

## 2SPD-012: COMPARATIVE EFFICACY OF ABROCITINIB, BARICITINIB AND UPADACITINIB IN MONOTHERAPY FOR THE TREATMENT OF ATOPIC DERMATITIS

R. Claramunt García<sup>1</sup>, C.L. Muñoz Cid<sup>2</sup>, A. Sánchez Ruiz<sup>3</sup>, N. Garcia Gomez<sup>3</sup>, M. Merino Almazán<sup>1</sup>, T. Sánchez Casanueva<sup>1</sup>.

<sup>1</sup>hospital Virgen De Altagracia, Pharmacy, Manzanares, Spain. <sup>2</sup>hospital De La Serranía De Ronda, Pharmacy, Ronda, Spain. <sup>3</sup>hospital Universitario De Jaén, Pharmacy, Jaén, Spain.

### Background

Several oral drugs for atopic dermatitis have been approved in recent years. However, there are no studies that directly compare these treatments.

### Aim and objectives

To establish, through an indirect comparison (IC) against placebo, whether abrocitinib (A), baricitinib (B) and upadacitinib (U) can be considered equivalent alternatives in efficacy for the treatment of atopic dermatitis, when used as monotherapy.

### Materials and methods



Pubmed search for pivotal clinical trials (CT):

- abrocitinib(200mg/24h)
- baricitinib(4mg/24h)
- upadacitinib(30mg/24h)

Main variable for comparison: EASI75 at week 16

RR compared to placebo was calculated. With these values, an IC of these drugs was performed using the Bucher method

The results were analyzed, seeing if there were statistically significant differences

### Results

5

Clinical Trials

- one with abrocitinib
- two with baricitinib (CTB1, CTB2)
- Two with upadacitinib (CTU1, CTU2)

All of them compared to placebo.

All the studies presented a similar methodology



However, in the CT of A, patients <18 years were not included, while in U (13.5%) and B (22%) they were. Moreover, in the A CT the EASI75 is measured at 12 weeks while in the others at 16 weeks.



These limitations for IC were eventually accepted.

DRUGS	OR (IC95)	P
A vs B (CTB1)	0.53 (0.24-1.18)	0.12
A vs B (CTB2)	0.65 (0.27-1.54)	0.32
A vs U (CTU1)	0.92 (0.46-1.82)	0.81
A vs U (CTU2)	1.04 (0.52-2.08)	0.92
B (CTB1) vs U (CTU1)	1.73 (0.98-3.07)	0.06
B (CTB1) vs U (CTU2)	1.95 (1.08-3.52)	0.03
B (CTB2) vs U (CTU1)	1.42 (0.73-2.73)	0.30
B (CTB2) vs U (CTU2)	1.60 (0.81-3.13)	0.17

### Conclusions

According to the results obtained, it could be that upadacitinib 30mg presented greater efficacy than baricitinib 4mg as it is the only IC that has given a statistically significant difference. However, due to the aforementioned limitations, these results should be taken with caution and safety and efficiency criteria should also be taken into account.