PO-277

A Phase 4 Randomized Double-blind Placebo-Controlled Study of Rimegepant for Acute Treatment of Migraine in Adults Unsuitable for Triptan Use

Messoud Ashina[1], Peter McAllister[2], Luz M Ramirez[3], Catherine Nalpas[4], Alexandra Thiry[5], Lucy Abraham[6], Robert Fountaine[5], Terence Fullerton[5]

[1]Danish Headache Center, Rigshospitalet, Copenhagen, Denmark; [2]New England Institute for Neurology and Headache, Stamford, CT, USA; [3]Pfizer Inc, Princeton, NJ, USA; [4]Pfizer Inc, Paris, France; [5]Pfizer Inc, Groton, CT, USA; [6]Pfizer R&D UK Ltd, Tadworth, UK

BACKGROUND

- There is an unmet treatment need for individuals with migraine who are unsuitable for triptans due to insufficient response, intolerance, or contraindication.[1-3]
- Post-hoc subgroup analyses from previous phase 3 trials suggest that rimegepant, an oral calcitonin gene-related peptide (CGRP) receptor antagonist, may be effective for acute treatment of migraine in individuals who previously discontinued triptans.[4]
- Prospectively designed trials in individuals unsuitable for triptans have not previously been conducted with gepants.

OBJECTIVE

- To investigate the efficacy and tolerability of rimegepant for acute treatment of migraine in individuals unsuitable for triptans due to a documented history of prior inadequate response and/or intolerance to multiple agents, or due to the presence of a contraindication.

METHODS

STUDY DESIGN

- This was a phase 4, multinational, randomized, double-blind, placebo-controlled study (NCT05509400; **Figure 1**).

Figure 1: Study design



DBT=double-blind treatment; MQoL=Migraine Quality of Life Questionnaire; ODT=orally disintegrating tablet; OLE=open-label extension

PARTICIPANTS

- Eligible participants were aged ≥18 years with ≥1-year history of migraine attacks (with or without aura), migraine onset prior to age 50 years, migraine attacks lasting an average of 4–72 h if untreated, and an average of 4–14 migraine days per month in the 3 months prior to screening.
- Participants were unsuitable for triptan therapy due to documented (A) history of prior intolerance or lack of efficacy to ≥2 triptans or (B) the presence of a contraindication.
  - Documentation was within the medical/pharmacy record – complemented by participant interview if needed – or via principal investigator interview of the treating physician.
- Participants on stable (≥3 months) preventive migraine treatment (excluding CGRP antagonists) were eligible.

TREATMENT

- Participants treated a single qualifying migraine attack with rimegepant 75 mg orally disintegrating tablet (ODT) or placebo.
  - A qualifying migraine attack was defined as an attack of moderate or severe pain intensity first treated with study intervention, not with non-study medication (eg, NSAID).
- Participants rated migraine pain and other symptoms prior to dosing and up to 48 h post dose.

ENDPOINTS

- The primary endpoint was the percentage of participants with migraine pain relief (no or mild migraine pain) at 2 h post dose.
- Key secondary endpoints included the percentage of participants with migraine pain freedom (no migraine pain) at 2 h post dose, rescue medication use within 24 h post dose, return to normal function at 2 h post dose, sustained return to normal function from 2–24 h and from 2–48 h post dose, sustained migraine pain relief from 2–24 h and from 2–48 h post dose, sustained pain freedom from 2–24 h and from 2–48 h post dose, and most bothersome symptom (MBS) freedom (absence of nausea, photophobia, or phonophobia) at 2 h post dose.
- On-treatment safety included the number and percentage of participants with adverse events (AEs), serious AEs, grade 3 or 4 clinical laboratory abnormalities, and liver function test elevations.

ANALYSIS

- Efficacy was assessed in all participants who were randomized once, had a qualifying migraine attack at time of dosing, took double-blind study intervention, and had post-dose efficacy data.
  - Treatment groups were compared using Mantel–Haenszel risk estimation. Type I error was controlled using hierarchical testing whereby the primary endpoint was evaluated at a 2-sided alpha level of 0.05.
  - If the primary endpoint was significant, key secondary endpoints were each tested at a 2-sided alpha level of 0.05 in the pre-specified order.
- Safety was summarized descriptively in all participants who took double-blind study intervention.

RESULTS

PARTICIPANTS

- 585 participants took double-blind study intervention (rimegepant, n=295; placebo, n=290) and 570 were analyzed for efficacy (rimegepant, n=286; placebo, n=284).
- Demographic and clinical characteristics were similar between treatment groups (**Table 1**).
- 93.5% of participants analyzed for efficacy had a documented failure to ≥2 triptans due to lack of efficacy and/or prior intolerance and 9.1% had a contraindication (**Table 1**).

Table 1: Summary of demographics and baseline clinical characteristics[a]

Demographic/Characteristic	Rimegepant 75 mg n=295	Placebo n=290
Age, mean (SD), years	43.0 (11.8)	42.7 (11.5)
Sex, n (%)		
Female	260 (88.1)	261 (90.0)
Male	35 (11.9)	29 (10.0)
Race, n (%)[b]		
White	52 (91.2)	45 (83.3)
Black or African American	5 (8.8)	8 (14.8)
Multiple	0	1 (1.9)
Body mass index, mean (SD), kg/m^2	25.3 (4.3)	25.5 (4.5)
Age at migraine onset, mean (SD), years[c]	19.7 (9.0)	19.7 (9.5)
Number of moderate to severe migraine days per month in the previous 3 months, mean (SD)[c]	6.7 (2.5)	6.6 (2.6)
Average duration of untreated attacks, mean (SD), h[c]	41.3 (21.6)	43.0 (20.2)
Primary migraine type, n (%)[c]		
Without aura	227 (76.9)	222 (76.6)
With aura	68 (23.1)	68 (23.4)
Reason for triptan unsuitability, n (%)	Overall (N=570)[d]	
Documented failure to ≥2 triptans	533 (93.5)	
With ≥1 reason due to lack of efficacy	484 (84.9)	
With ≥1 reason due to prior intolerance	174 (30.5)	
With ≥1 reason due to lack of efficacy and ≥1 reason due to prior intolerance	125 (21.9)	
Contraindication to triptans	52 (9.1)	

[a] Summarized in all participants who took double-blind study intervention unless noted.
[b] Race was only assessed among US participants (rimegepant, n=57; placebo, n=54).
[c] Based on self-reported migraine history.
[d] Summarized in all participants who were randomized once, had a qualifying migraine attack at time of dosing, took double-blind study intervention, and had post-dose efficacy data (rimegepant, n=286; placebo, n=284).

EFFICACY

- Rimegepant was superior to placebo for the primary endpoint of migraine pain relief at 2 h post dose (**Figure 2**).
  - The percentage of participants with pain relief at 2 h was 55.9% for rimegepant and 32.7% for placebo; difference: 23.2% (95% CI, 15.3, 31.1); P<0.0001.

Figure 2: Migraine pain relief at 2 h pose dose (primary endpoint)



Analyzed in all participants who were randomized only once, had a qualifying migraine attack at the time of dosing, took double-blind study intervention, and had post dose efficacy data. Groups were compared using Mantel–Haenszel risk estimation.

- Rimegepant was also superior to placebo for all 10 alpha-protected key secondary endpoints (**Figure 3**).
  - This included assessments of acute effects at 2 h post dose (migraine pain freedom, return to normal function, MBS freedom), assessments of sustained effects from 2–24 and 2–48 h post dose (migraine pain relief, migraine pain freedom, return to normal function), and assessment of rescue medication use within 24 h post dose.

SAFETY

- AE frequency was similar in the rimegepant (12.5%) and placebo (12.1%) groups (**Table 2**).
  - Only nasopharyngitis occurred in ≥1% of participants in the rimegepant group (rimegepant, 1.7%; placebo, 1.0%).
- No severe AEs, serious AEs, grade 3 or 4 laboratory test abnormalities, alanine aminotransferase or aspartate aminotransferase levels >3x upper limit of normal (ULN), or total bilirubin levels >1.5x ULN were reported among rimegepant-treated participants.

Table 2: Summary of on-treatment adverse events[a]

AE, n (%)	Rimegepant 75 mg n=295	Placebo n=290
Any AE	37 (12.5)	35 (12.1)
AE related to study drug	10 (3.4)	10 (3.4)
Mild AE[b]	31 (10.5)	19 (6.6)
Moderate AE[b]	6 (2.0)	15 (5.2)
Severe AE[b]	0	1 (0.3)
Serious AE	0	0
Hypertension AE	1 (0.3)	0
Raynaud's phenomenon AE	1 (0.3)	0

[a] Summarized in all participants who took double-blind study intervention.
[b] Based on preferred term worst intensity.
AE=adverse event

Figure 3: Summary of key secondary endpoints



Endpoint	Rimegepant n/N (%)	Placebo n/N (%)	Percentage difference (95% CI)	P value
Migraine pain freedom at 2 h post dose	65/286 (22.7)	21/284 (7.4)	15.3 (9.6, 21.1)	<0.0001
No rescue medication use within 24 h post dose[a]	232/283 (82.0)	150/279 (53.8)	28.2 (20.8, 35.6)	<0.0001
Return to normal function at 2 h post dose[b]	67/232 (28.9)	30/237 (12.7)	16.2 (9.0, 23.4)	<0.0001
Sustained return to normal function from 2-24 h post dose[b]	42/232 (18.1)	16/237 (6.8)	11.4 (5.5, 17.2)	0.0002
Sustained return to normal function from 2-48 h post dose[b]	37/232 (15.9)	10/237 (4.2)	11.7 (6.4, 17.1)	<0.0001
Sustained migraine pain relief from 2-24 h post dose	111/286 (38.8)	41/284 (14.4)	24.4 (17.4, 31.3)	<0.0001
Sustained migraine pain relief from 2-48 h post dose	97/286 (33.9)	30/284 (10.6)	23.4 (16.8, 29.9)	<0.0001
Sustained migraine pain freedom from 2-24 h post dose	40/286 (14.0)	14/284 (4.9)	9.1 (4.3, 13.8)	0.0002
Sustained migraine pain freedom from 2-48 h post dose	35/286 (12.2)	8/284 (2.8)	9.4 (5.2, 13.7)	<0.0001
MBS freedom at 2 h post dose	89/286 (31.1)	53/284 (18.7)	12.5 (5.4, 19.5)	0.0005

Analyzed in all participants who were randomized only once, had a qualifying migraine attack at the time of dosing, took double-blind study intervention, and had post dose efficacy data. Testing utilized a hierarchical gate-keeping approach to control type 1 error. First, the significance of the primary endpoint was evaluated at a 2-sided alpha level of 0.05 level. Because the primary endpoint was significant, key secondary endpoints were each tested hierarchically at a 2-sided alpha-level of 0.05 in the prespecified order. Groups were compared using Mantel–Haenszel risk estimation.
[a] Direction reversed so that positive percentage favors rimegepant. Participants with a first rescue medication use date being less than or equal to the study intervention dosing date +1 day, and missing the time of first rescue medication use, were excluded.
[b] Among participants with any level of functional disability (mild impairment, severe impairment, or requires bedrest) at time of dosing.
MBS=most bothersome symptom; n=number of participants meeting the endpoint; N=number of evaluable participants

CONCLUSIONS

- A single dose of rimegepant 75 mg ODT demonstrated superiority over placebo for the primary endpoint and all 10 key alpha-protected secondary endpoints, with a favorable tolerability profile that was similar to placebo.
- This is the first prospective controlled study to demonstrate efficacy of a gepant for the acute treatment of migraine in participants with a documented history of being unsuitable for triptans.
- Rimegepant may be a suitable option that addresses an unmet treatment need in this patient population.
- Findings from the 12-week open-label extension phase of this trial (currently ongoing) will allow for evaluation of the effectiveness of rimegepant and provide additional safety data in this population.

REFERENCES

1. Lipton RB, et al. Cephalalgia 2020;40 (5):437-47.
2. Dodick DW, et al. J Prim Care Community Health 2020;11:2150132720963680.
3. Lipton RB, et al. Headache 2025;65:164-79.
4. Lipton RB, et al. Cephalalgia 2023;43:1-11.

DISCLOSURES

MA: Advisory board/consultant/speaker: AbbVie, Astra Zeneca, Eli Lilly, GlaxoSmithKline, Lundbeck, Pfizer, Teva; institutional research grant: Lundbeck, Lundbeck Foundation, Novartis, Novo Nordisk Foundation; associate editor: Journal of Headache and Pain, Brain. **PM:** Advisory board/speaker/consultant: AbbVie, ANI, BrightMind.AI, Dompe, Lilly, Lundbeck, Pfizer. **LMR, CN, LA, RF, TF:** Employees of and hold stock/options in Pfizer. **AT:** Former employee of Biohaven Pharmaceuticals; owns stock in Biohaven Ltd; employee and owns stock/options in Pfizer.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

This study was sponsored by Pfizer. Medical writing support was provided by Matt Soulsby, PhD, CMPP, of Engage Scientific Solutions and was funded by Pfizer.

Electronic Poster: Please scan this QR code with your smartphone app to view this poster. If you do not have a smartphone, access the poster via the internet at:
https://scientificpubs.congressposter.com/p/kcs6qor3dn35ms1s

Presented at the 2025 International Headache Congress (IHC), September 10–13, 2025, Sao Paulo, Brazil

Copyright © 2025