Is NEDA a clinically relevant endpoint for therapeutic decisions? : Yes

Hans-Peter Hartung, Dept. of Neurology, Heinrich-Heine-University, Düsseldorf, Germany

The gratiyfing development of new drugs for the treatment of MS has greatly broadened our therapeutic armamentarium over the past 10 years. Availability of more efficacous agents has also raised the bar and prompted definition of more ambitious treatment goals. Following an approach adopted by rheumatologists some time ago, the concept of treating to target has also been introduced in the management of MS. In the absence of curative therapies, earlier goals to reduce relapse rate and slow progression have been abandoned and redefined with the aim of silencing disease activity and halting disease progression. Proof of this comes from clinical assessment and MRI evaulation of disease activity and burden. The Disease activity freedom status (DAF) was first analyzed posthoc in the AFFIRM trial of natalizumab. Freedom from disease was operationally defined as absence of relapses, disease progression, gadolinium enhancing T1 lesions and new or enlarging T2 lesions. Havradova et al could show superiority of natalizumab to placebo in attaining disease free status. Subsequently, completed phase 3 trials of new drugs were also analysed to determine what now is termed NEDA, no evidence of disease activity. Clearly, this aggregate outcome provides a more comprehensive view of the efficacy of a drug and is more sensitive to register impact of an agent than clincal or MR outcomes looked in isolation. More recently, in recpognotion of the importance of brain volume loss as a surrogate marker of the overall pathologic process and a predictor of disability, the composite NEDA 4 has been introduced integrating brain atrophy into the equation. There is discussion whether it might be possible to further enlarge the concept by adding measures of cognition, a very significant domain of neurologial functioning impacted by the disease process. Looking at NEDA also aids in assessing relative efficacies of drugs in the absence of head-to-head trials.

References:

Nixon N et al. No Evidence of Disease Activity: Indirect Comparisons of Oral Therapies for the Treatment of Relapsing–Remitting Multiple Sclerosis. Adv Ther (2014) 31:1134–1154

De Stefano N et al. Long-term assessment of no evidence of disease activit y in relapsing-remitting MS. Neurology (2015) 85;1722-1723

Havrdova E et al. Effect of natalizumab on clinical and radiological disease activity in multiple sclerosis: a retrospective analysis of the Natalizumab Safety and Efficacy in Relapsing-Remitting Multiple Sclerosis (AFFIRM) study. Lancet Neurology (2009) 8: 254–260

Giovannoni G. Any evident MRI T2-lesion activity should guide change of therapy in multiple sclerosis – Yes. Multiple Sclerosis Journal (2015) 21: 134–136

Bevan CJ, Cree BAC. Disease activity free status: A new end point for a new era in multiple sclerosis clinical research? JAMA Neurology (2014) 71: 269-270

Hartung HP, Aktas O. Evolution of multiple sclerosis treatment: next generation therapies meet next generation efficacy criteria. Lancet (2011) 10: 293-295