



University of Dundee

What does STOP-IgAN tell us about how to treat IgA nephropathy?

Rutherford, E.; Mark, P. B.

Published in:
Journal of the Royal College of Physicians of Edinburgh

DOI:
[10.4997/JRCPE.2016.107](https://doi.org/10.4997/JRCPE.2016.107)

Publication date:
2016

Document Version
Peer reviewed version

[Link to publication in Discovery Research Portal](#)

Citation for published version (APA):
Rutherford, E., & Mark, P. B. (2016). What does STOP-IgAN tell us about how to treat IgA nephropathy? *Journal of the Royal College of Physicians of Edinburgh*, 46(1), 23-25. <https://doi.org/10.4997/JRCPE.2016.107>

General rights

Copyright and moral rights for the publications made accessible in Discovery Research Portal are retained by the authors and/or other copyright owners and it is a condition of accessing publications that users recognise and abide by the legal requirements associated with these rights.

- Users may download and print one copy of any publication from Discovery Research Portal for the purpose of private study or research.
- You may not further distribute the material or use it for any profit-making activity or commercial gain.
- You may freely distribute the URL identifying the publication in the public portal.

Take down policy

If you believe that this document breaches copyright please contact us providing details, and we will remove access to the work immediately and investigate your claim.

What does STOP-IgAN tell us about how to treat IgA Nephropathy?

E Rutherford¹ PB Mark²

¹Division of Cardiovascular and Diabetes Medicine, Medical Research Institute, University of Dundee, Dundee, United Kingdom

²Institute of Cardiovascular and Medical Sciences, BHF Glasgow Clinical Research Centre, University of Glasgow, Glasgow, United Kingdom

TITLE: Intensive Supportive Care plus Immunosuppression in IgA Nephropathy

AUTHORS: Rauen T, Eitner F, Fitzner C et al.

JOURNAL: N Engl J Med 2015; 373: 2225-36. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1056/NEJMoa1415463>

DECLARATION OF INTERESTS: None declared

SUMMARY

The Intensive Supportive Care plus Immunosuppression in IgA Nephropathy (STOP-IgAN) trial was designed to investigate the outcomes of immunosuppressive therapy, when added to maximal supportive care, in patients with IgA nephropathy (IgAN). This was a multicentre, open-label, randomised, controlled trial with a two-group, parallel group design.

Following screening, 337 participants were recruited from 32 nephrology centres across Germany. The main inclusion criteria were biopsy confirmed primary IgAN; age 18 to 70; and a proteinuria level above 0.75g/day plus hypertension, impaired renal function (estimated glomerular filtration rate [eGFR] <90ml/min/1.73m²), or both. Patients with eGFR <30ml/minute/1.73m², those with rapidly progressive crescentic IgAN, secondary IgAN and other chronic renal diseases, or who had previously received immunosuppression were excluded.

The first stage of the trial involved a six-month run-in phase where all patients received intensive supportive care including Renin Angiotensin System (RAS) blockade to lower BP to a target below 125/70mmHg. If proteinuria persisted above 0.75g/day once this target BP was achieved, the dose of RAS blocker (either angiotensin converting enzyme inhibitor [ACEI], angiotensin receptor blocker [ARB] or both) was increased as tolerated up to the maximum approved dosage. Participants were seen seven times during this period. 34% of patients had a response to supportive care during this period with proteinuria falling to below 0.75g/day. These responsive patients were excluded from the randomisation phase of the study.

Following the run-in phase, 162 participants with persistent proteinuria more than 0.75g/day but less than 3.5g/day were randomised to the 3-year study phase. These participants were randomly assigned either to continue with maximal supportive care alone (80 participants), or to receive maximal supportive care plus immunosuppressive therapy (82 participants).

Depending on the eGFR, the immunosuppression given in the immunosuppression arm of the study varied. Patients with eGFR between 30 and 59ml/min/1.73m² received cyclophosphamide (1.5mg/kilogram/day) for 3 months, followed by azathioprine (1.5mg/kg/day) during months 4-36, plus oral prednisolone initially at dose of 40mg/day, tapered to 7.5mg/day by month 6 of the study and continued on this dose until the study end. Those with eGFR of \geq 60ml/min/1.73m² received glucocorticoid monotherapy for 6 months. They received intravenous methylprednisolone (1g/day) as 3 pulsed doses at the start of months 1, 3 and 5 and oral prednisolone (0.5mg/kg) every 48 hours on the other days.

The primary outcomes of the study were firstly, full clinical remission defined as proteinuria with protein:creatinine ratio of <0.2 and stable renal function with decrease in the eGFR of <5 ml/min/1.73m² from the baseline eGFR at the end of the 3 year trial phase and secondly, a decrease in the eGFR of at least 15ml/min/1.73m² from baseline eGFR.

After 3 years, 14 participants in the immunosuppression group met the first primary outcome measure of full clinical remission, compared to only 4 participants in the supportive therapy alone group. This difference was statistically significant (p=0.01). However, participants who had a full clinical remission had lower baseline levels of proteinuria than those who did not. There was no statistical difference in the number of patients in each group having decrease in eGFR of at least 15ml/min/1.73m² (28% in the supportive care group vs. 26% in the immunosuppression group) with no significant difference in rate of decline of eGFR between groups.

There were more episodes of infection (including one fatal pneumonia) in the immunosuppression group, of which 25% were considered directly related to immunosuppression. There were also more of episodes of neoplasm; impaired glucose metabolism and body weight gain in the immunosuppression arm.

The investigators stated, "We could not confirm our hypothesis that additional immunosuppressive therapy would provide substantial kidney-related benefits in patients with high risk IgAN."

OPINION

Approximately one quarter of individuals diagnosed with IgAN with significant proteinuria will progress to end stage renal disease (ESRD) requiring dialysis or a kidney transplant within 20-25 years of presentation.¹ The prognosis is worse for those patients with persistent proteinuria.¹⁻³ In this group approximately 50% may reach ESRD within 10 years.³ IgAN is the most common primary glomerulonephritis in the world (including Scotland).¹ RAS blockade to aggressively control BP and reduce proteinuria is the mainstay of treatment. Current Kidney Disease: Improving Global Outcomes (KDIGO) guidelines also recommend use of immunosuppression

with glucocorticoids if proteinuria remains above 1g/day with maximally tolerated RAS blockade.⁴ However, with the exception of those with nephrotic range proteinuria (>3.5g/day),⁵ the evidence base behind this strategy is relatively weak.⁶ The STOP-IgAN trial addresses this area of uncertainty.⁷

The first piece of knowledge we gain from this study is that, immunosuppression in patients with stage 1-3 chronic kidney disease caused by IgAN without nephrotic range proteinuria is of very limited benefit in addition to maximal supportive therapy.⁷ Previous studies, which inform the KDIGO guidelines, have shown some benefit from immunosuppressive therapy.^{4,8-12} However, as the STOP-IgAN investigators highlight, these studies lacked a run-in period where RAS blockade was maximised, and RAS blockade was either temporarily stopped pre-baseline, or was inconsistent throughout the studies.⁶⁻¹²

Further questions remain unanswered about immunosuppression in IgAN. Firstly, the follow up in STOP-IgAN was too short to determine if there is longer-term benefit gained by remission of proteinuria, which was achieved in a greater proportion of patients treated with immunosuppression.⁷ Similarly, due to the indolent yet progressive nature of IgAN, patients present at different stages in the disease. Some patients may have had haematoproteinuria for years prior to diagnosis. For immunosuppression to be effective, there should be minimal irreversible renal fibrosis present. Finally, the individual subgroups treated with the various immunosuppressive regimens were small.⁷ It is also unclear if more specific future immunosuppressive regimes (e.g. blisibimod, spleen tyrosine kinase inhibition etc) in the era of “precision medicine” may be more effective than the broad based immunosuppressive regimens employed in STOP-IgAN. The experience of STOP-IgAN highlights the challenges of testing new therapies in IgAN.

Perhaps the real success of this trial is the demonstration that traditional supportive therapy for IgAN is effective in the medium term – 34% of participants in STOP-IgAN achieved significant reduction in proteinuria.⁷ With effective RAS blockade and BP control proteinuria can be reduced significantly. Furthermore, with reduction in proteinuria one can expect an improved longer-term prognosis with slower rate of decline of eGFR.^{7,13} Incredibly mean BP in STOP-IgA was 126/78mmHg.⁷ The investigators must be commended on this achievement. Unfortunately real life rarely replicates the controlled environment of a clinical trial. This trial⁷ does provide further evidence that we should be aggressively targeting lower BP targets and maximising RAS blockade to reduce proteinuria even if, or when, these BP targets are achieved.

It is notable that approximately 42% of randomised participants in STOP-IgAN received both ARB and ACEI therapy simultaneously.⁷ On the back of three recent trials¹⁴⁻¹⁶ the UK Medicines and Healthcare products Regulatory Agency (MHRA) issued a warning against this combination, because of increased risk of hyperkalaemia, hypotension and impaired renal function.¹⁷ STOP-

IgAN had only one serious adverse event (in the supportive arm) associated with increased serum creatinine and potassium.⁷ The lack of serious complications of simultaneous ARB and ACEI in STOP-IgAN is probably due to intensive study monitoring. In clinical practice, where this level of monitoring is impractical, clinicians pursuing dual RAS blockade in this patient group would be contravening MHRA advice. We recommend maximal single-agent RAS blockade whilst heeding MHRA guidance.

REFERENCES

1. Barratt, J. & Feehally, J. IgA nephropathy. *J. Am. Soc. Nephrol.* **16**, 2088–97 (2005).
2. D’Amico, G. Natural history of idiopathic IgA nephropathy and factors predictive of disease outcome. *Semin. Nephrol.* **24**, 179–196 (2004).
3. Bartosik, L. P., Lajoie, G., Sugar, L. & Cattran, D. C. Predicting progression in IgA nephropathy. *Am. J. Kidney Dis.* **38**, 728–735 (2001).
4. Abstract. *Kidney Int. Suppl.* **2**, 142 (2012).
5. Kim, J.-K. *et al.* Clinical features and outcomes of IgA nephropathy with nephrotic syndrome. *Clin. J. Am. Soc. Nephrol.* **7**, 427–36 (2012).
6. Vecchio, M. *et al.* Immunosuppressive agents for treating IgA nephropathy. *Cochrane database Syst. Rev.* **8**, CD003965 (2015).
7. Rauen, T. *et al.* Intensive Supportive Care plus Immunosuppression in IgA Nephropathy. *N. Engl. J. Med.* **373**, 2225–36 (2015).
8. Pozzi, C. *et al.* Corticosteroid effectiveness in IgA nephropathy: long-term results of a randomized, controlled trial. *J. Am. Soc. Nephrol.* **15**, 157–63 (2004).
9. Pozzi, C. *et al.* Corticosteroids in IgA nephropathy: a randomised controlled trial. *Lancet (London, England)* **353**, 883–7 (1999).
10. Praga, M., Gutiérrez, E., González, E., Morales, E. & Hernández, E. Treatment of IgA nephropathy with ACE inhibitors: a randomized and controlled trial. *J. Am. Soc. Nephrol.* **14**, 1578–83 (2003).
11. Coppo, R. *et al.* IgACE: A Placebo-Controlled, Randomized Trial of Angiotensin-Converting Enzyme Inhibitors in Children and Young People with IgA Nephropathy and Moderate Proteinuria. *J. Am. Soc. Nephrol.* **18**, 1880–1888 (2007).
12. Manno, C., Torres, D. D., Rossini, M., Pesce, F. & Schena, F. P. Randomized controlled clinical trial of corticosteroids plus ACE-inhibitors with long-term follow-up in proteinuric IgA nephropathy. *Nephrol. Dial. Transplant* **24**, 3694–701 (2009).
13. Geddes, C. C. *et al.* A tricontinental view of IgA nephropathy. *Nephrol. Dial. Transplant* **18**, 1541–8 (2003).
14. Yusuf, S. *et al.* Telmisartan, ramipril, or both in patients at high risk for vascular events. *N. Engl. J. Med.* **358**, 1547–59 (2008).
15. Fried, L. F. *et al.* Combined angiotensin inhibition for the treatment of diabetic nephropathy. *N. Engl. J. Med.* **369**, 1892–903 (2013).
16. Parving, H.-H. *et al.* Cardiorenal end points in a trial of aliskiren for type 2 diabetes. *N. Engl. J. Med.* **367**, 2204–13 (2012).
17. *Combination use of medicines from different classes of renin-angiotensin system blocking agents: risk of hyperkalaemia, hypotension, and impaired renal function—new warnings Drug Safety Update - GOV.UK.* Drug Safety Update volume 7 issue 11, June 2014: A1.