Treatment Patterns and Healthcare Resource Utilization of Patients With Schizophrenia Prescribed Aripiprazole Lauroxil Versus Oral Aripiprazole: **A Retrospective Claims-Based Study**

John M. Kane, MD,¹ Andrea B. Barthel, MS,² Chenxue Liang,² Zhengfan Wang,² Elizabeth S. Nagelhout,² Lauren N. Strand, PhD, MS,³ Michael J. Doane, PhD,³ Regina Grebla, PhD³ ¹The Donald and Barbara Zucker School of Medicine at Hofstra/Northwell, Hempstead, NY, USA; ²Genesis Research, Hoboken, NJ, USA; ³Alkermes, Inc., Waltham, MA, USA

BACKGROUND

- Nonadherence to oral medication is a known challenge among some patients with schizophrenia¹
- Gaps in oral antipsychotic use are associated with an increased risk of hospitalization²
- Long-acting injectable (LAI) antipsychotic medications provide consistent medication exposure and are associated with greater adherence, lower discontinuation rates, and reduced acute healthcare resource utilization (HCRU) compared with oral antipsychotics³
- Aripiprazole lauroxil (AL) is an atypical LAI antipsychotic indicated for the treatment of adults with schizophrenia and is available with monthly, every-6-weeks, and every-2-months dosing options that can be paired with a separate 1-day initiation regimen^{7,8}
- In previous real-world studies of patients with schizophrenia, treatment initiation with AL was associated with significant reductions in the numbers of mental health–related inpatient (IP) admissions and emergency department (ED) visits^{9,10}

OBJECTIVE

• To compare demographic and clinical characteristics, treatment patterns, and HCRU among adults with schizophrenia initiating AL versus oral aripiprazole (OA)

METHODS

Data Source

- Administrative claims data from January 1, 2016, to June 30, 2022, for privately or publicly insured persons across the United States obtained from the Merative[™] MarketScan[®] Commercial Claims and Encounters (CCAE), Medicare Supplemental (MDCR), and Medicaid Multi-State (MDCD) research databases were analyzed retrospectively
- The CCAE database includes approximately 62.9 million covered lives per year; the MDCR and MDCD databases represent 2.6 million and 16.8 million lives (over 3 years), respectively

Study Design and Patient Selection

Figure 1. Study Design

~		Date of S	Schizophrenia Diagn	osis					
ہ Start of Study Period Jan 1, 2016	Jan 1, 2017						Jun 30, 20	021	End of Study Period Jun 30, 2022
•			Index Identification	n Period					
		12-mo baseline period ^a	1	≤6 mo	2	12-mo follow-up period ^b			
			1		1				
Patients had to have ≥12 month	ns of continuous enrollment befo	ore and ≥12 months of continuous	Index date ^c s enrollment after the index		cond Cla		2-month per	riod before and inc	usive of the index date. ^b Th

follow-up period from the index date (exclusive) to the date of disenrollment or end of study period allowed for a fixed 12 months of follow-up to assess treatment patterns and healthcare resource utilization. Date of first aripiprazol lauroxil or oral aripiprazole claim on or after initial diagnosis date. ^dThe second of 2 claims (pharmacy or medical) was required to be within 6 months of the first claim.

• Criteria for patient identification for this analysis are listed in **Figure 2**

Outcomes

- Demographics and baseline clinical characteristics by treatment group (AL or OA)
- Treatment patterns
- Discontinuation: a continuous gap of ≥60 days without a claim for the index prescription following the therapeutic window for AL or after the previous claim's days' supply for OA
- Persistence: the number of days from the index date to date of first discontinuation or end of the 1-year follow-up period, whichever occurred first
- *Switching*: the presence of a claim for antipsychotic medication other than that initiated at index within the 60-day maximum allowable gap from the date of discontinuation
- *Proportion of days covered (PDC)*: calculated as number of available days of index therapy divided by 365
- − Adherent: PDC \ge 0.80
- HCRU outcomes

- Proportions of patients with all-cause and mental health-related IP admissions and outpatient (OP) and ED visits - Utilization per patient per month (PPPM) for the outcomes listed above as well as all-cause OP pharmacy claims

- **Statistical Analysis**
- Propensity score matching (using a 1:1 matching ratio) was used to balance the treatment groups on 23 measured covariates (eg, age, sex, index year, and baseline HCRU)
- Treatment patterns
- Persistence was compared between the matched AL and OA cohorts using a Cox proportional hazards model
- Proportions adherent (PDC ≥ 0.80) were compared between the 2 matched cohorts using a logistic regression model The other treatment pattern outcomes were analyzed descriptively
- HCRU
- A logistic regression model was fitted to compare binary HCRU outcomes (occurrence of event, yes or no) between the 2 matched cohorts
- A 2-part modeling strategy combining logistic and Poisson regression models was used to compare visit counts PPPM for each cohort and all-cause drug claims PPPM, yielding the estimated rate ratio (RR); bootstrapping was used for generating 95% Cls

RESULTS

• The total sample size was 6599 patients (AL cohort, n=732 patients; unmatched OA cohort, n=5867) (Figure 2, Table 1) Figure 2. Patient Identification^a

Cohort Attrition Inclusion Criteria) Patients with ≥1 IP or ≥2 OP medical claims for a schizophrenia diagnosis (ICD-10-CM code of F20.x excludin 278,862 F20.81) between Jan 1. 2016. and Jun 30. 2021 **OA cohort** AL cohort Using a hierarchical approach^b) Patients with ≥ 2 pharmacy or medical claims within 6 months for AL on or after date of schizophrenia 3413 diagnosis, with the first claim (index date) between Jan 1, 2017, and Jun 30, 2021 Otherwise, patients with ≥2 pharmacy or medical claims within 6 months for OA on or after date of 21,936 schizophrenia diagnosis, with the first claim between Jan 1, 2017, and Jun 30, 2021 tients with ≥12 months of continuous medical and pharmacy enrollment before and including the dex date 11,217 (4) Patients with ≥12 months of continuous medical and pharmacy enrollment after the index date (5) Patients ≥18 years of age at index date **Exclusion Criteria**) Patients with an LAI prescription claim during the baseline period (applies to both cohorts) or OA prescriptic claim (for OA cohort only) tients with a claim for clozapine during the baseline period 5867 (3) Patients with missing index dose information, multiple doses at index date, or 0 days' supply Final Sample Size

^aPatients were categorized into the AL and OA cohorts using a hierarchical approach. If patients had ≥2 AL claims on or after the initial diagnosis date, they were included in the AL cohort; otherwise, patients were included in the OA cohort if they had ≥2 OA claims on or after the initial diagnosis date. ^bMaintaining patients with schizophrenia on treatment can be a clinical challenge. At least 2 claims were required to examine outcomes in the subset of patients across both treatment cohorts who may be more likely to benefit from treatment. AL, aripiprazole lauroxil; ICD-10-CM, International Classification of Diseases, Tenth Revision, Clinical Modification; IP, inpatient; LAI, long-acting injectable; OA, oral aripiprazole; OP, outpatient.

• Successful balancing of groups was achieved (standardized mean differences for all covariates < 0.10) through propensity score matching with a 1:1 ratio (matched OA cohort, n=732)

Table 1. Patient Demographics and Baseline Clinical Characteristics Before Propensity Score Matching

			AL. aripiprazole lauroxil [.] HR hazar	ratio: LAI. long-acting injectal	ole: OA, oral aripiprazole: OR, odds ratio	; PDC, proportion of days covered, Qn, quartile number.			
Characteristics	AL Cohort (n=732)	OA Cohort (n=5867)	 Fewer patients in 	the AL cohort had	d all-cause IP and ED vi	sits versus the OA cohort; odds o		tal health–rela	ited IP visi
Age at index, mean (SD), years	37.3 (13.4)	39.7 (13.9)	C	<i>,</i> ,	tients who initiated AL ealth—related IP and EI	(Figure 4) Divisits PPPM were significantly le	ower in the AL co	hort versus th	e matche
Female, n (%)	323 (44.1)	2941 (50.1)	OA cohort (Figure	e 5)					
Year of index, n (%)			 OP utilization did 	not differ betwee	n the matched cohorts				
2017	91 (12.4)	992 (16.9)	Figure 4. All-Cause a	and Mental Health	n–Related IP, OP, and El) Visits			
2018	105 (14.3)	1098 (18.7)		AL, n (%) Matched OA,	Matched OA, n (%)				
2019	196 (26.8)	1452 (24.7)	HCRU Event	(N=732)	(N=732)		ORª	95% CI	Р
2020	234 (32.0)	1503 (25.6)	All Cause						
2021	106 (14.5)	822 (14.0)			202(44.2)		0.75		0.0070
Payer type, n (%)			≥1 IP visit	253 (34.6)	302 (41.3)	⊢	0.75	(0.61, 0.93)	0.0079
Commercial	45 (6.1)	882 (15.0)	≥1 ED visit	427 (58.3)	470 (64.2)	⊢	0.78	(0.63, 0.97)	0.0222
Medicaid	683 (93.3)	4959 (84.5)		427 (38.3)	470 (04.2)		0.78	(0.03, 0.97)	0.0222
Medicare Supplemental	4 (0.5)	26 (0.4)	≥1 OP visit	727 (99.3)	731 (99.8)		0.27	(0.04, 1.80)	0.1741
CCI, mean (SD)	0.88 (1.4)	1.08 (1.8)			/31 (33.8)		0.27	(0.04, 1.80)	0.1741
Treatment history (past 12 months), ^a n (%)			Mental Health Rela	ted					
Typical oral antipsychotic	155 (21.2)	902 (15.4)	≥1 IP visit	232 (31.7)	280 (38.3)	⊢	0.75	(0.60, 0.93)	0.0082
Atypical oral antipsychotic	627 (85.7)	3794 (64.7)							
Oral aripiprazole	416 (56.8)	0	≥1 ED visit	282 (38.5)	314 (42.9)		0.83	(0.68, 1.03)	0.0888
Mood stabilizer	386 (52.7)	3023 (51.5)							
Antidepressant	494 (67.5)	4271 (72.8)	≥1 OP visit	695 (94.9)	705 (96.2)		0.73	(0.44, 1.21)	0.2280
Anticholinergic	234 (32.0)	1703 (29.0)							
Sedative/hypnotic	109 (14.9)	714 (12.2)				0.0 0.5 1.0 1.5	5 2.0		
Antianxiety medication	325 (44.4)	2762 (47.1)				OR (95% CI) for AL vs C			
Stimulant/ADHD medication	197 (26.9)	1734 (29.6)				Favors AL Favors C	A		
^a Patients with >1 pharmacy claim during the 12-month baseline period									

^aPatients with \geq 1 pharmacy claim during the 12-month baseline period. ADHD, attention-deficit/hyperactivity disorder; AL, aripiprazole lauroxil; CCI, Charlson Comorbidity Index; OA, oral aripiprazole. Figure 3. Index Prescription Dose



^aThree patients had an index dose of 675 mg AL_{NCD} (Initio), and their next AL claim had an unknown dose or was 675 mg. AL, aripiprazole lauroxil; AL_{NCD}, NanoCrystal Dispersion formulation of AL; OA, oral aripiprazole

• In the AL cohort, more patients were adherent to their medication compared with those in the matched OA cohort, and medication persistence was longer (Table 2)

Table 2. Treatment Patterns Among Matched Patient Cohorts

12-Month follow-up treatment patterns	AL Cohort (n=732)	Propensity Score–Matched OA Cohort (n=732)		
Persistence, days, median (Q1, Q3) ^a	365.0 (154.0 <i>,</i> 365.0)	153.0 (72.0 <i>,</i> 365.0)		
HR (95% Cl) for nonpersistence <i>, P</i> ^b	0.5 (0.44, 0.56), <0.0001			
Switching, n (%) ^c	163 (22.3)	216 (29.4)		
To oral antipsychotic	135 (18.4)	183 (24.9)		
To LAI antipsychotic	28 (3.8)	33 (4.5)		
PDC, mean (SD) ^d	0.72 (0.27)	0.51 (0.22)		
Adherence (PDC ≥ 0.80), n (%)	369 (50.4)	176 (24.0)		
OR (95% CI) <i>, P</i> ^b	3.22 (2.57, 4.02), <0.0001			
Discontinuation, n (%) ^e	362 (49.5)	522 (71.4)		

^aPersistence was defined as number of days the from index date to date of first discontinuation or end of the 1-year follow-up period, whichever occurred first, ^bReference = OA, ^cSwitching was defined as the presence of a claim. for antipsychotic medication other than that initiated at index within the 60-day maximum allowable gap period after the date of discontinuation. ^dPDC was calculated as number of available days of index therapy divided by 365 ^eDiscontinuation was defined as a continuous gap of \geq 60 days without a claim for the index prescription following the therapeutic window for AL or after the previous claim's days' supply for OA.

^aReference = OA. AL, aripiprazole lauroxil; ED, emergency department; HCRU, healthcare resource utilization; IP, inpatient; OA, oral aripiprazole; OP, outpatient; OR, odds ratio.

Figure 5. Numbers of All-Cause and Mental Health–Related IP, OP, and ED Visits, PPPM

HCRU Event	AL, mean (SD) (N=732)	Matched OA, mean (SD) (N=732)		RRª	95% Cl ^b
All Cause					
Number of IP visits PPPM	0.08 (0.18)	0.09 (0.12)	⊢∎ 4	0.83	(0.70, 0.97)
Number of ED visits PPPM	0.28 (0.57)	0.34 (0.49)	⊢_ 4	0.85	(0.72, 0.98)
Number of OP visits PPPM	7.03 (8.30)	7.50 (6.87)	⊢-■1	0.94	(0.86, 1.03)
Mental Health Related					
Number of IP visits PPPM	0.07 (0.17)	0.08 (0.11)	⊢■ 4	0.84	(0.70, 0.98)
Number of ED visits PPPM	0.12 (0.29)	0.15 (0.26)	⊢■ 1	0.78	(0.65, 0.93)
Number of OP visits PPPM	3.34 (4.23)	3.62 (3.88)	⊢ _∎4	0.93	(0.84, 1.03)
		0.0	0.5 1.0 1.5 Favors AL Favors OA		

^aReference = OA. ^bThe bootstrapping model conducted to compare counts PPPM between cohorts did not produce *P* values; CIs were reported for hypothesis testing AL, aripiprazole lauroxil; ED, emergency department; HCRU, healthcare resource utilization; IP, outpatient; OA, oral aripiprazole; OP, outpatient; PPPM, per patient per month; RR, rate ratio

LIMITATIONS

- Requiring ≥12 months of continuous enrollment before and after the index date may have limited the sample size
- Requiring 2 claims of AL and OA may have increased estimates of adherence and persistence; however, the requirement was the same for both cohorts
- Claims related to schizophrenia and its treatment may not have been captured accurately or completely, which could have led to inaccurate reports of treatment patterns and an underestimation of HCRU

CONCLUSIONS

- In this real-world study of patients with schizophrenia, patients initiating AL were more likely to be adherent to treatment and had longer medication persistence compared with patients initiating OA
- AL was associated with significantly reduced odds of all-cause IP and ED visits and mental health-related IP visits versus OA Numbers of visits to OP settings were similar between AL and OA
- All-cause and mental health—related IP admissions and ED visits PPPM were also significantly reduced among patients initiating AL versus OA
- Future investigations may explore whether the improved adherence and persistence and concurrent reductions in acute HCRU associated with use of LAI AL versus OA translate into lower rates of relapse and reduced physical, psychosocial, and economic burden experienced by patients with schizophrenia

REFERENCES

1. Greene M, et al. J Med Econ. 2018;21(2):127-34. DOI: <u>10.1080/13696998.2017.1379412</u>. **2.** Weiden PJ, et al. Psychiatr Serv. 2004;55(8):886-91. DOI: 10.1176/appi.ps.55.8.886. 3. Milz R, et al. Neuropsychiatr Dis Treat. 2023;19:531-45. DOI: 10.2147/ndt.s395383. 4. Romagnoli A, et al. Curr Clin Pharmacol. 2021;16(1):115-22. DOI: 10.2174/1574884715666200309121932. 5. Lin D, et al. CNS Drugs. 2021;35(5):469-81. DOI: 10.1007/s40263-021-00815-y. 6. Shah A, et al. Adv Ther. 2018;35(11):1994-2014. DOI: 10.1007/s12325-018-0786-x. 7. Aristada [package insert]. Waltham, MA: Alkermes, Inc.; 2023. 8. Aristada Initio [package insert]. Waltham, MA: Alkermes, Inc.; 2023. 9. Lauriello J, et al. CNS Drugs. 2021;35(10):1123-35. DOI: 10.1007/s40263-021-00849-2. 10. Strand LN, et al. Presented at: Annual Meeting of the American Association of Psychiatric Pharmacists; April 7-10, 2024; Orlando, FL

DISCLOSURES

JMK has been a consultant for or received honoraria from Alkermes, Boehringer Ingelheim, Click Therapeutics, Intra-Cellular Therapies, Janssen, Johnson & Johnson, Karuna, LB Pharmaceuticals, Lundbeck, Lyndra, Merck, Neurocrine Biosciences, Newron, Otsuka, Pierre Fabre, Reviva, Roche, Saladax, Sunovion, Takeda, and Teva; has received grant support from Janssen, Lundbeck, and Otsuka; and is a shareholder of LB Pharmaceuticals and Vanguard Research Group ABB, CL, ZW, and ESN have nothing to disclose

LNS, MJD, and RG are or were employees of Alkermes, Inc., and may own stock/options in the company



Acknowledgments and copies of this poster can be obtained through this QR (Quick Response) code. These materials are for person use only and may not be reproduced without permission of Alkermes. For permission, contact USMedInfo@Alk

Treatment Patterns and Healthcare Resource Utilization of Patients With Schizophrenia Prescribed Aripiprazole Lauroxil Versus Oral Aripiprazole: A Retrospective Claims-Based Study

John M. Kane, MD,¹ Andrea B. Barthel, MS,² Chenxue Liang,² Zhengfan Wang,² Elizabeth S. Nagelhout,² Lauren N. Strand, PhD, MS,³ Michael J. Doane, PhD,³ Regina Grebla, PhD³ ¹The Donald and Barbara Zucker School of Medicine at Hofstra/Northwell, Hempstead, NY, USA; ²Genesis Research, Hoboken, NJ, USA; ³Alkermes, Inc., Waltham, MA, USA

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

This study was sponsored by Alkermes, Inc. (Waltham, MA, USA). Medical writing and editorial support were provided by Peloton Advantage, LLC, an OPEN Health company, and funded by Alkermes, Inc.