Evaluation of apremilast in chronic pruritus of unknown origin: A proof-of-concept, phase 2a, open-label, single-arm clinical trial
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1 INTRODUCTION

Chronic itch in the absence of a clear etiology is referred to as chronic pruritus of unknown origin (CPUO).1 Although CPUO pathogenesis is poorly defined, it is believed that chronic low-grade inflammation drives itch in this setting.2,3 Apremilast, a systemic PDE-4 inhibitor, is currently approved for a variety of inflammatory disorders in the United States. However, the efficacy of apremilast remains unknown in CPUO. Herein, we present data from an early phase 2a, proof-of-concept, open-label study to investigate the efficacy of apremilast in adults with CPUO.

2 METHODS

2.1 Study design and treatment

This phase 2a, proof-of-concept, open-label, single-arm study in adult patients with CPUO was conducted in the United States at one site (ClinicalTrials.gov identifier: NCT03239106). Patients were recruited, screened, consented, and assessed out of a specialty itch clinic at Washington University School of Medicine during the course of routine clinical care. Key inclusion criteria included age ≥18 years, diagnosis of CPUO for ≥6 weeks, Numerical Rating Scale (NRS) itch score of ≥7, failure of topical triamcinolone 0.1% ointment twice daily (BID) for at least 2 weeks, and one of the histopathological features on skin biopsy in Table S1. Key exclusion criteria included chronic pruritus due to a primary dermatologic or other underlying medical disorder, topical treatments within 1 week of baseline, systemic immunomodulating agents within 4 weeks of baseline, and prior treatment with apremilast. The following medications were prohibited during the study: topical and oral steroids, leukotriene inhibitors, calcineurin inhibitors, allergen immunotherapy, phototherapy, tanning beds, live vaccines, and CYP450 inducers.

While there was no formally stated statistically powered a priori hypothesis for this study, the target enrollment of n = 10 subjects was based on the relative uniformity of the disease severity of the population (ie, severe itch only), and on the fact that we have previously observed relevant differences in populations of CPUO patients with only n = 5 to 6 patients per group in response to treatment.4,5 Ten patients with CPUO were enrolled and received 16 weeks of treatment with apremilast 30 mg tablet twice daily (BID).

2.2 Assessment

The primary endpoint analysis of this study was absolute reduction in 24-hour and 1-week NRS itch score at week 16 from baseline in patients who received apremilast 30 mg BID for 16 weeks. We chose
16 weeks as the primary endpoint in light of recent success at this
timepoint with agents employed to treat atopic dermatitis.6 The key
secondary endpoint was absolute reduction in Dermatology Life
Quality Index (DLQI) at week 16 from baseline. Safety and tolerability were
assessed by monitoring the type, frequency, duration, and severity of
adverse events (AEs) throughout the duration of the study by non-
systematic assessment and self-reporting by patients at each study
visit. The NRS itch score is a single-question assessment tool with a
scale of 0 (no itch) to 10 (worst imaginable itch).7 Patents reported
their worst level of itch over the prior 24-hour and 1-week period at
each study visit. Change from baseline in DLQI was also measured to
assess patient quality of life (QoL) improvement.8 Patients were
assessed at baseline and weeks 2, 4, 8, 10, 12, and 16 for these end-
points as well as for vital signs including respiratory rate, pulse, blood
pressure, and temperature, and a targeted symptom-directed physical
exam was conducted. Laboratory tests were performed at baseline and
at week 16, which included a complete blood count and a comprehen-
sive metabolic profile.

2.3 | Statistics

All patients were included in the intent-to-treat efficacy analysis. Given
the unexpectedly high dropout rate and inability to draw any systematic
conclusions (see below), we performed a last observation carried forward
(LOCF) to week 16 analysis with missing data inferred for the 24-hour
and 1-week NRS itch scores and DLQI score, in a post hoc manner. All
efficacy data points are shown at each individual assessment. Differences
in NRS and DLQI scores were assessed via Wilcoxon Signed-Rank non-
parametric tests for non-normally distributed data. Differences were con-
sidered statistically significant if a two-tailed \( P < .05 \). Statistical analysis
was performed using GraphPad Prism 8.0 software.

2.4 | Ethical considerations

The protocol was approved by the Washington University in St. Louis
Institutional Review Board (Protocol: 201709093) and informed con-
sent was obtained from all patients.

3 | RESULTS

3.1 | Patients

Between December of 2017 and October of 2018, 10 patients were
enrolled for treatment. The median [interquartile range, IQR] age was
75 [64.5-77.5] years and 6/10 were female. The median [IQR] baseline
24-hour and 1-week NRS itch scores were 9.25 [7.75-10] and 8 [7-9.25],
respectively. The baseline mean ± SD DLQI score was 14.3 ± 7.94. All
patients exhibited a generalized itch pattern including the trunk and upper
and lower extremities as assessed by the principal investigator (PI). The
baseline demographics of the patients are shown in Table 1.

### TABLE 1

| Characteristic | Number (%), mean ± SD, or median [IQR] |
|---------------|----------------------------------------|
| Age (years)   | 75 [64.5-77.5]                         |
| Female, number (%) | 6 (60%)                               |
| White, number (%)  | 9 (90%)                                |
| Black, number (%)    | 1 (10%)                                |
| 24-hour NRS itch score | 9.25 [7.75-10]                        |
| 1-week NRS itch score | 8 [7-9.25]                            |
| DLQI score     | 14.3 ± 7.94                            |

Abbreviations: DLQI, Dermatology Life Quality Index; IQR, interquartile range; NRS, Numerical Rating Scale.

3.2 | Efficacy

The data were analyzed in an intent-to-treat manner with key primary
and secondary endpoints measured as an absolute reduction in NRS
itch and DLQI scores, respectively, at week 16 from baseline. In total,
3/10 patients completed the study, which did not allow for meaning-
ful intent-to-treat statistical analysis. As an alternative approach, we
undertook a post hoc LOCF analysis by carrying forward to week 16.
By this analysis, we observed no statistically significant reduction in
24-hour or 1-week NRS itch scores at week 16 (Figures 1A and S1). Further,
we similarly observed no significant reduction in DLQI at week 16 from baseline (Figure 1B).

Given that 70% of the patients did not complete the study, we
sought to examine the reasons for patient dropout. Strikingly, 50% of the
patients dropped out due to experiencing an AE. One additional patient
opted to discontinue the study due to resolution of itch symptoms, while
another desired to use a prohibited medication for itch relief. Two of the
three patients who completed the study demonstrated absolute reduc-
tion in 24-hour NRS itch scores from 8 and 9.5 to 0 (Figure 1A). Further,
these same subjects also demonstrated a reduction in DLQI score from
26 and 10 to 4 and 0, respectively (Figure 1B). Lastly, one patient com-
pleted the study who did not demonstrate a reduction in NRS itch score
but a minimal reduction in DLQI score from 5 to 3.

3.3 | Safety

For this cohort of patients, apremilast was not well tolerated, and several
mild to moderate AEs were reported. There were 11 total AEs reported
by 5 (50%) patients in the study; all were considered treatment related
and resembled AEs reported in the prescribing information for
apremilast. The specific AEs and incidences are described in Table 2. Gas-
trointestinal (GI) dysfunction was reported by 5 (50%) patients, with nau-
sea and diarrhea being the most common. Complaints of nervous system
dysfunction were also reported by 2 (20%) patients, which included
headaches and presyncope. All AEs were mild to moderate in terms of
severity and ceased within 48 hours of stopping the medication. All five
patients who experienced AEs dropped out of the study due to the AEs
(median [IQR] follow-up 2 [0-5] weeks). Notwithstanding this, there
were no clinically significant changes as determined by the PI in vital signs, physical exam, or laboratory parameters for any of the patients during the course of the study.

4 | DISCUSSION

In the current study, apremilast demonstrated poor tolerability in this population of patients with CPUO, which resulted in high dropout. Because of this, a meaningful intent-to-treat statistical analysis was not possible, and we were unable to evaluate both the primary and secondary endpoints of efficacy based on NRS itch and DLQI scores. Therefore, we performed a post-hoc LOCF analysis, and we did not observe any inferred efficacy. Collectively, we conclude that due to the unexpectedly high rate of AEs in this population, when designing future studies, power analyses would benefit from accounting for a high dropout rate.

Our statistical analysis plan assumed a mean NRS itch score of 8.8 with a SD of 1.1 based on a sampling of patients from our specialty itch clinic. Based on these values and our recent experience in treating small cohorts of patients with CPUO, our target sample size was n = 10. Unfortunately, we did not anticipate such a high dropout rate. Notwithstanding this, two of the three patients who completed the study did demonstrate marked reduction of itch from severe (NRS itch score of 8 and 9.5) to no itch (NRS itch score of 0). This was associated with respective improvement in QoL as measured by the DLQI. However, given that this is not a placebo-controlled study, we cannot determine whether this is due to a placebo effect or even a direct response to apremilast. As the placebo response in CPUO was recently reported to be surprisingly high in phase 2 clinical trials with other agents such as serloptant (NCT03841331), studies in this condition will likely require much larger sample sizes than originally anticipated in the design of this study.

| TABLE 2 | Treatment emergent adverse events (AEs) |
|---|---|
| AEs | N |
| Number of patients experiencing an adverse event (% of total) | 5 (50%) |
| Total number of adverse events | 11 |
| Gastrointestinal disorders | 5 |
| Decreased appetite | 1 |
| Nausea | 3 |
| Vomiting | 1 |
| Diarrhea | 3 |
| Nervous system disorders | 2 |
| Fatigue | 1 |
| Headache | 1 |
| Migraine | 0 |
| Paresthesia | 0 |
| Presyncope | 1 |

Note: Values expressed as number (N) unless otherwise indicated.

Because of this, a meaningful intent-to-treat statistical analysis was not possible, and we were unable to evaluate both the primary and secondary endpoints of efficacy based on NRS itch and DLQI scores. Therefore, we performed a post-hoc LOCF analysis, and we did not observe any inferred efficacy. Collectively, we conclude that due to the unexpectedly high rate of AEs in this population, when designing future studies, power analyses would benefit from accounting for a high dropout rate.

Our statistical analysis plan assumed a mean NRS itch score of 8.8 with a SD of 1.1 based on a sampling of patients from our specialty itch clinic. Based on these values and our recent experience in treating small cohorts of patients with CPUO, our target sample size was n = 10. Unfortunately, we did not anticipate such a high dropout rate. Notwithstanding this, two of the three patients who completed the study did demonstrate marked reduction of itch from severe (NRS itch score of 8 and 9.5) to no itch (NRS itch score of 0). This was associated with respective improvement in QoL as measured by the DLQI. However, given that this is not a placebo-controlled study, we cannot determine whether this is due to a placebo effect or even a direct response to apremilast. As the placebo response in CPUO was recently reported to be surprisingly high in phase 2 clinical trials with other agents such as serloptant (NCT03841331), studies in this condition will likely require much larger sample sizes than originally anticipated in the design of this study.
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