

FDA Pulmonary-Allergy Drugs Advisory Committee Meeting FDA Introductory Remarks

**New Drug Application (NDA) 202049: Dry powder mannitol (DPM) for
inhalation for the management of cystic fibrosis (CF) to improve
pulmonary function in patients 18 years of age and older in conjunction
with standard therapies**

Robert H. Lim, MD
Division of Pulmonary, Allergy, and
Rheumatology Products
Center for Drug Evaluation and Research
US Food and Drug Administration

Cystic Fibrosis

- Autosomal recessive disorder
 - Mutations in cystic fibrosis transmembrane conductance regulator (CFTR) gene
 - Affects ~30,000 people in U.S.
- Multi-system disease
 - Airway obstruction, infection
 - Exocrine pancreatic insufficiency
 - Gastrointestinal abnormalities
 - Reproductive abnormalities
- Therapies
 - Symptomatic and complications of disease
 - CFTR “modulators” (first approval 2012)
- Remains a need for additional therapies



Dry Powder Mannitol (DPM) for Inhalation

- Sugar alcohol
 - Generally recognized as safe by enteral route
 - Approved as a bronchoprovocation agent by inhaled route (Aridol)
- Proposed indication
 - Management of CF to improve pulmonary function in patients 18 years of age and older in conjunction with standard therapies
- Dose: 400mg (10 capsules) by inhalation twice daily
- Initial NDA submitted May 2012 – Complete Response (CR)
- Current submission – Response to CR

Original NDA Submission

- Single dose-ranging study (202)
- Two 26-week phase 3 studies in CF patients ≥ 6 years
 - Studies 301 and 302
 - Primary endpoint – change from baseline in forced expiratory volume in one second (FEV_1) over 26-weeks
 - Secondary endpoints – included exacerbation and Cystic Fibrosis Questionnaire – Revised respiratory domain (CFQ-RRD) score
 - If a patient discontinued treatment, there were no provisions to continue following the patient



Original NDA Submission - Key Findings

- Efficacy –
 - Study 301 – positive FEV₁ results, but not statistically robust due to significant issues with differential drop-out and missing data.
 - 37% of DPM and 27% of control patients discontinued treatment
 - Study 302 – not statistically significant for primary endpoint
 - No support from secondary endpoints
- Safety –
 - Hemoptysis particularly in pediatric population

Complete Response (CR)

- January 2013 PADAC meeting
 - Unanimously voted against approval
- CR deficiency
 - Efficacy – not adequately demonstrated
 - Safety – hemoptysis safety concern primarily in pediatrics
- To address deficiency
 - Conduct at least one additional clinical trial to show substantial evidence of efficacy and balancing safety findings

Current Submission

- Indication limited to adults
- New 26-week phase 3 study in ≥ 18 years of age (303)
 - Primary endpoint – same as 301 and 302
 - Secondary endpoints – included exacerbation and symptoms
 - Designed to address concerns raised in Studies 301 and 302
 - Limited population to ≥ 18 years due to hemoptysis safety concerns
- *Post-hoc* analyses of ≥ 18 years of age subgroup from Studies 301 and 302
 - *Post-hoc* analyses same issues as in original submission

Efficacy Summary ≥ 18 years

- Change from baseline in FEV₁ over 26-weeks
 - Study 303
 - Statistically significant at approximately 50mL
 - *Post-hoc* analyses of Studies 301 and 302
 - Point estimates of approximately 80mL
- Exacerbation
 - No statistically significant differences
 - Study 303 – favored control (rate)
 - Study 302 – *post-hoc* analysis favored control (rate)
 - Study 301 – *post-hoc* analysis favored DPM (rate)
- CFQ-R respiratory domain score
 - No statistically significant differences

Efficacy Considerations

- Only Study 303 demonstrated clear statistically significant improvements in FEV₁
- Studies 301 and 302 analyses in ≥18 year olds were ***post-hoc***
 - Study 301 FEV1 result not statistically robust
 - Study 302 did not “win” on FEV₁
- FEV₁ effect size modest across studies - Clinically meaningful?
- Clinically important secondary endpoints across all studies not supportive of efficacy

Topics for Discussion

- Efficacy
 - Is there substantial evidence of efficacy in patients ≥ 18 years?
 - FEV₁ effect size modest
 - No secondary endpoint support
 - Statistical persuasiveness
- Safety
 - Exacerbation
 - Hemoptysis



U.S. FOOD & DRUG
ADMINISTRATION