Adis not for promotional use Guselkumab for the Treatment of Moderate-to-Severe Plaque Psoriasis in Pediatric Patients: Results of a Phase 3, Randomized, Placebo-Controlled Study

Vimal H. Prajapati,¹ Marieke M.B. Seyger,² Dagmar Wilsmann-Theis,³ Erzsebet Szakos,⁴ Andrzej Kaszuba,⁵ Meg Jett,⁶ Bart van Hartingsveldt,⁷ Gigi Jiang,⁶ Shu Li,⁶ Cynthia DeKlotz,⁶ Amy S Paller⁸

¹Dermatology Research Institute, Calgary, AB, Canada, Probity Medical Research, Calgary, AB, Canada; Skin Health & Wellness Centre, Calgary, AB, Canada; Division of Dermatology, Department of Medicine, University of Calgary, Calgary, AB, Canada; Section of Community Pediatrics, Department of Pediatrics, Calgary, AB, Canada; Section of Pediatric Rheumatology, Department of Pediatrics, Calgary, AB, Canada; ²Radboud University Medical Center, Nijmegen, the Netherlands; ³Department of Dermatology and Allergology, University Hospital Bonn, Bonn, Germany; ⁴Borsod Abaúj Zemplén County University Teaching Hospital, University of Miskolc, Miskolc, Hungary; ⁵DERMED Medical Centre, Lodz, Poland; ⁶Janssen Research & Development, LLC, a Johnson & Johnson Company, Spring House, PA, USA; ⁷Janssen Biologics BV, a Johnson & Johnson Company, Leiden, the Netherlands; ⁸Department of Dermatology and Pediatrics, Northwestern University Feinberg School of Medicine, Chicago, IL, USA.

Sponsored by Janssen Research & Development, LLC, a Johnson & Johnson Company Presented at: AAD Annual Meeting; March 7-11, 2025; Orlando, Florida

Disclosures

VHP: Advisor, consultant, and/or speaker for: AbbVie, Actelion, Amgen, Apogee Therapeutics, Aralez, Arcutis, Aspen, Bausch Health, BioJAMP/JAMP Pharma, BioScript Solutions, Boehringer Ingelheim, Bristol Myers Squibb, Canadian Psoriasis Network, Celgene, Celltrion, Cipher, CorEvitas, Eczema Society of Canada, Eli Lilly, Galderma, GlaxoSmithKline, Homeocan, Incyte, Janssen, Johnson & Johnson, LEO Pharma, Medexus, Novartis, Organon, Pediapharm, Pfizer, Regeneron, Sanofi Genzyme, Sun Pharma, Tribute, and UCB; investigator for: AbbVie, AnaptysBio, Apogee Therapeutics, Arcutis, Arena, Asana, Bausch Health, Boehringer Ingelheim, Bristol Myers Squibb, Celgene, Concert, CorEvitas, Dermavant, Dermira, Eli Lilly, Galderma, Incyte, Janssen, LEO Pharma, Meiji Pharma, Nektar Therapeutics, Nimbus Lakshmi, Novartis, Pfizer, RAPT Therapeutics, Regeneron, Reistone, Sanofi Genzyme, Sun Pharma, Takeda, UCB, and Vyne Therapeutics; and has received grants from: AbbVie, Bausch Health, Janssen, LEO Pharma, Novartis, and Sanofi Genzyme.

MMBS: Received grants from or has been involved in clinical trials with AbbVie, Amgen, Celgene, Eli Lilly, Janssen, LEO Pharma, and Pfizer; and has served as a consultant for AbbVie, Eli Lilly, Janssen, LEO Pharma, Novartis, Pfizer, and UCB; fees were paid directly to the institution.

DW-T: Advisor, speaker or investigator for AbbVie, Almirall, Amgen, Biogen, Boehringer Ingelheim, Bristol Myers Squibb, Celgene, GlaxoSmithKline, Hexal, Incyte, Janssen-Cilag, Leo Pharma, Eli Lilly, Medac, Merck Sharp & Dohme Corp., MoonLake, Novartis, Pfizer, and UCB Pharma.

ES: Principal investigator for AbbVie, Janssen, Pfizer, and Takeda.

AK: Principal investigator for AbbVie, Bristol Myers Squibb, Eli Lilly, Galderma, Janssen, Leo Pharma, Novartis, Pfizer, Regeneron and UCB.

MJ, GJ, SL, CD: Employees of Janssen Research & Development, LLC, a Johnson & Johnson Company and BvH: employee of Janssen Biologics BV, a Johnson & Johnson Company; employees may own stock/stock options in Johnson & Johnson.

ASP: Investigator for: AbbVie, Applied Pharma Research, Biomendics, Dermavant, Eli Lilly, Incyte, Janssen, Krystal, Regeneron, Timber, and UCB; consultant for AbbVie, Abeona, Apogee, Arcutis, Aslan, BioCryst, Boehringer Ingelheim, Bristol Myers Squibb, Dermavant, Incyte, Johnson and Johnson, Krystal Biotech, LEO, Mitsubishi Tanabe, Nektar, Primus, Procter and Gamble, Regeneron, Sanofi, Seanergy, TWI Biotech, and UCB; and on Data Safety Monitoring Boards for: AbbVie, Abeona, Galderma.



Pediatric Plaque Psoriasis (PsO)

- Approximately one-third of patients with plaque PsO report onset before adulthood¹
- Children/adolescents with plaque PsO have fewer highly effective and safe treatment options than adults and, notably, none that specifically target interleukin (IL)-23¹



- A fully human monoclonal antibody that selectively inhibits IL-23 by targeting its p19 subunit
- Shown to be highly effective for treating adults with moderate-to-severe plaque PsO^{2,3}, with a safety profile similar to placebo (PBO)



- Phase 3, randomized, PBO-controlled study with an open-label (OL) reference arm (NCT03451851)
- Evaluated GUS in pediatric participants with moderate-to-severe plaque PsO

¹Diotallevi F, et al. *Int J Mol Sci.* 2022;23:11128. ²Blauvelt A, et al. *J Am Acad Dermatol.* 2017;76:405-17. ³Reich K, et al. *J Am Acad Dermatol.* 2017;76:418-31. Prajapati VH, et al. AAD Annual Meeting; March 7-11, 2025; Orlando, FL.

PROTOSTAR – Study Design

Key inclusion criteria:

- ≥6 to <18 years of age, including
 - Children (≥6 to <12 years)
 - Adolescents (≥12 to <18 years)
- Moderate-to-severe plaque PsO for ≥6 months (IGA ≥3; PASI ≥12; ≥10% BSA) and ≥1 of the following:
 - Very thick lesions
 - Clinically relevant facial, genital, or hand/foot involvement
 - PASI ≥20, BSA >20% or IGA score=4
- PsO inadequately controlled with phototherapy or topical therapy
- Candidate for phototherapy or systemic therapy
- Not previously treated with etanercept (ETN); candidate for ETN according to approved product labeling



^aAt baseline, participants were randomized to receive PBO or GUS SC (1.3 mg/kg for <70 kg; 100 mg for \geq 70 kg) at W0, W4, and W12; or OL ETN SC (0.8 mg/kg up to 50 mg) weekly through W15. Participants who crossed over to GUS after randomization to PBO or ETN received their first dose of GUS at W16 and W20, respectively. ^bInvestigators evaluating efficacy were blinded to treatment arm. ^cThe number of participants enrolled was dependent on the number of participants randomized to GUS in Part 1, ranging from \geq 10 to a number sufficient to ensure \geq 100 participants exposed to GUS. ^dFollowed by long-term extension.

BSA=body surface area; E=enrollment; IGA=Investigator's Global Assessment; NR=PASI 90 nonresponder; PASI=Psoriasis Area and Severity Index; R=randomization; SC=subcutaneous; W=week. Prajapati VH, et al. AAD Annual Meeting; March 7-11, 2025; Orlando, FL.

Outcomes and Analyses

Part 1 (W0-16)	Co-primary and major secondary endpoints
	 All compared GUS vs PBO at W16
	 Tested in a predefined, fixed sequence:
	<u>Co-primary endpoints</u>
	1. Proportions of participants achieving IGA 0/1 and PASI 75 (or US FDA-required PASI 90)
	<u>Major secondary endpoints</u>
	2. Proportion of participants achieving PASI 90 (or US FDA-required PASI 75)
	3. Proportion of participants achieving IGA 0
	4. Proportion of participants achieving PASI 100
	Change from baseline in CDLQI*
Part 1 (W16-52)	 Participants entered a period of withdrawal and retreatment or crossover to or continuation of GUS at W16
	Descriptive analyses of endpoints
Part 2 (W0-52)	 Evaluated adolescents receiving continuous GUS in an OL, single-arm design Descriptive analyses of endpoints
Adverse events (AEs):	Summarized through Part 1 W16 and Parts 1 and 2 W52

tional use

*Children's Dermatology Life Quality Index (CDLQI): Questionnaire for children designed to measure the impact of dermatologic disease on health-related quality of life (HRQoL); scores range from 0-30, with higher scores indicating greater impact. Prajapati VH, et al. AAD Annual Meeting; March 7-11, 2025; Orlando, FL.

Baseline characteristics were generally balanced across treatment cohorts

			P/	ART 1		PART 2
		PBO (N=25)	GUS (N=41)	Ref: OL ETN (N=26)	Total (N=92)	OL GUS (N=28)
Demographi	ics			010		
	Age, yrs	12.4 (3.6)	13.4 (2.9)	12.5 (3.3)	12.9 (3.2)	15.1 (1.6)
	Adolescents (≥12 - <18	3) 60%	76%	62%	67%	100%
	Children (≥6 - <12)	40%	24%	38%	33%	0
(ÅÅ)	Male	48%	58%	58%	55%	61%
	White	80%	88%	85%	85%	100%
	BMI, kg/m ²	22.6 (7.8)	22.0 (5.0)	22.6 (5.2)	22.3 (5.9)	23.1 (4.6)
Disease Cha	Disease Characteristics					
	Disease duration, yrs	4.5 (2.9)	5.0 (3.1)	4.8 (3.6)	4.8 (3.2)	6.2 (3.1)
	BSA (%)	23.4 (9.8)	25.9 (16.8)	22.7 (10.4)	24.3 (13.5)	28.8 (14.1)
	IGA		SCO			
l l l l l l l l l l l l l l l l l l l	Moderate (3)	80%	76%	81%	78%	54%
<mark>₹</mark> •	Severe (4)	20%	24%	19%	22%	46%
	PASI (0-72)	18.0 (4.4)	19.9 (7.0)	17.9 (5.9)	18.8 (6.1)	21.2 (8.5)
	CDLQI (0-30)	9.3 (6.6)	9.4 (7.0)	9.6 (6.6)	9.4 (6.7)	8.3 (7.3)
Prior PsO Treatment						
Ŧ	Topical	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
	Phototherapy ^a	16%	37%	38%	32%	25%
	Nonbiologic systemic ^b	28%	34%	31%	32%	46%
	Biologic systemic ^c	4%	10%	15%	10%	14%

86% and 96% of participants in Parts 1 and 2, respectively, continued treatment through W52

Data shown are mean (SD), unless otherwise noted, ancludes PUVA, UVB. blncludes PUVA, methotrexate, cyclosporine, acitretin, apremilast, or tofacitinib. clncludes infliximab, alefacept, efalizumab, ustekinumab, briakinumab, secukinumab, ixekizumab, brodalumab, or adalimumab.

BMI=body mass index; PUVA=psoralen plus ultraviolet A; SD=standard deviation; UVB=ultraviolet B.

Prajapati VH, et al. AAD Annual Meeting; March 7-11, 2025; Orlando, FL.

PROTOSTAR W16 co-primary endpoints were met



p<0.01, *p<0.001 vs PBO

^aUS FDA-required. P-values represent the comparisons with PBO and are based on the Fisher's exact test stratified by age group and geographic region (pooled). Participants who met treatment failure criteria (discontinued study agent due to lack of efficacy, an AE of worsening PsO, or initiation of a prohibited PsO treatment) or used rescue treatment were considered nonresponders. Participants with missing data were also considered nonresponders after applying treatment failure and rescue treatment rules. **CI**=confidence interval. Prajapati VH, et al. AAD Annual Meeting; March 7-11, 2025; Orlando, FL.

7

Results. More than one-third of GUS-treated participants achieved completely clear skin at W16



**p<0.01 vs PBO

P-values represent the comparisons with PBO and are based on the Fisher's exact test stratified by age group and geographic region (pooled). Participants who met treatment failure criteria (discontinued study agent due to lack of efficacy, an AE of worsening PsO, or initiation of a prohibited PsO treatment) or used rescue treatment were considered nonresponders. Participants with missing data were also considered nonresponders after applying treatment failure and rescue treatment rules. Prajapati VH, et al. AAD Annual Meeting; March 7-11, 2025; Orlando, FL.

Results GUS-treated participants reported significantly greater improvement in HRQoL



***p<0.001 vs PBO

P-values test for no difference with PBO from mixed model for repeated measurement (MMRM) model with factors of treatment group, geographic region, age group, baseline CDLQI score, visit, baseline CDLQI score by visit and treatment by visit. Zero change was assigned after participants met treatment failure criteria (discontinued study agent due to lack of efficacy, an AE of worsening PsO, or initiation of a prohibited PsO treatment) or used rescue treatment. Participants with missing data were imputed as zero improvement from baseline. Prajapati VH, et al. AAD Annual Meeting; March 7-11, 2025; Orlando, FL.

9

PASI 90 rates markedly increased in W16 PASI 90 NR continuing/initiating GUS or after switching to GUS



^aIncludes participants randomized to GUS at W0 who were PASI NR at W16. ^bIncludes participants randomized to PBO at W0 who were PASI 90 NR at W16 and crossed over to receive GUS. ^cIncludes participants randomized to ETN at W0 and crossed over to receive GUS. Prajapati VH, et al. AAD Annual Meeting; March 7-11, 2025; Orlando, FL.

PASI 90 R at W16 maintained response for a median of 24 weeks after GUS withdrawal^a



Prajapati VH, et al. AAD Annual Meeting; March 7-11, 2025; Orlando, FL.

Results Continuous OL GUS also provided high rates of improvements that generally increased over time



Through W16, AE rates were generally comparable across groups

		PART 1	
-	PBO (N=25)	رم GUS مر (N=41)	Ref: OL ETN (N=26)
dverse Events Through W16	Contr		
lean weeks of follow-up	16.3 alical	16.4	16.1
lean number of administrations	2,9	3.0	14.9
articipants with ≥1:	E OL JE		
AE	. 10 ⁵⁶⁵ 68%	42%	58%
SAE	(c ⁰⁾ 0	2% ^a	0
AE leading to discontinuation	4% ^b	0	0
Infection	40%	29%	38%
Serious infection	0	0	0

^aRadius fracture in 1 GUS participant. ^bWorsening PsO in 1 PBO participant. Participants are counted only once for any given event, regardless of the number of times they experienced the event. AEs are coded using MedDRA Version 26.0.

Prajapati VH, et al. AAD Annual Meeting; March 7-11, 2025; Orlando, FL.

No GUS safety signal was identified through 1 year

	PART 1	PART 2
	Total GUS	OL GUS
	(N=86)	<u>(N=28)</u>
Adverse Events Through W52		nee
Mean weeks of follow-up	41.0	50.8 ⁵⁰
Mean number of administrations	4.8	6.8
Participants with ≥1:	Joy 1	
AE	72% s ^{or}	82%
SAE ^a	2%	4%
AE leading to discontinuation ^b	iffic 1%	4%
Infection	ر ^{ماری} 58%	54%
Serious infection	⁽⁰⁾ 0	0
AISTIDUL		

Most common AEs^c:

- Nasopharyngitis
- Upper respiratory tract infection

• COVID-19

No participants with:

- Active tuberculosis
- Opportunistic infection
- Malignancy

• Death

^aIncluded a radius fracture (GUS group), chronic tonsillitis (crossover from PBO to GUS), and trauma due to a fall (OL GUS). ^bIncluded pregnancy (GUS group) and suicidal ideation (OL GUS). ^cPart 1 (total GUS group): nasopharyngitis (28%) and upper respiratory tract infection (13%); and Part 2 (OL GUS): nasopharyngitis (25%) and COVID-19 (21%). Participants are counted only once for any given event, regardless of the number of times they experienced the event. AEs are coded using MedDRA Version 26.0. Prajapati VH, et al. AAD Annual Meeting; March 7-11, 2025; Orlando, FL.

Key Takeaways



In the Phase 3 PROTOSTAR study of GUS in pediatric participants with moderateto-severe plaque PsO:

- All co-primary and major secondary endpoints were met; more than one-third of GUS-treated pediatric participants achieved completely clear skin at W16
- Through 1 year, participant retention was robust and response rates to continuous GUS treatment were durable and generally increased
- AE rates for GUS in pediatric participants were generally comparable to PBO through W16
- Through 1 year, no new safety signals were identified in children/adolescents relative to the GUS safety profile established in adults