

EMA First Workshop on Advanced Therapy Medicinal Products (ATMP)

Requirements for gene therapy products:
Non-clinical and clinical aspects

Dr G Narayanan MD FRCP
Biologicals and Biotechnology Unit
MHRA, UK
3 April 2009

Non-clinical requirements

Pharmacology

In vitro and *in vivo* pharmacodynamic “proof of concept” studies

- appropriate models and relevant animal species
- Target selectivity

Pharmacokinetics:

- Biodistribution studies
 - persistence, clearance and mobilisation
 - germ line transmission

Non-clinical requirements

Toxicology:

Unintended effects on the physiological function

Repeated toxicity where single dosing may result in prolonged functionality

Reproductive and developmental toxicity

Integration studies

Immunogenicity and immunotoxicity

Pharmacokinetics:

shedding studies

biodistribution studies, including distribution to gonads

pharmacokinetics of the product and the gene expression

moieties *e.g.* expressed proteins

Pharmacodynamics:

expression

function

Pivotal factors for success **(where can it all go wrong?)**

- Concept i.e., assumptions
- Quality of the product
- Specificity of the product
- Dose
- Posology
 - Method
 - Route
 - Duration
 - Frequency
- Target group
- Current therapies

Regulatory requirements for approval

- Unequivocal efficacy
- Acceptable safety

Leading to **positive clinical benefit**

DOSE & POSOLOGY

- Minimal effective dose
- Optimal dose
- Dose interval
- Effect of dose increment
- Dose related toxicity
- Therapeutic margin

DOSE FINDING STUDIES

Extremely important, often poorly done

- Basis of chosen dose for MAA
- Maximal tolerated dose (MTD)
- Minimum Active Biological Effect Level (MABEL)
- Availability of PD markers
 - Are they valid?
- Can the planned studies support efficacy/ safety evaluation?

Proof-of-concept studies

If necessary

- End-points
- Homogenous patient group
- Duration
- Comparator
- Supportive value

Confirmatory trial (s)

- Single or multiple studies?
- Choice of countries/ centres
- Number of regions/ countries/ centres

Trial design

End-points:

- Clinically meaningful
- If using surrogate, its validity
- Objective vs. subjective
- Efficacy is usually primary
- Safety could be an end-point, usually secondary

Trial design contd.

Test Product

Use of commercial batches recommended. If not feasible, address comparability issues thoroughly

Comparator

- Placebo
- Active comparator
 - i. Choice
 - ii. Applicability

Active and placebo comparison
Blinding issues

Are any special procedures involved?

Training to investigators

Ensure consistency

External validity when employed more widely

Use might be restricted to specialists

Description of procedure in protocol

Problems with blinding

Safety aspects of the procedure

Can it be a confounding variable?

Trial design contd.

Type of trial e.g.,

- Double-blind
- Randomised
- Controlled
- Parallel group

Trial design contd.

Minimising bias

- Method of randomisation
 - Stratify, if necessary
- If open-label, choose objective end-points
- Consider independent efficacy evaluation
- Method of blinding, if applicable
- Avoid single-arm trial

Trial design contd.

Statistical methods

Superiority/ equivalence/ non-inferiority

- Choice of delta (depends on the assumptions on efficacy)
- Power – e.g., 90 or 95%? (not a regulatory concern)
- If underpowered, how will the results be analysed?
- Sub-group analysis

Trial design contd.

Analysis plan

- Interim analysis
- Stoppage rules for efficacy or futility
- Dropouts/ withdrawals handling
- Deviations/ violations handling
- Alpha spending effect

Trial design contd.

SAFETY – General

Expected
Unexpected
On-target
Off-target

Trial design contd.

Causality assessment

Minimise bias

Role of blinding

Safety monitoring committee

Scientific plausibility

Pattern of AEs

Trial design contd.

Safety – specific

Emergence of replication competent vector

Emergence of new strains

Re-assortment of existing genomic sequences

Tumour development

Long-term safety

RESULTS

Clinical benefit should be demonstrated

Statistical significance alone insufficient

Post-approval commitments may be necessary, based on the results

Post-hoc sub-group analysis usually not favoured –can be hypothesis generating at best!