

EMA workshop

How can scientific information needs of both HTAs and regulatory be accommodated in a common development track – Regulatory view



Overview

- Role of the regulator
 - Marketing authorisation, Product labelling
- High level description of evidentiary requirements and good scientific and methodological practices
- Promoting efficient collection and processing of data without compromising roles and responsibilities



Framework for marketing authorisations (MA)

- **Legislation** requires that marketing authorisation for a medicinal product shall be **refused** if:
 - (a) the **risk-benefit** balance is not considered to be favourable;
or
 - (b) its **therapeutic efficacy** is insufficiently substantiated by the applicant; or
 - (c) its qualitative and quantitative composition is not as declared.The risk-benefit balance is defined as an evaluation of the positive therapeutic effects of the medicinal product in relation to any risk relating to the **quality, safety or efficacy** of the medicinal product as regards patients' health or public health.
- Committee for Medicinal products for Human Use (CHMP)

Framework for ‘Scientific Advice’

- Legislation provides that *“The Agency shall provide the Member States and the institutions of the Community with the best possible scientific advice ... advising undertakings on the conduct of the various tests and trials necessary to demonstrate the quality, safety and efficacy of medicinal products.”*
- Given by CHMP, through Scientific Advice Working Party
- Hence Scientific Advice directly relevant to assessment, and is “morally binding” for the design of tests and trials in the development programme

History of 'Scientific Advice'

- Well established
- Increasing number
- Increasing range
 - Parallel FDA, Parallel HTA, Qualification of Biomarkers, Qualification of Novel Methodologies
- Adherence promotes chances of successful MA

What are the regulators information needs? Pillars of drug licensing

- Quality
- Basic science to support development and to inform product labelling
 - Non-clinical
 - Clinical pharmacology
 - Understanding dose response
- **Confirmatory studies; clinical efficacy and safety**
- **Risk management plans and post-authorisation studies**

What are the regulators information needs? Clinical efficacy and safety

- Randomised, controlled trials (RCT)
- Good Clinical Practice (GCP) / Database is available and can be verified and interrogated
- International Conference on Harmonisation (ICH)
 - Including E1, E9, E10
- EMA / CHMP guidelines
 - therapy area documents
 - methodological principles

Studies to establish therapeutic efficacy and safety - general

- Balancing internal validity and external validity to understand the properties of the intervention under study in a relevant setting.
- Population
 - Homogenous for internal validity
 - Heterogeneous for external validity
- Endpoints
 - Clinical outcomes, surrogates, biomarkers
 - Short-term effects, longer-term effects, need for continued treatment, rebound effects etc.
 - Targeted PROs / QoL
- Choice of control
 - Placebo control where ethical and feasible “absolute effects”
 - (One) active control otherwise and always welcome for context

Studies to establish therapeutic efficacy and safety – methodology

- Strive for unbiased estimates and ‘false-positive’ error control through direct comparisons
- Estimand = “efficacy” ... benefits observed across a clinical trial population that are attributable to the intervention under study
- Frequentist* statistical methodology to support ‘pillars’
- Pooled analyses supportive for efficacy, more important for safety
- Dedicated evidence vs available evidence; modelling primarily for ‘interpolation’ not for ‘extrapolation’
- Considerable guidance, research and ‘case-law’ to set standards

* not mandated

Post-authorisation

- Current:
 - RCTs to add another pillar for efficacy
 - Post-authorisation safety studies, registries, database studies, meta-analyses
- Future:
 - Integrating pre- and post- licensing safety data and risk-benefit decisions
 - Post-authorisation efficacy studies, pragmatic trials etc.
 - Maximising methodological rigour within bounds of feasibility

For discussion - where to look for efficiency gains?

- Exploratory development. Too early?
- Promote that post-authorisation studies that meet everyone's needs. Too late?
- Start to build information for HTA into confirmatory trials?
 - More external validity to Phase III trials?
 - Additional assessments?
- Must not confuse roles and responsibilities, increasing hurdles, just because of a common development track

For discussion - the single development track

- Which HTA need? Regulatory system more practiced in harmonising between EU member states.
- Longer studies, multiple active comparators, clinical outcome variables, broader populations etc.
 - Increase variability and decrease sensitivity to drug effects; neither necessary nor proportionate for the regulatory question
 - No compromise on bias or error control
 - Adaptation of studies after the ‘regulatory’ question is answered
- Harmonise certain standards in advance – therapy area guidelines

For discussion - the single development track

- The role of the active control – why does one suffice?
- Assessment burden for the trial participants; opportunities in targeted data collection and monitoring
- The single analysis track
 - Format for data collection and storage
 - Key data for targeted trial monitoring
 - Analysis plans
 - Data presentations and summaries
- On the justification that ‘we need it for HTA’ and on compromise to agree a feasible development programme