ΑT

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE FOOD AND DRUG ADMINISTRATION

WORKSHOP ON POTENCY AND DOSAGE OF von WILLEBRAND FACTOR CONCENTRATES

Friday, September 26, 1997 8:00 a.m.

Masur Auditorium

Building 10 National Institutes of Health Bethesda, Maryland 2

sgg		5
	Preclinical Evaluation of Recombination von Willebrand Factor:	
	Hans Peter Schwarz	187
	QUESTION/ANSWER PERIOD	208
	PANEL DISCUSSION AND QUESTIONS Chairperson: Margaret E. Rick	224

Augusto Federici Jeanne Lusher Robert R. Montgomery L. Ross Pierce Gilbert C. White

PROCEEDINGS

Welcome and Opening Remarks

DR. FEIGAL: Good morning. My name is David

Feigal. I am the Deputy Director of the Center for

Biologics. It is my pleasure to welcome you all here this
morning.

One of the things that I thought I would just begin with is what is the role of FDA in the regulation of blood products. If you look at the history of the standards that have been set, they come from two sources: One comes from the Public Health Act and the other from the Food, Drug and Cosmetic Act. They do a great deal to define our role and what the standards are, and it has a lot to do with the business that we have framed today.

Some of the things that we do not, we do not regulate the practice of medicine, and that includes off-label uses of approved products. We also do not control the use of pharmacies, or have any role in setting prices or purchasing in federal drug programs or drug availability programs. But, indirectly, I think we obviously have an important effect on all of those.

The key words in the Public Health Service Act about the products that we regulate are that we are charged by Congress to assure that they are safe, pure and potent.

The potency standard, actually, predated the efficacy standard for drugs. Biological products had to demonstrate that they worked long before Congress demanded that we know that drugs work. Part of the issue today is the issue of how do we define potency, and what are the issues that relate to establishing the relationship between potency and effectiveness for this group of products.

Because these are products which make claims that are defined in the Food, Drug and Cosmetic Act, claims for products which ameliorate disease, that Act also defines the nature of the standards of where we collect evidence from for FDA approval, and that is from controlled clinical trials. Controlled clinical trials, as described even in the regulations, is not simply the highest standard, placebo-controlled trials, but it also includes trials which show dose responses; trials which compare one agent to another; and trials which compare to no treatment or even historical controls. All of these are sources of evidence.

One of the things that I think is best known, particularly in the blood area, of what FDA's role often becomes is setting standards for products that are made available by multiple manufacturers so that when you read the labeling for a product, and it describes a set of properties, there is some consistency and there are some

standards that determine what those properties are.

This is a disease area and a product area that has challenges in all these areas, and we are grateful that this is a cooperative effort with the National Heart, Lung and Blood Institute, that we have participation from other regulatory authorities, from the academic community and, importantly, from people who use these products so that we can see if there is a way that we can define standards, collectively describe the evidence and make this a set of products that are more straightforward for use.

So, I welcome you and thank you very much for your participation today.

Session I: Regulatory Perspective on Licensure of vWF Concentrates

FDA Perspective: von Willebrand Factor

DR. WEINSTEIN: Thank you very much, Dr. Feigal.

I am Mark Weinstein. I am Director of the Division of

Hematology, here, at CBER. Before we start the formal part

of this meeting, I would like to express my thanks to a

number of people who have helped to make this meeting

possible. These include Andrew Chang, who did much of the

work in arranging the scheduling of speakers; my colleague

and co-chairman, Margaret Rick, from the NIH; and the staff

at CBER, particularly Jo Wilczek, who arranged for the

sgg 9

advertising and promotion of this meeting. I would also like to thank the speakers who have taken so much time and effort in arranging their presentations for this conference. Last, but hardly least, I would like to thank you, the audience, for coming and being involved in this meeting and being active participants in bringing issues forward here. The success of this meeting will depend a great deal on your active participation, and commenting on the presentations and bringing issues of concern forward that you might have.

I will next briefly review the agenda of this Workshop, which is devoted to the issue of potency and dosage of von Willebrand factor concentrates.

In the first part of this meeting we will discuss von Willebrand factor from a regulatory perspective, as seen as the vantage point of the U.S. regulatory agency and from the perspective of European regulatory agencies, and particularly the question about how can this product be available in Europe, license in Europe for use of von Willebrand factor indications, and use in the United States. Is this a uniform situation in Europe, and is there something different about their regulations as compared to ours?

Next we will have a presentation from a consumer representative, who will tell about her experiences as a

user of von Willebrand factor concentrates. This will be followed by presentations from clinicians who will talk bout their perspectives, practices and expectations. We wish to explore the range of options, procedures and what information do clinicians desire to use this product properly. In this regard, I particularly want to thank Drs. Jeanne Lusher and Alice Cohen who went to the trouble of doing survey work in this area particularly and specifically for this meeting. I feel that these surveys will help us get a broad perspective of how these products are used.

The next part of the meeting will consist of presentations about various assays of von Willebrand factor in an effort to get a better understanding of the status of measurements of von Willebrand factor functional activity. Can assays be selected that will correlate with clinical benefit, or at least provide critical characteristics of these products that can be used to define and standardize von Willebrand factor products?

The manufacturers will then have an opportunity to discuss investigations that they have conducted on the materials that contain von Willebrand factor. We should get a sense of the range of properties of these materials and what tests have been used to characterize them. Of particular interest will be the experiences that

manufacturers have had in performing clinical trials with these products. We will get a sense of the difficulties that they have had, the kinds of assays that have been used, and perhaps derive from this a better sense of what is a practical kind of clinical trial that we can use to get these products licensed.

In the last part of the meeting we will have a panel discussion where we will talk about the previous presentations and attempt to answer questions, such as what in vitro laboratory measurements best reflect von Willebrand factor activity in vivo, and how should doses be selected for study in clinical trials of von Willebrand factor concentrate. There should also be time throughout the meeting for your active participation in this process.

I will first start out by discussing very briefly von Willebrand factor from the perspective of the FDA. This will be expanded upon in the next talk with my colleague, Dr. Ross Pierce, from the FDA.

(Slide)

This is the title of the presentation.

(Slide)

The present situation in this country is that there is no product licensed for the indication of von Willebrand factor. In the United States patients are

treated with Factor VIII concentrates that contain von Willebrand factor but lack labeling for the von Willebrand factor content or dosage.

(Slide)

This has led, of course, to a number of difficult problems. Products do not have the von Willebrand factor content on the label and, therefore, there is potential for mishandling. We know that we have gotten complaints from physicians who have been in a situation of ordering Factor VIII from the pharmacy to treat a von Willebrand factor-deficient patient and receiving material that contained, in fact, Factor VIII with very little von Willebrand factor present and found, of course, that the products were useless. So there is a definite need for having a content of von Willebrand factor on products that contain the material, and that can be used for the treatment of von Willebrand factor disease.

Another problem is that the dosing is based on Factor VIII in many cases rather than von Willebrand factor, which is, of course, the defect of protein. This works out okay in many cases and people can get along with that for some products, but for other products, particularly some that do not contain any Factor VIII coagulant protein at all, this dosing problem can be very difficult. How do you

handle the dosing of that kind of product? We will be hearing today from some folks from France who do use products of this nature, and it will be interesting to hear how this is accomplished.

There is also a consensus within the community that says that ristocetin cofactor activity is adequate as a functional assay. Clinicians could make informed treatment regimens based on von Willebrand factor content. Later on we will explore whether this statement is, in fact, in true. Is this a good way of defining what the content of von Willebrand factor activity is?

(Slide)

As Dr. Feigal pointed out, we are constrained at the FDA by the Code of Federal Regulations to follow these definitions for getting products approved. There is a necessity of having a definition or potency label, that is, the specific ability or capacity of the product, as indicated by appropriate laboratory tests or by adequately controlled clinical data obtained through administration of the product in a manner intended to effect the given result. So, in order to have a produce licensed, it has to have some definition of potency on it. How you do that for von Willebrand factor when we don't have adequate standards or a definition, in fact, of what you Willebrand factor activity

is?

Secondly, there has to be information about dosage. Labeling shall state the recommended usual dose, the usual dosage range. Dosages shall be stated for each indication when appropriate. This section of the label shall also state the intervals recommended between doses, the optimal method of titrating dosage, and the usual duration of treatment. Many of the discussions that we will have later on today will address how we should devise studies to assess what the proper dosage of von Willebrand factor should be.

(Slide)

Also, in the complex language of the FDA and the CFR, the labeling of a drug may be considered to be misleading by reason of failure to reveal the proportion of, other fact, with respect to an ingredient present in such drug when such proportion or other fact is material in the light of the representation that such ingredient is present in such drug.

This needs a little translation. This means that one has to be able to say how much of something is in a drug if you say that it is going to have some degree of effectiveness, that it is going to be used for a certain treatment. Of course, with von Willebrand factor, where you

don't have a definition of what the element is of potency, you have a dilemma in how you are going to define what the product is. So, we have to get over this notion here of what we should call, what the measurement should be of Factor VIII, what it should say on the label, how many units of von Willebrand factor are present in the product.

(Slide)

Future directions that I hope will be explored in this meeting are new assays for von Willebrand factor, such as the collagen binding assay, shear-induced platelet aggregation. Maybe, with our present state of knowledge, the ristocetin cofactor activity is sufficient for defining the activity of the protein. Are new clinical studies needed to better correlate the von Willebrand factor property with clinical outcome? Should there be a new von Willebrand factor concentrate standard? These are all issues that will come forward, I hope, in our discussions and that will lead to licensure of these products in the near future.

I would next like to turn this over to Dr. Ross Pierce, from the Division of Blood Applications, who will further define what the requirements are for the FDA licensure of these products. Thank you.

Evaluation of vWF Concentrates and

2.

FDA Reviewers' Approach

DR. PIERCE: Thanks very much, Mark.

(Slide)

First I am going to discuss the type of approach that we would take in general for biologic products at FDA. Among the things we consider are evaluation of product potency. We ask the questions which in vitro assay is most appropriate as a reliable indicator of clinical activity? Does the manufacturing method assure lot-to-lot consistency of potency and safety? How should studies be designed in order to determine the correlation between in vitro potency and efficacy in the clinic? Which are the appropriate clinical settings for determining the efficacy and safety of the product? And, is sufficient information available to make informed dosing recommendations? Pharmacokinetic studies can help us with the last point but do not provide the whole answer.

(Slide)

Ristocetin cofactor activity has been proposed as a measure of potency but this assay does not provide a perfect solution at the present time. As is shown on this slide, from a published FDA study, different laboratories can obtain results that differ by as much as 75% relatively when measuring this activity on the same sample. Also,

correlation of ristocetin cofactor activity with correction of bleeding time has been poor, but we know that the correlation of bleeding time correction and clinical hemostasis also is certainly less than perfect.

(Slide)

Here we see that different von Willebrand factor concentrate products demonstrate markedly different ratios of ristocetin cofactor activity to Factor VIII activity level, with some products essentially devoid of Factor VIII.

(Slide)

As an interim measure, absent a valid single <u>in</u>

<u>vitro</u> measurement to assure product potency and consistency,

FDA might consider using a combination of assays such as

ristocetin cofactor activity, Factor VIII in those products

that contain it, multimer pattern and von Willebrand factor

antigen.

(Slide)

What we have asked sponsors of these concentrated products, who are interested in pursuing a von Willebrand factor disease indication, to do is to study the product's pharmacokinetics, to perform clinical studies relevant to the proposed use and to document consistency in manufacturing.

24 (Slide)

A good pharmacokinetic study in this disease should give us the following: the <u>in vivo</u> recovery, a handle on the variability within and between patients in <u>in vivo</u> recovery, plasma elimination half-life, the variability in that half-life, and we also consider it desirable to understand the influence, if any, of disease subtype severity and the severity of the bleeding episode on the half-life.

(Slide)

So, whom should we study in clinical trials that concern efficacy and safety? Well, subjects who have a documented history of abnormal bleeding episodes are certainly relevant and important. Subjects who would be likely to receive the product in actual practice -- this would exclude mild type 1 patients who may be managed satisfactorily with alternative agents.

We also need to recognize that if we restrict enrollment to the most severely affected patients, such as type 3, that will limit our study size and power due to the rarity of these patients.

(Slide)

We also need to ask the question what kinds of evidence do we need to say a product works in different settings, namely, surgery, the treatment of spontaneous

bleeding and the prophylactic use in the prevention of spontaneous bleeding.

(Slide)

We also need to consider the question of which clinical endpoints are most relevant to understanding product efficacy. Satisfactory clinical endpoints should reflect disease severity in the untreated condition distinguishing patients from normal individuals, of course. One hopes that they demonstrate minimal inter- and intra-observer measurement variability and, preferably, they should be objective in order to minimize bias. Examples of objective endpoints would include duration of spontaneous bleeding or surgical wound oozing and estimated perioperative blood loss in number of units lost or replaced.

(Slide)

Subjective endpoints are another possible choice but do present some problems. A subjective global assessment of bleeding could be a dichotomous variable, normalized or not normalized bleeding tendency. It could be a scale of quantities, such as three or more categories like excellent, good, fair, poor, abysmal. However, subjective endpoints can be associated with significant variability and, if true, that can limit power and reliability, and

subjective endpoints are subject to bias, especially in unblinded studies.

(Slide)

Surrogate clinical endpoints are especially useful in Phase II studies as markers of potential benefit. We need to keep in mind that in evaluating surrogate endpoints sufficient validation information is needed for the relationship between the surrogate marker and acceptable clinical efficacy in the therapeutic setting.

(Slide)

I will now survey of a variety of possible choices of trial design and touch on just some of the advantages and disadvantages in applying these designs to von Willebrand disease studies. As was mentioned, design issues will be considered in greater detail, we hope, during the panel discussion later today.

Use of a parallel comparison group and blinding are measures which can help reduce bias. So, we can ask the question is the question is a concurrent randomized control group feasible and ethical? Well, given that off-label use of some products has become standard of care, use of a placebo seems problematic due to the nature of the disease.

(Slide)

One ore more randomized comparison treatment

groups, however, may be considered if different suitable products are available for study. The efficacy of the standard comparison product should be well established and preferably FDA approved for the indication sought.

Cryoprecipitate is probably not the best option due to viral

So, when we lack and FDA approved standard for comparison, one thing that we can do is to randomize patients into different dosage regimen groups. We call this a dose-controlled study. The doses have to be sufficiently far apart, however, to show a difference between the dosage groups in clinical efficacy.

(Slide)

disease transmission risk.

What about concurrent non-randomized control groups? Are they feasible and useful? Here we can study concurrently normal patients, lacking bleeding disorders, undergoing matched surgical procedures and compare bleeding characteristics. Some of the problems we might encounter with this type of control include: age-matched patients may be available for some types of surgery but not others; the recruitment of matched normals may be difficult if longer than typical hospital stay is required for direct observation of delayed bleeding, which is seen in this clinical entity; and we have to keep in mind that the use of

normal controls does not establish whether patients did better than they would have had treatment been withheld. Normal controls do allow us to determine whether treated vWD patients become indistinguishable from normals in bleeding tendency under the particular dosage regimen that we are studying.

(Slide)

What about historical controls? These can be, for example, of at least two types. We could consider using patients as their own controls if we had adequate data on bleeding prior to the use of any replacement products, and it was well documented, or we could compare patients to historical data on normals. This might translate, in practical terms, into data on patients unselected with respected to bleeding disorder, for example in a surgical setting.

This approach depends on the availability of high quality historical data. As always, we need to take intercenter variability into account, and we feel in any discussion of using historical data it is imperative to define the historical database prospectively, such that the historical database must be relevant to today's practices. If ancillary therapy that could have an effect on hemostasis was not used during the time period of collection of the

historical data but is used today, then that would confound our interpretation of the efficacy of the product as it is being dosed. And, the historical database must be unbiased, which can be hard to ensure in practice. Comparisons to historical data could either be descriptive or quantitative and statistical. The latter would require adequate power and the pertinence of that can be discussed.

(Slide)

Let's now review again the dosage information that we would like to see available for product labeling purposes: The recommended usual starting dose; the usual dosage range; the doses according to disease subtypes, severity and indication or clinical setting; the recommended dosing interval; the optimal method of adjusting dosage; and the usual duration of treatment. Right now these are largely empirically based and often based on replacement of Factor VIII levels which, as we have seen, are not necessarily always a satisfactory endpoint, particularly in some settings with products that are devoid of Factor VIII.

(Slide)

In summary, some of the problems to be tackled in the development of these concentrates are settling on the choice of <u>in vitro</u> assay, and we need to determine its correlation with clinical effectiveness. The assay that we

choose should be reliable for use in assuring lot-to-lot consistency and potency. We need to determine the appropriate study design to be able to correlate pharmacokinetics with pharmacodynamics, that is, clinical hemostatic effectiveness.

(Slide)

We also need to determine the appropriate design of clinical studies to confirm and establish efficacy and safety, including subject selection criteria, clinical settings, surgery, spontaneous bleeding and/or prophylaxis. We need to settle on the choice of an appropriate control group or groups. We have to consider which study endpoints are going to be most informative. We need to settle on the analytical plans up front. Lastly, but certainly not least, the studies need to be designed in order to provide dosing information that is useful to physicians and patients.

Thank you.

DR. WEINSTEIN: The next speaker will be Dr.

Trevor Barrowcliffe, who is the head of the Division of

Hematology for the National Institute of Biological

Standards and Control in the U.K. Trevor's talk will be the

European Regulatory Perspective.

European Regulatory Perspective

DR. BARROWCLIFFE: Thank you very much, Mark.

Ladies and gentlemen, when Mark originally invited me to do this talk a little while ago I told him that I was really the last person to talk about this topic. So here I am, more or less the last person because a few other people couldn't make it.

The first thing to say is that there is no single

European perspective on licensing in relation to

concentrates for von Willebrand disease. The reason for

this is the complexities of Europe's licensing system, which

I have tried to set out in, hopefully, relatively simple

form on the first overhead.

(Slide)

We have the European Medicines Evaluation Agency, the EMEA, as of about three or four years ago. They have set up a centralized procedure for licensing where there is one European marketing authorization, but this is only used, or at least it is only obligatory for new biotechnology products in the area of biologicals. The other procedures that really are still in existence are the mutual recognition procedure where a product is licensed in one member state and then a procedure is available for transferring this license, although it is not automatic, to other member states. But as far as blood products are concerned, we are really still talking about national

licensing for nearly all blood products. Certainly, that is the situation as far as, for instance, using Factor VIII concentrates which are already licensed for treatment for von Willebrand disease.

(Slide)

To try and find out what the position is, you really have to go to all of the national authorities in 15 member states. This is essentially what I did. I have information back from most of them but not all of them.

So I simply asked some questions, namely, which products are licensed in the various member states and, if there are products which are licensed, what was the basis for licensing and, thirdly, is there a declaration of the von Willebrand factor content on either the package insert or the label?

So, we are now going to do a sort of Cook's tour of Europe and, if you will bear with me, we will go through the various member states.

(Slide)

So, if we start with the United Kingdom, in other words, the alphabetical reverse order, we have essentially one product currently licensed which is 8Y. That is the Factor VIII concentrate from Bio Products Laboratory, and that has been licensed since 1991 for treatment of von

Willebrand disease. The Centeon product Haemate P was originally licensed then it was taken off in 1992, not because of any clinical problems or anything like that, simply to do with the European regulatory requirements being a bit more stringent, and I think there is an application still outstanding for that. The basis for licensing was essentially review of the clinical data available at that time. Very recently, for the 8Y product the von Willebrand factor content is now going to be declared on the label as the von Willebrand factor antigen. Until now, in fact, it has only been available as the dosage in relation to 8C.

(Slide)

Across the Channel to Belgium, the products licensed in Belgium are the Centeon product Haemate P and also the von Willebrand factor concentrate from LFB, in France, which is made from Belgian plasma. The basis for licensing is was review of the clinical data and there is a declaration of the von Willebrand factor concentrates on the label. I am not quite sure whether that refers to both products or only the LFB product.

(Slide)

In The Netherlands, just one product licensed and, again, it is Centeon product Haemate P. The basis for licensing was a review of the clinical data and there is

declaration of the von Willebrand factor content in the package insert.

(Slide)

I think Germany is next. There are three products licensed, the Haemate HS, as it is called in Germany. It is the same product, Haemate P from Centeon; also the Immunate product from Immuno, and a locally produced Factor VIII concentrate, NDS, produced by the German Red Cross. The basis for licensing was a review of the clinical data and the von Willebrand factor content of the products, and the von Willebrand factor content is declared in the package insert as ristocetin cofactor for Haemate HS only, not for the other two products.

(Slide)

I think Italy is next. Here there are four products licensed and, again, are Haemate P from Centeon, locally produced Factor VIII concentrate called Emoclot, the Immuno product Immunate, and quite recently I think the Alpha product Alphanate. The basis for licensing was a review of the clinical data and, in the case of Alphanate some recent clinical trial data. The von Willebrand factor content is declared in the package insert. Again, I am not quite sure whether that refers to all products. It certainly is for Haemate P and I think also for Alphanate.

(Slide)

Moving on to Spain, there is just one product licensed. Again, it is the Centeon Haemate P. The basis for licensing was stated as prospective clinical trials, and the von Willebrand factor content was declared in the package insert and there is a variation there to allow that to be put onto the label.

(Slide)

From Spain we move north to Denmark. Here, there is the one product licensed. Again, it is the Centeon Haemate P. I don't have information on what the basis for licensing was. It is said that the von Willebrand factor content is not indicated, although we know from the other countries where Haemate P licensed it is declared in the package insert.

(Slide)

Now to move back down to Portugal, are no products licensed in Portugal and if clinicians want to use von Willebrand factor concentrate for treatment of von Willebrand disease, they have special dispensation, or they have to apply for dispensation for use of the product from LFB, in France.

(Slide)

24 This is also the situation in Austria, which is

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

the next country. Again, there are no products licensed. Here is the Haemate P product and also Immunate which is used by special dispensation. (Slide) Then in Greece, again, there are no products licensed and this time it is the LFB product, from France, which is used by special commission. (Slide) Finally, two countries where I couldn't get information from the national authorities but have got some information from the manufacturers, in France, the LFB product, the von Willebrand factor concentrate, is licensed. I understand also from Dr. Mazurier that there is a second product which contains also additional Factor VIII which is also licensed for treatment of von Willebrand disease in France. In Sweden, as far as I can gather, it is just the Haemate P product from Centeon, which is licensed. (Slide) So you can see, it is really quite a variable situation in Europe with regard to licensing. So, I have just summarized it here in relation to the products altogether, but there are certain products which are

licensed in the various European countries but three of

these are really only available in the country of
manufacture. Of the first four which are potentially used
in more than one country, Haemate P is the one which is
licensed in most, but not all, European countries; then the
von Willebrand factor concentrate from France, which is
licensed in France and Belgium and is also used in two other
countries; the Immuno product, which is licensed in Germany
and Italy; and the Alpha product, which is licensed in
Italy; and then the three, as I said, which are only
licensed in the country of their manufacture, which is 8Y
licensed in the U.K. and Emoclot, licensed in Italy, and the
German Red Cross product, NDS, which is licensed in Germany.

So, that is the situation as far as I have been able to ascertain. Some of this information was fairly recently acquired, and if anybody really wants to be sure about the situation in any one country I think really you need to check with the licensing authority in that country. Thank you.

DR. WEINSTEIN: Our next speaker will be Beth McDonald, who is a consumer of von Willebrand-containing products and has type 3 von Willebrand disease. She is active in the bleeding disorder community and advocates recognition of women with bleeding disorders, and is involved in peer review education to ensure the quality of

care in this community. Beth?

vWF Concentrates from Consumer Viewpoint

MS. MCDONALD: Good morning. Thank you for inviting me here. I am glad I get to speak but I kind of wish I could have spoken at a later time because after listening to all the lab values and studies that need to be done to approve this product, I think it would be nice to put a face to all the mumbo-jumbo that is hard for me to listen to, and I want to give a personal point of view.

First, let me introduce myself. Beth McDonald. I have type 3 von Willebrand disease, but I am also a surgical nurse with Columbia Hospital, in Lexington, Kentucky. So, von Willebrand's is not who I am, but it is an important part of my life. I am a very productive member of my community, including the surgical nurse community.

I want to tell you a little bit about my family.

I had a sister. She was a type 3 von Willebrand's and she was involved in a motor vehicle accident in 1986 and then they used cryoprecipitate to treat her bleeding. She sustained a closed-head injury, and through the cryo the hematologist that was treating her would treat her bleeding time, and every time her bleeding time would be prolonged, which it always was with the cryo, he would treat her with more cryo and this, in turn, raised her intracranial

pressure. She remained comatose for ten years and finally we ceased giving her blood products. By then we had gone on to give her factor concentrates, and she passed away ten years later through bleeding.

I also have two daughters, and they are six and nine and they are wonderful, and they have type 1. From what I understand, 1% of the population supposedly has some type of von Willebrand disease, type 1 probably.

Through this information I can put together that if you have more type 1's you are going to have more type 3's. If these are undiagnosed we are going to have an increased incidence in type 3's. There is going to be a need for these factor concentrates. We surely don't want to revert back to using cryo. Cryo is time consuming. It involves going to the emergency room. If I have a bleed, I like to be able to infuse within 15 minutes and be back to work, on my feet, and be productive. I do not want to take the time out to go to the emergency room, wait for somebody to order the cryo, wait for somebody to check and see that I have a bleed and then get my cryo in and go home four hours, six hours, sometimes 12 hours later.

There is also another problem with cryo. Nursing homes that I have encountered, my sister having been in a nursing home, they cannot hang cryo in a nursing home. So

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

we would have to go to the emergency room, and this involved getting an ambulance and taking my sister out of the nursing home and her environment, on a respirator. It was an ordeal. When we started using the factor concentrates the nurses could infuse her and this was just much easier on her and on our family.

The big factor in all of this though is the insurance issue. I have insurance coverage, luckily, and I want to keep that insurance coverage. I do not want to rely on my state to pay for my coverage, but the insurance companies are starting to deny coverage on factor products for us because it is not indicated. My treatments cost \$3000 per treatment. Say I make \$36,000 a year, which is within my realm, that would be one treatment a month. If I had an injury, like a knee bleed that has put me out, that would be a treatment over five days. That is going to put me to receiving only seven more treatments throughout the In other words, it will bankrupt me and my family, and my insurance company will not cover that.

I have many friends in the hemophilia and bleeding disorder community. We held a "Women with a Bleeding Disorder" conference and many of us got together and we have remained friends. So, I have met five other women that have type 3 von Willebrand's and they remain close friends, which

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

is very nice to have.

The interesting thing between all of us is that we treat differently. I have also met others that weren't type 3's and they seem to treat even more than I do. I have a hard time putting a lab value on treating. I think you should treat symptoms. I mean, putting a lab value -severity is a description and a lab value is very definitive. Severity should be how often you bleed, not that if I am a severe I bleed this much. I don't. treat as often as my friend Marge treats, and that should be It shouldn't be just black and white. an issue. I know you need regulations for somebody to follow but that shouldn't take priority over treating us.

I also want to stress that cryo is going back to the Dark Ages. It is inconvenient but it also is a risk. It increases our risk for hepatitis and HIV. I also have experience with both cry and factor concentrates. I was diagnosed at four years old. I have been through freshfrozen plasma. I have been through cryo. I now use factor concentrates. I have had three procedures in my life that have been major procedures, two deliveries, one vaginal, one C-section, for one of those we used cryo and for one of those we used factor concentrates. The cryo resulted in a pleural effusion from fluid overload, just too much fluid in

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

my system, and factor was used for the C-section and my bleeding was controlled. There was no regulation but it was controlled and it went well. I have also had a hysterectomy and we used factor, and it worked well and there was no pleural effusion, no fluid overload.

I cannot stress enough that time is a major factor My health care company calls me and is informing me that insurance are already, today, not covering for the factor concentrates. This, I have to say, would be the biggest issue. Yes, I would like to see the concentrates because it is the right thing to do, it is healthier and it would just be more effective but I hate to say that money plays a big part in all this. I do not want to have to go to Medicaid to be covered, and then it would be cryo and that would be even worse. I want to keep my insurance. want to be productive. I want to continue my job as a surgical nurse. If you have to go back to cryo, if the concentrates aren't soon enough that we will have to go back to this, people will not treat as often. I think it will cost the economy more because we are going to have more severe injuries; we are going to be sicker. I think if we keep our society healthy we need this now. We needed it a long time ago. So, I hope that this will be time producing, that you will take as little time as possible.

1	That is it. Thank you for having me here.
2	DR. RICK: I am Margaret Rick, part of the
3	Critical Pathology Hematology Service here, at the Clinical
4	Center at NIH. We certainly have heard an excellent
5	clinical perspective from the patient's point of view and we
6	will now turn to three different talks evaluating the
7	clinical perspective from the treaters' point of view. We
8	will have three speakers, and since I think the content is
9	relatively similar in their talks it perhaps would be best
10	to hold questions until the end of the three talks, at which
11	time we have about half an hour for a question and answer
12	period.
13	Our first speaker is Dr. Augusto Federici, who is
14	Associate Professor and a Senior Investigator in the
15	Hemophilia Center at the University of Milan. He will speak
16	to us on optimizing therapy with von Willebrand factor
17	concentrates in von Willebrand disease.
18	Clinicians Perspective, Practice and Expectations
19	Optimizing Therapy with von Willebrand factor Concentrates
20	in von Willebrand Disease
21	DR. FEDERICI: Thank you, Dr. Rick. It is a great
22	pleasure to be here to present our perspective and, of
23	course, I am glad and thankful to Mark Weinstein for having

organized such an interesting meeting.

I will just start with some comments on the previous presentation. I think this is the issue. We are dealing with patients and we have heard how difficult it is for these patients to cope with their bleeding problems, especially when you don't have appropriate products. So, I will start with general considerations.

(Slide)

For those who are dealing with vWD these are sort of dogmas: The determinant of bleeding of vWD, the prolonged bleeding time is the main determinant of mucosal hemorrhages. Low Factor VIII is the main determinant of soft tissues and postoperative hemorrhages.

(Slide)

So simplifying everything, the aims of the treatment should be to normalize the prolonged bleeding time and to normalize the low plasma Factor VIII.

(Slide)

Which are our mainstays in the treatments? We know, for sure, that the treatment of choice for vWD is desmopressin because, as I will try to show you in the next slides, most of the patients can respond very well to DDAVP. However, when you don't have such a good response you have to go to plasma products and in the rare situation where, in the case of mucosal bleeding, you don't have such a good

response after plasma products there are indications in the 1 2 literature that platelet concentrate, very rarely, can be 3 useful. 4 (Slide) 5 Let's go to the desmopressin effect. Everybody knows that it is safe, inexpensive and effective in about 6 7 80% of the patients. But there are limits. It is not 8 effective in about 20% of the patients, especially type 3, 9 type 1, platelet low and platelet discordant, and some cases 10 of type 2, and it can have tachyphylaxis. 11 (Slide) 12 This is a very simple history of the plasma 13 products so everybody knows how we started with the plasma, the cryoprecipitate, and we are into the Factor VIII 14 15 concentrate. 16 (Slide) 17 This is the issue we are talking about today. 18 we know for sure that the virally inactivated concentrates 19 are safer than cryoprecipitate. They consistently correct 20 the Factor VIII defect and contain a large amount of vWF, 21 except for monoclonally purified concentrate, of course. 22 (Slide) 23 So, what we wanted to have in the last year was a sort of impact on our patients -- how many patients treated

for vWD in Italy really needed Factor VIII concentrate, or were happy with the desmopressin? So we applied for a grant to the Instituto Superiore di Sanita, our national institute of health, of course, and we received the money to organize computerized retrospective information sent to the hemophilia center, the treaters of vWD patients, to see how many patients were actually treated with blood components generally speaking.

This is the second evaluation. The first evaluation was presented in Florence at the STH meeting. There were about 1023 patients. This is a retrospective analysis based on the diagnosis and the treatment performed in each hemophilia center, of course. As you can see, we have 65.8% of type 1, 21% type 2, 5.9% type 3, and the point that our friend raised before my presentation, the point of heterozygotes. These heterozygotes can be the kids of type 3, but they can also be misdiagnosed sometimes. If they match two of these can generate type 3 vWD.

(Slide)

These are the data. I have much data, but what was striking is the fact that we found that in the last 24 months, in the last 2 years, 29.4% of these patients, divided into type 1, type 2, type 3, and heterozygotes, received at least once 1 blood component and von Willebrand

factor concentrate altogether. When we analyzed which was the most representative concentrate, it was Haemate P because, as you saw before, Haemate P was already registered in Italy. So, it is not surprising that between 80% and 90% of type 2 were treated with these factors, but also type 2 and some type 1.

So this was an observation and so what we are now analyzing is the fact that maybe we are biased by the fact that the center is the treater of the most severe cases. So we can have an overexposure to Factor VIII concentrate. But this is one issue we have to face, the DDAVP works but sometimes physicians use Factor VIII concentrates also in patients with type 1 and type 2.

(Slide)

Now we are going to focus on the second point of my talk. Which is the concentrate we want to deal with? Going through the literature, I found that the most extensive study about in vitro and pharmacokinetic analysis of von Willebrand factor concentrate is still the paper by Manucci, in 1992, in Blood, where he published a comparison of four virus-inactivated plasma concentrates for treating severe von Willebrand disease in a crossover randomized trial.

To answer the question of the previous speakers, I

think that we also start with these kinds of observations, and also with a paper published in Thrombosis Haemostasis, in the same year where the recommendation for these analyses are synthesized.

(Slide)

In that paper, the four concentrates analyzed were analyzed, Factor VIII/von Willebrand factor concentrate had an intact multimeric structure similar to that of normal plasma or cryoprecipitate. We want to have the protein for our patients that is similar to what we have in our plasma. So this is a very important issue.

As you see, if you have a comparison to normal plasma, the Alphanate at that time, Haemate P, 8Y, high purity von Willebrand factor, the French concentrate. If you use a correct analysis for the multimers, low resolution gels that can solve very well the high molecular weight, all of them show a lot of the high molecular weight multimers. When you want to examine this, make sure that you have the right concentration agarose. I have been working for many, many years with the multimeric part and I know how to do small tricks. So, if you want to resolve high molecular weight multimers you have to use low resolution agarose gel. So, you don't have to see the banding very much, otherwise you don't solve this portion. You can have this concentrate

pretty much the same as normal plasma.

(Slide)

The summary of that pharmacokinetic study was that all concentrates were equally effective in obtaining normal and sustained levels of Factor VIII post-infusion, although peak levels were more delayed in the concentrate devoid of Factor VIII. We know that. But no concentrate normalized the bleeding time in a sustained fashion. So this is not an important issue. Bleeding time is not ristocetin cofactor.

(Slide)

As you can see, I wanted to put everything on one slide but the message is very clear. All these concentrates are able to correct in all the situations the ristocetin cofactor activity, but the bleeding time is not corrected in all the patients. So we know this and, for those who don't remember, each concentrate was infused in the same patients at different times. So, we know exactly what the crossover is in the open trial.

(Slide)

Now I want to turn to more practical information.

I have been working with on von Willebrand disease for about twenty years or so. I know how many patients we have and how they can end their problems. So, clinical hemostasis can be achieved in all types of vWD regardless of whether

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

the bleeding time is corrected. In repeated infusions, this sometimes becomes a problem. Daily dosages are usually decided according to Factor VIII C regardless of von Willebrand factor activity.

So, one important issue is what we want to do when we have patients in surgery. What are the levels of Factor VIII C, ristocetin cofactor, and what is the amount of von Willebrand factor concentrate that we want to give them?

(Slide)

I want to start with general comments about why we believe that in the postsurgical situation Factor VIII C is This is an example. the main determinant. paradoxical example. This is a patient with a severe type 3 vWD with alloantibody, high titer of alloantibody. responds, when you give just a shot of the von Willebrand factor she has a high level of alloantibody that produces immunoprecipitating immunocomplexes. This patient had a very severe abdominal hemorrhage and we went to surgery. These are the antibody levels. Factor VIII C is the red line. The blue line is the ristocetin cofactor activity. We used the most potent concentrate available, namely, the Haemate P, and she went to surgery and she could go through the surgery. So, we had von Willebrand factor and Factor VIII C at the same time.

Of course, she had a sort of anaphylactic reaction. We could manage that with the help of the people in the emergency area. You see, you have a very good response, but because of the alloantibody the response to von Willebrand factor was pretty poor but, still, we had some response with Factor VIII C. We went to day 7. But when we had such a rise in the antibody we were not able to give any more von Willebrand factor.

(Slide)

Most of the people know this slide. The only chance to have a solution for this patient was to turn to recombinant Factor VIII devoid of von Willebrand factor this time. You see, since we know for sure that if you don't have von Willebrand factor around you have a very short half-life, we had to turn to continuous infusion of Factor VIII C, and we managed that.

So, if you give Factor VIII C and you keep the amount of Factor VIII C at about 50 U/dl you can manage. You can go out of surgery.

(Slide)

But this comes with problems. When we are dealing with Factor VIII/von Willebrand factor concentrate one of the important thing is to remember that if you give a concentrate containing both von Willebrand factor and Factor

VIII C to a patient with vWD you have such a delay response to Factor VIII C.

So, when we are going to treat patients with severe von Willebrand disease type 2 or type 1, we have to consider that. This is a case report published in Vox Sanguina, by Eric Bertorp. During the operation he was giving Haemate P, or whatever. I am talking about Haemate P but it would be the same with other concentrates containing Factor VIII C and von Willebrand factor. You really have to deal with the fact that if you give many infusions -- at this time he had a good response in bleeding measured by Duke bleeding time, and a lot of von Willebrand factor around, and more than 500 units in the postsurgical time. So, this is another issue we have to deal with.

(Slide)

This is another case report on efficacy studying, you know, several infusions of a concentrate containing both Factor VIII C and von Willebrand factor. It reminds you of one thing, that the first thing we usually do is give for the first two or three days a daily infusion in order to have enough Factor VIII C and von Willebrand factor around. But when we see that Factor VIII C and ristocetin cofactor activity is very high, we usually go to every other day.

Only if there is a bleeding problem we try to go back to the

daily infusion.

That means that when you have to deal with patients, especially in emergency, you cannot make von Willebrand factor antigen. We should have a sort of very quick assay, and it can be Factor VIII C because actually in the postop. situation Factor VIII C is the main determinant. So, practically, we don't do ristocetin cofactor and von Willebrand factor antigen immediately. We do it for other purposes, for pharmacokinetics, but we use Factor VIII C as the marker of our next infusion.

(Slide)

This is another example. This is a patient with type 2A, a very old patient. She has 2A with very prolonged bleeding time, more than 30 minutes, ristocetin cofactor lower than the technical limits, von Willebrand factor antigen about 50 and Factor VIII C about 70%. She had a heart attack. She went through surgery. She had coronary-artery bypass surgery.

As you can see, she was 71 years old. DDAVP was impossible. So, in this case we used Haemate P and we adjusted the dose based on the Factor VIII C levels. You see that on the first day we gave Haemate P twice in order to have such an increase in Factor VIII C. Then we went to this kind of shorter dosaging in order to keep the amount of

Factor VIII C between 70-100, no more than that.

So, this is another situation where you have a sort of good response for the patient by giving Factor VIII vWD concentrate and by monitoring just by Factor VIII -- no bleeding time at all. And you have to deal with a surgeon who is very concerned about bleeding.

(Slide)

But there is another issue, the gastrointestinal bleeding. I don't know if the audience has experience with vWD and gastrointestinal bleeding. They come to you many times. They stay in the hospital for a very long time and they require sometimes months of treatment.

We have had a few patients with this situation and most of them were treated very well with Factor VIII concentrates. But, in a situation where you don't cope with bleeding, there is one extra emergency treatment, the platelet concentrate, as published by Castillo in 1991. I recall for those of you who don't remember, the fact that the experiment by Castillo was pretty nice. So, he treated with cryoprecipitate first and he had a very nice correction of ristocetin cofactor but still, in some patients, the bleeding time was prolonged. So, after that he gave these patients platelet concentrate and, as you can see, the bleeding time was fully corrected in spite of the reduction

of ristocetin cofactor since the platelet concentrate did not provide enough von Willebrand factor.

(Slide)

These are the conclusions and the expectations at the same time. How to avoid the loss of high molecular weight multimers in the preparation of our concentrate? You know, all the doctors who are going to treat patients with vWD, and also the patients, would like to have an intact von Willebrand factor.

One other thing we should evaluate is the Factor
VIII C pharmacokinetics following concentrate in vWD, and in
this issue indication for pure von Willebrand factor devoid
of Factor VIII C, if there are indications.

(Slide)

I want to conclude by saying to you that because we are concerned about these problems, Prof. Manucci and I, together with other groups in France, London, Frankfurt, have applied to the European Community to have a study called "Optimized Orphan Drug Therapy in Severe Forms of vWD," because we want to see if those patients who are unresponsive with vWD would have the best treatment.

(Slide)

These are the goals: to evaluate the proportion of the vWD unresponsive patients who require Factor VIII/von

1	Willebrand factor concentrate; to test the new plasma-
2	derived von Willebrand factor concentrate devoid of Factor
3	VIII in a crossover pharmacokinetic study with the Factor
4	VIII concentrate used in different European countries.
5	So, I will thank you for your attention with this
6	kind of message. Thank you.
7	DR. RICK: Thank you. We will now move along to
8	the first of our two survey reports for clinical guidelines.
9	Our first speaker will be Dr. Jeanne Lusher, who is the
10	Chairman of the National Hemophilia Foundation Medical and
11	Scientific Advisory Council, as well as a Marion Bernhardt
12	Research Professor at Wayne State University. Dr. Lusher?
13	Clinical Guidelines for Treating von Willebrand Disease
13 14	Clinical Guidelines for Treating von Willebrand Disease Patients Who are Not Candidates for DDAVP
14	Patients Who are Not Candidates for DDAVP
14 15	Patients Who are Not Candidates for DDAVP Survey Responses from European Physicians
14 15 16	Patients Who are Not Candidates for DDAVP Survey Responses from European Physicians DR. LUSHER: Thanks very much, Dr. Rick. I think
14 15 16 17	Patients Who are Not Candidates for DDAVP Survey Responses from European Physicians DR. LUSHER: Thanks very much, Dr. Rick. I think this is a fascinating conference, with a very impressive
14 15 16 17	Patients Who are Not Candidates for DDAVP Survey Responses from European Physicians DR. LUSHER: Thanks very much, Dr. Rick. I think this is a fascinating conference, with a very impressive agenda and, hopefully, we will all leave here with some
14 15 16 17 18	Patients Who are Not Candidates for DDAVP Survey Responses from European Physicians DR. LUSHER: Thanks very much, Dr. Rick. I think this is a fascinating conference, with a very impressive agenda and, hopefully, we will all leave here with some better understanding.
14 15 16 17 18 19	Patients Who are Not Candidates for DDAVP Survey Responses from European Physicians DR. LUSHER: Thanks very much, Dr. Rick. I think this is a fascinating conference, with a very impressive agenda and, hopefully, we will all leave here with some better understanding. In terms of these surveys, just a bit of the
14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	Patients Who are Not Candidates for DDAVP Survey Responses from European Physicians DR. LUSHER: Thanks very much, Dr. Rick. I think this is a fascinating conference, with a very impressive agenda and, hopefully, we will all leave here with some better understanding. In terms of these surveys, just a bit of the background of the surveys, in the United States we began

I don't think this has become widespread yet but at least it is occurring in certain parts of our country.

Perhaps as a result of this or in anticipation of this, at least two companies, at least two manufacturers, have either applied to the FDA, or are planning to, or are in the process of applying to the FDA for licensed indications for you Willebrand disease for their products.

So, when the Medical and Scientific Advisory

Council of the National Hemophilia Foundation had its last

meeting, this past spring, Dr. Mark Weinstein, who is a

member of our group, asked that we survey what various

esteemed treaters were doing in this regard since there did

not seem to be really clear-cut studies indicating what

dosage should be used, which products were best, and there

were certainly apparent problems with some of the assay

methodologies, particularly for von Willebrand factor.

So, in response to Mark's request, Dr. Kessler, as you will hear in the next presentation being given by Dr. Cohen, Dr. Kessler embarked on a survey questionnaire which has been used in the United States and, in talking to Mark, I thought it would be interesting to look at the experiences in Europe since many of these products, particularly Humate-P, have been used for many, many years by European treaters and they have written a lot of articles on proper dosages,

and how to monitor patients. So, I then surveyed what I viewed as a very experienced, esteemed group of European colleagues who have written on von Willebrand factor disease or are very active in the field to see what exactly they were doing.

(Slide)

This is a survey of clinical guidelines for treating von Willebrand disease patients who were unresponsive to DDAVP. I sent this questionnaire to 30 European physicians. I now have responses back from 27 but the last few just came in, in the past week and I didn't get them on the slides but, in looking at them, they really do not change the message of these responses.

At the time that I made the slides up I had received responses from nine countries. I have subsequently received responses from two additional European countries not listed here. But the ones in the slides are from Austria, Denmark, France, Germany, Italy, The Netherlands, Sweden, U.K. and, not European, but I decided as an afterthought to send this to some Japanese treaters as well as Australians and I have just recently received their responses.

23 (Slide)

One of the first questions asked was which

concentrates do you feel are useful in treating persons with von Willebrand who are unresponsive to DDAVP? As you can see, the majority of these European respondents said that they felt that either Humate-P or the French von Willebrand concentrate were most effective. One of the U.K. persons said 8Y. Interestingly, other U.K. persons didn't list 8Y. Actually, there are two now who indicated Alphanate SD. I think that reflects, in large part, what has been available in various European countries and, certainly, Alphanate, as we saw earlier this morning, is not very widely available in Europe.

(Slide)

In fact, if we look at those who checked off the French von Willebrand factor concentrate as being very useful, seven persons from France -- in fact, I got my greatest response from the French physicians and I must say that without exception the French physicians are extremely enthusiastic about their French von Willebrand factor concentrate, several of them writing patients describing how wonderful it was and that we should get used to it here and, hopefully, that some day we would have it available in the U.S. So, they feel that that works extremely well. Also, we got responses from Denmark and U.K. saying that they felt that this worked very well, not necessarily from personal

experience but from looking at data.

(Slide)

I also asked do you ever use cryoprecipitates, like in the 1990s? Are you using cryoprecipitates for such patients? All of them said emphatically no, and many wrote in that they felt that compared to the other concentrates, which are all treated, they were really concerned about viral safety. In some instances they even indicated that cryoprecipitates are no longer available to them.

(Slide)

The next question was how do you decide on the dosage to be used in a couple of different situations, first looking at major surgical procedures? Interestingly or perhaps expectedly, most did not make a distinction between how they treated severe or type 3 patients and type 2 von Willebrand disease patients. The type 2's were unresponsive to DDAVP, ones who had very low levels of von Willebrand factor.

Six stated that they aimed for a certain Factor VIII level only, and the levels that they aimed at in the responses were either greater than 50% -- some put in just greater than 50% or 80%, up to 100%. But this was the range in all that people would calculate based on the label, and they would aim for a level in the recipient somewhere over

50% or 100% for surgery.

Three of them aimed for a certain ristocetin cofactor level only, and the level they aimed for surgery was 60-80%. Most, or eleven of these respondents, aim for both a Factor VIII and a cofactor level, again, in the same ranges. Eleven would like to see not only the Factor VIII be greater than 50% up to 100%, but the von Willebrand factor as measured by ristocetin cofactor.

(Slide)

What about for mucous membrane bleeding? Again, most did not make a distinction between severe and type 2 von Willebrand disease, but several did write in that they distinguish between GI bleeding and epistaxis. I hadn't asked that but I think it makes sense that one would make a distinction there where one can look and see if the patient is still having nose bleeding, whereas the gastrointestinal bleeding may be much more problematic and it is not that easy to see how much is still going on in all instances. So, many of them said that they would tend to treat with higher levels and aim for higher levels for gastrointestinal bleeding than they would for epistaxis where they could see what was going on.

Again, some said that they would aim for a certain Factor VIII level only, again in the same range of 50-100%.

A few people aim for a certain ristocetin cofactor level only, 20-100%, the 20% being for epistaxis and the higher values, it was usually written in, used for gastrointestinal bleeding. Only one would also like to see correction of the bleeding time. In fact, most respondents didn't do bleeding times at all in the recipients. Four aim for both a certain level of Factor VIII and ristocetin cofactor, one with bleeding time.

A number of them gave an empiric dose of somewhere between 20-60 U/kg and just looked for control of bleeding without monitoring any particular test. Only two would do bleeding times. So, many would give an empiric dose and if it seemed to control the mucous membrane bleeding, particularly if it was epistaxis, no tests were obtained.

(Slide)

As far as monitoring, we asked how would you monitor the patient who has just undergone major surgery?

None here made a distinction between type 3 and type 2 von Willebrand disease. They indicated that their monitoring was pretty much the same. Two follow the ristocetin cofactor only, doing this once daily. Three follow the activator partial thromboplastin time and Factor VIII only, doing this once daily. One does Factor VIII daily plus a bleeding time on the first day only. Five do both Factor

VIII and ristocetin cofactor assays daily. One does a combination of Factor VIII, von Willebrand factor antigen and bleeding time. These are done once daily but the bleeding time is done every 12 hours for the first day and then PRN thereafter. Two did Factor VIII antigens and cofactor assays daily. One did Factor VIII, cofactor and bleeding time daily. One did Factor VIII, cofactor, antigen, bleeding time and the collagen testing daily.

You can see here quite a variety of choices, and many people wrote in that they really distinguished individuals depending on the extent of the bleeding the person was having. They monitor these on all of these parameters. They may do only a few of them if the patient's bleeding seems readily controlled. So, there is a lot of individual variation among the respondents from what they wrote in. They said that it was difficult to generalize for each individual because they do look at each in terms of the extent of the bleeding and how readily it was collected.

Several wrote in that even though they obtain this whole battery of tests, they don't get the test results back, in the most part, for perhaps two or three days. For instance, the collagen binding assays, and even in some instances the ristocetin cofactor assays. So they use these for retrospective analyses and to correlate with how the

patient's response has been on the dose they had given, but they do not really have this full range of test results back in order to make daily decisions as far as dosage.

One who responded in this fashion, of several who wrote this in, is Prof. Jenny Goudemand from whom we will hear later and perhaps she can tell us how those things have correlated. But in many instances the only thing that is readily available in order to make the decision as far as the next dose is the Factor VIII activity and, for those who do it, of course the bleeding time but they are in the minority. The collage binding assays, done by a few people, are generally not available for making any clinical decisions.

(Slide)

As far as monitoring for major surgery in general then, if we can summarize what tests were used even though they were used in various combinations by the various respondents, Factor VIII was certainly used by the majority for monitoring their patients postoperatively. We see here that 18/20 followed Factor VIII as far as monitoring and generally this was done daily; 3/18 follow Factor VIII only with the APPT; 1 other measured Factor VIII and bleeding time, the bleeding time being done on the first day only.

Ristocetin cofactor assays, two followed

ristocetin cofactor only, doing it daily. Six followed

Factor VIII plus ristocetin cofactor. Three followed Factor

VIII, von Willebrand factor, the cofactor and the antigen,

two of this group with bleeding times, and two with collagen

binding assays as well, again, not getting the results back

on the collagen binding assays and many times not getting

the cofactor or the antigen back until at least a day later.

Bleeding times were only used for monitoring in 4/20. In looking at the additional responses I received after making up the slides, there were no additional people who checked off that they monitor bleeding times. So, it seems to be a relatively small proportion who monitor the bleeding time postoperatively. Of those who do it, one did it on the first day only; one day did it every 12 hours for the first day and then daily; and two said they did it daily until they were sure that the patient was well controlled.

(Slide)

Several respondents noted, as I have mentioned, that they obtain multiple tests but the results come back one to two days later, therefore, they use only the Factor VIII and, in some instances, the aPTT as well and occasionally a bleeding time to make clinical decisions.

Many times they responded more to how the patient was doing in terms of any bleeding or lack thereof.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

(Slide)

What about monitoring the patient who has had significant mucous membrane bleeding, gastrointestinal bleeding, epistaxis? Six stated that they usually look for cessation of bleeding only. A seventh would do this for epistaxis, in other words, look for cessation of bleeding Six do aPTTs and a seventh would do aPTTs for GI bleeding. Ten stated that they monitor hemoglobins and hematocrits and that these are particularly useful in gastrointestinal bleeding for monitoring response to Eleven monitor both Factor VIII and ristocetin treatment. Fifteen monitor Factor VIII. Thirteen monitor cofactor. ristocetin cofactor and some the bleeding time, usually a modified IV bleeding time, and two with collagen binding assays.

(Slide)

In asking finally what information do you feel useful to have on the label? Most of us, at least in the U.S., have only Factor VIII on the label and, as we heard from Dr. Barrowcliffe, some of the European products do have ristocetin cofactor at least on the package insert, if not on the label itself. But what would clinicians like to have on the label in addition to Factor VIII?

Most said that they would like to have the

ristocetin cofactor, realizing the problems in assaying that and, hopefully, those assay problems could be resolved. But if it were a really bona fide ristocetin cofactor content in the product, they would like to see that on the label.

Thirteen of twenty said they would like also to see the range of multimers, in other words, to know whether or not the highest molecular weight multimers were present. Only 9/20 said that they would like to have the von Willebrand factor antigen content on the label, and 2/20 said that they would find it very useful to have the collagen binding assay information as well.

This is sort of an overview of the survey. I am going to try to summarize this in a better form for Mark Weinstein and send it to him because the letters that accompanied this I thought were very useful in seeing exactly how European physicians, who are very experienced, really thought about each individual patient and how they should be monitored.

Thank you, and I would also certainly like to thank all of the Europeans who took the time to answer the questionnaire. I thought it was extremely useful.

DR. RICK: Thank you. The second half of our survey information will be presented by Dr. Alice Cohen, who is Assistant Clinical Professor of Medicine at Columbia

1	University College of Physicians and Surgeons. Dr. Cohen?
2	Current Practice Patterns for the Management
3	of von Willebrand Disease
4	DR. COHEN: Thank you, Dr. Rick. Good morning. I
5	appreciate being invited to present the preliminary results
6	of our survey, and I would also like to thank Dr. Craig
7	Kessler and Dr. Bruce Ewenstein who helped with the
8	development of the questionnaires that we will be discussing
9	today, and for their assistance in reviewing some of this
10	preliminary data.
11	(Slide)
12	The optimum treatment of patients with von
13	Willebrand disease remains to be defined. Moreover, it has
14	not been firmly established which, if any, of the commonly
15	measured parameters of von Willebrand factor activity in the
16	blood are useful in guiding this therapy.
17	(Slide)
18	In order to better understand what guidelines
19	physicians follow for the management of von Willebrand
20	disease patients, this study was designed to evaluate
21	current practice patterns of North American physicians who
22	are frequent treaters of patients with von Willebrand
23	disease. In addition, the need for a specific von
24	Willebrand factor replacement product for treatment of von

Willebrand disease was assessed.

(Slide)

Two questionnaires were developed and sent to 201 active patients of the Hemophilia Research Society. Any of you who have not returned that survey, please do. The first questionnaire, consisting of 17 questions addressing diagnosis and general treatment guidelines, was to be completely completed within a two-week time period. The second questionnaire, consisting of 37 questions, was to be completed within six weeks and addressed details about the treatment of specific types of von Willebrand disease.

The preliminary results from the first of these questionnaires are being presented today and include the responses of 57 returned questionnaires, a 28% response rate. Since this data was looked at last week we have received an additional 10-12 questionnaires, and I looked at that data and it pretty much parallels the data that will be presented today.

(Slide)

The areas of investigation of the first questionnaire included laboratory diagnostic testing for von Willebrand's disease, laboratory monitoring pre- and post-treatment, the treatment of patients refractory to DDAVP, the prevalence of infectious complications after infusion of

plasma-derived von Willebrand factor replacement products, and the identification of the variables important in the selection of a von Willebrand factor replacement product by treaters.

(Slide)

Treaters were asked to select the laboratory tests which they utilized to make the diagnosis of von Willebrand disease and to indicate the frequency of use of each test in their diagnostic evaluation.

This slide lists the percentage of treaters that would always utilize an individual test. Treaters were also asked if they utilized tests sometimes or never, and I am presenting the data of the most frequently used tests. In this slide the von Willebrand factor activity used by almost all treaters was the ristocetin cofactor activity, and I will refer to it as von Willebrand factor activity in all of the rest of the slides. Factor VIII and von Willebrand factor antigen were employed by 100% of the treaters, and von Willebrand factor activity by 98% of the treaters to make the diagnosis of von Willebrand disease. Seventy-five percent of treaters utilized the aPTT and the platelet count when making the diagnosis of von Willebrand disease.

Less frequently utilized tests were the bleeding time, multimeric analysis, prothrombin time, blood type and

ristocetin platelet agglutination. As seen on this slide, the bleeding time was used only 49% of the time boy our treaters to make the diagnosis of von Willebrand disease.

(Slide)

The cost of performing diagnostic tests was extremely variable. Excluding treaters from Canada, the cost ranged from \$100 to \$1000 dollars, with 49% of treaters reporting the cost at greater than \$500. Treaters reported that the cost was variable even within their own center, depending on the workup selected for an individual patient, and in particular, those treaters that were utilizing multimeric analysis obviously had a much higher cost for making their initial diagnosis.

(Slide)

Fifty-eight percent of treaters reported difficulty with reimbursement for diagnostic testing, however, this rarely impacted on their selection of the diagnostic tests performed. Most of the difficulty related to managed care companies' requirements for authorization or for the use of a particular laboratory site for the testing. That is, insurance companies would tell some of the treaters that they could not perform the test on site and they had to perform the test at an outside laboratory. Some treaters reported that testing performed on site could allow them to

write-off their charges when insurance companies would not reimburse them so they were still able to continue doing the test at this time though cost was a major problem that they anticipated for the future.

(Slide)

In patients previously diagnosed with von
Willebrand's disease repeat laboratory testing was performed
only prior to major surgery. Testing prior to minor
surgery, dental extractions and postpartum was performed
extremely infrequently. Prior to major surgery the tests
utilized by most treaters are the Factor VIII and the von
Willebrand factor activity and the platelet count. The
Factor VIII C was utilized approximately 60% of the time
prior to major surgery, the von Willebrand factor and
ristocetin cofactor activity 60%, and the platelet count
52%.

(Slide)

When testing was performed to monitor treatment, most treaters tried to achieve levels of Factor VIII, von Willebrand factor activity and von Willebrand factor antigen of greater than 80% for patients undergoing major surgery or trauma and for the treatment of central nervous system bleeding.

For patients undergoing minor surgery or dental

extractions or patients with menorrhagia, the goal of treatment for most treaters was to increase Factor VIII and von Willebrand factor activity to between 50-80%. Though we said most people were not measuring levels, when they were asked the question what the goal of their treatment was they did admit to measuring levels sometimes and they would try to achieve them to this level.

For treatment of mucous membrane dealing the goal of treatment ranged from between 20-80% and there was a very wide range of levels that people would use. As Dr. Lusher mentioned, many of the comments were that it depends on the individual patient to what level they would treat the patient.

For Factor VIII, von Willebrand factor activity and antigen, this then ranged between 20-80%, and the bleeding time was used extremely infrequently to monitor patients postoperatively. Even with major surgery it was used only about 25% of the time.

(Slide)

We did ask patients if they utilized DDAVP what kind of laboratory testing they performed. Prior to therapeutic use of DDAVP, 93% of the treaters gave a test dose. In these patients that were then given intravenous DDAVP, if they were responsive 67% of the treaters felt that

if they were to switch to intranasal use of DDAVP they would retest these patients. For patients who were documented to be responders to intranasal DDAVP, 19% of the treaters then would retest them if they switched to intravenous use. The majority of treaters found that 10% of their patients who responded to intravenous DDAVP use did not respond to intranasal use, and 45% of physicians felt that age played a role in this non-responsiveness to intranasal DDAVP. Some of the suggestions were that the child was not utilizing the intranasal use appropriately.

(Slide)

For patients who are inappropriate for treatment with DDAVP, 96% of treaters utilized a pasteurized or solvent detergent-treated intermediate-purity Factor VIII concentration. Only 3% of our treaters utilize cryoprecipitate; 2% utilize a recombinant Factor VIII concentrate, and this was in an allergic patient; and 2% utilize an investigational von Willebrand factor concentrate.

The intermediate-purity Factor VIII concentrates that are utilized in this country included Humate-P, Alphanate and co-8-HP, and they were used in different percentages depending on the location and the availability of the product in each hospital.

(Slide)

To calculate the dose of a Factor VIII concentrate to be administered, physicians utilized one or more of the following parameters: the Factor VIII was utilized 77% of the time; the von Willebrand factor, ristocetin cofactor activity was utilized 31% of the time; and the von Willebrand factor antigen was utilized 2% of the time. And 75% of treaters tried to achieve a Factor VIII C level of greater than 50% post-infusion of their particular Factor VIII concentrate. However, 65% of treaters do not believe that the Factor VIII content is an accurate representation of the von Willebrand factor activity in the product.

Adjustment of the dose of replacement product was done empirically by 15% of the treaters, and also as Dr.

Lusher had mentioned, we had comments written in on our questionnaire that many times the test results were not available for them to make a determination as to when the next dose would be, or if a next dose was necessary.

Eighty-six percent of treaters utilized laboratory tests to predict efficacy, and 88% believe that labeling of the vial with von Willebrand factor activity would be helpful in selecting the appropriate dose for treatment.

(Slide)

Infectious complications in von Willebrand disease

have been seen in all age groups, the greatest number in patients aged between 12 and 50. In this age group, 79% of treaters reported at least one case of hepatitis C; 35% reported at least one case of HIV infection; 28% reported at least one case of hepatitis B; 10% hepatitis A; and 5% parvovirus infection.

As you can see, there were infections across all age groups and on this slide you can see that there were infections in children less than 12 as well as over 50.

(Slide)

This slide describes the prevalence of infections and the relationship to the prior treatment. Most treaters report HIV, hepatitis A, B and C, and parvovirus infection in patients with von Willebrand's disease who had been treated with cryoprecipitate and/or an intermediate-purity Factor VIII concentrate.

As you can see from this slide, most of the infections were occurring in patients that had been treated with cryoprecipitate, but there is overlap in that some of the patients that had been previously treated with cryoprecipitate also received intermediate-purity Factor VIII concentrates. There were infections reported from other blood products as well.

24 (Slide)

When asked to rank variables as to the importance in selection of von Willebrand factor replacement product, more than 95% of responders felt that viral attenuation techniques and clinical proof of lack of transmission of HIV, hepatitis B and hepatitis C were very important.

Greater than 80% selected PCR examination of the final material and clinical proof of lack of transmission of HIV and parvovirus as moderately or severely important.

(Slide)

As far as other factors unrelated to infection, the integrity of the von Willebrand factor multimeric structure, purity and cost of replacement products were rated by greater than 80% as moderately or very important.

(Slide)

Preliminary results from this study reveal that most von Willebrand disease treaters utilize the Factor VIII, the von Willebrand factor ristocetin cofactor activity, the von Willebrand factor antigen, the aPTT and the platelet count to diagnose von Willebrand disease, with bleeding times, ristocetin-induced platelet aggregation and multimeric analysis used infrequently.

The cost of laboratory testing is high and, therefore, is performed only prior to major surgery for previously diagnosed patients.

Despite the unavailability of a licensed von
Willebrand factor replacement product, most treaters select
a pasteurized or solvent-detergent treated intermediatepurity Factor VIII concentrate rather than cryoprecipitate
because of the desire for viral safety.

Post-treatment laboratory monitoring is performed to predict efficacy despite the lack of studies to define the therapeutic dosage and duration of treatment in different clinical settings.

The data presented today supports the need for controlled trials with prospective viral surveillance to define how to better utilize and monitor safe von Willebrand factor replacement products. Because of the desire by treaters to have safe products made available as soon as possible, the compilation of experience of treaters from many centers, as in this study, may provide information that would assist in the development of guidelines for management of patients with von Willebrand's disease, and the design of future clinical trials. We look forward to the second questionnaire to look for more specific details about how physicians are treating patients with specific types of von Willebrand disease. Thank you.

DR. RICK: There is now time for an open discussion, and I would ask perhaps that the speakers,

including not only the last three but those who went before also, to either sit near the front or near a microphone.

There are two microphones set up in the aisles. I would like to just open the discussion with questions.

Question and Answer Period

DR. WEINSTEIN: Actually, I wanted to ask Trevor, when you mentioned that von Willebrand factor content was put on European labels, was that just referring to the ristocetin cofactor activity, or was it antigen levels?

DR. BARROWCLIFFE: I think it is mostly the ristocetin cofactor activity, but I don't have the full information on all products in all countries, but certainly in Germany the package insert does have the ristocetin cofactor activity. This is for the Humate-P product. In the U.K., as I said, just very recently it is the von Willebrand factor antigen that is going to go on the label for the 8Y product.

DR. WEINSTEIN: When you mentioned that they had the trials there for the clinical evaluation -- I forget exactly what the wording was here, studies that were reviewed by the European authorities, do you have any sense of how that review was done? They just looked at papers and said this is okay? Do you have further explanation about what was done?

1	DR. BARROWCLIFFE: I think that is the question
2	that really needs to be addressed in much more detail. I am
3	not the person involved in those decisions but, certainly, I
4	think the various licensing authorities would be reviewing
5	all of the published evidence and, presumably, any
6	unpublished clinical data. I mean, there may be other
7	people in the room who can comment, either from the
8	manufacturers or any of the other licensing authorities.
9	But I didn't get any detailed responses to that in the
10	questionnaire. So, it is really a bit difficult to say.
11	DR. LUSHER: I have a follow-up question for Dr.
12	Barrowcliffe. Since, you know, we have all heard of the
13	problems in assaying ristocetin cofactor and standards, and
14	so forth, in the products in Europe that do have a notation
15	somewhere in the package insert of the ristocetin cofactor
16	content, is that done with a certain European standard or
17	NIBSC standard, or are they just manufacturer dependent, or
18	how is that being done?
19	DR. BARROWCLIFFE: There is no European standard,
20	as far as I am aware, and, as you know, there is no
21	concentrate standard. So, as far as I know, the ones who
22	are doing the ristocetin cofactor activity in concentrates
23	use the WHO plasma standard for ristocetin cofactor as the
24	basis for the unitage, but it may be that at least some of

the manufacturers probably have in-house concentrate reference materials. But the basis for the unitage is the WHO plasma standard for ristocetin cofactor.

DR. RICK: Please come to the microphone to ask questions, and also identify yourself, if you would.

DR. WHITE: White, Chapel Hill. I guess I am a little surprised that the responses regarding bleeding time, and would have thought that people would have checked bleeding times perhaps a little more often. Obviously, it is difficult to do a bleeding time but we all talk about the defect in von Willebrand's disease, and it is a platelet adhesion defect. So, I guess I would like to stimulate a little more discussion about the bleeding time and what role the bleeding time should play.

I wanted to ask Dr. Federici a couple of questions about his presentation. The first is, he says he doesn't check the bleeding time, but I wonder if he checks the bleeding time with a given product in a patient at some point in time, maybe years before surgery but at least at some point in time to ensure that a patient does respond to that product with bleeding time correction.

The second question that I have for him has to do with the comment that I thought I heard him saying, that there wasn't a good correlation between bleeding time and

ristocetin cofactor correction, and that it was the ristocetin cofactor correction that he thought correlated better with prediction of hemostasis following surgery.

DR. WEINSTEIN: Perhaps we could ask Dr. Federici to respond before the other questions.

DR. FEDERICI: I think one major point we have to state is the fact that there are two different situations.

Okay? And the information also comes from the questionnaire we sent to the centers. I mean, we have to make a distinction between the moment of diagnosis and the moment of when you have the patients in surgery or in emergency. I am not thinking that the bleeding time is not important, but I also think that sometimes it is difficult, or is it is not convenient in general practice to repeat the bleeding time as a monitoring system.

So, what we usually do -- and we have been following more than 300 patients, and for those patients, especially type 3, type 2, those who bleed and require several appointments, most of them are routinely followed in checkups, and we know the basal level. We have it in the computer. We know exactly what they are going to be. So, I am not thinking that the bleeding times or other assays cannot be repeated sometimes, but I am saying that when you have a postsurgical situation, if you follow, if the surgeon

is a good surgeon and can correct hemostasis during the surgery you don't need to repeat the day after the surgery the bleeding time. It is not convenient sometimes and I believe it is not so important because what you want to keep is the coagulation of this patient in a good position.

DR. RICK: Before you leave the microphone, could I just ask do you think it is, indeed, necessary to correct the bleeding time, whether you have been monitoring it or not, for hemostasis?

DR. FEDERICI: The practical, the clinical practice helps us. Not all of these patients treated with Factor VIII concentrate correct the bleeding time but they don't bleed. The other issue is Dr. White's questions. We know for sure there is discrepancy between bleeding time and ristocetin cofactor. The bleeding time -- you know, we have people here who are very experienced, and Dr. Gralnick showed very well in an old paper that the platelet content is important as concerns the bleeding time. He showed very well in the paper, in Blood, that you have a good correlation between the bleeding time and von Willebrand factor content, but you don't have the same correlation between bleeding time and the plasma von Willebrand factor.

DR. RICK: Thank you.

DR. JOIST: Joist, St. Louis. I have a comment in

regard to the issue of the bleeding time. I think the question here is are we measuring something, or are we missing something measuring the bleeding time that is in the von Willebrand factor concentrate or Factor VIII concentrates rich in von Willebrand factor, or is it perhaps that the bleeding time is influenced by something in vivo that has nothing to do with the factor concentrates? For instance, we know that there is a certain association of congenital collagen vascular defects in patients with von Willebrand disease.

So, it doesn't surprise me at all that there is some variation where you have good ristocetin cofactor levels, which really measure the concentrate activity in a defined way, and the bleeding time does not correlate with that ristocetin cofactor level. That has, to my knowledge, not been adequately explored.

The second comment was in regard to the questionnaire. I find it inconsistent that physicians or treaters aim for 50-80% Factor VIII and, at the same time, aim for 50-80% or ristocetin cofactor. You can't do that. With a ratio of 2:1 to 4:1 that is just inherently impossible. If they aim for 100% Factor VIII they, in fact, acknowledge that they tolerate 300-400% von Willebrand factor activity, which would worry me in middle age to

elderly patients. That is an issue that I think needs to be looked at.

DR. COHEN: When people returned the questionnaire there was a portion of returns that said we aim for the ratio of 2:1, but then most people did not say that and they just, you know, checked that they were doing both, which was not well explained, why they were doing that.

What I got out of a lot of the survey was that they were really monitoring this empirically; that they would like this but then they weren't really testing and were empirically managing these patients after the second dose or so.

DR. KESSLER: Kessler, from Washington. I have two questions. First of all, Dr. Federici mentioned that in Italy they are using the Duke method for bleeding time.

DR. FEDERICI: Maybe I didn't explain. This was the slide from Sweden. Maybe I didn't explain it very well. The slide where you saw the Factor VIII C level more than 500 units is from a paper by Eric Bertorp, from Sweden, published in Vox Sanguina. We don't do the Duke, we do the Tech Simplate.

DR. KESSLER: Well, let me follow up again then because some people believe that the Duke method may actually be more sensitive for monitoring mucosal bleeds

rather than the modified IV which we use mainly in our country. Have you seen this in your own clinical practice, and do you feel that one bleeding time over another might be able to reflect better intraplatelet content of von Willebrand factor?

DR. FEDERICI: It is still an open question, but we don't perform the Duke bleeding time so, as far as I remember, in my center in the last twenty years I have performed the Duke only a few times. So, we don't rely on that. We still make diagnoses of vWD by using the Simplate commercially available bleeding time.

DR. KESSLER: The other question that I wanted to ask from the European perspective, and perhaps Dr. Lusher asked this in her questionnaire and Dr. Federici has some experience as well, is on the use of fibrin glue. In the surgeries in von Willebrand patients it seems that the use of fibrin glue might really overcome a lot of the deficiencies and the unpredictability of maintaining hemostasis in patients, and I was wondering if you would comment on that, and Dr. Lusher as well.

DR. FEDERICI: We do use fibrin glue for dental extraction mainly. The use of fibrin glue in more general surgery is not so widespread in our surgery area. So, the experience I have is that when we have -- actually, we are

collecting data by comparing in a population of von
Willebrand disease patients, sort of double blind, those
with severe type von Willebrand disease, those who go
through with prophylaxis and those who don't do prophylaxis
but just do fibrin glue. So, that means that when you have
local bleeding the fibrin glue can be helpful.

DR. SCHWARZ: I am Peter Schwarz, from Vienna.

Dr. Barrowcliffe gave us an excellent idea on the European availability of von Willebrand factor concentrates. I would just like to add that there seems to be inconsistencies within the specific products regarding the labeling between the different countries. If you look carefully into the package inserts of those products, you will see that they differ from country to country where the products are used. However, in most of the countries those products are indicated for replacement therapy of Factor VIII in patients with von Willebrand disease who have decreased Factor VIII levels.

What is interesting regarding the situation in the U.K. is that there was a product available for the last several years which had a label, as far as I remember, for replacement of Factor VIII in other Factor VIII deficiencies than hemophilia.

This is my remark on the European situation.

However, if I may add, I think the products made by the LFB, the two different types, low Factor VIII containing von Willebrand factor concentrate and the mixture, they seem to have a very precisely and prospectively addressed package insert, really outlined specifically for this disease that we are talking about.

Concerning the assays, I am surprised not to have heard anything about the use of platelet function analyzers and if anybody wants to comment on that, I would be happy.

DR. MONTGOMERY: Montgomery, Milwaukee. I may not be the best one to make this statement. Jim White makes a much more impassioned point but, from his perspective and many people's perspective, the bleeding time was never meant to be a test of individual patients; it was meant to be a population survey type of testing.

I think that in our own practice we probably do still do it at diagnosis, and we don't know why. I mean, we sit around and say, you know, if it agrees with what we think then it is right, and if it doesn't then it is wrong, not that we are wrong. So, we actually never use the bleeding time in following patients in a therapeutic situation, with the one exception that if there appears to be continued hemostasis we will do that perhaps prior to considering giving platelets as an additional therapy.

Then one other point on the problem with
insurance, while I don't want to beg the issue because it
certainly is a problem that has to be dealt with, but I have
found a trick around this, that if you diagnose von
Willebrand disease and Factor VIII deficiency it is at least
a way of using a Factor VIII concentrate to treat the Factor
VIII deficiency that is present in von Willebrand patients
and sometimes insurance companies can be convinced that,
therefore, it is an appropriate indication.

DR. RICK: Before you leave the microphone, let me ask a question of you as well as the other speakers. Do you think that if we treated to the point of normalizing a bleeding time that we would be significantly over-treating or treating just right?

DR. FEDERICI: It is not my data but, actually, when I reviewed some of the important papers in the literature -- in that slide I wanted to present on purpose, you know, Eric Bertorp is very clever. So, he was increasing the concentration of Factor VIII C/von Willebrand factor concentrate in order to get a correction of the bleeding time. If you go to the paper, this was a woman who had ovarian section and was terribly bleeding. So he was very concerned about correction of the bleeding time in vWD. So he tried to give enough very high levels of von

Willebrand factor in order to keep within the Duke bleeding time. So, we don't know because every patient can be different. So, it is difficult to make a crossover in a patient when you have an emergency.

That is as a general consideration, and back to the comments by Peter Schwarz, you know, what is the content of Factor VIII or should we use von Willebrand factor devoid of Factor VIII, we actually don't know. That is why we want to have this kind of European study to make a crossover in the same patients to see how far we can go with one product and how far we can have results with the other.

But the point is that when you go to the hemophilia treaters, you know, they don't report failure by the normal Factor VIII/von Willebrand factor concentrate.

So, one question they raised is why do you want to have another product if these kind of products are working? So this is a sort of general discussion but we have to produce data about that. I think discussion is useful if we come up with some conclusions at the end and we can start together to figure out how we can come to the real solution.

DR. MAZURIER: Claudine Mazurier, France. I thing we could take the opportunity to ask a patient her opinion about monitoring with bleeding time. So, I would ask Mrs.

McDonald if she would appreciate having the template

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

bleeding time.

MS. MCDONALD: Would I appreciate bleeding time?

No, I don't appreciate bleeding times at all. I had

multiple bleeding times when I was testing, and I do

appreciate the fact that you do need the data but my

prolonged time, when we sit there for 30 minutes, is very,

very boring and you are in enough pain after surgery and you

don't want the added stress of that. I don't like bleeding

times.

DR. MONTGOMERY: This is a secondary comment because I have no direct experience with the platelet function analyzers, but I do think that from the meeting that was held in Florence what appeared to be evident is that these are exquisitely sensitive to platelet von Willebrand factor. Whereas, most of us probably expected that this would be a real answer to the therapeutic problems with von Willebrand disease, it is not because when patients are treated with very adequate levels of von Willebrand factor the closure time is still prolonged, and it really appears that it is very exquisitely sensitive platelet von Willebrand factor, particularly in patients with acquired inhibitors where their plasma von Willebrand factor is very low but their platelet von Willebrand factor would actually Some of them have very normal closure times.

DR. WHITE: Well, I guess I am still not quite sure whether bleeding time is overkill or not, Margaret, to go back to your question. I think for most von Willebrand's patients and for most procedures that are done or most bleeding situations bleeding time definitely is overkill.

In our own center I think we try, in addition to a diagnostic bleeding time when we diagnose von Willebrand's disease, we probably do another bleeding time or two if we are looking at a product to try and see if a patient will respond to that product. When we initially give that product we will often do a pre- and post-bleeding time to ensure that there is correction with that product. For most surgical cases we probably don't do bleeding times either before or after treatment for surgery.

But I do think that there are only three tests among all the tests that we can do that can be done in most centers within an hour's period of time. That is, the Factor VIII, the ristocetin cofactor and the bleeding time. I think where one may say that one doesn't have to do a bleeding time altogether, the problem with making a statement like that is that that gets interpreted very broadly as saying that a bleeding time is unnecessary and I would be very hesitant to be in that situation. I do check bleeding times sometimes in patients who are postoperative,

who are bleeding, in whom I am not sure whether I am getting correction of both the Factor VIII and the ristocetin cofactor activity.

So, my bottom line would be I don't think we have the information to really answer your question right now. I think we do in most cases but not in all cases. And I would make an argument that we need to keep the bleeding time as a viable test in certain situations in certain patients.

DR. RICK: Could I ask you one question about your testing a patient's response to a product? If you do a pretreatment bleeding time and then a post-treatment time do you insist that they be normal post-treatment, or is there some measure of "significant" decrease that is satisfactory?

DR. WHITE: I don't mean to make light of the question but I can't insist that a bleeding time be normal. It is what it is. But, sure, I like to see it normalize but it doesn't always do that. With some products it clearly does. It depends, I think, in part upon how long the bleeding time is to begin with. Clearly, with type 1 we see complete time correction in the vast majority of cases.

Many of them don't even have bleeding time prolongation on the pre-bleeding time. With type 3 it is much more variable.

DR. RICK: What kind of dose are you using when

you see the complete correction? 1 2 You mean in a type 3 or a type 2? Yes, either, or more severe type 1. 3 DR. RICK: Usually what we are doing in that 4 DR. WHITE: 5 situation is a test dose for some procedure, maybe a minor 6 procedure, we are giving something that we would not 7 normally check a bleeding time for but we are checking 8 bleeding times for the future when they need more serious 9 surgery. So, we are typically giving just a standard dose. 10 I mean, we are giving a dose to raise the Factor VIII to 11 100%. 12 The reason I asked the question is DR. RICK: 13 because although there is certainly variability among the concentrates as well as among the patients, it seems that 14 15 there is some dose response here, and I am wondering whether 16 we are significantly over-treating because we know that the 17 ratio of antigen is usually much higher relative to Factor VIII activity in the concentrate. 18 19 DR. WHITE: Well, I think that is a good point. 20 don't have any personal information on that because we 21 usually treat with a standard dose. Dr. Montgomery and I 22 were sitting next to each other when Dr. Federici presented 23 his work and we were interested that his levels of Factor VIII were often in the 200 and 300 range. I wondered if

that was on purpose to get better bleeding time or ristocetin cofactor correction, of if that was simply related to bottle potency, or what. But I don't have any personal information on dose-response curves to any of those three parameters, other than Factor VIII.

DR. WEINSTEIN: I would like to bring up an important point here that I think we have to set straight for the record and for the purposes of this meeting. What do people consider to be an overdose? What level would that be, and what are the consequences, health consequences of a so-called overdose? Is it more than financial? I would like the physicians in the audience perhaps to respond to that.

DR. MENACHE: I would like to make a comment. In the study that we have done on type 3 vWD patients, using a concentrate that does not contain Factor VIII, in our pharmacokinetic studies we have found a correlation between the levels of ristocetin cofactor activity and correction of the bleeding time in patients with type 3. We only had ten patients, but the ristocetin cofactor -- and I will show a slide this afternoon -- had to be over 100% to get a correction of the bleeding time. Again, all patients do not correct. We had one outlier, as everybody else has.

DR. RICK: Thank you.

DR. FEDERICI: I want to answer. I don't have a definite answer, of course, but this is just what I think about the overdoses. It is really important to overcome the defects of vWD, but how much we can correct the von Willebrand factor antigen and, consequently the Factor VIII, is not known.

But since I am a physician and I follow different patients, other than vWD -- I am used to seeing patients with cirrhosis for instance, and most of the people in the audience know that cirrhosis is associated with high Factor VIII C/von Willebrand factor complex. So, those patients usually go through surgery and they can sometimes bleed because they have a low platelet count but they have high von Willebrand factor levels and high Factor VIII C. If you go to measure Factor VIII C in those patients you have, I suppose, more or less the same dosage that we have.

Of course, we have to be concerned about how much von Willebrand factor and Factor VIII C we have in the postsurgical patients because, you know, have Factor VIII and von Willebrand factor are also important as factors that are involved in cardiovascular disease. So, you don't want to have a patient after surgery with so much von Willebrand factor around. So, that is why we have to think about it.

Those case reports I presented were done, I

remember, by using a concentrate containing both von Willebrand factor and Factor VIII by using between 50 and 80 U/kg. I think there is no definite recipe for von Willebrand's disease. We have to think about it because each patient can be a little different from another. So, we have to make recommendations but we have to be a little flexible and change this recommendation, first, according to the type of patients and, most important, to the type of bleeding episodes. So, this is something that we have to think about during these discussions.

DR. BARROWCLIFFE: Could I just make a comment about the concentrates used in the U.S. for treatment of von Willebrand's disease? As Dr. Cohen mentioned, I think the Alpha product, and these were described as solvent-detergent intermediate-purity. I think that is not really quite correct because they are, in fact, in relation to von Willebrand factor relatively high purity but, perhaps more important, the method of manufacture is the chromatography process which is optimized for Factor VIII, which means in practice that the von Willebrand factor content per unit of 8C would be different in those products and usually lower than in the intermediate-purity products. This has, obviously, consequences if, in fact, as we have already heard the dosage for these products may be based on their 8C

content. So, in other words, you would be giving very different amounts of von Willebrand factor in those products compared to the intermediate-purity product, Haemate P for instance.

DR. ARONSON: To talk to Margaret's question, as a non-treater I have heard of almost as many cases of thrombosis of von Willebrand's disease while under treatment as have been reported in the literature of failures resulting in hemostasis, over the last thirty years. I think we are over-treating substantially.

DR. KESSLER: I wanted to address Dr. Weinstein's question about the toxicity of Factor VIII. I think that all of us as physician treaters differentiate between short-term toxicity and long-term toxicity. I think that as far as short-term toxicity is concerned, if we have to raise the Factor VIII level of any individual with Factor VIII deficiency of von Willebrand disease, I don't think any of us are really concerned about the short-term toxicity of a 200% or 300% Factor VIII over a short period of time.

Now, perhaps there may be some long-term toxicity, and I think some of the epidemiologic data that Ernest Briet has reported indicating that maybe there is a correlation between cardiovascular deaths and Factor VIII levels might give us some pause on long-term toxicity if we felt that we

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

had to constantly maintain an elevated Factor VIII in a von
Willebrand patient.

But I think short-term, we don't really replacement therapy to be toxic, at least I don't and if others do here I would be interested in hearing their comments.

DR. RICK: We are getting close to our time -please, Dr. Federici, and then I would like to ask also if
Dr. Lusher has anything that she would like to add.

DR. FEDERICI: Just a very quick answer to this problem. You know, in one of my case reports I presented the case of the old lady, old, relatively old, 75 -- 75, so This lady has a lot of problems, she was not so old. hypothyroidism, hypertension and vWD type 2A. She has, as I mentioned, prolonged bleeding time, more than thirty minutes; no ristocetin cofactor activity, von Willebrand factor antigen in their family, between 30-40% of antigen, but Factor VIII C almost normal. So this was a real impact. She had a heart attack. She had to have coronary-artery I discussed it with the surgeon because we bypass surgery. were facing two problems, a problem of achieving hemostasis and not to have too much Factor VIII and von Willebrand factor around. But this was sort of a challenge. So I want to publish this data just because I want to maybe have some

comments from the reviewers for the future.

So, we have to deal with the fact that vWD patients come late in their life because I believe, you know, the von Willebrand factor is important for prevention so the lack of von Willebrand factor can prevent having too many thrombotic episodes but it is not the only factor for arterial sclerosis.

So, the point is we managed this. We use Humate-P in that case, and we know that we have to cover the bleeding time factor without having too much Factor VIII C after the operation, and we managed. I convinced the surgeon. I was in there, and the real issue was we didn't do extracorporeal circulation. The surgeon was so good that he was doing bypass in the open heart. So this is one major point.

The second point was that we were in the operating room. You can imagine, to convince to be there during the operation to make the bleeding time more than 30 minutes, and then give the Humate-P and then during the operation make the bleeding time afterwards. So, I decided we will treat the patient. I will stay in the operating room with you and I will give more Humate-P if we see that the patient is going to bleed. So, I know this is sort of a very general and non-scientific way of treating but this was the case.

DR. RICK: Thank you. I think many of us have been in those situations. Dr. Lusher, would you care to add to this discussion, especially to the bleeding time question and correction?

DR. LUSHER: Well, I can't add much more than has already been said. I think I agree with Dr. Kessler's comments. Certainly for the short-term to raise the Factor VIII level to 200% or above is not a major concern, whereas it may be on a long-term basis.

As a pediatric hematologist, fortunately, I am not faced with the erythematous plaques and so forth which some of my adult colleagues are, and having used Humate-P for many, many years for von Willebrand's patients, I have never seen any thrombotic complication but that is probably, at least in part, because of the age of the population I deal with.

In that regard though, if patients are regarded as being at risk because of those factors, it would seem that the French product would be ideal in that it is a high purity von Willebrand concentrate, the one that we will hear more about later today.

In terms of bleeding times, I no longer use them for monitoring any patient postoperatively or for a bleeding problem, myself, and I remember a few years ago when we had

a von Willebrand three-day session at the Mayo clinic, a symposium workshop, many people there pointed out the anxiety that you can create in patients after giving them a concentrate by doing a bleeding time preoperatively and it is not corrected. It can create major emotional problems in the patient and really doesn't add that much for the transient shortening that one might see. So, we no longer do them unless, as has been pointed out by others, there is something unusual, or you suspect that you are giving enough and, yet, the patient is still bleeding.

DR. RICK: Thank you. I would like to thank all of the speakers and the participants from the audience. We need to take a ten-minute break and return to the auditorium then. Thank you.

(Brief recess)

Assays for von Willebrand Factor

Potency Assays for von Willebrand Factor Concentrates

DR. MONTGOMERY: I am Bob Montgomery. I am from the Blood Center of Southeastern Wisconsin and Director of the Blood Research Institute there. I have had a long-standing interest in von Willebrand and it is nice to see the issue of not having approved products to treat this disease finally being addressed.

(Slide)

I would like to deal with potency issues. I am not going to answer questions; I am going to bring up problems, and that maybe is a recurring theme in dealing with this but I want to show some data, some of which has been seen in the past but that deal with some of the problems with potency.

(Slide)

There are certainly a number of Factor VIII concentrates that contain high levels of Factor VIII but none of these concentrates are obviously labeled for the level of vWF in these concentrates. These concentrates have certainly been used successfully in the clinical management of bleeding problems of patients with von Willebrand disease. Thus, if asked the question are there successful products right now to treat the condition, yes. Do we always know what we are doing, no.

As recombinant Factor VIII products become either the dominant or perhaps even exclusive accepted therapy for treating hemophilia A, the plasma-derived combination products that contain both proteins may have their primary use or even exclusive use as an off-label treatment of von Willebrand disease and, thus, I think drive some of the desire to do something about this prior to the time, I am sure the FDA wouldn't be real comfortable with the

predominant use of a product being an off-label use.

Purified plasma-derived von Willebrand factor
concentrates and recombinant von Willebrand factors are also
being developed as specific therapy for von Willebrand
disease. I think that the issues are how can consistency of
manufactured products be assured, and how should dosing of
patients be determined, and what is the scientific basis for
dosing, and how should clinical efficacy be determined? I
don't have anything to offer on the latter ones but are
certainly ones that we will be discussing through the day.

(Slide)

What really is the problem? Unlike Factor VIII, von Willebrand factor is a multimeric protein. So, not only can you have problems with the amount of protein, the activity of that protein but, on top of that, it is confounded by the structure of that protein. I think because of that, it is a unique problem.

There is no accepted <u>in vitro</u> method that assays the <u>in vivo</u> activity of von Willebrand factor. Antigen assays do not reflect activity but are probably most easily standardized.

Ristocetin cofactor assays can be inconsistent if assaying purified proteins. I think that with standard assays for ristocetin cofactor there can be good agreement.

The problem is that how people do ristocetin cofactors are quite varied. Whether one uses even platelet counting after the addition of ristocetin, the visual interpretation of the snowstorm that occurs with agglutination, the laboratory measurement of the slope of aggregation or agglutination, more properly, or the absolute amount of agglutination, all are different parameters that are used.

Multimeric determination reflects the quality but the significance, actually, at the highest level is debatable. I think everybody would like to give the most normal appearing vWF multimer protein but, in fact, whether there is a difference between the material that is at the very highest point of the multimeric analysis or maybe down a couple of multimers from that is not fully clear.

Collagen binding may not always reflect the biologic activity but it is relatively consistent. By that, I mean that there are variants of von Willebrand protein that vary in their binding to collagen, yet, the activity once bound to collagen may, in fact, be normal.

Platelet function analyzers or similar devices do not reflect the biologic improvement following therapy and may, actually, be a better measurement of platelet von Willebrand factor content.

I think the bottom line is that concentrates need

to be labeled in the units used to dose the patient and that the patients will be followed.

(Slide)

Standard assays for analyses of von Willebrand factor include antigen and there certainly are differences with ELISA and quantitative immunoelectrophoresis or Laurell technique. Certainly, there are differences in the way ristocetin cofactor assays are being done, but in general the relationship between antigen and ristocetin cofactor should be 1:1. I think that there are problems that I will mention in a subsequent slide about that.

Looking at vWF are multimers and then one that we don't have any direct experience with ourselves, except in looking at vWF variances, is collagen binding. For example, 2B von Willebrand factor may, in fact bind to collagen but once it is bound it has no increased activity in contrast to what it is in fluid phase.

(Slide)

Just to point out different ways, this points out what was described earlier, that is, the importance of differences in how multimeric determinations are done, and whether one amplifies the differences when you call this a low resolution gel when, in this case, it is a high resolution for what you are trying to study, which is the

presence of high molecular weight multimers. But, certainly, to use an assay that is reflective of the reproducibility of the manufacture may be important.

(Slide)

actually found correlation coefficients of antigen and ristocetin cofactor in excess of 0.96. Even that correlation holds true in patients with von Willebrand factors less than 50. This happens to be 690 patients, in the yellow box, that actually are studied and you can see how tightly these cluster around a ratio of 1 or ristocetin to antigen. So, for most practical purposes these two things are correlated at least with normal von Willebrand factor.

(Slide)

Just to point out, not going to a lot of detail, but the assay that we will be doing and that I will be discussing is using a ristocetin cofactor assay where the slope of the agglutination curve is in fact what is used to determine the amount. We are using formalin-fixed platelets that are made in-house, which have a much stronger agglutination response than the commercial fixed platelets that are available, but certainly standardization is a problem. In dealing with the assay for vWF concentrates, we

would assume that dosing would be used by units of Factor VIII currently but, certainly, this is not an ideal situation but as far as looking at concentrates we, in fact, did our initial concentration based upon Factor VIII units. Then we assayed these concentrates in buffer, in 0.5% or 1% BSA, and then in severe von Willebrand plasma by making the sample equal to 100% based upon the labeled Factor VIII units. Then we assayed in units of ristocetin cofactor and von Willebrand antigen, did multimeric determination and then as a side of this, looking at the question of commercial standards that are used for vWF.

(Slide)

Now, why we got into this -- and this is merely a representation slide; it is not meant to be precise data but it is why we got into this, having to deal with what I consider -- actually, in the last issue of <u>Blood</u> Dominique Meyer's group is again trying to address the question of GP1B on endothelial cells. But we got into this because early on we also were studying the interaction of von Willebrand factor with endothelial cells.

What you can see here is that in the presence of ristocetin that von Willebrand factor binds to endothelial cells. In fact, if you use AP1, which is a monoclonal antibody to GP1B, you inhibit that binding. If you use a

monoclonal antibody to von Willebrand factor ABW3, not shown here, you see the same thing. So it appears that if you inhibit the vWF binding to GP1B, either by antibodies to 1B or to vWF, you block this binding so everything seems fine.

That was until we did additional experiments and we used AP2, which is an antibody to 2B3A, not on endothelial cells. It blocked it. And if we used irrelevant IgG, adding it to the material, it also blocked it. If we looked at lymphocytes we found von Willebrand factor binding to those lymphocytes. As it turns out, if you add albumin or if you add other proteins you will block this binding, and that is because -- in papers that were in the JBC and elsewhere -- ristocetin precipitates proteins, particularly when they are purified.

(Slide)

So, in order to look at this, if you take just purified von Willebrand factor and then just add ristocetin, you find here about 40% of the von Willebrand factor in fact precipitates. As you add albumin you actually markedly decrease this and, in fact, at even higher concentrations you can almost totally block it. Why? Because other plasma proteins are competitors for the presence of ristocetin on them, particularly fibrinogen and others.

How does this affect an assay? If you have

purified von Willebrand factor and add it to platelets and add ristocetin and you have a precipitation occurring and you look at binding, then you see an increase apparently.

But if you do the same experiment and look at agglutination, the precipitation removes von Willebrand factor from it and, therefore, the assay will be lower.

(Slide)

So, we looked at a number of concentrates, identified here just by letters, and they in general are ranked, with the exception of this one, according to the way their multimers would appear in general. So, the one at the top would have the more normal looking multimers.

Then we assayed these and they were diluted to be 100% Factor VIII. They then had the ristocetin cofactor and antigen. As you can see, there is more von Willebrand factor than the amount of Factor VIII in most of them, not in all. But if you look at the specific activity, and this column will always be the ratio of ristocetin cofactor/unit antigen, but you can see that they vary greatly. In general, these will be lower than the other assays that I show you. Why? Because this is purified von Willebrand factor in buffer in which there is undoubtedly precipitation that is preventing the von Willebrand factor from agglutinating those platelets.

(Slide)

If you do this in albumin then you see similar things. On this one we have added another concentrate that has very little Factor VIII in it, and you can see that the levels of von Willebrand factor, both antigen and activity, increased. The specific activity, you can see, varies.

(Slide)

I want to spend most of my time on the final slide which has to do with when we reproduced the clinical situation. When w infuse patients with von Willebrand factor we are putting it essentially into 100% plasma. So it seems like we ought to adopt a similar way of approach that we do for hemophilia assays, which is to reconstitute concentrates in the deficient plasmas prior to assay.

What is pointed out here is, as you can see, that there may be a 3-fold or greater amount of ristocetin or antigen compared to the Factor VIII. So, if we use Factor VIII units we are going to be over-treating patients by a factor of 3. But also, the specific activity of concentrates varies greatly. You can see that if we take this concentrate, which is no longer even on the market, the ratio of the ristocetin cofactor to amount of antigen is about 1/4 to 1/5 the level seen in perhaps the highest concentrate.

(Slide)

If we look at multimers you can see that they vary greatly. This gel, you can see, has a setup so that it emphasizes differences at the high end, and you can see that there is a marked difference in concentrates as far as their multimeric appearance.

I have been asked to chair a subcommittee to deal with the laboratory diagnosis of von Willebrand disease for the ISTH, but there is a problem that is not just in concentrates because we have had a number of centers that have sent their samples to our referral laboratory and I got this call one day that said, "I think you'd be interested from a molecular standpoint in studying what's a most common variant that our laboratory sees, in which the ristocetin cofactor activity is higher than the antigen." And I said, "really? Let me see one of those." So they sent us a sample and we assayed it, and I think it was 81% ristocetin and 85% antigen, right on.

So I said, now send me your standard. And they sent us their standard, and their standard assayed out with a low ristocetin cofactor activity compared to the amount of antigen. So, as soon as you reference against that your normal individual will, in fact, have higher ristocetin cofactor activity than the amount of antigen. This was

caused by proteolysis of von Willebrand factor that, at least with the Laurell Rocket, will increase the amount of antigen at the same time that it decreases the ristocetin cofactor.

(Slide)

This is more recent, just trying to look at a number of commercial standards. When we do studies we do reference against the World Health Organization reference point. You can see that we in general do not agree with the absolute level, and I would say that when we survey randomly 100 patients we find that if we use the World Health Organization standard our mean level is actually between 115 and 120. So at least in the population that we deal with, we find that the WHO standard is a little bit low. But that is not necessarily the critical issue because the critical issue is that we have a standard reference point and, certainly, the WHO standard offers us that.

But you can see that a number of the standards have abnormal multimers. In this particular one the specific activities actually look relatively good, but you can see that if you use the WHO standard for ristocetin cofactor, there are standards that claim to be referenced against it that are in excess of 2-fold greater than it and obviously can cause a problem. So, much of the problem

between laboratories may not just be the assays, it may also be the reference standards.

(Slide)

This is a very preliminary single experiment but I think it also points out some interesting things. Disregard the data on this, I am only wanting to call your attention to the fact that this is a shear chamber that Larry

McIntire's group has developed and that we are utilizing to look at shear-induced binding of platelets to collagen in the presence of von Willebrand factor.

(Slide)

Just to point out that this follows much of the things that are known about this. We are looking here at platelets bound per square millimeter. If you look at a control with whole blood, you get this amount of binding. If you block through antibodies to GP1B, you block antibodies to von Willebrand factor, you block that.

Actually, antibodies to 2B3A show a participation in the finalization of really the fixation of platelets to the surface. This is AP2. It blocks that. Then if we lower shear rates and use intermediate shear we actually get a reduction.

23 (Slide)

24 I will point out at the beginning that this is a

single experiment so there is a real problem with this data point, but what I want to point out is that this is taking whole blood from a patient with type 3 von Willebrand disease and then adding a commercial concentrate to it. So, you can see that when you add the commercial concentrate you have a marked improvement in the platelet binding, in fact in excess of the control, and you see a fall-off and somewhere between 40% and 10% there is a marked diminution. Obviously, here platelet von Willebrand factor content is zero.

So, I think there are ways of being able to study an <u>in vitro</u> correlate, and I would point out the importance of maybe looking at some of these along with the study of new clinical concentrates.

(Slide)

Certainly a consensus must be reached of both physicians and industry on what the right assay is that must be standardizable and reproducible; must reflect consistency of production; and must determine what the reference standard should be. The assay must reflect dosing so that one has some idea from the vial what you are going to be using in the patient. The <u>in vivo</u> recovery must be done in the same units as labeled potency.

Recommendations, from my perspective, would be

that ristocetin cofactor needs to be done in a standardized manner because it is widely used, the results are relatively quick and it is probably the most accepted assay for vWF activity.

There would have to be the ability to pre-dilute the reconstituted concentrate in either type 3 von
Willebrand plasma or perhaps immunodepleted normal plasma, and then to use specific activity as the measure of production consistency so that the amount of ristocetin cofactor or collagen binding to antigen would, in fact, I think carry with it the assessment of at least adequate multimers because I think that multimeric quantification is more problematic.

There may be a problem, and this has to do with the fact that as recombinant von Willebrand factor -- or if you look even further down the road, mutant molecules of von Willebrand factor that have preferred activity, whatever that preferred activity is, may, in fact, not have a 1:1 relationship between activity and antigen, yet, could still be used to reflect the manufacturer consistency.

We really need to point out what the clinicians in the audience know about the problems with B-domainless Factor VIII, and it is causing people to reexamine do you dose people based upon the number of Factor VIII units, or a

1	particular clotting assay that is done <u>in vivo</u> to assess the
2	infusion of that product?
3	I think we just have to keep an open mind the fact
4	that there may be materials that are perfectly valid for
5	treating patients that may have a relationship between
б	antigen and activity other than 1:1, that may help us even
7	address some of the issues of dosing as we get into this
8	period of time.
9	So, I think with that, I will finish up and I will
10	move on to the other speakers. If we have time at the end,
11	although no time was specifically allocated, we can take
12	questions together at the end.
13	What I would now like to do is to introduce the
14	second speaker of this session, Dr. Anthony Hubbard who is a
15	principal scientist in the Division of Hematology at the
16	National Institutes for Biologic Standards and Control, in
17	the U.K. Dr. Hubbard?
18	Assay for von Willebrand Factor in Factor VIII Concentrates
19	DR. HUBBARD: Good morning, ladies and gentlemen.
20	(Slide)
21	I would like to present some data on a preliminary
22	study carried out at NIBSC on the assay of von Willebrand
23	factor and various Factor VIII concentrates.
24	(Slide)

As regards NIBSC, the two most important points, obviously, are the control and standardization of vWF and Factor VIII concentrates, and by control I really mean we need to agree on what parameter we use to label the products which can be used by all manufacturers so that we can compare the dosage of different products. For this to be meaningful, obviously the parameter has to relate to clinical effectiveness. Hand in hand with control comes the standardization of measurement of vWF. We need to ask ourselves if we can use an existing plasma vWF or whether we need a specific concentrate standard.

We also need to look at the inter-laboratory variability of vWF assays and Factor VIII concentrates.

There is no point in agreeing which parameter to measure if there is excessive variability between laboratories. In fact, as mentioned earlier, it was shown, in a publication in 1993 by Fricke et al., that there can be an excess of a 2-fold variability in von Willebrand factor estimates when laboratories measure the same samples.

(Slide)

The preliminary study we carried out really had two objectives, firstly, to asses the validity of assaying Factor VIII concentrates versus a plasma standard and we chose to use a straightforward antigen measurement and

collagen binding measurement. We also wanted to compare the content of antigen and collagen binding in different products.

(Slide)

The measurement of antigen with conventional ELISA using commercial antibodies, the catching antibody and the detector antibody were both polyclonal rabbit antihuman vWF antibodies. Detection was using a horseradish peroxidase conjugate.

(Slide)

For collagen binding we used an assay based on the original paper of Brown and Bosak, except that we used a different source of collagen. The detecting antibody was the same detector used in the previous assay. All test sample dilutions in both assays were carried out using a buffer containing 1% human albumin.

(Slide)

For the assay design and potency estimation we wanted to obtain as much information as possible from these assays. So, we assayed at least three dilutions of test and standard, and each dilution was tested at least in replicate in each assay. This allows us to construct a dose-response curve for both standard and test, which gives us valuable information regarding assay validity.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

Potency was estimated versus a calibrated British standard plasma, which was itself directly calibrated against the WHO international standard. As you probably realize, the WHO international standard is only calibrated for vWF antigen and ristocetin cofactor. Therefore, the potencies for the collagen binding assay were calculated using the assigned potency for ristocetin cofactor.

Calculation of the potencies was carried out using parallel line analysis techniques which compare the log dose response relationships. We used the log-log transformation since this gave us the best linearity for dose response.

(Slide)

This is an example from one of the assays we carried out. This was vWF antigen assay on a batch of concentrate A. Here we have the four dilutions of the plasma standard and four dilutions of the concentrate Each dilution was assayed using four replicates in materia. We have a mean and a range of values plotted this case. here on a log-log scale which gave us a nice linear The computer program we use at NIBSC gives us a response. measure of validity by the linearity and the parallelism of these two dose-response relationships. The potency of concentrate A is calculated using the horizontal distance between the two dose-response lines.

(Slide)

The test samples we looked at were four Factor
VIII concentrates. Two are intermediate purity, prepared
using conventional precipitation techniques and these have
been coded A and B. We also looked at two high purity
concentrates which were prepared using chromatographic
techniques, coded C and D. Only concentrates A, B and C
have been used for von Willebrand's disease therapy.
Concentrate D has never been proposed, and probably never
will be proposed for this therapy but it was included since
it was manufactured using similar technology to concentrate
C.

We also looked at a few plasma samples, mainly for control reasons, just to look at the behavior of the assays, the international standard and two British standards. These are actually pooled freeze-dried plasmas. We also looked at two commercially available Factor VIII-deficient plasmas.

(Slide)

These are the results from the control assays on the plasmas, the vWF antigen and the collagen binding results in U/ml. Basically, there is very good agreement between the two assay methods with the pooled freeze-dried plasmas, as you might expect given that the ratio is very similar to 1. Also, with one of the Factor VIII-deficient

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

plasmas which was chemically depleted, this also gave us a ratio close to 1. An immunodepleted Factor VIII-deficient plasma showed slightly reduced collagen binding, which might indicate slight denaturation during the manufacture.

(Slide)

If we note the results on the concentrates, basically they express the antigen and collagen binding per unit of Factor VIII C, and we also looked at the ratio of collagen binding to antigen.

(Slide)

This slide shows the antigen results for the four You can see the ratios here. This is the concentrates. mean value from the numbers of batches that were tested, six batches of concentrate A and three batches of concentrate B, We have a mean value and the extreme range of C and D. So, within each product we had quite good agreement values. in the vWF antigen, a wide range here. Of course, all ratios are greater than 1, but a wide range within the products, greater than 2-fold between concentrates B and C, with concentrate B obviously containing much larger amounts. Concentrate D, which has never been used for therapy -- you can probably see why, it contains very little antigen.

23 (Slide)

Looking at the collagen binding, we have a similar

profile but not exactly the same. Again, we have the largest amount of collagen binding for concentrate B and the smallest amount for concentrate C, if you look at the three materials used therapeutically, approaching a 3-fold difference between concentrates B and C and around 2-fold for concentrates A and B so a wide range there.

(Slide)

If we look at the ratio of collagen binding to von Willebrand factor antigen, again we see a fairly wide range with concentrate A giving the lowest ratio. These differences probably reflect different degrees of denaturation during the manufacture. So, concentrate B not only contains the highest amounts of vWF antigen but it appears to be the least denatured as well.

(Slide)

We plotted all of the results from the collagen binding assays and the antigen assays for the four concentrates, and you can see there is a fairly good correlation despite the ratio differences within the product.

(Slide)

Looking at assay validity and precision, the validity was examined by comparing the parallelism of the log dose response relationships between the concentrates and

the standard. Inter-assay variability was looked at by calculating the coefficient of variation from the peak assays, and intra-assay precision was investigated by looking at the 95% confidence limits with each individual assay.

(Slide)

This slide looks at the parallelism of the doseresponse relationship between the test concentrates and the
plasma standard. In this slide the slopes of the test
concentrates are being plotted as a percentage of the slope
of the plasma standard. So, 100% indicates complete
parallelism.

First, I would like to point out that within each product the results are very tight except, of course, for the antigen measurements on concentrate A. In fact, statistically there are significant differences between all of these assays and the slope of the plasma standard, except for the antigen assays here and the collagen binding for C and D. So, basically this dotted line here represents 85% agreement in the slope. So, most of these concentrates are around this range or above, which indicates that we can obtain, with some confidence, a good potency estimate for all of these assays but what is interesting is that there is an obvious trend for all of these assays to have slopes

slightly less steep than the plasma standard. This probably might be an indication that we should be looking at possible concentrate candidate standards or even some modification to the assay, such as a predilution of the concentrates in von Willebrand factor deficient plasma.

I don't want to be too pessimistic because we can still obtain good potency estimates using this system, and if we look at the most non-parallel assay from this study, which was this one here for the antigen measurement on concentrate B, it is quite obvious that there is a non-parallelism between the two dose-response lines of the concentrate and the standard. However, the degree of overlap is such that we can still, with some confidence, obtain a relative potency for concentrate B. So, I am not saying that all is lost using the present system of concentrate versus plasma, but I think there is some room for improvement.

(Slide)

Looking at inter-assay variability, we have only carried out four repeat assays using each method, on this slide. In this case we looked at the European Pharmacopoeia Factor VIII concentrate standard and we compared this to the British standard plasma. The bottom line is that the coefficient of variation was 6.3% for the antigen

measurement and 8.5% for the collagen binding, which is quite respectable when we are only looking at such a small number of assays.

(Slide)

Precision of potency estimates was looked at by converting the 95% confidence limits from the individual assays as a percentage of the mean potency from the individual assays. For the antigen measurements, basically we are looking at a range of plus/minus 10% of the mean, and this is even tighter for the collagen binding measurements. So, both assay methods show fairly good intra-assay precision.

(Slide)

To conclude, the different products varied widely in the ratios of antigen to HC, collagen binding to and collagen binding to antigen. So, therefore, dosage on the basis of HC or antigen would lead to the infusion of different amounts of functional activity and this would have implications in comparing the clinical effectiveness of different products.

(Slide)

Just to emphasize this point, we have recalculated what would be the total content of vWF in, say, a typical 500 IU vial of the three products used therapeutically. You

can see that dosage on the basis of HC or antigen would lead to greatly varying amounts of collagen binding or vWF function being infused.

(Slide)

There is a trend for non-parallelism between the Factor VIII concentrates and the plasma standard, with the plasma standard us equal log dose response relationship. Further studies are required to look at the effect of prediluting the concentrates in vWF-deficient plasma and to investigate parallelism with potential concentrate standards.

(Slide)

The collagen binding assay is easy to perform and gives a precise estimate of vWF function. However, adoption for labeling purposes requires conclusive evidence of clinical relevance and an investigation into interlaboratory variability and methodology. We need to know if the source of collagen would have an effect on this assay, and also whether the predilution in vWF-deficient plasma would also have an effect. Thank you.

DR. MONTGOMERY: Our third speaker will be Dr.

Peter Turecek, who is head of the Research Division and

Product and Process Development of Blood Coagulation at

Immuno AG, in Vienna, and has done a great deal of work with

the collagen binding assay both as it applies to plasma as well as recombinant von Willebrand factor.

The Determination of von Willebrand Factor Activity by Collagen Binding Assay

DR. TURECEK: Dr. Montgomery, ladies and gentlemen, first of all I would like to thank Dr. Weinstein for giving us the opportunity to present here our perspective on a quantitative assay for the function of von Willebrand factor.

(Slide)

This is almost the same slide as Dr. Montgomery showed you before, just giving you a brief introduction of what I want to talk about. These are the routine assays which can be carried out for measuring von Willebrand factor antigen, multimer analysis, Factor VIII binding, ristocetin cofactor activity and collagen binding. These are the assays which are most used routinely. There are a variety of other assays at present measuring interaction of GPIB, RIPA and so on.

(Slide)

The reason why we are in favor of the collagen binding assay is that the binding epitopes have been mapped. They are located in the Al and A3 domain of the mature subunit of the von Willebrand factor molecule.

(Slide)

Dr. Hubbard, the previous speaker, has already addressed the collagen binding assay very carefully. What I am showing you here now is almost the same, an assay where collagen is attached to a microtiter plate which interacts with von Willebrand factor and is then detected with a polyclonal antibody which is peroxidase labeled.

So you may ask yourself what is now the difference of the special thing of this assay. There are three points. One is the type of collagen we used. This is a type 3 collagen from human placenta which has been pepsin-digested, which is covalently -- this is the second point -- mobilized to the microtiter plate.

(Slide)

The third point is that the concentration for coating the microtiter plates in this assay is much lower than what is used routinely. Most other published collagen binding assays for von Willebrand factor assessment require concentrations in the range of 30 mcg/ml collagen, and the collagen we use is sufficient to have in a concentration of around 3 mcg/ml.

Why is this of importance? I should remind you that collagen is not a soluble protein. Due to its unique amino acid sequence and structure with repetitive epitopes

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

and its capability to interact with interchains of the molecule, it has a tendency to form fibrins. This is crucial when you coat the microtiter plate with a protein which has a tendency to form certain three-dimensional structures. You have to avoid this in general. The way we have solved the difficulties in making reproducibly coated microtiter plates is to utilize pepsin or protease-digested collagen on the one hand, and on the other hand, a rather low concentration which is more in the range of the coating In normal ELISA technology conditions for immunosorbents. immunoglobulins are utilized in a concentration of 1 or up to 5 mcg/ml for coating, but not in the high range, as published for the collagen binding assays which are appearing in the literature.

The third point, and I have mentioned this before, is that the collagen is covalently bound to the surface, which allows a very consistent and highly reproducible appearance of the active surface in this assay.

(Slide)

The assay is really specific for von Willebrand factor. In von Willebrand factor deficient plasma from a type 3 patient there is almost no collagen binding activity measurable. If we reconstitute recombinant von Willebrand factor in buffer or in von Willebrand factor-deficient

plasma -- we did this in a concentration of about 1.6 U/ml, we had 100% recovery in both buffer and the deficient plasma. There is obviously no interaction with any other plasma protein in the deficient plasma sample.

(Slide)

Calibration curves are looking very good. If we want to assess concentrates we would normally have to dilute our samples anyway, so in this range we have very good calibration curves. The limit of detection of this assay is even lower. It is in the range of around 10 ng/ml. The limit of quantitation is around 20 ng/ml, although I have here started this calibration curve at 100 ng/ml.

(Slide)

The stability of the precoated microtiter plates is shown in this slide. This is again the absorbance of the calibration curves with increasing von Willebrand factor amount. Storage at 37 degrees for 5 weeks does not harm the calibration curve of this assay.

(Slide)

The inter-assay reproducibility with plasma-derived Factor VIII/von Willebrand factor concentrate -this is our in-house standard for Factor VIII/von Willebrand factor concentrate. It is in an acceptable range. The coefficient of variation is not written here but it is below

10%. It is quite similar to what Dr. Hubbard has shown us before. It is around 8.5% or 8.3%.

In comparison, we make aggregometric ristocetin cofactor activity assay for the von Willebrand factor activity in our concentrate. The coefficient of variation is here in the range of about 15%.

(Slide)

Collagen binding correlates with ristocetin cofactor activity. Here we measured 29 normal plasmas from healthy donors. The correlation from our perspective was acceptable. Most of the normals have a ratio of 1:1.

(Slide)

The collagen binding activity also correlates with the appearance of the von Willebrand factor multimers. In this experiment we have degraded a recombinant von Willebrand factor preparation with the depolymerizing protease, the protease which has been described both by the groups in Switzerland and the United States, Fullan and Tsai. This polymerase cleaves at the tyrosine methionine 8, 42, 8, 43 position of the von Willebrand factor subunit and causes the proteolytic degradation which then appears the triplet structure of the protein. We have measured here a time-dependent degradation of the von Willebrand factor molecule. You can see that the high molecular weight

multimers disappear, and in the same range as the multimers disappear the collagen binding activity, the red line, goes down to almost zero. The arrows here should indicate that the recombinant von Willebrand factor then develops the typical triplet structure, but I think this is addressed in another lecture by Dr. Schwarz at the end of this day in more detail.

(Slide)

I can skip this slide because you are all aware of the von Willebrand factor subtypes.

(Slide)

This is a picture which I have modified a little in that I have now added collagen binding activity which correlates to the ristocetin cofactor activity in various subtypes of von Willebrand's disease. In type 1 it is decreased; in type 2 it is also decreased or even normal; in type 3 it is markedly decreased.

(Slide)

We had the opportunity to participate in a study together with a group of Dr. Blanchette, in Toronto, where we used this assay, together with other von Willebrand factor assays, to go through all his patient samples, plasma samples. I have listed here a few examples of what we found in this group.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

Patient F, for example, is a typical type 3

patient, no multimers, the antigen is below the limit of

detection and even ristocetin cofactor and collagen binding

is below the limit of detection. But we even found patients

where we had a slight response in the antigen assay,

although on the multimer gel no von Willebrand factor was

visible. In this case it really helped to have the collagen

binding assay because here we also could prove that there is

no functional activity of von Willebrand factor left in this

patient.

We heard before from Dr. Cohen that multimer analysis is not used frequently for assessing von Willebrand factor subtypes or patient analysis, and you forget about the numbers here in the line where the multimers are written and look at patient B. This also has the von Willebrand factor antigen level at the limit of detection or slightly above the limit of detection but no ristocetin cofactor If you want to know that multimers are present in activity. this patient you could even subtype this to a type 3 patient. But if you do the collagen binding assay, which is more sensitive than the ristocetin cofactor method, you see that there is functional activity left in the patient and now it was clear that patient B was a subtype 1 von Willebrand.

(Slide)

This is an experiment of an infusion of a plasmaderived von Willebrand factor concentrate, Immunate, where 46 ristocetin cofactor units/kilo body weight were applied, and we measured the pharmacokinetics in this patient. We see that ristocetin cofactor, the red curve, and collagen binding curves fit rather well. The PK both in collagen binding and ristocetin cofactor activity are almost similar.

(Slide)

This is one of my last slides to give you an example for the usage of the collagen binding assay. Here we investigated the storage stability of recombinant von Willebrand factor at the concentration of 40 units, ristocetin cofactor units/ml at room temperature. We saw that both von Willebrand antigen, the green line, and the ristocetin cofactor activity seem to be stable over a prolonged period of time, even longer than 70 hours.

But, interestingly, the collagen binding assay revealed increase of activity after 3 or 4 hours which was maintained up to 24 hours and then decreased again. This could indicate that there is some structural change occurring in von Willebrand factor upon storage in solution, which was even shown recently by the Sixma group. They published that heating of von Willebrand factor up to 55

degrees centigrade increases the tendency to bind to collagen. So, we think that this assay is really indicative for minor structural changes in the von Willebrand factor molecule, and it is a useful tool for assessing the quality of a von Willebrand factor product.

(Slide)

I would like to summarize. I have presented for you a collagen binding assay for determination of the functional vWF based on a simple ELISA technology, utilizing a covalent immobilization of pepsin-digested type 3 collagen from human placenta to microtiter plates. The precoated microtiter plates are storage stable. The assay is highly sensitive and highly specific for the determination of von Willebrand factor.

(Slide)

The collagen binding activity correlates with the multimeric structure. This was also published recently by Dr. Aronson, who did the experiment I showed you. He separated the multimer fractions of von Willebrand factor by ultracentrifugation and then made the collagen binding experiment.

Collagen binding activity also correlates with ristocetin cofactor activity. The assay may be used for the classification of von Willebrand's disease and is also

applicable for quality control of plasma-derived von Willebrand factor concentrates, as well as for recombinant von Willebrand factor.

For those who are interested in this assay, I have brought with me a prototype of this assay, and I also would like to invite you to participate in the field evaluation of this assay. So, you have my address in the handouts which you received this morning and please contact me, and thank you for your attention.

DR. MONTGOMERY: Our final speaker in this session is Dr. Heinrich Joist, from the St. Louis University where he is Professor of Medicine. He has had an interest in looking at the shear-induced activities of von Willebrand factor and will share some of that with us today.

Assay of von Willebrand Factor Activity Based on Shear Stress-Induced Platelet Adhesion/Aggregation

DR. JOIST: I would like to thank Dr. Weinstein for inviting me to participate in this meeting. Von Willebrand factor, as we all know, mediates the interaction of platelets with the injured vessel wall in a strikingly flow-dependent manner. There is some concern that assays like the ristocetin cofactor assay and also collagen binding assay, since they are performed either in a static system or in systems that have either low flow or very poorly defined

flow, might not be suitable for measuring the full biological activity of von Willebrand factor.

What I would like to do today is not present you a new assay, but discuss with you some of the concepts of relationship between flow and platelet aggregation and adhesion in relationship to von Willebrand factor, and set the background for the development of a shear-mediated or flow-mediated quantitative assay for von Willebrand factor.

(Slide)

As you well know, one of the first models that was developed for measuring the effects of flow on platelet interaction with an active surface is the Baumgartner annular perfusion chamber. You can see here that there is a strikingly flow-dependent development of platelet aggregates on the surface. This is a denuded rabbit aorta that has been placed into a perfusion model. You can see here that in a flow-dependent manner at relatively moderate flow, 600 inverse seconds, and I will come back to this in a second, you can see a substantial amount of platelets adhering to the surface, to this injured vascular surface, as well as large amounts of aggregates formed.

If you increase the shear stress here, and this is by no means the highest biologically relevant shear stress that we can apply, the aggregates seem to diminish and more

adhesion is noticed. If you block platelet aggregation with this compound, prostaglandin E1, then you can use this model to look at platelet adhesion selectively.

(Slide)

We have been using a cone/plate viscometer, and I will quickly explain to those who are not familiar with shear experiments, this is a detailed view of this cone/plate system that is placed into a microscope stand. The cone is driven by motor that is hooked up to a computer and this allows us to preprogram the number of shear stresses, the duration of shear stresses applied to a sample, as well as the total duration and the number of shear stresses. The shear actually takes place in this small chamber between the cone and the plate, static plate. The amount of shear that is exerted on the cell suspension that is placed into this space is essentially dependent on the cone angle, as well as on the velocity and frequency of the rotations.

(Slide)

This is a view of the actual cone/plate setup.

Here is the study plate. Here is the cone. To refresh your memory on some of the terms that we are using in shear experiments, the velocity or the shear rate at the plate is zero and then increases as we go through the diameter of the

space between the plate and the cone. At the cone surface it is maximum. This is the diameter of the shear chamber, and the shear rate is essentially determined by dividing the velocity over the diameter of the shear space. Shear stress, in contrast, is the shear rate that we determine by this formula, here, multiplied by the viscosity which is very dependent, of course, in blood on the concentration of red blood cells.

(Slide)

This is an example of what happens if we resuspend normal platelets in normal plasma, containing a normal concentration of von Willebrand factor, or in plasma from a patient with severe von Willebrand factor type 3. This is platelet aggregation in response to ADP, which is normal as we know. This is in response to ristocetin. There is an absence of aggregation, as we would expect.

If we now place these suspensions in the shear model that we use, in the cone/plate, we can see that as we increase the shear stress there is increasing platelet aggregation. This is the control, here, meaning normal von Willebrand factor. And that curve can be shifted towards lower shear stresses by the addition of red blood cells. I will come back to this in a minute.

If we have no detectable von Willebrand factor in

the plasma, then there is some shear-induced platelet aggregation but it is much reduced, and the difference between von Willebrand disease plasma and normal plasma increases with the shear stress.

(Slide)

The Rice group has recently developed an epifluorescense video viscometry cone/plate, actually not a cone/plate but a pallo/plate chamber system that is very suitable for measuring quantitatively the amount of platelet deposition on a particular surface. This is the overall system. Blood is directed through this system and then captured here, and can be recirculated if necessary so you can either have a single-pass system or a multiple recirculating system.

(Slide)

When you look at the data here, this is what happens when you expose blood from a healthy donor for 60 seconds to the system. You get a very remarkable demonstration of platelet adhesion and aggregation. If you take blood from a patient with type 3 von Willebrand disease, there is very minimal deposition of platelets on the surface. If you take this blood from a patient with von Willebrand disease type 3 and add purified von Willebrand factor to normalize the amount of von Willebrand factor

present, then you can restore most of the ability of platelets to deposit on the surface.

It is somewhat difficult to distinguish in this system between platelet adhesion and platelet aggregation.

So, what is measured here quantitatively, and Dr. Montgomery showed some data on this, is really total platelet deposition, which is a combination of adhesion and aggregation.

(Slide)

We have modified our system so that we can not only measure the aggregation that occurs in flow by measuring the loss of single platelets after flow and comparing it to before flow. But we can also insert glass disks, or we are now using plastic disks that are coated with collagen, into the plate of the cone viscometer and then following the shear experiments we can take these disks out and measure the platelet deposition. After appropriate washing, we can determine adhesion apart from aggregation. I will show you a few examples of this.

(Slide)

This is the effect in this system of plasma von Willebrand factor. This is on adhesion. Here we resuspended normal platelets in normal plasma. You can see here that with increasing shear stress there is increasing

adhesion.

This is normal platelets in von Willebrand factor-deficient plasma. As you can see here, the difference between normal and vWF-deficient increases as you increase the sheer stress.

(Slide)

This is an experiment where we tested the possible effects of platelet von Willebrand factor on platelet adhesion. Here, again, are intact platelets with von Willebrand factor-deficient plasma. Here we do the same experiments with NDP degranulated platelets that presumably have no or have very little internal platelet von Willebrand factor. You can see here that there is a marked difference in the adhesion of these platelets in deficient plasma.

If you then take degranulated platelets in von
Willebrand factor-deficient plasma and add ADP, you actually
do not get an increase in the amount of adhesion.

(Slide)

How do all these experiments fit into a common mechanism of shear-induced platelet aggregation? Some have suggested that what happens with shear is that platelets are directly activated by shear and that the main event that occurs in the activation process is that shear induced an influx of calcium that then modifies, in some way, GP1B to

recognize presumably unmodified von Willebrand factor, and also exposes GP2B3A, which then leads not only to platelet adhesion but also to platelet cohesion with von Willebrand factor being the main ligand not only between GP1B but also between GP2B3A on different platelets.

(Slide)

We have prepared some experiments to test this further. What is shown here is how this experiment was designed to test the role of ADP in shear-induced platelet aggregation. Here, first, you can see what happens when you remove ADP completely by CP/CPK and also block the ADP receptor with ATP. You very quickly come to a situation where there is virtually complete blockage of platelet aggregation in the viscometer.

You now take that concentration that completely blocks platelet aggregation and you do a shear experiment, and this is the control experiment with buffer added where you get about 65% platelet aggregation. Here, when you add this mixture that prevents or practically eliminates the role of ADP in platelet aggregation, virtually all platelet aggregation induced by shear is abolished.

(Slide)

This is showing the important effects of red blood cells on shear-induced platelet aggregation. This is shear-

induced platelet aggregation at different hematocrits. You can see that it doesn't really matter much whether you use fresh red blood cells or glutaraldehyde-fixed red blood cells. In fact, particularly in the adhesion experiments it seems that glutaraldehyde-fixed platelets are actually more potent in stimulating and potentiating shear-induced platelet aggregation than normal fresh red blood cells.

In other experiments we have shown that the effect of fresh red blood cells on shear-induced platelet aggregation is mediated by both small amounts of ADP being liberated from red blood cells, as well as the physical transport effects of red blood cells that bring the platelets to the boundary surfaces so that they can interact with the surface.

(Slide)

This shows the effects of red blood cells on shear-induced platelet adhesion in this model that I described, and you can see here that not only is platelet aggregation affected by red blood cells but platelet adhesion is striking potentiated by normal fresh red blood cells, as well as glutaraldehyde-fixed red cells. In fact, glutaraldehyde-fixed red blood cells cannot deform and appear to be much more potent in facilitating platelet adhesion than the fresh red blood cells.

(Slide)

Again, if you look at the effects of removing ADP from this system, it becomes clear that ADP seems to play a role not only in platelet aggregation induced by shear stress, but also in platelet adhesion in this shear model.

(Slide)

So, all of these experiments, and experiments done by other groups, suggest that there are some very essential requirements for shear-induced platelet aggregation, and some of them are listed here: ADP is clearly a major determinant of shear-induced platelet aggregation. Calcium is necessary, fibrinogen, intact platelet receptors, 2B3A, as well as GP1B and, finally, von Willebrand factor.

(Slide)

It is our concept that what happens here likely is that shear-induced platelet aggregation brings platelets to the surface. They can interact with von Willebrand factor altered by the attachment to the surface, the artificial surface, and contact is made. The initial contact then causes activation of platelets, release of small amounts of ADP, and some of it may actually come from red blood cells in the whole blood system, but blood cells also facilitate actually bringing the platelets to the surface and supporting the initial contact between platelets and von

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

Willebrand factor on the surface.

ADP then plays a major role in not only the adhesion process but also in the platelet aggregation that ensues after shear-induced platelet adhesion has occurred. We feel that the major determinant of platelet cohesion or aggregation following platelet adhesion is probably -- the major ligand is probably not from von Willebrand factor but fibrinogen.

(Slide)

How does all that fit into the feasibility of establishing a flow system? Well, what I have listed here is some of the ideal features of a shear-flow test of vWF It should be a simple, robust flow system. activity. should not be something that is enormously expensive and is only present in a few laboratories, which is unfortunately the case with most of the shear-flow systems that are currently in use. It should be a biologically relevant, standardizable surface. I apologize from colleagues from Austria that I put collagen type 1 on here; it should be collagen type 3 probably. There should be well-defined shear rate stress, and the system should be able to distinguish between low and high shear stress. With high shear stress I am talking about greater than 1500 inverse seconds, which relates to roughly 20 dyn/cm2 i shear stress.

It probably should be an anticoagulated whole blood system, and one will have to establish in more detail the most suitable anticoagulant for this. Glutaraldehydefixed platelets might be useful here in this system, rather than using normal fresh platelets, because with that you eliminate the platelet von Willebrand factor effects on the results.

Standardization should be, obviously, rigorous and there are lots of things that one could discuss here, standard plasma and so forth, standard glutaraldehyde-fixed blood cells perhaps that would lend themselves to much more reproducibility.

Finally, the test should be validated, and certainly there should be rigorous comparison with the ristocetin cofactor assay, perhaps the bleeding time, and there needs to be obviously in vivo correlation.

Where do we stand? I think there are several models now under development in different laboratories. I am personally very enthusiastic that we will probably come up with a flow system. We have been working on a modification of our cone viscometry system for sometime and have not been very successful in developing this into a quantitative assay. We find that the system, looking at gross platelet aggregation and adhesion, is only sensitive

in picking up von Willebrand factor levels when the von Willebrand factor drops below about 40%. That makes this test system, obviously, not very suitable.

We think that this is probably due to the fact that we have been using normal platelets in the system. Perhaps using glutaraldehyde-fixed platelets, which might work in this system, might offer a way around this. But so far there are formidable problems with making this into a reproducible, precise and quantitatively adequate assay over the entire range of von Willebrand factor activity. Thank you.

DR. MONTGOMERY: Although the time is right for going to lunch, you can compare your quest for knowledge versus your quest for food. We will take a few minutes if there are some questions. We will take about seven minutes at most. The other speakers can also go to the microphone to respond.

DR. ARONSON: I just want to comment on something you said, Bob, that you should have a 1:1 activity antigen ratio. There are going to be situations where you can have more. As you make your cryoprecipitate you get rid of all the low molecular weight stuff you started off with, and at that point it probably should be greater than 1:1, and if there is no degradation during preparation it also should be

sgg 144

more than 1:1.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

DR. MONTGOMERY: I think it was important for consistency purposes that whatever that ratio is would be a reasonable measure of consistency. As you looked at those concentrates, at least with von Willebrand plasma, they, in fact, were except that some of them were in excess of a ratio of 1. Trevor?

DR. BARROWCLIFFE: Just a comment and a question on your presentation, Bob. First of all in relation to the WHO reference plasma, I do take your point about the difference that you find with pooled normal. I mean, there are two aspects. One is that pooled normal plasma will also differ in different labs. But the other point is that in the last collaborative study that we did on this there was a difference or around, I think, 11% in the overall mean between the value in the standard and the pooled normal plasma. We hope to address that and correct that in the next round of the study which will go on next year. is still probably better to have a fixed reference standard, as you said, rather than use pooled normal plasma uncalibrated.

DR. MONTGOMERY: Having that standard is crucial for communication.

DR. BARROWCLIFFE: Yes. As I said, we hope to

improve the situation in the next year. My question really was in relation to the predilution in von Willebrand factor plasma of the concentrates. I probably couldn't quite get it from the slides, but did you actually find that that changed the potency of the concentrates compared to the albumin buffer? Because with Factor VIII you actually get an increase of 25% or even more when you switch to predilute in deficient plasma. Did you find the same thing with the concentrates?

DR. MONTGOMERY: I compared three slides side by side, but as you move from buffer to albumin to von Willebrand plasma the activity actually increased, the ristocetin cofactor activity increased.

DR. BARROWCLIFFE: So you did get an increase.

DR. FEDERICI: One comment and one question. The comment is I certainly suggest to use vWF-depleted or severe vWD patient plasma to do studies of purified von Willebrand factor. This comes from my old experience in Ted Zimmerman's and also my place when we are dealing with purified stuff. When we want to make good correlations with von Willebrand factor purified, I usually purify von Willebrand factor with concentrate in my lab. I also make measurements of ristocetin or antigen by using plasma of severe type 3 vWD or plasma depleted first.

1	DR. MONTGOMERY: At some point some companies
2	which were making immunodepleted Factor VIII plasma were
3	doing it with antibodies to von Willebrand factor. Do you
4	know, is there a commercial source of immunodepleted von
5	Willebrand factor?
6	DR. FEDERICI: Maybe this is another question. If
7	this kind of plasma depleted is available commercially, as
8	far as I know, in Europe there aren't any sources.
9	The second is a question to Dr. Joist. You know,
10	in several collaborations with groups which are dealing with
11	shear stress, we have repeated the experience that the
12	platelet von Willebrand factor is an important issue. Did
13	you perform the same cross experiments by using severe type
14	3 vWD in your cone viscometer to see whether or not there
15	were differences? Because this can be an important issue.
16	DR. JOIST: You mean the concentrate studies?
17	DR. FEDERICI: No, no, I am talking about what you
18	have been doing in your stress by mixing reconstituted blood
19	by different sources, and I mean normal platelets versus
20	plasma-deficient. Did you do the opposite?
21	DR. JOIST: Right, I showed you one slide where we
22	switched, where we resuspended degranulated platelets,
23	without von Willebrand factor, deficient platelets in von
24	Willebrand factor-deficient plasma. And they don't do

anything. There is virtually zero shear. Well, it is never zero. There is some adhesion and some aggregation but it is markedly depressed.

DR. FEDERICI: Thanks.

DR. MAZURIER: I have a comment about my concern about using a very sensitive method to measure the von Willebrand factor content in concentrate. For example, the CBA on the von Willebrand factor antigen assays there is a detection limit around 1 milliunit/ml, and we use such assays to make the potency of concentrates which contain about 50-100 U/ml. So we have large errors due to dilutions. When you compare after ristocetin cofactor activity, which is not very sensitive, to von Willebrand factor antigen or CBA assay, you have a ratio which is not a good ratio because you compare two different methods with two different sensitivities and with different errors.

DR. MONTGOMERY: And another question to deal with is you commented that collagen binding correlated with ristocetin, except you obviously showed that when you put a sample at room temperature correlation goes off by a factor of two. I don't know that one would want an assay that has that type of an in vitro -- I mean, I think it has to be standardized to avoid that type of a problem. Does it occur, for instance, with purified von Willebrand factor as

opposed to recombinant von Willebrand factor?

DR. TURECEK: This does also occur with purified plasma-derived von Willebrand factor, and it is due to certain conditions of storage. It should only give you an example that this is really an indicative assay for assessing structural changes in the von Willebrand factor molecule which cannot be measured with ristocetin cofactor antigen assays.

To the other comment before, I disagree in the way that I have shown you that we have linear calibration curves between 10 milliunits to almost 5 units. It depends in which range you want to measure. If you want to measure a concentrate that has a potency of, let's say, 50 units or 100 U/ml you have to dilute it 1:10 or 1:100 to maximum. You do not have to go to the very low end of the calibration curves. It really depends on what you want to assay. If you want to assay minor amounts of von Willebrand factor in type 3 or potentially type 1, then you will go down as low as possible.

DR. MONTGOMERY: It appears that we have reached the time of our pangs for lunch exceeding our pangs for questions. So, we will reconvene at 1:10.

(Whereupon, at 12:20 p.m., the Workshop adjourned for lunch, to reconvene at 1:15 p.m.)

AFTERNOON SESSION

DR. WHITE: My name is Gil White. I am from the
University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill, and this is
Session V, which is entitled "Manufacturer's Perspective:
Clinical Trials and Pharmacokinetics," and the format will
be the same as this morning. We will have six speakers and
then field questions to all of those speakers during a
discussion period after all six talks.

The first talk will be entitled, "Composition, Safety and Efficacy of Humate-P in von Willebrand's

Disease," and will be given jointly by Dr. Jorg Friedebold and Alena Dobrkovska, from Centeon Pharma, in Marburg

Germany. The first third of the talk will be delivered by Dr. Friedebold and then the second two-thirds of the talk will be by Dr. Dobrkovska. Dr. Friedebold?

Manufacturer's Perspective: Clinical Trials; Pharmacokinetics

Composition, Safety and Efficacy of Humate-P in von Willebrand's Disease

DR. FRIEDEBOLD: Mr. Chairman, ladies and gentlemen, I would like to thank the organizers of this meeting, CBER, for the invitation. We are pleased to have the opportunity to contribute to this topic.

(Slide)

In the United States Humate-P is widely used for the treatment of von Willebrand disease even though it is not licensed for this indication, as all of you may know.

Ninety-five percent of the product sold in the U.S. is used for the treatment of von Willebrand disease.

(Slide)

Centeon will present laboratory evidence that

Humate-P consistently contains a relevant fraction of high

molecular weight von Willebrand factor multimers. That will

be done by myself. After that, preliminary pharmacokinetic

data of Humate-P in von Willebrand disease patients will be

presented by Dr. Dobrkovska and, third, a summary of

experience in von Willebrand patients from Canada who

received Humate-P in an emergency release program will be

presented.

(Slide)

This overhead shows analytical data that confirms the consistency of the manufacturing process of Humate-P, and that the product is enriched 2.54-fold in von Willebrand factor activity, plasma 0.26, measured with 47 batches, and the specific activity of von Willebrand factor given as the ratio of ristocetin cofactor to von Willebrand factor antigen content measured by Laurell activity is 0.96

plus/minus 0.14 with the same 47 batches, which is close to the value expected for normal human plasma as being 1.

(Slide)

Here we see an immunostained Western blot of 18 different lots of Humate-P compared to normal human plasma, which is in lanes 1, 8, 15 and 22 as a standard.

The electrophoresis is carried out on a low concentration agarose gel in the presence of SDS. Lane 3 shows a non-representative result due to a sample loading error. This has been reanalyzed on another gel and showed a result comparable to the others. What this shows is an overall high consistency of the multimeric band pattern in the Humate-P lots tested if you compare this level, here.

(Slide)

Let's turn to the evaluation of the multimeric electrophoresis now. In 1989, Tatiwaki and Takahashi suggested an arbitrary grouping of von Willebrand factor multimers in gels, comprising three different groups: the small multimers, which are on the right side of this picture; the medium or intermediate sized high molecular weight multimers and the real large high molecular weight multimers over here.

Nevertheless, it is generally accepted by the community, and published by many authors, for example by

Scott and Montgomery, in 1993, that the clinical efficacy of von Willebrand factor is related to the high molecular weight multimers. Moreover, this grouping, 1, 2, 3, enables a reliable comparison of different Factor VIII/von Willebrand factor preparations. So, this was for normal human plasma in this picture.

(Slide)

This overhead shows the distribution of von
Willebrand factor multimers in a representative Humate-P
lot. Band 11 in higher, this portion here, comprise a high
amount of the total of the von Willebrand factor protein in
that lane. This particular batch has a content of 85% high
molecular weight multimers compared to band 11 and higher of
normal human plasma.

(Slide)

This slide displays the specific activities of different Factor VIII products from different manufacturers, shown as A, B, C and so on, expressed as the ratio of ristocetin cofactor to von Willebrand factor antigen content. Humate-P here is found at 0.9 approximately, which almost reaches the expected value of normal human plasma of 1.

23 (Slide)

24 This graph shows a good correlation between the

specific von Willebrand factor activity on the X axis expressed, again, as ristocetin cofactor activity to von Willebrand factor antigen content, to the high molecular weight content expressed in percent relative to normal human plasma, on the Y axis, again, for different Factor VIII concentrates. Humate-P is located in here, in the upper right part.

(Slide)

So, we can see now an overall high consistency of Humate-P batches, which also implies a high consistency of the manufacturing process by looking again at these numbers, with small deviations and content of about 84.2% plasma and 6.3% of high molecular weight multimers.

(Slide)

As a conclusion, appropriate analytical methods exist which enable the comprehensive and effective characterization of Factor VIII/von Willebrand factor products, including the von Willebrand factor multimer content and size distribution.

Using these methods, consistently high product quality has been confirmed for Humate-P. Humate-P reproducibly exhibits a high von Willebrand factor ristocetin cofactor to von Willebrand factor antigen ratio, so there is high specific activity, and contains a large

1	amount of biologically active high molecular weight von
2	Willebrand factor multimers. Thus, regarding its analytical
3	characteristics, Humate-P fulfills all requirements for
4	Factor VIII/von Willebrand factor concentrate highly
5	suitable for the effective treatment of von Willebrand
6	disease.
7	Now I would like to hand over the microphone to
8	Dr. Dobrkovska who will present the clinical data. Thank
9	you.
10	DR. DOBRKOVSKA: Ladies and gentlemen, Mr.
11	Chairman, excuse my voice, I have a little bit of a cold. I
12	would now like to continue with the clinical part.
13	(Slide)
14	I would like to present a pharmacokinetic study
15	interim results on six patients with von Willebrand disease,
16	various types, of Dr. Chediak who, unfortunately, is not
17	quite well and cannot be with us today.
18	There were six von Willebrand patients, two of
19	them with severe type 1, two with type 2A, and two with type
20	3, who received a single dose of Humate which was equivalent
21	to approximately 80 IU of von Willebrand factor/ristocetin
22	cofactor/kilogram body weight. The sampling was done before
23	the infusion and then over the following 50 hours.
24	(Slide)

The <u>in vivo</u> recovery was calculated in two ways,
once as the traditional percent of normal and the other with
a way which is expressed as increase in unit/deciliter
plasma per doses per kilogram body weight, and not
correlated with plasma. So the extensive clinical
experience which you have heard about before from various
speakers gave empiric knowledge that after each unit of
Factor VIII per kilogram body weight you can expect an
approximate increase by 2, and by ristocetin factor by at
least 1.5. Given the variation of the method for ristocetin
cofactor, one can say that this is fairly within the range
expected.

Here again you see something which was already mentioned today, that the antigen is lower than the ristocetin cofactor. That is most likely an artifact of comparing two different methods together.

(Slide)

Median half-life of ristocetin cofactor was approximately 11 hours, which is again in keeping with the general experience, and the antigen half-life appears to be somewhat longer, which may have something to do with perhaps the slow degradation of the high multimers in the course of the time. The distribution of volume by steady state is approximately 60 ml/kg body weight, which shows, as

expected, distribution space higher than the plasma volume.

The mean residence time is again in the expected levels,

again longer for the antigen.

(Slide)

This is also reflected in this curve which shows the course of the values as the half-life of Factor VIII, and these conditions cannot be calculated. You see that after the infusion of 80 U/kg body weight of ristocetin cofactor there is rapid increase in Factor VIII activity, in ristocetin cofactor and in antigen, and you see that the Factor VIII levels are fairly sustained during the whole observation time, which is certainly due to the Factor VIII synthesis of the patients which contributes and maintains the seemingly long half-life. The antigen and the ristocetin cofactor follow the normal decay curve and you can see, however, that by about 20 hours you still have levels above 50 U/ml.

(Slide)

This is by way of an example to show a typical patient with type 3 disease. This is the infusion value, and you see that after infusion the multimeric structure is almost, not completely but almost normalized. A little bit is missing here. Then it slowly declines over the time until the 50 hours, but still at 50 hours there are some

residua of von Willebrand factor.

(Slide)

The changes in the levels of Factor VIII and ristocetin cofactor and antigen were followed and reflected changes in bleeding time, transient changes in bleeding time, similarly as already described by other authors.

Infusion values are all over 15 minutes. Post-infusion, 3 patients were completely normalized, 3 partly normalized.

Then you see that already at 6 hours the normalization is slowly disappearing and at 22 hours it is practically gone.

As was mentioned before, this probably does not directly reflect efficacy because we observe this very often.

(Slide)

I would also like to introduce the evaluation of the clinical efficacy and safety in a rather large cohort of Canadian patients with von Willebrand disease. The clinical efficacy was retrospectively evaluated by the treating physicians.

(Slide)

We have two kinds of patients. We have 97 patients whose results were reviewed on site with the proper validation of the results. That was our primary population and we will refer here to that. We had an equally large group of patients where the results were only obtained by

remote retrieval methods, like telephone, fax and so on. We will not refer to those here because these data were not validated, but essentially they were the same as in the primary population.

You see that the main types of von Willebrand disease were included. There were somewhat less female patients than male patients but they were fairly represented. The scale of the age range was over practically all age groups.

(Slide)

This is the summary of the clinical efficacy. The clinical efficacy was judged as excellent, good, none or non-assessable. There were 97 patients who had 525 different events, either various surgeries, bleedings of spontaneous or traumatic origin, and other events were, for example, delivery of several patients or invasive diagnostic methods. Prophylaxis was long-term prophylaxis between various bleedings. Overall, one can say that a large proportion of events had good to excellent efficacy, about 86% to 98% by surgery, and this is modified by the fact that in 8% of the patients clinical efficacy could not be evaluated.

23 (Slide)

Overall tolerance was very good. In 97 patients

there were no serious side effects. There were only 7 mild or moderate, chiefly, effects related to the usage of the preparation, mostly mildly allergic. There was no evidence of transmission of hepatitis or other viruses by this therapy.

(Slide)

In conclusion, it is possible to say that there is an adequate increase of Factor VIII, ristocetin cofactor and antigen after intravenous infusion of Humate-P; that the half-lives and recoveries are in the expected ranges; that there is complete or partial correction of bleeding time shortly after the infusion, but transient; that there is nearly complete normalization of plasma multimeric structure which then slowly disappears; and there was excellent clinical efficacy in 86-98% of various types of bleedings, surgical interventions, obstetrics and various invasive diagnostic techniques. There was no evidence of viral transmission, and there was good general tolerance and safety. Thank you.

DR. WHITE: Thank you very much, Dr. Friedebold and Dr. Dobrkovska. The next speaker is Dr. Anastassios Retzios, who is a Clinical Project Manager with Alpha Therapeutics, in Los Angeles, and he will present studies with Alphanate. The title of his talk is "A High Purity

1	Factor VIII Concentrate in the Treatment of von Willebrand's
2	Disease. Dr. Retzios?
3	A High Purity Factor VIII Concentrate in the Treatment
4	of von Willebrand Disease
5	DR. RETZIOS: Thank you, Dr. White. I would also
6	like to thank Dr. Mark Weinstein and the organizers of the
7	meeting for the kind invitation.
8	I hope that in the next 25 or 30 minutes I will be
9	able to give you a comprehensive synopsis of the work that
10	we have done in order to characterize the efficacy and
11	safety of Alphanate in von Willebrand disease.
12	(Slide)
13	Alphanate is a high purity von Willebrand factor
14	concentrate that was originally licensed for use in
15	hemophilia A in the summer of 1974.
16	(Slide)
17	The original Alphanate included a single viricidal
18	step in its purification methodology. The purification was
19	provided by PG precipitation, chromatography through a
20	capillary micorose column and salt precipitation.
21	(Slide)
22	The resulting concentrate has a specific activity
23	of approximately 150 Factor VIII U/mg protein. The usual
24	intermediate purity concentrates are present in low level or

non-detectable amounts.

The major contaminant, if the word can be used in this context, is von Willebrand factor. Here, Alphanate contains 1 unit of ristocetin cofactor activity for every 2 units of Factor VIII. The ratio of ristocetin cofactor activity to von Willebrand factor antigen is approximately 0.72.

(Slide)

Here is a gel that shows the multimeric distribution of von Willebrand factor in a number of Alphanate lots, as well as in 2 commercially available concentrates from other manufacturers.

As one can see, there is substantial lot-to-lot variability and lot-to-lot consistency in the multimeric distribution of von Willebrand factor in Alphanate, as well as in other concentrates. The very high weight multimers are significantly reduced, although they are not necessarily always absent, as occasional overloading shows.

(Slide)

Going on to our clinical data, the ATC93-01 was designed to evaluate the efficacy and safety of Alphanate in von Willebrand's disease. It was a multicenter, open-label, uncontrolled study in two parts.

In part I we were interested in determining the

lab response to a single infusion of Alphanate. All of our patients received a single infusion of 40 units of ristocetin cofactor per/kilogram body weight. If the response was inadequate, they were infused with a higher dose of 60 units of ristocetin cofactor per/kilogram.

In part II of the study Alphanate was infused for the management of bleeding episodes and as prophylaxis during surgery.

(Slide)

The endpoint of the study in part I was adequate lab response at one hour post-infusion. Here I would like to add that ATC93-01 was influenced substantially by clinical studies that Dr. Manucci conducted in the beginning of the '90s with a number of Factor VIII concentrates in a cohort of type 3 patients. The study also conforms very closely -- actually, it exceeds many provisions of the guidelines for studies in von Willebrand disease that Dr. Manucci authored and published on behalf of the ICH subcommittee for von Willebrand's disease.

(Slide)

However, the guidelines did not provide particular guidance for endpoints in the efficacy part of the protocol, our part II. So, in meetings with CBER and subsequent correspondence at the end of 1994, we arrived at the

following endpoints: In at least 75% of patients there won't be any use of cryoprecipitate or alternate Factor VIII concentrate. The blood loss will not exceed expected normal blood loss, and all postoperative bleeding episodes will be controlled by Alphanate.

(Slide)

To clarify endpoints in part I, adequate lab response at one hour post-infusion was determined as Factor VIII and ristocetin cofactor levels at 50% of normal or above, and the bleeding time should be at least partially corrected. Here are our bleeding time correction criteria, which are in conformance with the guidelines

(Slide)

Going on to the enrollment into the study, we enrolled 65 patients, 53 participating in part I of the study, 10 were infused for 55 bleeding episodes in part IIa, and 23 in 40 invasive procedures in part IIb. If the numbers do not appear to add up, it is because patients were allowed to participate in more than one part of the study.

I do not have enough time to go into detail on our enrollment criteria, but I would like to mention that all of our patients are DDAVP non-responsive or DDAVP is contraindicated in them. Also, all our patients were devoid of Factor VIII and von Willebrand factor inhibitors.

1 (Slide)

Specifically in part I, using the new classification of von Willebrand's disease, it appears that we have enrolled equal numbers of type 2A and type 3 patients, 22 of each kind. We have 6 type 1 patients, 3 of which can possibly be regarded as type 3 because they have non-detectable levels of von Willebrand factor and have bleeding times in excess of 30 minutes, although a normal pattern of von Willebrand factor can be seen if their radiogram is exposed for over 2 weeks.

(Slide)

Going on to the blood types in our part I patients, the distribution of blood types is similar to the population as a whole. In this analysis 4 of the type 1 patients are all type 0.

(Slide)

Going on to the correction of bleeding time with the original infusion of 40 units of ristocetin cofactor per/kilogram, one can see that from the 49 patients with abnormally prolonged bleeding times 32 corrected partially or fully at 1 hour post-infusion.

(Slide)

Of the 17 patients that did not respond or showed a response that could not be graded as partial due to our

guidelines, 13 were reinfused. Six of those showed partial response, which shows that there may be a relationship between dose levels and response in bleeding time. However, we do not have enough points to determine the linearity of that response.

(Slide)

Going on to the bleeding time over the duration of the observation period, as one can see, both type 2A patients and type 3 patients saw substantial improvements in bleeding time at 1 hour post-infusion. The response to bleeding time is more sustained in type 2A patients. In type 3 patients the bleeding time starts reverting to baseline at about 6 hours post-infusion, although there is a cohort of patients that shows a more sustained response.

(Slide)

This is the ristocetin cofactor levels throughout the observation period. All the patients achieved levels of ristocetin cofactor at 50% or above, although the response has been more varied than the typical response that one sees in Factor VIII infusion in hemophiliacs. The mean levels remain at about 50% for at least 6 hours post-infusion.

(Slide)

Now for the \$64,000 question, what is the relationship between decreasing bleeding time and increasing

ristocetin cofactor activity? As this slide shows, there is none. These results are in accordance with results that were achieved by Dr. Manucci in his studies in a cohort of the ten type 3 patients that were published in <u>Blood</u> in 1992.

(Slide)

Going on to the possible influence of blood type in correction, there aren't enough data to obtain statistical significance, but if one subtracts those 4 patients with normal bleeding times pre-infusion, one can see that there were more non-responders with type 0.

(Slide)

Going on to the pharmacokinetics of ristocetin cofactor activity, prior to discussing this slide I would like to indicate that, first of all, neither 93-01 nor the guidelines were designed or even anticipated a very rigorous pharmacokinetic study. In the beginning of the '90s, response to concentrates was a great unknown. So, most investigators were very interested in limiting the blood rules in order to diminish discomfort to the patient.

However, going on, the terminal elimination halflife is approximately 10 for type 2A and type 3 patients. The difference that one can see here between type 2A and type 3 in terminal half-life and in mean residence time is

not statistically significant. However, differences in area under the curve, both in clearance and volume of 2 distribution at the steady state, are statistically 3 4 significant. 5 (Slide) Going on to von Willebrand factor antigen levels 6 7 throughout the observation period, no great surprises here. 8 The main difference is due to baseline levels. 9 (Slide) 10 Going on to Factor VIII, quite a sustained 11 response in increase in Factor VIII levels for both types, 12 type 3 and type 2A. 13 (Slide) Going on to the multimeric pattern over the 14 15 observation period with type 3 patients, we do not 16 particularly see significant differential clearance of very 17 high molecular weight multimers in comparison to the low molecular weight multimers. 18 19 (Slide) 20 The same profile can be seen in the type 2A 21 patients. 22 (Slide) 23 Going on to adverse events that we observed in

part I, we had 9 adverse events in 7 subjects in a total of

72 administrations of Alphanate. Eight were mild and included light-headedness, urticaria, headaches and nausea, and 1 was severe, erythema multiforma, as part of an anaphylactic reaction in a teenage subject.

(Slide)

Going on to treatment of bleeding episodes, we had 10 subjects that were infused for 55 bleeding episodes.

Three of those were type 1, 3 were type 2A and 4 were type 3. Of the 51 investigated bleeding episodes, 37 were GI bleeds. In 40/52 bleeding episodes a single infusion of Alphanate was adequate to achieve hemostasis. The maximum amount of infusions was 5 in 1/52 bleeding episodes, and that was a hemorrhage due to a shoulder injury.

(Slide)

Going on to part IIb, Alphanate as prophylaxis during surgery, 23 subjects were infused in 40 minor, moderate or major surgeries. Four were type 1, 11 were type 2A, 1 was type 2B and 7 were type 3. The most common surgery was dental extraction. Actually, we had 14 dental operations in the protocol, 6 GI prognostic procedures, 3 orthopedic operations, 2 biopsies, 2 GI surgeries, 1 total hysterectomy where an unannounced appendectomy was also included, a pelvic tumor removal, a double hernia repair, a very extensive hemorrhoidectomy and 9 other procedures.

(Slide)

Looking at the bleeding time correction after the presurgery dose of 60 units of ristocetin cofactor/kilogram, 13 of our subjects in 16 surgeries corrected fully, 8 subjects in 10 surgeries corrected partially, and 7 subjects in 9 surgeries did not correct. The percentage of corrections here is approximately almost the same, about 75%, as we saw in part I of the protocol.

We had adequate hemostasis in all procedures. No cryoprecipitate or alternate Factor VIII concentrate was used. According to our latest audited data, blood loss did not exceed expected blood loss in 85% of procedures.

Postoperative bleeding episodes in the treatment period, we had 2 in 40 cases controlled by Alphanate.

(Slide)

Here is a table with some details on the operations. I would like you to notice the relatively small number of infusions required to achieve hemostasis. As you can see in this table and the next one, most of our dental extractions or dental operations required no more than 2 infusions.

(Slide)

The hemorrhoidectomy that went to some distance, partially due to complications, required 13 infusions. We

had 12 infusions in the distal clavicle resection and 10 infusions in the abdominal hysterectomy.

(Slide)

Going on to some details in a selected number of patients, here is patient 2201, a type 2A patient. He shows a very typical dosing pattern. Patients usually received 2 infusions daily for the first 2 postoperative days. Then the infusion frequency decreased to 1 infusion daily for the next 2 or 3 days, and infusion frequency dropped even further to 1 infusion every 2 days until the completion of the procedure.

The patient corrected bleeding time fully after the first infusion, and the bleeding time remained in the corrected area while the frequency of the infusions was relatively high, but it tended to go to baseline when the frequency was decreased. Independent of the bleeding time, the patient did not present any postoperative bleeding episodes and made a full recovery.

(Slide)

The same is true in the patient that had a total hysterectomy and appendectomy. Here, again, we see the same dosing pattern of 2 infusions daily for the first 2-3 postoperative days. The infusion frequency decreases to approximately 1 infusion per day in the next 2 or 3 days,

and then it decreases even further to 1 infusion every 2 days. Again the bleeding time corrects fully and, as the infusion frequency drops, bleeding time tends to revert to baseline. Again, the patient did not show any postoperative bleeding episodes and again the patient made a full recuperation.

(Slide)

Here is a patient who has a double hernia repair operation. This patient showed total correction of bleeding time throughout the treatment period and, again, shows very much the same dosing pattern.

(Slide)

Here is a very interesting patient because she never corrected the bleeding time in the cervical scraping. Again, a similar dosing pattern and, although the patient did not correct the bleeding time, she actually had blood loss less than anticipated and did not show any postoperative bleeding episodes and she healed well.

(Slide)

Going on to adverse events in part IIa, we had a mild itching. In part IIb, subject 009 who underwent the rather extensive hemorrhoidectomy. The patient developed deep venous thrombosis in the right popliteal vein after 12 days of treatment, 5 days after the second hemorrhoidectomy.

The investigators attributed this to the patient's medical condition and to the long period of immobilization. It should be noted here that the patient went on to have a third hemorrhoidectomy and also a vena cava filter installation, all under Alphanate treatment. Subject 901, the one who underwent total hysterectomy, experienced a number of mild events connected with her medical condition and the operation, not to Alphanate.

(Slide)

Recently we added a second viricidal treatment to the manufacture of Alphanate. Alphanate is now heat treated at 80 degrees for 72 hours. We were, of course, interested in defining the effects of heat treatment in the von Willebrand factor of Alphanate.

(Slide)

As one can see here from the ratio of activity to antigen in the solvent detergent and in the solvent detergent heat-treated versions of Alphanate, they have hardly changed. In a study that we have undertaken in association with a special coagulation lab at the University of Miami, we investigated collagen binding in a number of Alphanate lots, heat treated and non-heat treated. We did find that there was no difference in the collagen binding to antigen ratio between the heat treated and non-heat treated

Alphanate.

2 (Slide)

Furthermore, we investigated the effects of heat treatment on the multimer distribution in von Willebrand factor in Alphanate. A number of Alphanate lots were examined both prior to heat treating and post-heat treatment and, as one can see on low resolution electrophoresis and high resolution electrophoresis, there haven't been any changes.

(Slide)

We were also interested in determining the effects of heat treatment in the clinical environment. So we attached an addendum to ATC93-01. In doing so, we modified partially part I of the protocol and so now part I is essentially a crossover study between Alphanate and Alphanate heat treated. We will have at least 12 subjects in the study. The dose has been set at 60 units of ristocetin cofactor/kilogram. We will be following ristocetin cofactor, antigen and Factor VIII for up to 48 hours post-infusion.

(Slide)

We have inserted two additional blood rows here in order to define the pharmacokinetic parameters with a high level of precision. There have been no changes in part II,

apart from the fact that patients will be treated exclusively with the heat-treated Alphanate.

(Slide)

The status -- we have infused 14 subjects so far in part I7, have completed a whole series of infusions in part IIa. We have treated 2 subjects for 4 bleeding episodes in part IIb, 5 subjects were infused in 5 surgical procedures.

(Slide)

Some preliminary results -- I don't know if they are very visible here, this is a type 3 and type 2A patient, heat-treated Alphanate versus solvent detergent only Alphanate. As one can see, there haven't been any dramatic differences in levels achieved of ristocetin cofactor, antigen and Factor VIII. What is noteworthy here is the consistency in response in bleeding time in both these patients in the heat-treated and the non-heat-treated versions of Alphanate.

(Slide)

Now, on to a story not often told, the inhibitors of von Willebrand factor. We had 2 patients, both type 3, that developed inhibitors in our study. Patient 111 developed a low titer inhibitor of approximately 1.2

Bethesda units after 3 administrations of Alphanate within a

week. The investigator thought that that was possibly an anamnestic response, and titers have progressively declined and the subject is now inhibitor-free.

In the addendum part of the protocol, subject 606 developed a low titer inhibitor, possibly after infusion in part I with heat-treated Alphanate. In this case, we are certain that this was an anamnestic response as the patient had a history of inhibitors.

(Slide)

I would like to note here that the inhibitor level has always been relatively low and was easily overwhelmed by further infusions of Alphanate as, indeed, it happened in patient 111. So the patients remain treatable even when they have inhibitors.

(Slide)

On to conclusions, Alphanate can be safely administered at doses up to 60 units of ristocetin cofactor activity per kilogram. Alphanate infusions resulted in hemostatic levels of ristocetin cofactor activity at 1 hour post-infusion. Alphanate corrected the bleeding time fully or partially in 77% of the subjects at 1 hour post-infusion.

As our part II shows, Alphanate appears to provide adequate hemostasis in bleeding episodes and as prophylaxis during surgery even in the absence in bleeding time

correction. 2 Biochemical characterization suggests that heat treatment does not affect the function of von Willebrand 3 factor in Alphanate, and clinical evaluation of heat-treated 4 5 Alphanate is currently ongoing. Thank you for your attention. 6 7 DR. WHITE: Thank you very much, Dr. Retzios. 8 Again, we still have a little bit of a hum down there, if 9 you can find out where it is coming from. It is better than it was, but it is still here. 10 11 The next speaker is Dr. Claudine Mazurier, who is 12 Director of Preclinical Development at LFB, which is the French National Laboratory for Fractionation and 13 Biotechnology in Lille, France. Dr. Mazurier will tall on 14 15 "<u>In Vitro</u> Evaluation of the Hemostatic Value of the LFB 16 Vapor Heat Treated von Willebrand Factor Concentrate." 17 Mazurier? 18 In Vitro Evaluation of the Hemostatic Value of the 19 LFB-VHP vWF Concentrate 20 DR. MAZURIER: Thank you, Dr. White. 21 (Slide) 22 About nine years ago the CRTS of Lille developed a plasma-derived product specially intended for the treatment 23

of von Willebrand disease. The S/D treated von Willebrand

factor concentrate is still produced in the facility of Lille, now belonging to the Laboratoire Francais du Fractionement et des Biotechnologies LFB. It contains 42-70 units of ristocetin cofactor activity per milliliter, but 10 less Factor VIII coagulant activity. Its specific activity ranges between 50-200 U/mg proteins.

I will summarize the tests we have performed during the preclinical development in order to evaluate the functional integrity of von Willebrand factor. Second, I will describe the routine evaluation of the different batches of the present production. Then Doris Menache and Jenny Goudemand will talk about the pharmacokinetic and the clinical efficiency respectively.

(Slide)

This is a description of the battery of tests we have performed in 89 different industrial batches for the preclinical development.

First, we analyzed the multimeric pattern in using at that time high resolution gel. We also measured the von Willebrand factor capacity to bind to different ligands, soluble human collagen, fixed platelets in the presence of ristocetin, fresh-washed platelets in the presence of thrombin and Factor VIII. We also measured the ability of von Willebrand factor to promote platelet adhesion in using

the rectangular perfusion chamber system described by Sakariassen.

(Slide)

This slide exemplifies the data obtained on different industrial batches, presented by colored symbols, compared either to normal plasma, on the left side, or to purified von Willebrand factor obtained on the laboratory scale, on the right side. You see that the von Willebrand factor molecules in the final product are able to specifically bind to collagen, platelet GBIb, platelet GP IIb/IIIa complex and Factor VIII.

(Slide)

Using the rectangular perfusion system of
Sakariassen with reconstituted blood containing indiumlabeled platelets, and using a flow rate of 1200 inverse
seconds, we obtained these data, expressed in percentage of
adhesion as a function of the amount of von Willebrand
factor added in the reconstituted blood.

The different therapeutic batches are represented by colored symbols. You can see that these batches induced normal adhesion with 1.0 U/ml or slightly lower adhesion.

When 0.5 units are added 100% adhesion is obtained for all the batches tested.

24 (Slide)

As far as routine quality control of the LFB von Willebrand factor concentrate is concerned, it includes the structural analysis of von Willebrand factor in using low resolution gel. We stained the multimers directly in the gel without transfer, using phosphatase-conjugated polyclonal antibodies and we quantified the high molecular weight multimers up to the 15th, the 10th, the 5th mers in using scanning.

(Slide)

These are examples of the multimers obtained for the concentrate as compared to the pool of normal plasma analyzed in the same gel. First, my eyes cannot see any significant difference between the concentrate and the normal plasma. Consequently, we have to scan the gel and to measure the percentage of the different multimers. Second, in spite of the standardized electrophoretic conditions, sometimes we can clearly see the triplet structure. In other cases we don't see this triplet structure. The length of migration is sometimes shorter, and we can't quantify accurately the multimers up to the 15th.

(Slide)

We have validated the quantification of the multimers by analyzing in 7 successive experiments aliquots in given batches of our production. You see that by intra-

and inter-assay there is very good evaluation for all the multimers up to the 15th, the 10th and the 5th, with CD lower than 10%.

We have also evaluated the robustness of this quantitative evaluation by analyzing the data obtained on the different pools of normal plasma that we store at less than 6 months at -80 degrees Celsius. For example, during the past year we have used 2 pools of normal plasma and you see that the quantitative evaluation of the different multimers is reproducible with CD lower than 5%.

Consequently, we may express the percentage of multimers of a given batch as compared to the pool of normal plasma analyzed in the same gel. We express the relative percentage of multimers.

(Slide)

Using this method of expression, we analyzed the 29 last batches of our production in '96 and '97, and found that multimers up to the 10th are 82.5% with a CD around 10%. We also measure the ristocetin cofactor activity and put this potency on the label on the product for each batch. The test that we use is a semi-quantitative microscopic assay which has been previously compared to the original aggregometer assay with fresh-washed platelets. During this comparison we found very good correlation coefficient of

0.95. We use commercially available platelets fixed with ristocetin. We dilute the sample in albumin and use a plasma standard as the reference. Using this test, we see that our prediction is also consistent, with a mean of 60 units of ristocetin cofactor activity per milliliter, and a CV of 10%. For all these batches the specific activity is around 100 U/mg protein.

(Slide)

The last slide is to compare ristocetin cofactor assay and collagen binding assay for the evaluation of the LFB concentrate. As expected, the CBA assay is far more sensitive than the ristocetin cofactor assay. Its quantification limit is 0.01 U/dl, two times the detection limit. The linearity is very good.

As far as accuracy is concerned, the repeatability is better than ristocetin cofactor activity, but we were very disappointed by the reproducibility performed in 7 experiments because it is not improved as compared to ristocetin cofactor activity.

Nevertheless, we still did the correlation of ristocetin cofactor activity and CBA assay in 44 samples taken during the process of preparation of our concentrate in samples ranging from 0.1 to 100 units of von Willebrand factor antigen per milliliter, and found a good correlation

(Slide)

	182
1	coefficient. Therefore, the CBA assay, as it is easier to
2	standardize and is probably more robust than ristocetin
3	cofactor activity, may be an interesting alternative in the
4	picture.
5	I thank you for your attention, and give the floor
6	to Doris Menache.
7	DR. WHITE: It is a special pleasure to be able to
8	introduce the next speaker, who is a good friend and
9	colleague. Dr. Doris Menache is former Director of Plasma
10	Operations at the American Red Cross, in Arlington, and has
11	now achieved the type of status that all of would like to
12	have achieved, that is the title of consultant. Dr. Menache
13	is going to present the second of three talks on the LFB
14	product, and the title of her talk is "Pharmacokinetics of
15	von Willebrand Factor and Factor VIII Coagulant Activity in
16	Patients with von Willebrand Disease Type 3 and Type 2.
17	Pharmacokinetics of von Willebrand Factor and Factor VIII
18	Coagulant Activity in Patients with von Willebrand Disease
19	Type 3 and Type 2
20	DR. MENACHE: Thank you. I would like to thank
21	Dr. Mark Weinstein for inviting me to this meeting to talk,
22	and to thank Gil White for his very nice introduction, and I
23	wish you to be a very good consultant, as I am.

1	Pharmacokinetics of Factor VIII coagulant activity
2	and von Willebrand factor were conducted in patients with
3	von Willebrand disease, using von Willebrand factor human.
4	This product is derived from blood collected by the American
5	Red Cross Blood Services from volunteer donors, and is
6	manufactured by the Laboratoire Francais du Fractionement et
7	des Biotechnologies LFB, Les Ulis, France.
8	Six lots of products were used in the study.
9	Ristocetin cofactor specific activity ranged from 131 to 175
10	U/mg protein. The ratio of ristocetin cofactor to von
11	Willebrand factor antigen ranged from 0.91 to 1.4, as this
12	has already been stated several times. Each lot contained
13	no more than 10 units of Factor VIII for 100 units of
14	ristocetin cofactor activity.
15	(Slide)
16	After obtaining IRB approval and informed consent,
17	9 patients with von Willebrand disease type 3, 6 patients
18	with type 2, 1 with type 2A and 1 patient with type $1/2$
19	entered the study. The characteristics of these patients
20	are shown on this slide.
0.1	(g] ; J -)

21 (Slide)

22

23

Patients were administered 1 infusion of von
Willebrand factor at a dose of either 50 or 100 units
ristocetin cofactor per kilo body weight. The bleeding time

was measured pre-infusion and at 1, 4, 8 and 24 hours post-infusion. Assays for ristocetin cofactor, von Willebrand factor antigen, Factor VIII coagulant activity and multimers were performed at the time indicated on this slide, which is pre-infusion and up to 96 hours post-infusion.

I would like to stress that all the assays were performed in one central laboratory, the Blood Center of Southeastern Wisconsin, in Milwaukee.

(Slide)

The data points for Factor VIII for all patients were fitted to a model with a linear time synthesis using the formula shown on this slide, where K1 represents the synthesis rate or, rather, the rate of appearance in the circulation of Factor VIII expressed in units per deciliter per hour. K2 is the decay rate of Factor VIII. A0 is the baseline of Factor VIII, and A1 the infused Factor VIII. The pre-infusion Factor VIII was assumed to be the baseline and the 15 minutes post-infusion increment was used to correct for the Factor VIII present in the preparation. The data points for the decay of von Willebrand factor, both the antigen and ristocetin, were fitted to the one-compartment model according to the formula shown at the bottom of the slide.

(Slide)

This model assumes a constant rate of Factor VIII synthesis, and assumes that the circulating level of Factor VIII is independent of the level of von Willebrand factor. The catabolic constant for Factor VIII was calculated using the model and the formula I have shown you, but it was also calculated in a traditional fashion, that is, it was not corrected for synthesis and calculations were made using the data point from 24 hours post-infusion to 96 hours post infusion, and you will see why we chose 24 hours in a minute.

(Slide)

This figure compares the calculated curves using the formula and the experimental data obtained in one single patient. The curve in red is for ristocetin cofactor. The curve in blue is for the antigen and the curve in yellow is for the Factor VIII. On each of these calculated curves you have the experimental data points obtained in this single patient for the three types of activities.

Following the administration of the product there is an immediate increase in ristocetin cofactor and in antigen, with the highest level noted at the first sample tested, approximately 15 minutes post-infusion. This is followed, of course, by a decay. The Factor VIII level decreased progressively and, except for one patient, a peak

was noted at 24 hours post-infusion. But please note that we have no samples between 8 hours and 24, and no samples between 24 and 48.

As you can see, the experimental data fit
extremely well with the calculated points. In addition, the
curve for Factor VIII indicates that the Factor VIII
persists in the circulation longer than the von Willebrand
factor, a fact that has been noted very often in patients
with von Willebrand disease after the infusion of AHF
products containing von Willebrand factor.

(Slide)

This slide shows the mean results we have obtained in 10 patients with von Willebrand disease type 3. The mean rate of synthesis of Factor VIII, or if you prefer, the mean rate of appearance in the circulation of Factor VIII was found to be 6.4 U/dl/h, and ranged from 4.4 to 8.8. The half-life of Factor VIII was around 17 hours. However, if one analyzed the Factor VIII decay without correcting for synthesis, using the one-compartment model from 24 hours post-infusion to 96 hours post-infusion, then the half-life, of course, is much longer and is 40 hours, which appears much slower than for the von Willebrand factor. The half-life of ristocetin and of von Willebrand factor antigen correspond to what others have found, around 12 hours.

Correction of the bleeding time in this population
of type 3 patients were strongly dose dependent. The white-
filled squares indicated the bleeding times at 1 hour post-
infusion and 4 hours post-infusion following the
administration of 50 units of ristocetin cofactor per
kilogram, while the green-filled squares indicate the
bleeding times at 1 hour and 4 hours post-infusion following
the administration of 100 units of ristocetin cofactor. At
4 hours post-infusion the median bleeding time at a dose of
50 units was 9 minutes, whereas the median bleeding time was
3 minutes for a dose of 100 U/kg.
The results in the type 2 patients indicated a
rate of synthesis of 5.5 U/dl/h, with a half-life of 16
hours for Factor VIII, 14 or 16 hours for the ristocetin
cofactor and for the antigen.
Analysis of the pharmacokinetic data indicates and
allows us to predict that the repetitive administration of a
material containing only von Willebrand factor will result
in a continuous rise of Factor VIII up to a plateau, the
height of which depends on the Factor VIII rate of release
in the circulation.

(Slide)

As shown on this slide, and this is according to the model, following the administration of 1 dose of 100

U/kg ristocetin cofactor and then a daily constant dose of 50 U/kg of ristocetin cofactor there should be relatively very small shifts in the Factor VIII levels over time, whereas each infusion would be followed by an immediate increase of ristocetin cofactor followed by a decay.

(Slide)

These expectations are illustrated in this slide, which shows the data from a patient, type 3, treated with 1 dose of 100 units ristocetin cofactor per kilogram 24 hours prior to surgery, and then 50 U/kg every 24 hours for 17 days. Pre- and post-infusion data for ristocetin cofactor activity are indicated by the yellow squares. Pre- and post-infusion experimental data for the Factor VIII are indicated in pink. The solid white lines indicate the expected calculated Factor VIII C levels. As you can see, the experimental data fit the expected curve. This regimen resulted in levels ranging from 50 units to 112 units of Factor VIII and ristocetin cofactor between 58 and 200 U/dl.

(Slide)

I would like to conclude by acknowledging that all this work has been done with the collaboration and together with my colleagues listed above, and I would also like to thank all the clinicians of the cooperative study group who enrolled patients and allowed us to perform this study.

1	Thank	you.

DR. WHITE: Thank you very much, Doris. The last speaker on the LFB von Willebrand factor concentrate is Dr. Jenny Goudemand, who is from the Hopital Claude Huriez, in Lille, France. The title of her talk is "Clinical Management of Patients with von Willebrand Disease with a Very High Purity vWF Concentrate." Dr. Goudemand?

Clinical Management of Patients with von Willebrand Disease with a Very High Purity vWF Concentrate

DR. GOUDEMAND: Thank you very much.

(Slide)

I will be presenting some data about the French clinical experience with the use of the vWF concentrate manufactured by LFB. Data were collected from three centers, Lille, Lyons and Hopital Cochin in Paris.

(Slide)

From 1989 to 1997 75 patients have been treated with the vWF concentrate. Most patients, 42, had type 1 von Willebrand disease, with various degrees of severity. The range for bleeding time, Factor VIII and ristocetin cofactor activity are indicated on the columns. Other patients included type 2A, 2B, 2N, type 3 and 7 patients with an acquired von Willebrand factor syndrome.

24 (Slide)

Patients unresponsive to DDAVP or with contraindications to that product were treated in 99 various clinical circumstances, either spontaneous bleedings, 15 cases, including digestive, genital, mucosal cutaneous bleedings and 1 psoas hematoma occurred in a 2N patient, or minor surgery with 5 days or less of institution in 48 cases, mainly dental or gynecologic procedures, or major surgery in 36 cases, mainly orthopedic surgery, 15 cases, including 7 total hip or knee replacements, and 2 of them were undertaken in type 3 patients.

(Slide)

During these occurrences, 40 lots of vWF concentrate have been used. Each vial is labeled with the ristocetin cofactor, which was 58 plus/minus 13 units per milliliter. This was the only information provided to the users. However, clinicians were aware of the low Factor VIII concentration, less than 10%. Only as a special request, we were informed of the exact Factor VIII concentration of each of these lots. Factor VIII content was specially low, from 0.3 to 3 U/ml in the last 26 lots.

(Slide)

Patients with type 2N were analyzed together and are not included in the following tables. In case of spontaneous bleedings, patients received a first infusion of

47 U/kg ristocetin cofactor, corresponding to 4 U/kg of Factor VIII. This was followed by subsequent infusions, almost the same dosage, every 12 or 24 hours when necessary. This was the case mainly for gastrointestinal bleedings, specially in type 2A. In fact, half of the patients received only 1-3 infusions.

You can see the baseline levels and levels measured at 1 hour, 12 hours and 24 hours after infusions. We observed that ristocetin cofactor activity was totally normalized 1 hour after the first infusion. At that time Factor VIII was around 50%. Activity measured at 12 hours showed similar levels of Factor VIII and ristocetin cofactor, around 110% and 120%. After that both activities declined.

(Slide)

Surgery protocols were established according to the baseline Factor VIII level. If Factor VIII was greater than 20%, 30% in case of major surgery, the patients received only 1 infusion 1 hour prior to surgery. If Factor VIII was equal to or less than 20%, or 30% in case of major surgery, there were two possibilities, either to administer 2 infusions prior to surgery, the first one 12 or 24 hours before the procedures, and the second one, 1 hour before surgery. If this was impossible, especially in case of

emergency, 1 infusion of Factor VIII was given 15-3- minutes after the infusion of vWF and surgery was started in the following 30 minutes.

(Slide)

In 31 cases of minor surgery and 23 cases of major surgery patients received only 1 infusion 1 hour prior to surgery. This is the dosage in both situations, 51-55 ristocetin factor per kilogram, which represents 5 or 6 U/kg of Factor VIII. You can see the baseline levels of the patients.

So, when starting surgery the mean Factor VIII level was 67% or 88% and ristocetin cofactor was around 100% in both groups. Of course, there were no type 3 in this series.

(Slide)

Eleven procedures were performed following the administration of 2 infusions, around 40 U/kg ristocetin cofactor for both injections in minor surgery, and 50 U/kg for both injections in major surgery. You can also see the baseline levels. At the time of surgery no patient had less than 53% Factor VIII in case of minor surgery, and 69% in case of major surgery. Ristocetin cofactor was totally normalized in the majority of patients.

(Slide)

In 11 cases patients received von Willebrand factor plus Factor VIII at first infusion. The plasma Factor VIII concentrate was administered at a dosage of around 50 U/kg, while vWF was infused at 50 U/kg. You can see the baseline levels of Factor VIII and ristocetin cofactor. When starting surgery, Factor VIII was greater than 65% in all patients. Ristocetin cofactor was almost normalized, with the exception of one patient with an acquired von Willebrand disease who maintained very low ristocetin cofactor activity while undergoing total hip replacement.

(Slide)

During the postoperative period vWF was infused at a dosage of 30-35 U/kg ristocetin cofactor activity every 12 or 24 hours. This kept the Factor VIII level around 120% or 130% and ristocetin cofactor around 80%. Patients received 1-11 infusions in the case of minor surgery and 6-16 infusions for major surgery.

(Slide)

I will not detail all the content on this slide on type 2N. In these cases, we mainly have to deal with low Factor VIII levels while ristocetin cofactor might be totally normal. So, in fact, these patients have not been treated differently from the others. For 9 episodes, 2 were

1	treated with 1 infusion prior to surgery; 2, with 2
2	preoperative infusions; and the others, with von Willebrand
3	factor plus Factor VIII.
4	(Slide)
5	We have only limited experience with the vWF
6	binding collagen assay in patients and their replacement
7	therapy. When they were performed, we noticed that this
8	assay gave lower values than ristocetin cofactor, especially
9	in type 2A. But, once more, our experience is very limited.
10	(Slide)
11	So, in conclusion, 75 patients affected with
12	different types of von Willebrand disease have been treated
13	with the vWF concentrate in various circumstances. No
14	hemorrhagic complication was observed in any of the
15	patients. Whatever the protocol used, we observed that
16	ristocetin cofactor was generally greater than 90% and
17	Factor VIII greater than 60% at surgery, mounting to greater
18	than 80% and 110% respectively in the postoperative period.
19	(Slide)
20	When tested, the collagen-binding assay gave
21	slightly lower values than ristocetin cofactor. Ristocetin
22	cofactor was the only information given to the clinicians,
23	aware of the los Factor VIII content.
2.4	Lastly ristocetin cofactor allowed modulation not

only of the von Willebrand factor but also the Factor VIII concentration, which is specially important in the case of surgery and provided efficient therapeutic protocols.

Thank you.

DR. WHITE: Thank you very much, Dr. Goudemand.

The last speaker of this session is Dr. Hans Peter Schwarz,
who is Director of Research and Development in the Division
of Blood Products and Therapeutics at Immuno, in Vienna,
Austria. The title of his talk is "Preclinical Evaluation
of Recombinant von Willebrand Factor."

Preclinical Evaluation of Recombinant von Willebrand Factor

DR. SCHWARZ: Good afternoon, Dr. White. Good afternoon, ladies and gentlemen. First of all, I would like to thank Mark Weinstein for the kind invitation to participate in this meeting, and we are very honored, from Vienna, to be able to be here.

Being the last speaker, I have the privilege to think over what we heard in the last few hours, and I think I will have to disappoint you because my presentation will not contribute to any clarification and to the objectives of this meeting, rather, I think it will increase the overall confusion regarding assays and related problems.

(Slide)

24 Being the last speaker, I can also show you an

introductory slide to von Willebrand factor, and maybe the problems arise from the fact that this protein is too complicated. It has too many functions. And we, clinicians, have to blame the protein for being too complicated.

Anyway, this is just a structural outline with the various domains of the von Willebrand factor. There is a large propeptide. There is a Factor VIII binding site.

There are binding sites for the glycoprotein 1B, heparin, collagen and other collagen-binding sites, and platelet receptor binding sites.

As you are all aware, C terminal dimers form in the ER and end terminal multimerization forms in the Golgi and post-Golgi, and this protein grows to become the largest plasma protein in the circulation.

(Slide)

Now, von Willebrand factor is synthesized in endothelial cells as a 2791 amino acid containing the provon Willebrand factor molecule. Pro-von Willebrand factor consists of, as I mentioned before, a large propolypeptide which contains 741 amino acids, and this is also called von Willebrand antigen-2, and a mature von Willebrand factor monomer.

24 (Slide)

We know that about 95% of the von Willebrand factor is secreted via the so-called constitutive pathway, and this consists of incompletely processed material which has a limited degree of polymerization and is functionally immature. Also, some mature von Willebrand factor and the propeptide is released or secreted via this pathway. About 5% of the synthesized von Willebrand factor is stored in the Weibel-Palade bodies or in the alpha granules of platelets and this is fully processes; it is biologically active and only released upon stimulation.

(Slide)

Why is this important for considering recombinant von Willebrand factor? Based on these facts and observations that there is both processed propeptide freed from von Willebrand factor as well as unprocessed material in the human body in the circulation, we made the decision to make both, two candidate preparations of von Willebrand factor, one which is fully processed and another one which is a mixture of processes and unprocessed material.

(Slide)

So, I will show you some preclinical data of our recombinant von Willebrand factor candidate 1, which is fully processed, and this is achieved by furin coexpression, and furin is a propeptide processing enzyme; it is a

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

heptidase which cleaves arg sequences, and I will show you data on candidate 2, which contains 50% pro-von Willebrand factor unprocessed, having the propeptide linked to the mature form and processed material. Of course, there is no furin coexpression involved in candidate 2. (Slide) This material is expressed in CHO cells. Candidate 1 is purified by affinity chromatography using various steps of heparin sepharose. It is fully glycosyslated and multimerized, and <u>in vitro</u> characterizations suggest that it binds to collagen under high shear rate conditions compared to plasma-derived von Willebrand factor and it stabilizes Factor VIII in vivo. (Slide) This is a comparison of the multimers of plasmaderived von Willebrand factor with the recombinant von Willebrand factor. Using a 2% agarose gel, the multimers in plasma dissolve in the classical triplet structure, having the intermediate band and the lower and faster migrating band. This is apparently not the case for the multimers present in the CHO-derived recombinant material. (Slide) This is also shown on this slide using two-

dimensional gel electrophoresis to demonstrate differences

between plasma-derived von Willebrand factor, von Willebrand factor circulating in plasma and recombinant material. All the multimers in the recombinant von Willebrand factor consist of intact subunits of about 225,000 molecular weight. No other split products are visible.

But if you look at the left side of the slide you see the same analysis performed for the plasma-derived von Willebrand factor, and you can see that the intermediate band of the multimer consists of three different structures, one having a molecular weight of 225,000, a band of 140,000 and 85,000, which is also demonstrated here. Now, the fast band of the triplet contains two bands, 225,000 and 140,000, and the lower migrating band has 225,000 and another band of molecular 80,000. So thee is a real difference between recombinant and plasma-derived von Willebrand factor

(Slide)

Is this a concern for us? Does it mean that this is something not physiologic that we have in our hands, derived from CHO cells? This is again a comparison of the multimeric structure between plasma recombinant plateletderived and endothelial cell-derived von Willebrand factor. You see that, in fact, only the plasma-derived von Willebrand factor multimers consist of the triplet structure with two satellite bands and one intermediate, recombinant

only intact multimers. This is also true for plateletderived von Willebrand factor, as well as endothelialderived human von Willebrand factor. For platelet and
endothelial, no satellite band formation is detectable using
these methods.

(Slide)

Where does the satellite triplet structure derive from? There is apparently a specific protease which cleaves the von Willebrand factor supplement at this tyrosine 842 methyrine 843, generating two polypeptides of this molecular weight.

(Slide)

This is the so-called depolymerase or von
Willebrand factor-specific protease, which is a high
molecular weight protein which needs to be activated to
cleave von Willebrand factor. It is activated by low salt
concentrations or urea or conditions of high shear stress.

It seems that high shear and all these other influences,
such as low ionic strength or guanidine chloride -- they
reside into a modulation of the three-dimensional structure
of von Willebrand factor, and then this will lead to an
exposure of the susceptible binding sites within the subunit
of the dimer.

This protease does not degrade fibrinogen,

collagen or albumin. It is not inhibited by leupeptin or classic serine protease inhibitors. it is also not present in platelets. Recently it was found that the activity of this protease is either absent or defective in chronic relapsing TTP.

So, we are currently collaborating with Furlan, from Berne, to address different issues regarding the protease and recombinant von Willebrand factor.

You saw this morning that purified protease can cleave recombinant von Willebrand factor in vitro in the presence of high concentrations of urea. However, you will see on the following slide that ex vivo, after the administration of recombinant von Willebrand factor into dogs or pigs with severe von Willebrand disease there is no processing, no proteolytic degradation of the intact multimer.

This is obviously an area of great interest.

Where does this protease really function in vivo? At which stage is it an artifact during blood drawing, fractionation?

Where is the site of the action of this protease in vivo?

(Slide)

I will show you some data we generated in infusion studies using dogs with severe von Willebrand factor disease. We have a dog colony in Vienna and I will show you

data generated with the pigs that we see with von Willebrand disease, which is type 3 in humans. This was in collaboration with the Institut National de la Recherche Agronomique, in France.

(Slide)

The objectives were, of course, to evaluate the <u>in</u> <u>vivo</u> recovery and half-life of human recombinant von
Willebrand factor to see whether or not there is an effect
of human recombinant von Willebrand factor on porcine and
canine Factor VIII <u>in vivo</u>, and to evaluate if there are any
effects of human recombinant von Willebrand factor on
primary hemostasis in those animals.

(Slide)

This is just to demonstrate that the pigs are really deficient in von Willebrand factor antigen. It is below the level of detection. Factor VIII activities are higher than what we know from humans with severe von Willebrand disease. They are between 10% and 24% using the two-stage clotting assay, and similar results using the chromogenic assay.

(Slide)

This is just a slide to remind the audience that the here are differences in the stoichiometry in the human and the porcine system. You should not forget looking at animal

data that the Factor VIII concentration in humans differs very much from this concentration in the porcine system. We only have 0.1 mcg/ml in the human but von Willebrand factor antigen concentration of 10 mcg/ml. So we can assume that 1% to 8% of the von Willebrand factor in the circulation will be saturated with Factor VIII, or 1 Factor VIII molecule per 50-100 von Willebrand factor multimers will bind.

Now, how is it in the porcine? Porcine has a 10fold greater Factor VIII activity. This greater activity is
presumably due to the fact that there is a lower
dissociation rate in the porcine Factor VIII molecule. The
A2 domain dissociates more slowly from the activation
complex than in the human system, and relatively von
Willebrand factor antigen concentration is lower than in
humans. So, more than 50% of the von Willebrand factor in a
pig is saturated with Factor VIII.

(Slide)

Primary hemostasis, a surrogate marker of efficacy, was evaluated by the so-called ear-emersion bleeding time where standardized incisions are performed at the edge of the pig's ear and the ear is placed in a beaker, and you can either measure bleeding time or measure the hemoglobin content in this liquid. The pigs bleed more than

30 minutes and they would apparently bleed to death, and cessation is achieved by electric cauterization.

(Slide)

This is a 2% agarose analysis of blood samples taken after the infusion of 35 ristocetin cofactor units in such a pig with severe von Willebrand's disease. This demonstrates the metabolic clearance of the infused multimers over time. You will appreciate that the high molecular forms of the multimers are cleared faster from the circulation than the low molecular weight forms.

(Slide)

This summarizes one experiment demonstrating results of some biologic assays. the red bars indicate the bleeding time. It was longer than 30 minutes. Cessation was performed by electric cauterization. Also, this was true for the measurement taken at 3 hours after the administration of recombinant von Willebrand factor. However, there was a surprising finding at 24 hours after this single dose administration, there was a spontaneous cessation of bleeding at about 30 minutes, and this effect on primary hemostasis was sustained for another 12 hours because at 32 hours there was still a spontaneous cessation of the prolonged bleeding in this single experiment.

MILLER REPORTING COMPANY, INC.

We also see that upon administration of

recombinant von Willebrand factor there is a rapid rise of endogenous porcine Factor VIII. This is the insert of the metabolic clearance of the multimers in this experiment.

You also see von Willebrand factor antigen levels, and the discrepancy between ristocetin cofactor activity and antigen after this infusion experiment.

(Slide)

This is another experiment using 70 ristocetin cofactor units and the disappearance of multimers over time. For longer than 70 hours recombinant von Willebrand factor multimers are detectable in animals.

(Slide)

This just shows you the remarkable effect of human recombinant von Willebrand factor on stabilizing porcine

Factor VIII. At this time point hardly any multimers are detectable in the circulation. However, Factor VIII is still 2- or 3-fold increased as compared to baseline. No ristocetin cofactor activity is detectable at this time point.

(Slide)

This summarizes some of the infusion experiments, and shows differences in half-life between human, porcine and recombinant von Willebrand factor in the porcine model of severe von Willebrand disease. The mean half-life for

porcine von Willebrand factor in the pigs is about 7 hours. Human plasma-derived, one experiment, 7 hour half-life, and for the recombinant, three experiments were performed, 32 hours, 11 hours and 16 hours. There is a trend to suggest that the half-life of the recombinant material is substantially longer than porcine and human.

(Slide)

This is representative of the Dutch Quaker dogs.

These are the dogs with severe von Willebrand's disease. We have recently identified the molecular defect underlying this disease, and this is caused by a splicide mutation resulting in a mutation within the von Willebrand factor propeptide.

(Slide)

Despite the fact that no von Willebrand factor antigen is detectable in dogs with severe von Willebrand's disease, they have relatively high Factor VIII activity levels in the circulation, a mean of 54% using the two-stage clotting and 52% using the chromogenic assay.

(Slide)

This is the normal dog, the multimeric composition of a normal dog, and 5 dogs with severe von Willebrand's disease. They have spontaneous mucous bleeding, nose bleeds, GI bleeds, though their symptoms resemble the

symptoms known in patients with type 3 von Willebrand's disease.

(Slide)

Here again, plasma samples were taken and analyzed on a 2% agarose gel after the administration of 35 ristocetin cofactor units times zero. The disappearance of the high molecular weight forms of recombinant von Willebrand factor is apparently faster than the lower molecular weight forms. There is no indication of a satellite band formation over time in the animals.

(Slide)

The red bars again indicate bleeding intensity, which is expressed as the blood loss in microliters per minute out of cuticle wounds. There is some decrease in the bleeding intensity after 3 hours. However, with no experiment was there a cessation of bleeding from cuticle wounds after the administration of recombinant von Willebrand factor. There is a very rapid rise in canine Factor VIII upon administration of the recombinant material, and a very long-lasting effect of stabilizing Factor VIII at times when von Willebrand factor antigen had disappeared from the circulation.

(Slide)

24 This is just another experiment using a higher

dose, and again a substantial increase in canine Factor VIII. The blue curves indicate the von Willebrand factor antigen measurements, and the green curves the ristocetin cofactor activity.

Also, experiments here are limited because of the few number of experiments performed, but also here there is a clear impression that the half-life of the recombinant von Willebrand factor is substantially longer, 21, 22 and 12 hours, as compared to one experiment using plasma-derived material. This slide also shows the recovery data.

In essence, we need more experiments, of course, and it is clear that the half-life of the recombinant material is longer than the plasma-derived equivalence. The reasons for this currently aren't clear, but it is very likely that this is due to the fact that the recombinant von Willebrand factor represents an intact molecule structure and is not processed. But there might be other reasons for that prolonged half-life.

(Slide)

Here we had occasion to test a fraction of recombinant material just containing low molecular weight multimers in a canine experiment.

(Slide)

24 It just shows that if you administer recombinant

von Willebrand factor which lacks intermediate and high molecular forms you also obtain a significant Factor VIII stabilizing effect, and this is only to confirm in vivo what was known for quite a while for in vitro data, that the Factor VIII stabilizing effect is independent of the degree of multimerization.

(Slide)

This is a dog which had a severe and almost life-threatening nose bleed. He was treated with 75 ristocetin cofactor units of the recombinant material, and cessation of this nose bleed occurred within 3 hours without any concomitant treatments.

(Slide)

This is just again the multimers of the blood samples taken after this emergency treatment in the dog.

The high molecular forms already disappeared within 30 minutes after the administration, and at 24 hours only very few multimers are still detectable in the circulation.

Despite this interesting observation of rapid clearance of multimers in an animal which has a bleeding problem, there was a clear hemostatic effect.

(Slide)

I can summarize what we learnt from infusion studies with the recombinant von Willebrand factor candidate

Of course, this material was well tolerated in dogs and 2 No thrombocytopenia occurred, and the biologic activity of recombinant von Willebrand factor was 3 4 demonstrated by some surrogate markers, bleeding time, 5 effective stabilization, in vivo. One single experiment 6 would suggest that it has clinical efficacy, at least in the 7 canine model. 8 (Slide) Let me turn now to candidate 2, which is a mixture 9 10 of unprocessed and processed von Willebrand factor. 11 (Slide) 12 Just to remind you that furin, which we used in candidate 1, would cleave the propeptide at this site. 13 14 (Slide) 15 Candidate 2 has a specific activity of 60 or 16 greater ristocetin cofactor units per milligram protein; a 17 specific antigen content of about 2 mg antigen/mg protein. CHO proteins are below 80 mcg/mg antigen. CHO DNA is below 18 19 1 mg/antigen, and mouse IgG below 20 ng/mg antigen. 20 material is purified using monoclonal antibody affinity 21 chromatography. 22 (Slide) 23 Here again is a comparison between candidate 1 and candidate 2 using an SDS-PAGE under reducing conditions.

This is the fully processed material and here is a mixture of the processed and unprocessed von Willebrand factor containing the propeptide.

(Slide)

Here again are SDS-PAGE blood samples taken after the administration of 70 units in a pig with severe von Willebrand's disease. This is the material infused, pro-von Willebrand factor and mature von Willebrand factor. You can see that the pro-von Willebrand factor-containing material disappears somehow faster from the circulation. It is suggested that this is due to propeptide processing which takes place in the circulation.

(Slide)

Here the same samples were analyzed using 2% agarose gel. If you look at this polymer which is the concentrate which was administered to peak, you will see that this band is a polymer consisting of a mixture of processed and unprocessed material. But within 30 minutes after the infusion you see that this picture changes and really reflects what we saw previously using the processed von Willebrand factor. So this is also suggestive that in vivo in the circulation propeptide removal takes place and these multimers are converted to multimers containing the mature von Willebrand factor. Again, there is no triplet

structure formation over time.

(Slide)

This is an ex vivo experiment which was performed by Ludwig Drouet with pigs. It just shows that 3 hours after the administration of 70 units of this material there is an increase in platelet adhesion to a collagen-containing surface. So, the recombinant material was able to mediate ex vivo platelet adhesion to a nice extent. This was lost 72 hours after the infusion.

(Slide)

This is a similar experiment performed in another dog with severe von Willebrand's disease. Again, the material infused was the mixture of propeptide-containing and processed mature von Willebrand factor. The propeptide-containing material seems to disappear faster, at least on these gels.

(Slide)

This is a comparison if you do an experiment with plasma-derived von Willebrand factor. In this case it was Humate-P. Of course, Humate-P does not contain unprocessed propeptide-containing von Willebrand factor. So, there is no band here as compared to candidate 2. But please note the difference in the half-life. There is nothing visible at 48 hours in such an animal. If you compare this to our

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

previous slide, at least at 95 hours there was still von Willebrand factor detectable. (Slide) So, again confirmation of prolonged half-life of recombinant material. (Slide) Here again is the analysis of the multimers which in 20 minutes in this case converts to the multimeric pictures consistent with fully processed multimeric composition. (Slide) You can also measure the propeptide release which takes place in the circulation when this material is administered to a dog. Using an ELISA assay, we could see a rapid increase in measurable propeptide and fast elimination of the propeptide from the circulation of the dog. So, this confirms really that propeptide processing of unprocessed von Willebrand factor can take place in the circulation. (Slide) Also, this is not a reason to be worried because Jon Van Mourik and others could demonstrate that there is von Willebrand factor propeptide concentration measurable in

normal human plasma; that upon administration of DDAVP

propeptide would increase but also unprocessed von

Willebrand factor is detectable in normals upon DDAVP administration, but also in situations of inflammation, stress and sepsis shock syndromes. What we really wanted to mimic with the recombinant approach was a physiological situation and I think this is confirmed by the data provided by others.

(Slide)

An interesting observation we made in one dog was that upon administration of propeptide-containing von Willebrand factor there was a rapid increase in thrombin generation in such an animal. This is very surprising because at that time there is no change in Factor VIII levels whatsoever. We have to keep in mind that only the von Willebrand factor was administered in one animal. However, there is a very rapid increase in thrombin generation.

So, there is thrombin generation <u>ex vivo</u> using a platelet-dependent thrombin generation assay, and at different time points the thrombin generated was measured and the decline in this so-called thrombin potential seems to parallel with the propeptide levels in the circulation of the animals. We were also able to confirm this now in other animal studies. So this opens a completely new area of investigation. What is the role of unprocessed von

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

Willebrand factor? What is the role, if any, of propeptide in the circulation? Maybe it will open new development of assays.

(Slide)

With my last slide just to share our current interest in the propeptide area. I mean, it is well known that the propeptide is very important intracellularly because it mediates the intracellular polymerization of the There are some extracellular functions already known for the isolated propeptide. It seems to have some tissue factor inducing activity. It binds to laninine and collagen, and also mature von Willebrand factor. This could potentially create a problem. There seems to be competition between the propeptide and mature von Willebrand factor for some binding sites. So, it needs to be investigated whether this could create a problem with the unprocessed material in achieving optimal hemostasis. It has some cytokine The propeptide is also a substrate for activity. transglutaminase and, very interestingly, it was shown that it binds to the very late antigen-4.

(Slide)

Infusion of candidate 2 was also well tolerated in dogs and pigs. The <u>in vivo</u> properties are comparable to those of candidate 1. I couldn't show you all the details

	216
1	but, in essence, it stabilizes Factor VIII. It prolongs the
2	half-life; it has a prolonged half-life as compared to
3	plasma-derived von Willebrand factor, and it is pretty clear
4	now that propeptide removal takes place in the circulation.
5	(Slide)
6	I would like to acknowledge my co-workers, the
7	Molecular Biology Group, headed by Prof. Dorner, in Vienna,
8	pharmacology, vascular biology and toxicology, and I really
9	would like to acknowledge also the very helpful and fruitful
10	discussions wit Ed Gomperts and Don Baker, and Ludwig
11	Drouet, Jon Mourik and Prof. Mertens and several groups from
12	in France.
13	Thank you very much for your attention.
14	DR. WHITE: Thank you very much, Dr. Schwarz and,
15	again, I apologize to Dr. Retzios and Dr. Schwarz for the
16	feedback that was occurring.
17	Since we have the table up here, it might be
18	easiest to do the questions and answers from the table, so
19	if I could get the speakers to come up and just sit at the
20	table, and then we can perhaps direct questions to the
21	speakers at the table. Dr. Lusher?
22	Question and Answer Period
23	DR. LUSHER: These were all fascinating talks,
24	hearing about those studies that have been done with these

various products. I have two questions for Dr. Retzios, with the Alphanate studies, the bleeding patients and the surgical patients.

You may have indicated this and I missed it, but how was the dose arrived at? For surgery it looked like 60 units of ristocetin cofactor per kilogram was given.

DR. RETZIOS: Sixty units ristocetin cofactor per kilogram was the initial dose, the presurgery dose. After that, the guidelines for dosing stated that the physicians can dose at 40-60 for the first two to three postoperative days. We recommend reduction of dosing to 20-30 units of ristocetin cofactor activity for the remainder of the treatment period. Dosing did not exactly go according to our guidelines. People reduced the dosing in time rather than units per kilogram. So, infusion frequency changed rather than dosing levels.

DR. LUSHER: In terms of the initial dose you chose and the range for thereafter, was that empiric? How did you arrive at that?

DR. RETZIOS: How did we arrive at 60 units?

Well, first of all, when we first designed the protocol we were certain that a certain number of our investigators were interested in having the bleeding time corrected prior to going into surgery. So, we knew that with using the highest

dose that we tested in part I we would have our best opportunity to correct the bleeding time, using 60 units of ristocetin per kilogram. So, we started with that.

A number of investigators stated that they wouldn't proceed with surgery unless the bleeding time was at least partially corrected. So, at that point we felt that it was best to set the initial, presurgery dose at 60 U/kg.

DR. LUSHER: So if you were to, yourself, then write a package insert for this product at this point, I mean as an indication for von Willebrand in surgery, would you then say the initial dose should be 60 ristocetin cofactor units per kilogram?

DR. RETZIOS: On the basis of the success of the protocol so far, I don't see why not.

DR. LUSHER: Okay. Then I have one more question. In terms of your evaluation of clinical efficacy for the surgical patients, you stated -- and I think it is in the abstract as well -- that blood loss remained below or at levels predicted for normal non-von Willebrand patients subjects. I wondered how you determined that.

DR. RETZIOS: How did I determine that?

DR. LUSHER: How did you determine what would be

24 normal?

1	DR. RETZIOS: Well, both blood loss prediction and
2	actual blood loss are relatively blunt instruments to use,
3	but they were I think the best under those circumstances.
4	The way that we determined those, we asked the principal
5	investigator to fax to us a prediction of a blood loss for a
6	patient of similar stature, age or sex at least 24 hours
7	prior to the operation. So, we retained that data and then
8	we asked the anesthesiologist or the attending surgeon to
9	estimate the blood loss that occurred during the surgery.
10	In addition, we take CBC prior and 24 hours after
11	the operation. So, we just tried to, you know, really gauge
12	how much blood loss we really had.
13	DR. WHITE: Other questions? Dr. Montgomery?
14	DR. MONTGOMERY: Peter, on the thrombin generation
15	with the propeptide, did you not see that when you infused
16	the material that didn't have the propeptide?
17	DR. SCHWARZ: That is right.
18	DR. MONTGOMERY: As far as the question of whether
19	it is degraded or whether has more rapid clearance, you
20	would expect that if you followed the half-life of the
21	material, if it was clearance it would be related to that
22	fraction that was lost because there would be accelerated
ı	
23	clearance of the total material. Was there any difference

at your distribution, what do you estimate the amount of pro-vWF is? About 15%, 20%?

DR. SCHWARZ: It is more than that. It is about 50%. However, on the left-hand side of the gel -- you would believe that it is 50-50. Right? If you analyzed the material. But this did not come out using the samples and applying them to the gels. There is less signal. I don't know the reasons but there is less material visible also when you do measurements of the bands. There is less propeptide-containing von Willebrand factor than there is apparently in the circulation. So, it seems to be a problem of the method, the sensitivity of the SDS-PAGE. Did I answer your question?

DR. WHITE: Peter, let me make sure I understand what your answer is. You are saying that on the slide that you showed, on the right-hand side was your concentrate which showed about equal amounts of pro-vWF and mature vWF. Then all of the samples on the left-hand side of that slide were after you had infused the von Willebrand factor, and there the density of the pro-vWF band looked considerably less than the density of the mature vWF.

I think what Bob's question is, it was 50% in the concentrate but it looks like it is closer to 10% or 15% once you infuse it. Does that represent a difference in

SDS-PAGE, or does it represent a difference in recovery of the two species of von Willebrand factor once you have infused them?

DR. SCHWARZ: It could represent a difference in recovery. It could represent that within 20 minutes -- because the first sample is either 20 minutes or 30 minutes after the administration -- that within this time you have already removed relatively more propeptide-containing material, or it has been already processed. So, at 20 minutes there is a difference between the processed and unprocessed material. The bands are much fainter for the propeptide-containing material.

DR. BARROWCLIFFE: I have a couple of questions on the measurement of ristocetin cofactor activity in the products. Maybe Dr. Friedebold and Dr. Mazurier, could you comment on the degree of parallelism with the plasma standard for your products? Secondly, did you look at the effects of prediluting in von Willebrand factor-deficient plasma?

DR. MAZURIER: We used the plasma standard because there is no concentrate available. So we predilute the concentrate in albumin because we have previously shown that the predilution in albumin and in plasma-deficient von Willebrand factor, either plasma from a severe type 3

1	patient or immunodepleted plasma, the results are the same.
2	DR. WHITE: Dr. Friedebold, could you comment?
3	DR. MAZURIER: As far as parallelism is concerned,
4	it is difficult to answer because we have a semi-
5	quantitative assay. But it looks proportional.
6	DR. BARROWCLIFFE: Okay, it looks parallel.
7	DR. MAZURIER: Yes, but it is semi-quantitative.
8	DR. FRIEDEBOLD: With our ristocetin cofactor test
9	we also have calibration against the WHO standard, and we
10	predilute in albumin too.
11	DR. BARROWCLIFFE: Did you look at the effects of
12	prediluting in deficient plasma?
13	DR. FRIEDEBOLD: No.
14	DR. BARROWCLIFFE: Could I just have one more
15	question for Peter Schwarz?
16	DR. WHITE: Sure.
17	DR. BARROWCLIFFE: As far as I could tell, the
18	ratio of ristocetin cofactor activity to antigen in your
19	product was quite low, around 0.2 or 0.25. Was that the
20	same for both candidate preparations, and could you comment
21	on why that might be?
22	DR. SCHWARZ: It was pretty much the same. You
23	are absolutely right. I have no further explanations.
24	DR. WHITE: Do you have any thoughts, Trevor?

sgg 223

DR. BARROWCLIFFE: No.

DR. FEDERICI: I have a question for Dr. Menache. In your presentation, and also in the paper, you point out that the Factor VIII C rate of synthesis is 6 U/dl/h. Did you calculate with a dosage of 100 U/kg, and is there any relationship between the amount of von Willebrand factor that you infuse into the patient? My question is, is it possible to increase this kind of rate if you give more von Willebrand factor, or is it not dependent on the dosage of the concentrate?

DR. MENACHE: In the publication, if I recall well, we had 5 patients at 50 units and only 2 patients at 100 U/kg. The rate of appearance in the circulation of Factor VIII seems a little bit faster with the higher dose. The mean that you saw here is putting together the 5 patients with 50 units and the 100 units. So it was 10 infusions. It is a combination of all the results for all the patients because we only have 10.

DR. FEDERICI: So what you are saying is that your expectation is that if you give to the patient 200 U/kg you would have a better increase? You don't know?

DR. MENACHE: I don't think so.

DR. FEDERICI: You don't think so?

DR. MENACHE: I don't think so.

DR. KESSLER: Perhaps Dr. Goudemand or Dr. Menache
mentioned this in their presentations but I don't recall,
that is, picking up on Dr. Lusher's idea of what you would
suggest if you were going to license your product and have
some guidelines for treatment of surgical patients with type
3 von Willebrand's disease with the high-purity von
Willebrand factor concentrate. Would you being your
treatment the night before, 24 hours before surgery in order
to assure that your Factor VIII concentration is adequate on
the day of surgery?

Secondly, you didn't mention whether or not you noted any formation of inhibitors in your patients, and I would like to know if you have any information on that.

DR. MENACHE: We have not treated currently many patients. For the patients we have treated, the dosage that we have recommended to evaluate for efficacy is based on the results of the pharmacokinetics. So, they are not pulled out of the air. We recommended for surgery to evaluate treating the patients 24 hours before surgery with 100 ristocetin cofactor per kilogram, and then 1 hour before surgery 50 units ristocetin and every day 50 units. The time of treatment will vary depending on the type of surgery and what is expected. So, the physician will have to determine the number of days which, of course, will not be

the same if it is a hip surgery or if it is an appendectomy, for example, although we have determined that we need a minimum of treatment days.

Now, our experience is limited and we are evaluating the efficacy on the basis of that protocol. We have so far had 1 patient treated for an ankle fusion, and that is the slide that I showed. This patient was treated with 100 units and then 50 units every 24 hours for 10 days, and then 50 units every 48 hours for another 7 days. This same patient had knee prosthesis a year later and the patient was treated the same way.

I know that Jenny Goudemand treats differently, and she has much more experience so she should tell you what she does.

DR. GOUDEMAND: In this series there were 2 patients with type 3 who underwent total knee replacement, and these 2 patients were treated by Yvette Suttan, in Paris, with exactly the same protocol. They received the day before 100 U/kg and the day of surgery 50 U/kg. At the time of surgery they both had Factor VIII levels around 80%. After that they received only 1 infusion per day, 50 U/kg and they kept the Factor VIII level around 100%, 120% maybe. So, I proceed differently but I did not have to treat type 3 patients, but usually we gave the first infusion 12 hours

1	before surgery. But maybe it is too early before surgery.
2	DR. WHITE: Jenny or Doris, what would you do in
3	the case of an emergency surgery situation? If it were an
4	automobile accident and you needed immediate hemostasis,
5	what would you do?
6	DR. MENACHE: I would give the first infusion of
7	von Willebrand factor concentrate, one infusion of Factor
8	VIII at 50 U/kg, and then only von Willebrand factor in
9	order to immediately increase the Factor VIII level.
10	DR. WHITE: I would do the same thing.
11	DR. MONTGOMERY: I think it was in the Alpha
12	study, you had 2 patients with antibodies?
13	DR. RETZIOS: Yes.
14	DR. MONTGOMERY: Those were von Willebrand factor
15	antibodies or Factor VIII?
16	DR. RETZIOS: Yes, von Willebrand factor
17	antibodies.
18	DR. MONTGOMERY: Tell me what a Bethesda unit of
19	von Willebrand factor is.
20	DR. RETZIOS: Okay. The study where we determined
21	approximately 1.2 Bethesda units was done by Dr. David
22	Green, at Northwestern
23	DR. MONTGOMERY: But this is a Bethesda assay
24	against Factor VIII?

sgg 227

DR. RETZIOS: No. It is his assay against von 1 2 Willebrand factor. I think he has published his assay on inhibitors to von Willebrand factor. 3 4 DR. MONTGOMERY: These are inhibitors of 5 ristocetin cofactor activity. DR. RETZIOS: Well, yes, ristocetin or --6 7 DR. MONTGOMERY: I certainly think the likelihood 8 is going to be that the majority of antibodies are not going 9 to be inhibitory there, and it is important that in any 10 clinical studies looking for inhibitors have other methods 11 for that. 12 DR. RETZIOS: David Green has published this 13 assay. DR. WHITE: So one Bethesda unit there is the 14 15 amount of antibody that neutralizes 50% of the ristocetin 16 cofactor activity in plasma? 17 DR. RETZIOS: Yes. 18 DR. WHITE: It is basically the same assay using 19 ristocetin cofactor as an endpoint. 20 That is right. DR. RETZIOS: 21 DR. FEDERICI: May I just make a comment on this 22 issue of the inhibitors? 23 DR. WHITE: You may, indeed. 24 DR. FEDERICI: We have been following that patient

I presented today several times. I don't think it is very good to express the Bethesda units. The assay is a little different. So you have a mixture and you make dilutions and you try to get 50% of inhibition. Okay? But you do an ELISA, for instance, for the residual amount of von Willebrand factor antigen or you can test the ristocetin cofactor in these patients. So, we can roughly calculate this. It is almost the same thing as Bethesda units but as we are dealing with another protein I don't know if it is correct to go through the same definition, but I agree that this is the assay.

The question of these two patients is related.

Were these patients previously untreated?

DR. RETZIOS: No.

DR. FEDERICI: So this is interesting --

DR. RETZIOS: You know, for the second patient, 606, we queried her upon enrollment and we did know that she was infused with cryoprecipitate and other concentrates, and we did know that she had a previous history of inhibitors to von Willebrand factor.

DR. FEDERICI: The reason I am asking is not a silly one. You know, all of us should be aware that now we know how to prevent or to know in advance what the chance is for these patients with type 3 to have development of

sgg 229

inhibitors. So we have the possibility to test at least if 2 there are wide deletions of the von Willebrand factor gene. By taking DNA, if you go to test deletions, the wider the 3 deletion is the higher the possibility is to get 4 5 alloantibody for these patients. The patient I presented 6 has the largest deletion I think you can imagine. 7 you. 8 DR. WHITE: I didn't hear. Were either of those 9 patients' molecular genetics known? 10 DR. RETZIOS: No, at least I don't know but I 11 don't think so. Joist, St. Louis. 12 Given the DR. JOIST: possibility at least that super physiological levels of von 13 14 Willebrand factor might be prothrombotic, I am surprised 15 that none of these trials were designed to infuse the 16 material rather than to give it periodically in boluses. 17 Has anybody experience with infusion of von Willebrand 18 factor preparations?

DR. MENACHE: Savage, in the U.K. has done that and has published on continuous infusion with the LFB concentrate, yes.

19

20

21

22

23

24

DR. JOIST: Do we know what the expected savings would be if we would infuse it, apart from a safety concern?

DR. SCHWARZ: It is widely used in some areas in

1	Germany, continuous infusion of von Willebrand factor
2	concentrates. I think it was published at the ISCH by
3	Aureswald, in Bremen, continuous infusion.
4	DR. FEDERICI: In the issue of 1994, <u>Thrombosis</u>
5	<u>Hemostasis</u> , the group of Hama, Bona, Zimmerman, Carter,
б	Herbert and Rickles published a report about continuous
7	infusion of CO-8
8	DR. MENACHE: Yes, but the question was purified
9	concentrate. That is why I answered it.
10	DR. FEDERICI: Yes, but this was just another
11	issue that people were trying to save Factor VIII
12	concentrate to do infusion.
13	DR. WHITE: I wonder if I might ask a question.
14	It sounded like many of you saw and observed that the von
15	Willebrand factor antigen half-life was longer than the von
16	Willebrand factor activity half-life after infusion. I
17	think Dr. Schwarz, in his last slide, showed a nice fall-off
18	on the high molecular weight multimers. I usually think of
19	smaller molecules as being cleared faster than larger
20	molecules. So, I have a series of questions.
21	One is, why are the large molecular weight
22	multimers preferentially cleared? Second, does anybody
23	remember if that same sort of thing was observed with
24	cryoprecipitate, that is, was there a differential clearance

1	between von Willebrand factor activity in antigen? Then,
2	finally, why does the Factor VIII stay up after the von
3	Willebrand factor antigen is long gone?
4	DR. MONTGOMERY: The question on cryo, I can tell
5	you we took a person through a patent ductus with cryo and,
6	very clearly, the high molecular weight multimers are gone
7	earlier. I don't know the answer, whether it is degradation
8	of those to smaller as opposed my thoughts have always
9	been that functional multimers get cleared faster because
10	they get used, and that the ones that are left behind are
11	the ones that are not as functional and, therefore, not
12	consumed.
13	DR. SCHWARZ: It could be multiplicity of binding
14	sites that is greater for high molecular forms and then they
15	have a higher potential to have receptor-mediated clearance.
16	But what is really intriguing is the fact that there is no
17	detectable von Willebrand factor antigen, however, Factor
18	VIII is still very high. So, what is the mechanism behind
19	that?
20	DR. WHITE: I think Dr. Mazurier knows the answer
21	to that.
22	DR. MAZURIER: I don't know, but maybe when cryo
23	was infused von Willebrand factor antigen was assayed with
24	the Laurell assay, and we know perfectly that when low

molecular weight multimers are analyzed there is an overestimation of von Willebrand factor antigen when using the Laurell assay. So you have a discrepancy between von Willebrand factor antigen and ristocetin cofactor which may be due to overestimation of antigen.

DR. WHITE: One possible explanation of the Factor VIII is that if you take a person with severe von Willebrand's and give Factor VIII, of course, you get a short T-1 half of Factor VIII. Maybe there is some saturation of clearance mechanisms by that von Willebrand factor so that it is no longer detectable in the circulation but for some reason it is blocking the clearance of Factor VIII. Is there any evidence for that?

DR. RETZIOS: Well, I don't know if there is any evidence on that. First of all, in your first questions regarding differential clearance of multimers, what I have to say is that the data that I have seen here today and the data that I have generated do not particularly show that to be the case. Yes, you may have disappearance of multimers but it is not due to the fact that they disappear preferentially. We have to differentiate between their loss and rate of disappearance. If they are present in much lower amounts to begin with, they will disappear by 12 hours, 48 hours if the rate of disappearance is constant.

Actually, a lot of the densitometry has been vertical. If you look at the horizontal, as I have sometimes done, you may see that the rate of disappearance actually is the same.

The second thing, regarding the stabilization of Factor VIII, although the assay for von Willebrand factor does not detect a lot of von Willebrand factor or detects a minimal amount of it, if you look at the multimers you will see von Willebrand factor there. That may still be stabilizing the Factor VIII. It is probably a case where the assay is not as sensitive at picking up very many amounts of you Willebrand factor.

DR. MONTGOMERY: Let me comment on that. We talk about a 50:1 ratio of von Willebrand factor to Factor VIII but, I will bet you, as you come down the multimeric scale that ratio doesn't hold. We know that monomeric von Willebrand factor binds Factor VIII probably not with the same affinity. We know from our dimer defect where only vWF dimers are made that it binds Factor VIII but at reduced levels. But it may well be that a molar level there is still a closer relationship between von Willebrand factor and Factor VIII with the smaller ones.

DR. WHITE: All right. Well, with that, I would like to thank the speakers for the session. It has been a fascinating combination of basic science and clinical

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

observations and I would like to give them a hand of applause.

(Brief recess)

Panel Discussion and Questions

DR. RICK: I wonder if we should get started. Ι believe at least one of our panel members has to leave shortly before 5:00. I would like to thank Drs. Federici, Lusher, Montgomery, Pierce and White for participating in the panel discussion. We would like some particularly focused discussion, if we could, on some of the questions that were handed out in your packet and that you see up on the screen, here. There is a lot of information that is asked for, perhaps more than we can expect to get over the next 45 minutes, but at least we would like to touch on the assay question, the in vitro assay reflecting function, in <u>vivo</u> also in terms of some specific questions about the trial designs and how subjects might be selected, and what types of clinical trial designs might be most useful. also in terms of dosing, we have discussed that we have been treating with doses that we are uncertain about, whether we need to be at that level or not. Then data collection if there is time.

So I would like to open the discussion first with the initial question about the <u>in vitro</u> laboratory

	235
1	measurement if further trials are to be done. Maybe I will
2	ask Bob to start on that, and we would invite all of your
3	participation in this. Please use the microphones.
4	DR. MONTGOMERY: I not sure we can necessarily say
5	for sure what the best assay is. I think we can say that
6	probably there is the most familiarity with ristocetin but
7	it is also probably the one that has a lot more variability
8	laboratory to laboratory.
9	If I can just ask a question, in the Alpha study
10	didn't you attempt to standardize the ristocetin cofactor
11	activity in the individual institutions?
12	DR. RETZIOS: (Not at microphone; inaudible)
13	DR. MONTGOMERY: I thought there was some clinical
14	study in which instruments were actually given to the
15	individual centers.
16	DR. RETZIOS: We had samples sent also to a
17	central lab. In 93-01 and right now also in the addendum of
18	the study, we do send samples to a core lab. So, we have
19	two sets of data, data from the individual sites and data
20	from the core lab.
21	DR. MONTGOMERY: I think when it comes to doing
22	studies on patients it is important that the individual
23	centers do the studies because they need the clinical input
24	but, in actuality, I think because with all of these assays

there will be some problems with standardization it is probably preferable that at least some laboratory does them unless it is carefully controlled so that individual laboratories can do it.

I think the issue of collagen binding -- I mean, there are problems with both collagen binding and ristocetin, and what you may want for clinical activity may not be what is best, most desired for the reproducibility of manufacture. I have to say that I probably came into this thinking more and more that collagen binding might be more appropriate until I saw Peter's slide that showed what happens when you take purified von Willebrand factor at room temperature.

But my feeling is that we probably need a specific activity, meaning an amount of an activity, either ristocetin or collagen binding, over an amount of antigen as being an indicator of sort of reproducibility of manufacture. If we are dealing with a recombinant product, like Immuno's, that ratio may be very different than the Humate-P. It doesn't necessarily mean that there is a correct one or a wrong one, it is that one is reproducible and that when patients are infused it would seem logical to infuse them based upon some type of an activity assay and to monitor that activity after infusion.

DR. WEINSTEIN: Just a question on the collagen assay again, if this product became commercially available would you dose on a collagen assay or a ristocetin assay? How would the product be dosed in the case of a recombinant product?

sgg

DR. SCHWARZ: It depends whether or not in the meantime collagen binding activity will also be addressed by the international standards available. The only standard, as we heard several times today, is the plasma standard which has been calibrated to ristocetin cofactor activity. If this is going to be calibrated for collagen binding activity as well, then collagen binding activity would be an appropriate unitage for clinical applications as well.

DR. MONTGOMERY: Does one collagen binding assay give you the same result as another collagen binding assay? In other words, is there comparability between those assays as done, or obviously if everybody is using the same kit it is going to be standardized, which may be your intent. But I think there are other collagen assays that are there, and have these been compared to see whether a unit of collagen binding activity in one assay is the same as another since there may be variability in a ristocetin assay?

DR. SCHWARZ: We have addressed this question internally by developing variants of collagen biding assays

based on different antibodies directed against von
Willebrand factor polyclonals, monoclonals, different
collagens.

We also tried to follow the described methodologies which, as I have pointed out, involve tremendous amounts of collagen bound to the microtiter plate. If it is done within one laboratory the results are comparable. But we have seen that with the routine collagen assays, as described for ten years, we have difficulties with inter-assay reproducibility and also with intra-assay reproducibility. Coating of the microtiter plates was not really homogeneous although we tried our best to do this properly. This is the reason why we came up with the protocol I presented today with the covalent immobilization of the pepsin-digested type 3 collagen.

I hope that there will be a comparison of several collagen-based von Willebrand factor binding assays in the course of the European Pharmacopeia Commission which is currently discussing whether or not collagen should be included as an activity assay for von Willebrand factor containing concentrates. It was restricted for ristocetin cofactor half a year ago and I hope they will add collagen binding as well, but not a special method in general.

DR. WHITE: I think this is a hard question to

answer. I don't know whether you are asking what is the best in vitro test to ask manufacturers to do to indicate the potency on a bottle. I am not sure whether you are asking what is the best in vitro test to determine whether a patient is responding properly to the concentrate.

Those may be two different questions. If the question is the former, I mean, that is a discussable point. If it is the latter, that is, if you are asking what is the best in vitro test to determine whether or not von Willebrand factor is doing what it is supposed to do in a person, I worry a little bit about the tenor of the question because I am not sure there is a best test, and I am not sure that you want to come out of this with a single test.

I still think that the combination and battery of tests that we do may be useful in different patients. Some tests may be useful in one patient and will suffice for one patient, but other tests may be necessary in other patients. What happens when you say there is a single test that is the best test is that people stop doing the other tests and they just do the single best test. Then that is the only test you have.

DR. LUSHER: In that regard though, Gil, which battery would you suggest? I mean, we have seen the problems and we all recognize the problems with bleeding

times. I mean, it is a fairly gross test, depending on who is doing it, and reproducibility leaves something to be desired. It is only transiently corrective. The antigens, as we have heard from many of the clinicians and the surveys we have done, are usually not available to make a clinical decision. So you are left with either Factor VIII or ristocetin cofactor.

DR. WHITE: Well, I still wouldn't exclude a bleeding time. I mean, in the middle of the night in most places the bleeding time is the only thing you can do. You are not going to get a Factor VIII and you are not going to get ristocetin cofactor activity. When it is you and a patient bleeding time is the only thing you can do.

I don't know, I mean, I am struck by the fact that many patients who seem to do well at surgery do not have any correction of their bleeding time. Does that mean that those patients would have done well if you hadn't given them anything? Does it mean the surgeon was just very careful and tied everything off because they knew it was a person with von Willebrand's disease? That is one possibility.

The other possibility is, indeed, that the concentrate did do something and that the bleeding time really doesn't reflect a bleeding tendency. I think all of us have a feeling that maybe bleeding times don't accurately

predict platelet function. I think we feel that more in uremic platelet defects -- at least in my case, I feel that more in uremic platelet defects than I do in von Willebrand's disease.

If I were going to do clinical studies, I would still want to check all of these things, and at the end of the study I would like to say that the following things seem to correlate with hemostatic effectiveness of the product, bleeding time, collagen-binding activity, ristocetin cofactor activity or whatever correlated. For clinical studies, I would still like to see folks do the whole battery of tests. Maybe I am still stuck in an ancient mode though.

DR. LUSHER: If we look at some of the rather extensive observations that have been made, for example by Jenny Goudemand just for one example, where they have looked at all of these things even though they don't get them back for a day or two, yet, have based their clinical judgment and can correlate with the thing that seem to measure the best and correlate with clinical outcome, if I understood correctly, it was the ristocetin cofactor assay.

DR. WHITE: No doubt. I mean, you have to make clinical decisions, and you make clinical decisions based on what you have. But retrospective analysis of data can still

be useful in terms of saying this is and this is not helpful.

DR. FEDERICI: I would like to add this kind of observation, we have to make a distinction. When we want to test a new product we should rely on as many tests as we can get. The other issue is when we want to think about following the efficacy, as far as we know, we don't have all the data available. This comes from the audience today. So, everyone should adjust the dosage by a quick decision by having a test that you can do in about one hour, two hours. So, this is critical. Of course, the test to be used in this kind of assessment should fit this kind of requirement, otherwise you can just make a decision without knowing what is going on.

So we have to adjust our goals. I certainly suggest and encourage using as many -- you know, the first generation, the second and maybe the third generation assays to know what is going on in pharmacokinetics when we infuse our patients. Of course, this is a general statement, von Willebrand factor is multifunctional. Why should we rely on only one test? So, we should understand what is going on in the Factor VIII binding assay and in the Factor VIII domain, in the von Willebrand factor collagen domain because we know that there are different epitopes. They are important for

function.

But this is one story. We have to have as many tests as we can in pharmacokinetics. But, of course, we also have to cope with the fact that by following the patient we should have tests. Bleeding time can be done at the bedside of course. Factor VIII C can be available within one hour. Also, ristocetin cofactor can be done by an aggregometric test in one hour, maybe less.

So, can we rely on other assays, like collagen binding? Are we discussing here about doing the collagen-binding assay in an ELISA system only for one patient? It would cost you \$1000 I think. So we also have to be realistic about that.

So, things are complex but we have to come up with some decisions that really distinguish the situation in trials in terms of pharmacokinetics and efficacy in clinical practice. Of course, this is my opinion.

DR. PIERCE: In order to make a correlation between in vitro activity or a battery of in vitro tests and attainment of clinical hemostasis, any time you look to make a correlation you need to have some patients who don't do as well. If you have uniformly positive experience, then you are still in an uncertain zone. So I think having endpoints that offer a broader range than just a dichotomy -- yes, the

patient did well or, no, the patient did not do well -- may be helpful in allowing us to better understand the correlation between some of these <u>in vitro</u> tests and clinical outcome.

The other point is that if we have two or three <u>in</u> <u>vitro</u> tests which are eventually shown to correlate rather well with clinical outcome and then we evaluated a totally new test, it is not out of the realm of possibility that the new test might actually correlate with the other <u>in vitro</u> tests but then when you try to make the correlation between what happens in the patient clinically in that new test, the correlation might not be as tight.

DR. RICK: One last comment and then we should probably move to the second question.

DR. TURECEK: Can I make one comment on the assays? I would like to come back to what Dr. Federici said. We have to clearly differentiate whether what we are talking about is clinical assessment of von Willebrand disease or von Willebrand concentrate test.

For clinical assessment you should use as many tests as available. For concentrate you should really have a test which is reliable and robust, and this is not the case for ristocetin cofactor assays because, I would remind you, that we depend on a reagent which is very difficult to

standardize and these are human platelets. This is not the case for the collagen binding assays and this is the reason why we are in favor of the collagen binding assay.

DR. LUSHER: In terms of assaying the ristocetin cofactor content of the concentrate, which I think is probably further down our list here but since this is coming up, presumably all of the manufacturers have assayed their products even though they may not have the ristocetin cofactor value in the package insert or on the label. Do we know what they are using as a standard? Are they all using the WHO plasma standard to assign the ristocetin cofactor potency of the vials, or how is this being done? Do we know that?

DR. RICK: Can anyone respond to that?

DR. BARROWCLIFFE: Well, Jeanne, I can tell you just about the ones I know about, which is the Haemate P and the 8Y in the U.K. They are both relating to the WHO plasma standard, either directly or indirectly. I am not sure about the Alpha product and the Immuno product but those two certainly are.

DR. CHANG: Some of them use the WHO standard and some of them use the WHO standard and generate their own inhouse standard.

DR. MAZURIER: As far as any LFB product is

concerned, we use an in-house standard calibrated against the WHO standard.

DR. TURECEK: I can speak for Immuno. What Dr. Chang said applies for us. We calibrate an in-house concentrate standard against the plasma standard. This is then used for routine assaying.

DR. BARROWCLIFFE: Can I just put in a word in defense of the much maligned ristocetin cofactor assay?

Everybody says it is a really lousy assay and the results are all over the place, but if you look objectively at the data in the collaborative studies, it is really not so bad at all. I mean, in the international collaborative study on the plasma standard that we did some years ago the coefficient of variation between labs was 8%. The Factor VIII clotting assay was 7%. So it is really not so bad, at least on that type of sample.

Now, if you look in the concentrate study that Bill Fricke and colleagues did, the variability between labs was around about 15% on most of the concentrates. But the antigen assays had a similar sort of variability. In that situation you have a like versus unlike situation.

We have seen from Dr. Mazurier's data that, in fact, you can get very reproducible results with a fairly simple ristocetin cofactor assay and, in her case, the CVs

were actually just as good, if not better, with the
ristocetin cofactor as the collagen binding. So I think we
can probably do better with the ristocetin cofactor assay
but I would say it is really not as bad as it is made out to
be.

DR. RICK; Thank you. I think we should probably move to thinking a little bit about how subjects might be selected for inclusion into clinical trials. Gil, do you have thoughts about that, and Jeanne, perhaps to start off?

DR. LUSHER: Well, I guess an easy way to start, and then I will turn it over to Gil, is clearly type 3 patients who do not have antibodies to von Willebrand factor and type 2 and type 1 who have low enough levels that they are not candidates for DDAVP I would think would be all good subjects for clinical trials, especially for safety of a product, and then perhaps broken down into subgroups in terms of efficacy studies depending on whether they had severe disease or type 1 disease.

DR. WHITE: Yes, I agree with that. I mean, I see no reason to study type 1 patients who are responsive to DDAVP so basically I would say patients who are unresponsive to DDAVP, which includes all type 3's and most type 2's. That would be what I would say.

DR. MONTGOMERY: And have been treated multiple

times before so that you try to eliminate the new inhibitors at least from the studies that are showing efficacy.

DR. WHITE: Again, as with the Factor VIII studies, if antibody formation is going to be a question that is going to be looked at and, of course, it is, then having molecular types on these people is probably going to be important.

DR. FEDERICI: Just a comment, I agree with all the definitions. So, I am thinking about what we have written in the protocol of the European Community project. So, what we would like to do in this kind of project which, don't forget, is a three-year project, is to select patients in the first year for this kind of trial, with a crossover between Factor VIII, von Willebrand factor and von Willebrand factor with Factor VIII. So we will do an infusion trial to make sure that there is no response.

Of course, I want to comment a little further on the fact that we don't want to use previously untreated patients, of course, and we exclude younger kids. I think that is normal regulation for hemophilia trials. Of course, we are confident that if you have patients who have been given for years, for many years von Willebrand factor concentrate, this situation doesn't have any chance to have inhibitors but, of course, there is a chance to test by

genetics right now if we know for sure that 10% of patients with von Willebrand's disease type 3 can develop von Willebrand factor antibody if they have large deletions. So we are confident that by knowing this we should enroll good and appropriate patients. Of course, the issue will also be raised for the type 2.

We didn't discuss in enough detail but, you know, it is still an open question whether type 2B can be treated with DDAVP. There are reports of people who are showing that you can give DDAVP to a type 2B, or what kind of type 2A or subtype 2A can be treated by DDAVP. So, there is an open question for the type 2B. But, of course, only by discussing with a steering committee in this kind of a multicenter trial will we have the solutions.

DR. PIERCE: In deciding which type 1 patients respond sufficient well to desmopressin to make it unreasonable to go into a trial of one of these concentrate products, what specific cut points would people use, and would they use a combination of cut points, such as ristocetin cofactor activity as well as Factor VIII response, or would they just use the former for example?

DR. FEDERICI: You know that those type 1 who do not show platelet von Willebrand factor measurable, you have a very prolonged bleeding time, very low amount of von

Willebrand factor in their plasma. So if you give DDAVP,
usually you have almost low response. Instead of 30 minutes
of bleeding time you can end up with 20 minutes and the
Factor VIII rises reasonably but not so high and the von
Willebrand factor antigen and ristocetin cofactor move from
the baseline but is not corrected. I mean, it stays still
at low levels, no more than 30, 35. So you don't go for
those patients to surgery with DDAVP alone.
You know, all these kind of parameters should be

discussed in the first steering committee, and this is an important issue because all the partners should agree about these kind of parameters of course. But I think we will come up with a decision and we will make the decision on who the responders are and who are not the responders.

DR. PIERCE: In evaluating that type 1 response, do you advocate using bleeding time?

DR. FEDERICI: Yes, sure.

DR. PIERCE: In conjunction with those other tests.

DR. RICK: Any other comments regarding selection of patients?

DR. RETZIOS: Actually, when the Alpha study started we were officially requested by CBER to use as enrollment criteria the criteria that were included in the

guide that Dr. Manucci offered in the studies for von
Willebrand's disease. In that guide he mentions that
patients should be enrolled that are DDAVP unresponsive or
DDAVP is contraindicated in them.

The point is we later went and clarified what unresponsiveness is. Since our endpoints in the study are that the patients should be reaching at least 50% Factor VIII, ristocetin cofactor and have at least a partial correction in their bleeding time, it appears to me that unresponsiveness to DDAVP should meet similar criteria. If the patients do not achieve 50% Factor VIII, ristocetin cofactor or do not show any improvement in their bleeding time, if any of those do not occur the patient should be regarded as DDAVP unresponsive or as having a limited response to DDAVP.

DR. MENACHE: Could Dr. Federici provide me with some clarification? The selection of your patients that you are discussing now is for a pharmacokinetic study?

DR. FEDERICI: Yes.

DR. MENACHE: Not for efficacy?

DR. FEDERICI: Not for efficacy. I am sorry, I don't want to go into detail because --

DR. MENACHE: No, I understand. When you say you will not include children, this means what age, and if they

are type 3 --

enroll them?

2 DR. FEDERICI: Twelve years old.

DR. MENACHE: And if these patients are type 3 and they are already under replacement therapy you will not

DR. FEDERICI: I think this is maybe an open issue, but in the original protocol submitted to the European Community, as far as I remember, it is 12 years old. But, of course, this can be modified and the steering committee could change its position in terms of previously untreated or previously treated.

DR. MONTGOMERY: Is your concern that they are going to develop inhibitors, or is your concern that the clearance in a child is different?

DR. FEDERICI: We are more concerned about the testing. You know, you are a pediatrician. You know how difficult it is to do bleeding time in those patients. It is one of the parameters we want to test in pharmacokinetics and the bleeding time is still very unpleasant for the patients. So when I see pediatric patients I have problems in convincing the patient, of course, first and then the parents to make at least more than one bleeding times. I am afraid if we ask these kind of patients to repeat bleeding time at least four times, as in the protocol, we will have a

lot of troubles. So I have the feeling I don't have enough experience with patients younger than ten years, and for those patients it is also difficult to standardize the bleeding time. Maybe you have better --

DR. MONTGOMERY: I don't. I don't feel there is a problem with the bleeding time being different in a child over four or five, other than being irritated by having it done.

9 DR. FEDERICI: Yes, yes, maybe that would be a 10 bias.

DR. MACIK: Actually, the question I have as far as patient selection also goes somewhat into the next question of what you are going to study because, although I use DDAVP up front, there are many type 1's who have come in bleeding then require surgery a day or two into it, and you only get so much mileage out of your DDAVP in your type 1's if you have big surgery or you need hemostasis for more than one or two days. So, I would hate to see the type 1's closed out of some of these studies when they are in a situation where DDAVP might not carry them all the way through their planned procedure, or whatever they came in with. Dental surgeries, planned surgeries that are open and shut, those DDAVP covers very well in most patients but we all know there are other situations where you will use up

your DDAVP and I would like to be able to include those patients.

DR. FEDERICI: So, if I understood exactly, your comment is related to long treating with DDAVP. Am I right?

DR. MACIK: Right.

DR. FEDERICI: If you have a patient with type 1 and DDAVP and you go through an operation that takes -- usually we try to cope with this problem, you know, the problem of tachyphylaxis by giving DDAVP three, four times in a certain period of time. Then, if we are lucky -- it depend son the operation, of course, and the surgery. If you can give at least four shots of DDAVP you can survive 48 hours. Then, hopefully, if the patient doesn't have any bleeding you can stop your infusion for maybe one or two days, waiting for the new synthesis of von Willebrand factor in endothelial cells. Then you start over --

DR. MACIK: Right, which sometimes you have the ability to do but I know that depending how low your von Willebrand is. I mean, if you have a mild von Willebrand you can usually get away with that. If you have someone who has little lower levels or, let's say, you throw in a little DIC on top of what is going on so that you are not keeping up your Factor VIII levels, then you need the ability to give something besides DDAVP. It can be problematic

treating those patients. So, you know, when we use concentrates we are not very comfortable stopping after one or two days and then giving them a day off and seeing if they don't bleed and then restarting concentrates. Yet, that is what we do with DDAVP.

I am not against that in a way because it is better than giving a blood product but it needs to be considered in severe surgeries.

DR. FEDERICI: Just a brief reply. You are right. The reason why I was presenting this data bout the registry on vWD in Italy is the fact that we were a little amazed by the fact that we found more type 1 treated with blood concentrate. This comes up maybe with your observations because, you know, if you have a very complicated situation DDAVP can cover you 100%. Maybe you can have sort of mixed treatment, DDAVP and Factor VIII concentrates.

DR. LUSHER: But I think what you are asking though is, are such patients really good candidates for a clinical trial with a new product? I mean, clearly, these other groups are not muddled with other things going on.

DR. MACIK: I guess there is a subset of those that are coming in for big surgery and you can pretty much anticipate that DDAVP for two days -- let's say even a bypass surgery for a moderately severe type 1 von Willebrand

is going to be a little tough to treat with DDAVP only, even though it is a standard surgery, not complicated and is anticipated to go well. That is a patient where you might want a little bit more than just DDAVP coverage, depending on how they go.

DR. MONTGOMERY: Certainly from a clinical standpoint that is important. Those may not be the ones though to include in a clinical trial. No one is trying to withhold the treatment for those patients because they surely need it, but they may not be the ones to best arrive at what the dose is that we should be using.

DR. MACIK: I would concede that. However, these are the patients, just as they found in Italy, that are most often going to get concentrate when all is said and done because the number of type 1 von Willebrand is so much higher than all the 2's and 3's put together and, therefore, have more surgeries, have more problems. So I would concede that maybe for the first studies, although you might consider, if you are going to treat major surgeries, that a certain level of von Willebrand type 1's might still be included.

DR. RICK: I think we have come to the third question here and before Jeanne leaves, I would like to get her feeling about what types of patients, indeed, would be

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

appropriate for a trial and perhaps the question of whether they can have been pretreated with DDAVP, and then if you have any feelings about the fourth question as well in terms of dosing. As Dr. Pierce mentioned, we have had reports today of very uniformly good responses and we don't really know what the dose should be. Do you feel that we can treat with those appropriate doses and half that appropriate dose with, of course, an out to treat again with a higher dose should bleeding occur?

Well, in terms of dosage, you know, DR. LUSHER: one could argue in a number of ways. From what we have read in the literature and what we have heard here today, it seems like many patients are responding extremely well to a dose of like 50 ristocetin cofactor units per kilo for surgery. So, with these products that are in use and have a track record now of being effective, but in order to do studies to give them an indication for von Willebrand's disease -- I guess it comes down to is it an ethical question? We know that 50 U/kg works, say, with product X. Is it really ethical to say, okay, we know that 50 works so let's try 50 versus 10, to make a big difference? Dr. Pierce said this morning if we are doing dosage studies it should be a sufficient power, so in other words a sufficient range, not like 50 versus 40 but something

substantially	less. S	So one o	gets in	nto the	ethical	dilemma
there, is that	really	someth	ing tha	at we sh	nould be	doing?

Or, when a product has been out there and used, like some of the ones we have heard about today, and a certain dosage, albeit empirically, has been used and seems to be effective, should we not just evaluate that and make sure that in a prospective clinical trial setting no one has bleeding, or at least just an occasional person does?

DR. PIERCE: Earlier today there was a comment about the correlation epidemiologically between Factor VIII levels and coronary disease. It certainly seems that if people are just treated sporadically and have sporadically higher Factor VIII levels that is probably not a great worry. But what about severe type 3 patients who really are using the product on a prophylactic basis on a fairly regular basis? There, there may well be an interest in understanding what the minimum dosage interval should be or the minimum dose, or to optimize the ratio of Factor VIII activity to von Willebrand factor activity in order to reduce the theoretical possibility of accelerated atherosclerosis with these products.

DR. LUSHER: Right. There seems to be a variety of types of products out there, as we have heard, in terms of their Factor VIII content versus ristocetin cofactor,

probably all with different potential dosage regimes and potential risks.

DR. PIERCE: The other point is that in considering the ethical issue of looking at lower doses, clearly, we need to do this relatively safely and not put patients at undue risk. But are there certain clinical circumstances, like dental extractions, that would be relatively more safe to try a lower starting dose and then give an increased follow-up dose if bleeding continued?

DR. LUSHER: The problem with dental extractions, at least in my experience, is that local factors play such a role: the operator, the person doing the extraction; the local care of the wound site; whether or not one is allowed to use anti-fibrinolytic agents in the clinical trial. So that perhaps isn't the greatest one to be trying to find the lowest dose, in my opinion.

DR. PIERCE: In cases where there are a lot of confounding factors like that, do you think there would be a role for, for example, randomizing patients to receive fibrin sealants maybe in conjunction with anti-fibrinolytics so that two dosage groups would both get that sort of background standard of care, if you want to call it that, although some of these products are not approved, and then one treatment group would be randomized to additionally

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

being covered with product, and maybe at a couple of different doses.

DR. MONTGOMERY: One comment I have about dental surgery, and in my experience with hemophilia I think we learned the lesson that to prevent a bleed from dental surgery takes one treatment plus an anti-fibrinolytic. Τf you have a breakthrough that occurs because you stopped something too soon and it occurs at day four or five, try to stop that one with one transfusion and anti-fibrinolytics and it doesn't work. I think to subject patients to dental surgery without coverage is not ethical if you know they are a bleeder, just because you want to study it. group that may have to get at what the minimal level is would be to look at prophylaxis at two very dissimilar levels to ask the question of when breakthrough bleeding is going to occur. The problem is going to be -- if any of you have ever prohylaxed against Factor VII deficiency with what used to be prothrombin complexes, the effect far outlives the plasma recovery, and that may well be a problem, particularly since von Willebrand patients don't necessarily bleed twice a week if untreated like, say, some hemophiliac patients do.

DR. WHITE: I worry a little bit about the von
Willebrand factor link and thrombosis and atherosclerosis.

Just because a person with atherosclerosis or thrombosis has a high von Willebrand factor doesn't mean that giving von Willebrand factor will necessary cause thrombosis or atherosclerosis. The high von Willebrand factor may simply be an epiphenomenon from some other factor that is leading to the thrombosis and atherosclerosis.

DR. KESSLER: As a physician treater, I would like to make a plea that we not spend a lot of time discussing minimal dosing but spend more time talking about optimal dosing because if we have to wait to decide what minimal dosing is, we are never going to be able to get this product into the market. The comment was made that we don't know what adequate minimal dosing is for hemophilia at this point. So I think what we should really be looking at is optimal dosing for the largest number of patients who have you Willebrand's disease.

What I am most intrigued with is the issue of thrombogenicity associated with this disease and the treatment of this disease. Dr. Retzios reported one case of thrombotic complications associated with a hemorrhoidectomy that the investigator attributed to prolonged bed rest of immobilization.

I think we have to remember several things. First of all, whenever you design a clinical trial and you

normalize these individuals with their von Willebrand and their Factor VIII level, I think you are going to have to design the trial in such a way that you actually prophylax these individuals the same way you might prophylax a normal individual who is undergoing hip, knee, or any other procoagulant related surgery.

From what Dr. Retzios presented, it almost makes me wonder whether we should be looking at von Willebrand patients for other inherited defects, such as Factor V leiden, in view of the recent reports that have indicated that individuals with hemophilia A who also have co-inheritance of Factor V leiden may actually have decreased bleeding as part of the course of their disease. I am wondering whether if we looked for Factor V leiden defects in von Willebrand patients we would see a similar type of decreased risk for bleeding and an increased risk for thrombotic complications that we have to be careful about prophylaxing for.

DR. JOIST: I was going to say exactly what Craig just pointed out. We don't know what the minimal dose in hemophiliacs in various indications is. I think at this point we are continuing to use an off-label drug, and we are expecting other physicians to use an off-label drug in von Willebrand disease that we know is effective in control of

bleeding in certain patients with von Willebrand's disease.

I think there is certainly more research that is needed to look more carefully at what the minimal effective doses are, and that is going to be very difficult given the number of patients available, the different types of bleeding situations that we can encounter, and so forth. But I think it is time that at least one or two of these preparations are approved for clinical used so that we do not any more use them off-label, and that we then go on and do additional studies to define our treatment modalities.

DR. PIERCE: Can we design a study in such a way as to tell the difference between a good dose and a better dose? I agree with you, we don't necessarily have to set up the hurdle of determining the minimum effective dose preapproval of any product, but the idea is, you know, what are our options for trial design? What kind of control groups are feasible and appropriate to use? How do we judge one product against another?

DR. JOIST: Well, I think these are very difficult questions and they can't be answered here in about two or three minutes. You have to look at different surgical procedures. You have to look at different injury situations; dental surgeries. These are all different. I think we are aided by experience in hemophilia, knowing

pretty well what doses we can use that are reasonably effective, and I don't think you can come up with an overall cutoff and say, well, 50 units is good for everybody. But I think a group of experienced treaters could come up and help the FDA to establish, in a preliminary sense, an adequately preliminary sense, what the recommended doses should be at this sort of stage of experience for various indications. It doesn't have to be too specific. I think that could be done based on the knowledge that we have and the experience that we have.

DR. MONTGOMERY: If I could make one comment, we shouldn't lose sight of the fact that normal patients with surgery have elevated von Willebrand factor and Factor VIII. So that necessarily patients that are 200% Factor VIII or 300% that may, in fact, be physiologic.

DR. RETZIOS: Well, I would like to add also that the issue of number of doses is that ATC93-01, the trial that we designed at Alpha, did attempt to answer that question within safety parameters that were acceptable.

Actually, when we designed the study in the beginning of 1993, all we had to go by were the studies by Dr. Manucci, and Dr. Manucci had, indeed, dosed the patients at about 60-70 units of ristocetin cofactor per kilogram. We then built two dosing groups, 40 and 60, and we would have infused more

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

patients at 60 had the 40 ristocetin cofactor not reacted as well as it did. So, the point is that it is very difficult sometimes to obtain IRB approval and to go back and say, well, now we would like to look at 20 but it is likely, from our results so far and possibly the dosing relationship that we have, that some of the patients are really not going to respond very well. I don't think that the IRB would probably allow us to perform such a study.

DR. FEDERICI: I have some comments. comment about prophylactic dose for dental extractions and side effects, namely thrombotic. We have a lot of experience with prophylactic dosage. In the last twenty years I think that I have seen many times type 3 vWD with hemarthrosis. So we usually give them concentrate. old days we gave, unfortunately, cryo. After the concentrates were available -- actually, the patients are now able to treat themselves at home. They call the center and they say we have hemarthrosis. What do we have to do? So they are used to treating themselves every other day with a dosage of about 30, 50 units every other day for at least one or two weeks until the problem of hemarthrosis is solved.

The problem with dental extraction, I agree with

Bob -- Bob knows how these kind of things work. So, if you

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

are relying on a good dental surgeon -- we have a sort of good retrospective analysis. We wanted to mimic what some people were proposing in a meeting last year, sort of treating on demand. We went to some of these dental extraction patients without concentrate, being very careful, of course. We have been following some of the type 3 for just one dental extraction, and it was enough to have a good surgeon and washing with transanamic acid in order not to have problems. Maybe we don't have enough data, but when we have more data we will publish this data. So we have to know that.

Then the side effects, thrombotic, in my twenty years experience I have never seen any thrombotic events in The reports by Retzios with Alphanate is a unique I have a patient in Milano. That patient was experience. very ill. He was not diagnosed in our center. followed by our center because he moved to Milano. He had HIV infections and he had the most important thing, chronic hemarthrosis, and he got DVP, DVP in that leg. concerned about not having too much Factor VIII C around, but I am not that concerned because these were local situations, local problems of that patient. You know that HIV can have sort of activation of endothelial cells. But the most important thing he got was don't know why.

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

hemarthrosis, chronic hemarthrosis in that leg and in his knees. So the venous circulation could be influenced by the fact that he was operated on. Post-operation he could not move his leg, as other type 2 vWD. So we have to realize that. By chance, we also checked in that patient Factor V leiden and it was negative.

Guidelines for the diagnosis and DR. SCHWARZ: management of von Willebrand's disease -- when was that published? A few weeks ago, in the supplement of <u>Hemophilia</u>, prepared by the Hemophilia Center in the United Kingdom. Everything is written here. The question is should the community stick to these published guidelines or are we discussing new issues? I mean, it is really very recent. So my question would be for surgery for patients with von Willebrand's disease, von Willebrand factor concentrates, only concentrates containing von Willebrand factor should be used. Preoperatively Factor VIII C levels should be raised to 100%. This would also raise von Willebrand factor level to above 100%. Treatment may be required 12 hours later, etc., etc. Factor VIII activity levels pre- and post-treatment should be assayed. Von Willebrand factor activity and antigen levels -- activity and antigen should be assayed pre- and post-treatment for the first three treatments so as to follow a more informed

plan of therapy.

I mean, this is an important document also on the liability issue. Do we have to stick to this, or what is your feeling? We have one of the authors here.

DR. PASI: Yes, I was one of the people that was involved in writing this document. I am John Pasi, from Royal Free, London.

I would like to say that many issues that have been mentioned today at this Workshop were actually thought about at the time we were writing that document, and we wrote that document to be the broadest type of document that would cover practical procedures and looking after patients at the time. I don't think it is cast in stone by any means, and I think it just provided a practical solution to the treatment of patients with von Willebrand's disease.

DR. WHITE: That would have been my comment too.

I think that document was conceived as a guideline for treatment document. The questions that are being discussed here are slightly different. It is how do you determine whether a product is working or not? They are related questions but they are not necessarily identical questions. So it is not unrealistic to re-raise some of those issues and say is this the best way to do it? I think those are fair questions.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

DR. RICK: I think the hour is late. We haven't dealt with the last question. Mark, I need to have some guidance from you whether we should thank all the participants in the audience or whether we should try for one more question.

DR. WEINSTEIN: (Not at microphone; inaudible)

DR. RICK: The answer was let us try to go on to talk a little bit about data should be collected in whatever trial is designed here. Let me ask Ross to elaborate on that just a bit.

Sure. So, we are really talking DR. PIERCE: about some of the nitty-gritty of the pros and cons of different clinical trial design options. Thinking in terms of how each product that is presented to the FDA should ideally in the future be evaluated, what choice of control group is most appropriate? Patients as their own controls? What kind of documentation of previous episodes prior to any therapy should be available? In my presentation I mentioned historical controls to normal individuals. We heard about a trial today where clinical investigators were asked to fax, 24 hours before the patient went to surgery, what they would guess a normal non-bleeding disorder patient would lose in the way of blood for that particular surgical procedure. Crossover trials comparing, for example, products that are

sgg 270

devoid of Factor VIII activity versus those that have the 2 combination of the two clotting factors, as is being planned What clinical endpoints are considered most 3 in Europe. informative as a primary efficacy endpoint and as additional 4 5 endpoints that can buttress our confidence in the outcome of 6 a trial, and how can we fold together the design of trials 7 to have us understand the relationship between 8 pharmacokinetics and clinical activity to really get at what 9 was mentioned before, how do we optimize therapy for the 10 benefit of patients and to aid the treating physician. 11 DR. MENACHE: I would like to ask a question 12 because I am a little bit confused. I heard a control My understanding is that for a control I should 13 population. have a group which is treated and a group which is not 14 15 Now, I have heard about crossover studies with treated. 16 different products. We don't have a licensed product. 17 are we going to cross it with? Cryoprecipitate? In Europe it is licensed. What choice do we have here? Crossover 18 19 studies with what? 20 DR. WHITE: Well, I think that is where I was 21 getting stuck too, on the control. I don't think it is 22 ethical to do a cryoprecipitate control.

> MILLER REPORTING COMPANY, INC. 507 C Street, N.E.

No.

DR. MENACHE:

DR. WHITE:

23

24

I don't think anybody would feel that.

I think the control that Ross is talking about is more a control in which where an individual undergoing a procedure there is an attempt to try and compare that individual with some theoretical control of a patient who is undergoing the same procedure who doesn't have a bleeding disorder.

I think any time you ask a surgeon how hemostasis is and you give him four or five choices, excellent, good, fair, poor and none, what he is basically doing is, in his mind, comparing that with historical controls.

DR. MENACHE: Right.

DR. WHITE: I don't really see a way to do a control here. I think it would be nice to do controls because, unlike hemophilia where if you take a severe hemophiliac through a procedure you are pretty sure you are going to take bleeding if you don't treat him, here sometimes you are not quite as sure.

DR. MENACHE: Have you tried? A severe von
Willebrand surgery with no replacement therapy? It works?

I mean, who would try? You wouldn't.

DR. WHITE: Well, I am thinking because I think that is a good question and that is what I am implying, but I am sure severe von Willebrand patients have had surgery without coverage. I am sure Glanzmann's patients have had surgery without coverage, and I am sure hemophiliacs have

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

had surgery without coverage.

DR. MONTGOMERY: But not with informed consent.

DR. WHITE: Not with informed consent.

(Laughter)

I am not advocating that. DR. WHITE: Don't misunderstand me, I am not advocating that, I am just saying that the thought does go through your mind how do you compare this with something? I think that is what Ross is But my bottom line -- I was looking over those questions, and the one I was really stuck on was the first one and I don't see a way to do a control. I think the FDA has to assume that although there is no licensed product here, there is a standard of care which is being performed, which provides patients with von Willebrand's disease with a Treatments have to be compared against that treatment. standard of care, in my opinion. You can't go back and say, well, what we have done for the last twenty years doesn't count; we have to do controlled studies; you have to simply compare it with a control. I am not saying the FDA is advocating a no treatment or some other type of control. think they probably agree with what I just said, but to just put that out there, I think that is what the control has to It has to be what our standard of care has been up to be. now whether it is approved for that use or not.

DR. PIERCE: One very specific thing that I would
like to throw out though is actually question 4B, and that
is treatment duration. As we heard the results of the
American survey, I compared what I heard about the number of
treatments in surgeries where it was uncommon for patients
to get more than five infusions, if I understood correctly,
to the average number of infusions used with the French LFB
product in their patient series, which was around 17
infusions for major surgery, and I wonder even with a
standard of care product if, at some point, there isn't room
to do a trial that looks at whether an outcome can be good
with randomizing patients to one minimum number of infusions
and better, lower incidence of rebleeding, if they receive a
larger number of infusions.

DR. MENACHE: I would like to make one comment.

When we first developed the protocol to evaluate the LFBmanufactured product, I had a meeting with the clinical
investigators to see at what level they wanted the Factor

VIII prior to surgery, and to calculate what amount of
product we should do. Bob was attending that meeting and
there were several investigators, and they would not budge
below 100%. Finally, with a lot of difficulty and
discussion we agreed on 80%. In France, with this same
discussion, 60% was enough.

So, what I am trying to say is that, number one,
no one knows what is the minimum level required for
hemostasis. No one is going to take the risk of knowing,
neither the physician nor the patient. In the United States
we treat patients with much higher dosage than in Europe.
It has always been the case. We were richer. We had more
products. We used more. Now it is a little bit different.
But it is extremely difficult to decide ahead of time. If
you discuss it with physicians, they don't want a level of
less than 80%. On what basis? I don't know. But they
don't want to take the risk of having a problem with a
patient. I just wanted to make this comment.
DR. RETZIOS: I would like to add to this. It is
the same with the Alphanate study, 100% of Factor VIII was
deemed the minimum limit before proceeding with surgery. If
the patient actually did not achieve 100% Factor VIII prior
to surgery, the surgery was aborted. It didn't happen in
any of our cases but that is the provision of the protocol,
and it came through the meetings with the investigators.
Regarding a possible control study, I would like

Regarding a possible control study, I would like to offer a historical note. About the beginning of 1994 we were approached by CBER to run a control study against cryoprecipitate. We did try, actually, to even get the safest cryoprecipitate we could possibly get our hands on.

sgg

We aged the cryoprecipitate; we did all kinds of PCR work. However, we couldn't find a single investigator who was willing to enter in a study like that. Plus, the study had other complications -- how could you match the dose of the cryoprecipitate to the dose of Alphanate? You probably had to dose almost 1.5 liters of cryoprecipitate in order to achieve the same dose of Alphanate. So, nobody was willing to proceed with this control study.

DR. MONTGOMERY: I think somewhere in the course of doing these studies to try to get at the question of minimal effective dose to prevent bleeding it may require prophylaxis in patients that bleed frequently, and it is a totally different study. Given that the standard of care, at least in most places, is not yet prophylaxis, then being able to do something on different levels of prophylaxis could be useful. If you actually could determine that prophylaxis with 10 units -- let's just be extreme -- 10 U/kg/week as opposed to 20 U/kg every other day, or something, in someone that maybe bleeds several times and is not on prophylaxis might be able to get at the question of are there really levels, other than zero, at which bleed in such patients.

DR. RICK: Are there other comments? If not, we certainly thank all of the participants, and I would like to