



UNIVERSITY OF LEEDS

This is a repository copy of *Confirmation on the immunogenicity assay used in the SB4 phase III study: Response to the comments by Meacci et al.*

White Rose Research Online URL for this paper:
<http://eprints.whiterose.ac.uk/103988/>

Version: Accepted Version

Article:

Emery, P, Vencovský, J, Kang, JW et al. (1 more author) (2016) Confirmation on the immunogenicity assay used in the SB4 phase III study: Response to the comments by Meacci et al. *Annals of the Rheumatic Diseases*, 75 (7). e40. ISSN 0003-4967

<https://doi.org/10.1136/annrheumdis-2016-209696>

© 2016, BMJ Publishing Group Ltd and the European League Against Rheumatism. This is an author produced version of a paper published in *Annals of the Rheumatic Diseases*. Uploaded in accordance with the publisher's self-archiving policy.

Reuse

Unless indicated otherwise, fulltext items are protected by copyright with all rights reserved. The copyright exception in section 29 of the Copyright, Designs and Patents Act 1988 allows the making of a single copy solely for the purpose of non-commercial research or private study within the limits of fair dealing. The publisher or other rights-holder may allow further reproduction and re-use of this version - refer to the White Rose Research Online record for this item. Where records identify the publisher as the copyright holder, users can verify any specific terms of use on the publisher's website.

Takedown

If you consider content in White Rose Research Online to be in breach of UK law, please notify us by emailing eprints@whiterose.ac.uk including the URL of the record and the reason for the withdrawal request.



eprints@whiterose.ac.uk
<https://eprints.whiterose.ac.uk/>

Confirmation on the immunogenicity assay used in the SB4 Phase III study: Response to the comments by Meacci et al.

Correspondence to Professor Paul Emery, Leeds Institute of Rheumatic and Musculoskeletal Medicine, University of Leeds, Chapel Allerton Hospital, Chapeltown Road, Leeds, LS7 4SA, UK; p.emery@leeds.ac.uk

Paul Emery^{1,2}, Jiří Vencovský³, Jung Won Kang⁴, Jeehoon Ghil⁴

¹ Leeds Institute of Rheumatic and Musculoskeletal Medicine, University of Leeds, UK

² NIHR Leeds Musculoskeletal Biomedical Research Unit, Leeds Teaching Hospitals NHS Trust, Leeds, UK

³ Institute of Rheumatology, Prague, Czech Republic

⁴ Samsung Bioepis Co., Ltd. Incheon, Republic of Korea

We appreciate Meacci et al.[1] for the comments on the anti-drug antibody (ADA) detection methods.

As noted by Meacci et al, the MSD electrochemiluminescence (ECL) bridging assay (Meso Scale Discovery, MD, USA) was used in the SB4 Phase III study to detect ADAs[2]. The bridging assay format relies on the characteristics of ADA to crosslink two drug molecules conjugated to a capture and a detection label. Due to the methods employed in the ECL bridging technology, ECL is more sensitive and has higher drug tolerance compared to ELISA or surface plasmon resonance (SPR) assay[3 4]. Furthermore, in order to facilitate detection of ADA, the drug-ADA immune complexes in our study samples were dissociated through acid dissociation[4] leading to an improved drug tolerance.

According to the biosimilar guidelines[5-7] the goal of the clinical immunogenicity assessment is to evaluate potential differences between the proposed product and the reference product in the incidence and severity of human immune responses. It is recommend that the sponsor should use assays that are sensitive and capable of detecting all antibodies induced against the product in all antibody positive patients. For the reasons explained above, ECL was employed in our study as well as most of other biosimilar studies[8-11] to detect any difference in immunogenicity between the biosimilar and reference product. Overall, as pointed out by Meacci et al., the use of ECL may have contributed to the higher incidence of ADA in our study compared to main literature data.[12-14]

We hope that the details and confirmation on the assay methods provide the readers of *Annals of the Rheumatic Diseases* additional reference for the immunogenicity data in our study.

References:

1. Meacci F, Manfredi M, Infantino M, *et al.* Comments on: “A phase III randomised, double-blind, parallel-group study comparing SB4 with etanercept reference product in patients with active rheumatoid arthritis despite methotrexate therapy” by Emery *et al.* *Ann Rheum Dis* 2016.
2. Emery P, Vencovsky J, Sylwestrzak A, *et al.* A phase III randomised, double-blind, parallel-group study comparing SB4 with etanercept reference product in patients with active rheumatoid arthritis despite methotrexate therapy. *Ann Rheum Dis* 2015.
3. Liang M, Klakamp SL, Funelas C, *et al.* Detection of high- and low-affinity antibodies against a human monoclonal antibody using various technology platforms. *Assay Drug Dev Technol* 2007;5(5):655-62.
4. Patton A, Mullenix MC, Swanson SJ, *et al.* An acid dissociation bridging ELISA for detection of antibodies directed against therapeutic proteins in the presence of antigen. *J Immunol Methods* 2005;304(1-2):189-95.
5. European Medicines Agency. Guideline on similar biological medicinal products containing biotechnology-derived proteins as active substance: non-clinical and clinical issues. (EMA/CHMP/BMWP/42832/2005). 2015.
http://www.ema.europa.eu/docs/en_GB/document_library/Scientific_guideline/2015/01/WC500180219.pdf (20 Apr 2016).
6. European Medicines Agency. Guideline on Immunogenicity assessment of biotechnology-derived therapeutic proteins. (EMA/CHMP/BMWP/14327/2006 Rev. 1).
http://www.ema.europa.eu/docs/en_GB/document_library/Scientific_guideline/2015/10/WC500194507.pdf (20 Apr 2016).
7. Food and Drug Administration. Guidance for Industry: Scientific Considerations in Demonstrating Biosimilarity to a Reference Product. 2015.
<http://www.fda.gov/downloads/DrugsGuidanceComplianceRegulatoryInformation/Guidances/UCM291128.pdf> (20 Apr 2016).
8. Udata C, Yin D, Cai C, *et al.* Immunogenicity Assessment of PF-06438179, A Potential Biosimilar to Infliximab, In Healthy Volunteers. *Ann Rheum Dis* 2015;74:Suppl 2 702
doi:10.1136/annrheumdis-2015-eular.4209.
9. Yoo DH, Hrycaj P, Miranda P, *et al.* A randomised, double-blind, parallel-group study to demonstrate equivalence in efficacy and safety of CT-P13 compared with innovator infliximab

- when coadministered with methotrexate in patients with active rheumatoid arthritis: the PLANETRA study. *Ann Rheum Dis* 2013;72(10):1613-20.
10. Kaur P, Kirshnan E, Zhang N, *et al.* Biosimilar candidate ABP501: immunogenicity results from 2 phase 3 studies. 11th Congress of ECCO; 2016; Amsterdam.
 11. Park W, Hrycaj P, Jeka S, *et al.* A randomised, double-blind, multicentre, parallel-group, prospective study comparing the pharmacokinetics, safety, and efficacy of CT-P13 and innovator infliximab in patients with ankylosing spondylitis: the PLANETAS study. *Ann Rheum Dis* 2013;72(10):1605-12.
 12. Combe B, Codreanu C, Fiocco U, *et al.* Etanercept and sulfasalazine, alone and combined, in patients with active rheumatoid arthritis despite receiving sulfasalazine: a double-blind comparison. *Ann Rheum Dis* 2006;65(10):1357-62.
 13. Keystone EC, Schiff MH, Kremer JM, *et al.* Once-weekly administration of 50 mg etanercept in patients with active rheumatoid arthritis: results of a multicenter, randomized, double-blind, placebo-controlled trial. *Arthritis Rheum* 2004;50(2):353-63.
 14. Bathon JM, Martin RW, Fleischmann RM, *et al.* A comparison of etanercept and methotrexate in patients with early rheumatoid arthritis. *N Engl J Med* 2000;343(22):1586-93.