AHRQ Comparative Effectiveness Review Surveillance Program

<u>CER #56:</u> Adjuvant Treatment for Phenylketonuria (PKU)

Original release date: February 2012

Surveillance Report: January 2013

<u>Key Findings:</u>

• All conclusions for KQ1-7 are still considered valid

• No new significant safety concerns were identified.

• Several new studies were identified, but none challenged existing conclusions.

Summary Decision

This CER's priority for updating is **Low**

Authors:

Sydne Newberry, PhD Jennifer Schneider Chafen, MS, MD Margaret Maglione, MPP Aneesa Motala, BA Jody Larkin, MLIS Paul Shekelle, MD, PhD

None of the investigators has any affiliations or financial involvement that conflicts with the material presented in this report.

Acknowledgments

The authors gratefully acknowledge the following individuals for their contributions to this project:

Subject Matter Experts

Barbara Burton, MD

Lurie Children's Hospital Northwestern University Evanston, Illinois

Thomas Morgan, MD

Vanderbilt University Nashville, Tennessee

Rani Singh, PhD Emory University Atlanta, Georgia

Desirée A. White, Ph.D. Washington University St. Louis, Missouri

Contents

2. Methods12.1 Literature Searches12.2 Study selection12.3 Expert Opinion12.4 Check for qualitative and quantitative signals12.5 Compilation of Findings and Conclusions22.6 Determining Priority for Updating33. Results33.1 Search33.2 Expert Opinion43.3 Identifying qualitative and quantitative signals44.3 Identifying qualitative and quantitative signals4Appendix A. Search Methodology15Appendix B. Evidence Table16Appendix C. Questionnaire Matrix21	1.	Introduction	.1
2.1 Literature Searches.12.2 Study selection12.3 Expert Opinion12.4 Check for qualitative and quantitative signals12.5 Compilation of Findings and Conclusions22.6 Determining Priority for Updating33. Results33.1 Search33.2 Expert Opinion43.3 Identifying qualitative and quantitative signals4References13Appendix A. Search Methodology15Appendix B. Evidence Table16Appendix C. Questionnaire Matrix21	2.	Methods	.1
2.2 Study selection12.3 Expert Opinion12.4 Check for qualitative and quantitative signals12.5 Compilation of Findings and Conclusions22.6 Determining Priority for Updating33. Results33.1 Search33.2 Expert Opinion43.3 Identifying qualitative and quantitative signals4References13Appendix A. Search Methodology15Appendix B. Evidence Table16Appendix C. Questionnaire Matrix21		2.1 Literature Searches	.1
2.3 Expert Opinion12.4 Check for qualitative and quantitative signals12.5 Compilation of Findings and Conclusions22.6 Determining Priority for Updating33. Results33.1 Search33.2 Expert Opinion43.3 Identifying qualitative and quantitative signals4References13Appendix A. Search Methodology15Appendix B. Evidence Table16Appendix C. Questionnaire Matrix21		2.2 Study selection	.1
2.4 Check for qualitative and quantitative signals.12.5 Compilation of Findings and Conclusions.22.6 Determining Priority for Updating33. Results33.1 Search33.2 Expert Opinion.43.3 Identifying qualitative and quantitative signals.4References13Appendix A. Search Methodology.15Appendix B. Evidence Table.16Appendix C. Questionnaire Matrix21		2.3 Expert Opinion	.1
2.5 Compilation of Findings and Conclusions22.6 Determining Priority for Updating33. Results33.1 Search33.2 Expert Opinion43.3 Identifying qualitative and quantitative signals4References13Appendix A. Search Methodology15Appendix B. Evidence Table16Appendix C. Questionnaire Matrix21		2.4 Check for qualitative and quantitative signals	.1
2.6 Determining Priority for Updating33. Results33.1 Search33.2 Expert Opinion43.3 Identifying qualitative and quantitative signals4References13Appendix A. Search Methodology15Appendix B. Evidence Table16Appendix C. Questionnaire Matrix21		2.5 Compilation of Findings and Conclusions	. 2
3. Results 3 3.1 Search 3 3.2 Expert Opinion 4 3.3 Identifying qualitative and quantitative signals 4 References 13 Appendix A. Search Methodology 15 Appendix B. Evidence Table 16 Appendix C. Questionnaire Matrix 21		2.6 Determining Priority for Updating	.3
3.1 Search	3.	Results	.3
3.2 Expert Opinion43.3 Identifying qualitative and quantitative signals4References13Appendix A. Search Methodology15Appendix B. Evidence Table16Appendix C. Questionnaire Matrix21		3.1 Search	.3
3.3 Identifying qualitative and quantitative signals4References13Appendix A. Search Methodology15Appendix B. Evidence Table16Appendix C. Questionnaire Matrix21		3.2 Expert Opinion	. 4
References13Appendix A. Search Methodology15Appendix B. Evidence Table16Appendix C. Questionnaire Matrix21		3.3 Identifying qualitative and quantitative signals	. 4
Appendix A. Search Methodology15Appendix B. Evidence Table	Re	ferences	13
Appendix B. Evidence Table	Ap	pendix A. Search Methodology	15
Appendix C. Questionnaire Matrix	Ap	pendix B. Evidence Table	16
	Ap	pendix C. Questionnaire Matrix	21

Table

Table	
Table 1: Summary Table	. 5

Adjuvant Treatment for Phenylketonuria (PKU): An Assessment for the Need to Update the 2012 Evidence Review

1. Introduction

Comparative Effectiveness Review (CER) #56, Adjuvant Treatment for Phenylketonuria (PKU), was released in February 2012.¹ It was therefore due for a surveillance assessment in August, 2012.

2. Methods

2.1 Literature Searches

Using the search strategy employed for the original report, we conducted a limited literature search of Medline for the years 2011-October 24, 2012. This search included five high-profile general medical interest journals (Annals of Internal Medicine, British Medical Journal, Journal of the American Medical Association, Lancet, and the New England Journal of Medicine) and five specialty journals (Journal of Inherited and Metabolic Diseases, Molecular Genetics and Metabolism, European Journal of Pediatrics, Pediatrics, and Acta Paed). The specialty journals were those most highly represented among the references for the original report. Appendix A includes the search methodology for this topic.

2.2 Study selection

In general we used the same inclusion and exclusion criteria as the original CER.

2.3 Expert Opinion

We shared the conclusions of the original report with 12 experts in the field (including the original project leader, suggested field experts, original technical expert panel (TEP) members, and peer reviewers) for their assessment of the need to update the report and their recommendations of any relevant new studies; 4 subject matter experts responded. Appendix C shows the questionnaire matrix that was sent to the experts.

2.4 Check for qualitative and quantitative signals

After abstracting the study conditions and findings for each new included study into an evidence table, we assessed whether the new findings provided a signal according to the Ottawa

Method and/or the RAND Method, suggesting the need for an update. The criteria are listed in the table below.^{2, 3}

	Ottawa Method
	Ottawa Qualitative Criteria for Signals of Potentially Invalidating Changes in Evidence
A1	Opposing findings: A pivotal trial or systematic review (or guidelines) including at least one
	new trial that characterized the treatment in terms opposite to those used earlier.
A2	Substantial harm: A pivotal trial or systematic review (or guidelines) whose results called
	into question the use of the treatment based on evidence of harm or that did not proscribe
	use entirely but did potentially affect clinical decision making.
A3	A superior new treatment: A pivotal trial or systematic review (or guidelines) whose results
	identified another treatment as significantly superior to the one evaluated in the original
	review, based on efficacy or harm.
	Criteria for Signals of Major Changes in Evidence
A4	Important changes in effectiveness short of "opposing findings"
A5	Clinically important expansion of treatment
A6	Clinically important caveat
A7	Opposing findings from discordant meta-analysis or nonpivotal trial
	Quantitative Criteria for Signals of Potentially Invalidating Changes in Evidence
B1	A change in statistical significance (from nonsignificant to significant)
B2	A change in relative effect size of at least 50 percent
	RAND Method Indications for the Need for an Update
1	Original conclusion is still valid and this portion of the original report does not need
	updating
2	Original conclusion is possibly out of date and this portion of the original report may need
	updating
3	Original conclusion is probably out of date and this portion of the original report may need
	updating
4	Original conclusion is out of date

2.5 Compilation of Findings and Conclusions

For this assessment we constructed a summary table that included the key questions, the original conclusions, and the findings of the new literature search, the expert assessments, and any FDA/Health Canada reports that pertained to each key question. To assess the conclusions in terms of the evidence that they might need updating, we used the four-category scheme described in the table above for the RAND Method.

In making the decision to classify a CER conclusion into one category or another, we used the following factors when making our assessments:

- If we found no new evidence or only confirmatory evidence and all responding experts assessed the CER conclusion as still valid, we classified the CER conclusion as still valid.
- If we found some new evidence that might change the CER conclusion, and /or a minority of responding experts assessed the CER conclusion as having new evidence that might change the conclusion, then we classified the CER conclusion as possibly out of date.

- If we found substantial new evidence that might change the CER conclusion, and/or a majority of responding experts assessed the CER conclusion as having new evidence that might change the conclusion, then we classified the CER conclusion as probably out of date.
- If we found new evidence that rendered the CER conclusion out of date or no longer applicable, we classified the CER conclusion as out of date. Recognizing that our literature searches were limited, we reserved this category only for situations where a limited search would produce prima facie evidence that a conclusion was out of date, such as the withdrawal of a drug or surgical device from the market, a black box warning from FDA, etc.

2.6 Determining Priority for Updating

We used the following two criteria in making our final conclusion for this CER:

- How much of the CER is possibly, probably, or certainly out of date?
- How out of date is that portion of the CER? For example, would the potential changes to the conclusions involve refinement of original estimates or do the potential changes mean some therapies are no longer favored or may not exist? Is the portion of the CER that is probably or certainly out of date an issue of safety (a drug withdrawn from the market, a black box warning) or the availability of a new drug within class (the latter being less of a signal to update than the former)?

3. Results

3.1 Search

The literature search identified 64 titles. After title and abstract review, 55 titles were rejected because they were editorials or letters or did not include topics of interest. The remaining 9 journal articles went on for further review. In addition to the searches, we also reference-mined articles that met inclusion criteria as well as non-systematic reviews identified by the literature searches but found no other articles. Four additional articles were reviewed at the suggestion of the experts: One had already been identified in our search (a published guideline⁴ that was not considered in the decision regarding whether to update but is cited below), one was rejected for inclusion in the original report, one was rejected as a non-systematic review, and one was accepted. In addition, one piece of grey literature (a manufacturer's press release) was identified through a brief Google search, as the original project lead suggested several new treatments were in trials but could not provide more information.⁵

Thus, through literature searches and expert recommendations, 9 articles went on to full text review. Of these, 3 articles were rejected because they were non-systematic reviews or did not address a key question. Thus, 6 articles were abstracted into an evidence table (Appendix B).⁶⁻¹¹

The FDA MedWatch, Health Canada, and MHRA UK searches identified no notifications of relevance.

3.2 Expert Opinion

The four experts were in unanimous agreement that none of the conclusions changed based on new evidence. Although one suggested new studies, he stated that several were not yet completed and none of the published studies would change the conclusions. One of the references mentioned by this expert was a guideline recently issued for the use of sapropterin in PKU; however this guideline cannot be interpreted as a recommendation for the use of sapropterin by any professional practice organization, as all 17 authors are employed by, or have received research support or honoraria from BioMarin, the manufacturer.⁴

3.3 Identifying qualitative and quantitative signals

Table 1 shows the original key questions, the conclusions of the original report, the results of the literature and drug database searches, the experts' assessments, the recommendations of the Southern California Evidence-based Practice Center (SCEPC) regarding the need for update, and qualitative signals.

Conclusions From CER	RAND Literature Search	FDA/ Health Canada/MHRA (UK)	Expert Opinion	Conclusion
Executive Summary			EPC Investigator	from SCEPC
			Other Experts	
Key Question 1a: What is the evid	lence for optimal Phe Levels Te	o Minimize Cognitive Impairment?		
Phe Levels and Impairments in	One new study assessed the	Not relevant	4/4 experts stated	Original
IQ	effect of concurrent Phe		that there was no	conclusion is
The data were analyzed according	levels and lifetime Index of		new evidence	still valid and
to two meta-analytic models The	dietary control (IDC) of Phe			this portion of
first represents the relationship of	on pre-attentive processing in			the original
Phe and IQ when Phe was	children with early and			report does not
measured "historically" (more	continuously treated PKU.			need updating
than 12 months before IQ	Higher lifetime Phe and IDC			
measurement). In the second	were associated with			
model, Phe and IQ were measured	increased visual evoked			
concurrently (within 6 weeks of	potential latencies and			
each other). Evidence from 17	decreased mismatch			
studies (mostly poor quality)	negativity amplitudes (which			
suggests increasing probability	differed with age), suggesting			
of low IQ at higher blood Phe	reduced ability to respond to			
levels, regardless of whether IQ	stimulus change and the need			
was measured during childhood	to switch attention.			
or later, with a stronger	(higher Phe: >360umol/L;			
association seen between Phe	lower lifetime Phe			
measured in early childhood and	\leq 360umol/L) ⁶			
later IQ. There is a lack of strong				
association in measurements	Another new study that			
taken concurrently during the	compared early and late			
critical period. Dietary control-	diagnosed individuals found			
and reporting of dietary control-	that 97.7% of the early			
varied among the studies.	diagnosed patients had a			
-	normal IQ cf. only 25% of			
	the late diagnosed. DQ/IQ			
	were significantly inversely			
	associated with IDC in early-			
	dx children. Neurological and			
	behavioral problems were			
	significantly higher among			

Table 1: Summary Table

Conclusions From CER	RAND Literature Search	FDA/ Health Canada/MHRA (UK)	Expert Opinion	Conclusion
Executive Summary			EPC Investigator	from SCEPC
	behavioral problems differed significantly in prevalence between good, intermediary, and poor dietary control (as indicated by IDC) ⁷		Other Experts	
Phe Levels and Impairments in Executive Function No measures of executive function have been validated for individuals with PKU. Nineteen unique studies determined to be too heterogeneous with respect to the neuropsychological measures used to allow pooling, showed that overall, while Phe levels correlate with various assessments of executive function in some studies, the degree to which they are correlated and the correlation on individual measures are inconsistent.	No studies identified	Not relevant	4/4 experts stated that there was no new evidence	Original conclusion is still valid and this portion of the original report does not need updating
Phe Levels and Impairments Related to Maternal PKU and Maternal PKU Syndrome Data predominantly from one longitudinal study, The Maternal PKU Collaborative Study, provide support for the observed increased risk of poor cognitive outcomes in the offspring of women with high maternal blood Phe concentrations. The study reported that timing of maternal metabolic control, defined as the	No studies identified	Not relevant	4/4 experts stated that there was no new evidence	Original conclusion is still valid and this portion of the original report does not need updating

Conclusions From CER	RAND Literature Search	FDA/ Health Canada/MHRA (UK)	Expert Opinion	Conclusion
Executive Summary			EPC Investigator	from SCEPC
			Other Experts	
number of weeks gestation before				
plasma Phe levels remained				
consistently lower than 605				
µmol/L, was associated with				
lower child cognitive scores at 4				
and 7 years of age.				
A model of the association	A new study by Teissier	Not relevant	4/4 experts stated	Original
between maternal blood Phe	(2012) that looked at birth		that there was no	conclusion is
levels during pregnancy and	outcomes in 115 pregnancies		new evidence but	still valid and
effect on offspring during	of 86 women with PKU in		one mentioned a	this portion of
childhood confirmed that the	France found an increased		study by Teissier	the original
relationship between maternal	risk for SGA among women		$(2012)^9$ that	report does not
blood Phe and offspring cognitive	who tightly controlled their		addressed the	need updating
outcomes was not linear:	diets and whose blood Phe		question of low	
cognitive impairment was	levels were less than		serum Phe levels	
significantly more common in	120umol/L, demonstrating			
offspring of mothers with PKU	that low as well as high blood			
than in controls at a Phe threshold	Phe may affect birth			
of 360 µmol/L, and Phe levels	outcomes. ⁹			
were linearly related to cognitive				
outcomes only above this				
threshold. Importantly, while				
other factors, including maternal				
characteristics, severity of				
mutations, and offspring head				
circumference, contributed				
strongly to outcomes at 1 year of				
age, maternal Phe strongly				
overtook those other factors in				
predicting cognitive impairment				
by age 2.				
Key Question 1b: What is the Evi	dence for Optimal Phe Levels	Fo Minimize Cognitive Impairment for Different Ag	ge Groups?	1
We examined the potential effect	A new study that analyzed	Not relevant	4/4 experts stated	Original
of age in the meta-analysis of the	lifetime Phe data showed that		that there was no	conclusion is
relationship of Phe and IQ. Any	Phe levels at ages 4, 5, and 6		new evidence	still valid and
influence of age was adequately	accounted for a higher			this portion of
represented by whether the Phe	proportion of the variance in			the original

Conclusions From CER	RAND Literature Search	FDA/ Health Canada/MHRA (UK)	Expert Opinion	Conclusion
Executive Summary			EPC Investigator Other Experts	from SCEPC
measurements were historical or concurrent and whether they were taken in the critical period.	a particular aspect of VEP (P110 amplitude) than did concurrent Phe levels. Phe levels at age 9 also accounted			report does not need updating
	for a higher proportion of the variance in N75 amplitude at occipital site 2 than did concurrent Phe. ⁶			
Key Question 2. What is the Effect	tiveness of BH4 in Patients wit	h PKU?		
Of the ten studies that evaluated the effects of BH4 in patients with PKU (relatively small, ranging in	One small new long-term (retrospective) study found that BH4 therapy, initiated in	Not relevant	4/4 experts stated that there was no new evidence. One	Original conclusion is still valid and
quality from poor to good, with varying doses, adherence rates, baseline Phe levels, and outcome	neonates or older children, significantly improved dietary Phe tolerance,		cites a case series on BH4 treatment of young children	this portion of the original report does not
measures), only 1 reported outcomes of interest, including measures of cognition and	allowing a 4-fold increase in Phe intake with a mean phenylalaninemia of		but the study was excluded from the original report.	need updating
nutritional status (most participants had demonstrated responsiveness to BH4 in	240±72uM, and 71±18% of Phe values within therapeutic targets (120-300uM). BH4			
reduced by at least 30 percent in up to half of treated participants	also improved metabolic control as measured by the decrease in mean			
(32 to 50 percent) at dosages of 5 to 20 mg/kg/day and for up to 22 weeks of observation in	phenylalaninemia $(352\pm85 \text{ to} 254\pm64 \text{ um})$ and concomitant increases in the Phe values			
comparative studies. In the one RCT that compared the effect of placebo on the likelihood of a 30-	within therapeutic targets and a decrease in the values above target and decreased			
percent reduction in Phe, only 9 percent of those on placebo	the variance in blood Phe levels from 130±21uM to			
achieved this effect after 6 weeks, compared with 44 percent of the treated group. Data suggested a	93±27uM°			
sustained response for up to 22 weeks duration, with 46 percent	that metabolic control improved among BH4-			

Conclusions From CER Executive Summary	RAND Literature Search	FDA/ Health Canada/MHRA (UK)	Expert Opinion EPC Investigator	Conclusion from SCEPC
Executive Summary			Other Experts	nom seere
achieving a 30-percent reduction in Phe levels. Responses varied by baseline Phe levels and other factors.	sensitive patients given BH4 while on a diet with twice the level of natural protein of usual PKU diets, but not among BH4-resistant participants. PKU patients reported higher physical well-being and HRQoL than age-matched healthy controls during the BH4 tx phase, but it was actually the resistant patients who had the higher HRQoL; BH4 sensitive patients did not increase their HRQoL. ¹¹			
BH4 use improved Phe tolerance over time. In the RCT, at a dosage of 20 mg/kg/day over 10 weeks, participants in the treatment group increased their Phe tolerance from 0 mg/kg at baseline to 20.9 mg/kg/day while maintaining blood Phe levels at <360 µmol/L, compared with an increase of 2.9 mg/kg/day in the placebo group. However, response varied substantially within the treatment group, with 33 percent tolerating an increase of between 31 and 50 mg/kg/day in supplement form but the rest of the participants tolerating lower levels of supplementary Phe. The degree to which this variability is associated with other factors possibly associated with Phe tolerance is	No studies identified	Not relevant	4/4 experts stated that there was no new evidence but one cites 2 studies supporting the original conclusion: one is a non- systematic review and the other is a set of guidelines for the use of BH4 (see text). ⁴	Original conclusion is still valid and this portion of the original report does not need updating

Conclusions From CER Executive Summary	RAND Literature Search	FDA/ Health Canada/MHRA (UK)	Expert Opinion	Conclusion from SCEPC
Executive Summary			Other Experts	IT OIL SCELC
unknown.				
One small case series reported on IQ and nutritional outcomes for up to 1 year on 5 mg/kg/day BH4 treatment. After 1 year of treatment, the 11 participants discontinued use of a medical food and normalized their diet. IQ scores after 12 months on BH4 were similar to scores before treatment and development quotients were within normal limits.	No studies identified	Not relevant	4/4 experts stated that there was no new evidence	Original conclusion is still valid and this portion of the original report does not need updating
Key Question 3: What is the Effe	ctiveness of BH4 in Pregnant V	Women with PKU?		
We did not identify any studies addressing this question.	No studies identified	Not relevant	4/4 experts stated that there was no new evidence (one stated that a new study has been completed but not yet published)	Original conclusion is still valid and this portion of the original report does not need updating
Key Question 4. What is the Effec	ctiveness of LNAAs in PKU?		·	•
Three brief studies of poor to fair quality, using varying doses addressed the effects of LNAAs. Two of the three studies measured reductions in Phe levels, and one assessed cognitive outcomes. One fair-quality study reported a positive effect on executive functioning, specifically verbal generativity, cognitive flexibility, and self-monitoring. Overall, participants who were using a Phe-free medical food for their nutritional needs did not	No new studies identified	Not relevant	4/4 experts stated that there was no new evidence	Original conclusion is still valid and this portion of the original report does not need updating

Conclusions From CER	RAND Literature Search	FDA/ Health Canada/MHRA (UK)	Expert Opinion	Conclusion
Executive Summary			EPC Investigator Other Experts	from SCEPC
experience a decrease in Phe,				
although those not adhering to				
diet or not using their formula did.				
In all three studies, blood Phe				
decreased after 1 week of				
treatment but remained above				
clinically acceptable levels.				
Key Question 5. What is the Effec	ctiveness of LNAAs in Pregnan	t Women With PKU?	1	1
We did not identify any studies	No new studies identified	Not relevant	4/4 experts stated	Original
addressing this question.			that there was no	conclusion is
			new evidence	still valid and
				this portion of
				the original
				report does not
Kay Question (What are the Us	uma of Adiument Treatment fo	- DEU9		need updating
Key Question 6: what are the Ha	rms of Adjuvant 1 reatment to	r PKU?	1/1 and arts stated	Original
of the 10 studies examining the	No new studies identified.	MHD A ag of Jonuary 15, 2012	4/4 experts stated	original conclusion is
participants with PKU A studies		MIRKA as of January 15, 2015	new evidence (one	still valid and
reported any type of harm related			(one referred to a	this portion of
to the intervention drug. The most			case series	the original
common side effects reported			excluded from the	report does not
during BH4 trials were headache			original report)	need undating
throat pain, upper respiratory			onginar report)	need apaaring
infection, diarrhea, abdominal				
pain, and nausea and vomiting.				
but harms were not significantly				
more common in the treatment -				
arm than in the placebo. One trial				
of LNAAs assessed				
neuropsychological outcomes and				
reported higher rates of				
anxiety associated with LNAA				
use.				
Key Question 7: What is the Effect	ctiveness of BH4 and LNAAs fo	or Subgroups of Individuals With PKU?	1	
We did not locate any studies	A new study whose aim was	Not relevant	4/4 experts stated	Original
addressing this question.	to identify genotypes		that there was no	conclusion is

Conclusions From CER Executive Summary	RAND Literature Search	FDA/ Health Canada/MHRA (UK)	Expert Opinion EPC Investigator Other Experts	Conclusion from SCEPC
	associated with sapropterin responsiveness: 74 patients completed the trial, of whom 36 were sapropterin responsive. Genotypes occurring in 2 or more patients were consistently associated with results of the START test for sapropterin response. Thus particular alleles can be used to screen for responsiveness to sapropterin ¹⁰		new evidence	still valid and this portion of the original report does not need updating

Are there new data that could inform the key questions that might not be addressed in the conclusions?

One expert mentioned a BioMarin PKU-016 study that measures outcomes of tetrahydrobiopterin in relation to neuropsychiatric symptoms; this study is scheduled for completion in Jan 2013. Another ongoing 7-year study in the PKU pediatric population will determine the effects, if any, on the development of children age 0-6 years who are using tetrahydrobiopterin.

A small Phase 2 trial of PEGylated phenylalanine ammonium lyase (PAL), an enzyme that breaks down Phe, was completed in September 2012; the Phase 3 trial is expected to begin in the 2^{nd} quarter of 2013, according to a press release from the manufacturer dated 9/26/12.⁵

Legend: BH4 tetrahydrobiopterin; LNAA large neutral amino acids; Phe phenylalanine; PKU phenylketonuria; SCEPC Southern California Evidence-based Practice Center; SGA small for gestational age; tx treatment

References

1. Lindegren ML, Krishnaswami S, Fonnesbeck C, et al. Adjuvant Treatment for Phenylketonuria (PKU). Comparative Effectiveness Review No. 56. (Prepared by the Vanderbilt Evidence-based Practice Center under Contract No. HHSA 290-2007-10065-I.) AHRQ Publication No. 12-EHC035-EF. Agency for Healthcare Research and Quality. Rockville, MD: February 2012.

2. Shekelle PG, Newberry SJ, Maglione M, et al. Assessment of the Need to Update Comparative Effectiveness Reviews: Report of an Initial Rapid Program Assessment (2005-2009) (Prepared by the Southern California Evidence-based Practice Center). Rockville, MD: Agency for Healthcare Research and Quality; October 2009.

3. Shojania KG, Sampson M, Ansari MT, et al. How quickly do systematic reviews go out of date? A survival analysis. Ann Intern Med. 2007 Aug 21;147(4):224-33. PMID 17638714.

4. Cunningham A, Bausell H, Brown M, et al. Recommendations for the use of sapropterin in phenylketonuria. Mol Genet Metab. 2012 Jul;106(3):269-76. PMID 22575621.

5. BioMarin Pharmaceutical Inc. BioMarin Announces Decision to Start Phase 3 Program for PEG-PAL in 2Q 2013. Preliminary Phase 2 Results Indicate Convenient and Accelerated Dosing Regimen Identified. Press Release on September 26, 2012.

6. de Sonneville LM, Huijbregts SC, Licht R, et al. Pre-attentive processing in children with early and continuously-treated PKU. Effects of concurrent Phe level and lifetime

dietary control. J Inherit Metab Dis. 20 Aug;34(4):953-62. PMID 21541727.

7. Gonzalez MJ, Gutierrez AP, Gassio al. Neurological complications and behavioral problems in patients with phenylketonuria in a follow-up unit. M Genet Metab. 2011;104 Suppl:S73-9. I 21821452.

 Leuret O, Barth M, Kuster A, et al. Efficacy and safety of BH4 before the 4 years in patients with mild phenylketonuria. J Inherit Metab Dis. 2 Mar 3PMID 22388642.

9. Teissier R, Nowak E, Assoun M, et a Maternal phenylketonuria: low phenylalaninemia might increase the ri intra uterine growth retardation. J Inhe Metab Dis. 2012 Jun 5PMID 22669364

10. Utz JR, Lorentz CP, Markowitz D, START, a double blind, placebo-contropharmacogenetic test of responsivenes: sapropterin dihydrochloride in phenylketonuria patients. Mol Genet N 2012 Feb;105(2):193-7. PMID 221128

11. Ziesch B, Weigel J, Thiele A, et al. Tetrahydrobiopterin (BH(4)) in PKU: 6 on dietary treatment, metabolic control quality of life. J Inherit Metab Dis. 201 Mar 6PMID 22391997.

12. Huijbregts SC, de Sonneville LM, v Spronsen FJ, et al. The neuropsycholog profile of early and continuously treate phenylketonuria: orienting, vigilance, a maintenance versus manipulation-func of working memory. Neurosci Biobeha Rev. 2002 Oct;26(6):697-712. PMID 12479843.

Appendices

Appendix A: Search Methodology

Appendix B: Evidence Table

Appendix C: Questionnaire Matrix

Appendix A. Search Methodology

DATABASE SEARCHED & TIME PERIOD COVERED:

PubMed - 6/1/2011-10/4/2012

LANGUAGE:

English

SEARCH STRATEGY:

phenylketonurias[mh] OR phenylketonuria[tiab] OR phenylketonurias[tiab] OR phenylalanine OR pku AND

therapy[sh] OR pharmaceutical preparations[mh] OR therapeutics[mh] OR diet therapy[mh] OR "diet therapy"[Subheading] OR diet[tiab] OR dietary[tiab] OR 5,6,7,8-tetrahydrobiopterin[nm] OR sapropterin[tiab] OR tetrahydrobiopterin[tiab] OR bh4[tiab] OR kuvan[tiab] OR amino acids, neutral[mh] OR large neutral amino acid[tiab] OR large neutral amino acids[tiab] OR lnaa[tiab] NOT animal* NOT (human OR humans)

NUMBER OF RESULTS: 721

FILTERED IN ENDNOTE FOR THE FOLLOWING JOURNALS:

Annals of Internal Medicine BMJ JAMA Lancet New England Journal of Medicine

Acta Paediatrica European Journal of Pediatrics Journal of Inherited and Metabolic Diseases Molecular Genetics and Metabolism Pediatrics

NUMBER OF RESULTS AFTER FILTERING: 64

Appendix B. Evidence Table

		Inclusion/Exclusion							
Study Description	Intervention	Criteria/ Population	Baseline Measures	Outcomes and Findings					
Key Question 1a: What is the	Key Question 1a: What is the evidence for optimal Phe Levels To Minimize Cognitive Impairment?								
Author:	None. 64 children with PKU	Inclusion Criteria:	Mean IDC for Phe-H group:	Pre-attentive processing was					
De Sonneville, 2011 ⁶	dx at birth were divided into	PKU dx within first 2 weeks	363umol/L	measured as follows:					
Country:	higher (Phe-H, >360umol/L)	of birth, and treated early(<1	For Phe-L group: 295umol/L	Visual evoked potentials					
Netherlands	and lower lifetime Phe(Phe-	month after birth) and		(VEP) were measured using					
Enrollment Period:	L, Phe≤360umol/L) levels	continuously with dietary	Concurrent Phe was also	the checkerboard reversal					
(see Huijbregts 2002) ¹²	based on concurrent and	restriction and regular	measured throughout study	task (CRT). Auditory evoked					
Funding:	lifetime midyear Phe levels	monitoring (controls were 73		potentials were measured					
Zorgonderzoek	and Index of Dietary Control	healthy children recruited		using the auditory oddball					
Disclosures:	(IDC)	from pts. families or peer		task (AOT). Serum Phe, EEG					
No influence of sponsor on		groups)		and eye movements were					
content				measured (via electro-					
Design:		Age, mean/yrs±SD (range):		oculogram) during the tasks,					
Prospective cohort		7-14 years		and visual and auditory acuity					
		Other characteristics:		tests were also administered.					
		NR							
		Mean dose, mg/kg/day:		Controls did not differ from					
		NR		children with PKU regarding					
				overall VEP and mismatch					
				negativity (MMN) indices.					
				But higher lifetime Phe and					
				IDC were associated with					
				increased VEP latencies and					
				decreased MMN amplitudes					
				(which differed with age),					
				suggesting reduced ability to					
				respond to stimulus change					
				and the need to switch					
				attention.					
Author:	None: 121 children diagnosed	Inclusion Criteria:	IDC	88% of patients were on a					
Gonzalez, 2011 ⁷	with PKU in one hospital	PKU confirmed in their clinic		protein-restricted diet and the					
Country:	divided into groups by PKU	with PAH deficiency		rest were on BH4.					
Spain	control to assess association	confirmed by differential		97.7% of the early diagnosed					

		Inclusion/Exclusion		
Study Description	Intervention	Criteria/ Population	Baseline Measures	Outcomes and Findings
Enrollment Period:	with IQ, developmental	diagnosis or genetic analysis;		patients had a normal IQ cf.
1985-2010	quotient (DQ), neurological	pretreatment plasma Phe		only 25% of the late
Funding:	complications, behavior.	levels >360umol/L		diagnosed.
NR	Mild PKU: 360-600umol/L;	Exclusion Criteria:		DQ/IQ were significantly
Disclosures:	Moderate: 600-1200umol/l	Late diagnosis and treatment		inversely associated with IDC
NR	Classic: >1200	or follow-up refusal; patients		in early-dx children.
Design:		lost to follow-up; death due to		Neurological and behavioral
Retrospective descriptive	IDC calculated as half-year	cause unrelated to PKU		problems were significantly
study	medians and mean of all	Age, mean/yrs±SD (range):		higher among late diagnosed
	medians	Median age 16 years, range 1		children than early dx.
		month-46 years (26%< 6 yrs.,		Neurological and behavioral
		13% 6-11 years; 16% 12-18		problems differed
		yrs., 45% adults)		significantly in prevalence
		Other characteristics:		between good, intermediary,
		76% early diagnosed		and poor dietary control (as
		12.4% mild PKU; 19%		indicated by IDC)
		moderate; 69% classic		
		Mean dose, mg/kg/day: NR		
Author:	No intervention. Independent	All French women with PKU	Serum Phe and 3 monitoring	Study looked at birth outcomes
Teissier, 2012 ⁹	variable was level of maternal	who were pregnant between	indices of levels over time	in 115 pregnancies of 86 women
Country:	Phe control achieved by	January 2002 and December		with PKU in France found an
France	dietary restriction (according	2007.		women who tightly controlled
Enrollment Period:	to guidelines), based on			their diets and whose blood Phe
2002-2007	monitoring indices			levels were less than 120umol/L,
Funding:				demonstrating that low as well as
NR				high blood Phe may affect birth
Disclosures:				outcomes.
Authors declared as conflicts				
of interest, None				
Design:				
Retrospective cohort record				
Vou Question 1b. What is the	Fridance for Ontimal Phater	ala To Minimizo Cognitino Inc.		
Authors	See KO1e	eis 10 Minimize Cognitive Imp	Moon IDC for Dis II and	ups: Analysis of lifetime Directory
Author:	See KQ1a	See KQ1a	Wean IDC for Phe-H group:	Analysis of filetime Phe data
De Sonneville, 2011			Sosumol/L	snowed that Phe levels at
Country:			For Phe-L group: 295umol/L	ages 4, 5, and 6 accounted for

		Inclusion/Exclusion		
Study Description	Intervention	Criteria/ Population	Baseline Measures	Outcomes and Findings
Netherlands				a higher proportion of the
Enrollment Period:			Concurrent Phe also	variance in a particular aspect
(see Huijbregts 2002) ¹²			measured throughout study	of VEP (P110 amplitude)
Funding:				than did concurrent Phe
Zorgonderzoek				levels. Phe levels at age 9
Disclosures:				also accounted for a higher
No influence of sponsor on				proportion of the variance in
content				N75 amplitude at occipital
Design:				site 2 than did concurrent
Prospective cohort				Phe.
Key Question 2: What is the I	Effectiveness of BH4 in Patients	s with PKU?		
Author:	BH4 therapy initiated during	Inclusion Criteria:	BH4 responsiveness as tested	Long-term BH4 therapy
Leuret, 2012^8	the neonatal period (n=7) or	Mild phenylketonuria	with 24-hour loading test,	significantly improved
Country:	later (n=8); median duration	Positive response to BH4	using single oral dose of	dietary Phe tolerance,
France	of treatment: 23 months (7-	loading test	20mg/kg; responsiveness	allowing a 4-fold increase in
Enrollment Period:	80)	Age, mean/yrs±SD (range):	defined as reduction of >30%	Phe intake with a mean
2004-2010		7 neonates, 8 older children	in blood Phe.	phenylalaninemia of
Funding:		Mean age of children in older		240±72uM and 71±18% of
NR		treatment group 13±12		Phe values within therapeutic
Disclosures:		months)		targets (120-300uM). The
None		Other characteristics:		increase in ability to tolerate
Design:		NR		natural protein intake allowed
Retrospective cohort		Mean dose, mg/kg/day:		Phe-free AA mixture to be
		median daily dose 20mg/kg/d		discontinued in 7 pts or not
		(8-24)		introduced in 7. Only 1 pt.,
				whose compliance was in
				doubt, continued the
				prescribed moderate Phe-
				restricted diet.
				BH4 also improved metabolic
				control as measured by the
				decrease in mean
				phenylalaninemia (352±85 to
				254±64um) and concomitant
				increases in the Phe values
				within therapeutic targets and
				a decrease in the values above
				target, and decreased the

		Inclusion/Exclusion			
Study Description	Intervention	Criteria/ Population	Baseline Measures	Outcomes and Findings	
Author: Ziesch, 2012 ¹¹ Country: Germany Enrollment Period: NR Funding: Merck-Serono Disclosures: NR Design: Prospective open clinical trial	Study conducted in 4 phases: Phase 1: baseline Phase 2: (2 weeks) doubling of natural protein intake Phase 3: (4 weeks) daily BH4 (20mg/kg) with increase natural protein intake Phase 4: (7 weeks) continuation of BH4 treatment by BH4-sensitive individuals	Inclusion Criteria: BH4 sensitivity established by mutational analysis and loading test Age, mean/yrs±SD (range): Range 4-18 years Other characteristics: NR Mean dose, mg/kg/day: NR	BH4 sensitivity, HRQoL	variance in blood Phe levels from 130±21uM to 93±27uM (The study did not compare children started on BH4 early vs. late) Metabolic control improved during Phase 3 in the BH4 sensitive patients but not the others. BH4-resistant participants, who consumed increased Phe during Phase 2, never regained their original blood Phe concentrations, even though they returned to pre-study consumption levels. PKU patients reported higher physical well-being and HRQoL than age-matched healthy controls during phase 3, but within this group, it was actually the resistant patients who had the higher HRQoL; BH4 sensitive patients did not increase their HRQoL (although responses to a set of supplementary questions suggested improved QoL). Parents of resistant patients, however, reported that their children's self- esteem decreased during the	
Key Question 3: What is the I	Effectiveness of BH4 in Pregnau	nt Women with PKU?	·	· · · · · ·	
No studies identified					
Key Question 4: What is the Effectiveness of LNAAs in PKU?					
No studies identified					
Key Question 5: What is the I	Effectiveness of LNAAs in Preg	nant Women With PKU?			
No studies identified					

		Inclusion/Exclusion		
Study Description	Intervention	Criteria / Population	Baseline Measures	Outcomes and Findings
Key Question 6: What are the	e Harms of Adjuvant Treatmen	t for PKU?		
Leuret, 2012^8	BH4 therapy initiated during	Inclusion Criteria:	Not relevant	No harms were reported by
Country:	the neonatal period (n=7) or	Mild phenylketonuria		study participants
France	later (n=8); median duration	Positive response to BH4		
Enrollment Period:	of treatment: 23 months (7-	loading test		
2004-2010	80)	Age, mean/yrs±SD (range):		
Funding:		7 neonates, 8 older children		
NR		Mean age of children in older		
Disclosures:		treatment group 13±12		
None		months)		
Design:		Other characteristics:		
Retrospective cohort		NR		
-		Mean dose, mg/kg/day:		
		median daily dose 20mg/kg/d		
		(8-24)		
Key Question 7: What is the I	Effectiveness of BH4 and LNAA	As for Subgroups of Individuals	With PKU?	
Author:	Alternating placebo or	Inclusion Criteria:		Aim of study was to identify
Utz, 2012 ¹⁰	sapropterin 1 week at a time,	PKU diagnosis, age 4 years		genotypes associated with
Country:	beginning with a week on	or older		sapropterin responsiveness.
US	sapropterin or placebo	Exclusion criteria:		74 patients completed the
Enrollment Period:		pregnancy, age less than 4		trial, of whom 36 were
NR		years, any clinical		sapropterin responsive.
Funding:		contraindication to		Genotypes occurring in 2 or
NR		sapropterin therapy		more patients were
Disclosures:		Age, mean/yrs±SD (range):		consistently associated with
NR		18 adults, 18 youth		results of the START test for
Design:		Other characteristics:		sapropterin response. Thus
RCT		NR		particular alleles can be used
		Mean dose, mg/kg/day:		to screen for responsiveness
		NR		to sapropterin

Table Notes: Legend: BH4 tetrahydrobiopterin; LNAA large neutral amino acids; Phe phenylalanine; PKU phenylketonuria; SCEPC Southern California Evidence-based Practice Center; SGA small for gestational age; tx treatment

Appendix C. Questionnaire Matrix

Surveillance and Identification of Triggers for Updating Systematic Reviews for the EHC Program

Title: Adjuvant Treatment for Phenylketonuria (PKU)

Conclusions From CER Executive Summary	Is this conclusion almost certainly still supported by the evidence?	Has there been new evidence that may change this conclusion?	Do Not Know
Key Question 1a: What is the evidence for	optimal Phe Levels To Minimize Cogn	itive Impairment?	
Phe Levels and Impairments in IQ The data were analyzed according to two meta-analytic models The first represents the relationship of Phe and IQ when Phe was measured "historically" (more than 12 months before IQ measurement). In the second model, Phe and IQ were measured concurrently (within 6 weeks of each other). Evidence from 17 studies (mostly poor quality) suggests increasing probability of low IQ at higher blood Phe levels, regardless of whether IQ was measured during childhood or later, with a stronger association seen between Phe measured in early childhood and later IQ. There is a lack of strong association in measurements taken concurrently during the critical period.		New Evidence:	

Conclusions From	Is this conclusion	Has there been new	Do Not Know
CER Executive	almost certainly still	evidence that may	
Summary	supported by the evidence?	change this conclusion?	
control-varied among the studies.			
Phe Levels and Impairments in Executive		New Evidence:	
Function			
No measures of executive function have been validated for individuals with PKU. Nineteen unique studies determined to be			
too heterogeneous with respect to the			
pooling, showed that overall, while Phe			
levels correlate with various assessments			
of executive function in some studies, the			
the correlation on individual measures			
are inconsistent.			
Phe Levels and Impairments Related to		New Evidence:	
Maternal PKU and Maternal PKU			
Syndrome			
Data predominantly from one longitudinal study. The Maternal PKU Collaborative			
Study, provide support for the observed			
increased risk of poor cognitive outcomes			
in the offspring of women with high			
maternal blood Phe concentrations. The			
study reported that timing of maternal metabolic control defined as the number of			
weeks gestation before plasma Phe levels			
remained consistently lower than 605			
µmol/L, was associated with lower child			
cognitive scores at 4 and 7 years of age.			

Conclusions From	Is this conclusion	Has there been new	Do Not Know
CER Executive	almost certainly still	evidence that may	
Summary	supported by the	change this conclusion?	
Summary	evidence?		
A model of the association between maternal blood Phe levels during pregnancy and effect on offspring during childhood confirmed that the relationship between maternal blood Phe and offspring cognitive outcomes was not linear: cognitive impairment was significantly more common in offspring of mothers with PKU than in controls at a Phe threshold of 360 μ mol/L, and Phe levels were linearly related to cognitive outcomes only above this threshold. Importantly, while other factors, including maternal characteristics, severity of mutations, and offspring head circumference, contributed strongly to outcomes at 1 year of age, maternal Phe strongly overtook those other factors in		New Evidence:	
predicting cognitive impairment by age 2.			
Key Question 1b: What is the Evidence for	• Optimal Phe Levels To Minimize Cog	nitive Impairment for Different Age Groups	?
We examined the potential effect of age in the meta-analysis of the relationship of Phe and IQ. Any influence of age was adequately represented by whether the Phe measurements were historical or concurrent and whether they were taken in the critical period.		New Evidence:	
Key Question 2. What is the Effectiveness	of BH4 in Patients with PKU?		
Of the ten studies that evaluated the effects of BH4 in patients with PKU (relatively small, ranging in quality from poor to good,		New Evidence:	

Conclusions From	Is this conclusion	Has there been new	Do Not Know
CER Executive	almost certainly still	evidence that may	
Summary	supported by the evidence?	change this conclusion?	
with varying doses, adherence rates, baseline Phe levels, and outcome measures), only 1 reported outcomes of interest, including measures of cognition and nutritional status (most participants had demonstrated responsiveness to BH4 in preloading trials). Phe levels were reduced by at least 30 percent in up to half of treated participants (32 to 50 percent) at dosages of 5 to 20 mg/kg/day and for up to 22 weeks of observation in comparative studies. In the one RCT that compared the effect of placebo on the likelihood of a 30-percent reduction in Phe, only 9 percent of those on placebo achieved this effect after 6 weeks, compared with 44 percent of the treated group. Data suggested a sustained response for up to 22 weeks duration, with 46 percent achieving a 30-percent reduction in Phe levels. Responses varied by baseline Phe levels and other factors			
BH4 use improved Phe tolerance over time. In the RCT, at a dosage of 20 mg/kg/day over 10 weeks, participants in the treatment group increased their Phe tolerance from 0 mg/kg at baseline to 20.9 mg/kg/day while maintaining blood Phe levels at <360 µmol/L, compared with an increase of 2.9 mg/kg/day in the placebo group. However, response varied substantially within the treatment group, with 33 percent tolerating an increase of between 31 and 50 mg/kg/day in supplement form but the rest of the		New Evidence:	

Conclusions From	Is this conclusion	Has there been new	Do Not Know
CER Executive	supported by the	conduct that may	
Summary	evidence?	change this conclusion:	
participants tolerating lower levels of supplementary Phe. The degree to which this variability is associated with other factors possibly associated with Phe tolerance is unknown.			
One small case series reported on IQ and nutritional outcomes for up to 1 year on 5 mg/kg/day BH4 treatment.59 After 1 year of treatment, the 11 participants discontinued use of a medical food and normalized their diet. IQ scores after 12 months on BH4 were similar to scores before treatment and development quotients were within normal limits.		New Evidence:	
Key Question 3: What is the Effectiveness	of BH4 in Pregnant Women with PKU3	?	
We did not identify any studies addressing this question.		New Evidence:	
Key Question 4: What is the Effectiveness	of LNAAs in PKU?		
Three brief studies of poor to fair quality, using varying doses addressed the effects of LNAAs. Two of the three studies measured reductions in Phe levels, and one assessed cognitive outcomes. One fair-quality study reported a positive effect on executive functioning, specifically verbal generativity, cognitive flexibility, and self-monitoring. Overall, participants who were using a Phe- free medical food for their nutritional needs		New Evidence:	

Conclusions From CER Executive	Is this conclusion almost certainly still	Has there been new evidence that may	Do Not Know
Summary	supported by the evidence?	change this conclusion?	
did not experience a decrease in Phe, although those not adhering to diet or not using their formula did. In all three studies, blood Phe decreased after 1 week of treatment but remained above clinically acceptable levels.			
Key Question 5: What is the Effectiveness	of LNAAs in Pregnant Women With PH	KU?	
We did not identify any studies addressing		New Evidence:	
this question.			
Key Question 6: What are the Harms of A	djuvant Treatment for PKU?		
Of the 10 studies examining the effectiveness of BH4 in participants with PKU, 4 studies reported any type of harm related to the intervention drug. The most common side effects reported during BH4 trials were headache, throat pain, upper respiratory infection, diarrhea, abdominal		New Evidence:	
pain, and nausea and vomiting, but harms were not significantly more common in the treatment arm than in the placebo. One trial of LNAAs assessed neuropsychological outcomes and reported higher rates of anxiety associated with LNAA use.			
Key Question 7: What is the Effectiveness	of BH4 and LNAAs for Subgroups of Ir	ndividuals With PKU?	

Conclusions From CER Executive Summary	Is this conclusion almost certainly still supported by the evidence?	Has there been new evidence that may change this conclusion?	Do Not Know
We did not locate any studies addressing this question.		New Evidence:	
Are there new data that could	inform the key questions the	at might not be addressed in the	e conclusions?