JORNADAS 2020 FORMATO WEBINAR

DE ACTUALIZACIÓN EN ATENCIÓN FARMACÉUTICA AL PACIENTE CON PATOLOGÍAS VÍRICAS

Esteatosis Hepática Metabólica (Manejo Multidisciplinar)

Javier Ampuero Herrojo

Hospital Universitario Virgen del Rocío

Instituto de Biomedicina de Sevilla

Universidad de Sevilla

ORGANIZA:

Barreras sociales y científicas de la EHGNA

Estoy perfectamente, no tengo síntomas

¿Hígado graso? Anda que no hay cosas más importantes!

¿Cómo voy a tener hígado graso?

¡Pues anda que yo!

Esto es cosa de mayores

Si no se contagia y no duele para tanto no será

El hígado graso siempre ha existido y nunca ha sido importante

¿Qué es y cuánta gente tiene EHGNA?

Increasing HCC risk with grade and stage of disease

Spain	
2016 Country population (000)	46,100
2030 Country population (000)	45,900
Adult obesity prevalence (BMI) ≥ 30 kg/m ²	
2016	18.0%
2030	18.9%
NAFLD	
2016 Total cases	10,532,000
2016 Prevalence (all ages)	22.9%
2030 Total cases	12,653,000
2030 Prevalence (all ages)	27.6%
NAFL	
2016 Total cases	8,728,000
2016 Prevalence (all ages)	18.9%
2030 Total cases	9,966,000
2030 Prevalence (all ages)	21.7%
NASH	
2016 Total cases	1,803,700
2016 Prevalence (all ages)	3.9%
2030 Total cases	2,687,300
2030 Prevalence (all ages)	5.9%
Incident NAFLD	
2016 Total cases	337,000
2016 Prevalence (all ages)	7.3
2030 Total cases	330,500
2030 Prevalence (all ages)	7.2
NASH mortality	
2016 Total cases	3,260
2016 Prevalence (all ages)	4,530
2030 Total cases	7,590
2030 Prevalence (all ages)	7,850

Factores de Riesgo → Fenotipos clínicos

Pacientes con EHGNA (%)

Fenotipo Metabólico: Cómo hemos cambiado

Necesidad de Manejo Multidisciplinario

¿Qué hay sobre EHGNA y Farmacia Hospitalaria?

薬学領域から発信する NAFLD/NASH 研究の最前線
—基礎研究から薬物治療及び薬剤師活動へのフィードバック—

徳山尚吾,^{*,a} 金啓二^b

**The Front Line of the NAFLD/NASH Study Reported from the Pharmaceutical Field
—Feedback from Basic Research to Medical Treatment and Pharmacist Activity—**

Shogo Tokuyama^{*,a} and Ke Ih Kim^b

^a*Department of Clinical Pharmacy, School of Pharmaceutical Sciences, Kobe Gakuin University; 1-1-3 Minatojima, Chuo-ku, Kobe 650-8586, Japan; and* ^b*Department of Hospital Pharmacy, Kobe Asahi Hospital; 3-5-25 Booji-cho, Nagata-ku, Kobe 653-0801, Japan.*

Métodos Diagnósticos

Evaluación no invasiva

Aproximación diagnóstica de EHGNA

279	241	197	137	72	Non-NASH, Fib (-)
56	46	30	19	7	Non-NASH, Fib (+)
43	35	31	20	12	NASH, Fib (-)
241	197	124	58	18	NASH, Fib (+)

	Hepamet Score	NAFLD Fibrosis Score	FIB-4
Edad	✓	✓	✓
Sexo	✓		
IMC		✓	
AST	✓	✓	✓
ALT		✓	✓
Plaquetas	✓	✓	✓
DM	✓	✓	
HOMA	✓		
Albúmina	✓	✓	

All Cause Mortality

Liver Related Mortality

Table 3. Discrimination Ability of the Hepamet Fibrosis Score Compared With NAFLD Fibrosis Score and FIB-4 in the Estimation and Validation Cohorts

	Hepamet Fibrosis Score	NAFLD Fibrosis Score	FIB-4
Estimation cohort (n = 758)			
Advanced fibrosis (F0-F2 vs F3-F4)	0.850 (0.807-0.893)	0.775 (0.723-0.828); .0025	0.772 (0.713-0.832); .0002
Validation cohort (n = 1694)			
Advanced fibrosis (F0-F2 vs F3-F4)	0.844 (0.819-0.869)	0.789 (0.764-0.814); <.0001	0.801 (0.776-0.826); <.0001
Overall cohort (n = 2452)			
Advanced fibrosis (F0-F2 vs F3-F4)	0.848 (0.826-0.869)	0.778 (0.756-0.801); <.0001	0.802 (0.780-0.825); <.0001

Aproximación diagnóstica de EHGNA

Transient Elastography

LSM (kPa) Fibrosis stage	XL+ Probe		M+ Probe		Mean
	n	BMI-Adjusted Mean	n	BMI-Adjusted Mean	
0	132	5.4	112	6.5	-1.0
1	136	6.4	106	7.2	-0.9
2	90	7.2	57	7.8	-0.5
3	137	11.3	70	13.7	-2.4
4	57	21.3	30	26.2	-4.8
Total	552	8.0	375	8.8	-0.8

MR Elastography

¿Cuál es el tratamiento?

¿Existen terapias eficaces?

Cambios en el estilo de vida

Figure. Benefits of Exercise and Weight Loss on Adipose Tissue Compartments and Insulin Resistance

Pero somos como somos...

Múltiples opciones farmacológicas

Resultados ECA Fase II

Resultados ECA Fase III (preliminares)

Necesidad de abordaje multidisciplinar

Papel de Farmacia Hospitalaria

Usar fármacos eficaces

Table 2. Primary Outcome and Changes in Histologic Features of the Liver after 96 Weeks of Treatment.

Variable	Placebo	Vitamin E	Pioglitazone	P Value ^a	
				Vitamin E vs. Placebo	Pioglitazone vs. Placebo
Primary outcome[†]					
No. of subjects randomly assigned	83	84	80		
Subjects with improvement (%)	19	43	34	0.001	0.04
Changes from baseline in histologic features					
No. of subjects with biopsy specimens at baseline and 96 wk	72	80	70		
Steatosis					
Subjects with improvement (%)	31	54	69	0.005	<0.001
Mean change in score	-0.1	-0.7	-0.8	<0.001	<0.001
Lobular inflammation					
Subjects with improvement (%)	35	54	60	0.02	0.004
Mean change in score	-0.2	-0.6	-0.7	0.008	<0.001
Hepatocellular ballooning					
Subjects with improvement (%)	29	50	44	0.01	0.08
Mean change in score	-0.2	-0.5	-0.4	0.03	0.01
Total NAFLD activity score (mean change)	-0.5	-1.9	-1.9	<0.001	<0.001
Fibrosis[‡]					
Subjects with improvement (%)	31	41	44	0.24	0.12
Mean change in score	-0.1	-0.3	-0.4	0.19	0.10
Resolution of definite nonalcoholic steatohepatitis (% of subjects)	21	36	47	0.05	0.001

Sanyal et al, NEJM 2010

Table 2. Primary Efficacy Outcome and Other Changes in Histologic Features, Intention-to-Treat Analysis

	Silymarin (n = 49)	Placebo (n = 50)	P between groups
Primary efficacy outcome ^a	16 (32.7)	13 (26.0)	.467
Steatosis			
Improvement ^b	9 (18.4)	13 (26.0)	.361
Change within group	-0.102	-0.200	.387
P for change within group	.168	.024	
Lobular inflammation			
Improvement ^b	16 (32.7)	15 (30.0)	.776
Change within group	-0.225	-0.240	.896
P for change within group	.015	.004	
Hepatocyte ballooning			
Improvement ^b	20 (40.8)	17 (34.0)	.483
Change within group	-0.347	-0.280	.610
P for change within group	.001	.003	
NAS			
Improvement ^b	26 (53.1)	27 (54.0)	.925
Change within group	-0.674	-0.720	.857
P for change within group	.001	<.001	
Resolution of steatohepatitis without worsening of fibrosis ^c	14 (28.6)	11 (22.0)	.452
Fibrosis			
Improvement ^b	11 (22.4)	3 (6.0)	.023
Change within group	-0.184	+0.100	.026
P for change within group	.071	.200	
Resolution of fibrosis ^d	5/39 (12.8)	3/37 (8.1)	.712
Development of cirrhosis	1 (2.0)	3 (6.0)	.617

Kheong et al, Clin Gastroenterol Hepatol 2017

Interacciones farmacológicas

	All patients N = 95 n (%)
Age, years	59.6 ± 9.4
Gender (male), % [§]	61 (64)
Ethnicity (Caucasian), %	75 (79)
BMI, kg/m ²	36.2 ± 8.4
Girth, cm	121.4 ± 18.6
CAP, dBm	339.6 ± 56.5
HbA1c, %	8.3 ± 1.6
Co-morbidities	
Ischaemic heart disease [§]	31 (32)
Obstructive sleep apnoea [§]	30 (32)
Depression [§]	42 (44)
Asthma [§]	21 (22)
Osteoarthritis [§]	19 (20)
Number of co-morbidities	2.9 ± 1.7
Number of medications [‡]	7.9 ± 3.2
Number of patients (%) taking:	
1–4 medications [§]	10 (10)
5–9 medications (polypharmacy)	56 (59)
≥10 medications (hyperpolypharmacy)	29 (31)

	Liraglutide (n=26)	Placebo (n=26)
Anti-diabetic		
Metformin	9 (35%)	8 (31%)
Sulfonylurea	1 (4%)	1 (4%)
Anti-lipidaemic	10 (38%)	7 (27%)
Anti-hypertensive	13 (50%)	12 (46%)
Anti-platelet	5 (19%)	5 (19%)

	Obeticholic acid (n=141)	Placebo (n=142)
Antilipidaemic	72 (51%)	64 (45%)
Cardiovascular	97 (69%)	92 (65%)
Antidiabetic	67 (48%)	73 (51%)
Metformin	55 (39%)	62 (44%)
Pioglitazone	1 (1%)	6 (4%)
Vitamin E	29 (21%)	32 (23%)
Thiazolidinedione	3 (2%)	5 (4%)
Aspirin (81 mg)	37 (26%)	33 (23%)

Reposicionamiento de fármacos

Farnesoid X nuclear receptor ligand obeticholic acid for non-cirrhotic, non-alcoholic steatohepatitis (FLINT): a multicentre, randomised, placebo-controlled trial

Brent A Neuschwander-Tetri, Rohit Loomba, Arun J Sanyal, Joel E Lavine, Mark L Van Natta, Manal F Abdelmalek, Naga Chalasani, Srinivasan Dasarathy, Anna Mae Diehl, Bilal Hameed, Kris V Kowdley, Arthur McCullough, Norah Terrault, Jeanne M Clark, James Tonascia, Elizabeth M Brunt, David E Kleiner, Edward Doo, for the NASH Clinical Research Network*

Liraglutide safety and efficacy in patients with non-alcoholic steatohepatitis (LEAN): a multicentre, double-blind, randomised, placebo-controlled phase 2 study

Matthew James Armstrong, Piers Gaunt, Guruprasad P Aithal, Darren Barton, Diana Hull, Richard Parker, Jonathan M Hazlehurst, Kathy Guo, LEAN trial team*, George Abouda, Mark A Aldersley, Deborah Stocken, Stephen C Gough, Jeremy W Tomlinson, Rachel M Brown, Stefan G Hübscher, Philip N Newsome

Reposicionamiento de fármacos

A Placebo-Controlled Trial of Subcutaneous Semaglutide in Nonalcoholic Steatohepatitis

P.N. Newsome, K. Buchholtz, K. Cusi, M. Linder, T. Okanoue, V. Ratziu, A.J. Sanyal, A.-S. Sejjing, and S.A. Harrison, for the NNN931-4296 Investigators*

Adherencia en enfermedades crónicas

Table 1. Prevalence of non-adherence behaviors in chronic diseases.

	All patients (n = 1,530)	Rheumatic disease (n = 336)	IBD (n = 322)	HIV infection (n = 442)	DM (n = 430)
At least one non-adherence behavior, n (%)	812 (53.1)	188 (56.0)	179 (55.6)	189 (42.8)	257 (59.8)
Forgetfulness in taking medication (skipping doses), n (%)	496 (32.4)	96 (28.6)	117 (36.2)	140 (31.6)	143 (33.3)
Taking medication at unscheduled hours, n (%)	89 (5.8)	19 (5.6)	18 (5.5)	22 (5.0)	31 (7.1)
Stopping medication when feeling well, n (%)	90 (5.9)	34 (10.1)	21 (6.5)	11 (2.5)	25 (5.7)
Stopping medication if it makes the patient feel unwell, n (%)	418 (27.3)	111 (33.0)	91 (28.3)	55 (12.5)	160 (37.2)
Stopping medication after reading the patients' information leaflet, n (%)	179 (11.7)	39 (11.5)	27 (8.4)	30 (6.8)	83 (19.4)

Overall adherence to therapy, by disease, % of patients

Y a vosotros, ¿qué más se os ocurre?

to be continued...

We We Can Do It!!

@Dr_Ampuero