The role of romiplostim for pediatric patients with immune thrombocytopenia

Hanny Al-Samkari, Rachael F. Grace and David J. Kuter ២

Abstract: The thrombopoietin receptor agonists (TPO-RAs) are a class of platelet growth factors used to treat immune thrombocytopenia (ITP) in children and adults. Romiplostim is a peptide TPO-RA approved for over a decade to treat adults with ITP but was just recently US Food and Drug Administration approved to manage ITP in children 1 year of age and older who have had an inadequate response to corticosteroids, intravenous immunoglobulin, or splenectomy. Like the small molecule TPO-RA eltrombopag, romiplostim offers a high clinical response rate in pediatric patients with ITP, but requires use over an extended, and possibly indefinite, duration. This review is a critical appraisal of the role of romiplostim in pediatric ITP, discussing the safety and efficacy of this agent in clinical trials of children and adults and defining the patients most likely to benefit from romiplostim treatment. The treating hematologist is additionally provided guidance with treatment goals, dosing strategies, toxicity management, and indications for discontinuation.

Keywords: children, immune thrombocytopenia, pediatric, platelets, romiplostim, thrombopoietin, thrombopoietin receptor agonist, TPO

Received: 30 October 2019; revised manuscript accepted: 18 February 2020.

Introduction

Thrombopoietin (TPO) is the major hematopoietic growth factor responsible for the production of platelets.1 Initial studies with first-generation recombinant thrombopoietic agents [pegylated recombinant human megakaryocyte growth and development factor (PEG-rHuMGDF) and recombinant human TPO (rhTPO)] were halted in the West due to the development of neutralizing antibodies against PEG-rHuMGDF that were capable of cross-reacting with and neutralizing endogenous human TPO. This led to the development of second-generation thrombopoietic agents, the TPO receptor agonists (TPO-RAs), that had improved function and lacked antigenicity that might result in similar anti-TPO antibody formation. TPO-RAs mimic endogenous TPO, promoting growth and development of megakaryocyte precursors and megakaryocytes, thereby increasing the platelet count.² There are currently four TPO-RAs available in the United States: the peptibody romiplostim (Nplate, Amgen, Thousand Oaks, CA) and the small molecule agents eltrombopag (Promacta, Novartis, Basel, Switzerland), avatrombopag (Doptelet, Dova, Durham, NC), and lusutrombopag (Mulpleta, Shionogi, Florham Park, NJ). In addition to management of immune thrombocytopenia (ITP) in adults and children, the TPO-RAs have been approved or are under investigation in numerous other thrombocytopenic disorders, including perioperative thrombocytopenia,3-5 chemotherapy-induced thrombocytopenia,^{6,7} severe aplastic anemia,8 and support of antiviral treatment in hepatitis C-associated thrombocytopenia.3 Romiplostim and eltrombopag were initially developed for treatment of chronic ITP, for which they have been approved for use in adults for over a decade. In December 2018, romiplostim was approved by the US Food and Drug Administration (FDA) to manage ITP of greater than 6 months' duration in pediatric patients 1 year of age or older. Its approved use was extended to adults with ITP of any duration following failure of corticosteroids, intravenous immunoglobulin (IVIG), or splenectomy in October 2019.

Ther Adv Hematol

2020, Vol. 11: 1-13

2040620720912992 © The Author(s), 2020.

Article reuse guidelines: sagepub.com/journalspermissions

Correspondence to: Hanny Al-Samkari

Division of Hematology, Massachusetts General Hospital, Harvard Medical chool, Suite 118, Room 112, Zero Emerson Place, Boston, MA 02114, USA hal-samkari@mgh. harvard.edu

Rachael F. Grace

Dana-Farber/Boston Children's Cancer and Blood Disorders Center, Harvard Medical School, Boston, MA, USA

David J. Kuter

Division of Hematology, Harvard Medical School, Boston, MA, USA

journals.sagepub.com/home/tah



Creative Commons Non Commercial CC BY-NC: This article is distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial 4.0 License (https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc/4.0/) which permits non-commercial use, reproduction and distribution of the work without further permission provided the original work is attributed as specified on the SAGE and Open Access pages (https://us.sagepub.com/en-us/nam/open-access-at-sage).

Use of the TPO-RAs in ITP is supported by the modern understanding of ITP as a disorder of both increased platelet destruction as well as inadequate platelet production. While other ITP therapeutics act to diminish platelet destruction by the reticuloendothelial system, cytolytic T cells, and complement, the TPO-RAs act to reverse the production defect, inhibiting the pro-apoptotic action of glycoprotein-specific platelet autoantibodies and lymphocytes on megakaryo-cyte precursors and megakaryocytes, thereby pro-moting their survival and platelet production.^{9–12}

This review will describe the pharmacology and data for use of romiplostim in pediatric patients with ITP, including safety, efficacy, dosing strategies, goals of treatment, and treatment discontinuation. Updated ITP guidelines will integrate use of romiplostim in pediatric and adult ITP patients.^{13–15} While the vast majority of data describing clinical romiplostim use in ITP is in adult patients, some of these data may also apply to the pediatric population and will be discussed as well.

Pharmacology and dosing of romiplostim

Pharmacodynamics

Romiplostim increases the platelet count of healthy subjects and ITP patients in a dose-dependent fashion.¹⁶ The pharmacodynamics of all thrombopoietic agents, romiplostim included, approximate physiologic thrombopoiesis. Physiologic TPO elevation occurs in the setting of diminished platelet production resulting in a reduction of TPO clearance.¹⁷ In response to an acute increase in TPO concentration, megakaryocyte colony-forming cells differentiate into mature megakaryocytes. As this process occurs, approximately 2-5 days are required for megakaryocyte size and ploidy to peak, with the platelet count starting to increase at approximately the fifth day and to peak after 10 days. Therefore, TPO-RAs, including romiplostim, generally take a minimum of 5-7 days to produce a clinically significant rise in the platelet count, as was demonstrated in pharmacodynamic studies.18

Pharmacokinetics

Over the dose range of $3-15\,\mu$ g/kg, romiplostim has a median half-life of approximately 3.5 days, with significant variations in half-life (1-34 days) noted in pharmacokinetic studies.¹⁸ It is bound to

and recycled by the neonatal fragment crystallizable (Fc) receptor (FcRn) on endothelial cells. Peak drug concentrations were observed at a median of 14h following a romiplostim dose. Romiplostim is eliminated by the dual action of the reticuloendothelial system and the platelet TPO receptor, cMPL. Serum concentrations of romiplostim therefore correlate with the platelet mass, rather than the dose of romiplostim administered, with higher platelet counts resulting in lower serum concentrations.¹⁹ Pharmacodynamicmediated drug disposition models in healthy subjects demonstrated that weekly dosing produces a sustained pharmacodynamic response as compared with dosing intervals of 2 weeks or greater, which produce considerable fluctuation in the platelet count.20

There are no known clinically significant drugdrug interactions with romiplostim. It can be safely administered in combination with other ITP therapies, such as corticosteroids or IVIG.¹⁹ Its effect on platelet production is not altered by deficiencies in either renal or hepatic function; thus, dose adjustment in these settings is not required.

Immunogenicity

Existence of pre-existing antibodies to romiplostim and development of antiromiplostim antibodies is not uncommon, occurring in 5% and 4% of adult ITP patients, respectively, across clinical studies including a total of 1112 patients.^{19,21} But neutralizing anti-romiplostim antibodies were much less common, occurring in less than 1% of adults treated with romiplostim.²¹ Even when present, neutralizing antibodies were rarely associated with a loss of treatment effect. Immunogenicity was more common in children, with 8% and 3% developing non-neutralizing antiromiplostim antibodies and neutralizing antiromiplostim antibodies, respectively, across clinical studies including a total of 282 pediatric patients.¹⁹ In patients with a documented sustained response to romiplostim who later lose this response, the treating clinician should consider the possibility of neutralizing antiromiplostim antibodies. To this end, patient blood samples can be sent to the drug manufacturer (Amgen, Thousand Oaks, CA) to evaluate for the possibility of such antibodies. There have been no reports of antibodies to romiplostim capable of crossreacting with and neutralizing native TPO; none

Table 1. (Our approach to	romiplostim	titration in	pediatric and a	adult ITP.
------------	-----------------	-------------	--------------	-----------------	------------

	Prescribing information	Our approach		
Starting dose	1µg/kg	3-5µg/kg		
Subsequent dosing				
Platelet count $<$ 50 \times 10%	Increase by 1µg/kg	Increase by 2µg/kg		
Platelet count 50–200 $ imes$ 10 9 /l	Maintain same dose	Maintain same dose		
Platelet count 200–400 $ imes$ 10%/l for 2 consecutive weeks	Decrease by 1µg/kg (discontinue if dose is at 1µg/kg)	Decrease by 1µg/kg (discontinue if dose is at 1µg/kg)		
Platelet count > 400 × 10°/l	Hold for 1 week	Reduce dose by one to two thirds; do not hold romiplostim		
Acute emergent bleeding	No recommendation	10µg/kg for one to two doses		
Discontinuation for futility	lf inadequate response after 4 weeks of 10µg/kg	Consider addition of low-dose prednisone (1–5 mg daily) to 10 µg/kg dose prior to discontinuation for futility at 10 µg/kg dose		
ITP, immune thrombocytopenia.				

of the 1112 adult patients or 282 pediatric patients in the aforementioned studies developed such antibodies.

Initiation and dose escalation

The romiplostim prescribing information recommends a starting dose of 1µg/kg/week in both adults and children with ITP.19 The dose is uptitrated weekly by 1µg/kg, based on the platelet count, advising an increase of 1 µg/kg for a platelet count < 50 \times 10⁹/l, continuing at the same dose for platelet counts $50-200 \times 10^{9}$ /l, and reduction in the dose by 1 μ g/kg for platelet counts $> 200 \times 10^9$ /l for 2 consecutive weeks.¹⁹ Despite these dosing recommendations, a large phase III study of romiplostim in adults utilized a starting dose of 3µg/kg/ week in all patients.²² Real-world studies of romiplostim use in adults have further demonstrated the safety of initiation of romiplostim at doses higher than 1µg/kg/week, with very low rates of thrombocytosis.²³ In a small group of pediatric patients, the median starting romiplostim dose when used off label was 2µg/kg/week.24

In clinical practice, initiation at a higher dose reduces the duration of drug titration, and therefore, also the duration of profound thrombocytopenia, reducing bleeding risk; clinical trials have demonstrated that bleeding risk is highest during dose titration.²⁵ In a small study of hospitalized adult ITP patients, relative to patients initiated at romiplostim at 1 µg/kg/week, patients initiated on romiplostim at a median starting dose of 4.5μ g/kg/week had fewer bleeding events, a shorter hospital length of stay, and improved rates of achieving a platelet count $\ge 50 \times 10^9$ /l with no thrombotic events.²⁶

For these reasons, the authors routinely start most adult and pediatric patients at 3-5 µg/kg/ week. Similarly, we do not hesitate to titrate the dose by greater than the 1µg/kg/week instructed by the prescribing information to minimize the total duration of profound thrombocytopenia, the bleeding risk, and the time until an effective dose is achieved. More aggressive titration does increase the risk of thrombocytosis, which raises the concern of thrombosis risk (as discussed further below), but the bleeding risk often takes priority in ITP patients and the thrombotic risk is lower in children, than adults, with ITP. Likewise, in case of emergencies, such as life-threatening bleeding, we use 10µg/kg/week for the first one to two doses to maximize the chances that the platelet count will adequately rise as quickly as possible; if there is no response after two doses, alternative treatments are chosen. Our approach to romiplostim dosing is summarized in Table 1.

Attention should be paid to the 'first-dose effect' in some patients with ITP; by this, we mean that

the platelet count may rapidly rise after the first dose.²² The rapid rise should not lead to a reduction in the second dose, since in most patients continuation of the same dose will be accompanied by a fall in platelet count at weeks 2 and 3. This probably occurs due to the expanded bone marrow megakaryocyte pool which is now prevented from undergoing apoptosis.

Because approximately two thirds of pediatric patients eventually remit, the authors generally titrate the romiplostim dose in pediatric patients to a platelet count of $30-150 \times 10^{9}$ /l so that continual dose decreases will allow the treating provider to know if romiplostim should be discontinued altogether to assess for remission (sustained platelet counts of $>150 \times 10^{9}$ /l off treatment).

Romiplostim is dispensed in vials of lyophilized powder for reconstitution. Standard administration is initially by a healthcare provider in a clinic setting due to the technical demands of reconstitution and injection of small volumes of reconstituted drug subcutaneously. Therefore, a significant time burden is therefore imposed upon the patient, and in the case of most pediatric patients, a parent or caregiver to take the child to the hematology clinic or their pediatrician's practice each week for injections. There is evidence in both adult and pediatric patients that provided proper education and tools (a home administration training pack), self-administration in selected patients can be as effective as administration by a healthcare provider while alleviating much of the time and travel burden.24,28,29 The authors encourage patients and families to learn how to administer romiplostim at home to ease this burden and increase the feasibility of this treatment to patients who live far from their medical center. Self-administration of romiplostim is standard of care in most countries, but it has not yet received FDA approval in the US.

Holding doses

The romiplostim prescribing information advises withholding a dose of romiplostim for platelet counts $> 400 \times 10^{9/1.19}$ This guidance is not based on any clinical evidence for risk. Despite the increased rate of venous and arterial thrombosis in ITP patients, these events are not associated with any platelet count or TPO-RA use.³⁰ The authors do not follow this threshold due to the marked rebound thrombocytopenia (platelets dropping below their prior baseline) that occurs in 10–15% of patients when romiplostim is abruptly stopped.³¹ We opt to dose reduce by one to two thirds instead to eliminate thrombocytosis and avoid the bleeding risk associated with rebound thrombocytopenia.

Laboratory monitoring on romiplostim

Platelet counts in children on romiplostim are checked weekly with dose titration and no less frequently than monthly when on a stable dose. The authors additionally advise review of the peripheral blood film every 6 months.

Efficacy of romiplostim in immune thrombocytopenia

Several randomized trials have evaluated the use of romiplostim against standard of care treatments or placebo in adult and pediatric ITP patients. There are two randomized studies of romiplostim in pediatric patients, both of which were followed by an open-label extension. The first was a phase I/II trial of ITP patients aged < 18 years that randomized patients to romiplostim (n=17) or placebo (n=5) weekly for 12 weeks.²⁵ The primary efficacy endpoint was a platelet count \ge 50 \times 10⁹/l for 2 consecutive weeks and was achieved in 88% of romiplostim-treated patients versus 0% of placebo-treated patients (Figure 1). Platelet counts $\ge 50 \times 10^9$ /l were maintained for a median of 7 weeks in the romiplostim arm versus 0 weeks in the placebo arm. Of these patients, 22 continued on to the extension study, receiving treatment for a median of 167 weeks and maintaining a platelet count $\ge 50 \times 10^{9}$ /l for a median of 84.3% of weeks.32

The second study was a phase III double-blind, placebo-controlled study randomizing 62 children with ITP (baseline platelet count $< 30 \times 10^{9}$ /l) 2:1 to romiplostim or placebo for 24 weeks.³³ The primary endpoint was a durable platelet response, defined as achieving a platelet response (platelet count $\ge 50 \times 10^{9}$ /l without rescue drug use in the preceding 4 weeks) in 6 or more of the final 8 weeks of the trial. The overall incidence of platelet response was significantly higher in the romiplostim group (72%) as compared with the placebo group (20%; Figure 2). A durable platelet response was achieved in 52% of the patients in the romiplostim group, compared with 10% in



Figure 1. Percent with platelet count $\ge 50 \times 10^{9}$ /l for at least 2 consecutive weeks phase I/II study of romiplostim for pediatric ITP (prepared from data from Bussel *et al.*²⁵). ITP, immune thrombocytopenia.

the placebo group. In the extension study that followed, 94% of patients had one or more platelet response, 72% had a platelet response at \geq 75% of visits, and 58% responded at \geq 90% of visits.³⁴ The median duration of treatment was 2.6 years.

The effect of romiplostim on bleeding symptoms and quality of life in children with ITP in comparison with other second-line ITP treatments has been additionally demonstrated in a large, prospective, multicenter observational study of 120 children.³⁵ Treatments evaluated included romiplostim, eltrombopag, splenectomy, rituximab, and oral immunosuppressive agents. In addition to demonstrating that romiplostim had the most pronounced improvement on platelet counts, only patients treated with romiplostim or rituximab had significant reduction in both skinrelated and nonskin-related bleeding symptoms after 1 month of treatment. Health-related quality of life also improved significantly in children treated with romiplostim or eltrombopag.

There are, additionally, several pivotal studies of adults with ITP treated with romiplostim that deserve mention given their size and role in regulatory approval of the agent. Two parallel doubleblind phase III studies carried out in the United States and Europe, randomizing a total of 83 adults with ITP (platelet count $< 30 \times 10^{9}$ /l) for ≥ 12 months to romiplostim and 42 to placebo found significantly higher rates of platelet response (platelet count $\geq 50 \times 10^{9}$ /l) in romiplostim-treated patients, with 88% of nonsplenectomized and 79% of splenectomized patients responding, compared with 14% of nonsplenectomized and 0% of splenectomized patients given placebo.³¹ Patients treated with romiplostim achieved a response over a mean of 15.2 weeks (nonsplenectomized) and 13.8 weeks (splenectomized) *versus* 1.3 weeks (nonsplenectomized) and 0.2 weeks (splenectomized) for patients treated with placebo. Additionally, 78% of romiplostimtreated patients reduced or discontinued concurrent ITP therapies compared with 38% of placebo-treated patients.

A large open-label phase III study carried out in North America, Europe, and Australia randomizing 157 nonsplenectomized adults with ITP (platelet count $< 50 \times 10^{9}$ /l) for ≥ 12 months to romiplostim and 77 to standard of care (SOC) found the rate of platelet response (platelet count $\ge 50 \times 10^{9}$ /l at a clinic visit) was 2.3 times higher in the romiplostim arm than the SOC arm.22 Additionally, there were lower rates of treatment failure (11% romiplostim, 30% SOC), splenectomy (9% romiplostim, 36% SOC), bleeding, and blood transfusions in the romiplostim arm as compared with the SOC arm. There was significantly greater quality-of-life improvement in romiplostim-treated patients compared with SOC, as well. Extension studies of romiplostim treatment of adults with ITP demonstrated continued efficacy for up to 5 years of treatment.

Phase III trials of romiplostim in ITP in children and adults are summarized in Table 2.

A large prospective 17-country open-label trial treating children with ITP for ≥ 6 months with romiplostim found similar efficacy to the smaller phase III studies.³⁷ Although final results of this trial have not yet been published, preliminary results were recently published in abstract form. A total of 203 children (mean age of 10 years)



Figure 2. Overall platelet response by age group in children with ITP treated with romiplostim *versus* placebo in phase III study (prepared from data from the work of Tarantino *et al.*³³). ITP, immune thrombocytopenia.

with a median baseline platelet count of $14 \times 10^{9/1}$ were treated for a median duration of 145 weeks, with 88% of patients having at least one platelet response (platelet count $\ge 50 \times 10^{9/1}$ with no rescue therapy in the preceding 4 weeks) in the first 6 months of treatment. Additionally, the median percent of time with an increase in platelet count of $\ge 20 \times 10^{9/1}$ above baseline from week 2 until the end of treatment was 79%.

Safety of romiplostim in immune thrombocytopenia

Romiplostim was overall well tolerated in clinical trials. In adult trials, the most common nonbleeding-related adverse events were headache, insomnia, myalgia, arthralgia, and mild dizziness.²² In pediatric studies, the most commonly reported nonbleeding-related adverse events were headache, upper respiratory infection, nausea/vomiting, and oropharyngeal pain^{25,33}; no patients suffered a thromboembolic event in the randomized pediatric studies or the open-label extension.

Consistent with the natural history of childhood ITP, bleeding events were rare overall in pediatric studies, with the highest risk of bleeding occurring in the initial few weeks of treatment during drug titration. In the initial randomized phase I/II trial, 12 patients had grade 1 bleeding and 1 patient had grade 2 bleeding (epistaxis, contusion, petechiae).²⁵ In the phase III study, 83% of romiplostim-treated patients had bleeding events, but nearly all were mild epistaxis, petechiae, contusion, or gingival bleeding; there were no intracranial hemorrhages or fatal bleeding.³³ Similar findings were seen in the extension study following the phase III trial³⁴ and have been reported

from a large international prospective open-label study published in abstract form.³⁷

Potential adverse events of greatest concern with the long-term use of romiplostim are thromboembolic events and bone marrow fibrosis. Studies of platelet function from human ITP patients treated with romiplostim,38 eltrombopag,39 and avatrombopag⁴⁰ showed no evidence of spontaneous platelet aggregation or hyper-reactive platelets in the setting of TPO-RA use. In a study examining platelet function by light-transmission platelet aggregometry in romiplostim-treated adults with ITP, rather than observing hyperactive platelets, there were, instead, defects in platelet-aggregation response to adenosine diphosphate and epinephrine in the platelets of these patients. These defects are probably due to the effects of platelet autoantibodies on platelets rather than any impact of romiplostim. Since ITP is known to be a prothrombotic state with higher rates of arterial and venous thromboembolic events than the general population,^{41–43} it remains unclear whether the thromboembolic events seen in ITP patients on TPO-RAs are due to the underlying risks of the disease or an effect of these treatments. All randomized studies of romiplostim in ITP patients have shown no higher risk of either arterial or venous thrombosis in romiplostimtreated patients compared with placebo.44 Furthermore, in large studies of ITP patients treated with romiplostim there was no association of the platelet count with thromboses⁴⁵; indeed, prior data in over 1000 ITP patients showed that the rate of thromboses increased as the platelet count decreased.45 An international multicenter study of 203 pediatric ITP patients treated with romiplostim with a total of 428.7 patient-years of

Study	Patient number (<i>n</i>)	Location	Study population	Major results (compared with placebo)
Kuter <i>et al</i> . ³¹	Romiplostim <i>n</i> =83 Placebo <i>n</i> =42 (patients from two parallel studies)	United States and Europe	Adults with ITP for ≥12 months and screening mean platelets < 30 × 10%/l 50% splenectomized	Significantly higher rate of platelet response ^a Reduced use of concomitant ITP medications
Kuter <i>et al.</i> ²²	Romiplostim n = 157 Standard of care n = 77	North America, Europe, and Australia	Adults with ITP for ≥12 months and a pretreatment platelet count < 50 × 10 ⁹ /l 0% splenectomized	Significantly higher rate of platelet response ^a Reduced use of concomitant ITP medications Lower rate of treatment failure Lower rate of splenectomy Significantly less bleeding and fewer transfusions Significantly improved quality of life
Shirasugi <i>et al.</i> ³⁶	Romiplostim <i>n</i> = 22 Placebo <i>n</i> = 12	Japan	Adults ≥ 20 -years old with ITP for ≥ 6 months and a screening platelet count $\leq 30 \times 10^{9}/l$ 44% splenectomized	Significantly higher rate of platelet response ^a Reduced need for rescue therapy
Tarantino <i>et al</i> . ³³	Romiplostim <i>n</i> =42 Placebo <i>n</i> =20	United States, Canada, Australia	Children aged 1–17 years of age with ITP for ≥6 months and a screening mean platelet count < 30 × 10 ⁹ /l 3% splenectomized	Significantly higher rate of platelet response ^a Significantly higher rate of durable platelet response Reduced need for rescue therapy

Table 2. Phase III trials of romiplostim in ITP.

Each trial was a prospective, multicenter, randomized, placebo-controlled, double-blind study except Kuter *et al.*,²² which was open label. ^aPlatelet response defined as a platelet count $\ge 50 \times 10^{9}$ /l at a given assessment on treatment with romiplostim or placebo. ITP, immune thrombocytopenia.

romiplostim exposure did not report any thrombotic events.³⁷

Bone marrow fibrosis over long-term use of TPO-RAs remains a potential concern, although evidence from adult patients receiving romiplostim for several years is reassuring, with very low risks of reversible marrow reticulin fibrosis and a nearzero risk of serious, irreversible collagen fibrosis.46,47 The risk of bone marrow fibrosis in infants or young children treated with romiplostim for long periods remains unknown, however, and is a risk that should be discussed with patients and caregivers. Randomized pediatric romiplostim studies did not require interval bone marrow biopsy to evaluate for possible fibrosis but there were no hematologic complications consistent with development of fibrosis; a large, international multicenter study including 203 patients reported bone marrow biopsy results on 75 children with ITP receiving romiplostim, finding no occurrence

of collagen fibrosis or bone marrow abnormalities. A potentially significant increase in reticulin fibrosis (an increase of ≥ 2 grades) occurred in a single patient.³⁷ Long-term effects of romiplostim and other TPO-RAs in children with chronic ITP, who may require lifelong treatment, are unknown. Finally, concerns for the possibility of leukemogenesis with romiplostim have been largely put to rest following publication of a large study of adult patients with myelodysplastic syndrome treated with romiplostim for extended periods, showing no increased risk of progression to acute myeloid leukemia after several years of follow up.⁴⁸

Selection of thrombopoietin receptor agonist in chronic pediatric immune thrombocytopenia: romiplostim *versus* eltrombopag

Choice of therapy in chronic ITP in children is a complex topic⁴⁹ and a subject of consensus

guideline statements.^{13–15} Because platelet counts vary considerably in ITP and many patients are able to maintain counts $\ge 30 \times 10^{9}$ /l consistently, the first question to be asked in each patient is whether treatment is indicated. Prior bleeding events, current bleeding symptoms, activity level and sports participation, fatigue, patient and caregiver anxiety, and other factors play a major role in this determination beyond baseline platelet count. In patients for whom treatment is indicated, long courses of glucocorticoids are contraindicated due to effects on growth and other short and long-term complications in children; IVIG and intravenous anti-D immunoglobulin typically provide only temporary platelet count improvement. Therefore, subsequent, or secondline treatment options in pediatric ITP generally include rituximab, thrombopoietin receptor agonists, and off-label immunosuppressive treatments such as azathioprine, mycophenolate, and sirolimus, with splenectomy much less commonly selected in comparison with adults with ITP. Thrombopoietin receptor agonists are the only FDA-approved second-line treatments in pediatric ITP and offer high response rates without immunosuppression and durable responses at the cost of prolonged or indefinite treatment. The new American Society of Hematology guidelines favor TPO-RA over rituximab and splenectomy in the treatment of children with ITP.14

In those patients for whom a TPO-RA is selected, romiplostim and eltrombopag are the two options FDA approved in children (avatrombopag's ITP approval is limited to adults, and lusutrombopag is not approved for ITP), Table 3. Currently, it is not possible to predict response to TPO-RAs, or differential response to romiplostim or eltrombopag, in children, although there are several studies evaluating this in adults that have found an inverse relationship between baseline TPO level and likelihood of response to TPO-RAs. A study of baseline endogenous TPO levels in adult ITP patients found different TPO thresholds for prediction of nonresponse to romiplostim and eltrombopag, suggesting that romiplostim is likely to be effective in a population of ITP patients with mild elevations in TPO levels, whereas eltrombopag is less likely to be effective.⁵⁰ This may be related to agent potency; in healthy subjects, maximal doses of romiplostim increased the platelet count approximately 8-10 times that of maximal doses of eltrombopag.20,51-53

The primary advantage of eltrombopag is oral administration. This may be especially relevant in young children, who may develop needle phobia from weekly romiplostim subcutaneous injections and, initially, weekly lab monitoring. However, there are several issues with eltrombopag that can affect its effectiveness and additional safety concerns compared with romiplostim. Absorption of eltrombopag is dramatically reduced by divalent cations such as calcium or magnesium, as well as dietary fats, and the drug label advises avoidance of these for a 4-6-hour window around its administration. Because dietary fats and minerals are so common in foods and unavoidable in most standard Western diets, this functionally becomes a 4-6-hour fasted window to ensure proper absorption, which may be very challenging in children. Given this, many pediatric hematologists will accept the child taking eltrombopag at least 1 h prior to eating, or 2h after eating and away from dairy or iron supplements. Considering the prolonged durations of treatment required, these dietary restrictions are not a minor issue; either quality of life or treatment effectiveness is compromised. Because eltrombopag has a half-life of 35h in patients with ITP, dosing less frequently than once daily to minimize quality-of-life concerns is reasonable; this approach has been tried in adults with success,⁵⁴ but there is no evidence to support this approach in children. The major important adverse effect of eltrombopag is hepatotoxicity, which merits regular liver enzyme monitoring and is not associated with romiplostim. Finally, eltrombopag is an iron chelator and can precipitate iron-deficiency anemia in children with ITP.55,56 Avatrombopag is an oral TPO-RA with no dietary restrictions with administration, reported hepatotoxicity, or iron-chelation properties,^{57,58} so presents a potentially appealing oral option if approved for children in the future. Romiplostim has none of these disadvantages but typically requires clinic visits for administration, which can be burdensome and time consuming for both patient and caregiver. Occasionally, the decision may be dictated by the patient's insurance coverage. Both romiplostim and eltrombopag are expensive, but cost-effectiveness studies of the two drugs are conflicting.59,60

Defining treatment success and failure

The goal of romiplostim treatment is bleeding prevention and optimizing patient quality of life. The target platelet count should be based on

	Romiplostim	Eltrombopag	Avatrombopag			
Molecular structure	Peptide	Small molecule	Small molecule			
TPO receptor site of action	Extracellular domain	Transmembrane domain	Transmembrane domain			
Route of administration	Subcutaneous	Oral	Oral			
Dosing frequency ^a	Weekly	Daily	Daily or less frequently than daily			
Relevant food interactions	N/A	Yes	No			
Hepatotoxicity observed in clinical trials	No	Yes	No			
Average US wholesale price	\$2230.30 per 250 µg vial \$4460.59 per 500 µg vial	\$197.06 per tablet (12.5 mg or 25 mg) \$356.61 per tablet (50 mg) \$534.92 per tablet (75 mg)	\$356.40 per 20 mg tablet			
Current indications	Newly diagnosed ITP (adults) Persistent ITP (adults and children) ^b Chronic ITP (adults and children)	Persistent ITP (children) ^b Chronic ITP (adults and children) Hepatitis-C-associated thrombocytopenia Severe aplastic anemia	Chronic ITP (adults) Periprocedural thrombocytopenia in CLD patients			
Selected indications under investigation	Chemotherapy-induced thrombocytopenia Perioperative thrombocytopenia	Acute ITP (first-line setting) Inherited thrombocytopenia	Chemotherapy-induced thrombocytopenia			

Table 3. Comparison of the TPO-RAs used in ITP treatment. Lusutrombopag is not included as it is not approved for ITP.

Adapted with permission from Al-Samkari and Kuter.27

^aPer drug label.

^bDisease duration \geq 6 months in children.

CLD, chronic liver disease; ITP, immune thrombocytopenia; N/A, not applicable; RA, receptor agonist; TPO, thrombopoietin.

achievement of these treatment goals and is generally between 50×10^{9} /l and 150×10^{9} /l in most patients. Normalization of the platelet count is rarely necessary, although an argument for a slightly higher goal range (albeit without supporting evidence), such as between 100×10^{9} /l and 200×10^{9} /l, may be made for children participating in contact sports. Children with ITP requiring major surgery may require platelet counts $\geq 100 \times 10^{9}$ /l. In most patients, and especially those with difficult-to-control disease, a platelet count of $\geq 20 \times 10^{9}$ /l without bleeding symptoms is adequate.

Treatment discontinuation for futility is advised if the platelet count is not sufficiently improved after 4 weeks of treatment at maximal dose $(10 \,\mu\text{g/kg})$ of romiplostim.¹⁹ Often, the addition of small amounts of prednisone $(1-5 \,\text{mg/day})$ in patients failing romiplostim treatment will convert a nonresponder to a responder.⁵⁰ If prednisone addition is unsuccessful or not tolerated, a switch to eltrombopag is not unreasonable; multiple publications report success with this approach in adults.⁶¹ However, some patients will fail both TPO-RAs and require a transition to a different treatment modality.

Most children with ITP will spontaneously remit regardless of treatment. A minority of adult patients with chronic ITP eventually remit, and remissions after prolonged treatment with TPO-RAs in these patients have been reported.^{62,63} Although it is not known if a similar phenomenon occurs in pediatric ITP, we advise gradual romiplostim downtitration and discontinuation should be considered in patients with platelet counts persistently $> 200 \times 10^9$ /l. When treatment is discontinued for possible remission or some other reason, we perform a taper over 2–4weeks, given that rebound thrombocytopenia with romiplostim discontinuation has been observed in approximately 10–15% of adult ITP patients.¹⁵

Conclusion

Romiplostim is a newly FDA-approved option in persistent and chronic pediatric ITP, supported by two randomized clinical trials and two long-term extension studies demonstrating efficacy and safety. It has a high response rate with few side effects. Its primary drawback is weekly subcutaneous administration, but it is not associated with the hepatotoxicity or dietary restrictions of eltrombopag. Choice of TPO-RA in the pediatric patient with ITP is patient dependent and clinicians should consider the benefits and risks of each agent. The most common adverse event attributable to romiplostim in clinical trials was headache. While it remains a theoretical concern, particularly in adults, thrombotic events have not been elevated in romiplostim-treated versus placebo-treated ITP patients in randomized clinical trials. The goal of treatment is to prevent bleeding, not to normalize the platelet count; given that most bleeding events in trials of pediatric ITP occurred in the first 6 weeks of treatment during drug uptitration, initiation of romiplostim at doses higher than 1 µg/kg is reasonable in clinical practice. Relatively little has been published in children beyond the initial clinical trials and extension studies. Therefore, many questions, such as predictors of romiplostim response in children, use in children less than 1 year of age, and possible long-term adverse events in children treated for years, or decades, into adulthood remain important topics of further study.

Acknowledgements

HA is the recipient of the National Hemophilia Foundation-Shire Clinical Fellowship Award, American Society of Hematology Scholar Award, and Harvard KL2/Catalyst Medical Research Investigator Training Award, which provide salary support.

Author contributions

HA drafted the manuscript, created the tables and figures, and contributed to concept and design, critical revision of the intellectual content, and final approval. RFG contributed to concept and design, critical revision of the intellectual content, and final approval. DJK contributed to concept and design, critical revision of the intellectual content, and final approval.

Funding

The author(s) received no financial support for the research, authorship, and/or publication of this article.

Conflict of interest statement

Dr Al-Samkari reports consultancy (Agios, Dova, Moderna) and research funding (Agios, Dova). Dr Grace reports scientific advisorship (Agios), consultancy (Agios), and research funding (Agios, Novartis). Dr Kuter reports research funding (Protalex, Bristol-Myers Squibb, Rigel, Bioverativ, Agios, Syntimmune, Principia, Alnylam) and consultancy (ONO, Pfizer, 3SBios, Eisai, GlaxoSmithKline, Genzyme, Shire, Alexion, Amgen, Shionogi, Rigel, Syntimmune, MedImmune, Novartis, Bioverativ, Argenx, Zafgen).

Ethics approval statement

Ethics approval was not required for this review.

Informed consent statement

Informed consent was not required for this review.

ORCID iD

David J. Kuter D https://orcid.org/0000-0001-6175-1383

References

- 1. Kuter DJ, Beeler DL and Rosenberg RD. The purification of megapoietin: a physiological regulator of megakaryocyte growth and platelet production. *Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A* 1994; 91: 11104–11108.
- 2. Kuter DJ and Gernsheimer TB. Thrombopoietin and platelet production in chronic immune thrombocytopenia. *Hematol Oncol Clin North Am* 2009; 23: 1193–1211.
- 3. Afdhal NH, Dusheiko GM, Giannini EG, *et al.* Eltrombopag increases platelet numbers in thrombocytopenic patients with HCV infection and cirrhosis, allowing for effective antiviral therapy. *Gastroenterology* 2014; 146: 442–452.e441.
- Al-Samkari H, Marshall AL, Goodarzi K, et al. Romiplostim for the management of perioperative thrombocytopenia. Br J Haematol 2018; 182: 106–113.

- Nagrebetsky A, Al-Samkari H, Davis NM, et al. Perioperative thrombocytopenia: evidence, evaluation, and emerging therapies. Br J Anaesth 2019; 122: 19–31.
- Al-Samkari H, Marshall AL, Goodarzi K, et al. The use of romiplostim in treating chemotherapyinduced thrombocytopenia in patients with solid tumors. *Haematologica* 2018; 103: e169–e172.
- Soff GA, Miao Y, Bendheim G, *et al.* Romiplostim treatment of chemotherapy-induced thrombocytopenia. *J Clin Oncol.* Epub ahead of print 23 September 2019. DOI: 10.1200/ JCO.18.01931.
- Townsley DM, Scheinberg P, Winkler T, et al. Eltrombopag added to standard immunosuppression for aplastic anemia. N Engl J Med 2017; 376: 1540–1550.
- Harrington WJ, Minnich V, Hollingsworth JW, et al. Demonstration of a thrombocytopenic factor in the blood of patients with thrombocytopenic purpura. J Lab Clin Med 1951; 38: 1–10.
- Harker LA and Finch CA. Thrombokinetics in man. J Clin Invest 1969; 48: 963–974.
- McMillan R, Wang L, Tomer A, *et al.* Suppression of in vitro megakaryocyte production by antiplatelet autoantibodies from adult patients with chronic ITP. *Blood* 2004; 103: 1364–1369.
- Al-Samkari H, Rosovsky RP, Karp Leaf RS, et al. A modern reassessment of glycoprotein-specific direct platelet autoantibody testing in immune thrombocytopenia. *Blood Advances* 2020 Jan 14; 4(1): 9–18.
- Neunert C, Lim W, Crowther M, et al. The American Society of Hematology 2011 evidence-based practice guideline for immune thrombocytopenia. *Blood* 2011; 117: 4190–4207.
- Provan D, Stasi R, Newland AC, et al. International consensus report on the investigation and management of primary immune thrombocytopenia. Blood 2010; 115: 168–186.
- Neunert CE and Cooper N. Evidence-based management of immune thrombocytopenia: ASH guideline update. *Hematology Am Soc Hematol Educ Program* 2018; 2018: 568–575.
- Bussel JB, Kuter DJ, George JN, *et al.* AMG 531, a thrombopoiesis-stimulating protein, for chronic ITP. N Engl J Med 2006; 355: 1672–1681.
- 17. Emmons RV, Reid DM, Cohen RL, *et al.* Human thrombopoietin levels are high when thrombocytopenia is due to megakaryocyte

deficiency and low when due to increased platelet destruction. *Blood* 1996; 87: 4068–4071.

- Wang B, Nichol JL and Sullivan JT. Pharmacodynamics and pharmacokinetics of AMG 531, a novel thrombopoietin receptor ligand. *Clin Pharmacol Ther* 2004; 76: 628–638.
- Nplate[®]. Prescribing information: Nplate (romiplostim). Thousand Oaks, CA: Amgen Inc., 2018.
- Kumagai Y, Fujita T, Ozaki M, et al. Pharmacodynamics and pharmacokinetics of AMG 531, a thrombopoiesis-stimulating peptibody, in healthy Japanese subjects: a randomized, placebo-controlled study. J Clin Pharmacol 2007; 47: 1489–1497.
- 21. Barger TE, Boshier A, Jawa V, *et al.* Assessment of romiplostim immunogenicity in adult patients in clinical trials and in a global registry. *Blood* 2018; 132: 2427.
- Kuter DJ, Rummel M, Boccia R, et al. Romiplostim or standard of care in patients with immune thrombocytopenia. N Engl J Med 2010; 363: 1889–1899.
- Steurer M, Quittet P, Papadaki HA, et al. A large observational study of patients with primary immune thrombocytopenia receiving romiplostim in European clinical practice. Eur J Haematol 2017; 98: 112–120.
- Neunert C, Despotovic J, Haley K, et al. Thrombopoietin receptor agonist use in children: data from the pediatric ITP consortium of North America ICON2 study. *Pediatr Blood Cancer* 2016; 63: 1407–1413.
- 25. Bussel JB, Buchanan GR, Nugent DJ, *et al.* A randomized, double-blind study of romiplostim to determine its safety and efficacy in children with immune thrombocytopenia. *Blood* 2011; 118: 28–36.
- DasGupta RK, Levine L, Wiczer T, et al. Initial romiplostim dosing and time to platelet response in patients with treatment refractory immune thrombocytopenia. *J Oncol Pharm Pract.* Epub ahead of print 3 January 2018. DOI: 10.1177/1078155217748470.
- Al-Samkari H and Kuter DJ. Optimal use of thrombopoietin receptor agonists in immune thrombocytopenia. *Ther Adv Hematol* 2019; 10: 2040620719841735.
- 28. Selleslag D, Bird R, Altomare I, *et al.* Impact of self-administration of romiplostim by patients with chronic immune thrombocytopenia

compared with administration by a healthcare provider. *Eur J Haematol* 2015; 94: 169–176.

- 29. Schipperus M, Kaiafa G, Taylor L, *et al.* Assessment of self-administration of romiplostim in patients with immune thrombocytopenic purpura after receipt of home administration training materials: a cross-sectional study. *Drug Saf* 2019; 42: 77–83.
- Cines DB, Gernsheimer T, Wasser J, et al. Integrated analysis of long-term safety in patients with chronic immune thrombocytopaenia (ITP) treated with the thrombopoietin (TPO) receptor agonist romiplostim. Int J Hematol 2015; 102: 259–270.
- Kuter DJ, Bussel JB, Lyons RM, et al. Efficacy of romiplostim in patients with chronic immune thrombocytopenic purpura: a double-blind randomised controlled trial. *Lancet* 2008; 371: 395–403.
- Bussel JB, Hsieh L, Buchanan GR, et al. Long-term use of the thrombopoietin-mimetic romiplostim in children with severe chronic immune thrombocytopenia (ITP). Pediatr Blood Cancer 2015; 62: 208–213.
- Tarantino MD, Bussel JB, Blanchette VS, et al. Romiplostim in children with immune thrombocytopenia: a phase 3, randomised, double-blind, placebo-controlled study. *Lancet* 2016; 388: 45–54.
- Tarantino MD, Bussel JB, Blanchette VS, et al. Long-term treatment with romiplostim and treatment-free platelet responses in children with chronic immune thrombocytopenia. *Haematologica*. Epub ahead of print 7 March 2019. DOI: 10.3324/haematol.2018.202283.
- Grace RF, Shimano KA, Bhat R, *et al.* Secondline treatments in children with immune thrombocytopenia: effect on platelet count and patient-centered outcomes. *Am J Hematol* 2019; 94: 741–750.
- 36. Shirasugi Y, Ando K, Miyazaki K, et al. Romiplostim for the treatment of chronic immune thrombocytopenia in adult Japanese patients: a double-blind, randomized phase III clinical trial. Int J Hematol 2011; 94: 71–80.
- Granger J, Bussel JB, Tarantino MD, et al. Updated results for the single-arm, openlabel, long-term efficacy and safety study of subcutaneous (SC) romiplostim in children with immune thrombocytopenia (ITP). Blood 2019; 134: 1095.
- 38. Al-Samkari H, Van Cott EM and Kuter DJ. Platelet aggregation response in immune

thrombocytopenia patients treated with romiplostim. *Ann Hematol* 2019; 98: 581–588.

- 39. Psaila B, Bussel JB, Linden MD, *et al.* In vivo effects of eltrombopag on platelet function in immune thrombocytopenia: no evidence of platelet activation. *Blood* 2012; 119: 4066–4072.
- Michelson AD, Smolensky Koganov E, Forde EE, et al. Avatrombopag increases platelet count but not platelet activation in patients with thrombocytopenia resulting from liver disease. J Thromb Haemost. Epub ahaed of print 15 October 2018. DOI: 10.1111/jth.14295.
- 41. Sarpatwari A, Bennett D, Logie JW, et al. Thromboembolic events among adult patients with primary immune thrombocytopenia in the United Kingdom general practice research database. *Haematologica* 2010; 95: 1167–1175.
- 42. Severinsen MT, Engebjerg MC, Farkas DK, et al. Risk of venous thromboembolism in patients with primary chronic immune thrombocytopenia: a Danish population-based cohort study. Br J Haematol 2011; 152: 360–362.
- Langeberg WJ, Schoonen WM, Eisen M, et al. Thromboembolism in patients with immune thrombocytopenia (ITP): a meta-analysis of observational studies. Int J Hematol 2016; 103: 655–664.
- 44. Cines DB, Wasser J, Rodeghiero F, *et al.* Safety and efficacy of romiplostim in splenectomized and nonsplenectomized patients with primary immune thrombocytopenia. *Haematologica* 2017; 102: 1342–1351.
- 45. Kuter DJ, Newland A, Chong BH, et al. Romiplostim in adult patients with newly diagnosed or persistent immune thrombocytopenia (ITP) for up to 1 year and in those with chronic ITP for more than 1 year: a subgroup analysis of integrated data from completed romiplostim studies. Br J Haematol 2019; 185: 503–513.
- 46. Kuter DJ, Mufti GJ, Bain BJ, *et al.* Evaluation of bone marrow reticulin formation in chronic immune thrombocytopenia patients treated with romiplostim. *Blood* 2009; 114: 3748–3756.
- Kuter DJ, Bussel JB, Newland A, et al. Longterm treatment with romiplostim in patients with chronic immune thrombocytopenia: safety and efficacy. Br J Haematol 2013; 161: 411–423.
- 48. Kantarjian HM, Fenaux P, Sekeres MA, *et al.* Long-term follow-up for up to 5 years on the risk of leukaemic progression in thrombocytopenic patients with lower-risk myelodysplastic syndromes treated with romiplostim or placebo in

a randomised double-blind trial. *Lancet Haematol* 2018; 5: e117–e126.

- Grace RF, Despotovic JM, Bennett CM, et al. Physician decision making in selection of second-line treatments in immune thrombocytopenia in children. Am J Hematol 2018; 93: 882–888.
- 50. Al-Samkari H and Kuter DJ. Thrombopoietin level predicts response to treatment with eltrombopag and romiplostim in immune thrombocytopenia. *Am J Hematol* 2018; 93: 1501–1508.
- Jenkins JM, Williams D, Deng Y, et al. Phase 1 clinical study of eltrombopag, an oral, nonpeptide thrombopoietin receptor agonist. *Blood* 2007; 109: 4739–4741.
- 52. Nomoto M, Pastino G, Rege B, *et al.* Pharmacokinetics, pharmacodynamics, pharmacogenomics, safety, and tolerability of avatrombopag in healthy Japanese and white subjects. *Clin Pharmacol Drug Dev* 2018; 7: 188–195.
- 53. Al-Samkari H and Kuter DJ. Relative potency of the thrombopoietin receptor agonists eltrombopag, avatrombopag and romiplostim in a patient with chronic immune thrombocytopenia. Br J Haematol 2018; 183: 168.
- Al-Samkari H and Kuter DJ. An alternative intermittent eltrombopag dosing protocol for the treatment of chronic immune thrombocytopenia. *Br J Clin Pharmacol* 2018; 84: 2673–2677.
- 55. Fattizzo B, Cavallaro F, Milesi G, et al. Iron mobilization in a real life cohort of aplastic anemia patients treated with eltrombopag. Am *J Hematol*. Epub ahead of print 17 June 2019. DOI: 10.1002/ajh.25550.

- 56. Vlachodimitropoulou E, Chen YL, Garbowski M, et al. Eltrombopag: a powerful chelator of cellular or extracellular iron(III) alone or combined with a second chelator. Blood 2017; 130: 1923–1933.
- 57. Al-Samkari H. Avatrombopag maleate for the treatment of periprocedural thrombocytopenia in patients with chronic liver disease. *Drugs of today* 2018; 54: 647–655.
- Cheloff AZ and Al-Samkari H. Avatrombopag for the treatment of immune thrombocytopenia and thrombocytopenia of chronic liver disease. *J Blood Med* 2019; 10: 313–321.
- 59. Tremblay G, Dolph M, Bhor M, *et al.* Costconsequence model comparing eltrombopag versus romiplostim for adult patients with chronic immune thrombocytopenia. *Clinicoecon Outcomes Res* 2018; 10: 705–713.
- Fust K, Parthan A, Li X, *et al.* Cost per response analysis of strategies for chronic immune thrombocytopenia. *Am J Manag Care* 2018; 24: SP294–SP302.
- Kuter DJ, Macahilig C, Grotzinger KM, et al. Treatment patterns and clinical outcomes in patients with chronic immune thrombocytopenia (ITP) switched to eltrombopag or romiplostim. Int J Hematol 2015; 101: 255–263.
- Newland A, Godeau B, Priego V, et al. Remission and platelet responses with romiplostim in primary immune thrombocytopenia: final results from a phase 2 study. Br J Haematol 2016; 172: 262–273.
- Gonzalez-Lopez TJ, Pascual C, Alvarez-Roman MT, et al. Successful discontinuation of eltrombopag after complete remission in patients with primary immune thrombocytopenia. Am J Hematol 2015; 90: E40–E43.

Visit SAGE journals online journals.sagepub.com/ home/tah

SAGE journals