

Effect of Siponimod on Disability Progression as Measured by the Ambulation Score, a Subscore of the Neurostatus-EDSS: Post hoc Analysis of the EXPAND Trial in SPMS

Marcus D'Souza^{1,2}, Gavin Giovannoni^{*3}, Patrick Vermersch⁴, Jeff Maca⁵, Soudeh Ansari⁶, Goeril Karlsson⁷, Daniela Piani-Meier⁷, Ludwig Kappos^{1,2}

¹Neurologic Clinic and Policlinic, Department of Head, Spine and Neuromedicine, University Hospital of Basel, Basel, Switzerland, ²Research Center for Clinical Neuroimmunology and Neuroscience Basel (RC2NB), Departments of Head, Spine and Neuromedicine, Clinical Research, Biomedicine and Biomedical Engineering, University Hospital and University of Basel, Basel, Switzerland, ^{3*}(co-first author) Blizard Institute, Barts and The London School of Medicine and Dentistry, Queen Mary University of London, London, United Kingdom, ⁴University Lille, INSERM U1172, CHU Lille, FHU Precise, Lille, France, ⁵Novartis Pharmaceutical Corporation, East Hanover, NJ, USA, ⁶Novartis Pharmaceuticals Corporation, Cambridge, MA, USA, ⁷Novartis Pharma AG, Basel, Switzerland

Objective:

Assess siponimod's effect on the Ambulation Score (AS; representing the type of assistance used and walking distance measured) of the Neurostatus-Expanded Disability Status Scale (Neurostatus-EDSS) in secondary progressive multiple sclerosis (SPMS).

Background:

In the Phase 3 EXPAND study, siponimod reduced the Neurostatus-EDSS-measured risk of 3/6-month (M) confirmed disability progression versus placebo by 21%/26%, with more pronounced effects (31%/37%) in active SPMS (aSPMS). Characteristically, ambulation steadily declines in SPMS. In EXPAND, siponimod's effects on the timed-25-foot walk test were not significant, probably due to higher variability in this measure at higher EDSS scores. Here we evaluated the contribution of the AS to siponimod's effect on disability progression.

Design/Methods:

This post-hoc analysis included the overall population (OP); siponimod/placebo n=1099/546) and aSPMS/non-active (naSPMS) patients (siponimod, n=516/557; placebo, n=263/270). Outcomes included change from baseline in Neurostatus-EDSS/AS, time-to-first worsening on AS (3M/6M confirmed worsening [3M/6MCW]) by $\geq 1/\geq 2$ -points and categorical analysis (proportion of patients with 3M/6MCW or confirmed improvement [CI] by ≥ 1 -point during the core study [median(range): 21(0.2–37.0)M]).

Results:

In the OP, the Neurostatus-EDSS, and more prominently, AS change from baseline, favored siponimod versus placebo at all visits (M6-M30); most pronounced at M18 (EDSS: 0.13 versus 0.23; p=0.003; AS: 0.50 versus 0.81; p=0.001). Siponimod significantly reduced the risk of 3MCW (≥ 1 -point, HR=0.78, p=0.0046; ≥ 2 -point, 0.71, p=0.0007) and 6MCW in AS (≥ 1 point, 0.74, p=0.0023. At M24, fewer patients worsened/more improved on siponimod versus placebo (Neurostatus-EDSS: 6MCW, 26.9% versus 35.7%; 6MCI, 11.1% versus 8.5%, p=0.03; AS: 6MCW, 33.4% versus 45.2%; 6MCI, 14.9% versus 10.6%, p=0.005). In aSPMS, pronounced effects were observed in 3MCW (≥ 1 -point, HR=0.68, p=0.002; ≥ 2 -point, 0.60, p=0.0005); 6MCW (≥ 1 -point, HR=0.63, p=0.0007), with fewer patients worsening/more improving on siponimod and a trend for fewer patients worsening in naSPMS.

Conclusions:

These findings corroborate siponimod's efficacy on disability progression in SPMS. More pronounced effects on the Neurostatus-EDSS and AS were observed in aSPMS and when using more stringent endpoint definitions.

Print

Close