023, Seoul, South Korea. 14–17 September 2023. Abstr IHC23-IND-002; 3. Katsarava Z. et al. Presented at: IHC 2023, Seoul, South Korea. 14–17 September 2023. Abstr IHC23-IND-003.



Real-world efficacy and safety following 6 months of anti-CGRP antibody use for migraine prevention

Real-world, multicentre, prospective, observational cohort study in 35 centres in Spain, Italy, Portugal, UK, Germany, Sweden and Poland



Following 6 months of use, anti-CGRP antibodies are effective and well tolerated for patients with HFEM and CM, with comparable response rates to those found in clinical trials

CGRP, calcitonin gene-related peptide; CM, chronic migraine; HFEM, high-frequency episodic migraine; MHD, monthly headache day. Caronna E, et al. Presented at: IHC 2023, Seoul, South Korea. 14–17 September 2023. Abstr IHC23-LBAPO-023.

Real-world outcomes following first or second anti-CGRP antibody switch for migraine prevention

Real-world, UK-based, retrospective, case note review study from a tertiary headache centre



N=54 Suboptimal response to anti-CGRP antibody after 12 weeks and received a 2nd or 3rd anti-CGRP antibody*



Initial anti-CGRP antibody

93% erenumab

Reasons for switching from 1st to 2nd anti-CGRP antibody (%)



baseline for those who switched due to lack or loss of response

Mean MHD

reduction

.....

-5.8

(p<0.0001

Outcomes at 12 weeks vs switch





Overall response rate: 58%

3rd anti-CGRP antibody (n=16)

44%



Fremanezumab Galcanezumab

Outcomes at 12 weeks vs switch baseline



No significant difference in MHDs or severe headache days

Switching between a 1st and 2nd anti-CGRP antibody was associated with significant improvement in outcomes after 12 weeks of treatment; no significant improvement was seen after switching from a 2nd to a 3rd anti-CGRP antibody

*A washout period of 3 months between treatments was targeted but not strictly adhered to. CGRP, calcitonin gene-related peptide; MHD, monthly headache day. Lowe M, et al. Presented at: IHC 2023, Seoul, South Korea. 14–17 September 2023. Abstr IHC23-LBAPO-024.



What are the clinical implications of recent real-world data on anti-CGRP antibodies for migraine prevention?



Clinical impact of the latest real-world data on anti-CGRPs for migraine prevention

Switching between anti-CGRP antibodies

- When and how
- Managing patient expectations

2 Long-term use of anti-CGRP antibodies

- Duration of use
- Managing patient expectations

5 Efficacy and safety of anti-CGRP antibodies

 Managing patient expectations

