

Tumour Necrosis Factor Inhibitor - Induced Pleuropericarditis

Qingxia Zhang, Xuan Wu Hospital, Capital Medical University, Beijing, China and Qun-Ying Yue, Uppsala Monitoring Centre

Summary

Pleuropericarditis associated with anti-TNF α agents was identified as a potential signal in a screening of VigiBase, the WHO global database of individual case safety reports, at the Uppsala Monitoring Centre (UMC).

Up to 18 December 2019, there were 94 unique cases from 18 countries reporting pleuropericarditis with anti-TNF α agents as a suspected or interacting medicine. Among the 94 reports, 42 were identified as well-documented on the basis of a vigiGrade completeness score $C \geq 0.80$, or having informative narratives, and were further assessed for clinical features. Of the 42 cases, 39 were serious, including three fatal and seven life-threatening. In 35 cases, anti-TNF α agent was the only suspected drug. Positive de- and rechallenge were reported in 95% and 17% of the 42 cases, respectively. The times to onset (TTO) showed a large variability among individual cases, ranging from one to 75 months (mean=24 months). In two cases with positive rechallenge where the information was detailed, it seems that the TTO became shorter when the reaction reoccurred upon drug re-introduction. The most commonly involved anti-TNF α agents are adalimumab, infliximab and etanercept; and the mostly reported pleuropericarditis types are classified as autoimmune-related with (n=17) or without (n=15) co-reported drug-induced lupus (DIL), or infection-related (n=8). While adalimumab was mostly reported in the infection-related cases (7/8), infliximab was the mostly reported in the autoimmune-related cases, in particular co-reported with DIL (9/17). There have been four cases where the reaction occurred one to two months after the anti-TNF α agents (infliximab and adalimumab) were stopped. Based on the review of the case series using the Bradford-Hill criteria, and also taking into account the information in literature, product label, and the mechanisms of action, the anti-TNF α agents associated pleuropericarditis are considered to be a class effect.

To clinically recognize and manage these potentially life-threatening serious cardiopulmonary complications, health care professionals should be aware of this possible risk. Meanwhile, we need to pay attention to the clinical features of pleuropericarditis cases, since they may cause diagnostic and therapeutic difficulties. Considering the long elimination time, clinicians need to be reminded to remain vigilant for the adverse reactions even after discontinuing anti-TNF α therapy.

SIGNAL

WHO defines a signal as:

“Reported information on a possible causal relationship between an adverse event and a drug, the relationship being unknown or incompletely documented previously”. An additional note states: “Usually more than one report is required to generate a signal, depending on the seriousness of the event and the quality of the information”.*

A signal is therefore a hypothesis together with supporting data and arguments. A signal is not only uncertain but also preliminary in nature: the situation may change substantially over time one way or another as more information is gathered. A signal may also provide further documentation of a known association of a drug with an ADR, for example: information on the range of severity of the reaction; the outcome; postulating a mechanism; indicating an “at risk” group; a dose range which might be more suspect; or suggesting a pharmaceutical group effect or a lack of such an effect by a particular drug.

Signals communicated by UMC are derived from VigiBase, the WHO global database of individual case safety reports. This database contains summaries of individual case safety reports of suspected adverse drug reactions, submitted by national pharmacovigilance centres (NCs) that are members of the WHO Programme for International Drug Monitoring. More information regarding the status of this data, its limitations and proper use, is provided in the Caveat on the last page of this document.

VigiBase is periodically screened to identify drug-ADR combinations that are unknown or incompletely documented. Combinations of such interest that they should be further reviewed clinically are sent to members

of the Signal Review Panel for in-depth assessment. The Signal Review Panel consists of experienced international scientists and clinicians, usually affiliated with a governmental or an academic institution. The expert investigates the clinical evidence for the reaction being related to the suspected drug.

The topics discussed in the signals represent varying levels of suspicion. Signals contains hypotheses, primarily intended as information for the national regulatory authorities. They may consider the need for possible action, such as further evaluation of source data, or conducting a study for testing a hypothesis.

The distribution of signals is currently restricted to NCs, regulatory authority staff and their advisers, participating in the WHO Programme. Signals are sent to the pharmaceutical companies when they can be identified as uniquely responsible for the drug concerned. UMC does not take responsibility for contacting all market authorisation holders. As a step towards increased transparency, since 2012 UMC signals are subsequently published in the WHO Pharmaceuticals Newsletter.

National regulatory authorities and NCs are responsible for deciding on action in their countries, including communicating the information to health professionals, and the responsible market authorisation holders, within their jurisdiction.

In order to further debate, we encourage all readers of signals to comment on individual topics.

* Edwards I.R, Biriell C. Harmonisation in pharmacovigilance. Drug Safety 1994;10:93-102.

Responses from industry

Signals on products under patent are submitted to patent holders for comments. Responses from industry are unedited. The calculations, analysis and conclusions are theirs, and should be given serious but critical

consideration in the same way as any scientific document. The WHO and UMC are not responsible for their findings, but may occasionally comment on them.



Caveat Document

Statement of reservations, limitations and conditions relating to data released from VigiBase, the WHO global database of individual case safety reports (ICSRs). Understanding and accepting the content of this document are formal conditions for the use of VigiBase data.

Uppsala Monitoring Centre (UMC) in its role as the World Health Organization (WHO) Collaborating Centre for International Drug Monitoring receives reports of suspected adverse reactions to medicinal products from National Centres in countries participating in the WHO Programme for International Drug Monitoring. The information is stored in VigiBase, the WHO global database of individual case safety reports (ICSRs). It is important to understand the limitations and qualifications that apply to this information and its use.

Tentative and variable nature of the data

Uncertainty: The reports submitted to UMC generally describe no more than suspicions which have arisen from observation of an unexpected or unwanted event. In most instances it cannot be proven that a specific medicinal product is the cause of an event, rather than, for example, underlying illness or other concomitant medication.

Variability of source: Reports submitted to national centres come from both regulated and voluntary sources. Practice varies: some national centres accept reports only from medical practitioners; others from a broader range of reporters, including patients, some include reports from pharmaceutical companies.

Contingent influences: The volume of reports for a particular medicinal product may be influenced by the extent of use of the product, publicity, the nature of the adverse effects and other factors.

No prevalence data: No information is provided on the number of patients exposed to the product, and only a small part of the reactions occurring are reported.

Time to VigiBase: Some national centres make an assessment of the likelihood that a medicinal product caused the suspected reaction, while others do not. Time from receipt of an ICSR by a national centre until submission to UMC varies from country to country. Information obtained from UMC may therefore differ from that obtained directly from national centres.

For these reasons, interpretations of adverse effect data, and particularly those based on comparisons between medicinal products, may be misleading. The data comes from a variety of sources and the likelihood of a causal relationship varies across reports. Any use of VigiBase data must take these significant variables into account.

Prohibited use of VigiBase Data includes, but is not limited to:

- patient identification or patient targeting
- identification, profiling or targeting of general practitioners or practice

Any publication, in whole or in part, of information obtained from VigiBase must include a statement:

- (i) recording 'VigiBase, the WHO global database of individual case safety reports (ICSRs)' as the source of the information
- (ii) explaining that the information comes from a variety of sources, and the probability that the suspected adverse effect is drug-related is not the same in all cases
- (iii) affirming that the information does not represent the opinion of the UMC or the World Health Organization.

Omission of this statement may exclude the responsible person or organization from receiving further information from VigiBase.

UMC may, in its sole discretion, provide further instructions to the user, responsible person and/or organization in addition to those specified in this statement and the user, responsible person and/or organization undertakes to comply with all such instructions.