Long-term hemoglobin response and reduction in transfusion burden are maintained in patients with pyruvate kinase deficiency treated with mitapivat

¹Dana-Farber/Boston Children's Cancer and Blood Disorders Center, Boston, MA, USA; ²Department of Haematology, Copenhagen University, Hamilton, ON, Canada; ⁵Duke University Medical Center, Durham, NC, USA; ⁶Hematology Department, Hospital Universitario La Paz, Madrid, Spain; ⁷Hammersmith Hospital, Imperial College Healthcare NHS Trust, London, UK; ⁸Department of Paediatrics, University of Würzburg, Germany; ⁹Unité des Maladies Génétiques du Globule Rouge, CHU Henri Mondor, Creteil, France; ¹⁰Benign Hematology Center, Van Creveldkliniek, University Medical Center Utrecht, University of Utrecht, Utrecht, The Netherlands; 17 Ohoku University, Bangkok, Thailand; 18 Aflac Cancer and Blood Disorders Center, Children's Healthcare of Atlanta, GA, USA; 14 Agios Pharmaceuticals, Inc., Cambridge, MA, USA; 15 Division of Hematology, Massachusetts General Hospital, Harvard Medical School, Boston, MA, USA

BACKGROUND

- Pyruvate kinase (PK) deficiency is a rare, lifelong, hereditary hemolytic anemia caused by
- mutations in the PKLR gene, encoding the red blood cell (RBC)-specific form of PK (PKR)^{1,2} • Defects in PKR lead to chronic hemolysis and anemia, which are associated with serious
- complications, regardless of transfusion status, including iron overload, pulmonary hypertension, and osteoporosis³⁻⁶
- The disease also negatively impacts patient health-related quality of life⁵
- Until recently, there were no disease-modifying pharmacotherapies approved for PK deficiency; available supportive therapies are associated with short- and long-term complications⁷
- Mitapivat (AG-348) is a first-in-class, oral, allosteric activator of PKR that is approved by the US Food and Drug Administration for the treatment of hemolytic anemia in adults with PK deficiency⁸⁻¹⁰
- Mitapivat demonstrated significant improvements in hemoglobin (Hb) in adult patients who were not regularly transfused (ACTIVATE, NCT03548220)¹¹ and a significant reduction in transfusion burden in adult patients with PK deficiency who were regularly transfused (ACTIVATE-T, NCT03559699)¹²
- Mitapivat was well tolerated, and the safety profile was generally consistent across all reported studies (Supplemental tables 1–3 [QR code])^{11–14}

OBJECTIVE

• To assess the long-term effects of mitapivat on Hb response and transfusion burden reduction in patients with PK deficiency in ACTIVATE, ACTIVATE-T, and their long-term extension (LTE) study

METHODS

Study designs for ACTIVATE, ACTIVATE-T, and the LTE study

- ACTIVATE was a phase 3, global, double-blind, placebo-controlled study of mitapivat in adult patients with PK deficiency who were not regularly transfused¹¹
- ACTIVATE-T was a phase 3, global, open-label, single-arm study of mitapivat in adult patients with PK deficiency who were regularly transfused¹²
- Patients who completed either trial were eligible to continue in the LTE where all patients received mitapivat treatment (**Figure 1**)

Figure 1. ACTIVATE, ACTIVATE-T, and the LTE study designs



^aStratified by average of screening Hb values (<8.5 g/dL vs \geq 8.5 g/dL) and *PKLR* gene mutation category (missense/missense vs missense/non-missense); ^bScreening may have been extended beyond 8 weeks if there was a delay in obtaining a patient's complete transfusion history or to ensure that the first dose of study drug could be administered 2–7 days after the most recent transfusion; ClinicalTrials.gov: ACTIVATE (NCT03548220); ACTIVATE-T (NCT03559699); LTE study (NCT03853798); BID, twice daily; BL, baseline; Hb, hemoglobin; LTE, long-term extension; M/M, mitapivat-to-mitapivat; P/M, placebo-to-mitapivat; R, randomized

Endpoints and analyses

• The ACTIVATE/LTE study analysis assessed:

- Duration of Hb response (defined as the time from the date a patient first achieved an increase in Hb ≥1.5 g/dL from baseline [BL] to the date of the last Hb assessment where the next Hb assessment had change from BL <1.5 g/dL) in 2 cohorts
- Mitapivat-to-mitapivat (M/M) arm: patients who received mitapivat and achieved a Hb response in ACTIVATE (defined as a ≥ 1.5 g/dL increase in Hb from BL sustained at ≥ 2 scheduled assessments at Weeks 16, 20, and 24 in ACTIVATE) and maintained it in the LTE study
- Placebo-to-mitapivat (P/M) arm: patients who received placebo in ACTIVATE and switched to mitapivat in the LTE study and then achieved a Hb response (defined as a \geq 1.5 g/dL increase in Hb from BL sustained at ≥2 scheduled assessments at Weeks 16, 20, and 24 in the LTE) and maintained in the LTE study

- The **ACTIVATE-T/LTE** study analysis assessed:
- Duration of transfusion reduction response (TRR) among patients in ACTIVATE-T who achieved \geq 33% reduction in number of RBC units transfused during the fixed-dose period in ACTIVATE-T, compared with the patient's individual historic transfusion burden standardized to 24 weeks
- Duration of TRR is the time from the start of the fixed-dose period in ACTIVATE-T to the day before a transfusion in the LTE study where the transfusion burden reduction becomes <33%
- Transfusion-free duration among patients in ACTIVATE-T who achieved transfusion-free status • Defined as a period of no transfusions received during ACTIVATE-T and the LTE study

RESULTS

Patient disposition in ACTIVATE, ACTIVATE-T, and the LTE study

- 80 patients were randomized in ACTIVATE (mitapivat N=40; placebo N=40); as of 27 March 2022, 35/40 patients continued from ACTIVATE to the LTE in the M/M arm and 38/40 patients continued to the LTE in the P/M arm (**Figure 2a**)
- 27 patients were treated with mitapivat in ACTIVATE-T; as of 27March2022, 17 patients continued from ACTIVATE-T to the LTE on mitapivat (**Figure 2b**)

Figure 2a. Patient disposition in ACTIVATE and the LTE study Randomized 1:1 (N=80)^a Allocation in ACTIVATE Allocated to mitapivat (N=40) Received mitapivat (n=40 Discontinued placebo (n=0) Discontinued mitapivat (n=0) Follow-up reatment in LTE M/M^b arm (N=35) reatment in LTE P/M^b arm (N=38) LTE study as o Discontinued treatment in LTE 27March2022

Figure 2b. Patient disposition in ACTIVATE-T and the LTE study

Allocation in ACTIVATE-T	Treated with mitapivat (N=27)
Follow-up	↓ Discontinued mitapivat (n=6)
	+
LTE study as of 27March2022	Treatment in LTE^b study (N=17) • Discontinued treatment in LTE (n=6) ^e

^aDisposition for end of randomization reflects the disposition after randomization but before the start of study treatment; ^bLTE study is ongoing; O patients have completed treatment; °Reasons for discontinuation, withdrawal n=4, adverse event n=1, accidental death unrelated to treatment n=1, other n=1; dReasons for discontinuation, withdrawal n=5, lack of efficacy n=2, physician decision n=1, adverse event n=1, other n=1; "Reasons for discontinuation, withdrawal n=3, lack of efficacy n=1, physician decision n=1, other n=1; LTE, long-term extension; M/M. mitapivat-to-mitapivat: P/M. placebo-to-mitapivat

Improvements in Hb concentrations with long-term mitapivat treatment in ACTIVATE and the LTE study

• An early increase in the mean Hb concentration from BL was observed in the M/M arm, with similar early improvements seen in the P/M arm following the switch to mitapivat in the LTE (**Figure 3**) - These improvements were sustained with continued treatment up to 33.2 months

Figure 3. Change from BL in Hb over time in patients randomized to mitapivat or placebo in ACTIVATE and continued in the LTE on mitapivat



Presented at the 64th American Society of Hematology (ASH) Annual Meeting and Exposition, December 10–13, 2022, New Orleans, LA, USA, and Virtual

Rachael F Grace, MD,¹ Andreas Glenthøj, MD,² Wilma Barcellini, MD,³ Madeleine Verhovsek, MD,⁹ Eduard J van Beers, MD,¹⁰ Koichi Onodera, MD,¹¹ Koichi Onodera, MD,¹⁰ Koichi Onodera, MD, Vip Viprakasit, MD, PhD,¹² Satheesh Chonat, MD,¹⁴ Hanny Al-Samkari, MD,¹⁴ Emily Xu, PhD,¹⁴ Bryan McGee, PharmD,¹⁴ Vanessa Beynon, MD,¹⁴ Hanny Al-Samkari, MD¹⁵

> Greater Hb response rates in patients treated with mitapivat vs placebo in ACTIVATE and the LTE study

- In ACTIVATE, 40% (16/40) of patients treated with mitapivat achieved a Hb response by 24 weeks¹¹
- None of the patients assigned to placebo in ACTIVATE (N=40) achieved a Hb response during ACTIVATE; in the LTE, 39.5% (15/38) of patients randomized to placebo in ACTIVATE showed a Hb response by 24 weeks after switching to mitapivat
- Hb response was sustained with long-term mitapivat treatment in ACTIVATE and the LTE study
- As of 27March2022, the median duration of Hb response among the 31 Hb responders from
- ACTIVATE and the LTE study was 18.3 months, with responses ongoing up to 32.9 months (Figure 4) • 8 patients from ACTIVATE and the LTE study fell below the 1.5 g/dL response threshold; however, 6/8 returned to a change from BL ≥ 1.5 g/dL, showing continued benefit from mitapivat treatment (Figure 4)



ACTIVATE LTE study AMM patients with Hb response in ACTIVATE P/M patients with Hb response in the LTE Hb response is defined as post-BL change from BL in Hb \geq 15 g/L (1.5 g/dL) that is sustained at 2 or more assessments at Weeks 16, 20, and 24 in the fixed-dose period, excluding those within 61 days after a transfusion. Duration of Hb response was defined as the time from the date a patient first achieved an increase in Hb \geq 1.5 g/dL from BL to the date of the last Hb assessment where the next Hb assessment had change from BL <1.5 g/dL; BL, baseline; Hb, hemoglobin; LTE, long-term extension; M/M, mitapivat-to-mitapivat; P/M, placebo-to-mitapivat; Pt, patient

Transfusion reduction and transfusion-free status of patients from ACTIVATE-T were maintained in the LTE study

- In ACTIVATE-T, 37% (10/27) of patients achieved a TRR and 22% (6 patients) achieved transfusionfree status¹²
- Among the 10 patients who achieved a TRR in ACTIVATE-T, the response was maintained in the LTE up to 37.1 months
- All 6 patients who achieved transfusion-free status in ACTIVATE-T maintained the status in the LTE up to 38.3 months (**Figure 5**)
- The median duration of transfusion-free status was 33.4 months
- 1 additional patient achieved TRR, but was not transfusion-free in ACTIVATE-T, and did not receive any transfusions in the LTE





- Long-term safety data
- As of 27March2022, mitapivat showed a consistent safety profile over the long-term duration of treatment (**Table 1**)
- No new safety findings were observed in subjects (N=90) treated in the LTE study
- The most common treatment-emergent adverse events (TEAEs) were headache
- (26 patients [28.9%]) and pyrexia (17 patients [18.9%]) • The majority of TEAEs were grade 1 or 2 in severity
- Two grade ≥3 treatment-related TEAEs were reported
- ACTIVATE/LTE M/M arm: arthralgia (n=1)
- ACTIVATE/LTE P/M arm: gastroenteritis (n=1)

Table 1. Summary of TEAEs in the LTE study

	ACTIVATE/LTE		ACTIVATE-T/ LTE	Total
	M/M (N=35) n (%)	P/M (N=38) n (%)	(N=17) n (%)	(N=90) n (%)
Any TEAEs	29 (82.9)	37 (97.4)	14 (82.4)	80 (88.9)
Grade ≥3 TEAEs	8 (22.9)	13 (34.2)	1 (5.9)	22 (24.4)
Treatment-related TEAEs	14 (40.0)	21 (55.3)	2 (11.8)	37 (41.1)
Grade ≥3 treatment-related TEAEs	1 (2.9)	1 (2.6)	0	2 (2.2)
Serious TEAEs	5 (14.3)	9 (23.7)	1 (5.9)	15 (16.7)
Serious treatment-related TEAEs	0	2 (5.3)	0	2 (2.2)
TEAEs leading to discontinuation of study drug	1 (2.9)	1 (2.6)	0	2 (2.2)
TEAEs leading to dose reduction of study drug	2 (5.7)	2 (5.3)	0	4 (4.4)
TEAEs leading to interruption of study drug	2 (5.7)	2 (5.3)	0	4 (4.4)
TEAEs leading to death ^a	1 (2.9)	Ο	0	1 (1.1)
Treatment-related TEAEs leading to death	0	0	0	0

^aAccidental death, unrelated to treatment; LTE, long-term extension; M/M, mitapivat-to-mitapivat; P/M, placebo-to-mitapivat; TEAE, treatment-emergent adverse event

CONCLUSIONS

- In patients with PK deficiency, treatment with mitapivat continues to show long-term and durable improvements in Hb and reduction in transfusion burden over several years
- Extended treatment duration in the LTE study shows no new safety findings and is consistent with previous studies

These data continue to support the long-term use of mitapivat as the first disease-modifying drug therapy approved for adults with PK deficiency and its clear potential for real-word benefits in these patients

Acknowledgments: We would like to thank the patients and study investigators for taking part in this study. Editorial assistance was provided by Nia Higgs, MPharm, Adelphi Communications, Macclesfield, UK, and supported by Agios Pharmaceuticals, Inc.

Disclosures: This study was funded by Agios Pharmaceuticals, Inc.

RF Grace: Agios, Novartis, Sobi – research funding; Agios, Sanofi – consultancy; A Glenthøj: Agios, bluebird bio, Bristol Myers Squibb, Novartis, Novo Nordisk, Pharmacosmos – consultancy/advisory board; Saniona, Sanofi – research support; W Barcellini: Agios, Alexion, Novartis – honoraria; Agios – research funding; Bioverativ, Incyte – board membership or advisory committee; **M Verhovsek:** Vertex - consultancy; JA Rothman: Pfizer - consultancy; Agios, Novartis, Pfizer - honoraria; Agios, bluebird bio, Novartis, Pfizer - research funding; MM Arias: Sanofi Genzyme – honoraria and other grants; DM Layton: Agios, Novartis – consultancy; Agios, Cerus, Novartis - membership on an entity's Board of Directors or advisory committees; **O Andres:** Agios - advisory board member; **F Galactéros:** Addmedica – board membership or advisory committee; EJ van Beers: Agios – advisory board member; Agios, Novartis, Pfizer, RR Mechatronics - research funding; K Onodera: nothing to disclose; V Viprakasit: Bristol Myers Squibb, Novartis - consultancy, honoraria, research funding, speakers bureau; Agios, Ionis Pharmaceuticals, La Jolla Pharmaceuticals, Protagonist Therapeutics, Vifor Pharma consultancy, research funding; S Chonat: Agios, Alexion, Global Blood Therapeutics, Novartis, Takeda – consultancy/research funding; MP Judge: Agios – employee and shareholder; PA Kosinski: Agios – consultancy and shareholder; P Hawkins: Agios – employee and shareholder; S Gheuens: Agios – employee and shareholder; E Xu: Agios – employee and shareholder; B McGee: Agios – employee and shareholder; V Beynon: Agios – employee and shareholder; H Al-Samkari: Agios, argenx, Forma, Novartis, Rigel, Sobi – consultancy; Agios, Amgen, Sobi – research funding

References: 1. Grace RF et al. Am J Hematol 2015;90:825–30. 2. Zanella A et al. Br J Haematol 2005;130:11–25. 3. Grace RF et al. *Blood* 2018;131:2183–92. **4.** van Beers EJ et al. *Haematologica* 2019;104:e51–3. **5.** Grace RF et al. *Eur J Haematol* 2018;101:758-65. 6. Boscoe AN et al. Eur J Haematol 2021;106:484-92. 7. Grace RF et al. Br J Haematol 2019;184:721-34. 8. Yang H et al. Clin Pharmacol Drug Dev 2019;8:246–59. 9. Kung C et al. Blood 2017;130:1347–56. 10. PYRUKYND® (mitapivat) [US prescribing information]. Cambridge, MA: Agios Pharmaceuticals, Inc.; 2022. **11.** Al-Samkari H et al. N Engl J Med 2022;386:1432–42. **12.** Glenthøj A et al. Lancet Haematol 2022;S2352–3026(22)00214–9. **13.** Al-Samkari H et al. 26th EHA Annual Congress 2021: Abstract S270. 14. Glenthøj A et al. 26th EHA Annual Congress 2021: Abstract S271.



