

# The Impact of Guidelines and Recently Completed Studies on Clinical Trial Design (Oral Agents)

Jim Gallivan, Ph.D.

Clinical Trials and Special Access Programme

Senior Medical Advisor Bureau

Therapeutic Products Directorate

April 20, 2005

**Health Products and Food Branch**

**Direction générale des produits de santé et des aliments**

# The Issue:

- since the Diabetes Control and Complications Trial in 1993, several studies have shown that improved glucose control in Type 2 diabetes reduces the risk of mortality and macro- and micro-vascular disease
- since 1993 there has been a decrease in the target range for glucose control from a HbA1c of 9-10% to <7%

## The Issue (2):

- in December 2003 the Canadian Diabetes Association published revised clinical practice guidelines with glycemic targets of  $\text{HbA1c} \leq 7\%$  or  $\text{FPG} = 4.0\text{--}7.0 \text{ mmol/L}$
- “the target HbA1c should be attainable within 6 to 12 months”
- $\text{HbA1c} > 9\%$  is marked hyperglycemia and the recommended treatment is with 2 antihyperglycemic agents or insulin

## The Issue (3):

- “several studies clearly show that even short-term exposure to hyperglycemia has significant impact on blood vessel walls. Aggressive treatment...can improve outcomes significantly.”

# The Problem:

- the revised CDA guidelines were not intended to apply to clinical trials, HOWEVER,
- under C.05.006 of the Food and Drug Regulations the Minister may refuse the sale of a drug for a clinical trial if (A) the use of the drug endangers the health of a clinical trial subject or other person, or (B) the clinical trial is contrary to the best interests of the clinical trial subject.

## The Problem (2):

- the glycemic targets and withdrawal criteria for many clinical trials did not conform to the CDA guidelines
- maintaining subjects on inadequate glycemic control to “prove” efficacy or collect safety data may endanger the health of a clinical trial subject and is contrary to the best interests of the clinical trial subject

## The Result:

- disagreements between reviewers and sponsors resulting in withdrawn submissions and delayed approvals of clinical trial applications

## The Solution:

- proposed guidance

# Type 2 Diabetes Clinical Trials:

- two primary types:
  - Phase II proof-of-concept
  - Phase III proof-of-efficacy and safety
- inclusion/exclusion criteria:
  - typically treatment naïve or poorly controlled diabetes with a HbA1c of 6.5–10.0%
  - reasonably healthy



# Expectations for All Trials:

- subjects will receive:
  - adequate dietary and lifestyle counselling
  - adequate treatment for other conditions
  - recommended targets for patients with diabetes under current clinical practice guidelines:
    - hypertension: blood pressure <130/80 mm Hg
    - lipids: LDL-C <2.5 mmol/L **and**  
total cholesterol/HDL-C ratio <4.0

# Expectations for All Trials (2):

- subjects should self-monitor blood glucose daily and self-monitor body weight at frequent intervals
- monitoring during the trial will conform to the CDA guidelines

# Phase II trials:

- typically placebo-controlled proof-of-concept dose ranging studies
- 12-24 weeks duration with a 2+ week placebo run-in
- experimental drug is monotherapy or add-on to approved therapy
- objective is to demonstrate superiority to placebo and select dose(s) for phase III studies

# Inclusion/Exclusion Criteria:

- HbA1c  $>9\%$  should only be allowed when CDA target can be achieved in 6-12 months
  - target unlikely to be met in the placebo arm of a 24 week monotherapy, placebo-controlled trial
  - NOTE: EMEA suggests patients in placebo-controlled trials should have HbA1c  $<8.5\%$  and patients with HbA1c of 8.5-10% should not be enrolled in trials  $>3$  months duration

# Withdrawal Criteria:

- primary risk is loss of glycemic control
- see physician if:
  - FPG >15 mmol/L on 2 consecutive days, >13.3 mmol/L on 3 consecutive days, or >12 mmol/L on 4 days per week (CDA CSS recommendation)
- withdraw if:
  - FPG laboratory values >15/15.5 mmol/L and no other explanation
  - symptomatic

# Phase III trials:

- typically 1-2 years duration
- objective is to demonstrate efficacy and safety
- may evaluate a dose response
- efficacy:
  - non-inferiority or equivalence of one or more doses to an accepted treatment
  - usually apparent in <6 months

# Inclusion/Exclusion Criteria:

- subjects should be representative of target patient population as per ICH guidelines
  - means higher HbA1c and more severe medical problems than would be allowed in phase II trials

# Withdrawal Criteria:

- risks are loss of glycemic control (short-term) and lack of efficacy (long-term)
- short-term
  - withdrawal criteria should be similar to those for phase II trials



# Withdrawal Criteria – long-term:

- after 3 months HbA1c should replace FPG as measure of blood glucose
- if HbA1c  $>7\%$  at 6-12 months, dose escalation or addition of other therapies should be instituted
- at 52 weeks withdraw if HbA1c  $>8\%$
- progressive lowering of withdrawal limit towards HbA1c  $\leq 7\%$  by 104 weeks

# Informed Consent:

- subjects should be informed that they could be maintained on a therapy that will delay optimal treatment

# Issues/Considerations:

- pathogenesis of type 2 Diabetes involves 3 primary defects:
  - insulin resistance
  - insulin secretory dysfunction
  - hepatic glucose overproduction
- range from predominant insulin resistance with relative insulin deficiency to predominant secretory dysfunction with insulin resistance

# Issues/Considerations (2):

- not all patients will respond adequately to a given regimen
  - monotherapy with currently effective antihyperglycemic agents lowers HbA1c by 1.0-1.5%
  - large variability in response (coefficient of variation  $\geq 75\%$ )

# Issues/Considerations (3):

## ■ GUIDE Trial (2004)

- 27 week treatment
- titrated to effective dose of gliclazide MR or glimepiride prior to treatment with upward dose adjustment of high dose of glimepiride at week 18 in non-responders
- baseline HbA1c was  $8.3 \pm 1.1\%$  (mean  $\pm$  SD)
- at week 9 HbA1c was  $7.45 \pm 1.1\%$

# Issues/Considerations (4):

- $\Delta\text{HbA1c}$  over 27 weeks was  $\downarrow 1.1 \pm 1.1\%$
- means:
  - $\approx 15\%$  of patients had an increase in HbA1c over the course of the trial
  - also  $\approx 15\%$  had decrease  $\geq 2.2\%$
- upward dose adjustment with glimepiride at week 18 had no effect on HbA1c at week 27

# Issues/Considerations (5):

- impact of withdrawal criteria
  - potential reduction in number of subjects completing trial (only 50% may meet CDA target)
- statistical considerations
  - effect on variance and sample size calculations
  - use of LOCF?
  - survival analysis as a 2<sup>nd</sup> endpoint?

# Issues/Considerations (6):

- increased risk of hypoglycemia with more aggressive treatment
- new agents better????



# Issues/Considerations (7):

- "real-world" trials
  - inclusion of subjects with HbA1c >10%
  - inclusion of patients with dyslipidemia and cardiovascular problems
  - special populations (elderly, paediatric, etc.)
  - 3 agent combination therapy in difficult to treat subjects

# Issues/Considerations (8):

- there is a difference between trials to evaluate therapeutic outcomes and those to evaluate efficacy of new drugs
- clinical trials designed to test the efficacy of a new drug are not real world - they are experiments
  - experiments should build on prior knowledge

# Issues/Considerations (9):

- in the real world many patients may not meet targets, BUT
- in the real world, physicians can also adjust therapy at any time
- in a clinical trial options for dose adjustments or addition of new therapies are limited by the protocol
  - only options may be protocol violation or withdrawal

# Issues/Considerations (10):

- knowingly maintaining subjects on suboptimal therapy is a violation of the Declaration of Helsinki and ICH
- “The rights, safety and well-being of the trial subjects are the most important considerations and should prevail over the interests of science and society.” (ICH GCP Article 2.3)

# Issues/Considerations (11):

- the goal is to allow a scientifically valid assessment of the efficacy and safety of a therapeutic product while ensuring that the safety of subjects is not compromised

# Acknowledgements:

- Dr. Ivo Hynie
- Dr. Karel Rakusan
- Dr. Michael Cain
- Dr. Adel Kyrollos