THE TABLET: PALLIATIVE CARE PHARMACY TIPS



September 10, 2021 Vol. 1, No. 22

Palliative Care Pharmacy Team:

Clinical Pharmacy Specialist:

Maria Felton Lowry, PharmD, BCPS, BCGP

Assistant Professor
University of Pittsburgh
School of Pharmacy,
Department of Pharmacy
and Therapeutics
Palliative
Care Clinical Pharmacy
Specialist
UPMC Palliative and
Supportive Institute

Cell: 412-627-8473 Office: 412-864-2899 Email: lowrymf@upmc.edu

If you have a topic you would like the pharmacy team to answer, please send your suggestions to: lowrymf@upmc.edu

TODAY'S TOPIC:

Requested Topic: Opioid-Induced Constipation Evidence Spotlight

Background:

Guidelines recommend use of peripherally acting mu-opioid receptor antagonists (PAMORAs) for OIC and have less strong recommendations for intestinal secretagogues, such as lubiprostone, although lubiprostone is FDA-approved for OIC.

Importance:

OIC is common in our palliative care population. It is important for palliative care clinicians to be aware of the *evidence* for treating OIC.

The Literature:

Clin Gastroenterol Hepatol. 2018 Oct; 16(10):1569-1584.

Efficacy of Treatments for Opioid-Induced Constipation: Systematic Review and Meta-analysis Methods:

- Systematic review through March 2017
- Relative risk defined as risk of failure to respond to treatment of medication
- OIC definitions varied between studies, heterogeneity existed across studies
- Outcomes: Most common primary outcome was 3 or more complete spontaneous bowel movements/week over the trial period

Results: 27 RCTs (23 trials PAMORAs, 3 trails lubiprostone)

- All agents FDA-approved for OIC: combined RR 0.70 [0.64-0.75]; NNT 5
- <u>Lubiprostone</u> (Amitiza): Chronic nonmalignant pain
 - O Number needed to treat (NNT): 15
- <u>Methylnaltrexone</u> (Relistor): Orthopedic procedure, chronic nonmalignant pain, advanced illness, methadone maintenance program
 - o NNT: 3.4
- <u>Naldemedine</u> (Symproic): Chronic nonmalignant pain
 - o NNT: 5
- <u>Naloxegol</u> (Movantik): Chronic Nonmalignant pain
 - o NNT: 7

	Event	Total	Event	Total		Relative risk (95% CI)	
	Lubiprostone ($I^2 = 0.0\%$)				•	0.90 [0.83, 0.97]	
Anissian et al., 2012	12	19	17	18	⊢ •	0.67 [0.47 , 0.96]	
Bull et al., 2015	44	116	103	114	⊢ ■	0.42 [0.33 , 0.53]	
Michna et al., 2011	62	150	100	162	⊢ ■	0.67 [0.53 , 0.84]	
Rauck et al., 2016	314	602	124	201	H■H	0.85 [0.74 , 0.97]	
Slatkin et al., 2009	23	55	38	52	─	0.57 [0.40 , 0.81]	
Thomas et al., 2008	30	62	60	71	⊢	0.57 [0.43 , 0.75]	
		Methylna	altrexone	$(I^2 = 77.2\%)$	•	0.62 [0.50 , 0.76]	
Murata et al., 2016	28	97	62	95	⊢	0.44 [0.31 , 0.62]	
Hale et al., 2016 (I)	143	273	178	272	H ≣ H	0.80 [0.69 , 0.92]	
Hale et al., 2016 (II)	131	276	182	274	H ≡ H	0.71 [0.62 , 0.83]	
Webster et al., 2017	65	177	37	61	HEH	0.81 [0.72 , 0.92]	
		Nald	emedine	$(I^2 = 79.6\%)$	•	0.65 [0.52 , 0.82]	
Chey et al., 2014 (04)	245	427	151	214	H≣H	0.81 [0.72, 0.92]	
Chey et al., 2014 (05)	291	464	164	232	H E	0.89 [0.80, 0.99]	
Webster et al., 2013	36	90	67	95	⊢	0.57 [0.43, 0.75]	
		N	laloxegol	$(I^2 = 86.4\%)$	•	0.77 [0.61, 0.97]	
Liu et al., 2002	2	6	3	3 ⊢		: - 0.41 [0.14, 1.18]	
Lowenstein et al., 2009	64	130	100	135	⊢■→	0.66 [0.54, 0.81]	
Meissner et al., 2009	65	152	35	50	⊢■	0.61 [0.47, 0.79]	
Sanders et al., 2015	13	32	6	8	- _	0.54 [0.30, 0.97]	
Simpson et al., 2008	68	162	106	160	⊢■→	0.63 [0.51, 0.78]	

- Other notable findings:
 - o Mean dose of opioids at baseline was a significant predictor of trial outcome
 - Higher doses associated with lower RR (better outcome for OIC agent)
 Populations refractory to laxatives responded better to OIC agent
 - Safety:
- Common adverse effects were: diarrhea, abdominal pain, or nausea/vomiting Conclusion
- PAMORAs are safe and effective for treatment of OIC

How does this affect QOL? See below for a *very* brief summary on QOL ... Clin J Pain. 2020 Sep;36(9):716-722.

Opioid-induced Constipation: A Review of Health-related Quality of Life, Patient Burden,

Practical Clinical Considerations, and the Impact of Peripherally Acting Mu-Opioid Receptor Antagonists

Objective: To provide an overview of OIC and its influence on disease burden and quality of Life

(QOL)
<u>Outcomes</u>: Different quality of life assessment tools utilized in separate studies

Methods: Narrative review

Results:

- All 3 PAMORAs FDA-approved for OIC improve QOL on patient-reported QOL scales <u>Conclusion</u>:
- If OIC is treated, QOL improves... which is not totally groundbreaking

Bottom Line:

- UPMC has a formulary for OIC: <u>UPMC Formulary</u>: <u>OIC 2019</u>
 - o Preferred, formulary agent: 1st line: Naloxegol (Movantik®)
 - Formulary-restricted agents (restricted to: Pain Service, Oncology, Critical Care, GI, Palliative Care): 2nd line: Naldemedine (Symproic®) 3rd line: Methylnaltrexone (Relistor®)
- Methylnaltrexone is technically the only agent approved for OIC that has been studied in a population other than chronic nonmalignant pain, including an advanced illness population
- It is possible that patients on higher Oral Morphine Equivalents (OMEs) have better response to OIC agents than those on lower OMEs
- It is possible that patients with laxative-refractory OIC have better response to OIC agents than those patients without laxative-refractory OIC
 Because of the two points above... it is possible that patients with more severe OIC will respond
- better to OIC agents
 When considering NNT, must also consider quality of evidence... NNT may not give the whole picture, must dig further into what types of studies helped formulate this number...
- It is unclear if PRN usage of these agents is as effective as scheduled use given the responses of these trials were defined as spontaneous bowel movements *per week*, not Yes/No response after dose administered...