With Moderately to Severely Active Ulcerative Colitis: Week 44 Results From the Phase 3 QUASAR Maintenance Study Panés, A. Dignass,² T. Hisamatsu,³ S. Yarandi,⁴ K. G. Huang,⁴ M. Germinaro,⁴ S. Stidhar,⁴ P. Branigan,⁴ R. Wilson,⁴ H. Zhang,⁴ F. Magro,⁶ V. Jairath,⁸ B.G. Feacan,⁷ G.R. Linhtenstein⁸ D.T. Dubie ⁸ D.T. Dub

¹Hospital Clínic de Barcelona, IDIBAPS, CIBERehd, Barcelona, Spain; ²Department of Medicine I, Agaplesion Markus Hospital, Goethe University, Frankfurt, Germany; ³Kyorin University, Frankfurt, Germany; ³Kyorin University, Frankfurt, Germany; ³Kyorin University, Frankfurt, Germany; ³Kyorin University, Tokyo, Japan; ⁴Janssen Research & Development, LLC, Spring House, PA, USA; ⁵CINTESIS@RISE, Faculty of Medicine of the University of Porto, Porto, Portugal; ⁶Department of Medicine, Schulich School of Medicine & Dentistry I, Western University, London, ON, Canada; ⁷Alimentiv Inc, London, ON, Canada; ⁸University of Chicago Medicine & Dentistry I, Western University, London, ON, Canada; ⁸University of Chicago Medicine Inflammatory Bowel Disease Center, Chicago, IL; ¹⁰Icahn School of Medicine at Mount Sinai, New York, NY, USA

Background



Histologic healing is an emerging therapeutic target in ulcerative colitis (UC) and is associated with less clinical recurrence, reduced corticosteroid use, and lower hospitalization rates^{1,2}



Guselkumab is a dual-acting IL-23p19 subunit inhibitor that potently neutralizes IL-23 and binds to CD64, a receptor on cells that produce IL-23



In the phase 3 QUASAR induction study (NCT04033445), participants with moderately to severely active ulcerative colitis treated with guselkumab 200 mg IV induction experienced clinically meaningful improvements in histologic and combined histologic and endoscopic outcomes at Week 12⁴

Objective

Here we report the effects of guselkumab maintenance on histologic and combined histologic and endoscopic outcomes at Week 44 among clinical responders to guselkumab IV induction



Results

Demographics, disease characteristics, and Crohn's disease medication history were similar across treatment groups at induction baseline

Table 1. Demographics, Disease Characteristics, and Medication History at Induction Baseline

		Guselkumab		
	Placebo (GUS withdrawal)	100 mg SC q8w	200 mg SC q4w	
Randomized full analysis set	(N=190)	(N=188)	(N=190)	
Demographics				
Age in years, mean (SD)	41.2 (13.58)	40.3 (13.00)	40.6 (14.66)	
Male, n (%)	109 (57.4%)	102 (54.3%)	100 (52.6%)	
Characteristics				
UC disease duration in years, mean (SD)	7.3 (6.34)	7.8 (8.46)	8.4 (8.40)	
Modified Mayo score ^a (0-9), mean (SD)	7.0 (1.09)	6.8 (1.15)	6.9 (1.10)	
Modified Mayo score of 7-9 (severe), n (%)	125 (65.8%)	114 (60.6%)	124 (65.3%)	
Mayo endoscopic subscore of 3 (severe), n (%)	129 (67.9%)	125 (66.5%)	123 (64.7%)	
Extensive UC, n (%)	95 (50.0%)	79 (42.0%)	83 (43.7%)	
Baseline histology scores, [▶] mean (SD)				
Geboes total score (GS, range 0-22)°	12.3 (4.16)	12.1 (4.64)	11.7 (4.80)	
Robarts histopathology index (RHI, range 0-33)	17.2 (7.33)	17.1 (8.04)	16.3 (7.99)	
Nancy histological index (NHI, range 0-4)	2.9 (0.97)	2.8 (1.06)	2.7 (1.19)	
Medication history				
Oral corticosteroid use, n (%)	77 (40.5%)	74 (39.4%)	76 (40.0%)	
History of inadequate response/intolerance to	75 (20 5%)	77 (41 0%)	99 (46 2%)	
biologic and/or JAK inhibitor therapy, ^{d,e} n (%)	10 (39.3%)	11 (41.070)	00 (40.3%)	

Randomized Full Analysis Set: Randomized patients in maintenance with modified Mayo score 5-9 at induction baseline who received at least 1 maintenance study treatment dose. aModified Mayo score: 3-component (stool frequency, rectal bleeding, and endoscopy subscores) Mayo score without the physician's global assessment. Based on N=187 for placebo, N=184 for guselkumab 100 mg SC q8w, and N=188 for guselkumab 200 mg SC q4w. "The continuous histology score is derived as the sum of all Geboes Grades and may take on values from 0 to 22. "Biologic therapy included tumor necrosis factor-a antagonists and vedolizumab. ^eJAK inhibitor therapy included tofacitinib.

Similar proportions of participants across all treatment groups achieved histologic and combined histologic/endoscopic outcomes after 12 weeks of induction with guselkumab

Table 2. Disease Characteristics at Maintenance Baseline

	Guselkumab		
Randomized full analysis set	Placebo (GUS withdrawal) (N=190)	100 mg SC q8w (N=188)	200 mg SC q4w (N=190)
Histologic outcomes		()	
Histologic improvement, ^a n (%)	112 (58.9%)	114 (60.6%)	114 (60.0%)
Histologic remission, ^b n (%)	102 (53.7%)	104 (55.3%)	101 (53.2%)
Endoscopic outcomes			
Endoscopic improvement,° n (%)	68 (35.8%)	75 (39.9%)	79 (41.6%)
Endoscopic remission (normalization), ^d n (%)	39 (20.5%)	41 (21.8%)	47 (24.7%)
Combined histologic/endoscopic outcomes			
Histo-endoscopic mucosal improvement, ^e n (%)	57 (30.0%)	65 (34.6%)	67 (35.3%)
Histologic remission and endoscopic improvement, n (%)	52 (27.4%)	64 (34.0%)	63 (33.2%)
Histo-endoscopic mucosal remission, ^f n (%)	32 (16.8%)	30 (16.0%)	41 (21.6%)

Randomized Full Analysis Set: Randomized patients in maintenance with modified Mayo score 5-9 at induction baseline who received at least 1 maintenance study treatment dose. *Neutrophil infiltration in <5% of crypts, no crypt destruction, and no erosions, ulcerations or granulation tissue according to the Geboes grading system (ie, Geboes histologic score <3.1). *Absence of neutrophils from the mucosa [both lamina propria and epithelium], no crypt destruction, and no erosions, ulcerations or granulation tissue according to the Geboes grading system (ie, Geboes histologic score <2 B.0). ^oMayo endoscopy subscore of 0 or 1 with no friability. ^dMayo endoscopy subscore of 0. ^oCombination of histologic improvement and endoscopic improvement. [†]Combination of histologic remission and endoscopic remission.



Figure 2. Histologic (A) and Combined Histologic/Endoscopic (B) Outcomes at Week 44 by BIO/JAK Inhibitor History

] Exe and other support from Lilly; research grants, consulting and speaking fees and other support from Lilly; research grants, consulting and speaking fees and other support from Eiosciences; consulting and speaking fees and other support from Lilly; research grants, consulting and speaking fees and other support from Eiosciences; consulting and speaking fees and other support from Eiosciences; consulting and speaking fees and other support from Lilly; research grants, consulting and speaking fees and other support from Eiosciences; consulting and speaking fees and other support from Eiosciences; consulting and speaking fees and other support from Eiosciences; consulting and speaking fees and other support from Eiosciences; consulting and speaking fees and other support from Eiosciences; consulting and speaking fees and other support from Eiosciences; consulting and speaking fees and other support from Eiosciences; consulting and speaking fees and other support from Eiosciences; consulting and speaking fees and other support from Eiosciences; consulting and speaking fees and other support from Eiosciences; consulting and speaking fees and other support from Eiosciences; consulting and speaking fees and other support from Eiosciences; consulting and speaking fees and other support from Eiosciences; consulting and speaking fees and other support from Eiosciences; consulting and speaking fees and other support from Eiosciences; consulting and speaking fees and other support from Eiosciences; consulting and speaking fees and other support from Eiosciences; consulting and speaking fees and other support from Eiosciences; consulting and speaking fees and other support from Eiosciences; consulting and speaking fees and other support from Eiosciences; consulting and speaking fees and other support from Eiosciences; consulting and speaking fees and other support from Eiosciences; consulting and speaking fees and consulting and speaking fees and consulting fees and consulting and speaking fees and consulting fees and con



 Eines E En ber and be be and ber and be be and be and be and be and be and be and be and be be and be be and be and be be and be a] End by a stroenterology and Hepatology (Castro-Hep Consultant), End by a consultant), End by a consultant), End by a consultant, End by a consultant), End by a consultant), End by a consultant, End by a consultant, End by a consultant), End by a consultant, End by a consultant, End by a consultant), End by a consultant, En En ber a ber ber a ber ber a ber ber ber a ber ber a be

Outcomes Evaluated

Geboes histologic score ≤ 3.1)

• Histologic improvement: Neutrophil infiltration

in <5% of crypts, no crypt destruction, and

no erosions, ulcerations or granulation tissue

according to the Geboes grading system (ie,

Histologic remission: Absence of neutrophils from

the mucosa [both lamina propria and epithelium], no

crypt destruction, and no erosions, ulcerations or

granulation tissue according to the Geboes grading

system (ie, Geboes histologic score ≤ 2 B.0) to other reasons except for COVID-19 related reasons (excluding COVID-19 infection) or regional Histo-endoscopic mucosal improvement: crisis in Russia and Ukraine prior to Week 44 were Geboes histologic score ≤3.1 and Mayo endoscopy considered not to have achieved the endpoint. subscore of 0 or 1 with no friability Patients who had an unevaluable biopsy (ie, a biopsy Histologic remission and endoscopic that was collected, but could not be assessed due improvement: Geboes histologic score ≤2 B.C to sample preparation or technical errors) or were and Mayo endoscopy subscore of 0 or 1 with no missing the endoscopy subscore (if applicable) or friability any of the histology components pertaining to an Histo-endoscopic mucosal remission: endpoint at Week 44 were considered not to have Geboes histologic score ≤ 2 B.O and Mayo achieved the endpoint endoscopy subscore of 0 (guselkumab withdrawal) decreased Figure 3. Relative Change in Combined Histologic/Endoscopic Outcomes From Week M-0 to Week 44 Δ=16.9 (95% Cl: 9.2, 24.7) Δ=29.6 (95% Cl: 21.1, 38.0) Δ=29.6 (95% CI: 21.3, 38.0) P<0.001ª P<0.001ª P<0.001 Δ=25.7 (95% Cl: 17.1, 34.3) Δ=24.7 (95% CI: 16.2, 33.2) Δ=16.2 (95% CI: 8.2, 24.3) P<0.001^a P<0.001 P<0.001 16.8 15.8 -42.3 -43.9 59/188 Histo-endoscopic Histologic remission and Histo-endoscopic mucosal remission mucosal improvement endoscopic improvement Histo-endoscopic mucosal improvemen Regardless of previous biologic/JAK inhibitor histologic and combined histologic/endoscopic outcomes at Week 44 than participants treated with placebo (guselkumab withdrawal)

Statistical Analysis and Data Handling

The randomized full analysis set included all

randomized patients in maintenance with a modified

Mayo score of 5-9 at induction baseline who received

medication, an ostomy or colectomy, a dose

adjustment (including sham dose adjustment),

discontinued study agent due to lack of therapeutic

effect or due to an AE of worsening of UC, or due

at least 1 maintenance study treatment dose

• Patients who had a prohibited change in UC

Key Takeaways



In the QUASAR maintenance study, participants with ulcerative colitis receiving guselkumab SC maintenance showed clinically meaningful improvements in endoscopic and histologic outcomes compared with placebo (GUS withdrawal), including subpopulations:

- Biologic/JAK inhibitor-naïve
- Inadequate response or intolerance to biologics and/or JAK inhibitors

Participants receiving guselkumab maintenance therapy showed improvement from maintenance baseline in combined histologic-endoscopic outcomes, while those who received placebo (GUS withdrawal) worsened

The proportions of participants achieving combined histologic/endoscopic outcomes increased from maintenance baseline to Week 44 for participants randomized to guselkumab at maintenance baseline, while participants randomized to placebo

