

Title: Comparative effectiveness of dimethyl fumarate in Multiple Sclerosis

Pauline Bosco-Lévy¹, Marc Debouverie^{2,3}, Bruno Brochet^{4,5}, Francis Guillemin^{3,6}, Céline Louapre^{7,8}, Elisabeth Maillard⁸, Olivier Heinzlef⁹, Séverine Lignot¹, Pauline Diez¹, Abdelilah Abouelfath¹, Régis Lassalle¹, Patrick Blin¹, Cécile Droz-Perroteau¹

Affiliations:

¹ Univ. Bordeaux, INSERM CIC-P1401, Bordeaux PharmacoeEpi, 33000 Bordeaux, France

² Département de neurologie, CHU Nancy, F-54035 Nancy, France ;

³ Univ. Lorraine, EA 4360 APEMAC, F 54500 Vandoeuvre-Lès Nancy, France

⁴ CRC SEP, Neurology Department, CHU de Bordeaux

⁵ Univ. Bordeaux, INSERM, Neurocentre Magendie, U1215, F-3300 Bordeaux, France

⁶ CHRU de Nancy, INSERM CIC 1433 Epidémiologie clinique, Nancy

⁷ Sorbonne Université, Institut du Cerveau et de la Moelle épinière, ICM, Hôpital de la Pitié Salpêtrière, Inserm UMR S 1127, CNRS UMR 7225, Paris, France

⁸ Neurology Department, Pitié Salpêtrière Hospital, APHP, Paris, France,

⁹ Neurology Department, Hôpital CHI de Poissy/Saint-Germain-en-Laye, Paris, France

Corresponding author: Pauline Bosco-Lévy, Batiment le Tondu, case 41, F-33076 Bordeaux cedex, France, pauline.bosco-levy@u-bordeaux.fr, Phone: +33 5 57 57 56 19, Fax: +33 5 57 57 46 71

Keywords : Multiple Sclerosis, dimethylfumarate, relapse, effectiveness, cohort study, high dimensional propensity score

ABSTRACT

Objectives: To assess the effectiveness of dimethyl fumarate (DMF) on annual rate of relapse (ARR) and disability progression in multiple sclerosis (MS) compared to injectable immunomodulators (IMM), teriflunomide (TERI) and fingolimod (FTY), in real life setting.

Methods: A population-based cohort study was conducted using data of the French nationwide claims database, SNDS. All patients initiating IMM, TERI, FTY or DMF between July 1, 2015 and December 12, 2017, with 4.5 years of database history and 1 to 3.5 years of follow-up were included in this study. DMF patients were 1:1 matched to IMM, TERI or FTY using a high dimensional Propensity Score. Negative binomial regression and a logistic regression models were used to estimate the relative risk ($RR \pm [95\% \text{ CI}]$) of ARR and the Odds Ratio ($OR \pm [95\% \text{ CI}]$) of disability progression, respectively.

Results: Overall, 9 304 subjects were identified: 29.0% initiated DMF, 33.2% TERI, 5.6% FTY and 32.2% an IMM. The matched cohorts consisted of 1779 DMF- IMM, patients, 1679 DMF-TERI patients, and 376 DMF-FTY patients. DMF significantly reduced ARR compared to IMM ($RR 0.72 [0.61 - 0.86]$) and TERI ($0.81 [0.68 - 0.96]$) and did not show any significant difference when compared with FTY. The risk of the progression of MS specific disability was not significantly different for any matched cohorts.

Interpretation: DMF is associated with lower risk of relapse for patients with RRMS than other first-line RRMS agents (TERI and IMM).

INTRODUCTION

To date, disease-modifying therapies (DMTs) represent the main therapeutic strategy in Relapsing-Remitting Multiple sclerosis (RRMS), to reduce the risk of relapses and delay disability progression. The first generation of medications approved were the Injectable ImmunoModulators (IMM) such as interferon beta-1a and 1b (INF) and glatiramer acetate (GA). Since then, treatment options have broadened to include the orally administered DMTs fingolimod (FTY), which is predominantly indicated as second-line therapy in Europe, and more recently, teriflunomide (TERI) and dimethyl fumarate (DMF). All these drugs showed a significant treatment effect compared with placebo on the occurrence of relapses, disease activity and disability progression [1].

Although head to head randomized clinical trials have been performed for IMM, FTY and TERI [1], well-designed head-to-head trials are lacking for DMF. Its clinical efficacy cannot thus be directly compared with other oral DMTs. A systematic review and meta-analysis of randomized clinical trials found that DMF significantly reduced the occurrence of relapse compared to IFNs, GA and TERI [2]. However indirect comparisons studies are not sufficient to conclude for DMF superiority due to the variability of study population, and endpoint definitions.

Many observational studies have been used to assess the real-world comparative effectiveness of DMF and a number of alternative treatments, using claims based-analyses or registries with mixed results. The variability of these results may be explained by the various durations of follow-up limited to 1 year in some studies [3–5], or by the use of simple propensity score (PS)-based methods in other studies [3,5–10], which although they can balance observed baseline covariates between groups, do nothing to balance unmeasured characteristics and confounders. In this context, comparative studies from real world practice in large population-based healthcare databases using robust statistical methods to handle confounders are needed to provide valuable evidence that will help clinicians in the choice of treatment.

The aim of this study is to assess the effectiveness of DMF in comparison with the injectable or oral DMTs used in RRMS, in terms of relapse frequency and disability progression using the French nationwide claims and hospital database, SNDS (*Système National des Données de Santé*).

METHODS

Design and population

We conducted a cohort study within the general scheme of the SNDS (*Système National des Données de Santé*) claims database. It included all naïve patients initiating an IMM (IFN or GA) or an oral DMT (FTY, TERI or DMF) between 1st July 2015 and 31st December 2017, with a 4.5 years history of data. The index date was the earliest date of dispensing of IMM or oral DMT or of hospitalization for administration of drugs that are used under Temporary Use Authorization (i.e. French procedure allowing the use of a drug before its market authorization) or reimbursed in addition to the procedure-based hospital payment system. Initiation was defined as having no dispensing or hospitalization for one of these drugs or any other drugs for MS (i.e. natalizumab, methotrexate, cyclophosphamide, mycophenolate, azathioprine, rituximab or tacrolimus) during the 4.5 years history period. MS patients were followed from the index date until index treatment switch or discontinuation (i.e. no dispensing of the index drug during 60 days after the end of the last dispensing), death or 31st December 2018, whichever occurred earlier.

Data source

The SNDS has been described in detail elsewhere [11,12]. Briefly, SNDS is the French nationwide claims database with individual information on all reimbursed outpatient claims linked to the national hospital discharge summaries database system and the national death registry, using a unique national pseudonymised identifier. It currently includes about 99% of the French population covered by a dozen of health care insurance systems, representing approximately 67 million persons from birth (or immigration) to death (or emigration), irrespective of socioeconomic status even if a person changes occupation or retires. It contains general characteristics, date and cause of death, all outpatient reimbursed medical and paramedical encounters, all private and public hospital-discharge summaries, and Long Term Disease (LTD) registration that ensures a full coverage for all medical expenses related to most expensive chronic diseases. Reimbursed drugs are identified according to their Anatomic Therapeutic Chemical

codes and hospital or LTD diagnoses according to their ICD-10 (International Classification of Diseases, 10th Revision) codes, the quality of this coding being ensured by regular internal and external audits [13].

Outcomes

The primary outcome was the annual rate of relapse (ARR) during the index treatment period. Relapses were identified through an algorithm, developed based on national guidelines[14] and clinicians' medical expertise, that included dispensing of high dose of corticosteroids for outpatients and hospitalizations with MS relapse diagnosis potentially combined with high dose of corticosteroids (Supplementary Table 1). To be considered as independent events, relapses must be separated by at least 31 days. The diagnostic performance of this algorithm was assessed in a validation study with 95.0% Positive Predictive value. The secondary outcomes were MS disability progression during the index treatment period defined according to new reimbursements related to equipment for motor or sphincter disability or the implementation of a neuromodulation device for the treatment of chronic pain identified in the index period compared with the pre-index treatment period.

Statistical analysis

Baseline characteristics included relapses, MS-related hospitalizations, steroid use, medical visits to the neurologist, lab test and encephalic or spinal cord magnetic resonance imaging in the 2 years prior to the index date. Data related to patient comorbidities and disability were collected during the 4.5 years prior to index date in order to ensure the completeness of the information. Chronic disease burden was measured using a version of the Charlson Comorbidity Index (CCI) score adapted for the SNDS database [15].

The probability of discontinuation or switch of the index treatment was described for each treatment groups using Kaplan-Meier survival analysis. Head-to-head comparisons were performed in three separate matched analyses of DMF versus IMMs, DMF versus TERI or DMF

versus FTY based on an “as treated” analysis. For each head-to-head comparison, we computed a high dimensional Propensity Score (hdPS), which reflects the probability to be treated with DMF versus one of the other treatments, given the comparison of interest, [16,17] adjusting for hidden confounders [18]. It was demonstrated that this approach achieved more plausible effect estimates than conventional PS modelling based on clinically selected variables or simple multivariable modelling. HdPS is estimated using a multivariable logistic regression model with treatment group as dependent variable and a large data set of independent variables collected in the pre-index period provided by six data dimensions (i.e. outpatient drugs dispensing, diagnoses related to hospitalizations and LTD registrations, outpatient and inpatient medical and paramedical visits, lab tests, medical procedures and medical devices) and fixed baseline characteristics (i.e. age, sex, number of relapses, MS medical device and outpatient and hospital costs identified in the pre-index period). The variables were selected on a bias-based approach. The number and the type of variables selected in the hdPS are detailed in the Supplementary material. We excluded the subjects in both treatment groups who were at or below the 2.5th percentile of the hdPS in the group of subjects who received the treatment predicted by the hdPS, as well as those at or above the 97.5th percentile in the alternative treatment group. This hdPS trimming ensures that each subject has a reasonable probability of receiving either compared treatment, given relevant confounding variables[19]. Remaining patients were 1:1 matched for the comparison. We assessed the predictive performance of the hdPS using the c-statistic calculated after matching and the balancing effect of the hdPS matching with standardized differences in baseline variables before and after matching, knowing that an absolute standardized difference of 10% or less indicates a negligible difference between groups [20].

For treatment effects, we estimated for the ARR, the Rate Ratio (RR) and its corresponding Confidence Interval (95%CI) by negative binomial regression and for the disability progression, the Odds Ratio (OR) and its 95%CI by logistic regression. For each outcome, estimates were calculated crude and after hdPS matching. To assess the robustness of our results, we also calculated adjusted results adjusting for hdPS and we modelled analyses by the inverse probability

of treatment weights (IPTW), which is a hdPS score-based weight used to control for confounding by indication [21].

We performed statistical analysis using SAS software (version 9.4; SAS Institute, NC) and hdPS using the routines from Harvard Medical School (SAS pharmacoepi toolbox, www.drugapi.org).

RESULTS

Baseline characteristics

Between the 1st July 2015 and the 31st December 2017, we identified 9,304 subjects in the SNDS meeting the inclusion criteria. Of this cohort, 29.0% of patients initiated DMF, 33.2% TERI, 5.6% FTY and 32.2% an IMM (18.5% INF and 13.7% GA). Three quarters of patients (72.8%) were female with an age of 39.9 (Standard deviation, SD: 12.1) years on average, ranging from 37.5 (11.9) years for IMM to 43.1 (11.7) years for TERI (Table 1). The mean CCI score was 0.58 (SD: 1.05) ranging from 0.52 (0.95) for DMF to 0.65 (1.04) for TERI. The other baseline clinical characteristics were similar among DMF, TERI or IMM groups: around 35% of patients had a disability mainly of motor type, the pre-index ARR was on average 0.13, around 40% of patients had a MS-related hospitalization, around 55% had a visit to a neurologist and around 90% had a cerebral or spinal cord MRI. In comparison with patients of other treatment groups, FTY patients had a specific clinical profile: they were more likely to have a disability (38.6%), a MS-related hospitalization (71.6%), they had an average pre-index ARR of 0.17, and they were less likely to have a visit to a neurologist (45.5%) or a MRI (85.2%).

For all patients initiating a DMT, the median exposure period (1st quartile; 3rd quartile) was 17.2 (7.4; 27.4) months over the 1 to 3.5 year of follow-up. Exposure periods varied across treatment groups: they were 14.6 (6.4; 24.6) months for IMM, 17.9 (7.8; 29.2) months for DMF, 18.6 (8.6; 28.4) months for TERI and 19.6 (10.0; 32.1) months for FTY. These results were due to the significant difference observed in the probability of treatment discontinuation among treatment groups ($p < 0.0001$; Figure 1): this was the highest in IMM (67.8%, CI95% [65.3; 70.3]) and the lowest in FTY (41.5%, CI95% [36.5; 47.0]).

DMF versus IMM

Of the 2697 DMF patients and the 2997 IMM patients, 433 (16.1%) and 395 (13.2%), respectively, were excluded by trimming, and 1780 patients were then matched in each group with a satisfying hdPS overlapping (Supplementary Figure) and a c-statistic at 0.53, as well as good

balance on all covariates (Table 2). DMF was associated with a significantly lower ARR compared to matched IMM patients (RR: 0.72, 95%CI [0.61 - 0.86]; Figure 2). Consistent results were found in the hdPS adjusted and IPTW analyses, which were performed in all patients remaining after trimming. No significant differences in the appearance or worsening of disability were observed between DMF and IMM patients whatever the analysis performed (Figure 3).

DMF versus TERI

Of the 2697 DMF patients and the 3089 TERI patients, 571 (21.2%) and 402 (15.0%), respectively, were excluded by trimming, and 1679 patients were then matched in each group with a satisfying hdPS overlapping (Supplementary Figure) and a c-statistic at 0.56, as well as good balance on all covariates (Table 2). DMF was associated with a significantly lower ARR compared to matched TERI patients (RR: 0.81 [0.68 - 0.96]; Figure 2). This result was confirmed in the hdPS adjusted and IPTW analyses, which were performed in all patients remaining after trimming. No significant differences in the appearance or worsening of disability were found between DMF and TERI patients whatever the analysis performed (Figure 3).

DMF versus FTY

Of the DMF 2697 patients and the 521 FTY patients, 726 (26.9%) and 145 (27.8%) respectively, were excluded by trimming, and 376 were then matched in each group with a c-statistic of 0.60, and some remaining imbalanced covariates (Table 2). There was no statistical difference for ARR between DMF and FTY (RR; 1.38 [0.95 - 1.99]. Consistent results were found in the hdPS adjusted and IPTW analyses, which were performed in all patients remaining after trimming. The hdPS matching did not identify significant difference between DMF and FTY in the MS disability progression, whereas in both hdPS adjusted or IPTW analyses, DMF showed a significant and positive effect in disability progression in comparison with FTY (Figure 3).

DISCUSSION

With the increasing number of DMTs developed in these last 10 years, and the lack of head-to-head randomized controlled trials to assess their comparative efficacy, data of robust observational studies are needed to support decision making by stakeholders and to assist clinicians in choosing the most favourable treatment option for their patients. This nationwide population-based observational study conducted to assess the DMTs effectiveness in a population of DMTs initiators on MS activity using robust hdPS-based methods found that the DMF treatment proved to be associated with better results than TERI and IMM regarding relapse activity, without significant difference on disability progression.

At treatment initiation, DMF patients' characteristics were very similar to those of TERI and IMM patients: their age was 40 years on average, they were mostly female and had an annual rate of relapses of 0.13 during the pre-index period. These findings are consistent with those of other studies [4,6–8,22,23]. Conversely, some baseline characteristics differed between DMF and FTY patients, although their age at treatment initiation was very similar. This suggests that FTY patients had a specific distinct profile at treatment initiation; fewer FTY patients had a complete medical monitoring before treatment initiation (i.e. medical visits to general practitioner or neurologist, lab tests related to MS or encephalic or spinal cord MRI), their pre-index ARR was slightly higher (0.17), and more patients already had a MS-related disability. These results are expected considering FTY specific indications of rapidly evolving severe RRMS [24].

In this study, DMF showed a higher clinical effectiveness than TERI or IMM with lower relapses rates. Results are consistently significant using various robust statistical methods, whether using hdPS matching which focused on patients with very similar clinical profiles or hdPS adjustment and IPTW, which considers the overall patients with more heterogeneous profiles. These consistent results through multiple methods and overlapping of hdPS between groups are

suggestive of balanced groups. In addition, these results obtained in a large population during a long period of follow-up, confirm trends of most of previous real-world observational studies conducted on shorter time periods [4,6–8,22,23]. Compared to FTY, DMF displayed a slightly higher rate of relapses, though the RR did not differ significantly. The partial overlap of the hdPS distribution between both groups confirms that FTY and DMF patients have a very distinct profile and are therefore difficult to compare. Indeed, only about one-fourth of DMF patients remained after matching. These patients shared the same characteristics to FTY patients and referred certainly to patients with high disease activity since FTY is the only DMT labelled specifically for the treatment of such patients. In this specific situation, the effectiveness remained similar between both groups.

In this study, the MS disability progression was found to be similar between DMF and TERI, IMM or FTY. These findings are difficult to compare to the literature, since the most popular and widely used instrument to assess disease progression is the Expanded Disability Status Scale (EDSS) score [25], which includes clinical information not available in the SNDS. Nevertheless, reimbursements for motor or sphincter medical devices or for neuromodulation device are a reliable indicator to estimate MS disability progression, although, in contrast with the EDSS, it does not include mild disabilities without medical device and visual or cognitive impairments. Globally, disability was probably underestimated, but all severe cases requiring medical devices have been identified with accuracy.

One of the main limitations of this study is that the SNDS is a database built for administrative and reimbursement purposes, not for research purposes and important data are lacking: clinical information, severity or stage of the disease, biological results and imaging results which enables to assess treatment effect on the appearance of demyelinating inflammatory lesions and on the development of cerebral atrophy. We thus had to develop an algorithm to identify relapse occurrence based on the specific therapeutic management of MS patients. This complex algorithm, refined by experts of the field, showed good diagnosis performance in a previous validation study

(PPV: 95% and NPV 96%), and has allowed to strongly mitigate any potential misclassification bias. To strengthen the validity of this algorithm, we also conducted an additional analysis by extending the period between 2 occurrences of relapses from 31 to 60 days, which did not affect fundamentally the algorithm performance. Some relapses may nevertheless not have been captured, and frequency of relapses could be underestimated but this should similarly affect all treatment groups and thus not bias the results.

As for any claims based real-world studies, this study presents an inherent risk of unmeasured confounding. To address this limit, we applied hdPS-based methods in the analysis of the outcome. The hdPS is a well-known statistical technique that attempts to estimate the effect of a treatment, policy, or other intervention by accounting for the measured and unmeasured covariates that predict receiving the treatment. It summarizes a large set of variables that characterize each subject for status and unmeasured confounders not recorded in a database (i.e. drugs, medical status, hospitalization, other co-morbidities directly, or indirectly linked with unmeasured confounders) [16,17]. Matching, adjusting or weighting on large numbers of covariates ascertained from subject healthcare claims data may improve control of confounding, as these variables may collectively be proxies for unobserved factors. Furthermore, using hdPS adjusting or weighting methods in addition to matching, allowed to include all patients meeting the eligibility criteria of the study, whereas matching method excludes patients not finding a match. Using hdPS weighting or adjustment ensures transparency of included patients and validity of results in the predefined study population.

In conclusion, this study provides further insight into the therapeutic benefit of DMF in real life setting compared to other commonly used agents for RRMS including IMM and another oral drug, TERI. The ARR was significantly lower in patients treated with DMF vs IMM and TERI using robust hdPS based methods. These data will be useful to feed into physician choices of patient's treatment.

Ethic Statement

The authors state that no ethical approval was needed.

Data accessibility

Data sharing is not available: access to the data is regulated by the national regulations for data protection, and we are not allowed to share them. However, these data may be freely requested from the data holder (INDS) according to the regulatory procedures.

Conflicts of interest:

E. M. declares personal fees and non-financial support from Biogen, Novartis, Roche, Merck, Sanofi-Genzyme. B. B. declares personal fees and non-financial support from Biogen, Genzyme, Bayer, Medday, Actelion, Roche, Celgene, Novartis, Merck. F. G. and M.D. declare personal fees and non-financial support from Biogen. C. L. declares consulting or travel fees from Biogen, Novartis, Roche, Sanofi, Teva and Merck Serono, and research grant from Biogen. O. H. declares personal fees and non-financial support from Biogen, Merck, Novartis, Roche, Genzyme. All remaining authors have declared no conflicts of interest.

Funding information:

This study was supported by a grant from Biogen, France.

Acknowledgements

This study was designed, conducted and analysed by Bordeaux PharmacEpi, a research platform of University of Bordeaux, France and supervised by an independent Scientific Committee. The authors thank all the members of these scientific committee for their support and advices, and the expert having taking part to case validation. The authors thank ADERA, Pessac, Fance, for its legal, human resource and management support.

Authors contributions

P.B.-L., S.L., P.B., M.D., B.B., F.G., C.L., E.M., O.H., P.D., N.M., C.D.-P. contributed in designing and supervising the study. R.L. and A.A. performed the analyses. All authors discussed the results. P.B.-L., S.L., P.B and P.D. wrote the manuscript in consultation with M.D., B.B., F.G., C.L., E.M., O.H..

REFERENCES

1. Montalban X, Gold R, Thompson AJ, et al.ECTRIMS/EAN Guideline on the pharmacological treatment of people with multiple sclerosis. *Mult Scler J*. 2018;24(2):96-120. doi:10.1177/1352458517751049
2. Hutchinson M, Fox RJ, Havrdova E, et al. Efficacy and safety of BG-12 (dimethyl fumarate) and other disease-modifying therapies for the treatment of relapsing–remitting multiple sclerosis: a systematic review and mixed treatment comparison. *Curr Med Res Opin*. 2014;30(4):613-627. doi:10.1185/03007995.2013.863755
3. Hersh CM, Love TE, Cohn S, et al. Comparative efficacy and discontinuation of dimethyl fumarate and fingolimod in clinical practice at 12-month follow-up. *Mult Scler Relat Disord*. 2016;10:44-52. doi:10.1016/j.msard.2016.08.002
4. Boster A, Nicholas J, Wu N, et al. Comparative Effectiveness Research of Disease-Modifying Therapies for the Management of Multiple Sclerosis: Analysis of a Large Health Insurance Claims Database. *Neurol Ther*. 2017;6(1):91-102. doi:10.1007/s40120-017-0064-x
5. D’Amico E, Zanghì A, Callari G, et al. Comparable efficacy and safety of dimethyl fumarate and teriflunomide treatment in Relapsing-Remitting Multiple Sclerosis: an Italian real-word multicenter experience. *Ther Adv Neurol Disord*. 2018;11:175628641879640. doi:10.1177/1756286418796404
6. Braune S, Grimm S, van Hövell P, et al. Comparative effectiveness of delayed-release dimethyl fumarate versus interferon, glatiramer acetate, teriflunomide, or fingolimod: results from the German NeuroTransData registry. *J Neurol*. 2018;265(12):2980-2992. doi:10.1007/s00415-018-9083-5
7. Ontaneda D, Nicholas J, Carraro M, et al. Comparative effectiveness of dimethyl fumarate versus fingolimod and teriflunomide among MS patients switching from first-generation platform therapies in the US. *Mult Scler Relat Disord*. 2019;27:101-111. doi:10.1016/j.msard.2018.09.038
8. Buron MD, Chalmer TA, Sellebjerg F, et al. Comparative effectiveness of teriflunomide and dimethyl fumarate: A nationwide cohort study. *Neurology*. 2019;92(16):e1811-e1820. doi:10.1212/WNL.00000000000007314
9. Laplaud D-A, Casey R, Barbin L, et al. Comparative effectiveness of teriflunomide vs dimethyl fumarate in multiple sclerosis. *Neurology*. 2019;93(7):e635-e646. doi:10.1212/WNL.00000000000007938
10. Kalincik T, Havrdova EK, Horakova D, et al. Comparison of fingolimod, dimethyl fumarate and teriflunomide for multiple sclerosis. *J Neurol Neurosurg Psychiatry*. 2019;90(4):458-468. doi:10.1136/jnnp-2018-319831
11. Tuppin P, Rudant J, Constantinou P, et al. Value of a national administrative database to guide public decisions: From the système national d’information interrégimes de l’Assurance Maladie (SNIIRAM) to the système national des données de santé (SNDS) in France. *Rev Epidemiol Sante Publique*. 2017;65 Suppl 4:S149-S167. doi:10.1016/j.respe.2017.05.004
12. Bezin J, Duong M, Lassalle R, et al. The national healthcare system claims databases in France, SNIIRAM and EGB: Powerful tools for pharmacoepidemiology. *Pharmacoepidemiol Drug Saf*. 2017;26(8):954-962. doi:10.1002/pds.4233

13. Gilleron V, Gasnier-Duparc N, Hebbrecht G. Certification des comptes: Une incitation à la traçabilité des processus de contrôle. *Revue Hospitaliere de France*. 2018;582(42):6.
14. *Guide - Affection de Longue Durée: Sclérose en Plaques*. Haute Autorité de Santé; 2006. Accessed July 15, 2020. https://www.has-sante.fr/upload/docs/application/pdf/07-024_sclerose-guide_sans_lap.pdf
15. Bannay A, Chaignot C, Blotière P-O, et al. The Best Use of the Charlson Comorbidity Index With Electronic Health Care Database to Predict Mortality. *Med Care*. 2016;54(2):188-194. doi:10.1097/MLR.0000000000000471
16. Schneeweiss S, Rassen JA, Glynn RJ, Avorn J, Mogun H, Brookhart MA. High-dimensional propensity score adjustment in studies of treatment effects using health care claims data. *Epidemiol Camb Mass*. 2009;20(4):512-522. doi:10.1097/EDE.0b013e3181a663cc
17. Rassen JA, Schneeweiss S. Using high-dimensional propensity scores to automate confounding control in a distributed medical product safety surveillance system. *Pharmacoepidemiol Drug Saf*. 2012;21 Suppl 1:41-49. doi:10.1002/pds.2328
18. Guertin JR, Rahme E, LeLorier J. Performance of the high-dimensional propensity score in adjusting for unmeasured confounders. *Eur J Clin Pharmacol*. 2016;72(12):1497-1505. doi:10.1007/s00228-016-2118-x
19. Glynn RJ, Lunt M, Rothman KJ, Poole C, Schneeweiss S, Stürmer T. Comparison of alternative approaches to trim subjects in the tails of the propensity score distribution. *Pharmacoepidemiol Drug Saf*. 2019;28(10):1290-1298. doi:10.1002/pds.4846
20. Austin PC. Balance diagnostics for comparing the distribution of baseline covariates between treatment groups in propensity-score matched samples. *Stat Med*. 2009;28(25):3083-3107. doi:10.1002/sim.3697
21. Curtis LH, Hammill BG, Eisenstein EL, Kramer JM, Anstrom KJ. Using Inverse Probability-Weighted Estimators in Comparative Effectiveness Analyses with Observational Databases. *Med Care*. 2007;45(10):S103-S107.
22. Bowen JD, Kozma CM, Grosso MM, Phillips AL. A real-world comparison of relapse rates, healthcare costs and resource use among patients with multiple sclerosis newly initiating subcutaneous interferon beta-1a versus oral disease-modifying drugs. *Mult Scler J - Exp Transl Clin*. 2018;4(4). doi:10.1177/2055217318819031
23. Granqvist M, Burman J, Gunnarsson M, et al. Comparative effectiveness of dimethyl fumarate as the initial and secondary treatment for MS. *Mult Scler J*. Published online 8 August 2019:1352458519866600. doi:10.1177/1352458519866600
24. *gilenya-epar-product-information_en.pdf*. Accessed February 13, 2020. https://www.ema.europa.eu/en/documents/product-information/gilenya-epar-product-information_en.pdf
25. Meyer-Moock S, Feng Y-S, Maeurer M, Dippel F-W, Kohlmann T. Systematic literature review and validity evaluation of the Expanded Disability Status Scale (EDSS) and the Multiple Sclerosis Functional Composite (MSFC) in patients with multiple sclerosis. *BMC Neurol*. 2014;14:58. doi:10.1186/1471-2377-14-58

TABLES

Table 1. Baseline demographic and clinical characteristics of MS patients initiating dimethyl fumarate, teriflunomide, fingolimod, or injectable immunomodulators.

	DMF n = 2697	TERI n = 3089	FTY n = 521	IMM n = 2997	Total N = 9304
Female, n (%)	1983 (73.5)	2111 (68.3)	342 (65.6)	2333 (77.8)	6769 (72.8)
Age (years), mean (SD)	39.4 (11.7)	43.1 (11.7)	38.2 (12.7)	37.5 (11.9)	39.9 (12.1)
CCI score, mean (SD)	0.52 (0.95)	0.65 (1.04)	0.61 (1.10)	0.54 (1.13)	0.58 (1.05)
CCI score, n (%)					
0	1875 (69.5)	1898 (61.4)	357 (68.5)	2140 (71.4)	6270 (67.4)
1-2	698 (25.9)	1021 (33.1)	127 (24.4)	705 (23.5)	2551 (27.4)
3-4	107 (4.0)	147 (4.8)	30 (5.8)	125 (4.2)	409 (4.4)
≥ 5	17 (0.6)	23 (0.7)	7 (1.3)	27 (0.9)	74 (0.8)
Disability, n (%)	941 (34.9)	1088 (35.2)	201 (38.6)	1061 (35.4)	3291 (35.4)
Motor disorder	812 (30.1)	949 (30.7)	174 (33.4)	884 (29.5)	2819 (30.3)
Sphincter disorders	220 (8.2)	248 (8.0)	46 (8.8)	281 (9.4)	795 (8.5)
Chronic pain treated with neurostimulator	5 (0.2)	1 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	7 (0.2)	13 (0.1)
Pre-index relapses, n (%)					
0	2097 (77.8)	2410 (78.0)	380 (72.9)	2291 (76.4)	7178 (77.1)
1	516 (19.1)	596 (19.3)	113 (21.7)	622 (20.8)	1847 (19.9)
2	73 (2.7)	69 (2.2)	23 (4.4)	77 (2.6)	242 (2.6)
3	11 (0.4)	14 (0.5)	5 (1.0)	7 (0.2)	37 (0.4)
Pre-index annual rate of relapse, mean (SD)	0.13 (0.27)	0.13 (0.26)	0.17 (0.31)	0.13 (0.26)	0.13 (0.26)
Pre-index MS-related hospitalizations (excluding relapse), n (%)	1120 (41.5)	1188 (38.5)	373 (71.6)	1239 (41.3)	3920 (42.1)
Pre-index medical visits to neurologist, n (%)	1570 (58.2)	1696 (54.9)	237 (45.5)	1529 (51.0)	5032 (54.1)
Pre-index cerebral or spinal cord MRI, n (%)	2536 (94.0)	2918 (94.5)	444 (85.2)	2775 (92.6)	8673 (93.2)
Pre-index lab tests, n (%)	2571 (95.3)	2953 (95.6)	483 (92.7)	2811 (93.8)	8818 (94.8)
Blood test	2465 (91.4)	2816 (91.2)	456 (87.5)	2630 (87.8)	8367 (89.9)
ALT/AST	2160 (80.1)	2540 (82.2)	407 (78.1)	2212 (73.8)	7319 (78.7)
Creatinine	2311 (85.7)	2615 (84.7)	416 (79.8)	2405 (80.2)	7747 (83.3)
Bilirubin	883 (32.7)	1010 (32.7)	254 (48.8)	896 (29.9)	3043 (32.7)
Pre-index corticosteroids dispensing (excluding high dose), n (%)	1266 (46.9)	1507 (48.8)	248 (47.6)	1518 (50.7)	4539 (48.8)
Number of distinct medications (level 3 of the ATC code), median [IQR]	13.0 [9.0;18.0]	13.0 [9.0;19.0]	14.0 [10.0;19.0]	14.0 [9.0;19.0]	14.0 [9.0;19.0]

DMF: Dimethyl fumarate, TERI: Teriflunomide, FTY: Fingolimod, IMM: Injectable Immunomodulators, MS: Multiple Sclerosis, CCI: Charlson Comorbidity Index, MRI: Magnetic Resonance Imaging, ATC: Anatomical Therapeutic Classification, IQR: Interquartile Range, SD: Standard Deviation

Table 2. Baseline demographic and clinical characteristics of post-matched populations DMF-IMM, DMF-TERI and DMF-FTY

	1:1 Matched			1:1 Matched			1:1 Matched		
	DMF n=1780	IMM n=1780	StD (%)	DMF n=1679	TERI n=1679	StD (%)	DMF n=376	FTY n=376	StD (%)
Female, n (%)	1343 (75.4)	1331 (74.8)	1.6	1193 (71.1)	1218 (72.5)	-3.3	234 (62.2)	248 (66.0)	-7.8
Age (years), mean (SD)	38.9 (10.8)	39.2 (12.2)	-2.7	41.1 (10.7)	40.9 (12.2)	2.3	38.4 (12.2)	38.8 (12.8)	-3.4
CCI score, n (%)			8.4			6.8			13.0
0	1282 (72.0)	1251 (70.3)	3.8	1149 (68.4)	1103 (65.7)	5.8	248 (66.0)	265 (70.5)	-9.7
1-2	427 (24.0)	426 (23.9)	0.1	453 (27.0)	501 (29.8)	-6.3	106 (28.2)	86 (22.9)	12.2
3-4	61 (3.4)	88 (4.9)	-7.6	66 (3.9)	67 (4.0)	-0.3	19 (5.1)	20 (5.3)	-1.2
≥ 5	10 (0.6)	15 (0.8)	-3.4	11 (0.7)	8 (0.5)	2.4	3 (0.8)	5 (1.3)	5.2
Disability, n (%)	595 (33.4)	605 (34.0)	-1.2	561 (33.4)	561 (33.4)	0.0	122 (32.4)	138 (36.7)	-9.0
Motor disorder	504 (28.3)	501 (28.1)	0.4	481 (28.6)	487 (29.0)	-0.8	107 (28.5)	118 (31.4)	-6.4
Sphincter disorders	138 (7.8)	159 (8.9)	-4.3	131 (7.8)	136 (8.1)	-1.1	34 (9.0)	30 (8.0)	3.8
Chronic pain treated with neurostimulator	4 (0.2)	3 (0.2)	1.3	4 (0.2)	0 (0.0)	6.9	1 (0.3)	0 (0.0)	7.3
Pre-index annual rate of relapse, mean (SD)	0.13 (0.26)	0.12 (0.24)	3.4	0.12 (0.27)	0.11 (0.24)	3.3	0.13 (0.26)	0.16 (0.27)	-10.4
Pre-index MS-related hospitalizations (excluding relapse), n (%)	737 (41.4)	706 (39.7)	3.5	664 (39.5)	677 (40.3)	-1.6	199 (52.9)	251 (66.8)	-28.5
Pre-index medical visits to neurologist, n (%)	1004 (56.4)	926 (52.0)	8.8	937 (55.8)	913 (54.4)	2.9	195 (51.9)	159 (42.3)	19.3
Pre-index cerebral or spinal cord MRI, n (%)	1687 (94.8)	1645 (92.4)	9.6	1581 (94.2)	1585 (94.4)	-1.0	338 (89.9)	308 (81.9)	23.1

DMF: Dimethyl fumarate, TERI: Teriflunomide, FTY: Fingolimod, IMM: Injectable Immunomodulators, MS: Multiple Sclerosis, CCI: Charlson Comorbidity Index, MRI: Magnetic Resonance Imaging, ATC: Anatomical Therapeutic Classification, IQR: Interquartile Range, SD: Standard Deviation, StD: Standardized Difference

FIGURE LEGENDS

Figure 1. Probability of discontinuation or switch of index treatment (Kaplan-Meier curve) during the 3.5 years follow-up period, according to treatment groups: dimethylfumarate, teriflunomide, fingolimod, injectable immunomodulatory drugs (IMM)

Figure 2. Forest plot of annualized relapse rate (ARR) for DMF versus comparator populations (RR [95% CI]). DMF dimethyl fumarate, TERI teriflunomide, IMM Injectable Immunomodulators, FTY fingolimod.

Figure 3. Forest plot of disability progression for DMF versus comparator populations (OR [95% CI]). DMF dimethyl fumarate, TERI teriflunomide, IMM Injectable Immunomodulators, FTY fingolimod.