Annals of the Rheumatic Diseases

Leader

Building towards a consensus for the use of tumour necrosis factor blocking agents

Over the past 10 to 15 years, scientific advances have ushered in a new era in the treatment of rheumatoid arthritis. The actiopathogenesis of rheumatoid arthritis is slowly being dissected and an increased understanding of the mechanisms by which tissue damage occurs in this disease is appearing.¹² This knowledge, combined with the use of molecular technology, have begun to allow medical research to pinpoint potential targets for treatment of rheumatoid arthritis. Among such targets, you could include T cells, macrophages, synoviocytes, the interaction between antigen presenting cells and T cells, the MHC and its sub-units, and numerous cytokines (for example, IL1, IL1ra, IL10, IL12, TNF α , etc).

This knowledge and technology have introduced a number of potential new therapeutic agents. Earlier efforts using IL2 fusion proteins were unfortunately unsuccessful.³ Various anti-CD4 monoclonal antibodies have been tried to treat rheumatoid arthritis and some may still be in development.⁴ Likewise, early trials of IL4, IL6, IL10 and IL11 are all underway.⁵

TNF α plays a very significant part in inflammation as it promotes IL1 production and augments GM-CSF, IL6 and IL8. Furthermore, it promotes the expression of adhesion molecules, which facilitate leucocyte traffic to sites of inflammation.6 Increased levels of TNFa were found in rheumatoid arthritis and this finding was followed by early experiments showing that anti-TNF α antibodies were effective in both in vitro and in animal models of rheumatoid arthritis.⁵⁻¹⁰ Later, chimeric monoclonal antibodies, recombinant TNF receptor fusion proteins and fully human anti-TNF antibodies were found to be remarkably effective for the treatment of rheumatoid arthritis.¹⁰⁻¹⁸ The clinical effectiveness of this group of drugs makes it probable that ongoing studies examining the progression of radiological damage will show that effective TNF blockade will result in slowing of radiological damage in rheumatoid arthritis.

With the marketing of the first of these TNF blocking agents in the United States for rheumatoid arthritis (etanercept) and soon for Crohn's disease (infliximab) there has been a groundswell of enthusiasm for the use of these agents. However, TNF blocking agents are very expensive and their long term consequences are not yet fully understood. Consequently, the place of TNF blocking agents in the rheumatological armamentarium is not clear.

In this context, it was appropriate that a group of rheumatologists and bioscientists get together to discuss current insights into TNF blockade and also formulate a provisional consensus statement on the use of TNF blocking agents for the treatment of rheumatoid arthritis. Approximately 80 rheumatologists and bioscientists from 22 countries were chosen from a worldwide group of people who had experience or interest in the use of TNF blocking agents for rheumatoid arthritis. Because of size limitations, not everyone who might have been appropriate for such a conference could be invited to attend. The conference was, entitled "Advances in Targeted Therapies. TNF-α Blockade in Clinical Practice", organised under the sole responsibility of several medical schools and supported by unrestricted educational grants from six pharmaceutical manufacturers. The latter had no part in the decisions regarding the programme, attendees or participants in this consensus conference. The proceedings of this conference are published as the supplement of the December issue of the Annals of the Rheumatic Diseases. This includes a consensus statement on the clinical use of TNF blocking agents that was finally formulated and approved by the participants.18

The process by which consensus was reached included initial discussion in small groups, large group discussion and repeated drafts, which permitted input from all participants. As the long term consequences and effectiveness of TNF block agents are not fully understood, it was felt that the use of these new agents should be under the supervision of those physicians experienced in the diagnosis, treatment and clinical assessment of rheumatoid arthritis.

The participants agreed that candidate patients for TNF blocking agents should have active rheumatoid arthritis despite a full and adequate trial of one or more DMARDs. In addition, given the varying aggressiveness of rheumatoid arthritis in individual patients, the effect of the patients rheumatoid arthritis on their quality of life as well as symptoms and signs engendered by the disease needed to be considered. As the TNF blocking agents presently on the market or approaching market will be very expensive and the properties of these agents are not fully known, it was felt that they should lead to significant documentable improvement in symptoms and/or laboratory parameters during 8–12 weeks of treatment when given in adequate

sidered. Given the many effects of TNF on inflammation and immune function, it was generally agreed that TNF blocking agents should not be started, or should be discontinued when serious infections occurred and should only be resumed if those infections are cleared and the risk of occurrence is low.

The participants at this consensus conference agreed that there were a number of situations in which the effect of TNF blockade is unknown, consequently calling for significant caution. Such situations include patients with lymphoma, lymphoproliferative disease, and, possibly, other malignancies; chronic viral infections such as HIV, hepatitis B or C; or during pregnancy or lactation.

As rare cases of lupus-like disease have occurred in patients receiving TNF blockade, such treatment should be stopped if there is clinical evidence of a lupus-like syndrome. On the other hand, the presence of a positive antinuclear antibody, or anti-cardiolipin antibody, in itself, did not seem to predispose patients to a clinical syndrome and, therefore, the participants felt that the presence of these antibodies (without suggestive clinical symptoms) would not prevent the use of TNF blocking agents. Furthermore, the group was unable to find evidence regarding the safety of primary vaccinations or the use of live, attenuated vaccines during TNF blockade treatment. Thus, such vaccinations need to be done cautiously and the potential consequences of those vaccinations need to be carefully considered during TNF blockade treatment.

As a certain percentage of patients given a TNF blocking agent do not respond to that treatment and as it is anticipated that TNF blocking agents will have slightly different mechanisms of action (for example, differing affinity constants, differing pharmacokinetics), it is probable that sequential use of TNF blocking agents will considered. The consensus group agreed that it was unlikely that cross reactivity among these agents would occur, but such cross reactivity is at least theoretically possible, and once more, emphasised the need to be sure that physicians using these treatments are experienced in the diagnosis, treatment and clinical assessment of rheumatoid arthritis so that subtle but untoward toxicity can be detected.

Undoubtedly, TNF blocking treatment will be used in other diseases where TNF appears to have a pathogenetic role. As evidence supporting the use of these agents in those diseases (for example, polyarticular juvenile arthritis or psoriatic arthropathy) is accumulated, TNF blocking treatment should be used in those populations.

The current developments are exciting for patients with rheumatoid arthritis and other rheumatic diseases and their physicians. However, any consensus statement on the

D E FURST F C BREEDVELD J R KALDEN J S SMOLEN

Correspondence to: Professor F C Breedveld, University Hospital, PO Box 9600, 2300 RC, Leiden, the Netherlands

- 1 Albani S, Carson DA. Etiology and pathogenesis of rheumatoid arthritis. In: Koopman WJ, ed. Arthritis and allied conditions. 13th ed. Baltimore: Williams and Wilkins, 1997: 979–92.
- 2 Jasin HE. Mechanisms of tissue damage in rheumatoid arthritis. In: Koop-man WJ, ed. Arthritis and allied conditions. 13th ed. Baltimore: Williams and Wilkins, 1997:1017–39.
- 3 Anderson JJ, O'Neill A, Woodworth T, Haddad J, Sewell KL, Moreland LW. Health status response of rheumatoid arthritis to treatment with DAB486 IL-2. Arthritis Care and Research 1996;9:112–19.
 Choy EH, Kingsley GH, Panaya GS. Anti-CD4 monoclonal antibodies in rheumatoid arthritis. Springer Semin Immunopathol 1998;20:261–73.
 Wallis WJ, Furst DE, Strand V, Keystone E. Biologic agents in immunotherapy in theumatoid arthritis progress and perspective. Phaum
- immunotherapy in rheumatoid arthritis: progress and perspective. Rheum
- Dis Clin North Am 1998;24:537-65.
 6 Arend WP, Dayer JM. Inhibition of the production and effects of interleukin-1 and tumor necrosis factor *a* in rheumatoid arthritis. Arthritis Rheum 1995;38:151-60
- Brennan FM, Chantry D, Jackson A, Maini RN, Feldmann M. Inhibitory effect of TNF-alpha antibodies on synovial cell interleukin-1 production in rheumatoid arthritis. Lancet 1989;ii:244-7
- 8 Maini RN, Elliott MJ, Brennan FM, Williams RO, Chu C, Paleolog E, et al. Monoclonal antibody anti-TNF alpha antibody as a probe of pathogenesis and therapy of rheumatoid disease. Immunol Rev 1995;144:195–223
- 9 Williams RO, Mason LJ, Feldmann M, Maini RN. Anti-tumor necrosis fac tor ameliorates joint disease in murine collagen-induced arthritis. Proc Natl Acad Sci 1992:89:9784-8
- 10 Elliott MJ, Maini RN, Feldmann M, Kalden JR, Antoni C, Smolen JS, et al. Randomised double-blind comparison of chimeric monoclonal antibody to tumour necrosis factor alpha (cA2) versus placebo in rheumatoid arthritis. Lancet 1994:344:1105-10.
- 11 Maini RN, Breedveld FC, Kalden JR, Smolen JS, Davis D, Macfarlane JD, et al. Therapeutic efficacy of multiple intravenous infusions of anti-tumor necrosis factor alpha monoclonal antibody combined with low-dose weekly
- methotrexate in rheumatoid arthritis. Arthritis Rheum 1996;41:1552–64.
 12 Rankin ECC, Choy EHS, Kassimos D, Kingsley GH, Sopwith AM, Isenberg DA, et al. The therapeutic effects of an engineered human anti-tumour necrosis factor alpha antibody (CDD 571) in rheumatoid arthritis. Br J Rheumatol 1995; 34: 334–42.
 13 Van de Putte LBA, van Riel P, den Broeder A, Sander O, Rau R, Binder C, et al. A single dong plogable controlled phone totat of the fully human anti-
- et al. A single dose placebo controlled phase I study of the fully human anti TNF antibody D2E7 in patients with RA. [Abstract]. Arthritis Rheum 1996;41:S57. 14 McCabe D, Moreland L, Caldwell J, Sack M, Weisman M, Edwards CK. A
- phase I/I study to evaluate the safety, immunogenicity, pharmacokinetics and potential efficacy of iv rhuTNF binding protein pegylated dimer in patients with active RA. [Abstract]. Arthritis Rheum 1996;41:S58.
- 15 Moreland LW, Schiff MH, Baumgartner SW, Tindall EA, Fleischmann RM Bulpitt KJ, et al. Etanercept therapy in rheumatoid arthritis. A randomized, controlled trial. Ann Intern Med 1999;130:478–86.
- Weinblatt ME, Kremer JM, Bankhurst AD, Bulpitt KJ, Fleischmann RM, Fox RI, et al. A trial of etanercept, a recombinant tumor necrosis factor receptor:Fc fusion protein, in patients with rheumatoid arthritis receiving methotrexate. N Engl J Med 1999;340:253–9.
- 17 Kempeni J. Preliminary results of early clinical trials with the fully human anti-TNFα monoclonal antibody D2E7. Ann Rheum Dis 1999;58 (suppl 1):I70-2.
- 18 Furst DE, Breedveld FC, Burmester G-R, Crofford L, Emery P, Feldman M, et al. Access to disease modifying treatments for rheumatoid arthritis. Ann Rheum Dis 1999;58 (suppl 1):I129–30.