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ABSTRACT

Objective C-C chemokine receptor type 5 (CCR5), a chemokine receptor expressed on T cells and macrophages, and its ligands are found in inflamed synovial tissue (ST) of patients with rheumatoid arthritis (RA). The rationale for testing CCR5 blockade in patients with RA was supported by the effects of a CCR5 antagonist in collagen-induced arthritis in rhesus monkeys. The effects of CCR5 blockade in patients with active RA were explored.

Methods In this phase Ib randomised, placebo-controlled trial, treatment with an oral CCR5 inhibitor (SCH351125) in patients with active RA was evaluated. Clinical efficacy was assessed using European League Against Rheumatism (EULAR) response criteria. ST biopsies were taken before and after 28 days of treatment, and analysed for CCR5+ cells. In a subset of patients, MRIs of an inflamed joint were obtained before and after treatment.

Results In all, 32 patients were included; 20 received SCH351125 and 12 placebo. Three patients who received SCH351125 did not complete the study due to adverse events; none of these were serious. No improvement was observed in the active treatment group compared to placebo. Results were consistent for clinical evaluation, ST analysis and MRI.

Conclusion This proof of concept study does not support the use of CCR5 blockade as a therapeutic strategy in patients with active RA.

INTRODUCTION

The inflamed synovial membrane in rheumatoid arthritis (RA) is infiltrated with inflammatory cells.1 Chronic synovitis is believed to be a dynamic process; continuous influx of leucocytes is required to maintain the inflammatory infiltrate. Leucocyte traffic is largely regulated by chemokines.2,3 C-C chemokine receptor type 5 (CCR5)+ T cells and macrophages are found in the synovial fluid and synovial tissue (ST), together with the known ligands for CCR5: macrophage inflammatory protein α (MIP-1α), MIP-1β and chemokine (C-C motif) ligand 5 (CCL5, also known as RANTES for ‘regulated upon activation, normal T cell expressed and secreted’).4,6 Supportive evidence for the relevance of CCR5 in RA is found in the suggestion that the CCR5-82 polymorphism plays a protective role in RA.7,8 Treatment with a CCR5 antagonist ameliorated collagen-induced arthritis in rhesus monkeys.9 These data suggest that CCR5 may be one of the crucial factors involved in the recruitment of monocytes/macrophages and T cells to the joint, and that blocking CCR5 might be of therapeutic benefit in patients with RA.

This study was performed to explore the safety and clinical effects of SCH351125, an oral CCR5 receptor antagonist, in patients with active RA. In addition, we performed ST biopsy and MRI before and after treatment.

PATIENTS AND METHODS

Patients A total of 32 patients with active RA were included in this phase Ib clinical trial, all fulfilling the American College of Rheumatology (ACR) classification criteria for RA.10 Patients had ≥3 tender and ≥3 swollen joints. Additionally, they had an elevated erythrocyte sedimentation rate (ESR) of ≥28 mm/h, or C reactive protein (CRP) ≥10 mg/litre, or morning stiffness ≥45 min. Concomitant treatment with a stable dose of methotrexate and/or prednisolone ≤10 mg/day was allowed. A washout period was required for other disease-modifying anti-rheumatic drugs or biologicals.

Study protocol The study protocol was approved by the Ethics Committees of all participating centres. Patients gave their written informed consent before enrolment. Physical examination, routine laboratory testing, chest x-ray and electrocardiogram were performed. Disease activity was evaluated by a blinded assessor at baseline, day 15 and 28. This included a tender joint count, swollen joint count (SJC), doctor’s and patient’s global health assessment, ESR and CRP. Clinical efficacy was assessed using ACR and European League Against Rheumatism (EULAR) response, using the Disease Activity Score in 28 joints (DAS28).11,12 Monitoring for adverse events continued until 2 months after the last administration of study medication.

Study drug Patients were randomised in a double-blind fashion to receive SCH351125 50 mg tablets twice a day or matched placebo (2:1 ratio) for 28 days.

ST biopsy and analysis If possible, an arthroscopy of an inflamed index joint (knee, ankle or wrist) was performed in patients at baseline and day 28, to obtain ST biopsies. In one centre, blinded needle biopsy was performed.13 Biopsies were snap-frozen immediately; tissue sampling and storage have been described previously.14,15
The number of CCR5+ T cells and macrophages was assessed by immunofluorescent double staining. Biopsy sections were incubated overnight at 4°C with primary fluorescein isothiocyanate (FITC)-labelled monoclonal antibody against CCR5, washed and incubated with FITC-labelled markers for CD3, CD4, CD8 and CD68 as previously described. Sections were analysed using a fluorescent photomicroscope with confocal scanning. Coexpression of cellular markers with CCR5 was determined using computer-assisted digital image analysis.

**MRI**

If possible, an MRI scan of a clinically inflamed wrist or knee joint was obtained before and after 28 days of treatment, according to protocol (see supplementary material), and evaluated by a blinded reader (MM).

**Statistical analysis**

Student’s t test and Wilcoxon signed rank test were used where appropriate for comparison of both treatment groups. The ACR20/50/70 and EULAR response rates were compared using the Fisher’s exact test.

**RESULTS**

A total of 32 patients (13 men, 19 women) were enrolled into the study and randomised between SCH351125 (n=20) and placebo (n=12) (table 1). Both groups were comparable with regard to demographic data and clinical disease activity, although the mean SJC was higher in the SCH351125 group (11.4 vs 7.7, p=0.026).

SCH351125 was generally well tolerated. In all, 8 patients (67%) in the placebo group and 15 patients (75%) in the SCH351125 group reported at least 1 adverse event. None of these were serious adverse events. One patient in the placebo group discontinued because of non-compliance with the protocol (deviation of visit schedule), and three patients in the SCH351125 group discontinued due to adverse events.

**Clinical efficacy**

DAS28 slightly improved in patients receiving SCH351125 from 5.72±1.33 (median±SD) to 5.09±1.53 (p=0.022). DAS28 also decreased in the patients treated with placebo from 5.31±0.81 (median±SD) to 4.80±0.98 (p=0.051) (figure 1). In total, 13 patients met the EULAR response criteria (1 good and 12 moderate responders), 8 patients fulfilled the ACR20 response criteria. The response rates were similar between patients treated with placebo and SCH351125 (table 2). No significant differences between the groups were detected in the individual disease parameters, including CRP and ESR.

**ST analysis**

Paired ST samples were available from 13 patients (n=8 in the SCH351125 group, n=5 in the placebo group). No significant reduction in numbers of CCR5+ T cells or macrophages was observed after SCH351125 treatment compared to placebo (table 2). We did find a significant decrease in the number of CD8 T cells after CCR5 blockade (p<0.05). It is unclear whether this represents a true biological effect. There was no decrease in the number of CD68 macrophages after active treatment.

**DISCUSSION**

Oral administration of SCH351125, a small molecule blocking CCR5, for 28 days to patients with RA was safe and generally well tolerated. If SCH351125 treatment could induce robust improvement in RA, we would have expected improvement in clinical parameters, ST markers or inflammation on MRI, based on previous experience in small proof of principle clinical trials. However, no significant differences or trends were observed differentiating SCH351125 from placebo. Paired ST samples did not show clear-cut differences in CCR5+ cells after treatment. The number of CD68 synovial macrophages was not reduced after active treatment. We have previously shown that all effective antirheumatic drugs ultimately decrease this cell population in the synovial fluid.
The lack of effect could be a reflection of suboptimal dosing, too short exposure to the drug, or a false negative effect related to the relatively small size of the study sample. Alternatively, CCR5 may not be a good therapeutic target in active RA. First, inadequate dose appears unlikely, because extensive dose finding studies in healthy individuals have shown good bioavailability for the dose used (data not shown). Moreover, a lower dose of SCH351125 (25 mg every 12 h) was shown to have clear biological effects in patients with HIV1 infection, starting within 3–5 days after initiation of treatment.21 Second, we did not find a reduction of synovial inflammation. Previous studies have shown changes in synovial biomarkers within 2 weeks of effective treatment.18–20 If CCR5 were a key molecule involved in the continuous influx of monocytes into the inflamed joint in RA, 4 weeks of CCR5-blocking therapy should have resulted in a decrease in the number of synovial macrophages. A false negative result could also be due to the relatively small number of patients in this proof of principle study. However, previous studies with a similar design18 19 22 have indicated that the number of patients should be sufficient to detect relevant changes within 3–5 days after initiation of treatment.21 Serial MRIs did not reveal marked improvement of synovial inflammation.

There may be different mechanisms explaining the lack of effect of CCR5 blockade in RA. First, CCR5 is also expressed by T regulatory cells.27 The lack of efficacy could perhaps be explained by inhibition of T regulatory cells. Another explanation may be redundancy of the chemokine system. Monocytes express CCR5 as well as other chemokine receptors such as CCR2 and CCR1. CCR5 blockade may be bypassed by other chemokines. Blockade of solely CCR128 or CCR229 did not result in clinical improvement either. Combinations of different chemokine receptor blockers may be a way to get around this problem. Alternatively, homodimer and heterodimer chemokine receptors are found on the cell membrane. Binding to their ligands stabilises specific receptor conformations and activates distinct signalling cascades.30 Heterodimerisation may allow for specific functions of receptors essential for receptor activity.31 32 Conceivably, CCR5 heterodimers are present in the inflamed synovium and not effectively blocked by SCH351125.

In conclusion, we did not find evidence of clinical efficacy of SCH351125 in patients with active RA.
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