

---

# Guidance for Industry

## Integrated Summary of Effectiveness

### *DRAFT GUIDANCE*

**This guidance document is being distributed for comment purposes only.**

Comments and suggestions regarding this draft document should be submitted within 60 days of publication in the *Federal Register* of the notice announcing the availability of the draft guidance. Submit comments to the Division of Dockets Management (HFA-305), Food and Drug Administration, 5630 Fishers Lane, rm. 1061, Rockville, MD 20852. All comments should be identified with the docket number listed in the notice of availability that publishes in the *Federal Register*.

For questions regarding this draft document contact (CDER) Howard Chazin at 301-796-0700, or (CBER) Leonard Wilson at 301-827-0373.

U.S. Department of Health and Human Services  
Food and Drug Administration  
Center for Drug Evaluation and Research (CDER)  
Center for Biologics Evaluation and Research (CBER)

August 2008  
Procedural

FDA-2008-D-0449

GDL

# Guidance for Industry

## Integrated Summary of Effectiveness

*Additional copies are available from:*

*Office of Training and Communications  
Division of Drug Information  
Center for Drug Evaluation and Research  
Food and Drug Administration  
10903 New Hampshire Ave., Bldg. 51, rm. 2201  
Silver Spring, MD 20993-0002  
(Tel) 301-796-3400  
<http://www.fda.gov/cder/guidance/index.htm>*

*or*

*Office of Communication, Training, and  
Manufacturers Assistance, HFM-40  
Center for Biologics Evaluation and Research  
Food and Drug Administration  
1401 Rockville Pike, Rockville, MD 20852-1448  
(Tel) 800-835-4709 or 301-827-1800  
<http://www.fda.gov/cber/guidelines.htm>*

**U.S. Department of Health and Human Services  
Food and Drug Administration  
Center for Drug Evaluation and Research (CDER)  
Center for Biologics Evaluation and Research (CBER)**

**August 2008  
Procedural**

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

<b>I.</b>	<b>INTRODUCTION</b> .....	<b>1</b>
<b>II.</b>	<b>BACKGROUND</b> .....	<b>2</b>
<b>III.</b>	<b>FORMAT AND CONTENT OF THE ISE</b> .....	<b>3</b>
	<b>A. Background and Overview of Clinical Efficacy</b> .....	<b>3</b>
	<b>B. Tabular Results of Individual Studies</b> .....	<b>5</b>
	<b>C. Comparisons and Analyses of Efficacy Results Across Studies</b> .....	<b>5</b>
	1. <i>Demographics of Efficacy Study Populations</i> .....	5
	2. <i>Efficacy Results</i> .....	6
	3. <i>Analysis Issues</i> .....	7
	4. <i>Integrated Data Analyses</i> .....	7
	<b>D. Comparison of Results in Subpopulations</b> .....	<b>9</b>
	<b>E. Analysis of Clinical Information Relevant to Dosing Recommendations</b> .....	<b>10</b>
	<b>F. Persistence of Efficacy and/or Tolerance Effects</b> .....	<b>11</b>
	<b>G. Exploratory Investigations</b> .....	<b>11</b>
<b>IV.</b>	<b>TABLES AND FIGURES</b> .....	<b>12</b>
	<b>REFERENCES</b> .....	<b>13</b>

***Contains Nonbinding Recommendations***

*Draft — Not for Implementation*

**Guidance for Industry<sup>1</sup>  
Integrated Summary of Effectiveness**

This draft guidance, when finalized, will represent the Food and Drug Administration's (FDA's) current thinking on this topic. It does not create or confer any rights for or on any person and does not operate to bind FDA or the public. You can use an alternative approach if the approach satisfies the requirements of the applicable statutes and regulations. If you want to discuss an alternative approach, contact the FDA staff responsible for implementing this guidance. If you cannot identify the appropriate FDA staff, call the appropriate number listed on the title page of this guidance.

**I. INTRODUCTION**

This guidance describes how an integrated summary of effectiveness (ISE) should be prepared by industry for inclusion in a new drug application (NDA) or biologics license application (BLA)<sup>2</sup> submitted to the Food and Drug Administration (FDA). The recommendations in this guidance reflect the FDA's current thinking regarding what industry should include in an ISE to provide a truly integrated analysis, rather than a summary of efficacy results from individual clinical trials, and to satisfy FDA regulatory requirements.<sup>3</sup> Although there are no corresponding regulations requiring an ISE for BLA submissions, applicants are encouraged to provide these analyses in their applications.

This guidance supersedes section G, Integrated Summary of Effectiveness Data, of the 1988 guidance on *Format and Content of the Clinical and Statistical Sections of an Application* (Clin-Stat guidance). It also incorporates the conceptual framework of section 2.7.3, Summary of Clinical Efficacy (SCE), from the ICH guidance for industry *M4E The CTD — Efficacy*.<sup>4</sup>

FDA's guidance documents, including this guidance, do not establish legally enforceable responsibilities. Instead, guidances describe the Agency's current thinking on a topic and should be viewed only as recommendations, unless specific regulatory or statutory requirements are

<sup>1</sup> This guidance has been prepared by the Office of New Drugs and the Office of Biostatistics in the Center for Drug Evaluation and Research (CDER) in cooperation with the Center for Biologics Evaluation and Research (CBER) at the Food and Drug Administration.

<sup>2</sup> This guidance does not apply to medical devices regulated as biologics under the Public Health Service Act.

<sup>3</sup> See 21 CFR 314.50(d)(5)(v).

<sup>4</sup> We update guidances periodically. To make sure you have the most recent version of a guidance, check the CDER guidance Web page at <http://www.fda.gov/cder/guidance/index.htm>.

## ***Contains Nonbinding Recommendations***

*Draft — Not for Implementation*

36 cited. The use of the word *should* in Agency guidances means that something is suggested or  
37 recommended, but not required.

### **II. BACKGROUND**

41  
42 The ISE is an overall integrated analysis that comprehensively examines the effectiveness data  
43 from individual clinical studies. In addition to the adequate and well-controlled studies that  
44 should be submitted as the basis for approval, the ISE should include other controlled trials (e.g.,  
45 incomplete trials or trials that do not support the claim) and the results of any other studies,  
46 published or unpublished, not conducted by the applicant, of which the applicant has become  
47 aware.

48  
49 Under 21 CFR 314.50(d)(5)(v), the ISE must include:

- 50  
51 • An integrated summary of the data demonstrating substantial evidence of effectiveness  
52 for each claimed indication
- 53  
54 • Evidence that supports the dosage and administration section of the labeling, including  
55 support for the recommended dosage and dose interval
- 56  
57 • Effectiveness data analyzed by sex, age, and racial subgroups
- 58  
59 • Evidence that is pertinent to individualization of dosing and the need for modifications of  
60 dosing for specific subgroups

61  
62 Since 1985, the ISE has been required as part of an NDA submission, but the regulation does not  
63 describe the specific components of the ISE in detail except for the components listed above.  
64 The FDA provided recommendations for what should be in an ISE in the Clin-Stat guidance, as  
65 follows:

66  
67 “The individual controlled studies to a great extent speak for themselves with respect to  
68 their ability to provide the evidence of effectiveness required by law. This section should  
69 provide an overview of the results, showing that they do satisfy the regulatory  
70 requirements for approval, i.e., represent adequate and well-controlled studies  
71 demonstrating the claimed effect, particularly if results are inconsistent or marginal. For  
72 example, the sponsor would explain here his basis for seeking to rely on a single study.  
73 Equally important, this section should include an examination of study-to-study  
74 differences in results, effects in subsets of the treated population, dose-response  
75 information from all sources, any available comparisons with alternative drugs, and any  
76 other information, so that the nature of the drug’s effectiveness can be as fully defined as  
77 possible, and the user of the drug can be given the best possible information on how to  
78 use the drug and what results to expect.”

79  
80 Since the Clin-Stat guidance was published, several International Conference on Harmonisation  
81 (ICH) guidances, including the ICH guidances for industry *E3 Structure and Content of Clinical*

## ***Contains Nonbinding Recommendations***

*Draft — Not for Implementation*

82 *Study Reports, E9 Statistical Principles for Clinical Trials, E10 Choice of Control Group and*  
83 *Related Issues in Clinical Trials, and M4E The CTD — Efficacy,*<sup>5</sup> have provided additional  
84 recommendations for describing individual trials and providing an efficacy analysis. The  
85 recommendations in this guidance reflect the FDA’s current thinking regarding what should be  
86 included in an ISE to provide a truly integrated analysis, rather than a summary of efficacy  
87 results from individual clinical trials, and to satisfy FDA regulatory requirements.

88  
89 The draft guidance for industry *Integrated Summaries of Effectiveness and Safety: Location*  
90 *Within the Common Technical Document*<sup>6</sup> outlines where to place the ISE within the framework  
91 of the common technical document (CTD) and electronic common technical document (eCTD).  
92 That guidance is intended to resolve the confusion concerning the difference between the  
93 document that should be included in Module 2, section 2.7.3, SCE, and the document that should  
94 be located in Module 5, section 5.3.5.3, Reports of Analyses of Data from More than One Study  
95 (Including Any Formal Integrated Analyses, Meta-Analyses, and Bridging Analyses). Although  
96 one of the goals of the ISE is to summarize the available effectiveness data, the ISE primarily is  
97 an integrated analysis of these data, going beyond a simple summary. For example, the  
98 regulatory requirements in 21 CFR 314.50(d)(5)(v) for support of dosing recommendations and  
99 analyses of demographic subset responses usually involve overview approaches that need both  
100 detailed explanation and documentation. The document in section 2.7.3 should summarize these  
101 analyses, but, in most cases, the ISE will be substantially larger than what would be appropriate  
102 for the section 2.7.3 summary of these data and analyses.

### **III. FORMAT AND CONTENT OF THE ISE**

#### **A. Background and Overview of Clinical Efficacy**

109 The format (including section titles) of the ISE should be flexible, but in many cases (and as  
110 broken down below) it can closely follow the format of the SCE that appears in Module 2,  
111 section 2.7.3, of the CTD. Applicants should take note of the following suggestions for content  
112 but should choose the format that best suits the data.

114 The ISE should not recapitulate detailed results of single studies, which are described in  
115 individual study reports, but instead should provide a comprehensive, detailed, in-depth analysis  
116 of the efficacy results in aggregate, with a clear rationale for the methods used in the analysis.  
117 Studies should be presented briefly while noting critical design and analytic features as well as  
118 important differences between studies (e.g., population, dose, duration, endpoints).

120 The background and overview section of the ISE should show clearly why individual studies  
121 should be considered adequate and well-controlled studies that demonstrate the claimed effect,

---

<sup>5</sup> Specifically, sections 2.5, Clinical Overview, and 2.7, Clinical Summary, in Module 2, and Module 5: Clinical Study Reports.

<sup>6</sup> When final, this guidance will represent the FDA’s current thinking on this topic. For the most recent version of a guidance, check the CDER guidance Web page at <http://www.fda.gov/cder/guidance/index.htm>.

## *Contains Nonbinding Recommendations*

*Draft — Not for Implementation*

122 and thus fulfill the legal requirements for approval. This demonstration is particularly important  
123 if results are inconsistent or marginal.

124

125 Critical study design features of the controlled studies supporting effectiveness should be  
126 discussed and compared among studies, especially when results are inconsistent. Examples of  
127 these features are as follows (see ICH E3 for additional important study characteristics):

128

- 129 • Randomization
- 130 • Blinding
- 131 • Choices of control treatment, particularly noninferiority designs
- 132 • Statistical approaches
- 133 • Dosing modifications
- 134 • Choice of patient population, and use of enrichment approaches to identify patients with  
135 high likelihood of events or high likelihood of response
- 136 • Particular design features such as crossover or randomized withdrawal designs
- 137 • Use of run-in periods as a method of enrichment
- 138 • Handling of dropouts in the study and analysis
- 139 • Choice of study endpoints (with particular attention to use of surrogate endpoints)
- 140 • Study duration
- 141 • Prespecified plans for analysis of the study results, with attention to multiplicity and  
142 primary and secondary endpoints
- 143 • Other features that may be critical in particular cases

144

145 As part of a comprehensive summary of experience related to efficacy, the ISE also can refer to  
146 nonclinical data and clinical pharmacology data as appropriate.

147

148 Particular attention should be paid to any recognized limitations of the efficacy studies. Thus, if  
149 an effectiveness claim is based on a surrogate endpoint, the basis for choice of the endpoint  
150 should be discussed and its validity as a predictor of clinical outcome should be supported. In  
151 some cases, this discussion may not be needed if the surrogate endpoint has been sufficiently  
152 validated and relied upon as the basis of approval for previously approved drugs (e.g.,  
153 antihypertensive, oral hypoglycemic, and lipid-lowering drugs generally have been approved on  
154 the basis of demonstrated effects on blood pressure, blood sugar and HgA1c, and LDL  
155 cholesterol or triglycerides, respectively, without evidence, at the time of approval, of an effect  
156 of the particular drug on survival or morbidity). Nevertheless any novel surrogate endpoint (e.g.,  
157 not used previously by the FDA as a basis for approval) should be discussed and supported.

158

159 If the objective of some of the studies was to show equivalence or noninferiority to an active  
160 control, the basis for the choice of noninferiority margin and support for the assay sensitivity of  
161 the trial, including support for the constancy assumption, should be provided in detail. The  
162 results should be evaluated by using the predefined criteria for defining equivalence or  
163 noninferiority, and any modification of plans should be explained (see ICH E10).

164

165 Graphs, technical discussion, mathematical derivations, or presentation of formulae should be  
166 included in an appendix, rather than in the main body of the ISE.

167

## *Contains Nonbinding Recommendations*

*Draft — Not for Implementation*

### **B. Tabular Results of Individual Studies**

Generally, a tabular listing of all studies with data relevant to drug efficacy should be provided, together with study narrative descriptions. Both positive and negative studies should be included. The study narrative descriptions should be brief (e.g., similar in level of detail to an abstract for a journal article) and describe critical design features and critical results, including the prospectively identified endpoints and statistical analysis plan for each study. Similar studies can be described together, noting the individual study results and any important differences among the studies. These brief study narrative descriptions should include references or electronic links to the full study reports.

### **C. Comparisons and Analyses of Efficacy Results Across Studies**

Using text, figures, and tables as appropriate, the Comparison and Analysis of Results Across Studies section should present all available data that characterize the efficacy of the drug. These comparisons and analyses should use appropriate methods for comparing studies of similar design, controlling for design differences, weighting by sample size, and examining by common covariates or stratifications. This section should include analyses of all data, irrespective of the strength of evidence of their support for the overall conclusion, and should discuss the extent to which the results of the relevant studies reinforce or do not reinforce each other. Any major inconsistencies in the data regarding efficacy should be addressed, and any areas needing further exploration should be identified. Data should be examined with respect to control groups, duration of exposure, patient populations enrolled, endpoints (including how defined), dropout profiles and analyses, and statistical methods (time-to-event versus cumulative rates).

Generally, this section should use two kinds of analyses: comparison of results of individual studies, and analysis of data combined from various studies.

#### *1. Demographics of Efficacy Study Populations*

The demographic and other baseline characteristics of study populations across all efficacy studies should be described. The following information should be included:

- The disease characteristics (e.g., severity, duration), prior treatment of the study subjects, concomitant treatment allowed or required, and study inclusion and exclusion criteria, including concomitant illness.
- Differences in baseline characteristics of the study populations in different studies or groups of studies, which may include any differences in age, sex, race, and geographic region (United States versus non-U.S. regions).
- Any differences among all populations included in critical efficacy analyses and the overall patient population expected to receive the drug when it is marketed.

## *Contains Nonbinding Recommendations*

*Draft — Not for Implementation*

- 212       • Assessment of the number of subjects who dropped out of the studies (separately for each  
213 treatment group), time of withdrawal (a defined study day or visit during treatment or  
214 follow-up period), and reasons for discontinuation.

215

216

### 2. *Efficacy Results*

217

218 Results from all controlled studies, including those controlled studies that did not favor the study  
219 treatment and other pertinent controlled studies that were included under clinical pharmacology,  
220 should be summarized, examined, and compared as appropriate using tables and figures (such as  
221 *forest plots*). Important differences in study design (such as endpoints, control group, study  
222 duration, patient population, dose, and statistical methods) should be identified.

223

224 Comparisons of results across studies should focus on prespecified primary endpoints. When the  
225 primary endpoints involved different variables, exposure durations, or time points in different  
226 efficacy studies, it can be useful to provide cross-study comparisons of important data elements  
227 that can be found in all studies even if not the primary endpoint in some of them. If results over  
228 time are important, study results can be displayed in a figure that illustrates the change over time  
229 in each study. Important secondary endpoints, particularly when examined appropriately after  
230 success on a primary endpoint, also should be shown.

231

232 The analysis should be consistent with the report of individual study results and can be  
233 accomplished with the help of tables that show major study design features, number of subjects,  
234 number of dropouts, and major outcomes.

235

236 When comparing study results for those cases in which many variables or time points were  
237 analyzed, representative ones (usually those that were identified as the primary endpoints in the  
238 individual studies) should be selected for display and evaluation.

239

240 Ordinarily, studies with similar controls (placebo control, active control) should be discussed  
241 together. A variety of methods have been used to display study results including tables, although  
242 graphic displays are more often helpful. It is increasingly common to use forest plots to display  
243 each study result on a common vertical axis, giving results (absolute effect versus placebo or  
244 hazard ratio) measured on the X axis. These plots can show p-values. To aid in the  
245 interpretation of point estimates, confidence intervals for treatment effects also should be given.  
246 If differences in change from baseline are shown for placebo and test drugs, the baseline values  
247 and the magnitude of effect in all treatment groups, including placebo and active controls (if  
248 used), generally should be presented in the table or in text accompanying a figure.

249

250 If there are important differences in outcome among studies of generally similar design, these  
251 differences should be displayed and an attempt should be made to explain why results were  
252 different, even though doing this can be difficult. Factors such as differences in subjects (disease  
253 definition, disease stage, severity, prior treatment, genetic differences among populations), drug  
254 dose or regimen, methods of observation, adherence to protocol or inadequate power (high beta  
255 error rate) may offer such an explanation and should be considered. Often such analyses will  
256 raise questions for future exploration rather than provide definitive answers.

257

## ***Contains Nonbinding Recommendations***

*Draft — Not for Implementation*

258 Studies may exist that can serve as *bridging studies* intended to allow reliance on studies  
259 conducted outside the United States by showing that the clinical effect can be demonstrated in a  
260 U.S. population (see the ICH guidance for industry *E5 Ethnic Factors in the Acceptability of*  
261 *Foreign Clinical Data*). These studies should be particularly noted in this section. There also  
262 should be an analysis of the similarity of efficacy for subjects in different regions either study by  
263 study, subsets of studies, or pooled analyses. Any other information that may support  
264 extrapolation of the efficacy data to the new region also should be provided.

### 3. *Analysis Issues*

266  
267  
268 Support for the proposed claim should be described in terms of the strength of statistical  
269 evidence (including consistency of findings, individual study strength, p-value, and confidence  
270 interval) and findings that appear to weaken the actual claim. The applicant should include a  
271 summary and discussion of the analyses of each individual study, the extent of evidence in  
272 support of claims, statistical issues that may affect the conclusion on efficacy, and any related  
273 comments. Statistical issues should be summarized study by study, as well as collectively, for all  
274 studies conducted. Resolution of these issues and any effect on overall efficacy assessment  
275 should be discussed.

276  
277 The following are examples of important statistical issues that may affect the results:

- 278
- 279 • Breaking the blind
- 280 • Unblinded or unplanned interim analyses
- 281 • High percentage of dropouts
- 282 • Inappropriate methods of imputation for missing values
- 283 • Change of primary endpoints during conduct of trial
- 284 • Dropping or adding treatment arms
- 285 • Sample size modification
- 286 • Adaptations to the design not planned in advance
- 287 • Inconsistency of results across subgroups
- 288 • Type I error inflation caused by multiplicity
- 289

### 4. *Integrated Data Analyses*

290  
291  
292 For the purposes of this guidance, the term *integrated analysis* refers to synthesizing the results  
293 of individual studies in an appropriate manner to collectively provide support for the claimed  
294 effectiveness of the study drug. Statistical literature formally uses the term *meta-analysis*, which  
295 was defined by Gene V. Glass as “the statistical analysis of a large collection of analysis results  
296 from individual studies for the purpose of integrating findings.”<sup>7</sup> Examples of related terms used  
297 in literature include: analysis of combined data, combined analysis, analysis of pooled data, and  
298 pooled analysis. No matter what term is used, the objective is to use appropriately sound  
299 methods when formulating an integrated analysis.

300

---

<sup>7</sup> Glass, GV, 1976, Primary, Secondary and Meta-Analysis of Research, Educational Researcher, 5(10):3-8.

## ***Contains Nonbinding Recommendations***

*Draft — Not for Implementation*

301 As a general rule, when individual studies fail to show effectiveness on the basis of their planned  
302 analyses, a meta-analysis will not provide persuasive evidence of effectiveness. The decision to  
303 pool data usually is made after the fact and is potentially biased. In some cases, however, meta-  
304 analyses involving the entire study populations can provide useful information in an efficacy  
305 evaluation. Interpretability of meta-analyses depends upon the ability to minimize biases during  
306 the selection of studies for the analyses. Careful prospective planning is necessary to reduce  
307 these selection biases.

308  
309 Meta-analyses or pooled analyses of clinical trials can provide useful information in a number of  
310 cases including:

- 311
- 312 • When examining various patient subgroups, such as those based on demographics,<sup>8</sup>  
313 etiology or severity of disease, or geographical regions, where individual studies might be  
314 expected to lack power.
  - 315
  - 316 • When assessing the dose-response relationship, especially if individual studies were  
317 conducted using different doses, and particularly in demographic subgroups.
  - 318
  - 319 • When assessing the drug effects on a secondary endpoint or on a component of a  
320 composite endpoint.
- 321

322 It is particularly important to plan such analyses in study protocols. For example, a mortality  
323 effect can be a planned pooled analysis of two studies using a composite outcome measure for  
324 each study. Pooled analyses also can be useful in evaluating time to effect and response rates  
325 (where the primary endpoint is a continuous variable).

326  
327 Such results also can be used to design future trials including trials used to satisfy phase 4  
328 commitments.

329  
330 If a pooled analysis (or meta-analysis) of the clinical studies is performed, it should be clearly  
331 stated in the ISE whether this analysis was performed according to a predefined protocol or was  
332 a *post hoc* exercise. To avoid producing potentially biased results, decisions on how data will be  
333 analyzed should be done prospectively, before the results are known. It also should be clear  
334 whether including or excluding studies based on their observed outcomes will introduce bias.

335  
336 Any differences in trial designs or populations, or in efficacy measurements, between studies  
337 should be described to allow an appropriate assessment of the relevance and validity of the  
338 results and conclusions (see ICH E9). A detailed description of the methodology and results of  
339 the meta-analysis should be provided.

340  
341 It is important that the analysis avoid pooling studies with drastic heterogeneity, and it is also  
342 important to maintain the randomization procedure. Therefore, studies having different  
343 allocation ratios generally should not be lumped together and analyzed as a single study.

344

---

<sup>8</sup> Demographic analyses are required under 21 CFR 314.50 and are expected to be reported in labeling.

## ***Contains Nonbinding Recommendations***

*Draft — Not for Implementation*

345 In summary, the points to consider with respect to meta-analyses are as follows:  
346

- 347 • A meta-analysis without positive individual studies is not likely to be accepted as support  
348 for a claim unless a pooled analysis is specified as the primary endpoint.  
349
- 350 • The measures and/or endpoints used in pooled or meta-analysis, such as survival, effects  
351 on less common endpoints, and dose response, should be specified and justified.  
352
- 353 • Heterogeneity of the measure across trials should be considered and summarized.  
354
- 355 • Measure and effect of the weight or influence of each study on the overall estimate of the  
356 measures should be given.  
357
- 358 • The effect of varying trial durations, possibly including nonconstant hazard functions,  
359 should be considered. How duration is considered is critical to understanding therapies  
360 used in chronic diseases.  
361

### **D. Comparison of Results in Subpopulations**

362 The results of individual studies or overview analyses of efficacy in specific populations should  
363 be summarized in this section. The purpose of these comparisons is to evaluate the observed  
364 treatment effect across all studies and to show whether the claimed treatment effects observed  
365 are not drastically inconsistent across all relevant subpopulations, especially those populations  
366 where there are special reasons for concern.  
367

368 The comparisons can highlight apparent variations in efficacy that call for further investigation  
369 and discussion. However, the limitations of such analyses should be recognized (see ICH E9),  
370 and it is important to note that their purpose is not to provide the basis for specific claims or to  
371 attempt to improve the evidence of efficacy in situations where the individual study results are  
372 disappointing.  
373

374 Given the limited sample sizes in individual studies, pooled analyses across multiple studies  
375 should be performed to evaluate effects of major demographic factors (e.g., age, sex, and race)  
376 and of other predefined or relevant intrinsic and extrinsic factors (e.g., disease severity, prior  
377 treatment, concomitant illness, concomitant drugs, alcohol, tobacco, body weight, renal or  
378 hepatic functional impairment) on efficacy. This analysis should be stratified and weighted by  
379 study size to minimize the chance of confounding caused by inherent differences in design  
380 specifications including baseline characteristics of the patient populations and use of  
381 concomitant medications across the studies to be pooled. Regional differences may need to be  
382 evaluated in multinational studies.  
383

384 Factors of special interest can arise from general concerns (e.g., regarding the use of drugs in the  
385 elderly) or from specific issues that are related to the pharmacology of the drug or that have  
386 arisen during earlier drug development. If the application is being submitted for a new active  
387 ingredient, new indication, new dosage form, new dosing regimen, or new route of  
388 administration, the Pediatric Research Equity Act of 2007 (21 U.S.C. 355c) requires that the  
389  
390

## ***Contains Nonbinding Recommendations***

*Draft — Not for Implementation*

391 safety and efficacy of the drug be assessed in all relevant pediatric populations. A deferral  
392 and/or waiver of the pediatric study requirements may be appropriate in some cases, and  
393 pediatric studies do not necessarily need to be conducted before seeking approval of a drug for  
394 use in adults.

395  
396 The comparison of results should be displayed using tables or figures/plots and should refer to  
397 the number of exposed subjects in the major subsets (e.g., age, race, sex). The examination of  
398 subsets need not routinely involve formal inferential statistical analysis.

399  
400 Of interest are differences of clinically meaningful size. If these differences are not observed,  
401 there may be minor differences that reflect the fact that multiple subsets have been analyzed.  
402 These minor differences should be described although they need not be analyzed further. If a  
403 tendency toward a difference in the pooled analysis is seen, it also may be useful to look at  
404 study-by-study results. Differences that are consistently large across studies may generate a  
405 hypothesis for further study.

406  
407 There might be cases in which formal inferential statistical analysis for specific subgroups may  
408 be needed to provide useful information in the drug label. For instance, the treatment effect may  
409 be most attributed to a specific subgroup. For such a labeling purpose, the integrated analysis  
410 should follow the clinical trial principle and statistical principle. The following issues that merit  
411 statistical consideration include:

- 412
- 413 • Whether or not the treatment effect in the overall population is conclusive
  - 414 • Whether the integrated analysis is pre-planned
  - 415 • Whether the studies pooled are drastically different with respect to patient population,  
416 dosage and study duration, pattern of missing values, among others
  - 417 • How each individual study is weighted in the integrated analysis (usually it should be  
418 weighted by the study size)
  - 419 • Whether proper multiple comparison adjustments are made for testing the multiple  
420 hypotheses (e.g., primary versus secondary endpoints) in the integrated analysis
  - 421 • Whether the pooled study is acceptable as one randomized clinical study equivalent
  - 422 • Whether the results of the integrated analysis are reproducible, if this analysis is  
423 acceptable for generating one-study worth evidence
- 424

425 For many NDA or BLA submissions, a well-constructed presentation of the results of several  
426 individual studies should be adequate to summarize the effectiveness results. Even in this case,  
427 however, a combined analysis usually will be needed to look at effects in demographic subsets  
428 and other subsets of the overall population. Interpretability of such a combined analysis rests  
429 upon careful prospective planning before commencement of the combination process. Careful  
430 prospective planning is needed to reduce the biases resulting from the combination process that  
431 is influenced by examination of study results.

### 432 433 **E. Analysis of Clinical Information Relevant to Dosing Recommendations**

434  
435 This section should provide an integrated summary and analysis of all data, including data from  
436 individual dose-response clinical studies, relevant pooled analyses, and clinical pharmacological

## ***Contains Nonbinding Recommendations***

*Draft — Not for Implementation*

437 studies, that pertain to the dose-response or blood level-response relationships of effectiveness  
438 (including dose-blood level relationships). These data contribute importantly to dosing  
439 recommendations, including the choice of dose interval. The individual study results and any  
440 cross-study analyses that will be used to support the dosing recommendations (including the  
441 recommended starting and maximal doses, the method of dose titration, schedule, and any other  
442 instructions regarding individualization of dosage) should be summarized here. These results  
443 and analyses should include descriptions of relatively simple dose-response or blood level-  
444 response relationships as well as any identified deviations caused by nonlinearity of  
445 pharmacokinetics, delayed effects, tolerance, or enzyme induction. Limitations of the data (e.g.,  
446 because titration designs were used instead of fixed-dose designs) should be candidly assessed.  
447

448 Any evidence of differences in dose-response relationships that result from a subject's age, sex,  
449 race, disease, or other factors should be described. Any evidence of different pharmacokinetic or  
450 pharmacodynamic responses also should be discussed, or discussions in section 2.7.2, Summary  
451 of Clinical Pharmacology Studies, CTD Module 2, can be cross-referenced. The ways in which  
452 such differences were looked for, even if no differences were found, should be described (e.g.,  
453 specific studies in subpopulations, analysis of efficacy results by subgroup, or blood level  
454 determinations of the test drug).  
455

### **F. Persistence of Efficacy and/or Tolerance Effects**

456  
457  
458 Assessments of treatment response over time can be of interest. For example, is the persistence  
459 of efficacy over a time interval erratic or fairly consistent and how does the response over time  
460 relate to the dose? Therapeutic effects of a treatment can decline over time because of  
461 tolerability issues (patients who experience adverse events and refuse treatment) or from the  
462 development of drug resistance or tolerance. In such cases, all available information on  
463 persistence of efficacy over time should be summarized. The number of subjects for whom long-  
464 term efficacy data are available, the dose, duration of exposure, and the reason for censoring  
465 should be provided. Any evidence of tolerance (loss of therapeutic effects over time) should be  
466 noted. Examination of any apparent relationships between dose changes over time and long-term  
467 efficacy can be useful.  
468

469 The primary focus should be on controlled studies specifically designed to collect efficacy data.  
470 These studies should be clearly differentiated from other, less rigorous studies, such as open  
471 extension studies. This distinction also applies to specific studies designed for evaluation of  
472 tolerance and withdrawal effects. Data concerning withdrawal or rebound effects pertinent to  
473 drug safety should be presented in the appropriate safety sections. Extension studies that enroll  
474 subjects who leave the controlled studies can provide valuable information and can permit true  
475 intent-to-treat analysis. Such analyses provide important information about the sensitivity of the  
476 analysis, especially for mortality or irreversible morbidity.  
477

### **G. Exploratory Investigations**

478  
479  
480 Results of exploratory analyses on nonspecified endpoints, patient subgroups, and pooled data  
481 can be reported. However, if such exploration was not prospectively defined, it will not meet the  
482 regulatory criteria for adequate and well-controlled clinical study, and, therefore, cannot be used  
483 as substantial evidence of efficacy (21 CFR 314.126). Nevertheless, these analyses can lead to

***Contains Nonbinding Recommendations***

*Draft — Not for Implementation*

484 proposals for additional studies and in some cases in which the analyses refine evidence of  
485 effectiveness that has already been established (e.g., demographic subset analyses), they can  
486 provide useful labeling information as well.  
487

488

489 **IV. TABLES AND FIGURES**

490

491 Tables and figures should be embedded in the text when they enhance understanding of the  
492 document. Lengthy tables can be placed in the appendix at the end of the section. For eCTDs,  
493 hyperlinks to tables can be provided within the body of the ISE.  
494

495

496 Tables should identify all studies pertinent to the evaluation of efficacy (including studies that  
497 were terminated or are not yet completed, studies that failed to show effectiveness for any  
498 reason, studies available as publications only, studies reported in full technical reports (ICH E3),  
499 and studies described in abbreviated reports) and should provide the most important results of  
500 those studies. However, it should be noted that unplanned interim analyses on ongoing studies  
501 generally are not needed and are not encouraged. When more than one ISE is provided for an  
502 application with more than one indication, usually each section should have its own appendix  
503 with tables.

503

***Contains Nonbinding Recommendations***

*Draft — Not for Implementation*

**REFERENCES**

- 504  
505  
506 Guidance for industry *Providing Clinical Evidence of Effectiveness for Human Drug and*  
507 *Biological Products*  
508  
509 ICH guidance for industry *E3 Structure and Content of Clinical Study Reports*  
510  
511 ICH guidance for industry *E5 Ethnic Factors in the Acceptability of Foreign Clinical Data*  
512  
513 ICH guidance for industry *E9 Statistical Principles for Clinical Trials*  
514  
515 ICH guidance for industry *E10 Choice of Control Group and Related Issues in Clinical Trials*  
516  
517 ICH guidance for industry *M4E The CTD — Efficacy, Section 2.7.3, Summary of Clinical*  
518 *Efficacy*  
519  
520 MAPP 4000.8 BLA *Biostatistics Biologics Licensing Application Template*  
521  
522 MAPP 4000.8 NDA *Biostatistics New Drug Application Review Template*  
523  
524 MAPP 6010.3 *Clinical Review Template, Attachment A, Section 6, Integrated Review of*  
525 *Efficacy*  
526