Observed and Simulated Pharmacokinetics and Pharmacodynamics of Nipocalimab, a Fully Human FcRn Blocking Monoclonal Antibody, in Adults with Sjögren's Disease: **Results from a Phase 2, Multicenter, Randomized, Placebo-Controlled, Double-Blind Study**

Sophia G. Liva,¹ Fudan Zheng,¹ Jocelyn H. Leu,¹ Kathy Sivils,¹ Keying Ma,¹ He Li,¹ Jacques-Eric Gottenberg,² Steven Leonardo,³ Kim Hung Lo,¹ Jada Idokogi,¹ Kim Campbell,¹ Jonathan J. Hubbard¹ ¹Johnson & Johnson, Spring House, PA, USA; ²National Reference Center for Rare Systemic AutoImmune Diseases, Strasbourg-Hautepierre University Hospital, Strasbourg, France; ³Johnson & Johnson, Cambridge, MA, USA

Background



Sjögren's disease (SjD) is a chronic, progressive autoimmune disease associated with substantial disease and symptom burden^{1,2}

- SiD results from dysregulated immune responses and includes aberrant B-lymphocyte activity, abnormally elevated immunoglobulin G (IgG), and production of IgG, particularly anti-Ro, autoantibodies³
- Elevated anti-Ro autoantibodies are associated with more severe disease and an increased need for immunosuppressive therapies⁴⁻⁹



Nipocalimab, a fully human IgG1 monoclonal antibody, selectively binds with high affinity to the IgG binding site on the endogenous neonatal fragment crystallizable receptor (FcRn)^{10,11}

 Through this mechanism, nipocalimab blocks IgG recycling, which results in an increase in clearance of IgG, including IgG autoantibodies (Figure 1)



To evaluate the pharmacokinetics (PK) and pharmacodynamics (PD) of nipocalimab in participants with SjD from the DAHLIAS study

myasthenia gravis¹³

Results

163 participants were enrolled in the study; key demographic and baseline characteristics are shown in Table 1

Table 1: Demographic and baseline characteristics

		Nipocalimab	
Characteristic	Placebo (n = 56)	5 mg/kg Q2W (n = 53)	15 mg/kg Q2W (n = 54)
Age, years, median (range)	46.5 (23–73)	49.0 (20–72)	48.5 (24–72)
Female, %	92.9	92.5	92.6
White, %	89.3	92.5	90.7
Time since diagnosis, years, median (range)	4.0 (0.6–34.0)	3.7 (0.6–27.9)	4.3 (0.6–18.2)
ClinESSDAI score, mean (SD)	10.0 (3.8)	9.4 (3.1)	10.2 (3.6)
ESSPRI score, mean (SD)	7.0 (1.3)	7.0 (1.3)	7.2 (1.2)
Total IgG levels, g/L, median (range)	14.8 (7.7–40.5)	14.8 (4.6–35.2)	15.5 (7.6–49.6)
Autoantibody positivity, n	55	52	53
Anti-Ro60, %	98.2	98.1	98.1
Anti-La, %	74.5	76.9	64.2
Anti-Ro52, %	78.2	86.5	77.4
RF, %	78.6	71.7	63.0



ClinESSDAI=Clinical European League Against Rheumatism Sjögren's Syndrome Disease Activity Index, **ESSPRI**=European League Against Rheumatism Sjögren's Syndrome Patient Reported Index, **IgG**=Immunoglobulin G, **Q2W**=Every 2 weeks, **RF**=Rheumatoid factor, **SD**=Standard deviation

IQR=Interguartile range, **Q2W**=Every 2 weeks

Medical writing support was provided by Aya Younes, PharmD, of Lumanity Communications Inc., and was funded by Johnson & Johns

IgG=Immunoglobulin G, IQR=Interquartile range, Q2W=Every 2 weeks

Solid line and shaded area represent median IgG lowering and 90% PI, respectively. Circles and error bars represent the median (IQR) of predose minimum IgG change from baseline levels. **IgG**=Immunoglobulin G, **IQR**=Interquartile range, **IV**=Intravenous, **PI**=Prediction interval, **Q2W**=Every 2 weeks

predose and simulated postdose total IgG and

$\mathfrak n$ baseline in simulated (maximum) and observed predose (minimum) serum IgG levels at Week 24 $^{\mathfrak a}$					
Total IgG	Anti-Ro60 lgG	Anti-La IgG	Anti-Ro52 lgG		
Maximum percent change from baseline, median (90% PI)					
-78.2 (-81.3, -72.7)	-71.2 (-74.6, -66.5)	-59.0 (-61.6, -54.5)	-62.6 (-65.2, -58.0)		
-64.9 (-72.7, -55.7)	-59.2 (-66.5, -50.6)	-48.0 (-54.5, -40.5)	-51.5 (-58.0, -43.9)		
Minimum percent change from baseline, median (Q1, Q3)					
-60.9 (-65.9, -45.7)	-60.1 (-72.3, -42.4)	-51.9 (-60.4, -21.4)	-44.3 (-59.5, 0)		
-30.0 (-41.0, -22.2)	-28.5 (-43.4, -16.9)	-32.5 (-49.0, 0)	-22.1 (-38.7, -10.0)		
-0.5 (-6.8, 5.0)	6.3 (-6.8, 19.6)	1.0 (–3.3, 21.2)	4.8 (–5.1, 17.1)		
d sample drawn for PD analysis					

PRESENTED AT: European Alliance of Associations for Rheumatology (*Oxford*). 1999;38(3):245-253. **5.** Ramos-Casals M, et al. *Rheumatology* (*Oxford*). 2009;48(9):1077-1082. **3.** Nocturne G, Mariette X. *Nat Rev Rheumatol*. 2013;9(9):544-556. **4.** Davidson BK, et al. *Rheumatology* (*Oxford*). 2009;48(9):1077-1082. **3.** Nocturne G, Mariette X. *Nat Rev Rheumatol*. 2013;9(9):544-556. **4.** Davidson BK, et al. *Rheumatol*. 2013;9(9):544-556. **4.** Davidson BK, et al. *Rheumatology* (*Oxford*). 2009;48(9):1077-1082. **3.** Nocturne G, Mariette X. *Nat Rev Rheumatol*. 2013;9(9):544-556. **4.** Davidson BK, et al. *Rheumatol*. 2013;9(9):544-556. **4.** Davidson BK, et al. *Rheumatol*.