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DIA ADSWG History & Objective

Adaptive Design Working Group (ADWG) started in 2001
- Working in association with PhRMA until 2011
- Transferred to DIA as a Scientific Working Group (SWG) in 2011 and became the ADSWG

Objective: To ensure that ADs are a well understood, accepted, and broadly utilized approach (where and when applied appropriately) in clinical research

ADSWG is organised & run by a dedicated group of volunteers
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To gather information on the perception and use of adaptive designs for clinical development programs in the industry and academia, in order to identify any persistent barriers to implementing such designs and provide recommendations to overcome these challenges.
ADSWG Survey

Questionnaire:
- 10 Adaptive Design (AD) related questions asked to pharma/biotech/academia/NGOs/CROs

Literature and registry reviews:
- Standard list of search items used to identify possible ADs
- Selection of questions asked (similar to those in the questionnaire)

Literature review: 7 scientific journals reviewed for ADs from Jan 2000 to Sep 2011

Registry review: AD trials starting between Jan 1996 and Sep 2011 and published on ClinicalTrials.gov
Questionnaire: Methods

Questionnaire distributed in October 2011

- via email to 92 organisations worldwide: pharma/biotech/academia/NGOs/CROs
- via the October PSI eBulletin

18 participants:

- 11 pharma/biotech
- 1 academic institution
- 6 CROs who propose adaptive trial design services

Results compiled in central DB by Elizabeth Zahn, UIOWA

Compared to results from previous survey (PhRMA ADWG)

- 13 medium to large pharma companies + 3 CROs
- Case studies of ADs designed/conducted from 2003-2008
Questionnaire: Key Limitations

Questionnaire

• Not fully representative
  • Few biotech and academic participants
  • No responses from device companies
  • Difficult for large pharma companies to obtain exhaustive list of ADs considered/implemented worldwide

• Confidentiality impact, especially with regard to disease areas and submission status

• Difficult to compare to results of 2008 AD survey
  • Case studies in 2008 vs summaries per organisation in 2011
  • Only identification of barriers to use of ADs was directly comparable
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Company</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Abbott</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amgen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aptiv Solutions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AstraZeneca</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cardinal Systems</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cytel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eli Lilly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>George Institute</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GSK</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geron</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Icon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iowa University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quintiles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J&amp;J</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Merck</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Novartis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pfizer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sanofi-aventis</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

DIA: Adaptive Design Scientific Working Group
Questionnaire: AD Definition

A clinical study design that uses accumulating data to decide whether and how to modify aspects of the study as it continues, without undermining the validity and integrity of the trial.

Note 1: Only trials with pre-planned adaptations were reported in the questionnaire.

Note 2: Standard 3+3 designs were not to be considered as ADs for the purposes of the questionnaire.
Adaptive designs were split into two categories for the purposes of the questionnaire:

GSDs / blinded SSR – Standard group sequential designs (with early stopping for efficacy/futility) and/or blinded sample size reestimation, with no other adaptation;

Other ADs – All other AD with at least one adaptation other than or in addition to early stopping for efficacy/futility and/or blinded SSR (for example, unblinded sample size reestimation).
ADs designed between 1st January 2008 and 1st September 2011

GSDs/blinded SSR: 283 studies
Other ADs: 153 studies

Other ADs
2011 Survey
100/153 exploratory
53/153 confirmatory
2008 Survey
30/59 exploratory
29/59 confirmatory

Note: One organisation did not answer this question and one did not split ADs by designed/ongoing/completed
Since 2010, percentage of all trials for which AD considered* during the conception phase (regardless of whether used)

* Calculations/simulations performed for comparison to more traditional designs

Based on responses from 12 of the 18 organizations

- ADs (GSDs/blinded SSR/other) are considered for approx. 30% of exploratory trials
- GSDs/blinded SSR are considered for approx. 40% of confirmatory trials
- Other ADs are considered for approx. 25% of confirmatory trials
New/persisting barriers to ADs since the FDA draft guidelines in February 2010 (where barriers may or may not be attributed to the issuing of the guidance)

* Not present in 2008 Questionnaire

Note: One organisation gave four sets of answers (one per unit)
**Questionnaire: Barriers**

New/persisting barriers to ADs since the FDA draft guidelines in February 2010
(where barriers may or may not be attributed to the issuing of the guidance)

![Bar Chart](chart.png)

- Randomisation
- Drug Supply Management
- Data Management
- Decision Criteria
- Operational Bias
- Negative Experiences*

Legend:
- No barrier/2011
- Minor barrier/2011
- (Major) barrier/2011
- Barrier/2008

*: Not present in 2008 Questionnaire

Note: One organisation gave four sets of answers (one per unit)
Of the 18 participants, 13 have some form of AD working group in place

- 7 of the 11 pharma/biotechs
- All of the 6 CROs
Questionnaire: Bayesian Methodology

Bayesian methodology...

- Has been used in at least one exploratory trial (n=12)
- Has been used in at least one confirmatory trial (n=3)
- Has been used in at least one confirmatory trial for a primary analysis (n=1)
- Has not been used in any clinical trials (n=8)

Note: One organisation gave four sets of answers (one per unit) and one organisation did not respond
Literature Review

7 scientific journals reviewed from Jan 2000 to Sep 2011

- Statistics in Medicine
- Journal of Biopharmaceutical Statistics
- Pharmaceutical Statistics
- Biometrics
- Biometrika
- Drug Information Journal
- Contemporary Clinical Trials (Controlled Clinical Trials before 2005)

Key Limitation: Predominantly statistical journals referring to design methodology rather than implemented ADs
Number & Propn of Articles with ≥1 AD Search Item

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Designs Used for Clinical Trials</th>
<th>2000-3</th>
<th>2004-7</th>
<th>2008-11</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>18 (24%)</td>
<td>8 (7%)</td>
<td>26 (21%)</td>
<td>52 (16%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

DIA: Adaptive Design Scientific Working Group
Text mining with a clinical trials intelligence database, to identify at least one AD term in either the clinical trial title or treatment plan

The number of trials identified from Jan 1996 – Sep 2011 are reported here

Possible reasons for low numbers in 2010 and 2011:

- reporting delays
- delays in the identification of trials in the search system used

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Start Year</th>
<th>Number of trials</th>
<th>Number of Trials by Year Range</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1996</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1997</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1998</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1999</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002</td>
<td>14</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>17</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>109</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>36</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>32</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>23</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>22</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Conclusions

- Industry and academia are showing more enthusiasm for ADs
- Rise in Exploratory ADs in recent years
  - FDA Draft Guidance on ADs encourages the use of “less well-understood methods” in exploratory studies
- Most common AD types: Treatment group adaptations (e.g. dose selection) and early stopping for futility
- Limited use of Bayesian methodology
  - More common in exploratory phases, particularly in recent years
- Some AD barriers identified in the 2008 survey now less common
  - e.g. reduction of barriers due to the increased availability of flexible randomisation and drug supply systems
Persistent Barriers

Key persistent barriers to implementing AD include

- **Education** (lack of team knowledge about methodology)
- **Change management** (team preference/greater comfort with traditional approach)
- **Pre-planning** (lack of time to conduct clinical trial simulations that are necessary for doing AD)
- **Regulatory acceptance** (risk of not obtaining agency approval due to the use of an AD)
Recommendations

Recommendations to overcome these challenges

- Education has to involve all levels (including senior management) so that there is alignment on expectations
- Additional time spent on simulation guided clinical trial design ultimately results in higher information value and increases chance of trial success
- Regulatory agencies are generally open to discussing adaptive approaches, we recommend early engagement in discussions with regulators