

Interrelationships Between Macular Neovascularization Lesion Type, Retinal Fluid Location, and Visual Outcomes in the HARBOR Trial

K. Bailey Freund, MD¹; Giovanni Staurenghi, MD²; Jesse J. Jung, MD³; Lauren Hill, MS⁴; Steven Blotner, MS⁴; Min Tsuboi, PharmD⁴; and Shamika Gune, MD⁴

¹ Vitreous Retina Macula Consultants of New York, New York, NY ² Department of Biomedical and Clinical Science Luigi Sacco, Luigi Sacco Hospital, University of Milan, Milan, Italy ³ East Bay Retina Consultants, Inc., Oakland, CA ⁴ Genentech, Inc., South San Francisco, CA

Presented at the 53rd Annual Scientific Meeting | Retina Society 2020 VR | September 21–22, 2020













Disclosures

Financial Disclosures

- **KBF:** Consultant: Bayer HealthCare, Genentech, Inc., Heidelberg Engineering, Optovue, Novartis, Zeiss; Research Support: Roche/Genentech, Inc.
- **GS:** Consultant: Allergan, Apellis, Bayer HealthCare, Boehringer Ingelheim, CenterVue, Chengdu Kanghong, Genentech, Inc., Heidelberg Engineering, Novartis, Roche; Grant Support: Carl Zeiss Meditec, CenterVue, Heidelberg Engineering, Nidek, Optos, Optovue, Quantel Medical, Topcon; Lecture Fees: Bayer HealthCare, Heidelberg Engineering, Nidek, Novartis, Roche; Patent/Royalty: Ocular Instruments
- JJJ: Consultant: Alimera, Allergan, Google, Zeiss
- LH: Consultant: Aerpio, Alimera, Genentech, Inc., PolyPhotonix, Recens Medical
- **SB, MT, SG:** Employee: Genentech, Inc.

Study Disclosures

- This study includes research conducted on human subjects
- Institutional Review Board approval was obtained prior to study initiation
- Funding was provided by Genentech, Inc., a member of the Roche Group, for the study and third-party writing assistance, which was provided by Karina D. Hamilton-Peel, PhD, CMPP, of Envision Pharma Group

Key Takeaways

- This post hoc analysis of HARBOR represents the first application of CONAN Study Group criteria to a major nAMD dataset
- We aimed to evaluate the relationship between baseline MNV lesion type, retinal fluid location, and vision outcomes among eyes receiving ranibizumab therapy for nAMD
- Vision outcomes over 24 months were associated with MNV lesion type at baseline, and the location/presence of retinal fluid over time
- Anatomic classification of MNV lesion type and a nuanced assessment of retinal fluid should be considered in the management of nAMD



K. Bailey Freund, MD* Sandrine A. Zweifel, MD† Michael Engelbert, MD, PhD*

*Vitreous Retina Macula Consultants of New York New York, New York Department of Ophthalmology University Hospital Zarich Zarich, Switzerland

Editorial

Do We Need a New Classification for Choroidal Neovascularization in Age-Related Macular Degeneration?



- In 2010, we proposed a classification for macular neovascularization (MNV) based on anatomic localization ascertained by multimodal imaging
- In 2015, we reported "Long-term Visual Outcomes for a Treat-and-Extend Anti-VEGF Regimen in Eyes With nAMD"¹



- 210 treatment-naïve eyes
- Mean follow-up of 3.5 years
- Anatomic classification was an independent predictor of visual acuity at 6 months and years 1, 2, 3, and 4
- Eyes with Type 1 MNV lesions had better visual outcomes



1. Mrejen S et al. J Clin Med. 2015;4(7):1380-1402.

logMAR, logarithm of the minimum angle of resolution; nAMD, neovascular age-related macular degeneration; VEGF, vascular endothelial growth factor.



Consensus Nomenclature for Reporting Neovascular Age-Related Macular Degeneration Data

Consensus on Neovascular Age-Related Macular Degeneration Nomenclature Study Group

CONAN Study Group Definitions











Type 1 MNV

Neovascularization located between the RPE and Bruch's membrane



Type 2 MNV

Neovascularization in the subretinal space above the RPE

Type 3 MNV

Intraretinal neovascularization originating from the deep vascular complex

Spaide RF et al. Ophthalmology. 2020;127(5):616-636.

CONAN, Consensus on Neovascular Age-Related Macular Degeneration Nomenclature; MNV, macular neovascularization; RPE, retinal pigment epithelium.

Objective

To evaluate the relationship between baseline MNV lesion type, retinal fluid location, and vision outcomes among eyes receiving ranibizumab for nAMD in HARBOR

MNV, macular neovascularization; nAMD, neovascular age-related macular degeneration.

HARBOR Compared Monthly and PRN Ranibizumab Therapy for nAMD Over 24 Months



Current Analysis (n = 700)

Post hoc analysis of pooled data from study eyes with:

- Multimodal assessment of baseline MNV (SD-OCT, FA, CFP)
- Retinal fluid (SRF and/or IRF) at baseline, screening, or week 1
- SD-OCT follow-up over 24 months

Outcomes of Interest:

- 1. Baseline MNV lesion type
 - Classified using CONAN Study Group criteria¹
 - Type 1
 - Type 2/Mixed Type 1 and 2 (Type 2/M)
 - Any Type 3
- 2. SRF and/or IRF over 24 months
 - Identified by SD-OCT
 - Location (central/noncentral) classified using a modified ETDRS grid
- 3. BCVA outcomes over 24 months
 - Assessed using standard ETDRS protocols

NCT00891735. *Re-treatment criteria for PRN arms: ≥ 5-letter decrease in BCVA from previous visit, or any evidence of disease activity on SD-OCT (SRF, IRF, or subretinal pigment epiretinal fluid). 1. Spaide RF et al. *Ophthalmology*. 2020;127(5):616-636. BCVA, best-corrected visual acuity; CFP, color fundus photography; CONAN, Consensus on Neovascular Age-Related Macular Degeneration Nomenclature; ETDRS, Early Treatment Diabetic Retinopathy Study; FA, fluorescein angiography; IRF, intraretinal fluid; LD, loading dose; MNV, macular neovascularization; nAMD, neovascular age-related macular degeneration; PRN, as-needed; RBZ, ranibizumab; SD-OCT, spectral-domain optical coherence tomography; SRF, subretinal fluid.

Distribution of Lesion Types at Baseline



*Type 2/Mixed Type 1 and 2.

Type 1 Eyes Had the Best Mean BCVA Profile Over 24 Months, While Type 2/M* Eyes Had the Worst

BCVA Over Time by Baseline Lesion Type



*Type 2/Mixed Type 1 and 2. Error bars represent 95% Cl.

1. Mrejen S et al. *J Clin Med*. 2015;4(7):1380-1402.

BCVA, best-corrected visual acuity; ETDRS, Early Treatment Diabetic Retinopathy Study; logMAR, logarithm of the minimum angle of resolution.

Mean Vision Gains Over 24 Months Were Numerically Greatest Among Monthly-Treated Type 2/M* Eyes

Type 1

Type 2/M*





*Type 2/Mixed Type 1 and 2. Error bars represent 95% Cl.

BCVA, best-corrected visual acuity; ETDRS, Early Treatment Diabetic Retinopathy Study; PRN, as-needed.

The Majority of Type 1 Eyes Had SRF Only at Baseline





📃 IRF only 📃 SRF only 🔲 IRF and SRF

*Type 2/Mixed Type 1 and 2. IRF, intraretinal fluid; SRF, subretinal fluid.

Across All Lesion Types, BCVA Outcomes Over 24 Months Were Similar Regardless of SRF Location at Baseline



*Type 2/Mixed Type 1 and 2. Error bars represent 95% Cl.

BCVA, best-corrected visual acuity; ETDRS, Early Treatment Diabetic Retinopathy Study; SRF, subretinal fluid.

Mean Vision Gains Were Similar in Type 1 Eyes With and Without Residual SRF Over 24 Months

Type 1

Type 2/M*

Residual SRF Residual SRF No SRF Residual SRF No SRF No SRF 20 20 20 Mean Change in BCVA, ETDRS Letters 13.2 15.5 16 16 16 10.5 9.8 9.6 10.2 4.3 8.1 9.3 12 12 8.8 12 9.1 1.6 8 8 8 4 4 4 0 0 0 192 54 226 48 233 7 138 9 136 69 184 65 n = n = n = Month 12 Month 24 Month 12 Month 24 Month 12 Month 24

Any Type 3

*Type 2/Mixed Type 1 and 2. Error bars represent 95% Cl.

BCVA, best-corrected visual acuity; ETDRS, Early Treatment Diabetic Retinopathy Study; SRF, subretinal fluid.

Mean Vision Gains Were Significantly Better in Type 2/M* Eyes With Residual SRF at Month 24

Type 1

Type 2/M*

Any Type 3



*Type 2/Mixed Type 1 and 2. Error bars represent 95% Cl.

BCVA, best-corrected visual acuity; ETDRS, Early Treatment Diabetic Retinopathy Study; SRF, subretinal fluid.

In Type 1 and Type 2/M* Eyes, BCVA Outcomes Over 24 Months Were Generally Worse When Central IRF Was Present at Baseline

Type 1

Type 2/M*

Any Type 3







*Type 2/Mixed Type 1 and 2. Error bars represent 95% Cl.

BCVA, best-corrected visual acuity; ETDRS, Early Treatment Diabetic Retinopathy Study; IRF, intraretinal fluid.

Mean Vision Gains Were Significantly Worse in Type 2/M* Eyes With Residual IRF at Months 12 and 24

Type 1

Type 2/M*

Residual IRF No IRF Residual IRF No IRF Residual IRF No IRF 20 20 20 Mean Change in BCVA, ETDRS Letters 16 16 16 12.9 12.7 10.5 10.5 8.6 10.1 12 9.3 12 12 6.9 6.8 5.6 6.1 5.5 8 8 8 Δ 4 Δ 0 0 0 62 192 184 75 212 43 101 74 207 72 50 94 n = n = n = Month 12 Month 24 Month 12 Month 24 Month 12 Month 24

Any Type 3

*Type 2/Mixed Type 1 and 2. Error bars represent 95% Cl.

BCVA, best-corrected visual acuity; ETDRS, Early Treatment Diabetic Retinopathy Study; IRF, intraretinal fluid.

Conclusions

- In this first application of CONAN Study Group criteria to a major nAMD dataset, MNV lesion type correlated with visual and anatomic endpoints in HARBOR
- Regardless of regimen, eyes with Type 1 lesions had the best BCVA profile over 24 months, while Type 2/M eyes had the worst
- Vision gains over 24 months were numerically greatest among monthly-treated Type 2/M eyes, and better in Type 2/M eyes with residual versus no SRF
- In eyes with Type 1 lesions, vision outcomes over 24 months were similar regardless of concurrent residual SRF
- Central IRF at baseline and residual IRF at month 24 correlated with poor vision across MNV lesion types

Anatomic classification of MNV lesion type and a nuanced assessment of retinal fluid should be considered in the management of nAMD

BCVA, best-corrected visual acuity; CONAN, Consensus on Neovascular Age-Related Macular Degeneration Nomenclature; IRF, intraretinal fluid; MNV, macular neovascularization; nAMD, neovascular age-related macular degeneration; PRN, as-needed; SRF, subretinal fluid; Type 2/M, Type 2/Mixed Type 1 and 2.