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



Anti-CGRP antibodies for patients with migraine: Practical management

Dr Simy ParikhDepartment of Neurology, Thomas Jefferson University Hospital, Philadelphia, PA, USA





Patient case introduction: Reuben



Age: 35 years

Sex: Male

Occupation: Plumber

- Diagnosed with chronic migraine
- Failed traditional preventive treatments
- Has agreed to start anti-CGRP antibodies



What would you discuss with the patient regarding the treatment goals and his expectations?



Key discussion topics before initiating preventive migraine treatment

Key treatment goals



Reduce attack frequency, severity and duration



Improve responsiveness to acute treatment and reduce overuse



Improve functioning and health-related quality of life

Developing an individualized treatment plan

Lifestyle

Identify and minimize exposure to migraine triggers

Maintain nutrition, regular exercise, adequate hydration, sleep and stress management practices

Keep a migraine diary



Goals

Agree on what defines success in migraine prevention

Understand common and severe potential side effects

Understand when to make dose adjustments



 When and how should the efficacy of anti-CGRP antibodies for migraine prevention be assessed after treatment initiation?



Patient case introduction: Rosa



Age: 38 years

Sex: Female

Occupation: Hairdresser

- Diagnosed with chronic migraine
- Has been receiving preventive treatment with erenumab for 2 months



Measuring the response to anti-CGRP antibodies

EHF guidelines¹

- First evaluation after a minimum of 3 consecutive months of treatment
- In selected cases, reassess after an additional 3 months

AHS criteria for continuation of anti-CGRP antibodies²

MMDs or headache days

• ≥50% reduction from baseline



MIDAS

 Reduction of ≥5 points (baseline 11–20) or 30% (baseline >20)

MPFID

Reduction of ≥5 points

HIT-6

Reduction of ≥5 points



Treatment initiation

Monitoring

*For patients who are transitioning from their previous preventive treatment to an anti-CGRP antibody therapy (i.e. assessment during the interim period when both treatments are being taken); †For treatments administered monthly; †For treatments administered quarterly.

AHS, American Headache Society; CGRP, calcitonin gene-related peptide; EHF, European Headache Federation; HIT-6, Headache Impact Test-6;

MIDAS, Migraine Disability Assessment; MMD, monthly migraine day; MPFID, Migraine Physical Function Impact Diary.

1. Sacco S, et al. J Headache Pain. 2022;23:67; 2. Ailani J, et al. Headache. 2021;61:1021–39.



When should treatment with anti-CGRP antibodies be paused or restarted?



Patient case introduction: Hana



Age: 30 years

Sex: Female

Occupation: Caterer

- Successfully treated with fremanezumab for 15 months
- Wants to pause treatment because of plans to start a family



Pausing and restarting anti-CGRP antibodies



Anti-CGRP antibodies should be avoided in patients who are pregnant or planning to start a family^{1,2}



Patients should be involved in the decision to pause and restart treatments to enhance optimal outcomes;² evidence is limited regarding optimal therapy duration^{1,2}

Real-world study following completion of 12 months of anti-CGRP treatment (N=44)³

Longitudinal cohort study following at least 8 months of anti-CGRP treatment (N=39)⁴



≥50% MMD reduction after initial therapy*



Restarted treatment[†]



Switched treatment[‡]



MMD reduction after initial therapy



Increase in MMD after discontinuation



MMD reduction after reinitiation§



^{*}All patients completed 12 months of anti-CGRP treatment due a good response; †Patients restarted treatment due to clinical worsening;

^{*}Decision to switch to another anti-CGRP was by medical decision (tolerance or improvement of response); §After a 3-month drug holiday. CGRP, calcitonin gene-related peptide; MMD, monthly migraine days.

^{1.} Sacco S, et al. J Headache Pain. 2022;23:67; 2. Ailani J, et al. Headache. 2021;61:1021–39; 3. Vallejo C, et al. Eur J Hosp Pharm. 2023;30:A193–4;

^{4.} Raffaelli B, et al. J Headache Pain. 2022;23:40.

How can treatment failure with anti-CGRP antibodies be determined and when should switching be considered?



Patient case introduction: Malik



Age: 48 years

Sex: Male

Occupation: Accountant

- Has been receiving erenumab for 3 months, but has reported only 1 fewer monthly migraine day
- Wondering if this treatment is working for him



Treatment failure and switching: Key considerations



- Reasons for treatment failure and/or switching include:¹⁻³
 - No relevant clinical response to treatment
 - Intolerable side effects,
 e.g. constipation or hypertension
- Shared decision making is required to determine treatment success³

Real-world study of <50% treatment response after 24 weeks of anti-CGRP treatment (N=864)⁵





Chronic migraine

HFEM



- Switching anti-CGRP therapy may improve patient outcomes following initial treatment failure^{1,3}
- Combination therapy, with agents such as BTX-A, could improve patient outcomes after initial treatment failure⁴

Subgroup analysis of patients with ≥50% reduction in MMD with fremanezumab treatment after other anti-CGRP treatment failure (n=138)¹



Chronic migraine



Episodic migraine



BTX-A, on abotulinum to xin A; CGRP, calciton in gene-related peptide; HFEM, high-frequency episodic migraine; MMD, monthly migraine days.

- 1. Straube A, et al. J Headache Pain. 2023;24:59; 2. Pavelic AR, et al. Cells. 2022;12:143; 3. Ailani J, et al. Headache. 2021;61:1021–39;
- 4. Ailani J, Blumenfeld AM. Headache. 2022;62:106-8; 5. Barbanti P, et al. J Headache Pain. 2022;23:138.