Challenges in Conducting Trials Involving Children: Sponsor's view

Gary J. Noel, MD, FAAP, FIDSA C.H.I.L.D., J&J Office of the CMO

Sue K. Cammarata, MD
Chief Medical Officer, Melinta Therapeutics





This is a joint industry presentation on behalf of the trade associations shown





Discussion points

- Planning and execution best practices
- Improving movement along a Pediatric Program decision tree

- The paradigm shift in antibiotic drug development and its implications
- Current and near future challenges

Best practices for planning

- Involvement of all stakeholders
 - Therapeutic experts, investigators, regulators and parents
- Defining the sponsor's position <u>early</u>
 - Sponsor accepting the role as the definitive expert of their asset
 - Recognizing the temporal components of medical practice identifying impending changes in SOC
- Collaborative development of PIP/PRSPs
 - Infeasible = unethical
- Potential contributions of c4c and I-ACT
 - Consultation early
 - Improving clinical trial infrastructure
 - Socializing the importance of conducting pediatric clinical trials

Pediatric Antibacterial Drug Development and the Decision Tree

Is it reasonable to assume that children, when compared to adults, have a similar (a) disease progression and (b) response to intervention? No to either Yes to both Is it reasonable to assume exposureresponse (ER) in children when compared to adults? Option C Conduct pharmacokinetic (PK) studies in Is there a pharmacodynamic (PD) children which are designed to achieve drug measurement that can be used to predict levels similar to adults and then conduct efficacy in children? safety trials at the proper dose. No Yes Option B Option A Conduct PK/PD studies to establish an ER in Conduct PK studies to establish dosing and children for the PD measurement, conduct then conduct safety and efficacy trials in PK studies to achieve target concentrations based on ER, and then conduct safety trials children. at the proper dose.

Figure 1: FDA Pediatric Study Decision Tree

Improving movement along the decision tree

- Extrapolation of efficacy from adult experience to children
 - Understanding pathogenesis of disease in adults, children, infants and neonates
 - Importance of defining exposure/response relationships in initial efficacy trials
- Borrowing data
 - Potentially unique toxicity in children suggested by preclinical studies
 - Safety profiles of drugs from the same class
- RWE
 - Assessing experience based on information collected in children included in health care databases

A paradigm shift

- Previously, acquisition of biotech by pharma brought big pharma resources
 - Acquisitions and licensing opportunities often underestimate impact on resources required to complete plans
 - Acquisitions and sponsor changes delay activities/timelines; disruptive to development
- Development and <u>commercialization</u> of antibiotics have shifted from big pharma to biotechs
- Now, big pharma is not buying small pharma/biotech; actually divesting antibiotics

Shift of antibiotic development and commercialization brings new challenges

- Huge resource differences
- All of the issues flagged by colleagues from big pharma are magnified many fold in small pharma/biotech
 - Resource-constrained enterprises delay early planning for pediatric development
 - Often can do one big thing at a time
 - Focus can be regional—how to best harmonize globally
 - Biotech unlikely to have internal expertise in pediatrics, CMC, tox, PK, regulatory (no regional resources)
 - External resources (c4c*, I-ACT*) may be limited in providing expertise to biotech not supporting these networks
 - Although they will bear the brunt of the work going forward, biotech/small pharma are typically not at the table during discussions of antibiotic development
 - They are not members of EFPIA or PhRMA

^{*}c4c=conect (<u>Co</u>llaborative <u>N</u>etwork for <u>E</u>uropean <u>C</u>linical <u>T</u>rials for Children) for children

^{*}I-ACT= Institute for Advanced Clinical Trials for Children

Disclaimer: QUICK SUMMARY! Summary of EMA Recent PIPs (PSPs)*

ICK	IPOUND	Year PSP agreed	COMPLETION	treatment study	EUDRACT	Sponsor shift
MARY!	bavancin	2008, modified 2013,	2021	neonatal sepsis	NA	X
		2014, 2015, 2016		3mo-18 patients requiring	X	
				hospitalization and IV ABX		
				CSSTI	X	
Ce	eftaroline	2010; modified 2011,	2018	CSSTI and CABP 2mo-18	Χ	Χ
		2012, 2013, 2014, 2015, 2016		neonatal sepsis	X	
Т	edizolid	2013, modified 2014,	2020	age 3mo-12, 12-18 gram positive	X	Х
		2016, 2018		infection		
				neonatal sepsis birth-90 d	NA	
Or	itavancin	2013; modified 2017	2022	SSTI birth-18	NA	Χ
Merope	ropenem-	2015	2025	UTI/IAI age 3mo-18	NA	Х
vab	orbactam			neonatal sepsis birth-90d	NA	
Oma	adacycline	2017	2024	CABP 8-18	NA	
Era	avacycline	2015; modified 2016	2026	UTI age 8-18	NA	
Le	efamulin	2017	2025	CABP 2mo-18 y; suspected bacterial infection birth-18	NA	
Pla	azomicin	2018	TBD	TBD	NA	

*Source: EudraCT, EMA pediatrics webpage

Current and near term challenges

- Understanding the changing antibiotic development and commercialization environment with its impact on pediatric plans
- Defining global pediatric development plans
 - Aligning regulatory timing and opinion
 - Consideration of extrapolation and alternative methods of data collection
 - The impact on timing and resources associated with amending plans
- Challenging studies
 - Wasting precious resources
 - The ethics of enrolling vulnerable patients in trials that can never be completed