The new boy in town:

Serelaxin Therapy in Acute Heart Failure



Piotr Ponikowski, MD, PhD, FESC Medical University, Centre for Heart Disease Clinical Military Hospital Wroclaw, Poland



Disclosure

Consultancy fees and speaker's honoraria from: Corthera, Novartis

Acute Heart Failure: landscape at the beginning of the 21st century

EUR Observational Research Program: The Heart Failure Pilot Survey

0.50

0.45

0.40

0.35

0.30

0.25

0.20

0.15

0.10

0.05

All-cause death or HF hospitalization 1892 pts with acute HF& 3226 pts with chronic HF Acute HF: 35.1% 1-year all cause mortality: acute HF – 16.8% chronic HF – 6.8% Chronic HF: 17.2% Days from enrolment

Cardiologist's summary:

"broadly speaking, the pharmacological armamentarium for AHFS – **loop diuretics**, **vasodilators and inotropes** – is largely *unchanged from 1970s*…"

Felker GM et al., Circ Heart Fail 2010;3:314-25

Cardiologist's question: Why all successful phase II studies are followed by failures in phase III trials ? **Do we need shift in a "AHF paradigm" ?**

A. Maggioni ESC 2011

Long-term benefit from short-term intervention: ever possible ?

Initial, short-term therapies (hours-days)

Target	"Traditional" therapeutic	Effects on long-term
	approach	outcome
Alleviate congestion	i.v. diuretics	?
		May be detrimental
Reduce ↑ LV	i.v. nitrates	?
filling pressure		Potentially favourable
Hypoperfusion	i.v. inotropes	Detrimental
Poor cardiac performance		

Dissociation between symptomatic improvement & clinical stabilisation and better long-term outcome

Modified from Pang PS et al. Eur Heart J 2010;31:784-93

Lessons from ACS trials: short-term intervention can result in long-term benefit



ISIS-2 follow-up



Baignet C et al. BMJ 1998;316:1337-43



Grines CL et al. NEJM 1993;328:673-9

Need for paradigm shifting in acute heart failure: short-term intervention and long-term goals (?)

What is needed ?

• Targeted-approach = characterizing patient' clinical profile different pathophysiologies & therapies for different clinical profiles (?)

An ideal drug / intervention

symptomatic improvement, "end-organ" protection, improvement in neurohumoral and proinflammtory profile

Appropriate timing = early administration of therapy

"the earlier the better" (?)

- \rightarrow prevention of tissue damage;
- \rightarrow phase of severe symptoms;
- \rightarrow early clinical stabilization & chance to introduce disease-modifying therapies

Serelaxin is a recombinant form of human relaxin-2



 Relaxin-2 is a naturally occurring peptide hormone which mediates systemic hemodynamic and renal adaptive changes during pregnancy

- Structure of human relaxin-2: 53 amino acids (2 chains connected by 2 disulphide bonds)
- Human relaxin-2 is one of seven peptides in the relaxin family of hormones
- Each of these seven peptides is structurally and functionally distinct
- Relaxin-2 mediates its effects via specific G-proteincoupled receptors: RXFP1 (LGR7) and RXFP2 (LGR8)
- Relaxin-2 receptors are localized in many blood vessels

Human relaxin-2 contributes to renal and cardiovascular adaptive changes in pregnancy

Parameter	Pregnancy
Cardiac output (L/min)	20% increase
Systemic vascular resistance (dyn.s.cm ²)	30% decrease
Global arterial compliance (mL/mmHg)	30% increase
Creatinine clearance (mL/min)	45% increase

Levels are elevated in circulation in the first trimester of pregnancy and throughout 9 months

Teichman et al. Heart Fail Rev 2009;14:321–9; Jeyabalan et al. Adv Exp Med Biol 2007;612:65–87; Sherwood. The Physiology of Reproduction. Acad Press 1994; 61–1009

Serelaxin Is NOT Just Another Vasodilator

Non-clinical and clinical evidence suggest that relaxin-2 may have additional effects



- The mechanism of action of relaxin/serelaxin involves upregulation of the endothelin type B (ET_B) receptor
- The ET_B receptor mediates: (1) increased systemic and renal vasodilation, (2) natriuresis, and (3) clearance of ET-1

ET_B receptor = endothelin receptor type B; ET-1= endothelin-1; MMP = matrix metalloproteinase;

NO = nitric oxide; NOS = nitric oxide synthase; TGF = transforming growth factor; TNF = tumor necrosis factor; VEGF = vascular endothelial growth factor

Teichman SL, et al. Curr Heart Fail Rep. 2010;7(2):75-82.

Serelaxin: proof of concept in heart failure Reduction in left ventricular filling pressure

Open-label pilot study of serelaxin in 16 patients with stable chronic HF[‡]

Serelaxin:

- reduced pulmonary capillary wedge pressure
- increased cardiac output
- improved renal function during infusion
- no abnormalities regarding vital signs, clinical status, electrocardiogram, serum chemistry, and hematology parameters, and no relevant adverse events at the doses tested (10–960 µg/kg/day)



*p<0.05 vs. baseline

[‡]3 dose escalation cohorts: Group A (8-hour sequential i.v. infusions at 10, 30, 100 μg/kg/day); Group B (240, 480, 960 μg/kg/day); Group C (24-hour infusion at 960 μg/kg/day)

Pre-RELAX-AHF and RELAX-AHF: clinical trials testing the efficacy of serelaxin in AHF

Timeline: Da	ay 1 Day 3 Day	y 5 Day 14		Day 60	Day 180
Treatment (within 16h of symptoms)	48h i.v. "the e	arlier the l	oetter"		
Primary EP1		Early Relief	(Likert) 6, 12, 24 I	n	
Primary EP2		Sustained	Effect (VAS AUC) 0	-100 mm; 0, 6, 1	2, 24h, D2-D5
Safety	Δ Worsening HF (%				
Safety	Creatinine changes				
HE	LoS (days)				
Secondary EP1	Days alive out of	hospital			
Secondary EP2	CV mortality or r	e-hospitalizati	on for HF or renal fail	ure	
Outcome	CV Mortality (%)				
Hospital a	admission	Hospital discha	arge Day	y 60 analysis	Follow-up

Teerlink et al. Lancet 2009;373:1429–39; Clinicaltrials.gov 2009 (NCT00520806)

Pre-RELAX-AHF

Teerlink JR, et al. Lancet 2009;373:1429-39.

- 234 patient, dose-finding, Phase II study
- Optimal dose across multiple clinical outcome domains was 30 mcg/kg/d
- Serelaxin had trends to:
 - Improve dyspnea relief
 - Decrease congestion
 - Reduce diuretic use
 - Limit worsening of heart failure
 - Shorten length of stay
 - Increase days alive out of hospital
 - Improve cardiovascular and all-cause survival
- Safe and well-tolerated without significant hypotension



RELAX-AHF: Study Design

Phase III, Multicenter, Randomized, Double-Blind, Placebo-Controlled, Parallel-Group Study



1° Endpoint: Dyspnea Relief (VAS AUC)



RELAX-AHF

VAS Results Consistent across all Subgroups

Subgroup		Placebo N	Serelaxin N	Favors placebo <	Favors Serelaxin	LS mean difference Estimate (95%CI)	Interaction P value
Total population		580	581			448 (120, 775)	
Gender	Male	357	368			441 (26, 855)	0.92
	Female	223	213		— —	474 (–61, 1009)	
Age	<75 years	296	315	-	•	192 (–260, 644)	0.11
	≥75 years	284	266		— —	725 (249, 1202)	
	<60 mL/min	408	409			504 (113, 895)	0.55
egfr	≥60 mL/min	160	155	_	• -	280 (-350, 910)	
	<140 mmHg	284	298			436 (–27, 899)	0.82
SBP	≥140 mmHg	294	279			513 (47, 980)	
HF Past Year Hospitalization	Yes	180	214			488 (–75, 1051)	0.88
	No	400	367			433 (28, 838)	
LVEF	<40%	295	303			378 (–71, 828)	0.83
	≥40%	244	249			454 (–41, 949)	
IV nitrates at baseline	Yes	42	39		• • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • •	808 (–435, 2050)	0.56
	No	538	542			421 (81, 761)	
				$\overline{1}$ \overline		22	

LS mean difference in dyspnea (VAS AUC) to Day 5

8

500

00 000 500

Metra et al., EHJ, 2013 AUC=area under the curve; HF=heart failure; LS=least squares; VAS=visual analogue scale;

1°Endpoint: Dyspnea Relief (Likert)

Proportion of subjects with moderately or markedly better dyspnea by Likert by time point



RELAX-AHF

Moderately or Markedly Worsening of Dyspnea on the Likert Scale

Less worsening than placebo at all time points through Day 5



Time Since Treatment Initiation

RELAX-AHF: Worsening of Heart Failure



Worsening Heart Failure (WHF) - worsening signs and/or symptoms of HF that required an intensification of IV therapy for heart failure or mechanical ventilatory or circulatory support.

*p value by Wilcoxon test **p value by log rank test for Serelaxin vs. Placebo; HR estimate by Cox model, HR<1.0 favors Serelaxin

RELAX-AHF

Variability in the clinical course of AHF: steady improvement vs. worsening



J Card Fail 2009;15: 639-44 Fundam Clin Pharmacol 2009;23:633-9 f

2°Endpoint: CV Death or Heart Failure / Renal Failure Re-hospitalization through Day 60

K-M estimate for time to first CV Death or HF/RF re-hosp (%)





RELAX-AHF

All-cause Death through Day 180

K-M estimate for All-cause Death ITT (%)



RELAX-AHF

RELAX-AHF: Incidence of AEs/SAEs to Day 14

	Placebo (N=570) n (%)	Serelaxin (N=568) n (%)
Subjects with any AE	320 (56.1)	305 (53.7)
Subjects with any drug-related AE	46 (8.1)	47 (8.3)
Subjects with AE leading to study drug d/c	22 (3.9)	26 (4.6)
Hypotension-related AE (through day 5)	25 (4.4)	28 (4.9)
Renal Impairment-related AE (through day 5)	49 (8.6)	26 (4.6)*
Subjects with any SAE	78 (13.7)	86 (15.1)
Subjects with any drug-related SAEs	2 (0.4)	3 (0.5)
Subjects with SAE leading to drug d/c	3 (0.5)	5 (0.9)
Serious AE with an outcome of death	15 (2.6)	10 (1.8)

RELAX-AHF

The number of subjects with any AE includes all AEs and SAEs reported through Day 14. Non-serious AEs were collected through Day 5, SAEs through Day 14

Mechamisms of Action of Serelaxin

- Beneficial effects of serelaxin in patients with AHF
 - Improvement in dypsnea
 - Improvement in signs and symptoms of heart failure
 - Preventing worsening heart failure
 Reducing (CV) mortality
- How is serelaxin doing this?

Changes from baseline in biomarkers related to organ damage in the RELAX-AHF study



Metra M et al. JACC 2013;61:196-206

CRLX030A2201: Study objective and design

 Study objective: to evaluate the hemodynamic effects of serelaxin in 71 patients with AHF at a dose rate of 30 μg/kg/day



Hemodynamic results: Change in PCWP



PCWP, pulmonary capillary wedge pressure; SE, standard error. Data represented in mmHg as least squares mean (SE) change from baseline. Time-weighted average is based on area under the effect curve for the corresponding time interval

Hemodynamic results: Change in mean PAP



PAP, pulmonary arterial pressure; SE, standard error. Data represented in mmHg as least squares mean (SE) change from baseline. Timeweighted average is based on area under the effect curve for the corresponding time interval

RELAX-AHF: Benefit-Risk Conclusion

Improvement in current clinical status	 Patient-reported dyspnea ↓ Physician-assessed signs and symptoms of conget NT-pro-BNP ↓, PCWP ↓, troponin ↓ Less diuretics required 	
Prevention of worsening clinical status		 Worsening HF ↓, NNT 15 by Day 5 Length of hospital stay ↓ Length of time in critical care unit ↓ Less worsening renal function
Reduction in risk of death		 ↓ Cardiovascular mortality at Day 180 ↓ All cause mortality at Day 180
Safety profile comparable to placebo		 BP decreases manageable Strong evidence of no harm in AHF patients with high unmet medical need

Short-term relief, long-term goals – the cardiologist's perspective on a novel therapeutic approach to acute heart failure



"broadly speaking, the pharmacological armamentarium for AHFS – loop diuretics, vasodilators and inotropes – is largely unchanged from 1970s…"

Will it be changed after RELAX ?

Sunrise or sunset ?

HFA Congress 17-20 May 2014 – Athens

Will publish then: International Consensus Document on the Diagnosis & Treatment of Acute Heart Failure



www.escardio.org