

# Intravitreal Aflibercept (VEGF Trap-Eye) in Wet Age-related Macular Degeneration

Jeffrey S. Heier, MD,<sup>1</sup> David M. Brown, MD,<sup>2</sup> Victor Chong, MD,<sup>3</sup> Jean-Francois Korobelnik, MD,<sup>4</sup> Peter K. Kaiser, MD,<sup>5</sup> Quan Dong Nguyen, MD,<sup>6</sup> Bernd Kirchhof, MD,<sup>7</sup> Allen Ho, MD,<sup>8</sup> Yuichiro Ogura, MD,<sup>9</sup> George D. Yancopoulos, MD, PhD,<sup>10</sup> Neil Stahl, MD,<sup>10</sup> Robert Vitti, MD,<sup>10</sup> Alyson J. Berliner, MD, PhD,<sup>10</sup> Yuhwen Soo, PhD,<sup>10</sup> Majid Anderesi, MD,<sup>11</sup> Georg Groetzbach, MD,<sup>11</sup> Bernd Sommerauer, PhD,<sup>11</sup> Rupert Sandbrink, MD, PhD,<sup>11,12</sup> Christian Simader, MD,<sup>13</sup> Ursula Schmidt-Erfurth, MD,<sup>13</sup> for the VIEW 1 and VIEW 2 Study Groups\*

**Objective:** Two similarly designed, phase-3 studies (VEGF Trap-Eye: Investigation of Efficacy and Safety in Wet AMD [VIEW 1, VIEW 2]) of neovascular age-related macular degeneration (AMD) compared monthly and every-2-month dosing of intravitreal aflibercept injection (VEGF Trap-Eye; Regeneron, Tarrytown, NY, and Bayer HealthCare, Berlin, Germany) with monthly ranibizumab.

**Design:** Double-masked, multicenter, parallel-group, active-controlled, randomized trials.

**Participants:** Patients (n = 2419) with active, subfoveal, choroidal neovascularization (CNV) lesions (or juxtafoveal lesions with leakage affecting the fovea) secondary to AMD.

**Intervention:** Patients were randomized to intravitreal aflibercept 0.5 mg monthly (0.5q4), 2 mg monthly (2q4), 2 mg every 2 months after 3 initial monthly doses (2q8), or ranibizumab 0.5 mg monthly (Rq4).

**Main Outcome Measures:** The primary end point was noninferiority (margin of 10%) of the aflibercept regimens to ranibizumab in the proportion of patients maintaining vision at week 52 (losing <15 letters on Early Treatment Diabetic Retinopathy Study [ETDRS] chart). Other key end points included change in best-corrected visual acuity (BCVA) and anatomic measures.

**Results:** All aflibercept groups were noninferior and clinically equivalent to monthly ranibizumab for the primary end point (the 2q4, 0.5q4, and 2q8 regimens were 95.1%, 95.9%, and 95.1%, respectively, for VIEW 1, and 95.6%, 96.3%, and 95.6%, respectively, for VIEW 2, whereas monthly ranibizumab was 94.4% in both studies). In a prespecified integrated analysis of the 2 studies, all aflibercept regimens were within 0.5 letters of the reference ranibizumab for mean change in BCVA; all aflibercept regimens also produced similar improvements in anatomic measures. Ocular and systemic adverse events were similar across treatment groups.

**Conclusions:** Intravitreal aflibercept dosed monthly or every 2 months after 3 initial monthly doses produced similar efficacy and safety outcomes as monthly ranibizumab. These studies demonstrate that aflibercept is an effective treatment for AMD, with the every-2-month regimen offering the potential to reduce the risk from monthly intravitreal injections and the burden of monthly monitoring.

**Financial Disclosure(s):** Proprietary or commercial disclosure may be found after the references. *Ophthalmology* 2012;119:2537–2548 © 2012 by the American Academy of Ophthalmology.



\*Group members listed online in Appendix 1 (<http://aaojournal.org>).


Age-related macular degeneration (AMD) is a leading cause of vision loss and blindness in industrialized countries.<sup>1</sup> The most severe vision loss occurs in the neovascular (or wet) form of AMD, involving choroidal neovascularization (CNV) and associated retinal edema. Early treatments for CNV (laser ablation, photodynamic therapy with verteporfin), although clearly better than no treatment at all, decreased severe vision loss rather than truly stabilizing vision or resulting in clinically significant improvements in visual acuity.<sup>2–4</sup> The suggestion that vascular endothelial growth factor (VEGF) might be driving the CNV and associated edema seen in AMD led to a paradigm shift with the success of the first anti-VEGF therapy, pegaptanib sodium.<sup>5,6</sup> Monthly intravitreal

injections of 0.5 mg ranibizumab, a humanized monoclonal antibody fragment that blocks VEGF, not only prevent vision loss in most patients but also lead to significant visual gain in approximately one-third.<sup>7,8</sup> The risk of rare but serious adverse events resulting from the intravitreal procedure, together with the significant burden of making monthly visits to their retinal specialist, have led to extensive efforts to decrease injection and monitoring frequency. However, fixed quarterly<sup>9,10</sup> or “as needed” (pro re nata [PRN]) dosing regimens,<sup>11,12</sup> without requiring monthly monitoring visits, were not effective at maintaining vision.

The Comparison of AMD Treatments Trials (CATT)<sup>13</sup> recently compared monthly ranibizumab with monthly

bevacizumab, as well as with PRN regimens that required monthly monitoring visits during which treatment decisions primarily were made on the basis of anatomic criteria. Monthly bevacizumab resulted in mean best-corrected visual acuity (BCVA) gains (8.0 letters) similar to those for monthly ranibizumab (8.5 letters), whereas PRN ranibizumab yielded a mean BCVA gain of 1.7 letters less than that of the monthly standard (with a confidence interval [CI] extending to 4.7 letters below) that achieved noninferiority, and PRN bevacizumab yielded a mean BCVA gain 2.6 letters below the monthly standard (with a CI extending to 5.9 letters below) that did not achieve noninferiority. In the CATT, monthly bevacizumab and both PRN regimens were significantly worse than monthly ranibizumab in terms of the propor-

tion of patients who had fluid-free retinas on optical coherence tomography (OCT). Although CIs were not provided for monthly and PRN regimens, switching from monthly to PRN regimens in the second year of the CATT resulted in a significant worsening of BCVA and retinal thickness, as well as a significant decrease in the proportion of patients without retinal fluid.<sup>14</sup> The “alternative treatments to Inhibit VEGF in Age-related choroidal Neovascularization” (IVAN) study also found that the mean foveal retinal thickness and the percentage of patients with fluorescein leakage were significantly higher with the PRN regimen compared with the monthly regimen.<sup>15</sup> In the HARBOR study (Invest Ophthalmol Vis Sci 2012;53:E-Abstract 3677), PRN regimens of both the approved 0.5 mg dose and the higher 2 mg dose of



**Figure 1.** Flowcharts describing treatment allocation and patient disposition in VIEW 1 (A) and VIEW 2 (B). In both VIEW 1 and VIEW 2 studies, the most common reason for patients to be screened but not randomized was ineligibility based on angiographic characteristics as identified by the reading center. The second most common reason was visual acuity out of range. Discontinuations are those that occurred from the study. Two milligrams intravitreal aflibercept every 2 months (2q8) dosing was performed after 3 initial monthly doses. The numbers of patients who prematurely discontinued study medication in the 2q4, 0.5q4, 2q8, and Rq4 groups were 16 (5.3%), 30 (9.9%), 30 (9.9%), and 27 (8.8%), respectively, in VIEW 1; and 37 (11.8%), 45 (14.5%), 33 (10.5%), and 33 (10.9%), respectively, in VIEW 2. In VIEW 1, 1089 patients were included in the per protocol set (PPS), with 92.6% to 96.1% completing week-52 visual acuity assessment. A total of 128 patients were not included in the PPS for the following reasons (in order of occurrence): missed 2 consecutive injections before ninth injection, major protocol deviation, received <9 injections, had <9 assessments, no baseline assessments, no post-baseline assessments. In VIEW 2, 1081 patients were included in the PPS with 95.9% to 97.8% completing week-52 visual acuity assessment. A total of 159 patients were not included in the PPS for the following main reasons: missed 2 consecutive injections before ninth injection, major protocol deviation, received <9 injections, had <9 assessments, no baseline assessments, no post-baseline assessments, unmasking by investigator or Global Pharmacovigilance. 0.5q4 = 0.5 mg IAI monthly; 2q4 = 2 mg IAI monthly; 2q8 = 2 mg IAI every 2 months after 3 initial monthly doses; IAI = intravitreal aflibercept injection.

ranibizumab did not achieve noninferiority compared with monthly ranibizumab, with the 0.5 mg PRN regimen yielding a mean BCVA gain 2.0 letters below the monthly standard (with a CI extending to 4.5 letters below). Of note, just like the CATT PRN regimens, the HARBOR PRN regimens still depended on monthly monitoring visits. Thus, there remains a need for new therapies that will provide equivalent efficacy and anatomic disease control to monthly ranibizumab, while reducing the risk of monthly injections and the burden of mandatory monthly monitoring visits.

Intravitreal aflibercept injection (IAI) (previously known in the scientific literature as VEGF Trap-Eye, Regeneron, Tarrytown, NY, and Bayer HealthCare, Berlin, Germany) is a soluble decoy receptor fusion protein<sup>16,17</sup> that is specifically purified and formulated for intraocular injection. Intravitreal aflibercept at doses of 0.5 mg and 2 mg provided the most robust outcomes in the Clinical Evaluation of Antiangiogenesis in the Retina Intravitreal Trial Phase 2 (CLEAR-IT 2) study after 4 monthly administrations followed by PRN dosing to week 52.<sup>18</sup> The binding affinity of intravitreal aflibercept to VEGF is substantially greater than that of bevacizumab or ranibizumab.<sup>17</sup> The greater affinity could translate into a higher efficacy or, as predicted by a mathematical model, into a substantially longer duration of

action in the eye,<sup>19</sup> allowing for less frequent dosing, as supported by early clinical trials.<sup>18,20</sup> In this article, we report the first-year results of 2 phase 3 studies comparing intravitreal aflibercept, monthly or every 2 months, with monthly ranibizumab.

## Materials and Methods

### Study Design

The “VEGF Trap-Eye: Investigation of Efficacy and Safety in Wet AMD” studies (VIEW 1 and VIEW 2) were similarly designed, prospective, double-masked, multinational, parallel-group, active-controlled, randomized clinical trials. The investigators from the VIEW 1 and VIEW 2 studies are listed in Appendix 1, available at <http://aaajournal.org>. Patients in VIEW 1 (registered at [www.clinicaltrials.gov](http://www.clinicaltrials.gov) on July 31, 2007; NCT00509795. Accessed August 8, 2012) were randomized at 154 sites in the United States and Canada. Patients in VIEW 2 (registered at [www.clinicaltrials.gov](http://www.clinicaltrials.gov) on March 12, 2008; NCT00637377. Accessed August 8, 2012) were randomized at 172 sites in Europe, the Middle East, Asia-Pacific, and Latin America; the last patient in both studies completed 52 weeks in September 2010. The study protocols were approved by institutional review boards or ethics committees for each clinical site; all participants provided written informed consent. All the US study sites complied with the Health Insurance




Figure 1. (Continued.)

Portability and Accountability Act. The 52-week outcomes are reported.

## Participants

Inclusion and exclusion criteria were designed to maintain constancy with the pivotal trials for the reference drug ranibizumab, consistent with regulatory guidelines for noninferiority studies, and included (1) age  $\geq 50$  years with active subfoveal CNV lesions (any subtype) secondary to AMD; juxtafoveal lesions with leakage affecting the fovea also were allowed; (2) CNV comprising at least 50% of total lesion size; and (3) BCVA between 73 and 25 Early Treatment Diabetic Retinopathy Study chart (ETDRS) letters (20/40–20/320 Snellen equivalent). Patients with prior treatment for AMD (including an investigational agent or anti-VEGF therapy) in the study eye were excluded. Eligibility was determined using fluorescein angiography at the reading center. Complete eligibility criteria are shown in Appendix 2 (available at <http://aaojournal.org>).

## Treatment Groups and Randomization

Patients were randomized in a 1:1:1:1 ratio to the following regimens: 0.5 mg aflibercept every 4 weeks (0.5q4); 2 mg aflibercept every 4 weeks (2q4); 2 mg aflibercept every 8 weeks (2q8) after 3 injections at week 0, 4, and 8 (to maintain masking, sham injections were given at the interim 4-week visits after week 8); or 0.5 mg ranibizumab every 4 weeks (Rq4). Consecutively enrolled patients were assigned to treatment groups on the basis of a predetermined central randomization scheme with balanced allocation, managed by an interactive voice response system.

## End Points and Statistical Analyses

The primary end point analysis, noninferiority margins, and definition of “clinical equivalence” were established in discussion with the Food and Drug Administration (FDA) (as part of a Special Protocol Assessment), European Medicines Agency, Pharmaceutical and Medical Device Agency and other regulatory authorities, with the intent of maintaining constancy with the previous ranibizumab pivotal trials<sup>7,8</sup> and preserving the majority of the treatment effect demonstrated in these trials. The primary end point analysis was noninferiority of the intravitreal aflibercept regimens to ranibizumab in the proportion of patients maintaining vision at week 52 (losing  $< 15$  ETDRS letters; per protocol data set) in each study. A noninferiority margin of 10% in the individual studies was chosen to preserve approximately two-thirds of the ranibizumab effect for prevention of moderate vision loss (loss of  $< 15$  letters) demonstrated in pivotal ranibizumab studies,<sup>7,8</sup> using the 2 CI approach. The FDA suggested that a margin of 5% could determine clinical equivalence. Thus, the margin of 10% was used for assessing noninferiority, and the margin of 5% was used for assessing clinical equivalence. The prespecified analysis plan also included a prospectively planned integrated analysis combining the 2 VIEW studies; in this integrated analysis, the European Medicines Agency/Committee for Medicinal Products for Human Use requested a noninferiority margin of 7%. In the individual studies, the primary end point was assessed by a prespecified hierarchical testing sequence of noninferiority to ranibizumab with the sequence of aflibercept 2q4, 0.5q4, and then 2q8 to control the 5% (4.9% for VIEW 1) overall type I error while maintaining a 5% significance level (4.9% for

VIEW 1) for each individual comparison (see Appendices 3 and 4 for details of the statistical analysis, available at <http://aaojournal.org>). If all aflibercept groups demonstrated noninferiority to ranibizumab for the primary end point, additional comparisons with ranibizumab were prespecified regarding the secondary end points, also using a hierarchical testing sequence in which each secondary end point was tested for superiority of aflibercept over ranibizumab. Prespecified secondary efficacy variables compared baseline and 52-week data regarding mean change in BCVA; gaining  $\geq 15$  letters; change in total National Eye Institute 25-Item Visual Function Questionnaire (NEI VFQ-25) score; and change in CNV area on fluorescein angiography. Anatomic measures included retinal thickness and persistent fluid as assessed by OCT. Change in BCVA also was assessed as part of the prospectively planned prespecified integrated analysis combining the 2 studies.

The full analysis set included all randomized patients who received any study medication and had a baseline and at least 1 post-baseline BCVA assessment. The per protocol set (PPS) included all patients in the full analysis set who (1) received at least 9 doses of study drug and attended at least 9 scheduled visits during the first year, (2) had not missed 2 consecutive injections before administration of the ninth injection (per patient), and (3) did not have major protocol violations. Sham injections were counted as doses administered for the purpose of defining the PPS. The PPS included patients who discontinued the study because of treatment failure, without a major protocol deviation, at any time during the first 52 weeks (even if they met points 1 and 2 above). These patients were considered nonresponders for the primary end-point analysis. The last observation carried forward (LOCF) approach was used to impute missing values. When indicated, the robustness of analysis results was assessed by using the observed case or completers' data. A completer was defined as a patient who received treatment for at least 9 months and had efficacy data for at least 9 months during the 52 weeks of study. The missing values for completers also were imputed using the LOCF approach.

## Schedule of Visits and Assessments

Patients were examined on the day of treatment initiation and every 4 weeks thereafter through 52 weeks, as well as 1 week after first treatment for safety assessment (subsequent safety assessments occurred by telephone). Each 4-week visit included BCVA assessment and anterior/posterior segment examination (with intraocular pressure determination) before injection (active or sham) and posterior segment examination with intraocular pressure determination 30 to 60 minutes after injection. For the 2q8 treatment group, no treatment decisions were made at the interim monthly visits. The NEI VFQ-25 assessment occurred at screening and weeks 12, 24, 36, and 52. Adverse events were recorded at every visit.

## Imaging Assessments

Fundus photography and fluorescein angiography were performed at screening and weeks 24 and 52, and evaluated by an independent center (Digital Angiography Reading Center, New York). Optical coherence tomography was performed using time domain Stratus machines (Carl Zeiss Meditec, Jena, Germany) and evaluated by an independent center (VIEW 1: OCT Reading Center at Duke, Durham, NC; VIEW 2: Vienna Reading Center, Austria). Visual acuity examiners were certified to ensure consistent measurement of BCVA. In VIEW 1, OCT was performed at screening, at the treatment initiation visit, and at weeks 4, 12, 24, 36, and 52

(and was optional at the investigators' discretion at other study visits). In VIEW 2, OCT was performed at every study visit. Areas of visible CNV (classic or occult) were identified when angiographic analyses showed evidence of late leakage or pooling of dye.

## Masking

Patients were masked as to treatments. An unmasked investigator performed the study drug or sham injection. An unmasked investigator also was responsible for the receipt, tracking, preparation, destruction, and administration of study drug, as well as safety assessments both pre- and post-dose. A separate masked physician assessed adverse events and supervised the masked assessment of efficacy. All other study site personnel were masked to treatment assignment by separating study records or masked packaging. Optical coherence tomography technicians and visual acuity examiners remained masked relative to treatment assignment. Intravitreal aflibercept and sham kits were packaged identically. Lucentis (Genentech Inc, South San Francisco, CA) was obtained commercially but only prepared and delivered by unmasked personnel at the sites.

## Results

### Patient Disposition, Baseline Characteristics, and Exposure

The disposition of patients is shown in Figure 1A-B. In VIEW 1, 1217 patients were randomized, with 91.1% to 96.4% of patients completing 52 weeks. In VIEW 2, 1240 patients were randomized, with 88.1% to 91.1% completing 52 weeks. Baseline demographics and disease characteristics were evenly balanced among all treatment groups (Table 1). The mean number of active injections received by patients in all monthly treatment arms, which were scheduled to receive 13 monthly injections, was 12.1 to 12.5 in VIEW 1 and 12.2 to 12.4 in VIEW 2. The aflibercept every-2-month groups, scheduled to receive 3 initial monthly injections followed by 5 active injections over the next 10 months, received an average of 7.5 active injections in VIEW 1 and in VIEW 2.

### Primary End Point Analysis

In both studies, the proportion of patients maintaining vision was similar among all treatment groups in the prespecified per-protocol analysis and the full analysis set (Table 2). All aflibercept groups achieved statistical noninferiority compared with monthly ranibizumab, with the CIs of the difference between ranibizumab and

Table 1. Patient Demographics and Baseline Characteristics

	VIEW 1				VIEW 2			
	Ranibizumab	Intravitreal Aflibercept			Ranibizumab	Intravitreal Aflibercept		
	0.5q4	2q4	0.5q4	2q8	0.5q4	2q4	0.5q4	2q8
N (full analysis set)	304	304	301	301	291	309	296	306
Age, yrs (mean ± SD)	78.2±7.6	77.7±7.9	78.4±8.1	77.9±8.4	73.0±9.0	74.1±8.5	74.7±8.6	73.8±8.6
Race								
White	296 (97.4)	295 (97.0)	291 (96.7)	287 (95.3)	213 (73.2)	226 (73.1)	219 (74.0)	217 (70.9)
Black	1 (0.3)	1 (0.3)	0	1 (0.3)	1 (0.3)	0	1 (0.3)	2 (0.7)
Asian	0	3 (1.0)	5 (1.7)	4 (1.3)	60 (20.6)	67 (21.7)	61 (20.6)	69 (22.5)
Other	7 (2.3)	5 (1.6)	5 (1.7)	9 (3.0)	17 (5.8)	16 (5.2)	15 (5.1)	18 (5.9)
Sex								
Men, n (%)	132 (43.4)	110 (36.2)	134 (44.5)	123 (40.9)	122 (41.9)	133 (43.0)	149 (50.3)	131 (42.8)
Women, n (%)	172 (56.6)	194 (63.8)	167 (55.5)	178 (59.1)	169 (58.1)	176 (57.0)	147 (49.7)	175 (57.2)
Baseline ETDRS BCVA (mean ± SD)	54.0±13.4	55.2±13.2	55.6±13.1	55.7±12.8	53.8±13.5	52.8±13.9	51.6±14.2	51.6±13.9
Proportion of patients with ≥20/40 BCVA, % (n)	4.3% (13)	4.9% (15)	6.3% (19)	6.6% (20)	2.7% (8)	2.6% (8)	5.4% (16)	3.3% (10)
CNV area, mm <sup>2</sup> (mean ± SD)	6.53±5.2	6.59±5.1	6.49±4.5	6.57±5.1	7.59±5.3	8.25±5.8	7.70±5.3	7.75±5.5
Lesion type								
Predominantly classic, n (%)	82 (27.0)	87 (28.6)	81 (26.9)	71 (23.6)	70 (24.1)	72 (23.3)	80 (27.0)	88 (28.8)
Minimally classic, n (%)	101 (33.2)	105 (34.5)	97 (32.2)	110 (36.5)	104 (35.7)	112 (36.2)	103 (34.8)	106 (34.6)
Occult, n (%)	115 (37.8)	110 (36.2)	121 (40.2)	118 (39.2)	116 (39.9)	123 (39.8)	113 (38.2)	110 (35.9)
Patients with juxtafoveal lesions, n (%)	15 (4.9)	13 (4.3)	17 (5.6)	17 (5.6)	20 (6.9)	15 (4.9)	11 (3.7)	14 (4.6)
Lesion size, mm <sup>2</sup> (mean ± SD)	6.99±5.5	6.98±5.4	6.95±4.7	6.89±5.2	8.01±5.7	8.72±6.1	8.17±5.5	8.22±5.9
Central retinal thickness, μm (mean ± SD)	315.3±108.3	313.6±103.4	313.2±106.0	324.4±111.2	325.9±110.9	334.6±119.8	326.5±116.5	342.6±124.0
Baseline NEI VFQ-25 scores (mean ± SD)	71.8±17.2	70.4±16.6	71.1±17.8	69.6±16.8	72.9±19.1	70.3±19.4	74.0±18.2	71.3±19.1

0.5q4 = 0.5 mg monthly; 2q4 = 2 mg monthly; 2q8 = 2 mg every 2 months after 3 initial monthly doses; BCVA = best-corrected visual acuity; CNV = choroidal neovascularization; ETDRS = Early Treatment Diabetic Retinopathy Study; NEI VFQ-25 = National Eye Institute 25-Item Visual Functioning Questionnaire; SD = standard deviation.

# Explore Litigation Insights

Docket Alarm provides insights to develop a more informed litigation strategy and the peace of mind of knowing you're on top of things.

## Real-Time Litigation Alerts



Keep your litigation team up-to-date with **real-time alerts** and advanced team management tools built for the enterprise, all while greatly reducing PACER spend.

Our comprehensive service means we can handle Federal, State, and Administrative courts across the country.

## Advanced Docket Research



With over 230 million records, Docket Alarm's cloud-native docket research platform finds what other services can't. Coverage includes Federal, State, plus PTAB, TTAB, ITC and NLRB decisions, all in one place.

Identify arguments that have been successful in the past with full text, pinpoint searching. Link to case law cited within any court document via Fastcase.

## Analytics At Your Fingertips



Learn what happened the last time a particular judge, opposing counsel or company faced cases similar to yours.

Advanced out-of-the-box PTAB and TTAB analytics are always at your fingertips.

## API

Docket Alarm offers a powerful API (application programming interface) to developers that want to integrate case filings into their apps.

## LAW FIRMS

Build custom dashboards for your attorneys and clients with live data direct from the court.

Automate many repetitive legal tasks like conflict checks, document management, and marketing.

## FINANCIAL INSTITUTIONS

Litigation and bankruptcy checks for companies and debtors.

## E-DISCOVERY AND LEGAL VENDORS

Sync your system to PACER to automate legal marketing.