

(File Attachment comment)

From: Morris, Nevitt

To: jennifer.wellman@sparktx.com

Cc: Morris, Nevitt; jim.wang@sparktx.com

Subject: BLA 125610 Information Request 7/27/17

Date: Thursday, July 27, 2017 9:42:13 AM

Attachments: image001.png

Hi Jennifer and Jim:

Please provide responses to the following Information Request, dated 7/27/17, by the end of next week, August 4, 2017. If more time is needed, please let us know.

Information Request:

1.

In your clinical report for the primary efficacy endpoint (Study 301), you state that the mean (SD) bilateral MLMT change score at Year 1 was 1.8 (1.1) for the Intervention

group and 0.2 (1.0) for the Control group, resulting in a mean group difference of

1.6. The mean group difference of 1.6 measures the absolute difference between

the mean value in two different groups. This measure only provides an idea of how

much difference there is between the averages of the MLMT scores of the experimental group and control groups. The "mean difference" (taking the difference

between each pair of scores for each subject, and then taking the mean of all those

differences) for the intervention group and the control should be calculated. We

believe that the mean of the changes for each group (intervention vs. controlled), and

not difference of the averages of the scores, will provide more meaningful

information regarding the efficacy of study subjects on the MLMT. Please provide an

analysis of the MLMT scores for the intervention and control groups that presents the

mean score differences at the 95% confidence intervals. Additionally, please perform

this analysis for the right eye, left eye and both eyes.

2.

Please stratify results of the final MLMT scores for each subject by age groupings and

by disease diagnoses (grouped) showing those who improved with treatment, remained the same with treatment, or worsened with treatment. This may be helpful

in identifying which subjects with inherited retinal diseases benefit most from the

treatment and can be used to establish appropriate labeling for patient population identification.

3.

Please perform a correlation analysis of the final MLMT Scores in comparison to the Full-field light sensitivity threshold (FST) and Visual Acuity outcomes stratified by age groupings to establish whether or not there is an association between the psychophysical outcome measures and the functional vision performance achieved by the study subjects. We recommend a regression analysis and suggest a presentation

as in the following table:

Correlation

Analysis

of

Final

MLMT

Scores

to

Psychophysical

Testing

By

Regression

Analyses

(Unsigned signature field (Click to sign)) Signature field is unsigned

Final FST Visual

MLMT Acuity

Score

= 10

years

of
age age
>10
years
of
age

4.

Your study results report a large proportion of subjects as improved over baseline

relative to the scoring method you devised to demonstrate efficacy of voretigene

neparvovec;AAV2-hRPE65v2. We believe that it is important to understand the

profiles of study subjects who worsened and/or stayed the same after treatment.

Please provide a subanalysis of the subjects who did not improve their MLMT scores

(both accuracy and speed) and those whose scores were worse after treatment as

compared to before treatment. This analysis should include

stratifications by age,

disease, and baseline MLMT scores in tabular form as well as narrative discussion of

these analyses.

5.

Please provide a tabular analysis for each of the three efficacy studies you conducted

by showing the proportion of subjects whose MLMT lux scores improved by stratifying

the lux scores at baseline by the lux scores achieved after treatment across the

assessment time intervals in your approved protocol. This should be done according

to the age strata that you used in your enrollment. We suggest a table such as the

following:

Baseline 1 lux 4 lux 10 lux 50 lux 125 lux 250 lux 400 lux

1 lux N (%) N (%) N (%) N (%) N (%) N (%) N (%) N (%)

4 lux N (%) N (%) N (%) N (%) N (%) N (%) N (%) N (%)

10 lux N (%) N (%) N (%) N (%) N (%) N (%) N (%) N (%)

50 lux N (%) N (%) N (%) N (%) N (%) N (%) N (%) N (%)

125 lux N (%) N (%) N (%) N (%) N (%) N (%) N (%) N (%)

250 lux N (%) N (%) N (%) N (%) N (%) N (%) N (%) N (%)

400 lux N (%) N (%) N (%) N (%) N (%) N (%) N (%) N (%)

Thanks and please acknowledge receipt of this email request once received.

Nevitt

Nevitt
Morris

Nevitt
Morris,
RN,
BSN,
BS
Consumer
Safety
Officer
Office
of
Tissues
and
Advanced
Therapies
Center
for
Biologics
Evaluation
and
Research
(CBER)

U.S.
Food
and
Drug
Administration
Building
71,
Room
4207
10903
New
Hampshire
Avenue
Silver
Spring,
MD 20993
Phone: (240)
402-8269
Fax: (301)
595-1303
Nevitt.Morris@fda.hhs.gov

THIS MESSAGE IS INTENDED ONLY FOR THE USE OF THE PARTY TO WHOM IT IS
ADDRESSED AND MAY
CONTAIN INFORMATION THAT IS PRIVILEGED, CONFIDENTIAL, AND PROTECTED FROM
DISCLOSURE
UNDER LAW. If you are not the addressee, or a person authorized to
deliver the document to the
addressee, you are hereby notified that any review, disclosure,
dissemination, copying, or other action
based on the content of this communication is not authorized. If you have
received this document in
error, please immediately notify the sender immediately by e-mail or
phone.