Discussion and debate:

Treatment with anti-VEGF agents in AMD should be stopped when benefits to the patient can no longer be expected

For: Professor Anat Loewenstein
Against: Professor Paolo Lanzetta

Presentation of viewpoint: Professor Anat Loewenstein
Session aims

- To debate and discuss evidence for and against the argument that treatment with anti-VEGF agents in AMD should be stopped when benefits to the patient can no longer be expected.
- To provide a summary of the Vision Academy’s position on the topic.

AMD, age-related macular degeneration; VEGF, vascular endothelial growth factor.
Debate:
Is there a case FOR stopping treatment?

Professor Anat Loewenstein
Tel Aviv Sourasky Medical Center,
Israel
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What is medical futility?

“The moment when a treatment has no realistic chance of providing an effect that the patient would have the capacity to appreciate as benefit…”

Quantitative medical futility is related to the success of a treatment in achieving its intended goals.

Qualitative medical futility is related to the value of a treatment to a patient’s quality of life.

Why is medical futility important?

Hippocratic oath

- *Primum non nocere*,
  do no harm

Cost

- Cost of drug and procedure
- Time
  - Patient’s
  - Physician’s
- Complications

Anti-VEGF treatment in nAMD should aim to produce optimal responses

- Despite regular anti-VEGF therapy, ~25–35% of patients still have evidence of active exudation on either angiography or OCT after 1 year of therapy\(^1,2\)
- While there is currently a lack of consensus over what constitutes non-response, several guidelines have attempted to address the issue
- A poor or lack of response may be due to misdiagnosis with entities such as:\(^3\)
  - Polypoidal choroidal vasculopathy
  - Chronic central serous chorioretinopathy (persistent exudation can mimic treatment-resistant nAMD)

nAMD, neovascular age-related macular degeneration; OCT, optical coherence tomography; PED, pigment epithelial detachment; VEGF, vascular endothelial growth factor.
Guidelines are in agreement that in cases of poor or suboptimal response, treatment with anti-VEGF should be discontinued.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>VA</th>
<th>Good response</th>
<th>Partial response</th>
<th>Poor response</th>
<th>No response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>Discontinue. Consider review with further imaging or change therapy</td>
<td>More imaging and consider switch / combination</td>
<td>More imaging and consider switch / combination unless poor visual potential</td>
<td>Discontinue. Consider review with further imaging or change therapy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>No response</td>
<td>Poor response</td>
<td>Partial response</td>
<td>Good response</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

VA, visual acuity; VEGF, vascular endothelial growth factor.
The Royal College of Ophthalmologists also recommend suspension of treatment in cases of futility

➢ The Royal College of Ophthalmologists recommends permanent discontinuation of anti-VEGF treatment in cases where:
  • BCVA in the treated eye has decreased to fewer than 15 ETDRS letters (absolute) on two consecutive visits, attributable to nAMD (in the absence of other pathology)
  • BCVA in the treated eye has decreased by ≥30 letters vs. baseline and/or best recorded level since baseline
  • There is evidence of deterioration in lesion morphology despite optimal anti-VEGF therapy

BCVA, best corrected visual acuity; ETDRS, Early Treatment Diabetic Research Study; nAMD; neovascular age-related macular degeneration; VEGF, vascular endothelial growth factor.
Before treatment can be discontinued, several key assumptions must be confirmed

- The patient has nAMD
- Anti-VEGF treatment was administered in a correct and timely fashion

nAMD, neovascular age-related macular degeneration; VEGF, vascular endothelial growth factor.
When to stop therapy?

- Stopping anti-VEGF therapy should be considered:
  - No anatomical and no functional response
  - Misdiagnosis
  - Foveal scarring
  - Other major ocular pathology (e.g. retinal detachment)

- All of this should only be considered after verifying appropriate anti-VEGF treatment has been administered

VEGF, vascular endothelial growth factor.
Debate:
Is there a case AGAINST stopping treatment?

Professor Paolo Lanzetta
University of Udine, Italy
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The criteria for defining responses to treatment should be carefully assessed

- There are currently no standardized guidelines for defining a poor or non-response to therapy
  - Responses to anti-VEGF therapy may be classified into functional and morphological responses – however function and morphology do not always correlate
- Morphological failures may or may not be associated with a loss of visual acuity

VEGF, vascular endothelial growth factor.
Treatment intervals and number of injections should be reassessed before stopping treatment

- Poor response to treatment may be due to less frequent treatment than is required for a particular patient.

- This may be due to pathophysiologic factors such as:\textsuperscript{1,2}
  - Chronic disease with change in cytokine profile
  - Chronic inflammation or high levels of VEGF
  - Tachyphylaxis

- Or external factors (e.g., logistical or other factors) such as:\textsuperscript{1}
  - Physicians misinterpretation of retreatment criteria
  - Capacity of retinal center
  - Patient difficulty in traveling to the retina center

VEGF, vascular endothelial growth factor.
Lack of visual acuity gain does not always mean a treatment is not beneficial

- Even if treatment does not lead to visual acuity gains, treatment cessation may lead to a deterioration in visual acuity and/or morphology
  - Treatment should be continued to ensure a stable condition is maintained
Summary

- If the patient’s condition is stabilized under treatment (i.e., no gains or losses in visual acuity), the treatment regimen should be maintained to avoid disturbing this established balance.

- If the patient’s condition is deteriorating under treatment, stopping the treatment may actually accelerate deterioration.

- Conclusion: do not give up hope and do not leave the patient alone without monitoring and treatment.
What is the Vision Academy’s position?

Professor Anat Loewenstein

Tel Aviv Sourasky Medical Center,
Israel
Stopping anti-VEGF treatment of nAMD in cases of futility

Vision Academy objective:
To provide a practical, expert opinion on when to stop anti-VEGF treatment in cases of futility, and how this may differ from the decision to switch therapies

Algorithm has been developed following a thorough review of the literature and employing the combined knowledge and expertise of the Vision Academy

nAMD, neovascular age-related macular degeneration; VEGF, vascular endothelial growth factor.
Stopping anti-VEGF treatment of nAMD in cases of futility

- The decision tree on the next slide sets out the key decisions that need to be made before stopping anti-VEGF treatment.

- This decision tree was drafted based on the following assumptions:
  - The patient has nAMD
  - The patient has unilateral disease
  - Anti-VEGF treatment is administered in a correct and timely fashion (i.e., the patient is neither under- nor over-treated)

nAMD, neovascular age-related macular degeneration; VEGF, vascular endothelial growth factor.
The patient has been diagnosed with nAMD treatable with anti-VEGF*  

**STAGE 1:** Patient decision

- **Does the patient wish to proceed with anti-VEGF treatment?**
  - **Y**
    - **Maintenance regimen**
      - **Y**
        - Administer anti-VEGF treatment according to protocol and monitor  
          - **Y**
            - Are visual and anatomic* outcomes improving (gain in VA of Vb letters from baseline) or being maintained (loss or gain in VA of <Wb letters from baseline)?
            - **Y**
              - Switch to alternative anti-VEGF therapy
            - **N**
              - Are visual and anatomic* outcomes worsening (loss of Z letters from baseline)?
                - **Y**
                  - Switch to alternative anti-VEGF therapy
                - **N**
                  - Reassess condition and treat appropriately

  - **N**
    - Are alternative anti-VEGF treatments available in your region?  
      - **Y**
        - Switch to alternative anti-VEGF therapy
      - **N**
        - Reassess condition and treat appropriately

**STAGE 2:** Treatment protocol

- **Administer anti-VEGF treatment according to protocol and monitor**
  - **Y**
    - Are visual and anatomic* outcomes improving (gain in VA of Vb letters from baseline) or being maintained (loss or gain in VA of <Wb letters from baseline)?
      - **Y**
        - Reassess condition and treat appropriately
      - **N**
        - Are alternative anti-VEGF treatments available in your region?  
          - **Y**
            - Switch to alternative anti-VEGF therapy
          - **N**
            - Reassess condition and treat appropriately

**STAGE 3:** Adjust treatment protocol

- **Switch to alternative anti-VEGF therapy**
  - **Y**
    - Are visual and anatomic* outcomes improving (gain in VA of Vb letters from baseline) or being maintained (loss or gain in VA of <Wb letters from baseline)?
      - **Y**
        - Reassess condition and treat appropriately
      - **N**
        - Are alternative anti-VEGF treatments available in your region?  
          - **Y**
            - Switch to alternative anti-VEGF therapy
          - **N**
            - Reassess condition and treat appropriately

**STAGE 4:** Investigate why inadequate response*

- **D. Treatment holiday**  
  - After observing a 'treatment-free interval,' have visual and anatomic outcomes worsened (loss of Z letters from baseline)?
    - **Y**
      - Reassess condition and treat appropriately
    - **N**
      - Are there any complications or other issues to consider?

**STAGE 5:** Establish anti-VEGF futility

- **C. Alternative anti-VEGF**  
  - Are alternative anti-VEGF treatments available in your region?  
    - **Y**
      - Switch to alternative anti-VEGF therapy
    - **N**
      - Reassess condition and treat appropriately

- **B. Treatment-related complications**  
  - Are there any complications or other issues to consider?
    - **Y**
      - Reassess condition and treat appropriately
    - **N**
      - **A. Misdiagnosis**  
        - Have any factors changed within the course of treatment that would lead you to challenge the original diagnosis?
          - **Y**
            - Reassess condition and treat appropriately
          - **N**
            - Anti-VEGF treatment is considered to be futile and should be suspended

**Notes:**
- All of the following apply to the eye in question: the patient has unilateral nAMD; there is no permanent damage to the central fovea; lesion size is ≤12-disc areas in greatest linear dimension; and there is evidence of disease progression from fluorescein angiography, or recent VA changes. OCT changes also to be considered here, in accordance with region- and physician-specific criteria.  
- Complications may also include thromboembolic events; anti-VEGF treatment should be suspended temporarily and then recommenced (period of time defined by region-specific criteria).  
- "Inadequate response" is defined as progressive deterioration in VA of ≥X letters from baseline in treated eye in primary phase (X defined by region-specific criteria).  
- "Treatment-free interval" is defined as Y weeks of no anti-VEGF treatment (period of time defined by region-specific criteria).  
- "Worsening" defined as loss of Z letters from baseline (Z defined by region-specific criteria).  
- nAMD, neovascular age-related macular degeneration; OCT, optical coherence tomography; VA, visual acuity; VEGF, vascular endothelial growth factor.

---

*As defined by region-specific criteria. **Maximal therapy** is defined as the shortest dosing interval of 2–4 weeks (as defined by region- and physician-specific criteria). OCT changes also to be considered here, in accordance with region- and physician-specific criteria. Complications may also include thromboembolic events; anti-VEGF treatment should be suspended temporarily and then recommenced (period of time defined by region-specific criteria). Inadequate response is defined as progressive deterioration in VA of ≥X letters from baseline in treated eye in primary phase (X defined by region-specific criteria). Treatment-free interval is defined as Y weeks of no anti-VEGF treatment (period of time defined by region-specific criteria). Worsening is defined as loss of Z letters from baseline (Z defined by region-specific criteria).
Summary

- This decision tree has been drafted to prompt discussion and debate within the ophthalmic community.

- The key decision points can be categorized into four stages:
  - Diagnosis, recommendation and patient decision
  - Treatment protocol
  - Adjusting the treatment protocol
  - Investigating inadequate responses to treatment