Assessing the Potential Benefits of Oral Therapies in Hereditary Angioedema

Daniel F. Soteres, MD MPH; Kristen A. Cribbs, PhD MPH; Wendi Guo, PhD; Shawn Czado

1. Ashms & Allergy Associates, PC and Research Center, 2703 North Tejon Street, Colorado Springs, CO, 80907
2. Allura LLC, 50 Murray Hill South Road #15, Manchester Center, VT 05255
3. KalVista Pharmaceuticals, Inc. 50 Murray Hill South Road #15, Manchester Center, VT 05255

Background

• Hereditary angioedema (HAE) is a rare, chronic disease characterized by debilitating swelling episodes in various parts of the body.

• Current on-demand treatments for HAE are limited to parenteral therapies, which have been associated with significant burden and adherence challenges.

• Drug route of administration can impact patient preference, quality of life, disease outcomes, and costs of care.

• Novel, oral therapies are emerging for the treatment of acute HAE attacks; however, little is known about patient preference for these therapies and other benefits.

• As on-demand HAE treatment landscape evolves, there is a need to better understand the potential humanistic and cost benefits of oral therapies, as well as drivers of patient preference, to ensure optimal disease management.

Methods

• A targeted literature review (TLR) was conducted to assess the economic and patient benefits of oral therapies in HAE and in chronic disease analogues that have parenteral and oral treatment options.

• Searches were conducted in PubMed and Google Scholar.

• English HAE-specific peer-reviewed articles and conference proceedings from January 1, 2017-October 15, 2022 were prioritized for inclusion.

• Articles in other chronic disease areas and older articles were considered, if relevant.

• No study design restrictions were applied.

• No patient-level data were included.

• Articles reporting on other disease states were included if relevant.

• We identified 8 publications: Three (37.5%) focused on HAE, 7 (87.5%) were observational, and 7 (87.5%) were conducted in the United States (Table 1).

• Findings in the HAE publications revealed that drug route of administration was rated as the most significant HAE treatment development desired by patients, with preference expressed for noninvasive administration modalities, especially oral and non-intravenous medications (62%, 8/13).

• HAE patients receiving prophylaxis had a high preference for oral therapy (98%, n=47/48), followed by improved “convenience” and avoiding “needle sticks” (both 67%, n=32/48) and treating the disease more discretely (61%, n=46/75) (Figure 2).

• The most common reason why patients receiving prophylaxis reported interest in an oral HAE therapy was ease of administration (87%, n=65/75), followed by improved “convenience” and avoiding “needle sticks” (both 67%, n=32/48) and treating the disease more discretely (61%, n=46/75) (Figure 2).

Results

• In analogous chronic disease states, oral therapies were associated with higher patient adherence rates (87% vs. 59%) than parenteral therapies.

• Annual healthcare costs associated with oral therapies were also lower in several domains compared to parenteral therapies: disease-specific healthcare costs ($65,149 vs. $76,197 12 months post-index) total medical and pharmacy costs ($48,494 vs. $56,709), and patient out-of-pocket costs ($2,100 vs. $4,000) (Figure 3).

• A cost-minimization analysis found that a switch from intravenous to oral formulation would generate a yearly cost-savings of $16,000 per patient, largely due to fewer intravenous administrations.

Conclusions

• This TLR found that patients with HAE and those with analogous disease states prefer oral therapies due to ease of administration, improved convenience, needle stick avoidance, and discreetness.

• Additionally, results revealed that oral therapies yield lower healthcare and out-of-pocket costs than parenteral therapies, with implications for patients and payers.

• As such, there is an opportunity for an oral, on-demand HAE therapy to support patient disease management and mitigate healthcare expenditures.

Table 1. TLR Study and Sample Characteristics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Study Location</th>
<th>Study Design</th>
<th>Sample Size, Number of patients</th>
<th>Total Number of Publications</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>United States</td>
<td>Observational</td>
<td>3 (37.5)</td>
<td>6 (87.5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multiple Disease States</td>
<td>Observational</td>
<td>3 (37.5)</td>
<td>6 (87.5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multiple Disease States</td>
<td>Observational</td>
<td>3 (37.5)</td>
<td>6 (87.5)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 1. Patient Preference for Oral HAE Therapy

Figure 2. Primary Patient-Reported Reasons of Interest in Oral HAE Therapy

Figure 3. Annual Healthcare Costs, Oral Versus Parenteral Therapies
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