Lessons Learned from Completed TB Trials and Implications for Future Trials
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New TB Drugs

Development of Regimens

Adapted from Ma Z et al. Lancet 2010
Approaches to trial design

• Classical path in DS TB
• Accelerated approval in MDR-TB
• The combination development path
• Unified path in DS and MDR-TB
• Uncontrolled trials
Classical path in Drug Susceptible TB: ReMox, OFLOTUB & Rifaquin

- Single drug substitution in EHRZ control regimen
  - moxifloxacin for isoniazid or ethambutol
  - gatifloxacin for ethambutol

- Non-inferiority design

- Margin determined by limit of what could be expected to be achieved using reduced duration of control regimen

- Delta was set at 6% - "reflect[ing] consultation with clinicians in high-burden countries and re-analysis of previous trials showing the effect of shortening treatment to 4 months without substituting a new drug.” (Gillespie et al, NEJM, 2014)
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**Figure:** Quinolone-containing regimens compared with standard treatment for tuberculosis

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Trial regimen</th>
<th>Treatment duration</th>
<th>2 month culture negativity (%)</th>
<th>Relapse rates (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2EHRZ/6HE (Study A)</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2EHRZ/4HR (Study A)</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2EHRZ/4HR (RIFAQUIN)</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2EMRZ/4P1M1 (RIFAQUIN)</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2EMRZ/2P2M2 (RIFAQUIN)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2EHRZ/4HR (OFLOTUB)</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2GHRZ /2GRH (OFLOTUB)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2EHRZ/4HR (REMOX)</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2MHRZ/2MHR (REMOX)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2EMRZ/2MR (REMOX)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Re-analysis of Fluoroquinolone Clinical Trials (TB-ReFLECT) - Main findings

- Integrative analysis of 3 fluoroquinolone phase III TB clinical trials – N=3,039
- Failures both in Standard of care and Test arms were mostly associated with insufficient drug (rifampicin) levels (adherence)
- Longer duration of treatment beneficial
- Culture based predictors:
  - 4 month > 2 month
- Baseline covariates:
  - "Hard to Treat" patients with a higher risk of unfavorable outcome: HIV+, older, underweight, high initial smear, cavity at CXR.
- Evidence that different patient groups require different treatment duration
  - Concept of “one duration for all” needs re-examination
  - More aggressive regimens for 'hard-to-treat' patient categories

R Savic, Union conference, Liverpool, 2016
Accelerated/conditional approval in MDR-TB

- Comparison of \textbf{bedaquiline} + BR (background regimen) \textit{vs.} placebo + BR in patients with MDR-TB

\textit{Diacon et al, NEJM, 2014}

- Provisional approval from FDA obtained in December 2012 based on significant improvement in time to culture negativity

- Comparison of two different doses of \textbf{delamanid} \textit{vs.} placebo in addition to an optimized BR based on WHO recommendations

\textit{Gler et al, NEJM, 2012}
But ....

• While these two studies provided important information about the safety and efficacy of two new drugs, they did not provide any information about the best way these drugs could be used within a regimen.
• A series of new trials being funded to assess these and other drugs in different combinations
Combination development pathway for the treatment of TB

SAD: Single ascending dose; MAD: Multiple ascending dose; DDI: Drug-drug interaction; ADME: Absorption, Distribution, Metabolism, and Excretion; EBA: Early Bactericidal Activity; SSCC: Serial Sputum Colony Count; Combo: combination
Unified Path in Drug Sensitive/Drug Resistant Regimen Development

**Stage**

**Pre clinical**
- Mouse Model
  - Single drug
  - Combo in regimen
  - Relapse free sterilizing activity

- **Healthy Subjects**
  - Single and repeat dose
  - Safety, tolerability
  - PK
  - Drug Interactions

- **Monotherapy 2-Week EBA**
  - Single drug
  - Dose ranging
  - DS patients only

- **Combination/Regimen EBA**
  - Optimized dose Regimen
  - Test final regimen
  - DS patients only?

- **Regimen 2-Month Study**
  - DS and DR sensitive to regimen
  - DS vs HRZE standard
  - DR for consistency

**Phase 3**

- **Registration**
  - 2 to 4 month treatment, eg
  - DS vs HRZE for non-inferiority
  - DR for consistency

---

**Go/No-Go Criteria:**
- PK to support daily dosing
- Clear effect to reduce CFU count
- As good as HRZE standard
- Better Than HRZE

---

**TB ALLIANCE**
Unified path in DS and MDR-TB: 8 week SSCC Study of B-Pa-Z-M (NC005)

- Patients with newly diagnosed DS- or MDR-TB, sensitive to moxifloxacin
  - **DS:** randomised comparison of bedaquiline, pretonamid & pyrazinamide vs. EHRZ
  - **MDR-TB:** uncontrolled, same drugs plus moxifloxacin

- Phase II results in MDR-TB cohort suggested that there was evidence of substantial additional benefit from addition of moxifloxacin – an indirect comparison

- Next step? A phase III using four drug MDR-TB regimen?
Efficacy endpoints

Quantitative basis of efficacy endpoints

* Treatment failure may occur with or without development of new resistance

Davies G. 2017

GLOBAL TB PROGRAMME

END TB
Phase II studies

N=37,173  67 drugs/combinations

133 trials with Phase IIA/B Outcomes

96 Phase III trials with intermediate outcomes

EBA_{0.2} and 8w CC most commonly reported endpoints

Inconsistent reporting of other EBA endpoints (EBA_{0.7}, EBA_{0.14}) and alternative approaches

Only 3 regimens with EBA over >2 days and 8w CC data

Davies G.
2017
Effects of replacing ethambutol with moxi- or gatifloxacin in the first-line therapy of TB

OFLOTUB Phase II-SSCC Study

Brazil/JHU Orphan Drug Study


Conde et al., Lancet 2009,373:1183-9
Analysis of culture results as surrogate endpoints across all trials.

15 BMRC trials 6974 participants 37 treatment comparisons

Phillips, PLoS ONE 2013
Longitudinal endpoints

- Independent of sampling time-points
- No need for future ad hoc re-evaluation
- Unrestricted scale of measurement
- Greater statistical power
- Well-adapted to cumulative meta-analysis
- Little trial level evaluation due to design and reporting
**Time-to-event endpoints**

Boeree MJ, Hoelscher M  
CROI 2015 Abstract 95 LB

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Control</th>
<th>Q</th>
<th>20RQ</th>
<th>20RM</th>
<th>35R</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Included in analysis</strong></td>
<td>123</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Median time</strong></td>
<td>62 days</td>
<td>63 days</td>
<td>66 days</td>
<td>55 days</td>
<td>48 days</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Adj. HR¹ (95% CI)</strong></td>
<td>0.85 (0.57 - 1.27)</td>
<td>0.76 (0.50 - 1.17)</td>
<td>1.42 (0.98 - 2.05)</td>
<td>1.78 (1.22 - 2.58)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>p</strong></td>
<td>0.42</td>
<td>0.21</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>0.003</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Need for real-time assessment of efficacy in TB regimen development trials

Major issue:

• Lack of direct readout of response (amount of TB organisms killed) severely limits the measure of treatment effect

• Lack of a predictive quantitative relationship between Phase 2 readout (organisms killed) and Phase 3 readout (cure)

  \[\text{\(\rightarrow\)}\,\text{unclear how to translate culture conversion outcomes}\]

• Need for new biomarkers for quantitative measurement of bacterial load in sputum
Multi-Arm Multi-Stage (MAMS) Phase II/III

- Multi-arm phase II/III trials, originally developed in oncology, with planned interim analyses
- The final analysis is done on the definitive endpoint
- Usual Phase III bacteriological endpoint of failure or relapse
- An intermediate endpoint used to compare each experimental arm with the common control at interim analyses
- Arms dropped if insufficient evidence of benefit using pre-specified critical values or hurdles
MAMS in TB

- Feasibility of MAMS design in TB demonstrated (Panacea trial)
- Arms without evidence of sufficient efficacy dropped early thereby reducing the sample size
- Slight risk of dropping an effective regimen

*But...*

- Logistically challenging
- Culture results slow and not a good predictor
- Need for better and real time biomarkers measured earlier in treatment
- Would limited data on relapse assist our decision making process?
Accelerating development: Phase IIC STEP design

- Studying the intended duration in Phase II
- Generating richer data prior for more informed Phase III go/no-go decision making
- Richer data for accelerated/conditional approval?
Accelerating development: Phase IIC

**STEP design**

- Sample size similar to Phase IIb study
- Novel regimen(s) given for intended duration, 3 or 4 months
- Patients followed for 12 months post randomisation
- Composite failure/relapse endpoint data collected
• Trials of new treatments for Ebola:
  • “When conventional care means such a high probability of death [70%], it is problematic to insist on randomising patients to it when the intervention arm holds out at least the possibility of benefit. Ethical arguments are not the same for all levels of risk.”
  • “Equipoise is a useful principle, but it can break down when conventional care offers little benefit and mortality is extremely high.”

Nix-TB Trial in XDR-TB

Patients with XDR-TB or Who Have Failed MDR-TB Treatment

- Pretomanid 200 mg
- Bedaquiline 200 mg tiw after 2 week load
- Linezolid 1200 mg qd*

Follow up for relapse-free cure over 24 months

6 months of treatment

Additional 3 months if sputum culture positive at 4 months

*XAmended from 600 mg bid strategy

Sites: Sizwe and Brooklyn Chest, South Africa
Particular considerations for uncontrolled confirmatory trials

• Do the arguments for uncontrolled trials apply in XDR-TB? MDR-TB? DS-TB?

• How comparable is the trial patient population with that of the historical control?

• Historical case fatality rates are irrelevant if current study patients receive better supportive care - are there other appropriate historical controls?

• What would be the efficacy of the standard of care if given with “study’s level of supportive care”?
Developing TPPs for TB Treatment: starting with the goal in mind...

- **Objective**
  To align the targets and specifications that developers should meet for the performance of new TB treatment regimens with the needs of end-users.

- **Target audience**
  Pharmaceutical industry, research institutions, product development partnerships, donors, NGOs and CSOs.

http://www.who.int/tb/areas-of-work/treatment/new_drugs/en/
Target Regimen Profiles for TB Treatment

• Three Target Regimen Profiles:
  – Rifampicin-susceptible
  – Rifampicin-resistant
  – Pan-TB regimen

• All Target Regimen Profiles explicitly describe:
  o *clinical indication* of the treatment (e.g. DS-TB; DR-TB; all forms of TB)
  o *critical endpoints* to be obtained and their measurement (e.g. non relapsing
cure within 2/4/6/9 months of starting treatment)
  o *target population* (children, adults, PLHIV, ...)
  o *treatment characteristics*: e.g.. expected duration; frequency and route of
administration (e.g. daily, fully oral); formulation (dispersible tabs; FDCs;...)
  o likely set of users.

http://www.who.int/tb/areas-of-work/treatment/new_drugs/en/
Lessons learnt:

1- Treatment implications

• Most impactful intervention is ensuring adequate dosing and adherence to treatment
• Importance of rifamycins as backbone of shortened therapy re-emphasized
  • Role of high dose?
• Patients with high bacterial burdens and experiencing slow decline in bacterial burdens over the initial 4–8 weeks of treatment constitute a subset most likely to relapse.
  • Evidence that different patient groups may require different treatment duration
  • 'Hard to treat patients' to be considered as specific population for longer treatment duration and/or higher doses?
  • Specific drug combination?
• Implications for Phase 2/3 trials: need for initial patient stratification?
• Ensure appropriate representation to allow robust subgroup analysis.
Lessons learnt:

2 - Design of future regimens

• An increasing number of potential regimens are being assessed - need to be able to review multiple regimens together

• Culture conversion limited value for predicting long term outcome - high need of quantitative assays of bacterial burden over time

• Alternative designs enable more rapid differentiation between multiple candidate regimens but logistical constraints remain

• Uncontrolled studies may have a place early in development

• Choice of the non-inferiority margin needs careful consideration, as does the risk of bio-creep
Lessons learnt:

2 - Design of future regimens (contd)

• PK/PD analyses are critical
  • using drug exposure to understand intermediate endpoints in addition to dose selection is key
  • examining the relation between dose and treatment duration for efficacy endpoints

• PK/PD data should be incorporated to build integrative PK/PD models that could reveal further opportunities for regimen optimization (incl. safety) and improve trial design.
Lessons learnt:

3. Standardization of trial data collection

• Consistency in collecting clinical data across the trials is needed to expedite integrated learning

• Culture results are relevant risk factors, but not capable of predicting individual relapse

• Definition of Phase III clinical trial endpoint should be at minimum recurrence/relapse

• MITT and PP definition need re-examination (impact of adherence)

• Incorporation of PK data and detailed adherence histories

• C-DISC

• Safety data key
WHO needs for Guideline development

• WHO guidelines based on best available evidence
  o GRADE approach for evidence assessment across questions and outcomes
  o Criteria for moving from evidence to recommendations

• Main aspect: what is the best available evidence that can be brought about that ultimately benefits patients?

• Need for clearly and rationally justified approaches (choice of drug combination, design, conduct, end-points, analyses);

• Based on the premise that TB drug R&D focus is shifting towards developing and testing TB regimens (rather than individual drugs), a set of targets is proposed, for three types of indications: RS-TB, RR-TB and Pan-TB;

• Need to further strengthen dialogue between regulators and policy-makers
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