

photon

Diana V. Do,<sup>1</sup> on behalf of the PHOTON study investigators

<sup>1</sup>Byers Eye Institute, Stanford University School of Medicine, Palo Alto, CA, USA

Presented at the 56<sup>th</sup> Annual Scientific Meeting of the Retina Society, October 11–14, 2023

#### Disclosures

- photon DME
- Diana V. Do is a consultant to Boehringer Ingelheim, Genentech, Kodiak Sciences, Kriya, and Regeneron Pharmaceuticals, Inc.; has received research funding from Boehringer Ingelheim, Genentech, Kriya, and Regeneron Pharmaceuticals, Inc.; and has stock options from Kodiak Sciences
- This analysis was sponsored by Regeneron Pharmaceuticals, Inc. (Tarrytown, NY). The sponsor participated in the design and conduct of the study, analysis of the data, and preparation of this presentation
- Study disclosures: This study includes research conducted on human patients. Institutional Review Board approval was obtained prior to study initiation
- Writing support was provided by Stephanie Agbu, PhD, and Disha Patel, PhD, of Regeneron Pharmaceuticals, Inc.

### **PHOTON Study Design**

photon



End of study at Week 96

<sup>a</sup>Treatment-naïve and previously treated.

BCVA, best-corrected visual acuity; DME, diabetic macular edema; DRSS, Diabetic Retinopathy Severity Score.

#### **Dosing Schedule and DRM Criteria in Year 1**

photon



Stippled boxes = initial treatment phase; X=active injection; o=sham injections. Note: Figure does not reflect all dosing options once a patient is shortened. DRM, dose regimen modification; Wk, week.

# Large Majority of 8 mg Patients Maintained Randomized Intervals Through Week 48

dosing intervals ≥12 weeks



<sup>a</sup>Patients shortened based on DRM assessments at some point through Week 48. <sup>b</sup>Patients completing Week 48.

## **Objectives and Methods**

#### **Objectives:**



- To describe baseline characteristics of patients with maintained vs shortened dosing intervals
- To identify baseline characteristics associated with shortened dosing intervals
- To evaluate visual and anatomic outcomes at Week 48 in patients with maintained vs shortened dosing intervals

#### Methods:

- To identify associations between baseline characteristics and shortened dosing intervals:
  - Univariable Cox regression analysis (adjusted for randomization strata) assessed baseline factors (diabetes type, hemoglobin A1c, duration of diabetes, BMI, BCVA, CRT, DRSS, prior DME treatment) associated with the incidence of dosing interval shortening
  - Identified baseline characteristics were subsequently assessed in a multivariable analysis with stepwise regression
  - A ROC analysis was performed to identify the optimal cutoff point for predicting shortened dosing intervals
  - Data for aflibercept 8 mg groups were pooled for the univariable, multivariable, and ROC analyses
- BCVA and CRT were evaluated at baseline and Week 48 using observed values

#### **Baseline Demographics by Dosing Interval**

p	h	0	t	)]
-				

DI	M	Ε

	Ivial
n (%)	273
Age (years)	62.2
Sex (%)	
Female	
Male	e
Race (%) <sup>b</sup>	
White	
Black or African American	
Asian	· ·
Other <sup>c</sup>	
Not reported	
Ethnicity (%) <sup>b</sup>	
Hispanic or Latino	
Not Hispanic or Latino	3
Not reported	

8q12 (n=300)ª					
Maintained	Shortened				
273 (91.0)	27 (9.0)				
62.2 (10.9)	59.1 (13.9)				
36.3	25.9				
63.7	74.1				
69.6	70.4				
10.3	14.8				
15.8	14.8				
2.9	0				
1.5	0				
16.1	3.7				
81.3	96.3				
2.6	0				

- · ·	
Maintained	Shortened
139 (89.1)	17 (10.9)
62.0 (9.6)	60.1 (9.9)
41.0	29.4
59.0	70.6
77.0	88.2
6.5	0
14.4	11.8
0.7	0
1.4	0
23.0	5.9
75.5	88.2
1.4	5.9

8a16 (n=156)<sup>a</sup>

Data are mean (SD) unless otherwise indicated.

<sup>a</sup>Patients from the FAS who completed Week 48.

<sup>b</sup>The sum of proportions may not equal 100% due to rounding.

<sup>c</sup>Other includes American Indian or Alaskan Native, Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander, and Multiple.

#### **Baseline Characteristics by Dosing Interval**

	8q12 (ı	<b>8q12 (n=300)</b> ª			<b>8q16 (n=156)</b> ª		
	Maintained	Shortened		Maintained	Shortened		
n (%)	273 (91.0)	27 (9.0)		139 (89.1)	17 (10.9)		
Type 2 diabetes (%)	94.5	92.6		95.0	94.1		
Duration of diabetes (years)	15.5 (10.1)	11.1 (9.7)		15.6 (10.5)	15.8 (11.0)		
BMI (kg/m <sup>2</sup> )	30.3 (6.1)	29.3 (6.6)		31.1 (6.3)	30.5 (4.8)		
Hemoglobin A1c (%)	8.0 (1.5)	7.8 (1.4)		7.9 (1.5)	7.8 (1.9)		
BCVA (ETDRS letters)	63.9 (10.1)	59.4 (10.0)		62.7 (11.2)	53.7 (12.8)		
CRT (µm)	444.9 (129.8)	511.4 (117.5)		447.1 (112.5)	534.8 (134.3)		
Baseline DRSS score (%)							
Level 43 or better	61.2	51.9		66.9	58.8		
Level 47 or worse	33.7	40.7		26.6	41.2		
Ungradable	5.1	7.4		6.5	0		
Prior DME treatment, n (%)	42.5	55.6		44.6	47.1		

Compared with patients who maintained their randomized dosing intervals, those whose dosing intervals were shortened had on average lower BCVA and greater CRT at baseline

Data are mean (SD) unless otherwise indicated. <sup>a</sup>Patients from the FAS who completed Week 48. photon

#### Univariable Analysis: Baseline Characteristics Associated With the Incidence of Dosing Interval Shortening

				Ν	n	OR (95% CI)	<i>P</i> -value
Diabetes type (Type 2 vs. Type 1)	·@		1	456	431	0.77 (0.22, 2.69)	0.6827
Hemoglobin A1c (per 1% increase)	H			452	_	0.94 (0.76, 1.17)	0.5871
Duration of diabetes (per 1-year increase)	(			454	—	0.97 (0.94, 1.01)	0.1048
<b>BMI</b> (per 5-kg/m² increase)	⊢ <b></b> ●			455	_	0.90 (0.69, 1.17)	0.4273
<b>BCVA</b> (per 5-letter decrease)		H_J		456	-	1.27 (1.12, 1.45)	0.0003
<b>CRT</b> (per 50-µm increase)		⊢ <b>_</b> ⊣		455	—	1.21 (1.09, 1.35)	0.0005
<b>DRSS</b> (≥47-<90 vs ≤43)	F	•		431	147	1.51 (0.79, 2.89)	0.2101
Prior DME treatment (Yes vs No)	н.			456	201	1.44 (0.77, 2.68)	0.2513
	Favors maintained		Favors shortened	→			
	0 0.5	1 1.5 2 2	.5 3 3.5	4			
OR (95% CI)							

OR, odds ratio.

N, number of patients evaluated for the specified baseline characteristic; n, number of patients in the first specified category.

photon

#### Multivariable Analysis: Baseline Characteristics Associated photon With the Incidence of Dosing Interval Shortening



A subsequent ROC analysis of pooled data for aflibercept 8 mg demonstrated that patients with BCVA ≤58 letters (20/70 or worse) or CRT ≥474 µm at baseline were more likely to have shortened dosing intervals through Week 48 in this trial

#### Absolute BCVA at Baseline and Week 48 by Dosing Interval







8q16 (n=156)<sup>a</sup>

<sup>a</sup>Patients from the FAS who completed Week 48. FAS, observed values (censoring data post-ICE).

#### Absolute CRT at Baseline and Week 48 by Dosing Interval





#### <sup>a</sup>Patients from the FAS who completed Week 48. FAS, observed values (censoring data post-ICE).

### Conclusions

- photon DME
- Aflibercept 8q12 and 8q16 demonstrated non-inferior BCVA gains compared to aflibercept 2q8 at Week 48, with a large majority of patients maintaining their randomized 12- or 16-week dosing intervals
  - Dosing intervals were shortened in approximately 10% of patients
- Lower BCVA and greater CRT at baseline were associated with shortened dosing intervals in patients receiving aflibercept 8 mg in this trial
- Aflibercept 8 mg-treated patients with shortened dosing intervals had meaningful BCVA gains and CRT improvements at Week 48, although absolute BCVA and CRT values at Week 48 were not equivalent to those of patients with maintained dosing intervals

# **PHOTON: 96-week Results**

- 8q12 and 8q16 groups had non-inferior BCVA compared to 2q8 at Week 96, with up to 6 fewer injections
- Through Week 96, 89% of 8 mg patients maintained ≥12-week dosing intervals
  - At Week 96, 44% of 8 mg patients had a last assigned dosing interval of ≥20 weeks
- Safety of aflibercept 8 mg was comparable to that of aflibercept 2 mg over 96 weeks



<sup>a</sup>LS mean values (censoring data post-ICE); FAS: 2q8 n=167; 8q12 n=328; 8q16 n=163 (at baseline). LS mean values were generated using MMRM, with baseline BCVA as a covariate, treatment group (2q8, 8q12, 8q16) and stratification variables (geographic region [Japan vs rest of the world], baseline CRT [<400 µm vs ≥400 µm], prior treatment for DME) as fixed factors, and interaction terms for baseline and visit and for treatment and visit. <sup>b</sup>Patients were assigned to 24-week dosing intervals if they continued to meet extension criteria but there was not sufficient time to complete the interval within the 96-week study period. <sup>c</sup>Patients completing Week 96.

photon