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Outline

• Need for Efficient Drug Development
• Challenge of Cardiovascular Toxicity in Drug Development
• Promise and Challenge of Using Non-Clinical Models to Replace Clinical Testing
Central Messages

• Needed optimization of drug development requires:
  – Broad stakeholder interaction between regulators, academics and industry
  – Ongoing willingness to test our current testing paradigms and look for more efficient approaches without lowering our standards for safety
  – Non-clinical cardiovascular safety testing is an important and promising area of focus for FDA
Challenge of Efficient Drug Development
Data as of 6/30/2014

† Multiple applications pertaining to a single new molecular/biologic entity (e.g. single ingredient and combinations) are only counted once. Therefore, the numbers represented here for CY14 filings are not indicative of workload in the PDUFA V Program.

† Original BLAs that do not contain a new active ingredient are excluded

* Since applications are received and filed throughout a calendar year, the filed applications in a given calendar year do not necessarily correspond to an approval in the same calendar year. Certain applications are within their 60-day filing review period and may not be filed upon completion of the review.
Challenge of Cardiac Toxicity in Drug Development
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reason</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Reason</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Worldwide withdrawal</td>
<td></td>
<td>US Withdrawal</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(121 compounds)</td>
<td></td>
<td>(95 compounds)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hepatotoxicity</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>Cardiovascular safety</td>
<td>19 (12)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(proarrhythmia)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hematologic toxicity</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Neuropsychiatric effects</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cardiovascular safety</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>Hepatotoxicity</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dermatologic effects</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Bone marrow toxicity</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carcinogenicity</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Allergic reactions</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Challenge: Identifying Common CV Toxicities

QT-Interval Prolongation and Torsade de Pointes (TdP)
Drugs Removed From Market for Arrhythmia Risk

- Encainide (Enkaid®)  1991 (1986)*
- Terfenadine (Seldane®)  1998 (1985)
- Astemizole (Hismanal®)  1999 (1988)
- Grepafloxacin (Raxar®)  1999 (1997)
- Cisapride (Propulsid®)  2000 (1993)
- Levomethadyl (Orlaam®)  2003 (1993)

* year of removal (year of approval)
Responses to Drug-induced TdP

- **Regulatory**
  - ICH S7B, E14 guidances
  - FDA QT interdisciplinary review team

- **Technical**
  - HL7 ECG data standard
  - ECG Warehouse

- **Community & Research**
  - Specialized QT study vendors
  - ECG Metrics Consortium
  - Cardiac Safety Research Consortium
Direct costs

• Since 2005
  – Around 300 Through QT (‘TQT’) studies reported to FDA
  – Estimated 450 TQT studies performed
  – Estimated cost per study is few million dollars

• Total of ~$1B over 9 years
Impact

• No new drug withdrawals
  – Decline in TdP as a reported adverse event

• Negative impact on drug development?

All drugs
Excluding anti-arrhythmic
Challenge: Identifying Common CV Toxicities

Other Unanticipated CV Toxicities
Other Reported Drug-Induced Cardiovascular Toxicity

• Tyrosine Kinase Inhibitor* cardio-toxicity:
  – Reduced myocardial contractility, CHF
  – Hypertension
  – QT prolongation

• Antibody pro-thrombotic effects
  – Bevacizimab, Ponatinib

*--imatinib mesylate, dasatinib, nilotinib, sunitinib, sorafenib and lapatinib
Challenge: Efficient Development

• Identify safety signals early and accurately wherever possible
• Monitor for unanticipated or incompletely characterized cardiovascular toxicities after approval
• Additional important goal: reduce, replace and refine use of animals
Meeting These Challenges: Role of Non-Clinical Testing
Goals of Nonclinical Test Development

• One goal is to replace clinical testing
  – When that’s not possible, non-clinical testing has a role in understanding mechanisms, reducing clinical testing and mitigating toxicities

• Efficient use of animal resources is a separate important goal: can we be smarter about collecting nonclinical data?
  • e.g., collection of parts of S7a/b as a part of other non-clinical studies
QT as an Example: Changing the Paradigm

• E14 and S7B have allowed us to avoid additional drug withdrawals
  – Clinical testing paradigm (TQT studies) carries additional cost in $$ and time

• Question to be addressed: can improved science provide alternative to TQT?
Reasons for Optimism

• Basis for TdP is mechanistically well-understood and testable

• Technology exists to be able to test drug effects on isolated channels using high-throughput technology that is reasonably available

• Computational techniques exist to analyze data and model effects on proarrhythmic risk

• Group has committed resources and time to testing a new assay system to try to assess clinical CV risk using comprehensive in vitro test system
Challenges in Applying this Model in Other Areas of CV Safety

• Identification of appropriate model
  – Off-target toxicities frequently not well-understood mechanistically (e.g., TKI inhibitors)
  – Models vary in their test characteristics in ways that are sometimes hard to predict (e.g., dog versus primate)

• Rigorous assessment of predictive power of model and testing strategy necessary
  – Assay sensitivity (e.g., telemeterized animals vs cageside observations for CV effects)
Challenges in Applying this Model in Other Areas of CV Safety (cont)

• Toxicities that emerge with chronic exposure challenging to identify in short-term and in vitro models

• Need to identify and use tests that enhance and not impede drug development
  – Consider unintended consequences of new, including new ‘add-on’ testing
Summary

• Non-clinical testing to identify cardiovascular toxicity is important in drug development:
  – Identifying the toxicity early allows the sponsor to develop ways to prevent or mitigate a toxicity, or abandon a compound early
  – Characterizing toxicities identified late in development or during postmarketing
  – Replacing, refining or reducing human (animal) testing

• Ongoing work to replace clinical testing with in vitro testing for QT interval prolongation provides a possible pathway for other cardiovascular toxicities
  – Collaboration of willing and interested groups is essential

• We have a shared goal of developing efficient testing methods and strategies using non-clinical testing methods to further needed drug development