Fighting the Flu in Older Adults

Marilyn N. Bulloch PharmD, BCPS, FCCM mjn004@auburn.edu

Objectives

Describe the pathophysiology, clinical presentation, and disease

burden of influenza in

geriatrics

Identify geriatric specific considerations for medications and vaccinations used in the treatment or prevention of

influenza

Discuss literature and clinical studies involving older adults evaluating mediactions and

medications and vaccinations used in the treatment or prevention of influenza

Disclosures

- Pharmacy Times Contributor
- · Genetech Speaker's Bureau for Xofluza (baloxavir)

All content discussed in this presentation will remain unbiased

Brief Review of Influenza

Contagious RNA viral infection

Spread via respiratory droplets

Can infect anyone at any time

More commonly appears during "seasons"

- Southern Hemisphere: April September
- Northern Hemisphere: October March
- Tropics : year round



Scolari S. Lateral organization of the transmembrane domain and cytoplasmic tail of influenza virus hemagglutinin revealed by time resolved imaging. 2009. Thesis

Influenza Categorization

	Influenza A	Influenza B	Influenza C	Influenza D
Infections in:	Humans ("flu") Animals (birds, pigs, ect)	Humans ("flu")	Humans	Animals (cattle)
Severity	Mild-severe	Mild-severe	Mild	
Categorized by:	Hemagglutinin Neuraminidase	Lineages: Victoria and Yamagata		
Pearls	 Most common in average year Most virulent Mutates more quickly Susceptible to antigenic shift – implicated in pandemics 	 Mutates more slowly Rarely if ever cause pandemics 		

Classic Presentation





Source: https://www.cdc.gov/flu/about/burden/preliminary-in-season-estimates.htm

Risk Factors Associated with 30-day Mortality in Older Adults

- Retrospective cohort study of patients ≥ 75 years with influenza
- Mean Age 87.9 years [Survivors 87.3 years vs. Non-Survivors 91.5 years; p=0.006]
- Mean # medications 6.32 [Survivors 6.15 vs. Non-Survivors 7.5; p=0.026]

	Univariate	Analysis	Multivariate Analysis		
	OR (95% CI)	<i>p</i> -Value	OR (95% CI)	<i>p</i> -Value	
Age	1.18 (1.04;1.35)	0.013	1.37 (1.05;1.79)	0.021	
Female	0.97 (0.28;3.36)	0.964	3.01 (0.31;29.20)	0.342	
Charlson Comorbidity Index	1.31 (0.96;1.80)	0.092	1.39 (0.78;2.48)	0.268	
Diabetes	0.56 (0.12;2.68)	0,466	0.60 (0.06;5.91)	0.662	
Chronic respiratory disease	1.83 (0.45;7.43)	0.401	0.27 (0.02;3.91)	0.334	
Chronic cardiac disease	3.26 (1.04;10.24)	0.043	6.48 (0.56;74.69)	0.134	
Immunosuppression	0.94 (0.19;4.65)	0.944	1.62 (0.16;16.40)	0.683	
ADL score	0.69 (0.50;0.95)	0.027	0.36 (0.17;0.75)	0.006	
Number of drugs	1.16 (0.96;1.40)	0.128	1.15 (0.83;1.61)	0.405	
Nosocomial infection	0.58 (0.15;2.22)	0.426	2.17 (0.18;26.76)	0.545	
Antiviral < 48 h	0.33 (0.09;1.27)	0.107	0.04 (0.002;0.78)	0.034	
Antibiotic prescription	3.67 (0.97;13.94)	0.057	0.64 (0.07;6.28)	0.704	
SOFA score	1.83 (1.27;2.64)	0.001	2.30 (1.07;4.94)	0.034	
Lymphopenia	2.17 (0.45;10.45)	0.336	0.42 (0.04;4.03)	0.453	

OR, Odds Ratios; ADL, Activities of Daily Living; SOFA, Sequential Organ Failure Assessment .





Source: Weir JP. Food and Drug Administration. Influenza Virus Vaccine Strain Selection 2022-2023 Northern Hemisphere. March 3, 2022 https://www.precisionvaccinations.com/vaccines/influenza-vaccines-2022

Vaccinating Older Adults



Vaccine Administration Timing

Ideal	SeptemberOctober
Avoid too early vaccination in some people	 July or August Especially in older adults Protection may decrease over time
When early vaccination is okay	ChildrenThird trimester of pregnancy

Grohskopf LA, Alyanak E, Ferdinands JM, et al. Prevention and Control of Seasonal Influenza with Vaccines: Recommendations of the Advisory Committee on Immunization Practices, United States, 2021–22 Influenza Season. MMWR Recomm Rep 2021;70(No. RR-5):1–28.

Vaccine Interactions

"Acceptable" to give IIV₄ or RIV₄ while a patient is getting antivirals

Data on LAIV₄ administration to patients on antivirals is limited

- In theory antivirals will interfere with LAIV4 action
- Labeling 48 hours before and 14 days after vaccination
- Baloxavir and peramivir may interfere if given > 48 hours before
- ACIP "Reasonable" to assume 5 days before with peramivir and 17 days before with baloxavir and 2 weeks after vaccination

Unless given at same time, separate LAIV₄ four weeks from administration of another live vaccine

Simultaneous administration of IIV_4 with PPSV23 in geriatrics was associated with lower seroprotection to one influenza B antigen at 4-6 weeks postvaccination vs. sequential administration 2 weeks apart

Grohskopf LA, Alyanak E, Ferdinands JM, et al. Prevention and Control of Seasonal Influenza with Vaccines: Recommendations of the Advisory Committee on Immunization Practices, United States, 2021–22 Influenza Season. MMWR Recomm Rep 2021;70(No. RR-5):1–28.

Reduction in Dementia Risk with Flu Vaccination

Rationale

- · Influenza vaccine previously shown to increase microglia activity causing clearance of amyloid-beta in animals
- · Influenza vaccine may decrease neuroinflammation

Meta-analysis of 5 articles published through September 2021

297,157 older adults free from dementia at baseline

- Mean age 75.5 years (± 7.4 years)
- 46.8% female
- · Mean follow-up 9 years

All studies of high quality, observational, and included validated diagnosis of dementia

Results

- Influenza vaccination reduced risk of dementia by 3% (RR=0.91, 95% CI 0.94-1.00; p=0.04)
- Vaccination associated with 29% reeducation in studies that adjusted for potential confounders (including age, gender, medical conditions, substance abuse, education, smoking history, and other cofounders)

Veronese N et al. Ageing Res Rev. 202;73:1015342



Vaccines in Development

NanoFlu	Quadrivalent recombinant hemagglutinin protein nanoparticle IM vaccine Produced in SF insect cell baclovirus system Uses HA amino acid protein sequences similar to the wild-type circulated virus HA sequences Contains patented adjuvant Older adults are a targeted population Phase 3 study in older adults – well tolerated and produced enhanced immune response vs. IIV4.
CD388 (drug-FC conjugate)	•Potent, long-acting antiviral to provide universal prevention and treatment of both seasonal and pandemic influenza •Single dose
CVSQIV	 Second generation-mRNA vaccine Multiple non-chemically modified mRNA constructs – produce immune responses vs. relevant targets of 4 different influenza strains

https://www.precisionvaccinations.com/vaccines/influenza-vaccines-2022

Vaccines in Development

Moderna mRNA-1230	 Annual combination booster for influenza, RSV, and SARS-CoV-2
	• Intranasal
REVTx-99a	 For prevention of H3N2 in healthy humans Also for parainfluenza, rhinovirus, RSV, and SARS-CoV-2

https://www.precisionvaccinations.com/vaccines/influenza-vaccines-2022







Figure 4: https://www.cdc.gov/flu/professionals/antivirals/summary-clinicians.htm



Key Points: Prophylaxis
Antiviral prophylaxis should not be a substitute in most patients for immunization
Start within 48 hours of exposure to be helpful
CDC decreased minimum duration of therapy for oseltamivir and zanamivir from 10 to 7 days
In LTC facilities – prophylaxis should continue for 7 days after the last influenza case identified
Neuraminidase inhibitors are ~ 70-90% effective at protecting against susceptible influenza viruses
When recommended:
 High risk patients during 1st 2 weeks following vaccination after exposure High risk patients who have a vaccine contraindication and have exposure Patients with severe immune deficiencies or others who may not respond to a vaccine and have exposure All nursing home residents – regardless of vaccination status

	Paramendad	Antivirals
Amantadine	Rimantadine	An anticological design of the second design of the
Contraction of the second seco	Reprised The second se	Xofluza* soc soc soc ender (balocavir mathool) tablet 40 mg per tablet Contais do mg total dose (r x 40 mg tablet) Und news Baloxavir marboxil
Zanamivir	Peramiviral Influenza antiviral medications: summary for clin	icians. https://www.cdc.gov/flu/professionals/antivirals/summary





Oseltamivir Considerations							
	Prodrug	Only generic antiviral for influenza	Available as a capsule or suspension				
		Request flavoring for any suspension being administered via traditional oral route					
Uyeki TM, et al. Clin Infe Influenza antiviral medi Kawai N, et al. J Infect. 2	ect Dis. 2019;68(6):e1-e47 cations: summary for clinicians. www.cdc.gov/flu/professionals/antiv 2008;56(1):51-57	Chairat K, et al. <i>Brit J Clin Pharmacol.</i> 2016;81(6):1103-1112 Dutkowski R, et al. <i>Int J Antimicrob Agents.</i> 2010;35(5):461-467.					

ALIC ⁴ E Trial					
Open-label pragmatic, response- adaptive platform randomized controlled trial January 2016-April 2018	 3,059 patients ≥ 1 year of age with influenza symptoms < 72 hours Excluded: CKD, immunosuppression, hospitalization, liver impairment, and scheduled procedures requiring general anesthesia in next 2 weeks 				
Groups	Usual Care vs. Usual Care with Oseltamivir				
Results	 Faster overall recovery with oseltamivir vs. usual care [5.71 days vs. 6.73 days; HR 1.29, 95%CI 1.2-1.39) No evidence of difference in results between type of influenza or season 				

Butler CC, et al. Lancet. 2020;395:42-52

2years Low Mediu High -64years Low Mediu High	everity ww edium igh	Comorbid No Yes No Yes No No	Symptom duration, h = 48 > 48 > 48 > 48 > 48 = 48 = 48 = 48 = 48 = 48 = 48 = 48 =	n 79 44 10 9 71 71 71 71 8 38 10 0 1	Mean days benefit 0.70 1.10 1.30 1.30 1.40 2.00 1.40 2.20 1.20 1.20 1.20 1.20 2.70	95% Bayesian credible interval	Pr (days>0) 0-999 1-000 0-999 1-998 1-000 1-000 1-000 1-000 1-000 1-000 1-000 1-000 1-000		
2years Low Media High -64years Low Media High	w edium igh	No Yes No Yes No Yes	488 448 448 448 448 448 448 448	79 44 10 9 139 71 17 8 38 10 0 1	070 1-10 1-30 1-80 070 1-10 1-40 2-00 1-20 1-20 1-20 2-70 2-70	0.30 to 1.20 0.50 to 1.40 0.50 to 2.40 0.50 to 2.40 0.50 to 1.30 0.50 to 1.30 0.50 to 1.30 0.50 to 2.30 0.50 to 2.30 0.50 to 2.00 0.50 to 2.60 0.80 to 2.60 0.90 to 3.20 1.40 to 4.20	0-999 1-000 0-999 1-000 1-		
Low Mediu High 2-64 years Low Mediu High 55 years Low	edium igh	No Yes No Yes Yes	x 48 x 448 x 4	79 44 10 9 139 71 17 8 38 10 0 1	0-70 1-10 1-30 1-80 0-70 1-10 1-40 1-40 1-200 1-20 1-70 2-00 2-70	$\begin{array}{c} 0.30 \ \text{to} \ 1.20\\ 0.50 \ \text{to} \ 1.60\\ 0.50 \ \text{to} \ 2.10\\ 0.90 \ \text{to} \ 2.80\\ 0.20 \ \text{to} \ 1.30\\ 0.50 \ \text{to} \ 1.30\\ 0.50 \ \text{to} \ 2.30\\ 0.50 \ \text{to} \ 2.30\\ 0.50 \ \text{to} \ 2.40\\ 0.50 \ \text{to} \ 2.00\\ 0.80 \ \text{to} \ 2.60\\ 0.80 \ \text{to} \ 2.60\\ 0.90 \ \text{to} \ 3.20\\ 1.40 \ \text{to} \ 4.20 \end{array}$	0-999 1-000 0-999 1-000 0-998 1-000 1-000 1-000 0-999 1-000 1-000 1-000 1-000 1-000 1-000		_
2-64years Low High 55years	edium igh w	Yes No Yes Yes No	- 48 448 448 448 448 448 448 448 448 448	44 10 9 139 71 17 8 38 10 0 1	1-10 1-30 0-70 1-40 2-00 1-20 1-70 2-00 2-70	0.50 to 1.60 0.50 to 2.10 0.50 to 2.40 0.20 to 2.80 0.50 to 1.30 0.50 to 1.30 0.50 to 2.30 0.50 to 2.30 0.50 to 2.40 0.50 to 2.00 0.80 to 2.60 0.90 to 3.20 1.40 to 4.20	1.000 0.999 1.000 0.998 1.000 1.000 0.999 1.000 1.000 1.000		_
Mediu High 2-64years Low Mediu High 65years	edium igh ww	Yes No Yes No Yes	×48 ×48 ×48 ×48 ×48 ×48 ×48 ×48 ×48 ×48	10 9 139 71 17 8 38 10 0 1	1.30 1.80 0.70 1.10 1.40 2.00 1.20 1.70 2.00 2.70	0.50 to 2.10 0.50 to 2.80 0.20 to 1.30 0.50 to 1.30 0.50 to 2.30 0.50 to 2.30 0.50 to 2.30 0.50 to 2.40 0.50 to 2.40 0.80 to 2.60 0.80 to 2.60 1.40 to 4.20	0999 10000 0-998 10000 10000 10000 0-999 10000 10000 10000		_
Mediu High 2-64years Low Mediu High 65years Low	edium igh w	No Yes Yes No	- 148 > 48 > 48 > 48 = 48 = 48 = 48 = 48 = 48 = 48 = 48 =	9 139 71 17 8 38 10 0 1	1.80 0.70 1.10 1.40 2.00 1.20 1.70 2.00 2.70	0-90 to 2-80 0-20 to 1-30 0-50 to 1-80 0-90 to 2-30 0-90 to 3-10 0-50 to 2-00 0-80 to 2-60 0-90 to 3-20 1-40 to 4-20	1-000 0-998 1-000 1-000 0-999 1-000 1-000 1-000 1-000		
Mediu High 2-64 years Low Mediu High 65 years Low	edium igh ww	No Yes No Yes	- 148 ×48 ×48 >48 ×48 >48 ×48 ×48 ×48 ×48 ×48 ×48 ×48	139 71 17 8 38 10 0 1	070 1-10 1-40 2-00 1-20 1-70 2-00 2-70	0-20 to 1-30 0-50 to 1-80 0-50 to 2-30 0-90 to 3-10 0-80 to 2-00 0-80 to 2-60 0-90 to 3-20 1-40 to 4-20	0-998 1-000 1-000 1-000 0-999 1-000 1-000 1-000		_
High 2–64 years Low Mediu High 65 years Low	igh w	Yes No Yes	- 148 - 448 - 448	71 17 8 38 10 0 1	1-10 1-40 2-00 1-20 1-70 2-00 2-70	0-50 to 1.80 0-50 to 2.30 0-90 to 3-10 0-80 to 2-60 0-80 to 2-60 0-90 to 3-20 1-40 to 4-20	1.000 1.000 0.999 1.000 1.000 1.000		_
High 2-64 years Low Mediu High 65 years Low	igh w	Yes No Yes	≤48 >48 ≤48 >48 ≤48 >48 >48 ×48 >48	17 8 38 10 0 1	1-40 2-00 1-20 1-70 2-00 2-70	0-50 to 2-30 0-90 to 3-10 0-50 to 2-00 0-80 to 2-60 0-90 to 3-20 1-40 to 4-20	1.000 1.000 0.999 1.000 1.000 1.000		
High 264.years Low Mediu High 65.years Low	igh w	No Yes No	>48 =48 >48 =48 >48 =48 =48 =48	17 8 38 10 0 1	2-00 1-20 1-70 2-00 2-70	0-90 to 3-10 0-50 to 2-00 0-80 to 2-60 0-90 to 3-20 1-40 to 4-20	1-000 0-999 1-000 1-000 1-000		
High 2-64years Low Mediu High 65years Low	igh w	No Yes No	×48 >48 ×48 ×48 >48 ×48	38 10 0 1	1-20 1-70 2-00 2-70	0-50 to 2-00 0-80 to 2-60 0-90 to 3-20 1-40 to 4-20	0.999 1.000 1.000 1.000		
2-64 years Low Mediu High	~	Yes	>48 <48 >48 <48	10 0 1	1-70 2-00 2-70	0-80 to 2-60 0-90 to 3-20 1-40 to 4-20	1-000 1-000 1-000		
2-64 years Low Mediu High	~	Yes No	≤48 >48 ≤48	0	2.00	0-90 to 3-20 1-40 to 4-20	1.000 1.000		
2-64 years Low Mediu High	~	No	 >48 ≤48 >48 	1	2.70	1-40 to 4-20	1.000		
2-64 years Low Mediu High 65 years Low	~	No	≤48 >48	258					
65years Low	~	No	≤48 >48	258					
Low Mediu High			>48		0.70	0 30 to 1 10	0.008	_	
Mediu High 65years			~ 48	1.79	1.10	0.50 to 1.10	1.000		
Mediu High 65years				120	1.10	0.50 to 1.70	1.000		
Mediu High 65years		Yes	≤48	34	1.00	0.50 to 2.10	1,000		
Mediu High 65years			>48	22	1.90	0.80102.90	1.000		-
High 65years Low	edium	NO	≤48	8/1	0.70	0-30 to 1-10	0.999		
65 years			>48	429	1-10	0.60 to 1.70	1.000		
65 years		Yes	s48	139	1-40	0-60 to 2-20	0.999		
-65years Low	-		>48	69	2-00	1-00 to 3-10	1-000		
65years	gn	NO	s48	2/0	1-20	0.50 to 1.90	1-000		
65years			>48	135	1.80	0-90 to 2-70	1.000		
65years		Yes	s48	48	2.10	1-00 to 3-30	1.000		-
65years			>48	22	2-80	1-50 to 4-30	1-000		
Low									
		No	s:48	20	0.70	-0-40 to 1-90	0.894 -		
			>48	19	1-30	-0.00 to 2.60	0.972		
		Yes	≤48	9	1-60	0-00 to 3-20	0.976		
			>48	9	2.30	0-50 to 4-10	0.994		
Mediu	edium	No	s48	40	0.70	-0-60 to 2-00	0.850		
			>48	25	1-30	-0-20 to 2-80	0.954		
		Yes	≤48	28	1.60	-0-10 to 3-30	0.964	+	
			>48	22	2.30	0-40 to 4-20	0.992		
High	igh	No	≤48	13	1-40	-0-30 to 3-10	0.951 -		
			>48	7	2-10	0-30 to 4-00	0.987	-	
		Yes	≤48	11	2-40	0-40 to 4-50	0.989		
			>48	5	3-20	1-00 to 5-50	0.998		

ALIC⁴E Trial: Impact of Oseltamivir on Quality-Adjusted Life Years



Effectiveness of Oseltamivir Prophylaxis in Influenza Outbreaks in Residential Aged Care

Large cohort study using prospective administration	in data from database of aged care facilities in
Australia that reported influenza outbreaks between	n 2015-2018

• 86 outbreaks in 49 facilities

Considerations

 Oseltamivir prophylaxis failure: new clinical case of influenza occurring in a patient on oseltamivir prophylaxis calculated as the attack rate in patients on prophylaxis divided by attack rate in patients not on prophylaxis

Patients

- 10,064 total patients
- 16% patients diagnosed with influenza (9% confirmed by PCR)
- Vaccination rates 88% for patients and 37% for staff

Results Overall

- Attack rate significantly lower in facilities that used oseltamivir prophylaxis compared to those who did not (1.9% vs. 18.9%; ARR 17%; NNT 6)
- Oseltamivir 90% effective at preventing new cases of influenza (RR of OP failure 0.1; p<0.0001)
- Increased risk of failure in facilities with high prophylaxis utilization rate (RR 6.5; 95% CI 2.86-14.77)

Dronavalli et al. J Epidemiol Glob Health.2020;10:184-89

Effectiveness of Oseltamivir Prophylaxis in Influenza Outbreaks in Residential Aged Care

- Facilities with dementia wards had 30% more influenza cases and more use of oseltamivir for treatment (34%) than prophylaxis (12%) vs. those without dementia wards
- Facilities with dementia wards had lower prophylaxis failure rates (44%)



Figure 1 Relative risk of clinical outcomes in influenza outbreaks in dementia wards compared with non-dementia wards in ACFs. ACF, aged care facility; OP, oseltamivir prophylaxis; deaths, any deaths occurring in residents of the ACF during the outbreak.

Effectiveness of Oseltamivir Prophylaxis in Influenza Outbreaks in Residential Aged Care

- · Facilities with only high care wards had 29% fewer cases of influenza
- Rates of oseltamivir prescriptions were similar between facilities with only high care wards vs. other facilities
- · Prophylaxis failure rate was 87% lower in facilities with high care wards



Figure 2 | Relative risk of clinical outcomes in influenza outbreaks in high care wards compared with non-high care wards in ACFs. ACF, aged care facility; OP, oseltamivir prophylaxis; deaths, any deaths occurring in residents of the ACF during the outbreak.

Dronavalli et al. J Epidemiol Glob Health.2020;10:184-89

Effectiveness of Oseltamivir in Reducing Complications and 30-day Mortality in Hospitalized Adults

[Multi-center, retrospective cohort study in the Netherlands •390 hospitalized adults with confirmed influenza •Mean age 65 years(49% patients > 65 years) •Other demographics: 42% female, 80% had comorbidities, 60% had cardiovascular comorbidities 42% lung comorbidities, and 46% were immunocompromised	
_[Median duration between symptom onset and drug initiation: 3 days	_
	Patients more likely to receive oseltamivir •Younger adults •Patients with comorbidities •Given concomitant antibiotics •Admitted to ICU within 48 hours of hospital admission	

Table 3

Outcome using propensity score matching in the group of influenza patients treated with oseltamivir within 48 h of hospital admission compared with the group of patients without this treatment

Outcome variable	Untreated (%)	Treated (%)	Difference (%)	OR	95% CI	Р
30-day mortality	12/88 (13.6)	4/88 (4.6)	-8/88 (9.1)	0.30	0.07-1.07	0.04
In-hospital mortality	9/88 (10.2)	3/88 (3.4)	-6/88 (6.8)	0.31	0.05-1.31	0.13
Composite endpoint	14/88 (15.9)	4/88 (4.6)	-10/88 (11.4)	0.25	0.06-0.86	0.02
Median (IQR) length of hospital stay (days)	6 (2.8-11.0)	4 (2.6-8.0)	-	-	-	0.14

OR, odds ratio; CI, confidence interval; ICU, intensive care unit; IQR, interquartile range; composite endpoint, 30-day mortality and/or ICU admission >48 h after hospital admission.

Groeneveld et al. Int J Antimicrob Agents.2020;56:106155

	Zanamivir	
For treatment and prophylaxis]
Dose – 2 inhalations)
Frequency and Duration of Therapy]
 Treatment – Twice daily x 5 days Prophylaxis – Once daily x 7-10 days 		
Contraindications)
 Reactive lung disease and/or bronchospas Milk protein allergy 	m	·



Zanamivir vs. Oseltamivir in COPD patients with Influenza

Table 2. Changes in body temperature (*C) on days 1, 3, and 7 of treatment of chronic obstructive pulmonary disease patients with influenza virus infection treated with oral oseltamivir (OSELTA group) or inhaled zanamivir (ZANA group).

Randomized controlled trial of 160 adult patients with COPD and influenza in China

No difference in influenza A (O 52.5% vs. Z 55%) or influenza B (O 47.5% vs. 45%)

Assessment day	OSELTA group (N=80)	ZANA group (N=80)	Statistics
Day 1	38.2±0.8	38.2±0.7	∆°=0.02; 95%Cl=-0.2049 to 0.2833 t=0.148; P=0.882
Day 3	37.0±0.6	37.3±0.7	Δ°=0.23; 95%CI=-0.4507 to -0.027 (=2.631; P=0.009
Day 7	36.6 ± 0.2	36.5 ± 0.3	∆°=–0.04; 95%Cl=–0.0193 to 0.137 t=–0.918; P=0.360

Table 3. Comparison of clinical improvement of influenza non-specific symptoms on days 3 and 7 of treatment of chronic obstructive pulmonary disease patients with influenza virus infection treated with oral oseitamivir (OSELTA group) or inhaled zanamivir (ZANA group).

Assessment day	OSELTA group (N=80)	ZANA group (N=80)	Statistics
Day 3			
Body temperature returned to normal	41 (51.3%)	32 (40.0%)	χ ² =2.041; P=0.153
Improvement in clinical symptoms	68 (85.0%)	55 (68.8%)	χ ² =5.942; P=0.015
Day 7			
Body temperature returned to normal	80 (100.0%)	77 (96.3%)	χ ² =3.057; P=0.080
Improvement in clinical symptoms	78 (97.5%)	67(83.8%)	χ ² =8.901; P=0.003

Li et al. Braz J Med Biol Res.2021;54:e9542



Peramivir

FLU-PRO Symptom Severity Score

2.5

2

1.5

1

0.5

0

79 72 70 65

Open-label RCT at 2 academic emergency departments (Johns Hopkins Hospital and Maricopa Medical Center)

FLU-PRO Symptom Severity Score for 14 Days of Follow-up

--- Oseltamivir --- Peramivir

Day 1 Day 2 Day 3 Day 4 Day 5 Day 6 Day 7 Day 8 Day 9 Day 10 Day 11 Day 12 Day 13 Day 14

60 72 56 55 69 72 55 55

57

57 74

64 66 75 70

69 72

Compared oral oseltamivir (n=84) to IV peramivir (n=95)

Both groups received first dose in ED

Oseltamivir group took remaining 4 days either as outpatient or inpatient
 Peramivir could be continued in patients admitted to hospital based on
 physician discretion

Average FLU-PRO score similar at baseline (P 2.67 vs. O 2.52)

Decrease in scores non-inferior (P<0.05 at day 5, day 10, and day 14) $\,$

No difference in all influenza-related complications (31% vs 21%; p> 0.05) or pneumonia (11% vs. 14% ; p> 0.05)

Hsieh Y et al. Influenza Other Respir Viruses.2021;15:121-131

Other Peramivir Studies

Study	Design	Results
Kato et al. 1	2 week randomized open-label study in 209 patients Evaluated Peramivir repeat (600 mg IV on 2 consecutive days) vs. peramivir single (300 mg IV single dose) vs. oseltamivir in adults with influenza and chronic respiratory disease	 NO difference in peramivir repeat or single Cumulative area of time vs. symptoms (CATVS) shorter for peramivir single vs. oseltamivir (Treatment difference -1.45.07) CATVS shorter for peramivir single vs. oseltamivir in patients with influenza A (TD -206.61; p=0.0231), bronchial asthma (-156.57;p=0.0328), baseline respiratory severity score < 5 (TD-265.32;p=0.012) and age < 65 (TD - 184.3;p=0.0249)
Kato et al. 2	Additional outcomes from 2-week open label study	 Both peramivir regiments reduces COPD Assessment Test (CAT) score on day 3 more than oseltamivir (Repeat -0.45 vs. O -0.9 p=0.0032) (single -3.8 vs. O -0.9 p=0.0203) Median time to alleviation of 3 respiratory symptoms longer with repeat vs. single (68.9 hours vs. 50.6 hours, HR 1.57; p=0.0191) and shorter with single vs. oseltamivir (50.6 hours, HR 1.57; p=0.0124) Alleviation of 7 influenza symptoms shorter with single vs. roseltamivir (50.6 hours, st. 8.4 hours, HR 0.62 p=0.0141) Alleviation of 7 influenza symptoms shorter with single vs. roseltamivir (70.3 vs. 103.8 hours, HR 1.62, 95% CI 1.12-2.34) and vs. oseltamivir (70.3 vs. 102 hours, HR 0.96, 95% CI 0.466), but no difference between repeat and oseltamivir (HR 0.96, 95% CI 0.65-1.41)
Chen et al.	 Single center RCT in 40 adults in China with severe influenza A with primary viral pneumonia from December 2018-April 2019 Compared Peramivir (300 mg IV daily for 5 days) vs. oseltamivir 	 No difference between oseltamivir and peramivir in duration of viral positivity (2.95 vs. 2.8 days; p>0.05), remission of symptoms (3.9 vs. 3.25 days;p=0.29), or time to cough alleviation (75.53 vs. 63.89 hours; p=0.51) Peramivir had a shorter duration of time to fever alleviation (12.32 vs. 23.67 hours; p=0.034)
Kato et al. Influenza Othe	r Respir Viruses.2021;15:132-141	

Kato et al. Influenza Other Respir Viruses.2021;15:651-660 Chen et al. Open Forum Infec Dis.2020;8:ofaa562

Su et al. J Infect Chemother.2022;28:158-68

Comparison Of Neuraminidase Inhibitors

Network Meta-	Symptom Alle	viation
Analysis of NAIs	Treatment Effect	Mean Difference with 95%C
	Oseltamivir vs,Placebo	-15.89 (-23.09,-8.6
		-12.22 (-30.44,6.00
- acused on reducing	Zanamivir	-15.29 (-21.67,-8.9
ocused on reducing	Peramivir •	
influenza symptoms	Laninamivir vs.Oseltamivir	3.66 (-13.07,20.40
	Oseltamivir_zanamivir	• 1.55 (-11.41,14.52)
	Zanamivir	0.59 (-7.67,8.86)
58 two-arm studies	Peramivir	-4.00 (-18.42,10.43
ublished 1007 2019	Oseltamivir zanamivir vs Laninamivir	-2.11 (-23.28.19.06
$\frac{1997-2010}{10}$	Zanamivir	-3.07 (-21.73,15.60
	Peramivir	-7.66 (-29.76,14.43
	Zanamivir vs.Oseltamivir_zanamivir	-0.96 (-13.95,12.03
22,250 patients total	Peramivir	-5.55 (-24.56,13.45
	Peramivir vs.Zanamivir	-4.59 (-20.28,11.05

Comparison Of Neuraminidase Inhibitors

	Summanzeu Ou	us Rations for Diarried
Coriotrio	Treatment Effect	Odds Ratio with 95%Cl
Results	Oseitamivir vs.Placebo Laninamivir Oseitamivir_zanamivir Zanamivir Peramivir	0.77 (0.66,0.90) 0.67 (0.43,1.04) 0.35 (0.07,1.76) ↓ 0.74 (0.58,0.94) 0.79 (0.55,1.13)
	Laninamivir vs.Oseitamivir Oseitamivir_zanamivir Zanamivir Peramivir	0.87 (0.57,1.32) 0.45 (0.09,2.30) 0.95 (0.72,1.27) 1.03 (0.72,1.46)
No significant effect on	Osetlamivir_zanamivir vs.Laninamivir ► Zanamivir Peramivir	0.52 (0.10,2.77) 1.10 (0.67,1.79) 1.18 (0.68,2.03)
symptom alleviation from any NAI	Zanamivir vs.Oseltamivir_zanamivir Peramivir	2.12 (0.42,10.63 2.28 (0.43,11.99)
	Peramivir vs.Zanamivir	1.07 (0.70,1.65)
	0.001	0.5 1 2 5 500

Su et al. J Infect Chemother.2022;28:158-68

Comparison of Neuraminidase Inhibitors



Neuraminidase Inhibitors Adverse Effects

Retrospective study of the U.S. FDA adverse event reporting systems (FAERS) and WebMD data from 2013-2018

Results

- 16,729 adverse effects from 4,598 patients in FAERS and 575 adverse effects from 440 patients in WebMD
- FAERS: adverse effects in older adults more common with peramivir (63.51%) and in pediatrics with zanamivir (30.67%)
- Peramivir abnormal liver function, cardiac failure, shock, respiratory failure
- · WebMD: Oseltamivir associated with GI symptoms in older adults



Ison MG, et al. Lancet Infect Dis.2020;20"1204-1214

Baloxavir Prophylaxis in **Household Contacts**

	Baloxavir (n=374)	Placebo (N=375)	Adjusted Risk Ratio (95% CI)
Lab confirmed influenza	7 (1.9%)	51 (13.6%)	0.14 (0.06-0.3)
Negative PCR at baseline but contact with PCR positive index patient	5/344 (1.5%)	39/337 (11.6%)	0.13 (0.05-0.31)
Patients < 12 years	3/71 (4.2%)	11/71 (15.5%)	0.27 (0.08-0.9)
Patients ≥ 12 years	4/303 (1.3%)	40/304 (13.2%)	0.1 (0.04-0.28)
Patients with high-risk factors	1/46 (2.2%)	8/52 (15.4%)	0.13 (0.02-0.94)
Lab confirmed influenza regardless of fever or symotoms	49 (13.1%)	114 (30.4%)	0.43 (0.32-0.58)
PCR confirmed illness	20 (5.3%)	84 (22.4%)	0.24 (015-0.38)

Ikematsu et al. N Eng J Med.2020;383:309-320

Baloxavir vs. Neuraminidase **Inhibitors on House Transmissions**

Retrospective study using Japanese claims database

1st family members with influenza in 2018-19 identified as index patient

Families classified into

- · Oral baloxavir (BXM) vs. 3 controls
- Oral oseltamivir (OTV) (Primary control)
- Inhaled zanamivir (ZNV)
- Inhaled laninamivir (LNV)

Household transmission defined as influenza diagnosis in family during days 3-8

Families included in JMDC database in the 2020-19 influenza season: 3 933 733 families

- Ineligible for the study population: 3 676 407 families (93.5%) [Reason for ineligibility] [Reason for ineligibility] Not having day 1 within the enrollment period*: 3 522 436 families (89.5%) Not having an IP who was diagnosed with influenza on day 1 on an outpatient basis: 998 families (0.0%) Not having an IP to whom any study drug** was prescribed on day 1: 34 320 families (0.9%) Having no family member other than an IP: 115 717 families (2.9%) Having 2 or more IPs: 14 859 families (0.4%) Study population: 257 326 families Ineligible for the primary analysis population: 49 101 families (19.1%) [Reason for ineligibility] At least 1 family member could not be observed throughout from 2018–2019 to day 1: 48 574 families (98.9%)
 Having an IP who was hospitalized on days 1 to 2: 119 families (0.2%)
 - Having an IP who received multiple antiinfluenza drugs*** on days 1 to 2: 567 families (1.2%)
- Primary analysis population: 208 225 families BXM : 84 672 families

• OTV	: 62	004	families

	-	44 005 6 11	
•	ZNV	: 14 085 families	

· LNV	: 47 464 families	

ure 1. Flow of identification of families included in the study population and analysis population. *1 October 2018 to 23 April 2019. **BXM, OTV, ZVW, UNV ***Anti uenza drugs: BXM, OTV, ZVW, UNV, or peramivir hydrate. Abbreviations: BXM, baloxavir marboxil; IP, index patient; UNV, laninemivir octanoate hydrate; OTV, oseltamivir Figure 1. Flow of ide ZNV. zanamivir hydrate.

Komeda T, et al. Clin Infect Dis.2021;72:e859-67

Baloxavir vs. Neuraminidase **Inhibitors on House Transmissions**

Lower transmission with Baloxavir vs. Oseltamivir (17.98% vs. 24.16%)

Higher odds of transmission in Baloxavir than Zanamivir, although the proportion of families with household transmission was lower in Baloxavir (17.95% vs. 18.41%)

Odds of transmission high if index patient was ≤ 12 years

Drug	Ν	Household transmission	%	Unadjusted OR	Adjusted ^{**} OR (95%CI)		
BXM	84 672	15 226	17.98				
OTV	62 004	14 983	24.16	1.45	1.09 (1.05-1.12)		
ZNV	14 085	2 593	18.41	1.03	0.93 (.8997)	•	
LNV	47 464	8 272	17.43	0.96	0.99 (.96-1.02)	•	
					0.5	0 1.00	2.00

Favors Favors comparators baloxavir

A Inf	luenza A							
Drug	N	Household transmission	%	Unadjusted OR	Adjusted ^{**} OR (95%CI)			
BXM	61 246	11 106	18.13					
OTV	42 883	10 727	25.01	1.51	1.11 (1.07-1.15)			
ZNV	9188	1717	18.69	1.04	0.92(.8798)			
LNV	33 353	6079	18.23	1.01	1.03 (.99–1.07)		-	
						0.50	1 00	2 00

Favors Favors comparators baloxavir

B Influ	enza B							
Drug	N	Household	%	Unadjusted	Adjusted			
		transmission		OR	OR (95%CI)			
ЗХМ	818	89	10.88					
DTV	570	74	12.98	1.22	1.06 (.71-1.56)			-
ZNV	193	26	13.47	1.28	1.15 (.70–1.89)			_
NV	594	67	11.28	1.04	1.08 (.76–1.54)			-
						0.50	1.00	2.00

0.50 1.00 2.0 Favors Favors comparators baloxavir

