

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22

FOOD AND DRUG ADMINISTRATION
CENTER FOR DRUG EVALUATION AND RESEARCH

PULMONARY-ALLERGY DRUGS ADVISORY COMMITTEE
(PADAC)

Wednesday, May 8, 2019
8:03 a.m. to 4:33 p.m.

FDA White Oak Campus
Building 31 Conference Center
The Great Room
Silver Spring, Maryland

1 **Meeting Roster**

2 **DESIGNATED FEDERAL OFFICER (Non-Voting)**

3 **Cindy Chee, PharmD**

4 Division of Advisory Committee and Consultant

5 Management

6 Office of Executive Programs, CDER, FDA

7

8 **PULMONARY-ALLERGY DRUGS ADVISORY COMMITTEE MEMBERS**

9 **(Voting)**

10 **David H. Au, MD, MS**

11 *(Chairperson)*

12 Professor of Medicine

13 University of Washington

14 Director, Health Services Research and

15 Development Center of Innovation

16 VA Puget Sound Health Care System, Seattle Division

17 Seattle, Washington

18

19

20

21

22

1 **John M. Kelso, MD**

2 Staff Physician

3 Division of Allergy, Asthma, and Immunology

4 Scripps Clinic

5 San Diego, California

6

7 **David J. Lederer, MD, MS**

8 Associate Professor of Medicine and Epidemiology

9 Division of Pulmonary, Allergy and Critical Care

10 Medicine

11 Columbia University Medical Center

12 New York, New York

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

1 **Gailen D. Marshall Jr., MD, PhD, FACP**

2 The R. Faser Triplett Sr MD Chair of
3 Allergy and Immunology
4 Medical Director, UMMC Clinical Research
5 Support Program/Clinical Research and Trials Units
6 Professor of Medicine, Pediatrics and Pathology
7 Vice Chair for Research, Department of Medicine
8 Director, Division of Clinical
9 Immunology and Allergy
10 Chief, Laboratory of Behavioral Immunology Research
11 The University of Mississippi Medical Center
12 Jackson, Mississippi

13
14 **Loretta G. Que, MD**

15 Professor of Medicine
16 Department of Internal Medicine
17 Division of Pulmonary, Allergy and Critical Care
18 Medicine
19 Duke University Health System
20 Durham, North Carolina

21
22

1 **Carrie A. Redlich, MD, MPH**

2 Professor of Medicine, Pulmonary Section &
3 Occupational and Environmental Medicine
4 Director, Yale Occupational and Environmental
5 Medicine Program
6 Yale University School of Medicine
7 New Haven, Connecticut

8

9 **Richard W. Weber, MD**

10 Professor Emeritus
11 Department of Medicine
12 National Jewish Health
13 Denver, Colorado

14

15 **PULMONARY-ALLERGY DRUGS ADVISORY COMMITTEE MEMBER**

16 **(Non-Voting)**

17 **Stuart Green, MD**

18 *(Industry Representative)*

19 Vice President
20 Respiratory and Immunology
21 Merck Research Laboratories
22 Rahway, New Jersey

1 **TEMPORARY MEMBERS (Voting)**

2 **Kathryn Blake, PharmD, BCPS, FCCP, CIP**

3 Director, Center for Pharmacogenomics and

4 Translational Research

5 Principal Research Scientist

6 Associate Professor of Pharmacy, Mayo Clinic

7 College of Medicine and Science

8 Nemours Children's Specialty Care

9 Jacksonville, Florida

10

11 **Erica Brittain, PhD**

12 Mathematical Statistician

13 Deputy Branch Chief

14 Biostatistics Research Branch

15 National Institute of Allergy and Infectious

16 Diseases (NIAID)

17 National Institutes of Health (NIH)

18 Bethesda, Maryland

19

20

21

22

1 **Mary Cataletto, MD, MMM**

2 Professor of Clinical Pediatrics

3 Stony Brook University

4 School of Medicine

5 Stony Brook, New York

6

7 **Scott S. Emerson, MD, PhD**

8 Professor Emeritus of Biostatistics

9 Department of Biostatistics

10 University of Washington

11 Seattle, Washington

12

13 **Daniel L. Gillen, PhD**

14 Professor and Chair

15 Department of Statistics

16 University of California, Irvine

17 Irvine, California

18

19 **Erin Moore, BS**

20 *(Patient Representative)*

21 Hummelstown, Pennsylvania

22

1 **Richard B. Parad, MD, MPH**

2 Associate Professor of Pediatrics

3 Harvard Medical School

4 Department of Pediatric Newborn Medicine

5 Brigham and Women's Hospital

6 Connor's Center for Women

7 Boston, Massachusetts

8

9 **Karen S. Schell, DHSc, RRT-NPS, RRT-SDS**

10 **RPFT, RPSGT, AE-C, CTTS**

11 *(Acting Consumer Representative)*

12 Clinical Assistant Professor

13 University of Kansas Medical Center

14 School of Health Professions

15 Respiratory Care Education

16 Kansas City, Kansas

17

18

19

20

21

22

1 **James M. Tracy, DO**

2 Managing Partner

3 Allergy, Asthma and Immunology Associates, PC

4 Associate Clinical Professor of Pediatrics

5 University of Nebraska College of Medicine

6 Omaha, Nebraska

7
8 **FDA PARTICIPANTS (Non-Voting)**

9 **Sally Seymour, MD**

10 Acting Director

11 Division of Pulmonary, Allergy, and

12 Rheumatology Products (DPARP)

13 Office of Drug Evaluation II (ODE II)

14 Office of New Drugs (OND), CDER, FDA

15
16 **Robert H. Lim, MD**

17 Clinical Team Leader

18 DPARP, ODE II, OND, CDER, FDA

19
20
21
22

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22

Yongman Kim, PhD

Biostatistics Team Leader
Division of Biometrics II (DB II)
Office of Biostatistics (OB)
Office of Translational Sciences (OTS)
CDER, FDA

Khalid Puthawala, MD

Clinical Reviewer
DPARP, ODE II, OND, CDER, FDA

Cesar Torres, PhD

Statistical Reviewer
DB II, OB, OTS, CDER, FDA

| 1 | C O N T E N T S | |
|----|---|------|
| 2 | AGENDA ITEM | PAGE |
| 3 | Call to Order and Introduction of Committee | |
| 4 | David Au, MD | 13 |
| 5 | Conflict of Interest Statement | |
| 6 | Cindy Chee, PharmD | 17 |
| 7 | FDA Introductory Remarks | |
| 8 | Robert Lim, MD | 21 |
| 9 | Applicant Presentations - Chiesi USA | |
| 10 | Introduction to Bronchitol for | |
| 11 | Adult Patients with Cystic Fibrosis | |
| 12 | Mark Parry-Billings, PhD | 30 |
| 13 | Unmet Need and Disease Background | |
| 14 | Scott Donaldson, MD | 37 |
| 15 | Efficacy in Adult Patients with | |
| 16 | Cystic Fibrosis | |
| 17 | Carmen Dell'Anna, MD | 49 |
| 18 | Safety of Bronchitol | |
| 19 | W. James Alexander, MD, MPH | 60 |
| 20 | Bronchitol: A Clinician's Perspective | |
| 21 | Patrick Flume, MD | 69 |
| 22 | Clarifying Questions | 78 |

| | | |
|----|---|------|
| 1 | C O N T E N T S (continued) | |
| 2 | AGENDA ITEM | PAGE |
| 3 | FDA Presentations | |
| 4 | Overview of Clinical Program | |
| 5 | Khalid Puthawala, MD | 133 |
| 6 | Statistical Review of Efficacy | |
| 7 | Cesar Torres, PhD | 147 |
| 8 | Clinical Review of Efficacy, | |
| 9 | Safety and Benefit-Risk Assessment | |
| 10 | Khalid Puthawala, MD | 166 |
| 11 | Clarifying Questions | 185 |
| 12 | Open Public Hearing | 218 |
| 13 | Charge to the Committee | |
| 14 | Robert Lim, MD | 272 |
| 15 | Questions to the Committee and Discussion | 277 |
| 16 | Adjournment | 386 |
| 17 | | |
| 18 | | |
| 19 | | |
| 20 | | |
| 21 | | |
| 22 | | |

1 P R O C E E D I N G S

2 (8:03 a.m.)

3 **Call to Order**

4 **Introduction of Committee**

5 DR. AU: Good morning. I would like to
6 remind everyone to please silence your cell phones,
7 smartphones, and any other devices if you have not
8 already done so.

9 I also want to remind attendees of today's
10 meetings that there may be multiple people with
11 cystic fibrosis in this room. If needed, we have
12 items recommended by the Cystic Fibrosis Foundation
13 available outside of the meeting room. People with
14 CF and their families should be aware that
15 individuals with CF might choose to attend this
16 advisory committee without notifying the staff.
17 Therefore, we cannot guarantee that you will not
18 encounter others with CF at this meeting.

19 I would also like to identify the FDA press
20 contact, Nathan Arnold. If you are present, please
21 stand, at the back of the room there.

22 My name is David Au. I am the chairperson

1 for the Pulmonary Allergy Drugs Advisory Committee.
2 I will be chairing this meeting. I will now call
3 today's Pulmonary Allergy Drugs Advisory Committee
4 to order. We'll start by going around the table
5 and introduce ourselves. We will start with the
6 FDA to my left and go around the table.

7 DR. SEYMOUR: My name is Dr. Sally Seymour.
8 I'm the acting director for the Division of
9 Pulmonary Allergy and Rheumatology Products.

10 DR. LIM: Bob Lim, clinical team leader,
11 DPARP.

12 DR. PUTHAWALA: Khalid Puthawala, clinical
13 reviewer, DPARP.

14 DR. KIM: Yongman Kim, statistical team
15 leader, FDA.

16 DR. TORRES: Cesar Torres, statistical
17 reviewer.

18 DR. TRACY: Jim Tracy, University of
19 Nebraska.

20 DR. BLAKE: Kathryn Blake from Nemours
21 Children's Specialty Care.

22 DR. MARSHALL: I'm Gailen Marshall,

1 University of Mississippi Medical Center.

2 DR. LEDERER: Good morning, Dave Lederer,
3 Columbia University in New York.

4 LCDR CHEE: Hi. Cindy Chee, DFO for
5 Pulmonary Allergy Drugs Advisory Committee

6 DR. AU: David Au, the VA Puget Sound
7 Healthcare System and the University of Washington.

8 DR. KELSO: John Kelso. I'm an allergist
9 at Scripps Clinic in San Diego.

10 DR. QUE: Loretta Que. I'm at Duke
11 University in North Carolina.

12 DR. REDLICH: Carrie Redlich, Yale
13 University.

14 DR. WEBER: Richard Weber, National Jewish
15 Health, Denver, Colorado.

16 DR. SCHELL: Karen Schell, University of
17 Kansas Medical Center. I'm a consumer
18 representative.

19 MS. MOORE: I'm Erin Moore. I'm the
20 patient rep today.

21 DR. PARAD: I'm Richard Parad from Harvard
22 Medical School.

1 DR. EMERSON: Scott Emerson,
2 biostatistician, University of Washington.

3 DR. BRITTAIN: Erica Brittain. I'm a
4 statistician at National Institute of Allergy and
5 Infectious Diseases, NIH.

6 DR. GILLEN: Daniel Gillen, Department of
7 Statistics, University of California at Irvine.

8 DR. GREEN: Stuart Green, Merck Research
9 Laboratories. I'm the industry representative.

10 DR. AU: For topics such as those being
11 discussed at today's meeting, there are often a
12 variety of opinions, some of which are held quite
13 strongly. Our goal is that today's meeting will be
14 a fair and open forum for these discussions and
15 that individuals can express their views without
16 interruption.

17 Thus, as a gentle reminder, individuals
18 will be allowed to speak into the record only if
19 recognized by the chairperson. We look forward to
20 a productive meeting.

21 In the spirit of the Federal Advisory
22 Committee Act and the Government in the Sunshine

1 Act, we ask that advisory committee members take
2 care that their conversations about the topic at
3 hand take place in the open forum of this meeting.

4 We are aware that members of the media are
5 anxious to speak with the FDA about these
6 proceedings. However, FDA will refrain from
7 discussing the details of this meeting with the
8 media until its conclusion. Also, the committee is
9 reminded to please refrain from discussing the
10 meeting topic during breaks or lunch. Thank you.

11 I will now pass it to Lieutenant Commander
12 Cindy Chee, who will read the conflict of interest
13 statement.

14 **Conflict of Interest Statement**

15 LCDR CHEE: The Food and Drug
16 Administration is convening today's meeting of the
17 Pulmonary Allergy Drugs Advisory Committee under
18 the authority of the Federal Advisory Committee Act
19 of 1972. With the exception of the industry
20 representative, all members and temporary voting
21 members of the committee are special government
22 employees or regular federal employees from other

1 agencies and are subject to federal conflict of
2 interest laws and regulations.

3 The following information on the status of
4 this committee's compliance with federal ethics and
5 conflict of interest laws, covered by but not
6 limited to those found at 18 U.S.C. Section 208, is
7 being provided to participants in today's meeting
8 and to the public.

9 FDA has determined that members and
10 temporary voting members of this committee are in
11 compliance with federal ethics and conflict of
12 interest laws. Under 18 U.S.C. Section 208,
13 Congress has authorized FDA to grant waivers to
14 special government employees and regular federal
15 employees who have potential financial conflicts
16 when it is determined that the agency's need for a
17 specific government employee's services outweighs
18 his or her potential financial conflict of
19 interest, or when the interest of a regular federal
20 employee is not so substantial as to be deemed
21 likely to affect the integrity of the services
22 which the government may expect from the employee.

1 Related to the discussions of today's
2 meeting, members and temporary voting members of
3 this committee have been screened for potential
4 financial conflicts of interest of their own, as
5 well as those imputed to them, including those of
6 their spouses or minor children, and for purposes
7 of 18 U.S.C. Section 208, their employers.

8 These interests may include investments;
9 consulting; expert witness testimony; contracts,
10 grants, CRADAs; teaching, speaking, writing;
11 patents and royalties; and primary employment.

12 Today's agenda involves discussion of new
13 drug application 202049 for mannitol inhalation
14 powder for oral inhalation, submitted by Chiesi,
15 USA, Inc. for the proposed indication of management
16 of cystic fibrosis to improve pulmonary function in
17 patients 18 years of age and older in conjunction
18 with standard therapies.

19 This is a particular matters meeting during
20 which specific matters related to Chiesi's NDA will
21 be discussed. Based on the agenda for today's
22 meeting and all financial interests reported by the

1 committee members and temporary members, no
2 conflict of interest waivers have been issued in
3 connection with this meeting.

4 To ensure transparency, we encourage all
5 standing committee members and temporary voting
6 members to disclose any public statements that they
7 have made concerning the product at issue.

8 With respect to FDA's invited industry
9 representative, we would like to disclose that
10 Dr. Stuart Green is participating in this meeting
11 as a non-voting industry representative, acting on
12 behalf of regulated industry. Dr. Green's role at
13 this meeting is to represent industry in general
14 and not any particular company. Dr. Green is
15 employed by Merck Research Laboratories.

16 We would like to remind members and
17 temporary voting members that if the discussions
18 involve any other products or firms not already on
19 the agenda for which an FDA participant has a
20 personal or imputed financial interest, the
21 participants need to exclude themselves from such
22 involvement, and their exclusion will be noted for

1 the record.

2 FDA encourages all other participants to
3 advise the committee of any financial relationships
4 that they may have with the firm at issue. Thank
5 you.

6 DR. AU: Thank you. We will now proceed
7 with the FDA's opening remarks from Dr. Robert Lim.

8 **FDA Introductory Remarks - Robert Lim**

9 DR. LIM: Good morning, Dr. Au, esteemed
10 members of the committee, the Chiesi team, my FDA
11 colleagues, members of the CF community, and other
12 members of the audience, my name is Robert Lim.
13 I'm a clinical team leader in the Division of
14 Pulmonary Allergy and Rheumatology Products. I am
15 also trained as a pediatric pulmonologist.

16 On behalf of the agency, I would like to
17 welcome you all here to the FDA campus at White Oak
18 to this very important advisory committee meeting,
19 where we will discuss the NDA for dry powder
20 mannitol, or DPM, for inhalation for cystic
21 fibrosis. In my presentation this morning, I'll
22 provide some brief background introductory remarks

1 and provide some context as we begin our discussion
2 of this product.

3 The sponsor's probably going to go over
4 this in greater detail, but briefly, cystic
5 fibrosis is an autosomal recessive disorder caused
6 by mutations in the CFTR gene. It affects
7 approximately 30,000 patients in the U.S. and about
8 twice that worldwide. It's a multisystem disorder
9 affecting the airways, exocrine pancreas, GI tract,
10 and reproductive tract.

11 There is no cure, and the majority of
12 therapies are aimed at the symptoms and sequelae of
13 disease. However, in 2012, the first drug
14 targeting the underlying cause was approved, and
15 since then, additional products have been approved
16 which target the underlying cause of CF for
17 patients with certain mutations.

18 These treatments have been referred to by
19 some as CFTR modulators, and while these new
20 therapies have been life-changing for some
21 patients, there continues to be a continued need
22 for additional therapies for all patients with

1 cystic fibrosis. It's also worth noting that the
2 CF treatment landscape is rapidly evolving with
3 many innovative products in the pipeline.

4 The product we're discussing today, dry
5 powder mannitol, or DPM, is a sugar alcohol. It is
6 generally recognized as safe by the enteral route
7 and is approved as a bronchoprovocation agent by
8 the inhaled route under the trade name Aridol.

9 The applicant's proposed indication is for
10 the management of cystic fibrosis to improve
11 pulmonary function in patients 18 years of age and
12 older in conjunction with standard therapies. The
13 proposed dose is 400 milligrams by inhalation twice
14 daily.

15 This NDA was initially submitted in May of
16 2012. At that time, the product was not approved,
17 and a complete response or CR action was issued.
18 This current submission is the applicant's response
19 to the CR action. In the next few slides, I will
20 briefly review the regulatory history.

21 The original NDA was submitted in May of
22 2012, and at that time the development program

1 included one dose-ranging study, study 202, and two
2 phase 3 studies in CF patients greater than 6 years
3 of age. These were studies 301 and 302.

4 The primary endpoint for both these studies
5 was FEV1 change from baseline in FEV1 over
6 26 weeks. Secondary endpoints included
7 exacerbation as well as Cystic Fibrosis
8 Questionnaire-Revised respiratory domain scores.

9 It is worth noting that in these two
10 studies, if a patient was discontinued for
11 treatment, there were no specific provisions to
12 continue collecting data or follow these patients.

13 The key findings from the original NDA
14 submission are summarized in this slide. With
15 regard to efficacy data from study 301, while the
16 results were positive in terms of the FEV1-based
17 endpoint, the results were not considered to be
18 statistically robust due to significant issues with
19 differential dropout and missing data, which was
20 potentially missing, not at random.

21 In study 301, 37 percent of DPM patients
22 and 27 percent of control patients discontinued

1 treatment, and as there were no specific provisions
2 to follow these patients, there was a significant
3 amount of missing data. Study 302 did not
4 demonstrate a statistically significant win on its
5 primary endpoint.

6 Importantly, across both studies, secondary
7 endpoints were also not supportive of efficacy.
8 With regard to safety, there were concerns with
9 hemoptysis, particularly in the pediatric
10 population.

11 Given these issues, this NDA was discussed
12 at a January 2013 Pulmonary Allergy Drug Advisory
13 Committee or PADAC. At that time, the committee
14 voted unanimously against approval in the 6-year
15 and older population.

16 As a result of the committee input and
17 agency review, DPM was not approved, and a complete
18 response action was taken. Deficiencies included
19 that efficacy was not adequately demonstrated and
20 that there were safety concerns.

21 To address these deficiencies, the
22 applicant was told to conduct at least one

1 additional clinical trial to show substantial
2 evidence of efficacy and balance the safety
3 findings. The expectation was that the trial would
4 win on the FEV1 endpoint and have support from
5 clinically meaningful secondary endpoints such as
6 exacerbation and symptoms.

7 In the current submission, which is a
8 response to this CR action, the applicant has
9 limited the indication statement to include only
10 adults, that is, patients greater than 18 years of
11 age, and the contents of the current submission
12 include a new 26-week phase 3 study in patients
13 18 years of age and older. That is study 303. The
14 primary endpoint of the study was the same as 301
15 and 302. Secondary endpoints also included
16 exacerbation and symptom-related outcomes.

17 This study was designed to address the
18 concerns raised in 301 and 302 in the hopes that
19 the same issues would not come up again. The
20 current submission also includes a post hoc
21 analysis of the 18-years-of-age and older subgroups
22 from studies 301 and 302, so post hoc subgroup

1 analysis of a study whose results are not
2 statistically robust, 301, and a study, subgroup
3 analysis, of a study that did not win, study 302.

4 In the applicant's and the FDA's
5 presentations that will come later, detailed
6 discussions of the results will be presented.
7 However, in order to provide some context for the
8 issues that the agency would like the AC to
9 consider, in this slide, high-level results for the
10 18-year-old-of-age-and-older population are
11 summarized.

12 With regard to the primary endpoint for
13 study 303, the results were statistically
14 significant with a treatment effect of
15 approximately 50 milliliters when comparing DPM to
16 control.

17 In the post hoc analysis of the adult
18 population in studies 301 and 302, point estimates
19 were approximately 80 mLs in both studies. For
20 exacerbation-related endpoints across all studies,
21 there were no statistically significant differences
22 between DPM and control. And in study 303, point

1 estimates for exacerbation rate favored control,
2 and a similar observation was made in a post hoc
3 analysis of study 302. In study 301, in contrast,
4 post hoc analysis of exacerbation favored DPM.

5 With regard to symptom scores, as measured
6 by CFQ-R, respiratory domain score, there were no
7 statistically significant differences between DPM
8 and control.

9 In considering the efficacy that is
10 presented later this morning, keep in mind that
11 only study 303 demonstrated clear statistically
12 significant improvements in FEV1 in the adult
13 population. While post hoc analysis of adults from
14 studies 301 and 302 will be presented, it is
15 important to note that these are post hoc subgroup
16 analyses of a trial which was not considered to be
17 statistically robust, 301, and a study that didn't
18 win on its primary, study 302.

19 We also ask that you consider the magnitude
20 of the FEV1 effect size point estimates, which are
21 relatively small, and that the results have no
22 support from secondary endpoints such as

1 exacerbation or symptoms.

2 In today's discussion, there are two
3 primary topics, efficacy and safety. In the
4 discussion of efficacy, we ask that you discuss
5 whether there is substantial evidence to support
6 efficacy in the proposed population, taking into
7 consideration the effect size, the lack of
8 secondary support, and statistical persuasiveness.

9 With regard to safety, we ask that you
10 consider the overall safety as well as concerns
11 regarding hemoptysis and numerical differences in
12 exacerbations.

13 Thank you. That ends my presentation, and
14 I'll hand it back over to the chair.

15 DR. AU: Thank you.

16 Both the FDA and the public believe in a
17 transparent process for information-gathering and
18 decision-making. To ensure such transparency at
19 the advisory committee meeting, FDA believes that
20 it is important to understand the context of an
21 individual's presentation.

22 For this reason, FDA encourages all

1 participants, including the applicant's
2 non-employee presenters, to advise the committee of
3 any financial relationships that they may have with
4 the applicant, such as consulting fees, travel
5 expenses, honoraria, interests in the sponsor,
6 including equity interests, and those based upon
7 the outcome of the meeting.

8 Likewise, FDA encourages you, at the
9 beginning of your presentation, to advise the
10 committee if you do not have any such financial
11 relationships. If you choose not to address this
12 issue of financial relationships at the beginning
13 of your presentation, it will not preclude you from
14 speaking.

15 We will now proceed with Chiesi's
16 presentations.

17 **Applicant Presentation - Mark Parry-Billings**

18 DR. PARRY-BILLINGS: Good morning,
19 Mr. Chairman, members of the advisory committee,
20 and members of the FDA. I'm Mark Parry-Billings.
21 I'm head of drug development at Chiesi. Thank you
22 for the opportunity to present the data supporting

1 Bronchitol today.

2 Let me start with a brief overview of
3 Bronchitol. Bronchitol acts effectively through a
4 unique mechanism to improve lung function. It's a
5 naturally occurring osmotic agent that is generally
6 recognized as safe or GRAS by the enteral route.

7 The efficacy profile is based on
8 improvements in lung function as measured by FEV1,
9 which is a prognostic indicator of both morbidity
10 and mortality in patients with CF. Moreover,
11 Bronchitol has a generally well-tolerated safety
12 profile.

13 Our data provides substantial evidence of
14 efficacy with consistent FEV1 improvements across
15 three phase 3 trials, as well as 8 years of
16 worldwide post-approval clinical experience.
17 Bronchitol is an easy-to-use inhaled dry powder
18 form of mannitol.

19 Let me emphasize that we understand
20 Bronchitol may not be appropriate for every
21 patient, but we also know that patients with CF
22 need options. There are clearly patients that will

1 gain clinically meaningful improvements in lung
2 function and that will find Bronchitol easy and
3 convenient to use. For these patients, Bronchitol
4 can be a viable option.

5 Bronchitol effectively targets the lung.
6 At its site of action, it first creates an osmotic
7 gradient which facilitates efflux of water into the
8 airway lumen. This increases airway clearance for
9 two complementary mechanisms through enhanced
10 mucociliary clearance and through cough clearance.

11 Thus, Bronchitol increases clearance of
12 airways mucus, which is a key, indeed a central
13 pathological feature of CF. This is somewhat
14 different to COPD and asthma, for example, where
15 bronchoconstriction and inflammation are central
16 pathological features.

17 This targeted mechanism of action has been
18 confirmed through a series of clinical studies,
19 including this study, in patients with CF, where
20 airway clearance was quantified by following a
21 radio-labeled marker.

22 On the Y-axis, you see the percent of

1 radio-labeled marker where lower down on the axis
2 represents improved clearance. On the X-axis, this
3 is a time from inhalation of either mannitol or
4 control. As you can see, mannitol in blue very
5 clearly and effectively enhances airway clearance
6 as compared to control in pink.

7 Now, let me show you how Bronchitol is
8 delivered to the lungs. There are four simple
9 steps. The process starts by removing the inhaler
10 cap and simply twisting the top. Next, the patient
11 places the capsule in the chamber and closes the
12 inhaler.

13 After closing the inhaler, the patient
14 presses the buttons on the side to puncture the
15 capsule, and finally, the inhaler is placed in the
16 mouth and the patient takes a deep breath, holding
17 it for five seconds. This process is then repeated
18 for the remaining capsules, which takes about
19 5 minutes overall.

20 In terms of global experience, Bronchitol
21 was first approved in 2011 in Australia. It's now
22 been approved in 35 countries for the treatment of

1 adult patients with CF, and markets include UK,
2 Germany, Italy, and Spain.

3 In total, approximately 8,000 patients have
4 been treated with no notable safety concerns. The
5 proposed U.S. indication therefore follows this
6 reassuring global experience. Here is the proposed
7 indication for Bronchitol, indicated for the
8 management of CF to improve pulmonary function in
9 patients 18 years and older, in conjunction with
10 standard therapies.

11 Next, I would like to summarize the U.S.
12 regulatory history, very much in line with the
13 presentation from Dr. Lim. The NDA was originally
14 submitted in 2012 by Pharmaxis. The proposed
15 indication was for patients with CF aged 6 years
16 and older. You'll note this included pediatrics,
17 which have now been removed from the proposed
18 indication. This original submission included two
19 phase 3 studies.

20 Then, in 2013, following an advisory
21 committee, the conclusion of the FDA review was
22 that the two phase 3 studies were not adequate,

1 particularly because one study missed the primary
2 endpoint and the other study had a high level of
3 patient dropouts, which were imbalanced across the
4 treatment groups and which were not accounted for
5 appropriately in the statistical analysis.

6 Moreover, there were concerns regarding hemoptysis
7 in the pediatric population.

8 Therefore, the agency recommended at least
9 one additional phase 3 study with a similar design
10 to the originals, using the same primary lung
11 function endpoint and with proactive steps to
12 minimize patient dropouts. This third study was
13 also to be conducted in adult patients.

14 If we now fast-forward to 2018, in December
15 of last year, the NDA was resubmitted, capturing
16 key elements from the pre-submission meeting with
17 the agency. The resubmission included and indeed
18 focused on the new study, referred to as study 303,
19 and focused on the adult population only.

20 Moreover, dropouts were minimized and accounted for
21 in the statistical analysis.

22 While study 303 is the primary dataset,

1 earlier studies were re-assessed using the
2 prespecified statistical plan for study 303, and
3 additionally, an integrated analysis of all three
4 studies was also incorporated.

5 In summary, the primary evidence of
6 Bronchitol benefit-risk comes from three similar
7 randomized double-blind controlled phase 3 studies
8 in a total of 789 adult patients with CF. The
9 clinical data from these studies, which we'll share
10 today, along with the global marketed experience,
11 support a positive benefit-risk profile of
12 Bronchitol in adult patients.

13 With this background in mind, here's the
14 agenda for the remainder of our presentation.
15 Dr. Scott Donaldson will describe the unmet need
16 and disease background for adult patients with CF.
17 The efficacy section will be presented by my
18 colleague, Dr. Carmen Dell'Anna. Dr. James
19 Alexander will review the safety data, and
20 Dr. Patrick Flume will conclude with his clinical
21 perspective.

22 We also have three additional experts with

1 us today to answer your questions. All outside
2 experts have been compensated for their time and
3 travel to today's meeting. Thank you very much,
4 and Dr. Donaldson will now discuss the disease
5 background and current treatment options for
6 patients with CF.

7 **Applicant Presentation - Scott Donaldson**

8 DR. DONALDSON: Good morning, everyone.
9 I'm Scott Donaldson. I'm a pulmonologist, and I
10 direct the adult cystic fibrosis center at the
11 University of North Carolina. I've been treating
12 people with CF and working in CF research for more
13 than 25 years. I really appreciate the opportunity
14 to provide background on CF and to highlight the
15 ongoing need for treatments that effectively
16 improve lung function in our patients.

17 In the United States, cystic fibrosis is a
18 disease affecting more than 30,000 patients, of
19 whom 54 percent are now adults. This is a genetic
20 disease caused by mutations in a single gene called
21 CFTR, and most people with CF are Caucasian.

22 The median predicted survival in CF has

1 increased significantly over the years, and since
2 2002, we've seen a large improvement. However,
3 patients with CF are still dying very young. In
4 2017, the average age of the time of death of
5 patients with CF was approximately 30 years.
6 Clearly, we still have a long way to go.

7 As you might expect, as a result of
8 improved therapies, the number of adults with CF
9 has increased and it will continue to do so going
10 forward. CF is a disease that affects many organs,
11 but progressive lung disease continues to be the
12 major cause of morbidity and mortality.

13 People with CF develop bronchiectasis,
14 which is defined as permanently thickened and
15 dilated airways, and once this disease process is
16 established, people with CF suffer from progressive
17 loss of lung function and recurrent disease
18 exacerbations until either premature death from
19 respiratory failure or a lung transplant is
20 performed.

21 Let me describe the pathophysiology in more
22 detail. Mutations in the CFTR gene cause a cascade

1 of consequences. Reduced or absent CFTR activity
2 results in depletion of that thin layer of fluid
3 that lines airway surfaces and dehydration of
4 airway secretions. This in turn causes airway
5 mucus to become very thick and abnormally viscous
6 and will stick to airway surfaces.

7 As a result, mucociliary clearance becomes
8 impaired. Mucociliary clearance is a key lung
9 defense mechanism, and when it fails, mucus begins
10 to plug airways. This retained mucus in the lung
11 creates an environment that's favorable for
12 bacterial colonization that results in chronic
13 airways infection, often with pseudomonas.

14 The inability to clear these infections
15 results in a chronic intense neutrophilic
16 inflammatory response. Once this process of
17 chronic infection and inflammation is initiated, a
18 vicious cycle further impairs airway function,
19 including mucus clearance, and results in
20 progressive injury and remodeling of the airways or
21 bronchiectasis.

22 Now, it's well understood in the CF

1 community that treating CF should focus on mucus
2 clearance. Improvements in mucus clearance lead to
3 improvements in lung function, and improving lung
4 function will inevitably reduce associated
5 morbidity and mortality.

6 Let me explain further. The FEV1 is a
7 widely accepted measure of lung function. We
8 monitor lung disease status in a number of ways.
9 The measurement of lung function through spirometry
10 is our most reliable metric. Spirometry gives us
11 an assessment of disease severity at that point in
12 time, as well as allows us to assess the
13 progression of lung disease over time. It's also
14 an index of patient's response to therapies.

15 The spirometric parameter of interest in CF
16 is FEV1, and this is really the gold standard. The
17 FEV1 correlates with the extent of structural lung
18 damage and is our strongest predictor of exercise
19 capacity and survival.

20 It's long been known that when lung
21 function declines to the point where severe
22 impairment is present, the risk of death increases

1 substantially. FEV1 is not only the strongest
2 predictor of mortality, but it's also a primary
3 factor used to determine the need for lung
4 transplantation.

5 As just noted, clearing mucus out of the
6 airways is the most fundamental way that we treat
7 our patients. This is a graphical description of
8 the CF abnormalities in the airways. On the left
9 is the normal airway, which has an intact airway
10 surface liquid layer and normal hydration of mucus.
11 This allows cilia to stand up, to beat
12 rhythmically, and to clear mucus from the lung.

13 On the right is the CF airway where that
14 thin layer of fluid is now very shallow, and this
15 prevents the cilia from standing upright and moving
16 mucus. In addition, the secreted mucus layer
17 becomes very thickened and becomes
18 non-transportable.

19 On the next slide, this is what CF lung
20 disease actually looks like. On the left is a
21 resected CF lung where you see a mucus plug that's
22 being attempted to pull out of a very dilated

1 airway, and this is a prime environment for
2 inflammation and infection. On the right is a
3 photo micrograph of the CF airway. What we see is
4 complete obstruction of the airway with mucus,
5 infection, and inflammation.

6 Let me discuss how we currently treat our
7 patients. Strategies for CF therapy have been
8 outlined and treatment guidelines are evolving
9 rapidly. Because mucus clearance is key, we use
10 medications to change the properties of airway
11 mucus, trying to make them easier to clear.
12 However, all of these therapies are time and energy
13 consuming and constrict patient mobility and
14 lifestyle.

15 Nebulized hypertonic saline is an
16 unapproved therapy that's used to hydrate airway
17 secretions and to promote mucus clearance from the
18 lung. Nebulized recombinant human DNase is used to
19 enzymatically cleave extracellular DNA, which
20 thickens inflamed secretions. Aerosolized
21 antibiotics are used to suppress infection, and
22 oral macrolides are used for their

1 anti-inflammatory properties.

2 These therapies are trying to treat,
3 really, the downstream consequences of CFTR
4 dysfunction, with a final option of lung
5 transportation, which is a high-risk treatment
6 option that's available when all other options have
7 failed and lung disease is very severe.

8 We're now, however, in the era of CFTR
9 modulators, which are oral drugs that can improve
10 CFTR function and therefore are treating the
11 upstream pathophysiology of this disease.

12 The relatively recent development of orally
13 available small molecule CFTR modulators has been
14 very impactful in CF. These drugs are useful for
15 specific CFTR mutations, and highly effective
16 modulators are currently available only for a
17 relatively small proportion of our patients.
18 However, even in those patients who are treated
19 with CFTR modulators, we know that these
20 medications slow, but do not stop, the progression
21 of lung disease once it is established. There is
22 going to be an ongoing need for downstream

1 treatments that focus on airway clearance.

2 The projected impact that highly effective
3 CFTR modulators still in development may have for
4 our patients has been included in a model developed
5 by the CF foundation. As you can see, over the
6 next 20 years, these medications will contribute
7 toward a relatively large increase in the number of
8 patients who are needing care, from the current
9 approximately 18,000 patients to about 30,000
10 patients.

11 Not only are we expecting an increase in
12 the total number of patients, but the number of
13 patients with moderate to severe lung disease, as
14 shown in the yellow, red, and black, is actually
15 going to increase. And we know that these are the
16 patients that are going to continue to need other
17 treatments that improve lung function, so the need
18 for new therapies is not going to go away.

19 The burden of lung disease is very high in
20 CF. From the CF registry, we know that roughly
21 half of adults with CF in their 20s and 30s are
22 being prescribed all three of the major inhaled

1 CFTR treatment classes. That is inhaled
2 antibiotics, recombinant human DNase, and
3 hypertonic saline.

4 We also know from prior CF studies that
5 while we may be writing a lot of prescriptions for
6 these medications, adherence to these
7 time-consuming treatments is quite low. Our best
8 estimates of actual treatment adherence, using
9 either electronic monitoring of nebulizer use or
10 pharmacy refill data, range between 36 and
11 62 percent. Interestingly, the lowest adherence is
12 for hypertonic saline, which is a somewhat more
13 time-consuming treatment.

14 This failure to adhere to prescribed
15 therapies is very important because reduced
16 adherence is clearly associated with worse clinical
17 outcomes, including important events such as
18 hospitalization.

19 Patients are telling us that burden of
20 treatment is one of the most important things to
21 them. In the UK, a survey of CF patients,
22 families, and healthcare providers list the

1 treatment burden as the number one research concern
2 for them.

3 In the U.S., a separate survey of
4 135 patients, families, and an expert clinical
5 research ward, treatment burden was ranked as the
6 third most important research priority. So we are
7 getting a consistent message, when surveying both
8 patients are caregivers, that they want treatments
9 that are less burdensome.

10 Finally, to crystallize an image of what
11 our adults with CF go through, I want to present a
12 typical patient example, and I'll refer to this
13 patient by the name of Kim.

14 Kim is a 30-year-old woman with CF. She
15 was diagnosed in the first year of life, and she's
16 enjoyed reasonably good health. She's married.
17 She has two kids. She's currently working full
18 time and enjoys her work, but she has the usual
19 complications seen in people with CF. Her airways
20 are infected with *Pseudomonas aeruginosa*, the most
21 common bacterium that we see in our adult patients,
22 and she also suffers from pancreatic insufficiency.

1 I'll note that, although I describe her as
2 relatively well, she has a lung function impairment
3 that's about 50 percent of predicted FEV1, so she
4 clearly has considerable lung disease.

5 To maintain her health, Kim is prescribed
6 several medications. She has to get up very early
7 in the day in order to get her CF treatments done,
8 get her children up and to school, so that she can
9 get to work on time. She follows a recommended
10 order of treatment for bronchodilators, hypertonic
11 saline, recombinant human DNase, inhaled
12 antibiotics, and airway clearance. And of course,
13 she tries to do all of these therapies before she
14 eats in the morning.

15 After a full day of work, where she really
16 avoids trying to take treatments in order to
17 maintain some semblance of privacy and normalcy,
18 she comes home. And after a busy day, she has to
19 repeat all of these therapies all over again.

20 The constraints for treatment really
21 compete with some of the fun and social activities
22 she'd like to do more in her life. Finally, around

1 10:30, she's able to go to bed just to repeat this
2 routine the next day, and day after day going
3 forward.

4 So I don't know about you, but I would
5 personally last about one day in this routine, yet
6 we ask people with CF to do exactly this on a
7 day-to-day basis throughout their life.

8 I'll close by simply reinforcing the idea
9 that despite great progress in the treatment of CF,
10 we've not solved the problem of progressive lung
11 disease, even with intensive treatment regimens,
12 including CFTR modulators. We therefore continue
13 to need treatment options that are not only
14 effective, but are feasible to use by our patients,
15 because these easier-to-use treatments are much
16 more likely to be actually used by people with CF,
17 and they also will be more likely to achieve
18 real-world efficacy.

19 The cornerstone of treating CF is to
20 improve airway clearance using both mechanical
21 devices and inhaled medications to improve lung
22 function. This goal is not going to change going

1 forward. While hypertonic saline is our current
2 approach of stimulating mucociliary clearance, not
3 all patients will tolerate it, and many treatments
4 will be skipped due to the significant treatment
5 burden they entail.

6 An alternative agent that reduces treatment
7 burden and increases portability would therefore be
8 welcomed, and in fact is being demanded by our
9 patients. Thank you very much. I'll now turn the
10 presentation over to Dr. Dell'Anna.

11 **Applicant Presentation - Carmen Dell'Anna**

12 DR. DELL'ANNA: Thank you.

13 I'm Carmen Dell'Anna, vice-president of
14 medical affairs at Chiesi. I will now share the
15 Bronchitol efficacy data in adult patients with
16 cystic fibrosis, which demonstrate consistent
17 clinically meaningful improvement in lung function
18 as measured by FEV1.

19 First, I will briefly discuss the three
20 phase 3 trials included in the program. Next, I
21 will present the primary endpoint results and the
22 supportive sensitivity analyses. I'll then review

1 results from other measures of pulmonary function
2 in two other clinical endpoints. Let me first turn
3 to the overview of our three clinical studies.

4 As presented earlier, the clinical
5 development program for Bronchitol include three
6 randomized double-blind controlled phase 3 studies
7 with 789 adults with cystic fibrosis, including
8 423 patients randomized in the most recent study,
9 303.

10 Overall, the design of study 303 was
11 similar to 301 and 302. All included 26-week
12 double-blind treatment periods, the same treatment
13 arms, and a mannitol tolerance test to identify
14 bronchial hyperresponsiveness. However, study 303
15 included additional measures to minimize patient
16 dropout and missing data, such as encouraging
17 patients to remain in study even if discontinuing
18 from study treatment.

19 Patients who passed the MTT were randomized
20 to either 400 milligrams of Bronchitol or control
21 containing 50-milligram mannitol. In-office
22 efficacy assessments, including spirometry,

1 occurred at week 6, 14, and 26. Patients
2 completing studies 301 and 302 could elect to
3 receive Bronchitol in an open-label extension for
4 either 26 or 52 weeks.

5 Based on the need to meet the requirements
6 of matching taste and appearance and the lack of
7 response in phase 2 findings, we chose
8 50 milligrams inhaled mannitol, a twice-daily dose,
9 as control for phase 3 studies. This selection was
10 discussed with the FDA.

11 Moving to enrollment, all three studies had
12 similar enrollment criteria. Patients were
13 enrolled if they had a confirmed diagnosis of
14 cystic fibrosis. Patients also had to have a
15 percent of predicted FEV1 at screening, ranging
16 between 40 and 90 percent, with values of greater
17 than or equal to 30 percent allowed in study 301.
18 Antibiotics and rhDNase treatments were also
19 permitted.

20 Key exclusion criteria included the
21 prohibition of nebulized hypertonic saline for
22 maintenance treatment and failure to pass the

1 mannitol tolerance test at screening.

2 The endpoints were also similar. In all
3 three phase 3 studies, the primary endpoint was the
4 FEV1 change from baseline over 26 weeks. Other
5 lung function endpoints evaluated were forced vital
6 capacity and forced expiratory flow, 25 to
7 75 percent.

8 In addition, rate of protocol-defined
9 pulmonary exacerbations, or PDPE, and change from
10 baseline in CFQ-R, which is a measure of symptom
11 severity, were evaluated in all studies.

12 Additional endpoints assessed during the studies
13 are included in our briefing book.

14 The statistical analysis accounted for
15 missing data, and the prespecified methods from
16 study 303 were applied to study 301-302, and
17 integrated analysis. The ITT was defined as all
18 randomized adult patients regardless of study drug
19 intake.

20 Based on the assumption that the patients
21 who withdrew from study due to an adverse event
22 that lack of efficacy or physician decision do not

1 benefit from treatment, missing data were imputed
2 with baseline value. On the other hand, no formal
3 imputation was applied for patients who withdrew
4 from study for other reasons.

5 The statistical method applied to the
6 primary analysis was the Mixed Model Repeated
7 Measures or MMRM. The analysis used all available
8 data, including assessments measured after
9 treatment discontinuation.

10 In order to assess the robustness of study
11 results, preplanned sensitivity analysis, as
12 discussed with the FDA, were performed under
13 different assumptions, both for missing at random
14 and not-at-random, and different statistical
15 methods. These methods were pattern mixture
16 modeling, MMRM without imputation, tipping point,
17 and responder analysis using different thresholds.

18 We are presenting the efficacy data,
19 focusing on study 303 to the left, followed by the
20 adult data from the original studies, 301 and 302,
21 and then the supportive integrated analysis.

22 In study 303, 88 percent of patients

1 completed the study, and reasons for study
2 withdrawal were balanced between arms. Therefore,
3 in study 303, the previous concerns for withdrawal
4 and differential dropout rates were addressed.

5 All three studies reported similar
6 demographics consistent with the adult patient
7 population with cystic fibrosis. In study 303, the
8 demographics were well balanced between arms, and
9 as expected, the majority of patients were adult,
10 young adult, and mostly Caucasian. U.S. sites were
11 the largest contributor at 27 percent. In general,
12 we see similarity across all three studies in
13 baseline CF characteristics.

14 Focusing on study 303, the baseline FEV1
15 percent predicted in this population of adult
16 cystic fibrosis patients was approximately
17 63 percent. More than one-third of the population
18 had a baseline predicted FEV1 of greater than
19 70 percent.

20 The CFQ-R scores ranged from 0 to 100,
21 where higher scores reflect less symptoms. Across
22 all studies, 71 to 80 percent of patients had

1 baseline CFQ-R scores of greater than 50, attesting
2 to a well-controlled patient population. About
3 43 percent of the patients had
4 *Pseudomonas aeruginosa* infections at the time of
5 screening.

6 In terms of exacerbations history, most
7 patients in study 303 and 302 did not experience a
8 pulmonary exacerbation requiring hospitalization or
9 use of intravenous antibiotics within the last
10 12 months before enrollment. Data on exacerbations
11 before enrollment were not collected in study 301.

12 Turning now to the primary results from the
13 studies, the difference between treatments in FEV1
14 change from baseline over 26 weeks were significant
15 in favor of Bronchitol compared to 50 milligrams
16 control, with an adjusted mean difference of
17 0.054 liters in study 303 and a p-value of 0.02.

18 When identical statistical methods were
19 applied post hoc to each study in the adult
20 population, improvements were also observed in lung
21 function over the 26-week treatment period.

22 Reassuringly, all three studies revealed

1 consistent findings. There was little effect on
2 FEV1 from the control arms, with a majority of FEV1
3 gains driven by improvement in the Bronchitol arms.
4 The integrated data demonstrated a 0.067-liter mean
5 difference from control.

6 We also performed a multiple sensitivity
7 analysis. All sensitivity analysis confirmed the
8 primary results observed in study 303 and showed
9 consistently favorable treatment difference
10 supporting Bronchitol's efficacy. Highlighting
11 represents a treatment difference in favor of
12 Bronchitol.

13 The sensitivity analysis across the other
14 two studies and the integrated analysis, again,
15 supported the primary results. The entirety of
16 this finding support the robustness of the dataset
17 for improvement in pulmonary function.

18 An additional way to assess the FEV1
19 response to Bronchitol is to look at various
20 response thresholds. In study 303, regardless of
21 FEV1 threshold we apply, we see consistently more
22 responders among patients treated with Bronchitol

1 at week 26 compared to the control group.

2 At the threshold of 0.1 liters, 34 percent
3 of patients treated with Bronchitol were responders
4 compared with 24 percent of patients in the control
5 group. When, again, identical statistical methods
6 were applied to study 301 and 302, similar
7 responder benefits were observed across thresholds.

8 In this analysis, we see the impact of the
9 effect of Bronchitol on lung function based on
10 disease severity, as measured by percent predicted
11 FEV1. It is notable that there is a consistent
12 improvement with a greater effect observed in more
13 severely affected patients.

14 Next, I will present results of other
15 pulmonary function endpoints, starting with
16 absolute change from baseline in forced vital
17 capacity.

18 In study 303, as well as in study 301 and
19 302, FVC demonstrated the treatment difference in
20 favor of Bronchitol compared to control, supporting
21 the results of the primary endpoint or lung
22 function. Similarly, FVF, 25 to 75 percent

1 calculation from the spirometry results supported
2 the benefit of Bronchitol or lung function. We
3 observed a positive treatment difference in all
4 studies.

5 I will now discuss protocol-defined
6 pulmonary exacerbations and the cystic fibrosis
7 questionnaire. Several secondary endpoints were
8 hierarchically tested, however, none met
9 statistical significance.

10 Starting with the rate of pulmonary
11 exacerbations, protocol-defined pulmonary
12 exacerbations were defined as patients being
13 treated with intravenous antibiotics because of 4
14 or more prespecified design and symptoms. These
15 are reported PDPE experienced by the patients.

16 Only 13 and 14 percent of patients
17 experienced a PDPE over the 26-week trial period in
18 study 303. Moreover, it is notable that the number
19 of events was very low. In the integrated
20 population, the rate ratio was 1.0 between arms.

21 In study 303, there was no difference
22 between arms in time to first PDPE, and as you can

1 see, very few patients experienced an event.
2 Additionally, these curves look similar for the
3 integrated analysis.

4 Next, looking at the CF questionnaire data,
5 CFQ-R changes over 26 weeks were similar for both
6 Bronchitol and control, which was not unexpected
7 given the population was well-controlled at
8 baseline.

9 Here, you see the CFQ-R results for the
10 most symptomatic patients, who all had a baseline
11 score less than or equal to 50. This is a post hoc
12 small subset of patients and needs to be
13 interpreted with caution.

14 In these more symptomatic groups, you can
15 see that the changes from baseline were calculated
16 within each treatment arm, and for these patients,
17 the adjusted mean difference between treatment is
18 about 4 units, in favor of Bronchitol and
19 consistent with a clinically meaningful change.
20 Studies 301 and 302 were also supportive.

21 To summarize, Bronchitol demonstrated
22 consistent improvements in FEV1 across various

1 biometric measures, with greater improvements
2 observed in patients with more severe lung disease.
3 The results were confirmed in multiple sensitivity
4 analysis and responder analyses, and were observed
5 in a relatively stable CF population across the
6 large phase 3 studies.

7 Secondary lung function endpoints support
8 the primary results. The secondary endpoint of
9 PDPE was comparable among treatments. In this
10 relatively stable population, changes in CFQ-R were
11 not noted overall. However, a clinically
12 meaningful effect on non-symptoms was observed in
13 more symptomatic patients.

14 Thank you. Dr. Alexander will now come to
15 the podium to discuss the safety findings.

16 **Applicant Presentation - James Alexander**

17 DR. ALEXANDER: Good morning. I'm James
18 Alexander. I'm representing the medical affairs
19 division at Chiesi. It is my pleasure this morning
20 to describe and discuss the safety data on the
21 safety of Bronchitol in adult patients with cystic
22 fibrosis. The safety profile of Bronchitol has

1 been well characterized in adult patients with CF.
2 The data come from the three phase 3 studies, and
3 because the designs were similar, we have pooled
4 the events.

5 I'll first discuss the overall safety
6 profile and then briefly summarize the safety
7 profile for the open-label extension. Then I'll
8 review the adverse events of special interest,
9 including pulmonary exacerbations, looking
10 specifically at the events in the U.S. and the
11 non-U.S. subpopulations.

12 I want to mention now that the pulmonary
13 exacerbations in the safety database represent a
14 different dataset than that for the secondary
15 efficacy endpoint of PDPE that was just discussed
16 by Dr. Dell'Anna.

17 First, let me describe the patient exposure
18 to Bronchitol across the phase 3 studies.

19 508 patients were treated with Bronchitol in the
20 three phase 3 studies. Patients evaluated for
21 randomization were required to pass the mannitol
22 tolerance test to screen for hyper-responsiveness

1 to inhaled mannitol. 896 patients were tested;
2 824, or 92 percent, passed the MTT and were
3 eligible for randomization.

4 The 508 patients exposed consist of the
5 414 randomized to Bronchitol in the double-blind
6 period, 130 of whom entered the open-label period,
7 and 94 patients who entered the open-label period,
8 who had received control in the double-blind phase.
9 In total, 62 percent of these 508 patients received
10 Bronchitol for longer than 6 months.

11 Let's look at the overall safety profile
12 during the double-blind period. Across the three
13 studies in parallel with the 414 patients treated
14 with Bronchitol, 347 received control. The
15 percentages of patients with 1 or more adverse
16 events, 1 or more severe adverse events, or 1 or
17 more serious adverse events were very similar
18 between the two treatment arms.

19 More patients receiving Bronchitol
20 discontinued study drug due to an adverse event,
21 and I will review the specific reasons in a later
22 slide. Among adults in the phase 3 program, one

1 19-year-old male who received control in study 303
2 died following a pulmonary exacerbation.

3 Next, I'll show the more common adverse
4 events that were reported. Pulmonary exacerbation
5 was the most commonly reported adverse event, and
6 it has the MedDRA code of condition aggravated.
7 Cough, headache, and hemoptysis were the next most
8 common events reported by 10 to 15 percent of
9 patients.

10 Cough was more common with Bronchitol
11 treatment, as would be expected based on the
12 mechanism of action. Hemoptysis occurred in
13 similar percentages of patients in both treatment
14 groups. Among the less common events,
15 pharyngolaryngeal pain, which is coded as
16 oropharyngeal pain in MedDRA, was more common with
17 Bronchitol treatment than with control.

18 Let's turn now to the more common serious
19 adverse events. The percentages of patients with
20 any of these individual SAEs were generally similar
21 between the two treatment groups. For pulmonary
22 exacerbations, 13 percent of patients in the

1 Bronchitol group and 11 percent of the control
2 group experienced events meeting the definition of
3 a serious adverse event.

4 Now, I'll review the adverse events that
5 led to study drug discontinuation. We see that
6 more patients on Bronchitol discontinued treatment
7 due to an adverse event, and the two most common
8 reasons were cough followed by pulmonary
9 exacerbation.

10 While more Bronchitol patients discontinued
11 due to cough compared to control, similar
12 percentages of patients in both groups discontinued
13 study drug due to pulmonary exacerbation. These
14 data demonstrate that, overall, in the majority of
15 patients, twice daily treatment with Bronchitol was
16 well tolerated.

17 Let's look now at the safety profile for
18 the 224 patients who entered the open-label
19 extensions. In studies 301 and 302, patients could
20 participate in open-label extensions and receive
21 Bronchitol for up to 6 or 12 months. Among these
22 patients, the adverse event profile was similar to

1 that for Bronchitol treatment during the double-
2 blind treatment. These data support the long-term
3 safety of daily treatment with Bronchitol.

4 I'll now review and discuss the adverse
5 events of special interest, including pulmonary
6 exacerbations. I will only briefly summarize the
7 data for 4 of the 5 adverse events of special
8 interest since our conclusions are consistent with
9 the FDA's assessment of these events.

10 Cough and pharyngolaryngeal pain are
11 expected with Bronchitol, and these events occurred
12 more frequently than with control. The percentage
13 of patients with hemoptysis was similar for
14 Bronchitol and control, and the rate of this event
15 aligns with expectations in the adult cystic
16 fibrosis population.

17 Bronchospasm is a known risk, but this risk
18 is mitigated by the use of the mannitol tolerance
19 test. Consequently, the rate of bronchospasm was
20 very low.

21 Finally, the overall event rate for
22 pulmonary exacerbations was similar in both

1 treatment arms. However, I want to explore the
2 exacerbation data in depth based on the observed
3 imbalance in the U.S. patient subgroup.

4 As shown in table 33 of the FDA briefing
5 document, among U.S. patients, there was a 2-fold
6 difference in the number of patients with SAEs in
7 the Bronchitol group compared to control,
8 21 percent versus 11 percent, or numerically, this
9 is 23 patients versus 10.

10 In contrast, in the non-U.S. population,
11 there was no difference. However, we need to
12 understand that the U.S. patients randomly assigned
13 to these two treatments were not comparable
14 populations at baseline in a very important
15 baseline characteristic.

16 More U.S. patients randomized to Bronchitol
17 had a prior history of pulmonary exacerbations.
18 Forty-five percent had experienced one or more
19 exacerbations in the 12 months prior to screening
20 compared to 38 percent with its history in the
21 control group. An imbalance is also evident when
22 looking at U.S. Bronchitol patients who had 2 or

1 more exacerbations in the past year, 20 percent
2 versus 14 percent for the control group.

3 A similar imbalance was seen in the U.S.
4 patients who had pulmonary exacerbation requiring
5 IV antibiotics in the 12 months prior to screening.
6 Consequently, comparative assessments should be
7 viewed with caution since the U.S. subpopulation
8 makes up only 27 percent of the total data. In
9 contrast, the larger non-U.S. subpopulation was
10 balanced for these key baseline characteristics.

11 It's commonly accepted that prior
12 exacerbations are the number one predictor of
13 future exacerbations in patients with cystic
14 fibrosis. If you look across studies 302 and 303
15 by a subpopulation, most of the exacerbations SAEs
16 on study occurred in patients with a prior history
17 of pulmonary exacerbations.

18 With this in mind, I return to the display
19 of the exacerbation SAEs in the U.S. shown on the
20 first row of this slide. 21 out of 23 Bronchitol
21 patients in the U.S. subpopulation who had an
22 exacerbation SAE also had a prior history of

1 pulmonary exacerbation, and 6 out of 10 control
2 patients in the U.S. had a similar history.

3 In contrast, we see a balance between
4 treatments in the non-U.S. population. This
5 emphasizes the importance of this baseline
6 characteristic as a predictor of future
7 exacerbation independent of treatment.

8 In conclusion, pulmonary exacerbations are
9 not a Bronchitol-related risk that is specific to
10 the U.S. population. In terms of the concern of
11 pulmonary exacerbation in U.S. patients that has
12 been raised by the FDA, Chiesi agrees that small
13 subsets of data need to be cautiously interpreted.
14 Moreover, since there were imbalances by treatment
15 arm in the U.S. subpopulation for prior pulmonary
16 exacerbations before study enrollment, caution is
17 all the more warranted.

18 The overall safety population informs the
19 risk for pulmonary exacerbations in the most
20 reliable manner, and as I have shown, these data
21 show no increase in risk.

22 In summary, Bronchitol treatment in adults

1 with cystic fibrosis was generally well tolerated.
2 The adverse events of cough and pharyngolaryngeal
3 pain are expected in this population due,
4 respectively, to the mechanism of action of
5 Bronchitol and the local effects of dry powder.

6 Hemoptysis was no more common with
7 Bronchitol treatment than with control, and the
8 occurrence of bronchospasm was infrequent and
9 similar between arms. Pulmonary exacerbations were
10 similar between treatment groups.

11 Finally, the Bronchitol safety profile is
12 supported by eight years of post-marketing data and
13 a five-year registry study conducted by the UK
14 Cystic Fibrosis Trust. Thank you for your
15 attention this morning. I'll now turn the podium
16 over to Dr. Patrick Flume.

17 **Applicant Presentation - Patrick Flume**

18 DR. FLUME: Good morning, and thank you. I
19 come to you as a clinician with considerable
20 experience in treating patients with cystic
21 fibrosis, more than 25 years of clinical
22 experience, extensive participation in CF clinical

1 trials, and as a founding co-chair of the CF
2 Pulmonary Guidelines Committee.

3 I believe that Bronchitol offers our
4 patients an effective and safe choice, an option
5 that they can consider for the routine management
6 of their cystic fibrosis.

7 Here again is a slide demonstrating the
8 pathophysiology of lung disease in cystic fibrosis
9 and where we believe that current therapies have
10 their function. I've placed Bronchitol in the same
11 position as hypertonic saline, as its mechanism of
12 action is to draw fluid into the airways to augment
13 mucociliary clearance and help to clear the
14 secretions.

15 I cannot stress enough the importance of
16 clearance of airway secretions. It is the most
17 fundamental aspect of disease management. Not only
18 does this relieve some of the airway obstruction,
19 but every drop of sputum contains millions of
20 bacteria, so coughing up mucus, which we know that
21 Bronchitol accomplishes, unloads a lot of infection
22 as well as inflammation.

1 When I evaluate a medication for my
2 patients, there are three questions that I ask:
3 what is the evidence for efficacy, what's the
4 safety and tolerability of the therapy, and when
5 and how will I introduce this medication into their
6 regimen? Let's look at Bronchitol with respect to
7 these questions.

8 The results from the Bronchitol studies
9 compared with the results from the hypertonic
10 saline trial represent a clinically important
11 treatment option for our CF patients. I have
12 compared Bronchitol to hypertonic saline because it
13 is the most relevant comparator. The CF Chronic
14 Medication Guidelines recommend hypertonic saline
15 based on its improvement in lung function, with a
16 treatment effect that is similar to what has been
17 shown with Bronchitol.

18 Hypertonic saline has become a major part
19 of the CF treatment regimen. I know this to be
20 true by looking at the CF patient registry data,
21 which tracks prescription of therapies in the
22 population. And as you can see, the use of

1 hypertonic saline has increased considerably, being
2 prescribed for the majority of patients, and
3 especially for adults.

4 I suggest to you that this demonstrates
5 that the CF community perceives the effect of
6 hypertonic saline on FEV1 to be clinically
7 meaningful, and I would expect the same for their
8 interpretation of the Bronchitol data.

9 This is the subgroup analysis of the impact
10 of the effect on Bronchitol and lung function based
11 on disease severity, as measured by FEV1, and I
12 found this analysis revealing. It's notable that
13 there is improvement in all subgroups, but a
14 greater effect was demonstrated in more severely
15 affected patients, and this may also provide a hint
16 as to which patients may benefit the most. As
17 Dr. Dell'Anna showed, the more symptomatic patients
18 are also those that showed the greatest improvement
19 in the CFQ-R.

20 Now, let's address the question of safety
21 and tolerability in adults with CF. It is well
22 known to us that some patients cannot tolerate the

1 introduction of inhaled medication, whether by
2 nebulized solution or by dry powder. Cough is
3 common. Some patients will experience bronchospasm
4 with chest tightness or wheezing. Voice changes
5 are also common.

6 But these are not all safety issues. Some
7 are tolerability issues, and these can be easily
8 mitigated by informing our patients about
9 expectations. When they expect a cough, it is not
10 as concerning to them. This is one reason why our
11 center has had success in getting patients to adopt
12 inhaled therapies.

13 Some patients will respond to teaching
14 alone and perhaps some prevention in their
15 technique. There will be others who cannot
16 tolerate the therapy in spite of these efforts.
17 But again, this is known for all of our aerosol
18 therapies. The mannitol tolerance test provides
19 clinicians a useful step to identify those patients
20 who may not tolerate therapy. There is no such
21 standard test for hypertonic saline.

22 It's notable to me that looking at

1 pulmonary exacerbations and serious exacerbations
2 in the safety dataset, we see no clinically
3 relevant differences between Bronchitol and
4 control. In summary, the safety data reassure me
5 that there are no major safety concerns.

6 Now that we find that Bronchitol may prove
7 safe and effective, how do we think about
8 introducing it to our patients? As Dr. Donaldson
9 mentioned, we have enjoyed success in developing
10 therapies for our CF patients. We are now in the
11 era of CFTR modulators with even better results, so
12 patients and clinicians have already begun to ask
13 what therapies they might be able to stop, thinking
14 about trading therapies rather than always adding
15 on.

16 It's clear that novel therapies will not
17 cure our patients nor will it repair established
18 bronchiectasis, so we will not be able to stop all
19 the other therapies. But if you ask patients, they
20 are most interested in stopping those therapies
21 that take the most time or require the most effort,
22 such as in set-up and cleaning. In my practice, I

1 need options. I need options to individualize
2 therapy and my patients want alternatives.

3 As should be readily apparent, our patients
4 with cystic fibrosis have a significant burden of
5 treatment. Bronchitol represents a therapeutic
6 option with a lower treatment burden. It's
7 portable. Treatment takes approximately 5 minutes.
8 There is minimal set-up in cleaning. No
9 refrigeration is required. So Bronchitol
10 represents a convenient treatment choice and one
11 that might fit into the lifestyle of many of our
12 patients.

13 Going back to the patient example from
14 Dr. Donaldson, recall that in order for Kim to
15 complete all of her therapies, to get her kids off
16 to school, and then get to work, she has to get up
17 at 5:00 in the morning. What do you think her
18 enthusiasm is to repeat that treatment cycle when
19 she gets home after a long day?

20 For her, Bronchitol might actually offer a
21 great option, to reduce the time in the morning and
22 evening therapies, and perhaps even more relevant

1 is the freedom it offers, the portability. Maybe
2 she chooses a dry powder inhalation with a
3 hand-held therapy device, which would allow her to
4 do her therapies discretely at work. She'd no
5 longer have to decide whether she skips her
6 children's activities or skips a treatment.

7 Having a portable treatment could have a
8 significant impact on her life and perhaps being
9 able to take that device and medication with her
10 would allow her to take the therapy more
11 effectively rather than choosing to not do the
12 therapy at all.

13 In conclusion, Bronchitol is a viable
14 treatment option with a positive benefit-risk
15 profile. The cornerstone of CF treatment for adult
16 patients is airway clearance. I cannot stress the
17 importance of this enough, and this is how
18 Bronchitol works.

19 Looking at the data, we see that treatment
20 with Bronchitol consistently improves lung
21 function. The efficacy was clearly established.
22 Changes to FEV1 were clinically meaningful, even in

1 patients already treated with the best standard of
2 care.

3 For me, the overall safety and tolerability
4 profile appears acceptable. Bronchitol also offers
5 additional benefits that may be important to people
6 with CF, such as its ease of use, the short
7 administration time, and the portability of the
8 device. These benefits give the patients the
9 freedom that they do not experience with many of
10 their other therapies.

11 We do not expect Bronchitol to be the
12 option for all patients, but that is what we
13 already know for all of the other medications that
14 we use to treat CF lung disease. This is about
15 providing our patients with choices that offer
16 benefits and fit into their lifestyle.

17 I thank you for your attention.
18 Dr. Parry-Billings will now return to take your
19 questions.

20 DR. AU: Thank you very much. Before we
21 continue on with questions, Dr. Cataletto, will you
22 please introduce yourself?

1 DR. CATALETTO: My name is Dr. Mary
2 Cataletto. I'm from NYU Winthrop, and I'm a
3 pediatric pulmonologist.

4 **Clarifying Questions**

5 DR. AU: Thank you very much.

6 Are there any clarifying questions for
7 Chiesi? Please remember to state your name for the
8 record before you speak. If you can, please direct
9 your questions to a specific presenter.

10 Yes, Dr. Brittain? Sorry if I
11 mispronounced that.

12 DR. BRITTAIN: Yes. I guess my first
13 question is about slide CO-57. One thing I'm a
14 little confused about, compared to results in the
15 FDA briefing package, is in study 303, in their
16 briefing package, they have a result that looks
17 almost statistically significant in the wrong
18 direction for what I think is this result.

19 Now, this one says "adjusted" and I don't
20 know if that's the difference. Can someone
21 explain? Am I comparing apples and oranges or is
22 this just, this is adjusted and the other one

1 wasn't? And if it is adjusted, was it
2 prespecified?

3 DR. PARRY-BILLINGS: Thank you for the
4 question. If I may ask Dr. Day, our statistician,
5 to talk to that point to explain the details.

6 Thank you.

7 DR. BRITTAIN: And I will have a follow-up.

8 DR. DAY: Thank you. I'm Simon Day,
9 statistical consultant to Chiesi. The explanation
10 is that in the original submission in the clinical
11 study report, and as reported by the, the analysis
12 was an adjusted analysis, including adjustment for
13 missing values that were imputed based on the
14 patient's historical p rate in the year prior to
15 entry to the study.

16 Now, the problem was, in study 301, those
17 historical rates were not collected. In this
18 slide, what we wanted to present was the same
19 method of analysis for each of the three studies
20 and the integrated. So we had to come down to the
21 lowest common denominator and use a method that did
22 not impute the historical rate that patients had.

1 DR. BRITTAIN: I'm sorry. I'm still a
2 little confused. For study 303, when you say
3 adjusted, you've adjusted for what? I'm focusing
4 on 303.

5 DR. DAY: The reason the result comes out
6 differently in this slide, compared to the clinical
7 study report and the FDA's presentation, is because
8 this slide here does not use imputation for the
9 historical rate of these in patients who had
10 missing data.

11 DR. BRITTAIN: Okay. Secondly, in the
12 pooled analyses that you present, also for
13 exacerbations, in the safety presentation, when
14 you're pooling, first of all, you're not doing it
15 in a stratified way, I assume.

16 In the integrated analyses of efficacy, is
17 that stratified by study, and in the safety
18 pooling, you're not doing it in a stratified
19 fashion; you're just lumping? Is that correct?

20 DR. PARRY-BILLINGS: Dr. Day again. Thank
21 you.

22 DR. DAY: Yes, you're right. In the

1 efficacy analysis, there's a factor for study in
2 the model. In the safety data, I believe it's just
3 all pooled together.

4 DR. BRITTAIN: In fact, just to be clear,
5 the pooled results say, for the exacerbations,
6 we've understood in study 301, there was a lot of
7 missing data. So you're only going to reflect
8 exacerbations during the period when people were on
9 drug.

10 DR. PARRY-BILLINGS: I'm sorry. Could you
11 clarify your question?

12 DR. BRITTAIN: So in the pooled studies of
13 exacerbations at all safety endpoints, we
14 understood from before that there was a lot of
15 missing data in study 301. Will you only be
16 capturing the exacerbations and other events when
17 people are on drug in those pooled analyses?

18 DR. PARRY-BILLINGS: Yes. In the earlier
19 studies, when patients discontinued therapy, they
20 discontinued the study. This was an enhancement of
21 the design in the most recent 303 study, whereby
22 for those patients who discontinued study

1 treatment, they were encouraged to stay in the
2 study to complete the 26 weeks of treatment.

3 DR. AU: Dr. Emerson?

4 DR. EMERSON: Yes. On slide CO-74, where
5 we're looking at the U.S. population in the pooled
6 studies -- but those would actually just be two of
7 them, I suppose -- you were making the point of an
8 imbalance in terms of the history.

9 Now, as I look at the data that you also
10 present on CO-73, but we can stay on this slide,
11 where you said 45 percent of the Bronchitol
12 patients had a prior history, whereas only
13 38 percent -- if I look stratified by that prior
14 history -- and I'll note that, in any SAE, I'm
15 always very, very worried about a treatment that
16 magnifies an underlying risk -- I come up with that
17 means that 42 percent of the patients with the
18 prior history on Bronchitol went on and again had
19 an SAE, whereas, on the control group, only
20 17 percent of the patients who had a prior history
21 went on to have an SAE. And for what it's worth,
22 in the non-prior history subgroup, it's 3 percent

1 and 7 percent for the mannitol and control groups,
2 respectively.

3 I'd be interested in your comments on that.
4 It looks like there's a great increased risk in
5 that stratum of prior history.

6 DR. PARRY-BILLINGS: If we can have up
7 again the CO-74, and I ask Dr. Alexander to come to
8 the microphone to talk about that in more detail.
9 The headline from our assessment of the data, and I
10 think pretty well established in the literature, is
11 that prior history of exacerbations drives future
12 exacerbations, potentially with an independence
13 from treatment.

14 But please, Dr. Alexander, if you can
15 comment further.

16 DR. ALEXANDER: Jim Alexander from Chiesi
17 medical affairs. Again, overall, we saw no
18 difference. We looked very intensively at these 23
19 versus these 10 subjects for their history. I
20 might mention that the history of previous
21 exacerbation and previous IV antibiotic use was a
22 male medical record determination look-back. This

1 was not something from memory. This was based on
2 the records in the clinics.

3 There were actually more differences than I
4 showed earlier because if you look at the 23, first
5 of all, they both had the same disease severity,
6 but then if you look at the number of
7 hospitalizations, 21 of the 23 had 4, 11, 5, 1
8 versus lower numbers in the control groups.

9 This was an imbalance pretty obvious to
10 look at. Also, the pseudomonas prevalence was also
11 imbalanced.

12 DR. EMERSON: But again, if we're going to
13 go on this, then I'm going to do a stratified
14 analysis. I'm going to say, then, within each
15 group, let's stratify by this prior history, and
16 let's look at the rate of exacerbations within
17 those groups. And I'm coming up with -- and the
18 only data I have to do this on is the prior history
19 of greater than or equal to 1. But I'm coming up
20 with a difference of 42 percent versus 17 percent.

21 So if we're just pretending that for
22 whatever reason, you did a -- well, I guess this

1 would be something like a 5 to 4 randomization
2 ratio in that stratum, whatever it is. As I look
3 at those statistics, I'm still seeing that there
4 looks to be a greater tendency to magnify it.

5 I'll grant you, I do expect it to be
6 predictive -- well, to be prognostic, but I'm
7 afraid it's also predictive, is my problem. I'm
8 afraid that there's also an increased chance that
9 you are magnifying this tendency to have the
10 exacerbations.

11 DR. PARRY-BILLINGS: If I may ask
12 Dr. Alexander to comment further, and perhaps also
13 we could explore the analysis that you proposed and
14 perhaps come back to you after the break with
15 further clarification because we appreciate, and
16 indeed it was the reason we flagged this particular
17 U.S. subpopulation in our core presentation.

18 Please, Dr. Alexander?

19 DR. ALEXANDER: Thank you again. Jim
20 Alexander from Chiesi. I want to show you one
21 analysis of subjects who had no history of previous
22 exacerbations coming into the study. 351 of our

1 adult subjects in studies 302 and 303 answered no,
2 and the medical records confirmed they had no
3 history of previous exacerbations.

4 You see that, in that group, which
5 represents over 50 percent of the subjects in both
6 these studies, there was a 3-fold lower rate of
7 pulmonary exacerbation in the Bronchitol-treated
8 group, and these exacerbations were, as you may
9 see, less severe than those in the control group.

10 These data and another subpopulation,
11 albeit a very large subpopulation, show that we,
12 again, don't see an effect of Bronchitol in
13 increasing the risk of exacerbation.

14 DR. PARRY-BILLINGS: May I suggest, if I
15 may --

16 DR. EMERSON: Just one comment, though, and
17 then we can just go on to other things because I
18 think the numbers speak for themselves. But this
19 is not restricted to the U.S. population, and this
20 is the opposite group that I was worried about,
21 which is those patients who are at risk for an
22 exacerbation because they have a history of an

1 exacerbation; is there a safety signal in that
2 group?

3 Telling me that there isn't in a group that
4 we have less statistical power because it's a lower
5 rate doesn't answer that question.

6 DR. PARRY-BILLINGS: If I may, just to
7 perhaps elaborate further and also to put some U.S.
8 clinical context on these exacerbation findings, if
9 I might ask Dr. Flume to comment because this is an
10 area, I know, of his clinical expertise.

11 Thank you, Dr. Flume.

12 DR. FLUME: Yes. Thank you. Patrick
13 Flume. I spent the last decade of my life focusing
14 on pulmonary exacerbations in cystic fibrosis
15 patients, and we have learned a lot about what
16 predicts events, how they respond to events, and
17 such.

18 If I could have the slide that shows the
19 exacerbations with the pseudomonas that
20 Dr. Alexander just had up. To make it more
21 complex, since you're looking at a subgroup
22 analysis, there are other risk factors that predict

1 events. So as has been stated, the history of
2 events, and specifically IV events, are the
3 strongest predictor of future events. Actually, if
4 you design the study specifically looking at
5 exacerbations as your primary endpoint, you really
6 want to power your study for those patients who
7 have a history of events, particularly those that
8 have 2 or more events.

9 But the other highly predictive factor is
10 also shown on this screen, and that's the
11 prevalence of *Pseudomonas aeruginosa*. It was
12 greater in the U.S. population, that had
13 exacerbations had *pseudomonas*, because in order to
14 meet the definition of the protocol-defined
15 exacerbation, they had to get IV antibiotics.

16 We don't have many choices of oral
17 antibiotics for *pseudomonas*. So if there is a
18 situation in which the clinician has thought an
19 intervention is warranted, it is much more likely
20 to get IV therapy as opposed to oral antibiotics.

21 DR. AU: Great. Dr. Gillen?

22 DR. GILLEN: I have two actually. One is a

1 follow-up to what Dr. Emerson brought up just a
2 moment ago. When you guys go back to look at that
3 analysis, I was actually coming at this from a
4 slightly different point of view, which is, when
5 you look at the time to first exacerbation versus
6 the rate which is going to allow people to have
7 multiple exacerbations count, you see quite a bit
8 of a difference, particularly in the analysis
9 presented by the FDA.

10 So when you go back to re-examine those
11 data and stratify on that, I would like to also see
12 the time to first exacerbation versus the rate
13 that's accounting for multiple events within side
14 of a subject. It's a very similar concern in that
15 if you are predisposed to a high risk of
16 exacerbations, are we perpetuating that risk?

17 There's an attenuation when we only go to
18 time to first, so I'd like to request that one when
19 the sponsor goes back to that analysis.

20 My question that I was coming up with prior
21 to Dr. Emerson's comment is much more broad,
22 though. And I'm trying to get a feel for the study

1 design in 303 versus 301 and 302. Really, I'm
2 trying to understand the rationale behind the
3 sample size choice in those, and I'll tell you
4 where I'm coming from.

5 We have almost a 2-fold increase in the
6 sample size for 303, and my understanding of
7 reading the briefing documents is there were
8 questions at the previous advisory committee about
9 the clinical relevance of the observed effect on
10 FEV.

11 So given what was observed in those 301 and
12 302 studies, why are we powering a study for 303 to
13 detect an even smaller minimally detectible
14 difference? I'm just trying to get a feel for what
15 was the rationale behind the choice of sample size;
16 what were we looking to detect in terms of FEV;
17 what was the clinical relevance thinking of what
18 that minimum detectible difference would have been?

19 DR. PARRY-BILLINGS: If I take your
20 comments in turn, if I may, you requested further
21 analysis that we may provide after the break,
22 evaluating both time to first as well as multiple.

1 So this is noted, and we'll try to come back to you
2 after the break with that point.

3 In terms of the power calculation for 303
4 and to the specific question you've asked of the
5 magnitude of effect size, in the power calculation,
6 it was 80 mL.

7 DR. GILLEN: How did that change from 301
8 and 302? Those were much smaller studies.

9 DR. PARRY-BILLINGS: To address further
10 details on the power calculation, I might ask my
11 statistical colleague, Dr. Muraro, to come to the
12 microphone. Thank you.

13 DR. MURARO: Annamaria Muraro, Chiesi
14 statistician. You can see in this slide the
15 assumptions that were used in 303 studies to define
16 the number of patients to be randomized.

17 The treatment difference assumed was 80 mL,
18 and this was based on the result of 301 and 302
19 studies in the adult population. We assume a
20 standard deviation of 230 mL, a power of
21 90 percent, a two-sided alpha level of 5 percent,
22 leading to 350 patients that had to be randomized.

1 Since there was uncertainty about the
2 standard deviation, a blind sample size reassessed
3 was also planned. The 80 mL was selected based on
4 the result of previous studies, and there was no
5 purpose to define with this 80 mL any link with the
6 clinical relevance.

7 DR. GILLEN: My point here, though, is 301
8 and 302 started with some assumption about what the
9 minimally clinically relevant difference would be
10 to detect. How did that relate to this 80 mL that
11 you're now pooling from 301 and 302?

12 I'm trying to get an idea for what the
13 clinical relevance of this change in FEV is and
14 what the original thinking on 301 and 302 was, and
15 then that updated, if you will, prior, after you've
16 seen the 301/302 data, to design the 303 study.

17 DR. PARRY-BILLINGS: Dr. Muraro, I don't
18 know if you're able to comment further on the
19 specifics of the power calculations, and then
20 perhaps we can add a comment from the clinical
21 experts on clinical relevance.

22 DR. MURARO: Annamaria Muraro, Chiesi

1 statistician. I could say again that the power
2 calculation was based on results observed in
3 previous studies. Indeed, there was no reference
4 saying that this 80 mL is considered clinically
5 relevant in the study protocol.

6 DR. PARRY-BILLINGS: You're pushing more
7 specifically on clinical relevance, so if I may ask
8 Dr. Flume to return to the microphone to talk to
9 that.

10 While he does so, I should emphasize that,
11 as you probably know, within the context of CF
12 disease, there isn't a predefined numeric threshold
13 for clinical relevance as is more typical, perhaps,
14 in asthma, where we have an MCID of 100 that is
15 commonly used in such trials.

16 DR. GILLEN: I understand, but I'm assuming
17 there is some rationale for choosing the sample
18 size in 301/302. I'm wondering what the rationale
19 was behind the FEV difference that you were
20 powering around in 301/302.

21 Now, I hear it's prior studies. That's
22 fairly vague. And again, there must be some

1 thought to what the clinical relevance of that
2 minimum detectible difference would have been. And
3 I'm wondering why it changed when you went from
4 301/302 to 303.

5 DR. PARRY-BILLINGS: Perhaps we can come
6 back after the break with the specifics on the
7 numerics for you, but perhaps, Dr. Flume, since
8 you're at the microphone, it may be helpful to put
9 it into clinical context.

10 DR. FLUME: Yes. Thank you. Patrick
11 Flume. This is a chronic progressive lung disease,
12 and the natural history of lung disease in CF
13 patients is loss of lung function. If I could have
14 first the slide at the change in lung function from
15 the population just to demonstrate what we see in
16 our patients from the CF patient registry data.

17 When we're in the clinic with these
18 patients, know that our patients are keenly aware
19 of -- the patient registry data, please -- their
20 FEV1. We teach it to them. We talk about it.
21 They know these numbers. So when they come to
22 clinic, they're really motivated to what the

1 changes might be. Actually, in the clinic, when
2 lung function is stable, has not changed, that's a
3 good day, and when it's gone up, that's a great
4 day. So they get very depressed when those numbers
5 come down.

6 What I am trying to show you is to look at
7 that progressive loss of lung function in these
8 patients; then if I could just jump to the
9 hypertonic saline slide again. When we look at the
10 basic mechanism of action in what we see with
11 hypertonic saline -- and I use a lot of hypertonic
12 saline. I prescribe it to my patients. We coach
13 them, we teach them, and we encourage them to take
14 this medication because we believe that it works.

15 What you see here is that change in lung
16 function is comparable to what we see what has been
17 reported with hypertonic saline. I would again
18 state that I think the CF community has argued that
19 that is a clinically relevant difference because
20 they are also prescribing hypertonic saline to the
21 majority of their patients. So in my view, this is
22 a clinically meaningful difference.

1 DR. GILLEN: Since you brought that slide
2 up, just for clarification, that's prescriptions,
3 not use. Right? I mean, do we know that those
4 patients were using?

5 DR. FLUME: [Inaudible - off mic].

6 DR. GILLEN: Sorry. So in terms of
7 clinical relevance, we have a prescription, but
8 whether patients are actually using that and
9 adhering to that is slightly different, is it not?

10 DR. PARRY-BILLINGS: The confirmation from
11 the experts was that, indeed, this is the correct
12 interpretation of those data. Indeed, we know from
13 adherence or compliance studies with hypertonic
14 saline, this is not a therapy that is so readily
15 adhered to. But nevertheless, there is an
16 intention by the physician through the prescription
17 to commit to that therapy.

18 DR. AU: Just for the committee, I just
19 want to let you know that we've been taking notes
20 about who's raised their hand, so we're just going
21 in order, so just to let you know. Dr. Kelso?

22 DR. KELSO: I have, I guess, sort of three

1 sets of questions. While we're on the hypertonic
2 saline, is it correct that use of hypertonic saline
3 was an exclusion criteria because, in some respect,
4 we're thinking of the mannitol as a substitute for
5 hypertonic saline?

6 DR. PARRY-BILLINGS: Shall I take that
7 first question? Sorry. You indicated you had a
8 number of questions.

9 DR. KELSO: Yes, I do, but certainly, you
10 can answer that, if you would.

11 DR. PARRY-BILLINGS: To this first part of
12 your question, correct, the use of hypertonic
13 saline for maintenance use of hypertonic saline was
14 a prohibited medication on entry into the trial.
15 However, the sporadic or periodic use of hypertonic
16 saline was not excluded and did indeed occur during
17 the trial.

18 In terms of your question on positioning,
19 because I understood from your question that flows
20 to how is the product positioned with respect to
21 hypertonic saline, I can perhaps ask Dr. Schwarz to
22 come to the microphone.

1 Dr. Schwarz is from Germany where
2 Bronchitol is approved, so he can speak to the
3 real-life clinical practice of prescribing both
4 Bronchitol and hypertonic saline, and this might
5 address your question on positioning.

6 Thank you, Dr. Schwarz.

7 DR. SCHWARZ: Thank you. My name is
8 Carsten Schwarz from Berlin, Germany, and I'm the
9 head of the Cystic Fibrosis Centre at the Charite
10 University Hospital, and I'm also the chairman of
11 the CF Conditions Council in Germany. Our center
12 has more than 500 patients, so with this number,
13 it's one of the biggest centers in Europe and the
14 biggest one in Germany, and we are happy that we
15 have Bronchitol now since 2012.

16 If I would try to reflect the use of
17 Bronchitol, I mean, it's usually on an individual
18 basis, where we try to implement new drugs and
19 discuss those drugs with the patients. But
20 regarding Bronchitol, I would say there might be
21 three different groups.

22 One group is not tolerating hypertonic

1 saline, for example, so these patients need another
2 option or an alternative. Then there are patients,
3 although they are inhaling already Pulmozyme,
4 hypertonic saline, and maybe other things, they
5 still have a lot of mucus that they can't get rid
6 of. So this is the second, maybe the biggest one,
7 and so they're still suffering from this mucus.

8 The third one is that there are patients
9 who want to have an easier way or a faster way to
10 inhale drugs, therefore, they are using Bronchitol
11 to get rid of their sputum a bit quicker, faster,
12 and their clinic time is less.

13 These are, I would say, the three different
14 groups we see in Germany.

15 DR. KELSO: The other question about
16 saline, we saw that at least one prior study, the
17 absolute increase in FEV1 with hypertonic saline
18 and the mannitol is about the same. In the
19 mannitol studies, there was no decrease in
20 exacerbation rate and no improvement in the
21 quality-of-life measures.

22 Do we have data on exacerbation rates and

1 quality-of-life measures from hypertonic saline
2 studies?

3 DR. PARRY-BILLINGS: Yes. I can ask
4 Dr. Flume to talk to that, but while he moves to
5 the microphone, the short answer is yes. This
6 study, which we refer to as the Elkins study, was a
7 New England Journal paper, and they did measure
8 exacerbations and showed an effect.

9 This was a 12-month study, a 12-month
10 study, and also, very importantly, the event rate
11 was around 0.9 exacerbations per year in the Elkins
12 study, in the hypertonic saline study, as compared
13 to 0.2, 0.2, in study 303; so coming back to the
14 number of events being an element to allow us to
15 measure a treatment benefit.

16 Please, Dr. Flume, if you could talk
17 further.

18 DR. FLUME: Thank you. Patrick Flume. As
19 was just stated, the Elkins study did actually show
20 not just the changes in lung function, but in
21 exacerbations. And when the pulmonary guidelines
22 committee reviewed that, both of those factored

1 into the recommendation that it would become a
2 routine therapy.

3 But there are striking differences between
4 these studies that doesn't dissuade me from
5 believing this is going to work as well, so if I
6 could have the slide of the PDPE across all of the
7 studies, not just looking at the event rate, but in
8 the Elkins study, 40 percent of patients had an
9 exacerbation during the study.

10 When you look at the proportion of patients
11 who had an exacerbation in the 303 study, you see
12 that's only 13 to 14 percent. And as we know, if
13 you want to power a study to show a reduction in
14 exacerbations, you need to demonstrate that you've
15 got patients who are really at risk because you've
16 got a different population here.

17 Similar numbers in 302, and we can look at
18 study 301 where now the proportion of patients
19 having events was starting to increase, you can see
20 a nominal change in favor of Bronchitol. So those
21 are some of the key differences between those
22 studies.

1 DR. KELSO: Then finally, the results have
2 been presented in absolute increase in FEV1, and
3 I'm wondering if you have representations of the
4 same data in percent predicted FEV1, and also if
5 you have something akin to a scatter plot or dot
6 plot comparing the group, so we can see, rather
7 than just the mean values, what the spread is.

8 DR. PARRY-BILLINGS: To answer the last
9 part of your question, I don't believe we have a
10 scatter plot to show you instantly, but allow me
11 to -- if we can have the slide of the FEV1 changes
12 in the three studies as expressed by percent
13 predicted, I understand that's the focus of the
14 question.

15 This is the slide on the screen now. In
16 terms of the key messages from this slide, the
17 first is that there is a consistent therapeutic
18 benefit of Bronchitol in blue versus control in
19 pink across the three studies.

20 The second point, I think to your question,
21 is that the magnitude of the treatment effect
22 expressing FEV1 in this way is at or around

1 2 percent. The other aspect of the data that may
2 be helpful, but sticking with the data expressed as
3 FEV1 percent predicted, is a responder analysis.

4 In this presentation, as you can see in the
5 title, this is in a responder analysis looking at
6 the proportion of patients whose FEV1 as a percent
7 predicted improved by 5 percent. You saw the mean
8 change in the previous slide, which is 2 percent,
9 but these are the responders above 5 percent.

10 You can see across the studies a similar
11 message. The data is indicating a consistent
12 therapeutic benefit of Bronchitol in blue versus
13 control.

14 DR. KELSO: Thank you.

15 DR. AU: Dr. Parad?

16 DR. PARAD: I have three questions,
17 hopefully short. One is, I'm wondering whether
18 there are any sort of equivalent of wash-out data
19 in 303, whether you did follow up on re-function
20 testing after some period of time off the drug
21 and/or whether any data are available from 301 or
22 302 on that, just to give a sense of whether there

1 was a return to baseline or worsening after coming
2 off the drug.

3 The second question is regarding use of
4 correctors. I'm wondering whether you have any
5 stratification by patients who were on correctors,
6 since that might affect pulmonary lung fluid and
7 may also show some kind of responder difference.

8 Then thirdly, I'm interested a design
9 question, how you improved your attention and what
10 you had to do to keep those patients in the study
11 that dropped out in the other studies.

12 DR. PARRY-BILLINGS: I take them in reverse
13 order, if I may. In terms of measures taken from a
14 clinical operations point of view at the sites,
15 having been alerted that with the point of
16 attention of dropouts in the previous trials, all
17 the clinical investigators were encouraged to ask
18 the patients.

19 Of course, it couldn't be mandated to stay
20 with the study assessments, so it was a really
21 practical measure taken at the sites. And indeed,
22 we saw that that played out, so data were collected

1 for patients who discontinued study medication, but
2 nevertheless, completed the 6-months assessment
3 regimen.

4 The second question was about CFTR, and we
5 appreciate that's a very important question.
6 Dr. Donaldson talked about the era of CFTR
7 modulators. Again, if I may ask Dr. Schwarz to
8 speak to that since he is treating patients with
9 both classes of therapeutics.

10 Whilst he's moving to the microphone, if I
11 can just clarify, in the 301 and 302 study, there
12 were no patients on CFTR modulators. This was a
13 chronological consequence of the timing of those
14 studies. In 303, there were, if I remember
15 correctly, around 7 patients, so relatively a low
16 number of patients who were on CFTR modulators.

17 Dr. Schwarz, if you can talk to your
18 clinical experience, that might be helpful to
19 address this point.

20 DR. SCHWARZ: Carsten Schwarz. Yes,
21 Bronchitol is an important part of the therapy of
22 our patients. We have more than 150 patients on

1 Bronchitol right now, and we have, I would say,
2 180 to 200 patients on modulator therapy, so
3 including Kalydeco, Orkambi, and also Symkevi,
4 that's called in German, tezacaftor/ivacaftor.

5 What we see is that there is an
6 improvement, especially in the sinuses, where the
7 fluid is not that thick anymore. But if it's in
8 the bronchial system, we have the experience that
9 the patients got rid of their sputum with CFTR
10 modulators in the central airways, but not in the
11 small airways.

12 So the patients are still using all their
13 inhale therapy. We are not at the level where we
14 can say you can stop any kind of their inhaled
15 therapy. We would wish to do so, but with this
16 treatment, what is on the market right now, there
17 is no change in inhaled therapy.

18 DR. AU: Did you have a follow-up? Yes, go
19 ahead.

20 DR. PARRY-BILLINGS: No, not a follow-up,
21 but we didn't address the first question. We were
22 working backwards.

1 DR. PARAD: The question was wash-out.

2 DR. PARRY-BILLINGS: Yes. The question was
3 on washout. I'm not sure if we have the data to
4 show you immediately, but in principle, since
5 Bronchitol was evaluated in the studies as a
6 chronic therapy, twice-daily therapy, and as you've
7 heard, the central pathological role of mucus in
8 the airway, we would anticipate that a change and
9 improvement in lung function to be maintained would
10 require the patient to continue treatment.

11 You were asking about the specifics, I
12 think, of the time profile of change, and perhaps
13 we can clarify that later. But the principle of
14 the therapy is that it would need to be maintained
15 to maintain the lung function benefit.

16 DR. PARAD: I was really asking more from
17 the standpoint of additional reinforcement of your
18 finding of a positive effect, that when you take
19 the drug away, there's a change --

20 DR. PARRY-BILLINGS: I see. Sorry, yes.

21 DR. PARAD: -- back to baseline, and also
22 in some cases, when some of these drugs are

1 removed, there may actually be an overreaction, and
2 you'd drop below the original baseline.

3 DR. PARRY-BILLINGS: Yes. Sorry. I
4 understand the point you are making. Again, if I
5 may, in terms of stopping or not be able to use
6 Bronchitol, Dr. Schwarz, if you could speak briefly
7 to perhaps some experience you've had with patients
8 who have initiated therapy, continued therapy, and
9 then for whatever reason have not been able to
10 maintain the regimen.

11 DR. SCHWARZ: Carsten Schwarz again. I
12 think the main selection is done at the beginning
13 when they do the mannitol tolerance test. And
14 then, once on the treatment, usually they stay on
15 the treatment.

16 So there might be some difficulties when
17 patients experience an exacerbation because, then,
18 it's sometimes a bit harder for them to inhale.
19 But exactly at that moment, we motivate them to
20 stay on the treatment because it's very useful in
21 doing this phase of exacerbation, and we have
22 experience that it gets through this exacerbation a

1 bit quicker and easier than without it.

2 During our experience over the 7 years,
3 when looking back, there were only single patients
4 who stopped the treatment regarding hyperactivity.
5 I think the mannitol test is very important at the
6 beginning, but we also use them for other drugs for
7 inhaled antibiotics.

8 For example, with inhaled antibiotic, we
9 sometimes have calls from patients because they get
10 dyspnea at home, and we never saw such cases with
11 Bronchitol.

12 DR. PARAD: So just to clarify just one
13 more time, from a study design standpoint, you did
14 not then collect pulmonary function data at some
15 point in time after patients exited the study?

16 DR. PARRY-BILLINGS: Annamaria Muraro, my
17 colleague statistician, can talk to the specifics
18 of the data that we did collect because, as said,
19 it was a feature of design enhancement of study 303
20 to continue assessments after termination of study
21 indication.

22 DR. MURARO: Annamaria Muraro, Chiesi

1 statistician. We have summarized this in these
2 slides, numbers to give you and the data about a
3 patient who discontinued treatment, 37 patients in
4 Bronchitol and 44 in control.

5 The majority of them continued in the
6 study, 36 and 41 in the Bronchitol and control arm.
7 We had 22 patients versus 31 in the control who had
8 at least 1 FEV1 measurement during the
9 off-treatment period or after-treatment
10 discontinuation; 13 of them in the Bronchitol and
11 21 in the control completed this study while off
12 treatment.

13 We can even show the trend in those 22 and
14 31 patients with data during the off-treatment
15 period. In this slide, we have presented the data
16 from those 22 patients randomized to Bronchitol.
17 If we look at the line starting from the bottom,
18 this is the line of patients who were treated for
19 less than 6 weeks and all measurements were taken
20 off treatment. We can see that the change from
21 baseline in those patients is below zero or around
22 zero or negative.

1 If you look at the curve on the top, this
2 is representing patients who were treated for less
3 than 14 weeks, so the first assessment taken off
4 treatment was at week 14. In these patients, the
5 effect was maintained until week 26.

6 Then we have the third group of patients,
7 and I'm referring to the line in the middle. These
8 represented patients who are treated for 14 weeks
9 at least, but they perform the assessment at
10 week 26 of treatment. In this case, we see that
11 they returned to their baseline value.

12 DR. PARRY-BILLINGS: So small numbers, but
13 I think it confirms the point that you were looking
14 to address.

15 DR. AU: Great. Thank you. Dr. Schell?

16 DR. SCHELL: Thank you. Karen Schell,
17 Kansas University. I just have a question, as a
18 respiratory therapist treating patients with a
19 variety of lung diseases over the years, compliance
20 and instruction of delivery devices is so variable.
21 I was curious to how the patients had consistency
22 across in instruction or proper use of the dry

1 powdered inhaler versus the other possible ways
2 they were taking medicine, and if that was re-
3 evaluated throughout the study, because our
4 patients, just because they've been taught once,
5 doesn't mean that they still can do it properly
6 throughout the study. And I was curious how that
7 was handled during the study itself

8 DR. PARRY-BILLINGS: Of course at this
9 initiation of the study, patients were trained on
10 how to use the DPI, the 4 simple steps that I
11 illustrated earlier. I'm looking for confirmation
12 from my colleagues in terms of whether this
13 assessment, whether correct inhaler technique was
14 confirmed at the end of the study, which I
15 understand is what you're looking to --

16 DR. SCHELL: Correct, not just at the end,
17 but many times, while there are patients at the
18 bedside, from one visit to the next, have developed
19 habits that are not conducive to the equipment, and
20 we have to reinstruct on a regular basis to make
21 sure they're compliant and able to perform
22 adequately.

1 I was curious if, during your pulmonary
2 function or any time during the test, they were re-
3 evaluated by observation, particularly, to see if
4 their technique was proper because how we take a
5 metered-dose inhaler, versus a dry powdered
6 inhaler, versus an aerosol is completely different,
7 and the medication delivery is susceptible to their
8 technique. So I was just curious if this was
9 monitored throughout the study.

10 DR. PARRY-BILLINGS: Yes. I can confirm
11 that, indeed, as is routinely done, inhaler
12 technique was re-confirmed at each visit. In terms
13 of a specific assessment of correct
14 technique -- and again, I'm just looking to my
15 colleagues to make a confirmation.

16 Dr. Dell'Anna, if you could, talk to that,
17 please?

18 DR. DELL'ANNA: Carmen Dell'Anna, Chiesi.
19 Yes, compliance was monitored, and in particular,
20 education was done at the beginning of the studies
21 and during the visit. Additionally, if the
22 patients missed some of the capsules, because

1 compliance was assessed by returned drug capsules,
2 they were re-trained and they were re-educated to
3 confirm that they understand the technique.

4 DR. SCHELL: Thank you.

5 DR. AU: Dr. Redlich?

6 DR. REDLICH: I had three questions since
7 discussing the capsules. It's 10 capsules that are
8 40 milligrams each. Could you just clarify how
9 that's actually administered?

10 DR. PARRY-BILLINGS: In terms of how the
11 patients administers the 10 capsules, the simple
12 graphics, the simple graphic that I showed earlier
13 was the procedure for one capsule, if we could look
14 at that slide again.

15 These are the four steps to deliver one
16 capsule. Insert the capsule, puncture the capsule,
17 inhale. This is the procedure for one capsule and
18 this is essentially repeated 10 times.

19 DR. REDLICH: So how long would it take to
20 do all 10 capsules?

21 DR. PARRY-BILLINGS: Around 5 minutes; so
22 that would compare one of the points that our

1 clinical colleagues were making, was that this
2 compares rather favorably to the duration for
3 setting up, administering, and cleaning, et cetera,
4 a nebulized therapy.

5 DR. REDLICH: That's the same dosage given
6 for everybody, no matter their size or weight?

7 DR. PARRY-BILLINGS: Correct.

8 DR. REDLICH: Thank you. I believe the
9 study was completed in early 2017. Has it been
10 published in a peer-reviewed journal?

11 DR. PARRY-BILLINGS: Not yet.

12 DR. REDLICH: Has it been submitted for
13 publication?

14 DR. PARRY-BILLINGS: No. It's not been
15 submitted. The full manuscript has not yet been
16 submitted.

17 DR. REDLICH: Then the third question, the
18 last question, related to the durability of
19 response. The table 17 from the FDA briefing
20 document looked like over time, the magnitude of
21 the difference in FEV1 had declined from 60 mLs
22 down to 39 mLs.

1 Just related to the durability, you showed
2 one slide that was looking at adverse events that
3 showed the open-label extension. Do you have that
4 data on the study 303? Did that one include an
5 open-label extension for a year? And if so, is
6 there data on the FEV1 endpoint?

7 DR. PARRY-BILLINGS: Yes. I can address
8 both parts of your question, if I may by
9 showing -- allow me 4 quick data slides. The first
10 is you asked about the durability during the study,
11 so if we can look at the 303 FEV1 profile on the
12 same slide as the integrated analysis.

13 If we look at study 303, the effect size,
14 you can see is the delta written across the top of
15 the blue line there. Numerically, there's a small
16 decline. I don't know if that's what you were
17 referring to. However, if we look at the
18 integrated analysis on the right-hand side, the
19 effect size, as you can see, across the 6 months of
20 the trial are rather well maintained.

21 The second set of data that I'd like to
22 share --

1 DR. REDLICH: Could you just explain the
2 integrated analysis?

3 DR. PARRY-BILLINGS: Yes. In short, the
4 integrated analysis is the combination of the data
5 and analyzed in a consistent manner across all
6 three clinical studies.

7 DR. REDLICH: I'm not sure I understand
8 that, but maybe others do.

9 DR. PARRY-BILLINGS: So we have the three
10 phase 3 studies, and in all those, the FEV1 data
11 from those three studies was essentially pooled and
12 analyzed in a consistent manner. This is what we
13 mean by the integrated analysis.

14 DR. REDLICH: Oh, okay. I understand.

15 DR. PARRY-BILLINGS: Focusing on study 303,
16 the primary and most recent study -- sorry; if we
17 could have the responder analysis -- this is a
18 responder analysis looking at those patients who
19 improved FEV1 by greater than 100 mLs, and along
20 the bottom, you can see, we made this comparison of
21 the two treatments at week 6, week 14, and week 26.
22 So the difference, the therapeutic effect of

1 Bronchitol based on this highest predefined
2 responder threshold is maintained throughout the
3 trial.

4 The final set of data to address the
5 durability of the response during the 26-week
6 period is the completer analysis, if I might see
7 the completer analysis. This, we think, can be
8 justified like the graph of the completer analysis,
9 FEV1 plotted against time. These are patients who
10 completed the trial.

11 So if we're addressing the question, if
12 patients continued treatment throughout the
13 6 months and all FEV1 measurements were taken to
14 address your question on durability, there again
15 you can see the FEV1 effect is maintained.

16 To the final part of your question, which
17 was about the open-label extension, just recapping
18 on the design study, 301 and 302 included an
19 open-label extension. So of course, in looking at
20 the data, we have to keep that design element in
21 mind. This is open label and non-comparative.

22 Nevertheless, these are the FEV1 data. So

1 at the left, on the Y-axis is change from baseline
2 in FEV1 expressed in liters. Week 26 refers to the
3 end of the double-blind phase, and those
4 130 patients are the patients who agreed to
5 continue in the open-label extension.

6 Those who completed the open-label
7 extension to 52 weeks, that was 113 patients and
8 that data is shown on the right-hand bar. So you
9 can see that the treatment effect is maintained
10 during that period.

11 If we look at 113 patients at week 52 and
12 just look at those patients at week 26, the numbers
13 are essentially the same at 84 mLs at week 26. I
14 hope I addressed the question.

15 DR. REDLICH: Do you have a comparison to
16 the control group at the 52?

17 DR. PARRY-BILLINGS: Again, in the
18 open-label extension, this was not --

19 DR. REDLICH: You didn't follow the
20 controls, obviously. Okay. Then just the final
21 question was, in terms of how many people you
22 needed to screen to get the 420 bigger number --

1 DR. PARRY-BILLINGS: Yes. I think the most
2 useful slide, perhaps, is the slide that
3 Dr. Alexander showed, showing the patient
4 disposition.

5 This was a slide shown by Dr. Alexander.
6 The number of patients treated in the double-blind
7 phase or extension was 508 at the bottom row, and
8 those that entered were 896. The percent of
9 patients who passed the mannitol tolerance test in
10 study 303 was 92 percent. So 92 percent of all
11 patients screened by the MTT were able to move into
12 the studies.

13 DR. REDLICH: It was actually a slightly
14 different question, which was, there were exclusion
15 criteria such that if you were on normal saline or
16 some type of transplant -- so a certain number were
17 screened that didn't meet the inclusion criteria.
18 So related to that, if someone was on normal
19 saline, were they offered participation to stop
20 taking the normal saline or how did that work?

21 DR. PARRY-BILLINGS: As mentioned earlier,
22 if a patient was on normal saline -- on hypertonic

1 saline, rather, they were not --

2 DR. REDLICH: That's what I meant.

3 DR. PARRY-BILLINGS: -- permitted to
4 continue as a maintenance dose because, clearly,
5 this would have confounded the analysis.

6 As Dr. Flume showed, Bronchitol and
7 hypertonic saline are acting at a similar point in
8 the pathological cascade. So maintenance dose of
9 hypertonic saline was prohibited and not taken
10 during the studies. However, if a patient needed a
11 short burst, if you like, of hypertonic saline,
12 that was permitted.

13 DR. REDLICH: But still in terms of how
14 many were screened to get the 400 --

15 DR. PARRY-BILLINGS: Perhaps we can come
16 back with the specifics on that point after the
17 break.

18 DR. AU: Great. We have a number of
19 questions. Right now, we have 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7,
20 8; so just to put everyone that -- if I've seen
21 you, I have your name down.

22 Why don't we go back to Dr. Emerson?

1 DR. EMERSON: Yes. I have some questions
2 about the missing data analyses, and particularly
3 the sensitivity analyses, which are crucial, but
4 were presented in the briefing book, but were not
5 presented in your presentation. I just would like
6 some clarity on exactly what was done there.

7 The first question -- well, actually just a
8 statement -- is I'm assuming the true estimand of
9 greatest clinical interest is how would this drug
10 work in chronic use among those patients who would
11 be willing to keep taking it, that is to say, they
12 could tolerate it, they seemed to respond to it,
13 and they complied. But for regulatory and
14 scientific reasons, we have to think about
15 randomization, so there is this clash that we need
16 to worry about.

17 As I understand it --and again, I am most
18 interested in the tipping-point analyses, and I
19 personally regard that your best missing data
20 analysis would be the tipping-point analysis with
21 00 is the analysis that ideally you should have
22 chosen.

1 I have great problems with baseline
2 observation carried forward, and the panel on
3 missing data in clinical trials was just unanimous,
4 that that's a very, very bad thing to do. So
5 that's not withstanding.

6 But the tipping-point analysis is useful,
7 but if I understand, you centered that analysis on
8 imagining that patients resumed to what their
9 average effect was, and in the multiple imputation,
10 you dealt with the variability. Is that correct?

11 DR. PARRY-BILLINGS: To explain the
12 tipping-point analysis, if I may ask Dr. Muraro to
13 move to the microphone, and perhaps we can share a
14 summary slide to take you through the approach used
15 in the findings.

16 DR. MURARO: Annamaria Muraro, Chiesi
17 statistician. We performed a tipping-point
18 analysis to evaluate the robustness of study
19 results as recommended by the FDA. I would like to
20 show you the result of this analysis applied on
21 study 303.

22 After multiple imputation of missing data

1 in both treatment arms, we assign penalties,
2 penalties to the control arm and penalties to the
3 Bronchitol arm.

4 DR. EMERSON: Before I can understand this,
5 I need to understand how you've done your multiple
6 imputation. If I understand correctly, it seems
7 that on those patients for whom you were missing
8 data, you first imputed a baseline observation for
9 them using the idea of what their baseline was, but
10 trying to put some variability on that in your
11 multiple imputations. Then your penalty was added
12 to that in each of the -- I believe it was 2,000
13 imputations or 1,000 imputations you did, but
14 again, it was centered on baseline.

15 DR. MURARO: No, this is not correct. The
16 tipping point was performed following four
17 different steps. The first step was to define a
18 monotone pattern, so post-baseline, missing data on
19 the terminated [indiscernible] visits were imputed
20 to obtain the monotonal pattern, assuming missing
21 at random. With this second step, multiple
22 imputation, and we applied 1,000 imputation, was

1 applied using a regression-based model, regardless
2 of reason of withdrawal, assuming missing at
3 random.

4 After these steps, we assign to the imputed
5 data for patients in the control and in the
6 Bronchitol penalties, penalties from zero in the
7 control arm, then 20 mL, 40 mL, 80 mL, et cetera.
8 Then for all combination of penalties, statistical
9 analysis was performed in order to evaluate the
10 treatment.

11 DR. EMERSON: So can I ask for some
12 clarification? There are roughly, just
13 conservatively speaking, an infinite number of
14 analyses that I could call missing at random. I
15 need to understand missing at random based on what?
16 What were you conditioning on as you went through
17 and imputed the data, saying this was missing at
18 random based on the data that you have. What was
19 that?

20 DR. MURARO: Based on the data viable,
21 meaning missing at random, based on patients who
22 remain in the study, and then we applied the

1 penalties.

2 DR. EMERSON: So you imagined that the
3 subjects who dropped out of the study were just
4 like anybody who remained on the study, and you did
5 not use the partial data you had on that subject so
6 far to try to figure out whether they were the more
7 responding or the less responding.

8 DR. MURARO: We did, but there are 2 steps
9 in implementation of the tipping point. The first
10 step is to apply the multiple imputation with
11 missing not at random in order to have the pattern,
12 and then to apply the penalties.

13 DR. EMERSON: So again, this is very, very
14 important, and I'm still having trouble
15 understanding this. Your primary analysis was
16 baseline observation carried forward, which again I
17 think was very bad, but that's okay. So now, this
18 missing at random, you are imagining that the
19 subjects who dropped out, because you were -- now,
20 was this a mixed model? By the way, that was also
21 recommended heavily against in the monograph, not
22 using a mixed model.

1 But was this a mixed model? So then, when
2 you were assuming missing at random, the patient
3 was more or less continuing on their trajectory
4 relative to the population of treated patients.

5 DR. MURARO: Yes. But this is an
6 intermittent step of the tipping point, so then we
7 have --

8 DR. EMERSON: Right. I'm trying to find
9 out when delta is zero what you were doing.

10 DR. MURARO: So the delta of zero, if we
11 describe in this table the first row, for example,
12 in the first row is a description of penalty to
13 control equal to zero. This is the assumption when
14 patients in the control arm were dropped from the
15 study are similar to the ones who remain in the
16 study, missing at random, while we had to assign a
17 penalty of 100 mL to patients who dropped from the
18 Bronchitol arm, meaning that patients in the
19 Bronchitol arm should be 100 mL worse than patients
20 who remain into the study in the Bronchitol arm
21 with similar characteristics.

22 DR. EMERSON: But here is the crucial point

1 that I need to make certain I understand. In the
2 mixed model, more or less, you're imagining that
3 every patient has their effect. So there are some
4 patients who maybe were on a downward trend, some
5 patients who were on an upward trend, although I
6 bet you weren't modeling this as a trend for each
7 patient, but just where they were in the
8 population.

9 If you are then imputing under a missing at
10 random model conditioning only on that, then your
11 imputation will tend to follow that trend. That's
12 very different from assuming the average for the
13 entire treatment population. So which was it?

14 DR. MURARO: I have to verify. I think we
15 applied the missing at random approach, meaning
16 that patients who discontinued were multiple
17 imputed with a regression model that included
18 treatment and other characteristics, including the
19 observed value during the study, if I understood
20 correctly your question. But I think, as a tipping
21 point, we should focus on the penalty assigned.

22 DR. EMERSON: Well, only if I know what the

1 penalty is measured relative to. This is my next
2 question. This is what I'm trying to do, but let's
3 move on to this penalty question.

4 In order to interpret what this penalty is,
5 I need to know the distribution of changes. Do you
6 have data, just among the completers, what the mean
7 and standard deviation is on the change from
8 baseline at each of the 6, 14, and 26 time points?

9 As I do a back-of-the-envelope calculation,
10 I do find a standard deviation around 0.26, which
11 is sort of similar to your standard deviation of
12 0.23. I don't know what the correlation is, but
13 it's looking like there's not real good correlation
14 in these measurements.

15 Do you have just those descriptor
16 statistics? Because that 0.100 is interpretable as
17 the average among the people who have dropped out.
18 And if that 0.23 standard deviation is correct,
19 we're saying, well, those are just people randomly
20 selected from the lower 85 percent. So dropping
21 off the study was, per chance, biased because they
22 weren't doing as well, but it's the bottom

1 85 percent, which is not that implausible.

2 So can you provide me the descriptive
3 statistics by time --

4 DR. MURARO: We can certainly --

5 DR. EMERSON: -- and all I want is just the
6 change from baseline, the mean, and standard
7 deviation for each treatment.

8 DR. MURARO: Yes. We can certainly
9 provide.

10 DR. EMERSON: Thank you.

11 DR. MURARO: I would like to add, tipping
12 point provides robust results, considering that we
13 were focusing on only one of the scenarios
14 presented in that table, the scenario where we are
15 assigning no penalty to the control arm, meaning
16 that we assume that patients in the control arm are
17 similar; patients who drop in the control arm are
18 similar to the ones who remain in the study, while
19 in patients in the Bronchitol arm, we are saying
20 that those patients who drop should be worse by
21 100 mL.

22 We can even consider the other scenarios,

1 where we consider that patients in both arms would
2 drop out worse.

3 DR. EMERSON: Let me tell you my take-home
4 message from this slide because this is one of the
5 ones that concerns me very much. Number one, we
6 have to recognize that the control arm did not have
7 as much adverse effects -- or certainly in the
8 other trials. It's not as clear here, so maybe I'm
9 not as concerned, but the idea of the adverse
10 effects. So there may be a greater tendency for
11 them to drop off when they have slightly better
12 effects than it is for the control group.

13 But what I was very interested in, in this,
14 is that the difference that the FDA asked for and
15 you did -- and this is the correct thing to do --
16 the 2-parameter tipping point. But what often you
17 see when you do the 2-parameter tipping point is it
18 wasn't all that necessary, that the difference is
19 there.

20 But what we see here is the difference
21 between the two penalties was negative 0.1 when its
22 control was 0, but it drops down to 0.06 as you

1 start building up the difference in there. And
2 some of this is going to be the uncertainty in the
3 models and things like that, relative to what's
4 potentially going on, but this tells us that there
5 is something more going on than the very simple
6 procedure.

7 Of course, there is nothing in our data,
8 absolutely nothing in our data that tells us which
9 of these are the correct penalties.

10 DR. AU: We are at 10:23. We were supposed
11 to take a break at 10:15. I know there were a
12 number of people who still had questions, and we're
13 going to hopefully have an opportunity to come back
14 to those questions during discussion.

15 Why don't we go ahead and take a break? We
16 have 6 minutes now for a break in lieu of 15.
17 Cindy just allowed me to make it to 10:35, so a
18 little bit of reprieve from the FDA, so 10:35, back
19 here, please. Thank you.

20 (Whereupon, at 10:23 a.m., a recess was
21 taken .)

22 DR. AU: In the interest of time, I think

1 we're going to get going again. If I could have
2 everyone take their seats, please. I think we're a
3 little behind schedule, but we'll make it up with
4 volume.

5 So we'll now hear from the FDA. We'll now
6 proceed with FDA presentations.

7 **FDA Presentation - Khalid Puthawala**

8 DR. PUTHAWALA: Good morning, everyone. My
9 name is Khalid Puthawala, and I'm a clinical
10 reviewer in the Division of Pulmonary Allergy and
11 Rheumatology Products. My training is as an adult
12 pulmonologist and critical care physician.

13 I'd like to thank the panel members for
14 coming out today and sharing their expertise with
15 us. I'd like to thank the CF community for
16 participating in clinical trials that really allow
17 the agency to help it achieve its ultimate goal in
18 furthering public health.

19 We've heard the sponsor's presentation and
20 discussion on DPM, and the agency will now present
21 its perspective on efficacy and safety of DPM.

22 This is an outline for the approximate

1 one-hour presentation by the FDA. I'll first begin
2 by giving an overview of the clinical program for
3 DPM. My colleague, Dr. Torres, will then provide
4 the statistical review of efficacy in detail, and
5 then I'll return to provide some clinical context
6 for the efficacy, go over the safety, and wrap up
7 with a benefit-risk discussion.

8 Let's start with the overview of the
9 clinical program. As has been discussed, CF is a
10 serious disease with considerable morbidity and
11 mortality, and no cure. This table shows many of
12 the common therapies used by CF patients. The top
13 two-thirds of the table shows that the treatment
14 landscape from a pulmonary standpoint, until fairly
15 recent, has focused on treating symptoms and
16 sequelae of the disease, which involved secretion
17 management using mucolytics, bronchodilators,
18 inhaled antibiotics, and other measures not shown.

19 More recently, some of the newer
20 medications that have been approved for CF,
21 sometimes referred to as CFTR modulators, focus on
22 the more proximal cause of CF, the CFTR protein.

1 Those therapies are shown in the bottom one-third
2 of the table.

3 I'll now discuss aspects of those recent
4 approvals and the basis upon which those approvals
5 were made. All of the recent approvals within the
6 Division of Pulmonary Allergy and Rheumatology
7 Products between 2012 and 2018 for CF have been the
8 CFTR modulators. These recent approvals
9 demonstrated FEV1 improvement within the
10 approximate range as shown.

11 Studies used to support these approvals
12 generally included exacerbations as a secondary
13 endpoint along with other clinically meaningful
14 measures, as shown, and had overall support from
15 the secondary endpoints.

16 The general point to note here is effect
17 size and the support from the secondary endpoints,
18 and the agency will focus on this point repeatedly
19 throughout the presentation for the advisory
20 committee members to consider effect size and
21 clinically meaningful endpoint support.

22 Let's focus our attention now on the DPM

1 program. I'll first start by going over the
2 regulatory history. In 2012, the sponsor submitted
3 their clinical development program that, at that
4 time, included two phase 3 studies, 301 and 302,
5 and we'll be discussing those in more detail
6 further along.

7 Those were reviewed by the agency and
8 several efficacy and safety concerns were noted.
9 In light of these issues, an advisory committee
10 panel was convened in January 2013, and the vote at
11 that time was unanimous against approval.

12 The agency then took a CR action, stating
13 that in order to move forward, an additional trial
14 would be needed that demonstrated substantial
15 evidence of efficacy and balanced safety. The
16 sponsor then conducted study 303 and resubmitted
17 their program in December 2018.

18 Let's look at some of these issues in a bit
19 more detail. In the prior submission in 2012,
20 there were two phase 3 studies. As I just noted,
21 there were significant issues with efficacy. First
22 of all, study 301 had significant statistical

1 issues, and these were mostly due to the large
2 amount of missing data from study dropouts.

3 To give one a sense of this, 37 percent of
4 DPM-treated patients in this study dropped out and
5 27 percent of control patients dropped out. For
6 all of these dropouts, efficacy data was not
7 collected, which led to major statistical problems
8 that could not be overcome despite the multitude of
9 sensitivity analyses that were conducted. For
10 study 302, DPM did not show a statistically
11 significant improvement over control.

12 Beyond these issues was the question that
13 we will be raising for the panel to discuss today,
14 which was raised in 2012 as well, which was whether
15 the small treatment effect seen in the prior
16 studies, albeit with statistical concerns, was
17 clinically meaningful, especially in light of the
18 lack of secondary endpoint support. From a safety
19 perspective, there were concerns raised with
20 hemoptysis, particularly in the younger population.

21 So with these problems with efficacy and
22 safety, an advisory committee was convened. The

1 advisory committee reviewed the data and felt that
2 overall DPM had not demonstrated an acceptable
3 benefit-risk profile. They voted unanimously
4 against approval.

5 For safety and efficacy, individually
6 considered, the majority of the votes were still
7 against DPM. However, several comments made by
8 panel members at that time were directed at
9 considering adults separately from the pediatric
10 population.

11 In other words, many panel members, whether
12 they voted for or against DPM in regards to safety
13 or efficacy, made comments suggesting that the
14 overall decision-making process for them was
15 clouded due to some conflicts in the adult versus
16 non-adult data.

17 Given the agency's review of the program at
18 that time as well as the panel's decision, a CR
19 action was taken in March 2013. In the CR letter,
20 the deficiencies that I mentioned were outlined,
21 specifically that substantial demonstration of
22 efficacy was lacking because of treatment-related

1 dropouts, a lack of statistical significance, and a
2 lack of secondary support.

3 From a safety perspective, the main
4 deficiency was hemoptysis concerns in the younger
5 age group, so overall, the benefit-to-risk ratio
6 was not in favor of DPM. The agency recommended at
7 least one future trial that demonstrated
8 substantial efficacy and addressed safety concerns,
9 specifically the hemoptysis concern. And related
10 to this, the agency recommended that adults be the
11 study population.

12 Shortly thereafter, a meeting with the
13 sponsor occurred in May 2013. At that meeting, it
14 was discussed that the most expedient path forward
15 would be to adopt an identical trial design for
16 study 303, but to minimize missing data and
17 dropouts. It was recommended to exclude younger
18 patients in light of the safety concerns that had
19 been raised in 301 and 302.

20 The agency confirmed its agreement with the
21 primary endpoint of FEV1 over 6 months, but it was
22 noted that this primary endpoint would have to be

1 statistically significant and clinically
2 convincing. Along with this, the new study 303
3 results would have to trend favorably for
4 exacerbations.

5 This new study, which would be study 303,
6 would be the tie breaker study, and the agency
7 emphasized the importance that this study would
8 have in a resubmission, given the problems with the
9 prior studies and the post hoc nature of their
10 analyses. As we move forward in the presentation,
11 I'll remind the audience of this fact.

12 So study 303 was conducted, and a pre-NDA
13 meeting occurred in November 2016. The agency at
14 that time reiterated the importance of
15 exacerbations as secondary endpoints, as well as
16 the importance of the CFQ-RRD.

17 Also, the importance of assessing FEV1 at
18 26 weeks in addition to the primary endpoint, which
19 is FEV1 over 26 weeks, was noted. Some of the
20 necessary details to understand the difference
21 between FEV1 at 26 weeks versus FEV1 over 26 weeks
22 will be gone over by my colleague, Dr. Torres.

1 With this, study 303, was submitted as a completion
2 to the clinical development program.

3 The sponsor's development program has
4 already been described in detail, so my overview
5 will be brief. There were 5 early-phase studies,
6 most of which were open label. Dose determination
7 was primarily based on study 202. Study 202 was
8 also open label. It was a cross-over study over
9 2 weeks with 48 patients, and the results suggested
10 the 400-milligram twice-a-day dose, the highest
11 dose studied, to be the best candidate moving
12 forward into phase 3.

13 Additionally, there was no effect with the
14 40-milligram dose, so 50 milligrams was chosen for
15 control to match for mannitol's sweet taste.

16 The remainder of our talk will be on the
17 three phase 3 studies, which constitute the focus
18 of the current submission. Please note that
19 studies 301 and 302 are from the original
20 submission. However, as the target population has
21 changed to adults only, the analysis of results
22 from those studies is post hoc adults only. To

1 reiterate, this is one reason why study 303 is felt
2 to be crucial.

3 Let's look at the three studies in a bit
4 more detail. Here's a table showing the three
5 phase 3 studies. The studies in blue were from the
6 prior submission, and the most recent study, study
7 303, is shown in white. These were all randomized,
8 double-blind, controlled parallel group studies of
9 26 weeks' duration comparing DPM 400 milligrams
10 twice a day to control, which was DPM 50 milligrams
11 twice a day.

12 In all three studies, patients continued
13 their routine CF medications with the exception of
14 hypertonic saline. CF patients with recent
15 hemoptysis were excluded. Sample sizes shown on
16 this table for studies 301 and 302 include all
17 patients and not just the adult subgroup.

18 Next, we'll look at the important
19 differences between the studies. Key differences
20 are shown in this table, focusing on study design
21 and study population differences. Again, blue
22 shading represents the prior studies and the newest

1 study, study 303, is shown in white.

2 One very important difference between
3 study 303 and the other studies was in its design
4 in that study 303 had a specific provision to
5 follow patients after treatment discontinuation.
6 To clarify, in study 301 and 302, if a patient
7 stopped study drug, they were withdrawn from the
8 study and, importantly, no further data was
9 collected.

10 As Dr. Torres will explain moving forward,
11 this compromised the interpretability of these
12 earlier studies considerably. In contrast,
13 study 303 continued following patients who stopped
14 study drug unless they withdrew entirely from the
15 study.

16 Another important difference that has been
17 mentioned was in regards to the study populations'
18 ages. The earlier studies included patients 6 and
19 older, whereas study 303 was patients 18 and older,
20 and that is related to the prior hemoptysis
21 concerns in the other population.

22 So the results we will be reviewing from

1 the prior studies are post hoc adult subgroup
2 analyses, and thus carry less weight, and this will
3 be touched on further by Dr. Torres. Also, it's
4 important to highlight that study 301 did not
5 include any U.S. patients. This also will be later
6 reiterated in the study results that Dr. Torres
7 will discuss.

8 Lastly, I'll mention what is fairly
9 obvious, that study 303 was the most recent study.
10 Note that a 4-year time span is present between the
11 completion of study 302 and the start of study 303.

12 Based on these important differences, one
13 can understand why study 303 plays a crucial role
14 in the current benefit-risk assessment. Let's look
15 at study 303 in a bit more detail.

16 I've shown diagrammatically the study
17 design here. You'll see that patients were
18 screened with the mannitol tolerance test initially
19 and hyperresponsive patients were excluded. In
20 other words, you had to pass the MTT and meet
21 eligibility criteria to begin treatment.

22 The treatment period was 26 weeks, during

1 which there were 4 visits. The first
2 post-treatment initiation visit was at week 6, the
3 second at week 14, and the third at 26 weeks. Key
4 efficacy and safety assessments are shown at the
5 bottom. We'll focus in on efficacy.

6 The primary endpoint used, as I've
7 mentioned before, was FEV1 over 26 weeks, and this
8 was identical to the prior studies. The secondary
9 endpoints in study 303 are listed here, and I'll
10 remind the audience of the regulatory history I
11 discussed a few slides back. The agency noted that
12 exacerbation-related results and CFQ-RRD would be
13 important considerations given their clinical
14 relevance.

15 Next, let's look at the disposition of
16 study 303's patients. In this table on the right,
17 I show study 303 completers, non-completers, and
18 early treatment discontinuations. I'll make a few
19 points.

20 First of all, you'll note that there was no
21 observed disproportionality between treatment arms
22 in early study withdrawals, about 11 to 12 percent

1 in each arm. Next, you'll note that the treatment
2 discontinuation rate is not the same as the study
3 withdrawal rate due to the specific provision made
4 in study 303's protocol to allow treatment
5 discontinuation without study withdrawal, as I
6 mentioned in the previous slides.

7 Lastly, overall, these rates of study
8 withdrawal were lower than the prior studies,
9 particularly study 301, in which early study
10 withdrawal occurred in 37 percent of DPM patients
11 and 27 percent of control patients. Note that
12 these numbers are for the total study population,
13 which include pediatric and adolescent patients.

14 Because of these disposition results
15 showing less disproportionality and less dropout
16 than the prior studies, the statistical results
17 that Dr. Torres will be discussing will not have
18 the same issues as the prior studies and will be
19 more robust in that sense.

20 Next, we'll look at the demographics. The
21 demographics of the patient populations studied in
22 303 were balanced and what one may expect from an

1 adult CF population. The mean age was about 27 to
2 29 years, and the majority of the population was
3 Caucasian.

4 As noted before, study 303 did include U.S.
5 patients, about a quarter of the study. And the
6 baseline disease characteristics such as prior
7 hemoptysis, lung function, mutational composition,
8 and pseudomonal prevalence were also generally
9 balanced between arms.

10 Although not an imbalance, it is worth
11 mentioning that likely due to the timing of the
12 study, there were no patients on CFTR modulators in
13 study 303.

14 At this point, I think we're ready to go
15 into the efficacy results for study 303, and I'd
16 like to turn it over to Dr. Torres.

17 **FDA Presentation - Cesar Torres**

18 DR. TORRES: Thank you, Dr. Puthawala.

19 Hello. I am Cesar Torres, and I'm a
20 statistical reviewer in the agency's Division of
21 Biometrics II. As Dr. Puthawala noted, I will be
22 presenting the review of efficacy. Dr. Puthawala

1 will then provide clinical context for efficacy
2 before presenting the review of safety and
3 discussing benefit-risk considerations.

4 Specifically, I will go over the endpoints
5 and the planned analyses for these endpoints for
6 study 303, and note some important differences from
7 those of studies 301 and 302. I will then present
8 results for the primary and key secondary efficacy
9 endpoints, as well as for Cystic Fibrosis
10 Questionnaire-Revised respiratory domain.

11 Finally, I will present some subgroup
12 analysis results before summarizing the statistical
13 efficacy findings and handing it back to Dr.
14 Puthawala .

15 The primary endpoint for study 303, as well
16 as for studies 301 and 302, was change from
17 baseline in FEV1 over 26 weeks, not at 26 weeks.
18 The primary analysis model included assessments at
19 weeks 6, 14, and 26. Change from baseline to each
20 visit was given equal weight.

21 For study 303, the primary analysis used a
22 mixed effects model for repeated measures,

1 adjusting for treatment, rhDNase use, pooled
2 country, visit, and interaction term between
3 treatment and visits, baseline FEV1, and baseline
4 percent predicted FEV1.

5 To target the treatment policy estimand for
6 the primary analysis of this endpoint, all observed
7 data were used, even those collected after
8 treatment discontinuation. A modified baseline
9 observation carried forward approach was used for
10 patients with missing data for specific reasons.

11 In particular, for each patient who
12 withdrew from the study due to adverse events,
13 death, physician decision, or lack of efficacy, the
14 baseline observation for that patient was carried
15 forward. For patients who withdrew from the study
16 for other reasons, missing data were not imputed
17 and the primary analysis assumed that these data
18 were missing at random.

19 In contrast, for the primary analysis for
20 this endpoint in studies 301 and 302, post-baseline
21 missing data were not imputed. In the primary
22 analyses for the two prior studies, all post-

1 baseline missingness was assumed to be at random,
2 even that resulting from patient withdrawal due to
3 the reasons listed previously.

4 To control the family-wise type 1 error in
5 study 303, a hierarchical testing procedure was
6 used. If the primary analysis results from the
7 primary efficacy endpoint were found to be
8 statistically significant at the two-sided
9 significance level of 0.05, then the first
10 hierarchical endpoint, change from baseline over 26
11 weeks in forced vital capacity, was to be tested at
12 the same significance level.

13 If the primary analysis results for this
14 endpoint were also found to be statistically
15 significant, then the next endpoint would be tested
16 at the same significance level and so on. If at
17 any point in the hierarchical testing procedure
18 primary analysis results for a formal hypothesis
19 test were found to not be statistically
20 significant, formal hypothesis testing was not
21 performed for any remaining endpoints in the
22 analysis hierarchy.

1 Cystic Fibrosis Questionnaire-Revised
2 respiratory domain was not in the analysis
3 hierarchy, but I will also present results for this
4 endpoint.

5 Change from baseline in forced vital
6 capacity over 26 weeks was analyzed in the same
7 manner as for the primary efficacy endpoint,
8 including the handling of missing data. Time to
9 first PDPE was analyzed using a Cox proportional
10 hazards model that adjusted for treatment, pooled
11 country, rhDNase use, and number of IV antibiotic-
12 treated pulmonary exacerbations in the year prior
13 to screening.

14 Key secondary efficacy endpoints related to
15 antibiotics, hospitalizations, and PDPE rates were
16 each analyzed using a negative binomial model that
17 adjusted for the same covariates; that is, they
18 adjusted for treatment, pooled country, rhDNase
19 use, and number of IV antibiotic-treated, pulmonary
20 exacerbations in the year prior to screening. For
21 each of the antibiotics and hospitalizations
22 endpoints, no imputation procedure was performed

1 for the primary analysis.

2 However, the statistical analysis plan for
3 study 303 prespecified an imputation procedure for
4 the primary analysis of the PDPE rate.

5 Specifically, for each patient who withdrew before
6 week 26 with no observed instances of a PDPE, the
7 number of PDPEs was imputed using that patient's
8 pulmonary exacerbation count in the previous
9 12 months. Further details regarding this
10 imputation procedure are provided in the agency's
11 briefing document for today's meeting.

12 Conversely, the statistical analysis plans
13 for studies 301 and 302 did not prespecify any such
14 imputation procedure for the primary analysis of
15 this endpoint.

16 The following results are based on the
17 analyses performed by the agency's statistical
18 review team. In most instances, numerical
19 differences between the agency review team's
20 results and the applicant's results are small to
21 the extent that the conclusions drawn are the same.

22 Recall that for the primary analysis for

1 FEV1, a modified baseline observation carried
2 forward approach was used for the handling of
3 missing data. With this approach, the adjusted
4 mean change from baseline was 65 milliliters for
5 the DPM arm and 10 milliliters for the control arm.
6 The adjusted mean difference of 55 milliliters was
7 statistically significant with a two-sided p-value
8 of 0.018. The observed data are consistent with
9 the adjusted mean difference being between 9 and
10 101 milliliters.

11 This analysis had the potential of being
12 limited by the prespecified handling of missing
13 data. One consideration regarding this approach
14 was that for patients whose baseline observation
15 was carried forward, the variability in
16 measurements would be underestimated, potentially
17 resulting in a confidence interval and a p-value
18 that overestimated the precision in estimation of
19 the treatment effect difference.

20 For this reason, the agency's statistical
21 review team considered one of the prespecified
22 sensitivity analyses for this endpoint to be

1 important. This sensitivity analysis used a
2 pattern mixture model approach that incorporated
3 multiple imputation.

4 This approach generally made similar
5 assumptions as the modified baseline observation
6 carried forward approach regarding the mean
7 trajectory of the outcome for each patient who
8 withdrew from the study.

9 However, the pattern mixture model approach
10 more appropriately estimated the variability in
11 measurements for patients who withdrew from the
12 study. Details regarding this approach are
13 provided in the agency's briefing package for
14 today's meeting.

15 With this sensitivity analysis, the
16 adjusted mean change from baseline was 63
17 milliliters for the DPM arm and 12 milliliters for
18 the control arm. The adjusted mean difference of
19 51 milliliters was statistically significant with a
20 two-sided p-value of 0.028. With this analysis,
21 the observed data are consistent with the adjusted
22 mean difference being between 6 and 97 milliliters.

1 How do these results compare to results
2 from analogous analyses performed with data from
3 adults in studies 301 and 302? From the
4 perspective of the agency's review team, this
5 comparison is difficult to make due to the concerns
6 the agency had regarding 301 and 302 during the
7 review of the original NDA submission.

8 Specifically, one, the protocols for
9 studies 301 and 302 did not have provisions to
10 continue following patients for regularly scheduled
11 assessments after treatment discontinuation; two,
12 the data missingness rates in study 301 were high;
13 and, three, study 302 failed to meet its primary
14 objective.

15 In this figure, the red dotted line
16 indicates the missingness rate for the DPM group
17 while the blue line indicates the missingness rate
18 for the control group. As can be seen in this
19 figure, in study 303, the missingness rates were at
20 around 1 to 2 percent by week 6, 5 to 7 percent by
21 week 14, and 9 to 12 percent by week 26.

22 Conversely, by week 26, according to the

1 solid lines, 301 adults had missingness rates of 35
2 to 41 percent, and according to the dashed lines,
3 study 302 adults had missingness rates of 12 to
4 25 percent.

5 Again, given that the missingness rates in
6 study 301 were high and study 302 was a failed
7 study, the agency review team's position is that
8 the following comparisons are limited.

9 This figure shows the treatment effect
10 difference and corresponding 95 percent confidence
11 interval for each of studies 301, 302, and 303.
12 The dashed and solid black lines for the confidence
13 intervals are to visually indicate that comparisons
14 of results from study 303 to those of studies 301
15 and 302 are limited.

16 As shown previously, the treatment effect
17 difference in study 303 was estimated to be
18 51 milliliters. Conversely, in each of studies 301
19 and 302, the estimated difference was 78
20 milliliters in adults.

21 The results of the pattern mixture model
22 sensitivity analysis for study 303 along with other

1 sensitivity analysis results for this study suggest
2 that the results for the primary analysis in study
3 303 appear to be statistically robust for the
4 primary endpoint of change from baseline over
5 26 weeks in FEV1.

6 However, we found that this endpoint
7 effectively puts more than two-thirds of the weight
8 on change occurring during the first 54 percent of
9 the 26-week period under consideration and less
10 than one-third of the weight on change occurring
11 between weeks 14 and 26.

12 Therefore, the analysis results could be
13 largely driven by data collected in the first
14 14 weeks, leading to the analysis not estimating
15 efficacy over the treatment duration period as
16 intended.

17 Thus, a natural question arises that is
18 important from a regulatory perspective. Is the
19 treatment effect sustained through the end of the
20 26-week period? To help address this question, we
21 also looked at change from baseline at each of
22 weeks 6, 14, and 26 in FEV1.

1 Once more, the color red is for the DPM arm
2 and the color blue is for the control arm. In this
3 figure, the by-arm point estimates and 95 percent
4 confidence intervals for the change from baseline
5 to each of the 3 visits is presented.

6 The numbers at the top indicate the
7 corresponding point estimates and 95 percent
8 confidence intervals for the treatment effect
9 difference. For example, the change from baseline
10 at week 14 just past the halfway point of the
11 26-week period was estimated to be 56 milliliters
12 higher in the DPM group than the control group with
13 the observed data being consistent with the
14 difference being between 2 and 109 milliliters
15 higher.

16 However, the change from baseline at
17 week 26 was estimated to be 39 milliliters higher
18 in the DPM group than the control group, with the
19 observed data being consistent with the difference
20 being between 18 milliliters lower to
21 96 milliliters higher.

22 The point estimate of the difference here

1 was noticeably lower than those for change from
2 baseline at week 6 and at week 14. Given the
3 potential attenuation of the treatment effect by
4 week 26, another question of interest from a
5 regulatory perspective is, is there any support
6 from the secondary efficacy endpoints?

7 The analysis results for the first key
8 secondary efficacy endpoint in the analysis
9 hierarchy were not statistically significant, with
10 a two-sided p-value of 0.169. Therefore, all
11 remaining endpoints in this hierarchy are not
12 statistically significant and we do not report
13 p-values for these endpoints.

14 Of the results presented in this table,
15 those for PDPE rate are worth noting. For the PDPE
16 rate per patient per year, the adjusted rate ratio
17 was estimated to be 1.55, with the observed data
18 being consistent with the adjusted rate ratio being
19 between 0.99 to 2.41.

20 The results for the prespecified analysis
21 for this last endpoint have raised some concerns
22 within the agency's review team. Once more, we

1 recognize that there is some interest in comparing
2 results from this study to those from studies 301
3 and 302 in adults only.

4 We remind everyone of comparisons across
5 the studies being limited due to the reasons
6 Dr. Puthawala and I have previously stated. The
7 comparison of PDPE rate results specifically across
8 studies is further limited by the fact that the
9 statistical analysis plans for studies 301 and 302
10 did not prespecify any imputation procedure for the
11 primary analysis of PDPE rates while the
12 statistical analysis plan for study 303 did.

13 This figure shows the treatment effect
14 ratio and corresponding 95 percent confidence
15 interval for each of studies 301, 302, and 303.
16 The dashed and solid black lines for the confidence
17 intervals are to visually indicate that the
18 comparisons of results from study 303 to those of
19 studies 301 and 302 are limited.

20 As shown previously, in study 303, the
21 adjusted rate ratio for this endpoint was estimated
22 to be 1.55, with a 95 percent confidence interval

1 of 0.99 to 2.41. Conversely, for study 301, adults
2 only, the adjusted rate ratio was estimated to be
3 0.77, and for study 302, adults only, the adjusted
4 rate ratio was estimated to be 1.35.

5 Due to the importance of these comparisons
6 being limited, we stress again that, one, the
7 protocols in studies 301 and 302 did not have
8 provisions for following patients after treatment
9 discontinuation; two, the data missingness rate in
10 study 301 was high; three, the statistical analysis
11 plan for each of studies 301 and 302 did not
12 prespecify an imputation procedure for the analysis
13 of this endpoint; and four, the analyses using data
14 from adult patients in studies 301 and 302 are
15 post hoc.

16 Finally, the Cystic Fibrosis
17 Questionnaire-Revised respiratory domain score was
18 analyzed in the same manner as the primary efficacy
19 endpoint. The treatment effect was estimated to be
20 0.87 when comparing DPM to control, and the
21 observed data are consistent with the treatment
22 effect difference between being 1.4 lower to 3.1

1 higher.

2 We do not present analysis results from
3 adults in studies 301 and 302, but the results are
4 generally consistent across the 3 studies.

5 There is some interest in comparing the
6 effect of DPM on adult cystic fibrosis patients in
7 the U.S. to the effect of DPM on patients not in
8 the U.S. The following results comparing U.S. to
9 non-U.S. patients are all from post hoc analyses.

10 In this figure, the color orange
11 corresponds to U.S. patients while the color green
12 corresponds to non-U.S. patients. The figure shows
13 the by-region treatment effect difference and
14 corresponding 95 percent confidence interval for
15 each of studies 302 and 303.

16 The dashed and solid lines for the
17 confidence intervals are to visually indicate that
18 comparisons of results from study 303 to those of
19 study 302 are limited. For change from baseline
20 over 26 weeks in FEV1, the treatment effect
21 comparing DPM to control in study 303 was observed
22 to be slightly higher in U.S. patients with a point

1 estimate of 68 milliliters compared to non-U.S.
2 patients with a point estimate of 50 milliliters.

3 The previous considerations apply regarding
4 the comparison of results from study 303 to results
5 of study 302, adults only. However, a similar
6 trend, as in study 303, was observed in study 302,
7 adults only, when comparing U.S. patient results to
8 non-U.S. patient results.

9 As shown in the table here, the study 303
10 treatment effect difference between the DPM and
11 control arms for each of number of days on
12 antibiotics and number of days in hospital due to
13 PDPE seemed to be similar between the U.S. and
14 non-U.S. populations.

15 For time to first PDPE, the hazard ratio of
16 2.02 for the U.S. population was noticeably higher
17 than that of 0.87 for the non-U.S. population. For
18 this endpoint, it is not clear if the observed
19 difference in hazard ratios between the regions is
20 due to chance or if perhaps there is a concerning
21 signal here.

22 Regardless, the numerical difference in

1 hazard ratios for this endpoint suggests that a
2 difference between rate ratios for PDPE rate might
3 have been observed as well.

4 In this figure, the color orange
5 corresponds to U.S. patients while the color green
6 corresponds to non-U.S. patients. The figure shows
7 the by-region treatment effect adjusted rate ratio
8 and corresponding 95 percent confidence interval
9 for each of studies 302 and 303.

10 The dashed and solid lines for the
11 confidence intervals are to visually indicate that
12 comparisons of results from study 303 to those of
13 study 302 are limited. As stated previously, the
14 PDPE adjusted rate ratio in the overall study 303
15 population when comparing the DPM arm to the
16 control arm was 1.55 with a 95 percent confidence
17 interval of 0.99 to 2.41.

18 However, the adjusted rate ratio in
19 study 303, U.S. patients, was estimated to be 2.93,
20 with a 95 percent confidence interval of 1.36 to
21 6.32. Conversely, the adjusted rate ratio in
22 study 303, non-U.S. patients, was 1.06 with a

1 95 percent confidence interval of 0.61 to 1.86.

2 The by-region results for this endpoint
3 along with those for time to first PDPE suggest
4 that DPM may have an undesirable effect on PDPE
5 rate in U.S. patients. However, given that all of
6 these analyses are post hoc, the ability to draw
7 conclusions may be limited.

8 In summary, the primary analysis results
9 for the primary efficacy endpoint of change from
10 baseline over 26 weeks in FEV1 were statistically
11 significant and appear to be statistically robust,
12 given the results of sensitivity analyses for this
13 endpoint. However, the observed effect size was
14 marginal.

15 It is difficult to compare study 303
16 analysis results to results from study 301 and 302,
17 adults only analyses because of the issues
18 previously raised such as the protocols for studies
19 301 and 302 not having provisions for patients
20 being followed after treatment discontinuation and
21 the high amount of data missingness in study 301.

22 Furthermore, the analyses in studies 301

1 and 302, adult patients, were post hoc. Finally,
2 there is no support from the secondary endpoints.

3 Thank you for your time. I'll hand it back
4 to Dr. Puthawala for him to provide some clinical
5 context for the efficacy discussed and to review
6 safety before he wraps up with a benefit-risk
7 discussion.

8 **FDA Presentation - Khalid Puthawala**

9 DR. PUTHAWALA: Thank you, Dr. Torres.

10 I will be delivering the last presentation
11 for the FDA this morning. Here's the outline for
12 my presentation. I'll review some of the key
13 efficacy information that Dr. Torres discussed and
14 add a clinical perspective. I'll then go into
15 safety and the major safety categories listed here.

16 I'll then summarize the safety and provide
17 a framework upon which a discussion of overall
18 benefit versus risk can be initiated.

19 Let's start with the primary endpoint
20 results for the three studies. This is the slide
21 that Dr. Torres showed earlier. This shows the
22 primary endpoint, FEV1, over 26 weeks for the three

1 phase 3 studies. The treatment effect size or the
2 difference between arms is shown on the right with
3 the confidence intervals

4 It should be noted, as he mentioned, that
5 although these studies are shown together on the
6 same diagram, there were some major statistical
7 problems in the previous studies, as mentioned.

8 He visually indicated with the dashed
9 lines, the studies that provide us limited
10 information, and thus study 303 was the most
11 statistically robust study. I'd like for us to
12 again focus on the treatment effect size as shown
13 on the right.

14 Next, we'll look at the durability of this
15 treatment effect. This slide, which shows FEV1
16 over the treatment duration, was also shown to us
17 by Dr. Torres, and I'll go over a few points.

18 Given the relevance of discussing
19 durability in regards to a medication intended for
20 chronic use, the agency had asked for an analysis
21 of FEV1 at 26 weeks. The rightmost set of points
22 represents that analysis. The main point is that

1 the magnitude of the treatment effect appears to
2 attenuate over time.

3 Dr. Torres reviewed the findings of a
4 treatment effect size, as shown at 26 weeks,
5 observed to be lower than at earlier time points
6 and that the confidence intervals shown at the top
7 now included the value 0. Let's take a small step
8 back and consider FEV1.

9 The issue is, in what context do we
10 interpret these FEV1 treatment effects and how is
11 FEV1 as an endpoint? In this program, FEV1 is
12 being used as a measure for overall pulmonary
13 function, and that is reasonable, as FEV1 has been
14 used as a primary endpoint for many, if not all, of
15 the recent CF drug development programs.

16 I had discussed earlier the range of FEV1
17 improvement seen in some of the more recent
18 approvals, about 3 to 13 percent predicted.
19 Although not presented as percent predicted, the
20 observed treatment effect difference of
21 approximately 50 milliliters is 1.2 percent
22 predicted.

1 It's important to note that FEV1 does not
2 directly measure how a patient functions, feels, or
3 survives. DPM, which is not a bronchodilator, is
4 expected to improve pulmonary toilet and secretion
5 clearance. In that setting, we would look to other
6 supportive measures as we have done for prior
7 approvals.

8 One would expect that meaningful
9 improvement in overall function would translate
10 into meaningful improvement in other measures such
11 as exacerbations, infections, hospitalizations,
12 and/or symptoms.

13 So with those points in mind, the agency
14 was concerned with the small treatment effect
15 estimate that I showed you on the previous slide,
16 and we will ask you to discuss this treatment
17 effect size and consider it in your benefit-risk
18 assessment.

19 The agency was also concerned with the
20 potential treatment effect attenuation seen at
21 week 26. This is important to consider as well,
22 given that this would be a chronically administered

1 medication and could be, if approved, a medication
2 that a CF patient may use for his or her lifetime.

3 Given these concerns, we would then
4 naturally look to the secondary endpoints for
5 support in more clinically meaningful measures.

6 Here are the secondary endpoints from
7 study 303 that Dr. Torres discussed. We focused on
8 exacerbation-related endpoints, shown in the red
9 box, as they are the most clinically important of
10 the secondary endpoints in the DPM phase 3 program.
11 Those include time to first protocol-defined
12 pulmonary exacerbation, PDPE, antibiotic usage due
13 to PDPE, hospitalizations, due to PDPE, and the
14 rate of PDPE.

15 You'll notice that 3 of the 4 secondary
16 endpoints shown in the highlighted box are trending
17 in favor of the control arm and not in favor of
18 DPM, and the PDPE rate, arguably the most important
19 of the exacerbation endpoints, suggests that
20 exacerbations may be more common with DPM use.

21 Let's see how the PDPE rate compares across
22 studies. Here's the slide that Dr. Torres showed

1 you comparing three studies for PDPE rates. Again,
2 cross-study comparisons notwithstanding, the slide
3 notes the PDPE rate in the phase 3 studies. The
4 data for the prior studies is post hoc and thus
5 limited in that respect and is shown with the
6 dashed lines.

7 Remember that in the statistical analysis
8 in the prior studies, there were no prespecified
9 imputation procedures, as Dr. Torres went through
10 in detail. What we see is that in studies 302 and
11 303, there were trends unfavorable for DPM. You'll
12 remember that these were the two studies that
13 included U.S. patients, so, understandably, the
14 next step in our analysis was to look at the U.S.
15 subpopulation.

16 Dr. Torres showed you this subgroup
17 analysis for U.S. and non-U.S. patients in
18 studies 302 and 303. Again, as he pointed out, the
19 dashed lines are to visually indicate that results
20 from 302 are limited.

21 What we see here is that the U.S.
22 population shows numerically higher rates of

1 exacerbations than the non-U.S. population in
2 studies 302 and 303. And remember, study 303 was a
3 statistically more robust study overall for the
4 reasons previously mentioned.

5 To clarify, the post hoc subgroup analysis
6 of U.S. patients in study 303 suggests that
7 DPM-treated CF patients have a numerically higher
8 rate of exacerbations than controlled-treated U.S.
9 patients. And the unfavorable trends seen in the
10 overall population is accentuated in the U.S.
11 population. So the rate ratio was quite concerning
12 to the agency.

13 Let's discuss some of the implications of
14 the secondary endpoint data that I just reviewed.
15 It's clear that exacerbations are of significant
16 clinical importance. They play a large role in the
17 quality of life for CF patients, a large role in
18 healthcare cost, and quality time lost.

19 Each exacerbation comes with considerable
20 burden. Exacerbation measures have been used in
21 all the recent approved therapies as secondary
22 endpoints, so the emphasis that we are placing on

1 this is nothing new.

2 As I noted previously, we had discussed
3 with the sponsor that a 26-week study may not be
4 able to capture enough exacerbation data to reach
5 statistical significance, so we would be looking
6 for trends, and that the expectation was that
7 trends would be in a favorable direction for DPM.

8 What I've shown you on the previous slide
9 is that there are point estimates that do not favor
10 DPM. There was a suggestion of an increased rate
11 of exacerbations with DPM compared to control and
12 with similar trends noted for time to first
13 exacerbation.

14 Particularly concerning were the worsened
15 trends in study 303 in the U.S. population, and
16 that is of obvious interest, as we are a U.S.
17 regulatory body. One additional important
18 secondary endpoint that the agency had asked the
19 sponsor to look at and that measures quality of
20 life is the CFQ-RRD. You'll recall from
21 Dr. Torres' presentation that there was no
22 significant difference observed between arms in

1 study 303 and also for the other two studies as
2 well.

3 So overall, in the entire phase 3 program,
4 there were no secondary endpoints that provided
5 significant report, and in fact, some concerning
6 trends were seen.

7 To summarize the efficacy, let's first talk
8 about the primary endpoint. We've discussed the
9 problems with the prior studies and their post hoc
10 adult analyses. It is likely that the treatment
11 effect estimate, depending on the statistical
12 analysis method used, lies somewhere between 50 and
13 80 mLs.

14 We would like the panel members to focus on
15 the clinical relevance of this small treatment
16 effect. Understanding that we are not assessing a
17 bronchodilator, but rather a medication that by
18 clearing airway secretions, should lead to clinical
19 improvement in other clinically meaningful
20 measures, we naturally look to the secondary
21 endpoints. But there is no significant support
22 from any secondary endpoint in any of the phase 3

1 studies.

2 In contrast, trends in 2 of the 3 studies
3 are in the opposite direction, which raised
4 concern. Those concerns are increased when we
5 further look at the U.S. subpopulation, which is
6 the main population for which the agency would
7 focus on.

8 To summarize, a small treatment effect on
9 the primary endpoint of FEV1 is likely present, but
10 without clinically meaningful secondary endpoint
11 support, and in fact, with concerning exacerbation
12 trends.

13 I'll now go over safety results. I'll
14 start with a brief mention of exposure and then go
15 over the main safety categories as listed here. In
16 general, the exposure for this orphan disease
17 population was adequate, with a median exposure of
18 around 6 months.

19 What I've highlighted in the red box is
20 that more patients in the DPM group had a duration
21 under 3 months, and this speaks to the tolerability
22 of the medication, which we will discuss further in

1 the upcoming slides.

2 It's also worth noting that the safety data
3 here and in the upcoming slides is only from the
4 adults in the phase 3 studies, which for
5 studies 301 and 302 was about half of the study
6 population, whereas it would represent the entire
7 study 303 population.

8 This safety overview shows the major safety
9 categories for the phase 3 pooled adult subgroup.
10 It shows that in all categories other than deaths,
11 there were more DPM patients with the listed
12 adverse event type than control.

13 For some of the categories, the differences
14 between groups are small and for others, more
15 noticeable. The difference between arms for the
16 categories other than death ranges from 1 to
17 4 percent.

18 Let's focus on serious adverse events and
19 look at the breakdown. This table shows SOC in
20 preferred terms for SAEs with greater than or equal
21 to 1 percent frequency from the phase 3 pooled
22 adult subgroup. I'll also remind everyone that in

1 the original submission, there were concerns
2 regarding hemoptysis, so you see I've highlighted
3 that box in red.

4 I will continue to highlight hemoptysis as
5 we move forward, and the difference between
6 treatment arms for hemoptysis SAEs in phase 3
7 adults was minimal.

8 Also, I've highlighted the most common SAE
9 in the phase 3 program, which was CF exacerbation
10 coded as condition aggravated. This, too, I will
11 continue to highlight as we move forward to help
12 understand why the agency feels that this may be a
13 safety concern.

14 It's important to note that CF
15 exacerbations as reported from an adverse event
16 standpoint were not the same as the protocol-
17 defined pulmonary exacerbations that we discussed
18 in the efficacy review. These were investigator
19 determined without any prerequisites.

20 You'll note that there were slightly more
21 serious CF exacerbations in the DPM patients than
22 control overall. I will be returning to CF

1 exacerbations as an adverse event of special
2 interest.

3 Next here, I have adverse events that led
4 to treatment discontinuations, and this table shows
5 results with a greater than or equal to 0.5 percent
6 frequency. Here, I've highlighted a few things.
7 On the top line, you can see that overall
8 tolerability of DPM was an issue, with more adult
9 DPM patients discontinuing treatment as a result of
10 an adverse event as compared to adult control
11 patients, and that mostly was driven by respiratory
12 symptoms, the next row down, of which cough was the
13 most frequent. This is understandable knowing
14 DPM's action as an airway irritant.

15 Now, I've highlighted hemoptysis and CF
16 exacerbations again. While slightly higher rates
17 of DPM discontinuation due to hemoptysis and CF
18 exacerbations were noted as compared to control,
19 the differences between arms were small.

20 Let's look at the common AEs. On this
21 table of all treatment-emergent adverse events,
22 those with a greater than 5 percent frequency or

1 greater than 2 percent difference between arms are
2 shown. You can see that, overall, more DPM
3 patients had adverse events, the top row, and the
4 most common adverse event was CF exacerbations, the
5 second row. Cough was noticeably more common in
6 DPM patients, and as I showed you before, led to
7 treatment discontinuation more commonly as well.

8 I'd like to now focus on two adverse events
9 of special interest, hemoptysis and CF
10 exacerbation. As I mentioned earlier, hemoptysis
11 was a concern raised, particularly in the pediatric
12 population in the original submission, and
13 therefore, exploring that further is important to
14 ensure that a similar concern is not present in
15 adults.

16 Exacerbations will then be discussed, not
17 only for the reasons shown on the previous safety
18 slides, but also to see if a safety signal is
19 present that correlates with the efficacy concerns
20 seen for higher PDPE rates, especially in the U.S.
21 population.

22 Here, I've shown hemoptysis events in all

1 of the major safety categories, excluding deaths,
2 but I've separated out the original submission,
3 studies 301 and 302, the left two data columns and
4 study 303, the middle two data columns, and then
5 the pooled data for all 3 studies is the rightmost
6 columns.

7 As I mentioned several times, the
8 hemoptysis concern in the original submission
9 studies was mostly in the pediatric subgroup. But
10 what can be seen here in the leftmost part of the
11 highlighted region is that even in adults,
12 hemoptysis related to some of the important safety
13 categories was still more common in the DPM
14 patients in studies 301 and 302.

15 In contrast, study 303 results do not
16 replicate those concerns -- you can see that in the
17 middle two columns -- with the end result in the
18 pooled adult subgroup for all 3 studies being such
19 that the difference from the original studies are
20 dampened.

21 I'd like to next move on to exacerbations.
22 On this slide, I've consolidated information, most

1 of which I've already shown you. I've already
2 shown you CF exacerbations that were SAEs, CF
3 exacerbations that led to drug discontinuation, and
4 a listing of all CF exacerbations.

5 The main purpose of this slide is to show
6 that in most of the safety categories, CF
7 exacerbations were more common in DPM patients than
8 control, albeit with small differences between
9 treatment arms.

10 While the differences were small, the
11 consistency of these small differences across
12 multiple important safety categories raised some
13 concern, and given the PDPE efficacy data results
14 showing concerning accentuation in U.S. patients,
15 we decided to look at that type of regional
16 breakdown for CF exacerbation in the safety data.

17 Here is that breakdown. This is from the
18 pooled adult subgroup data across all phase 3
19 studies comparing the U.S. study population to the
20 non-U.S. population. The highlighted box shows a
21 strikingly higher percentage of U.S. adult CF
22 patients in the DPM arm, nearly double, having

1 serious CF exacerbations.

2 I'll remind everyone that we saw a similar
3 concerning increase in PDPE rates in the efficacy
4 data that we reviewed when we narrowed down to the
5 U.S. population. These subgroup safety results are
6 consistent with the subgroup efficacy results seen
7 earlier and raises the concern even further.

8 To summarize, we just reviewed CF
9 exacerbations as an adverse event of concern.
10 There were more serious CF exacerbations in DPM
11 patients, and this difference was particularly
12 concerning when looking at the U.S. subgroup.
13 Also, there were more CF exacerbations leading to
14 treatment discontinuation and study withdrawals.

15 The original submission in 2012, upon
16 review, had raised concerns for hemoptysis,
17 however, for adults, those concerns are lessened by
18 the results from study 303.

19 Lastly, DPM-treated patients had more cough
20 that led to treatment withdrawal as well as certain
21 other adverse events related to the known airway
22 irritant effect of DPM, and this may pose a

1 tolerability issue.

2 Let's quickly review the key efficacy
3 points and then look at efficacy and safety
4 together to frame a discussion of risk versus
5 benefit.

6 Here's the key efficacy data for adults
7 from the phase 3 studies. This slide summarizes
8 what could be considered two of the most crucial
9 endpoints, the primary endpoint of FEV1 and the
10 clinically meaningful secondary endpoint, PDPE
11 rate.

12 The treatment effect estimate is between 50
13 to 80 mLs for FEV1 on the left, and the PDPE rate
14 favors control in both studies 302 and 303, two
15 U.S. studies. We reviewed the efficacy focusing on
16 the primary endpoint of FEV1 and its small
17 treatment effect size.

18 We've looked at the results from the
19 individual phase 3 studies with Dr. Torres
20 providing us details on the multiple problems seen
21 in the prior studies and the post hoc nature of
22 their adult analyses. We noted that study 302 did

1 not achieve statistical significance on the primary
2 endpoint and that study 303, for a variety of
3 reasons, was the most robust study statistically
4 speaking.

5 With this in mind, the treatment effect
6 estimate remains in the range of 50 to 80 mLs.
7 Because this was a small effect, we looked at the
8 secondary endpoints that included clinically
9 meaningful measures such as exacerbation-related
10 endpoints and CFQ-RRD.

11 From those measures, there was no
12 significant support, and of those measures, the
13 exacerbation rate, arguably the most important
14 measure, trended unfavorably for DPM. This
15 unfavorable trend was further accentuated in the
16 U.S. population. This raised concerns beyond just
17 discussion of clinical significance of a small
18 treatment effect. We also briefly discussed the
19 lack of support from CFQ-RRD scores.

20 When we looked at safety, no large
21 differences between treatment arms were noted in
22 the major safety categories, but overall, a

1 consistent small increased frequency of adverse
2 events in multiple important safety categories for
3 DPM-treated patients was noted.

4 We focused on CF exacerbations where,
5 again, a small increase in the frequency for DPM
6 patients was seen in several safety categories.
7 What was most concerning from a safety standpoint
8 was that the U.S. subpopulation analysis, similar
9 to what was done for exacerbation efficacy data,
10 showed a striking increase for serious CF
11 exacerbations, and the consistency of safety and
12 efficacy results for increased CF exacerbations was
13 of particular concern.

14 So I would ask for the panel members to
15 carefully keep these points in mind as we enter the
16 discussion. Thank you.

17 **Clarifying Questions**

18 DR. AU: Great. Are there any clarifying
19 questions for the FDA? Let me actually see who
20 didn't get to speak last time. We have
21 Dr. Marshall as well as Dr. Blake. Why don't we go
22 in that order?

1 DR. MARSHALL: It's Gailen Marshall,
2 University of Mississippi. I actually have a
3 question for both of the FDA speakers, and it
4 relates to a non-statistician asking these
5 question.

6 The question relates to the fact that it
7 almost seems that one could suggest that you're
8 selectively enforcing statistical significance,
9 things that are not significant, but would speak
10 against the product you're describing as concerning
11 and trending; yet in one of Dr. Torres' slides, and
12 because there was no statistical significance, they
13 didn't even report the numbers, yet they use those
14 to express concern.

15 I submit that if the sponsor were to say
16 that those were trends that supported their
17 argument, it would be rather heavily argued.

18 Could they comment about that, please, just
19 from a procedural standpoint, how they do that?

20 DR. PUTHAWALA: I'll answer first from a
21 non-statistician point of view. When we looked at
22 PDPE rate, some of the things that we focus on are

1 what we have focused on in the past with prior
2 approval, so I didn't think that we looked at
3 things in a different fashion.

4 DR. LIM: This is Bob Lim, clinical team
5 leader. I think what you're getting at is maybe
6 we're looking at trends in PDPE rate being
7 unfavorable for DPM versus placebo, and you're
8 wondering perhaps we're unfairly bringing that up
9 when it's not statistically significant.

10 I think that with these presentations,
11 we're careful to note the limitations of the
12 analyses, that some of these were post hoc, the
13 previous ones didn't win, and then we had noted
14 that there were certainly limitations to it.

15 We are not saying that DPM is causing
16 exacerbations. We are simply raising that as a
17 concern because of these trends that we have seen,
18 so I don't think we are applying this in an uneven
19 fashion, per se.

20 DR. MARSHALL: If I can just ask for
21 clarification. I'm not really suggesting that
22 you're attacking or not attacking. I'm trying to

1 understand your weighting of statistical
2 significance because it does seem to be different
3 depending upon what parameter you're talking about.

4 So is the standard different if you're
5 raising a concern -- I'm not saying that's right or
6 wrong; I'm just asking for clarification -- as
7 opposed to saying there is a clear difference that
8 is statistically significant?

9 DR. LIM: This is Bob Lim again. I think
10 there is probably a difference. For just raising a
11 concern, it's just a concern.

12 DR. MARSHALL: That's all I'm saying.

13 DR. LIM: That would be the answer, then.

14 DR. AU: Actually, Dr. Blake, and then
15 Dr. Tracy?

16 DR. BLAKE: Thank you. Kathryn Blake. I'd
17 kind of like to better understand the enrolled
18 population a little bit better so we know who was
19 in this trial. I know you didn't go over the
20 inclusion/exclusion criteria, but previous use of
21 hypertonic saline was an exclusion. Was that any
22 use or was that that they had been prescribed it

1 before?

2 What I'm trying to get at is were the
3 patients then who enrolled in this trial, given
4 that one of the other slides showed prescriptions,
5 percent of patients was about 60 percent at the
6 time this trial would have been enrolling.

7 So would the patients who enrolled in this
8 trial have been previous users of hypertonic saline
9 at any point?

10 DR. PUTHAWALA: My understanding is
11 hypertonic saline during the treatment period was
12 not allowed, but previous use was not an exclusion
13 criteria.

14 DR. BLAKE: So I'm just wondering what
15 percent of patients have been previous users and
16 maybe discontinued it because they had problem with
17 hypertonic saline, and then enrolled in this trial
18 and also had problems with mannitol.

19 DR. LIM: We don't actually have those
20 numbers at our fingertips. I don't know if the
21 sponsor would have that.

22 DR. BLAKE: Okay. I did have one other

1 question, which hopefully you can answer. It had
2 to do with the durability of response.

3 When you're looking at -- it was slide 17,
4 looking at the trend downward. I'm curious,
5 though, what was the percent change from 6 to
6 14 weeks, and then 14 to 26 weeks, and then 6 to
7 26 weeks for DPM, and what was it for saline?

8 Saline also decreased, so I'm just
9 wondering what that change was within the saline
10 group versus the percent change within those
11 patients in the DPM arm.

12 DR. PUTHAWALA: Sorry. Just to clarify, by
13 saline, you mean the control group which was
14 50 milligrams?

15 DR. BLAKE: Control, excuse me. That's
16 what I meant. I'm sorry, the control.

17 DR. PUTHAWALA: I would look to my
18 statistical colleagues to see it.

19 DR. BLAKE: Because I'm just looking -- the
20 trend is the same for both. I just wondered if the
21 magnitude of the change was similar for the control
22 in the DPM arm.

1 DR. TORRES: I'm sorry. Can you repeat
2 that question?

3 DR. BLAKE: Certainly. So it's slide
4 number 17. In the DPM arm, there was a decrease
5 that started between weeks 6 and 14 and continued
6 through 14 to 26, but also in the control arm,
7 there was a decrease between week 6 and 14, and
8 then 14 to 26.

9 So I'm wondering what the percent change
10 was for both the DPM arm and the control arm to see
11 is this change a 4 percent and 5 percent change in
12 DPM and also a 4 and 5 percent change in the
13 control arm.

14 DR. TORRES: We don't have those numbers
15 right now, but maybe during the break, we can get
16 them and get back to you.

17 DR. BLAKE: Thank you.

18 DR. LIM: This is Bob Lim again. In regard
19 to that question, we don't have that percentage,
20 but I believe table 17 of the FDA briefing document
21 on page 47 has the change from baseline in terms of
22 milliliters.

1 DR. AU: Great. I'm going to go to
2 Dr. Tracy, and then we'll come to the side.

3 DR. TRACY: Dr. Tracy. I'd like to circle
4 back a little bit on the hemoptysis question. It's
5 actually fairly simple. It goes with the exclusion
6 parameters for 303. You mentioned recent
7 hemoptysis was an exclusion criteria, and then
8 recognizing the differences of hemoptysis as a
9 safety signal between 301 and 302 compared to 303,
10 so it looked like it was better.

11 I just don't recall, with 301 and 302,
12 whether that same parameter was part of the
13 exclusion criteria.

14 DR. PUTHAWALA: It was. The exclusion
15 criteria did not change.

16 DR. AU: Actually, Dr. Emerson first, and
17 then Dr. Brittain?

18 DR. EMERSON: Just a question, again, about
19 Dr. Torres' slide 17. As you computed that, what
20 sort of imputation did you use? Also, you were
21 using measurements that, by then, 20 percent of the
22 subjects were off study.

1 Is that you were just using their
2 follow-up? I mean, not off study, off drug?

3 DR. TORRES: For these analysis results, I
4 did use all observed data, including data collected
5 after treatment discontinuation, and I believe that
6 for these numbers, I used a pattern mixture model
7 approach with multiple imputation, but I'll
8 double-check that and get back to you.

9 DR. EMERSON: Do you have any particular
10 feel for the amount that potentially -- did you do
11 any analyses to look to see whether the amount that
12 this decrease might go with being off the study
13 drug and that the patients who stayed on it might
14 have descriptively stayed more constant?

15 DR. TORRES: I did not look at that.

16 DR. AU: Dr. Brittain?

17 DR. BRITTAIN: In terms of the U.S.
18 population results, I wonder if you have any sense
19 of whether the U.S. population could be different
20 from the non-U.S. population at baseline in terms
21 of previous exacerbation rates, et cetera.

22 I'm not taking about the difference between

1 arms, just overall, I'm trying to understand why
2 the U.S. population might have a different outcome
3 than the non-U.S. in terms of any baseline
4 characteristics.

5 DR. PUTHAWALA: I'm not sure if what I'm
6 going to say now is going to answer that question
7 fully, but the U.S. population, in terms of
8 medication usage; for example rhDNase use is
9 significantly higher than it is in the rest of the
10 world. There are mutational compositional
11 differences in F508.

12 I don't know if these are playing a factor,
13 but these are some of the differences between the
14 U.S. population and the non-U.S. population.

15 DR. BRITTAIN: So potentially, the U.S.
16 population results are more generalizable to
17 the -- the U.S. population results in your study
18 may potentially be more generalizable to the
19 patients here in this, which you don't know.

20 DR. PUTHAWALA: That's the intention of the
21 analysis. Yes.

22 DR. BRITTAIN: I just wondered if perhaps

1 they were sicker in some way like -- you don't seem
2 to be thinking that.

3 DR. LIM: Yes. There might have been some
4 differences, but it's really hard to attribute that
5 to the difference that we see. I think,
6 ultimately, it's hard to know exactly how real the
7 difference is, and if it is real, then what the
8 causes are. I think that's one of the things
9 that -- that's why we brought it up at this
10 committee, to get you guys' input as to what your
11 thoughts were on that.

12 DR. BRITTAIN: Thank you. One other quick
13 question. On slide 19, as an example, from the
14 statistical set --

15 LCDR CHEE: Stats or which one?

16 DR. AU: Yes, stats.

17 DR. BRITTAIN: There you go. Just again,
18 for this slide and in general, I just want to make
19 sure I understood -- you emphasized how in the 301
20 and 302, they didn't have the plan, the provision
21 in the study to follow people up once they were
22 taking drug or withdrew in other ways.

1 Here, when you're doing these post hoc
2 analyses, you use the same statistical approach in
3 this post hoc analysis for 301 and 302 as had been
4 prespecified in 303. Is that correct in terms of
5 dealing with the missing data?

6 DR. TORRES: In study 303, they
7 prespecified this imputation approach. For studies
8 301 and 302, that was not prespecified. There was
9 a tricky situation where in study 301, the data was
10 not collected that would allow for that imputation
11 procedure, so we had a choice of either doing the
12 imputation for studies 302 and 303 or just doing it
13 for 303.

14 Given that we feel that studies 301 and 302
15 are more comparable to each other than they are to
16 study 303, our perspective was that maybe it made
17 more sense to just analyze 301 and 302 in the same
18 way, which was no imputation.

19 DR. BRITTAIN: There's no imputation in 301
20 and 302.

21 DR. TORRES: Yes.

22 DR. BRITTAIN: Thank you.

1 DR. AU: Actually, does the sponsor have a
2 comment about the previous discussion?

3 DR. PARRY-BILLINGS: Yes. We had a data
4 slide that we could share very briefly to address
5 Dr. Brittain's question about the difference in the
6 U.S. population because we absolutely understand
7 the focus on the pulmonary exacerbations and
8 understand the focus in the U.S. population.

9 If I can share this slide with you, if you
10 focus your attention in the middle of the slide,
11 this shows the percentage of patients with PEs,
12 exacerbations, treated with IV antibiotics in the
13 last 12 months, and also in the row below, the
14 percentage of patients with exacerbations requiring
15 hospitalizations.

16 As we mentioned earlier, as you can see, by
17 chance, those patients randomized to Bronchitol had
18 a much more intense, if you like, exacerbation
19 history based on those two key parameters. Thank
20 you.

21 DR. AU: Thank you for clarifying that.

22 Dr. Gillen?

1 DR. BRITTAIN: Can I have a brief follow-up
2 on that?

3 DR. AU: Dr. Brittain, did you want to
4 follow up?

5 DR. BRITTAIN: I just wanted to say that it
6 seems like this is relevant to the question that
7 was brought up through here about getting results
8 stratified by exacerbation history or
9 hospitalization, which I can't remember how it was
10 defined previously.

11 Is that going to be provided?

12 DR. AU: We'll see. I mean, the request
13 has been made of the sponsor, so hopefully after
14 lunch, we'll be able to see that in discussion.

15 Dr. Gillen?

16 DR. GILLEN: Thank you. This is a question
17 on Dr. Torres' slide 18. I just want to make sure
18 that I'm fully understanding what was done in the
19 analysis to be able to compare this to what the
20 sponsor has presented for the PDPE rates, at 18,
21 one prior to this. There we go.

22 Just to make sure, individuals that stopped

1 study prior to week 26, you used their prior
2 12-month rate that was observed prior to this study
3 to impute their PDPE rates if they had no observed
4 PDPE events. Is that correct?

5 DR. TORRES: Yes, That's correct.
6 Specifically, if we could pull up the backup slide
7 number 3?

8 Here, we have that for each patient who
9 withdrew before week 14 with no observed PDPEs,
10 then the number of PDPEs imputed was using half of
11 the patient's historical pulmonary exacerbation
12 count, rounded upwards. However, for patients who
13 withdrew after week 14, the number of PDPEs --
14 withdrew with no observed PDPEs, the number of
15 PDPEs was imputed using one-fourth of the patient's
16 historical pulmonary exacerbation count, rounded
17 upwards, according to the prespecified analysis and
18 the statistical analysis plan.

19 DR. GILLEN: Was there ever any analysis
20 performed where you just used your best estimate of
21 what that rate was relative to the amount of time
22 that you had not followed them for? I mean, that

1 seems to be the most natural thing to do.

2 DR. TORRES: No.

3 DR. GILLEN: Was there any accounting for
4 uncertainty in any of this? This was just a
5 straight plug-in estimator?

6 DR. TORRES: Yes. We recognize that this
7 is a single imputation approach, and we did not
8 perform any sensitivity analyses that maybe more
9 appropriately accounted for the uncertainty in
10 parameter estimation.

11 DR. GILLEN: Just a final thing; for your
12 confidence intervals, then, is this just based upon
13 a Poisson model or is this counting for
14 overdispersion at all?

15 DR. TORRES: This used a negative binomial
16 regression model.

17 DR. GILLEN: Just as the sponsor did.
18 Okay. Thank you.

19 DR. AU: Yes, a comment from the sponsor.

20 DR. PARRY-BILLINGS: A one-sentence
21 clarification if I may. There were in fact
22 multiple imputation methods prespecified in the

1 303 study protocol. I understand the focus on this
2 specific data point and the rate ratio of around
3 1.5, but the other multiple imputation showed
4 different rate ratios at around 1.2. These are
5 data that we could share to put into context if
6 that was helpful.

7 DR. GILLEN: I think it would be very
8 helpful.

9 DR. AU: Yes. Why don't we share that
10 after discussion?

11 Dr. Kelso?

12 DR. KELSO: If the possible explanation for
13 the worst exacerbation rate in 303 is that the
14 patients were more exacerbation prone to start
15 with, is it also true that since there was a trend
16 in 301 toward a lower exacerbation, that they were
17 less sick, and in 302, they also had a worse
18 exacerbation rate going into the study?

19 If that's going to be the explanation for
20 303, does that same pattern hold for 301 and 302?

21 DR. PARRY-BILLINGS: As mentioned also by
22 the agency, the exacerbation history was not

1 recorded in study 301, so we don't have the ability
2 to look backwards at 301.

3 In 302, as indicated by Dr. Flume in his
4 presentation, the exacerbation rate during the
5 studies were higher, and we accept the limitations
6 as flagged by the agency in the analysis of those
7 studies. But in 302, where the exacerbation rate
8 was higher, the data were trending in favor of
9 Bronchitol.

10 DR. AU: Great. Dr. Que?

11 DR. QUE: Hi. Loretta Que. A question for
12 the sponsor. I could not find this information.
13 Adherence is really important in any clinical
14 trial, and usually, during the study, adherence is
15 improved.

16 When you see the waning here of the effect
17 over time, what was going on with adherence with
18 these patients, starting out with 10 tablets and
19 then maybe they started dropping tablets, or can
20 you tell us what was going on?

21 DR. PARRY-BILLINGS: Because we have the
22 capsule-based medication as opposed to, perhaps, I

1 don't know, a multi-dose, metered-dose inhaler,
2 we're able to monitor adherence quite carefully.
3 In fact, in 303, the adherence was extremely high.
4 It's around 98 percent, if I remember correctly,
5 and this was maintained throughout the study.

6 DR. AU: Thank you. Dr. Schell?

7 DR. SCHELL: Thank you. Karen Schell. I
8 just have a question regarding the U.S. differences
9 regarding the pulmonary function, the FEV1. What
10 are the rates for the U.S.?

11 Since FEV1 is the amount of lung function
12 the person came to, were they lower to begin with
13 than the other countries, not so much through the
14 aspirations, but what were the PFT functions? Were
15 they comparable on both sides?

16 I don't know if that was looked at, and I
17 think I read something during the studies about
18 that, but I'm not quite sure if the PFTs were
19 comparable.

20 DR. PUTHAWALA: Just to clarify, we're
21 talking about the U.S. subpopulation?

22 DR. SCHELL: Yes.

1 DR. PUTHAWALA: I don't have that, but I
2 can try to get that to you.

3 DR. AU: We may have follow-up from the
4 sponsor. Yes.

5 DR. PARRY-BILLINGS: We can share those
6 data. They're on the screen now. Perhaps the
7 easiest way to look at it is FEV1 percent predicted
8 at baseline. If you run your eyes along the second
9 row of this table, there was consistency across the
10 groups and across the U.S. and non-U.S. population.

11 DR. AU: Thank you for that.

12 Dr. Parad?

13 DR. PARAD: Richard Parad. This is a
14 question from the briefing document, figure 1. I
15 was wondering if Dr. Torres or one of the
16 statisticians would like to comment on what could
17 be a different effect between males and females.

18 DR. TORRES: As a clarification, you asked
19 about figure 1, right?

20 DR. PARAD: Figure 1 from your briefing
21 document.

22 DR. TORRES: Yes, we have that. When we

1 looked at different subpopulations, the treatment
2 effect estimate was trending in the other direction
3 for women as opposed to men.

4 DR. PARAD: Just from looking at the
5 confidence intervals, it looks like a pretty big
6 difference. Is this something you considered or
7 looked into any further than that?

8 DR. TORRES: We're looking at a lot of
9 different subgroups here. If there was truly no
10 difference among the different subgroups, I think,
11 by chance, you might have some random highs or
12 random lows. So from our perspective, we didn't
13 see this as something that was too concerning as
14 opposed to something like U.S. or non-U.S., where,
15 a priori, we were kind of interested in those
16 differences.

17 DR. KIM: This is Yongman Kim. We looked
18 at the study 301 and 302 for the general
19 difference, but we didn't see any specific detected
20 differences.

21 DR. PARAD: So it was only in 303 that --

22 DR. KIM: That's my finding.

1 DR. AU: Great. Thank you.

2 Dr. Lederer?

3 DR. LEDERER: Thanks. Dave Lederer. I
4 just want to get back to the point the
5 statisticians on the panel had brought up about the
6 rate ratios for exacerbations in 303 and in the
7 U.S. population.

8 Do you just have rate ratios, like plain
9 old rate ratios for these events? This is from a
10 negative binomial model where you're imputing
11 events after 26 weeks. Do you just have rates per
12 person over rate per person-year? Do you have
13 that?

14 DR. TORRES: I'm not exactly sure I
15 understand what you're asking. Are you asking for
16 an unadjusted rate ratio?

17 DR. LEDERER: Yes. So you have randomized
18 groups, and you can compare the rates in one group
19 to the rates in the other group. Is there any
20 barrier to doing that?

21 DR. TORRES: There is no barrier to doing
22 that. We can certainly compute it. We did not

1 compute it.

2 DR. LEDERER: Okay. To me, it seems like a
3 critical element here, is you're going to ask us
4 about the safety of this, and these findings about
5 exacerbations and exacerbations in the U.S. are a
6 safety signal.

7 I certainly understand what was done, but I
8 don't quite understand why we didn't see just
9 unadjusted rate ratios in 303 for exacerbations
10 when you have the data. And the sponsor presented
11 adjusted rate ratios if I remember correctly.

12 I don't know. Maybe I'm not smart enough
13 to understand. Maybe the statisticians on the
14 panel can help me out.

15 DR. TORRES: The whole idea of the adjusted
16 rate ratio, it's still clinically interpretable.
17 For example, the adjusted rate ratio, one might say
18 is that among those of the same region, having the
19 same rhDNase use, and number of IV antibiotic
20 treatment pulmonary exacerbations in the year prior
21 to screening, when comparing the DPM to the control
22 group, the rate ratio is 1.55. So it still has a

1 clinical interpretation.

2 DR. LEDERER: I understand the clinical
3 implication. It's a randomized trial. We could
4 look at rates in one group versus rates in the
5 other group.

6 DR. EMERSON: Can I just comment on how I'm
7 looking at this is we've got a problem; that this
8 was a secondary endpoint for efficacy. It fails
9 there, but had it never been a secondary endpoint
10 for efficacy, we would have treated it only as a
11 safety endpoint and we would have -- again, this
12 goes to Dr. Marshall's question about p-values
13 being reported or not. Efficacy; we need the
14 p-value. Safety, we need what we're scared about,
15 and that's really what it comes down to.

16 So there are some issues about how we would
17 treat this for those two different issues. And
18 again, we're sort of back to what's our estimand.
19 At one level, you could say we only care about
20 things that happened among those people who will
21 take the treatment forever, but in the randomized
22 comparison, we have to worry about the differential

1 dropouts. Even when the rates are the same, we
2 have to worry about that the reasons for dropping
3 out were differential, and we don't really know
4 what that is. So these are the difficulties in
5 judging these things.

6 DR. AU: Great. I just have -- go ahead,
7 Dr. Brittain.

8 DR. BRITTAIN: I don't know if this is at
9 all what you were talking about, but it appears
10 that both the sponsor and the FDA are adjusting for
11 the same covariates. The difference seems to be
12 how they're handling the missing data.

13 DR. AU: Did you want to address that?
14 Yes, the sponsor.

15 DR. PARRY-BILLINGS: If it's helpful, since
16 there were questions about the rate ratios and
17 adjusted rates, I wonder if we could see the slide
18 which shows those data; and also to the question on
19 clinical context, the number of events.

20 This was a slide that was shown earlier
21 with a focus on the left-hand side of the slide,
22 study 303. In terms of the second road, number of

1 events, as you can see, in the overall population,
2 the actual number of events is really rather low.

3 You asked about the rate ratio. These are
4 the adjusted rate ratios around 0.2. As you can
5 see in the earlier study 303, we're acknowledging
6 the limitations from the agency on those studies,
7 but you can see there they're substantially higher.

8 When we were referring to the hypertonic
9 saline study, the Elkins paper from the New England
10 Journal, the annualized rate ratio is 0.9, so very
11 similar to our first pivotal trial, but much higher
12 than in the more recent 303 study.

13 DR. LEDERER: Sorry. I know we're running
14 out of time, but I have to respond to that. My
15 understanding on the Elkins 2006 study is that
16 there was a significant reduction on the rate of
17 acute exacerbation on the order of a 10 percent
18 absolute risk reduction. Is that not correct?

19 DR. PARRY-BILLINGS: Yes. As mentioned,
20 that study was a one-year study and did report a
21 reduction in exacerbations, and this comparison,
22 the positioning, if you like, versus hypertonic

1 saline, I appreciate it's rather important for the
2 argument.

3 If I may ask Dr. Flume, since he is very
4 familiar with exacerbations and indeed that study,
5 to perhaps provide extra color for you.

6 Thank you, Dr. Flume.

7 DR. FLUME: Thank you. Patrick Flume.

8 Yes, the study did show a reduction in
9 exacerbations using a definition that was not
10 unlike the definition used here for protocol
11 determined. But they did have not just an
12 increased event rate per patient, but 40 percent of
13 the patients had exacerbations compared to just
14 13 percent here.

15 So again, if you're designing a study
16 specifically looking for that, you'd like to enrich
17 your sample with patients who are likely to
18 exacerbate.

19 The way I look at it is if I think about
20 the mechanisms of action, what we're trying to
21 accomplish with our patients, I think of this
22 product as very similar to hypertonic saline. We

1 see a comparable change in lung function. We see
2 comparable issues of tolerability. It fits into
3 our paradigm of treatment. So from that standpoint
4 and the safety, I think we would expect similar
5 results.

6 DR. PARRY-BILLINGS: If I may add -- and I
7 appreciate we have to keep time short -- drilling
8 down further on the clinical relevance, the
9 difference we're seeing in between those two groups
10 is in fact driven by one patient who had, if I
11 remember correctly, 3 or 4 exacerbations. So it's
12 one patient as well that's driving this difference
13 in the number of events that I highlighted on the
14 prior slide.

15 DR. TORRES: I would like to clarify, I
16 believe it's the case that this patient that had 3
17 or 4 was not in the U.S.

18 DR. PUTHAWALA: I would also like to
19 add -- if we could pull up my slide 15 from my
20 second slide deck, and this is the safety data.
21 You'll notice the SAEs for CF exacerbations. The
22 numbers are similar to our understanding that

1 adverse event reporting is obviously different than
2 PDPE. But generally, you've seen numbers that are
3 not too far off from what we were just shown.

4 As soon as we have slide 15, this is
5 showing the CF exacerbation SAEs, which the vast
6 majority were deemed SAEs due to hospitalization
7 and understanding that there's probably some
8 crossover there between these SAEs reported in the
9 PDPE, which was defined by standard criteria.

10 So this is one point. The second point
11 that I want to make is if you could pull up backup
12 slide 21, this is something that I think will add
13 some element.

14 There's a lot going on, but I've tried to
15 highlight the boxes. This is just showing some
16 consistency in the safety data. This is study 302
17 and 303, and 301 is not present because there were
18 no U.S. patients.

19 The pooled data that I showed you during my
20 presentation is the rightmost highlighted box.
21 That's the 23 and 10, and those are number of
22 patients, and that's the difference. But you can

1 see the breakdown is seen in study 302 and 303.

2 I understand the sponsor's statement
3 regarding their underlying history. I don't know
4 if that same methodology goes for 302 as well, and
5 if they have that, it would be interesting to see
6 if that applies to 302. So that's it.

7 DR. AU: Please?

8 DR. PARRY-BILLINGS: I'm just responding to
9 the question. We do have those data and would be
10 very happy to provide it after the break.

11 DR. AU: Great. Yes, Robert?

12 DR. LIM: This is Bob Lim again. I just
13 wanted to remind the committee, we're talking a lot
14 about the exacerbation, and I think the reason
15 we're talking a lot about it is because the FEV1
16 benefit is sort of numerically small, and that is
17 really the only benefit we've consistently seen.

18 For a CF drug, primary endpoints, we
19 measure FEV1. But even in a study that's not
20 necessarily powered to show an exacerbation
21 benefit, maybe even that's not long enough to show
22 an exacerbation benefit statistically, our general

1 expectation is that in addition to showing an FEV1
2 benefit, that we would also want to see other
3 things trending in the right direction.

4 What we have here is a relatively small
5 treatment effect in terms of FEV1 and exacerbation
6 results which, at best, are greater than 1, and at
7 worse are -- are at best, greater than 1 and really
8 don't support -- they're not trending in the right
9 direction, which is something that we would expect
10 and have seen previously, and that's really the
11 concern here.

12 Regardless of what we talk about having the
13 larger effect on the U.S. population versus the
14 non-U.S. population, fundamentally, we have a small
15 FEV1 effect and we do not have favorable trends in
16 exacerbation, nor in CFQ-RRD.

17 That's the agency's dilemma in determining
18 how clinically significant this FEV1 benefit is,
19 and I do recognize that, in CF -- I took care of
20 these patients -- on an individual-patient basis,
21 any improvement is improvement, and you would want
22 to take that. But I think that it's a pretty small

1 improvement. It wasn't directly expressed as
2 percent predicted, but we're talking 1.2 percent
3 improvement; 1.2 percent improvement in percent
4 predicted, that's not huge.

5 DR. AU: Can I follow up on one question
6 that I've had for a while now, that I thought I
7 might take the prerogative to ask?

8 In the FDA document, it says study 302 did
9 not win on FEV1. On slide number 46 from the
10 sponsor, CO-46, study 302 notes an ADML benefit in
11 drug with a p-value of 0.028. I was just asking
12 for some reconciliation between these two pieces of
13 information.

14 DR. LIM: That's adult only.

15 DR. AU: This is only adult.

16 DR. LIM: That's adult only.

17 DR. AU: And the non-win is for the primary
18 trial --

19 DR. LIM: The primary trial, the primary
20 endpoint of the trial in the population.

21 DR. AU: Great. I just wanted to clarify.
22 Thank you.

1 It is 12:13. Why don't we give ourselves
2 45 minutes and come back at 1:00 p.m.? Again,
3 we're going to adjourn for lunch. I'll remind the
4 committee not to discuss any of these proceedings
5 during their lunch break. I look forward to seeing
6 everyone back at 1:00 p.m. Thank you.

7 (Whereupon, at 12:13 p.m., a lunch recess
8 was taken.)

9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22

1 A F T E R N O O N S E S S I O N

2 (1:00 p.m.)

3 **Open Public Hearing**

4 DR. AU: I hope everyone enjoyed their
5 lunch and their break. We will begin the open
6 public hearing portion of the meeting, a little
7 preamble.

8 Both the Food and Drug Administration and
9 the public believe in a transparent process for
10 information-gathering and decision-making. To
11 ensure such transparency at the open public hearing
12 session of the advisory committee meeting, FDA
13 believes that it is important to understand the
14 context of an individual's presentation.

15 For this reason, FDA encourages you, the
16 open public hearing speaker, at the beginning of
17 your written or oral statement to advise the
18 committee on any financial relationship that you
19 have with the sponsor, its product, or if known,
20 its direct competitors.

21 For example, this financial information may
22 include the sponsor's payment of your travel,

1 lodging, or other expenses in connection with your
2 attendance at this meeting.

3 Likewise, FDA encourages you at the
4 beginning of your statement to advise the committee
5 if you do not have any such conflicts. If you
6 choose not to address this issue of financial
7 relationships at the beginning of your statement,
8 it will not preclude you from speaking.

9 The FDA and this committee place great
10 importance in the open public hearing process. The
11 insights and comments provided can help the agency
12 and this committee in their consideration of the
13 issues before them. That said, in many instances
14 and for many topics, there will be a variety of
15 opinions.

16 One of our goals today is for the open
17 public hearing to be conducted in a fair and open
18 way where every participant is listened to
19 carefully and treated with dignity, courtesy, and
20 respect. Therefore, please only speak when
21 recognized by the chairperson, and thank you for
22 your cooperation.

1 I would like to call speaker number 1 to
2 the podium, and please introduce yourself. Please
3 state your name and any organization you are
4 representing for the record.

5 MR. CALLANAN: Good afternoon. My name is
6 Brian Callanan, and I am nearly 43 years old,
7 living with the most common genetic form of cystic
8 fibrosis, since my diagnosis at birth in 1976, when
9 the average life expectancy at the time was that of
10 10 years

11 I'm here representing myself as an adult
12 patient and do not have financial interest in
13 Chiesi USA, aside from the accommodation and travel
14 assistance for today's meeting.

15 I'm the founder and executive director of
16 the Cystic Fibrosis Lifestyle Foundation of which
17 Chiesi USA is one of more than a dozen corporate
18 grantors. My organization provides recreation
19 grants to patients in overcoming financial barriers
20 to exercise as a supplemental means of airway
21 clearance therapy and psychological and social
22 strengthening. Since 2007, we have awarded more

1 than 1300 grants totaling more than \$650,000 in
2 assistance to the CF community.

3 I speak to you today with emphasis on, A,
4 the importance of continued growth for treatment
5 options, and B, considering treatment benefit in
6 light of typically steady decline of lung function.
7 I stand before you as somewhat of an anomaly in the
8 CF community. I have been fortunate living with a
9 mild to moderate form of cystic fibrosis, which has
10 enabled me to maintain normal lung function in the
11 mid 80th percentile.

12 I experience low levels of lung congestion
13 on a daily basis, which is typically manageable
14 with four different nebulized medications, roughly
15 an hour of airway clearance, wearing a vest twice
16 daily, consuming 5 to 7 enzymes with every meal and
17 snack, and 7 to 9 additional medications and
18 supplements in both the morning and evening. For
19 the past 12 years, I've had to add both
20 short-acting and long-acting insulin to manage CF
21 related diabetes.

22 I've done the math, and since diagnosis,

1 I've swallowed more than 314,000 enzymes with
2 meals, and I've had my chest clapped on or shaken
3 more than 35,000 times.

4 I've consumed more than 5,000 pounds in
5 supplements and vitamins, and additionally, I
6 exercise 3 hours a day, 3 to 4 days a week to
7 maintain my weight and lung function, and by
8 maintain, I mean to slow the projected decline of
9 lung function.

10 I've tried most new treatments that have
11 come out. Some I've not been able to tolerate. My
12 hearing is partially destroyed. I've had my throat
13 burned for years. I had a bleeding ulcer that
14 required 6 units of blood replacement and months of
15 treating anemia. As my body has changed with age,
16 I've also had to change between very similar
17 medications. Without options, I would have been
18 left to either suffer through the adverse effects
19 or go without the treatment.

20 Diversification of treatments has enabled
21 me to not only survive CF, but to thrive. It has
22 enabled me to backpack across the Australian

1 outback, to ride my bicycle from Canada to Key
2 West, and to sail from Miami to Cape Cod.
3 Refrigeration hasn't always been possible on my
4 travels, so an alternative treatment in powder form
5 that does not require refrigeration would be
6 welcomed.

7 With the progressive nature of cystic
8 fibrosis, gradual decline of lung function is the
9 expectation. Preventing loss of lung function is
10 relevant in adding years on to lifespan trajectory.
11 And any percentage gain in lung function is
12 significant.

13 To illustrate what a small percentage of
14 lung function improvement can feel like, please do
15 me this favor. Please close your eyes for a
16 moment. Imagine breathing through a snorkel with
17 water trapped in the bottom of it. You feel the
18 rattle and gurgle as you try to control your
19 inhalation in fear of choking and coughing on the
20 fluid. You also feel the difficulty of exhaling
21 with the airway being partially blocked.

22 Now imagine the fluid is removed from the

1 snorkel and your breathing is unobstructed. While
2 breathing through a snorkel is still restrictive,
3 it is comparatively a literal breath of fresh air.

4 This difference is what just a 5 percent
5 lung function improvement or loss feels like to me.
6 What may look like modest benefits on paper feels
7 like tremendous benefits in reality. In the
8 context of a disease of typical steady decline in
9 lung function, I ask that you consider the term
10 "modest" as a patient would, and I ask you to also
11 consider that this effective treatment also may
12 provide the alternative to patients unable to
13 tolerate other existing options, who are forced to
14 currently go without tolerable access to treatment.

15 We are coming ever closer to a cure for
16 cystic fibrosis, and we are all striving to see
17 that cure in our lifetime. Please help us to have
18 another powerful tool that will help us with this
19 goal of maintaining our health long enough to see
20 that happen. We need all the help we can get. I
21 thank you for your consideration.

22 DR. AU: Thank you. Will speaker number 2

1 step to the podium and you introduce yourself?
2 Please state your name and any organizations you're
3 representing for the record.

4 MS. WETMORE: Good afternoon. My name is
5 Ronnie Wetmore. I'm a registered nurse with a
6 bachelor of science degree in public health and a
7 master of science in health care policy
8 administration. In full disclosure, Chiesi is
9 reimbursing me for my travel here today.

10 For the last half of my professional
11 nursing career, I specialized in adult cystic
12 fibrosis as coordinator of three adult CF centers,
13 Albany, New York; Jacksonville, Florida; and
14 Stanford in California. I'm also the sister of two
15 now deceased brothers who had cystic fibrosis.

16 My first brother passed away at the age of
17 3, over 60 years ago, and the second brother at the
18 age of 40, 15 years ago. I also have a second
19 cousin who is currently post-bilateral lung
20 transplant at the age of 35 who required a
21 transplant, as his CF had progressed to the
22 end-of-life diagnosis.

1 In addition to my first personal family
2 history and career work, I've made myself available
3 for research trials requiring family members of CF
4 patients, as I myself am a carrier of delta F508.
5 I've been able to participate in several research
6 trials over the course of my career, assisting in
7 recruitment of patients to participate as subjects
8 in studies and with the collection and entry of
9 data as required by specific studies. I was
10 fortunate to be involved in the initial phases of
11 the inhaled mannitol trial several years ago while
12 still in Florida.

13 As we all know, there's no cure for cystic
14 fibrosis. It's a progressive and debilitating
15 disease. Patients with cystic fibrosis face a
16 lifetime of intensive therapies, which includes
17 multiple medications.

18 In addition to those medications, it's
19 extremely important for this patient population to
20 exercise and practice aggressive airway clearance
21 routine, lasting at least 20 to 30 minutes each
22 time and at least twice daily. This airway

1 clearance aids in maintaining optimal FEV1, which
2 measures lung function, which is a strong
3 determinant in the health of the cystic fibrosis
4 patient.

5 My argument for the approval of inhaled
6 mannitol is this; adherence, underlined. According
7 to the WHO, the World Health Organization,
8 non-adherence is a major obstacle to effective
9 delivery of healthcare. WHO estimates that only
10 50 percent of patients with a chronic disease
11 follows recommended treatment.

12 Adherence to a demanding medication and
13 therapy routine for patients with this chronic
14 progressive and debilitating disease is difficult.
15 Multiple medications and therapies require an
16 average of 2 to 3 hours daily, 7 days a week, no
17 vacations, no exception.

18 How many in this room can say that we have
19 a minimum of 2 hours every day just for ourselves
20 for medication and therapy? This doesn't include
21 routine things like breakfast, a shower, going to
22 work, or reading, or emails.

1 I believe, along with scientific data
2 showing improvement in FEV1m with the use of
3 Bronchitol, along with other prescribed therapies,
4 this will have a side effect and benefit of
5 contributing to adherence. Whatever can be done to
6 maintain or slow the progressive inevitable decline
7 of this disease is a benefit and may just
8 contribute to the adherence.

9 No medication can be effective if it's not
10 administered as prescribed. And if a medication or
11 therapy is time consuming or difficult to
12 administer, that medication may be one of the most
13 likely to not be adhered to by 100 percent.

14 In the life of cystic fibrosis where time
15 and multiple medications and therapies are required
16 daily simply to maintain the status quo, or at
17 best, to slow the progression, any medication that
18 can be offered in a simple and easy to administer
19 manner is needed, welcomed, and necessary. Thank
20 you.

21 DR. AU: Thank you very much. Will speaker
22 number 3 step up to the podium introduce yourself?

1 Please state your name and any organization you are
2 representing for the record.

3 MS. KELLY: Hello. My name is Nicholas
4 Kelly. I'm a dietitian. I have my master's in
5 food nutrition. I'm an artist, a patient advocate,
6 and I am a CF fighter. I have not been paid by any
7 entity to be here, however, my travel has been
8 covered.

9 First, take a breath in. Now take another
10 breath. Now imagine taking that breath through a
11 straw. Difficult right? Now imagine if I squeeze
12 the bottom of that straw and you tried to take that
13 same breath. That's what it's like living with
14 cystic fibrosis for so many patients.

15 Cystic fibrosis primarily affects the
16 lungs, pancreas, and stomach, but what they don't
17 tell you when you sign up for this disease is that
18 it has the ability to affect everything else.

19 Now, I could give you a bunch of stats and
20 statistics about CF, but the one that I find most
21 important is that 50 percent of the patient
22 population is over the age of 18 years old. Now

1 this is a far cry from where we've come, and it's a
2 testament to where we can go.

3 This is also a direct byproduct of the
4 strides research physicians and healthcare
5 professionals have made. The research is a vital
6 and pivotal part in this conversation because in
7 many ways, it is the backbone that contributes to
8 help individuals like myself and so many others
9 that look nothing like me excel.

10 As a patient, we rely on hard work and
11 dedication that researchers, and the companies, who
12 provide these medication therapies to create,
13 innovate, and understand our needs. Sometimes
14 these needs are very simple, just like everyone
15 else's. But other times these needs are extremely
16 complex with so many layers.

17 As medication and therapies, they literally
18 treat a litany of the part of the healing process.
19 And for that reason, it is important to understand
20 that variance, variety, and options are a crucial
21 part of that healing process.

22 My doctors once told me the unique thing

1 that she loves about treating CF is that if you
2 treat one CF patient, then you've only treated one
3 CF patient. That sentiment really speaks to the
4 unique nature of this disease, while also speaking
5 to how we can be similar, and why the need for
6 those variances.

7 Now understand, me as a patient, I've had
8 numerous ups and downs with this disease. On
9 average, I spend a third of my year in the
10 hospital, but that has not stopped me from living
11 because I take a large part in taking my health
12 into consideration as my priority by committing.

13 This is an example I've seen by being a
14 part of research studies because my mother once
15 told me what's good for the few is good for the
16 many. That's actually one of the main reasons I'm
17 here today, to speak for the individuals without a
18 voice who could not be here today, that rely on
19 policy makers to consider all areas of this
20 conversation, a conversation that is fueled by
21 science, statistics, information, but most
22 importantly that human element, because that's the

1 factor that that must be considered.

2 Look, I'm not asking you to approve every
3 medicine and therapy that comes across your desk,
4 or minimize the process or due diligence that you
5 go through. But what I am saying is you're in an
6 amazing and a unique position to provide hope, and
7 more importantly, opportunity to patients by
8 offering them medications that will improve their
9 quality of life.

10 Understand, for a CF patient that could be
11 as big as walking down the aisle without oxygen, or
12 it could be as simple as going to the ballpark and
13 catching a Nationals game with their friends. But
14 the thing that is most important, regardless of
15 activity, is the thing to remember is you have a
16 chance to affect people that before today you may
17 have never known existed. But now you can apply
18 faces to fighters who look or sound something like
19 me, nothing like me, or something like you. Thank
20 you.

21 Thank you. Will speaker number 4 step up
22 to the podium and introduce yourself? Please state

1 your name and any organization you're representing
2 for the record.

3 DR. WOJTCZAK: Good afternoon. It's a
4 pleasure to be here to address this committee
5 today. My name is Henry Wojtczak, and I am a board
6 certified pediatric pulmonologist. I've had the
7 privilege

8 over the last 20 years to direct the CF
9 care team that's positioned within the Department
10 of Defense medical healthcare system, and I've had
11 the opportunity to provide care for hundreds of
12 pediatric as well as adult CF patients. I wish to
13 disclose that the sponsor Chiesi is providing
14 funding for my travel here today.

15 I'm here today to ask you to consider
16 approving Bronchitol and to talk about how
17 Bronchitol can have a positive impact on the life
18 of adults with cystic fibrosis.

19 As mentioned by several previous speakers
20 in this forum, back in September of 2014, we
21 crossed an amazing milestone. When I first started
22 practicing CF care, we had about 3,000 CF patients

1 in the United States older than 18. In September
2 2014, I have about 15,000. We're now at about
3 54-55 percent of our total U.S. CF population,
4 enjoying adulthood.

5 You can see how quickly CF is emerging from
6 a pediatric disease to an adult disease. We also
7 believe we're changing CF from a symptom based to a
8 disease-modifying based model, i.e., going from a
9 progressive lung disease to a chronic lung disease.
10 This may be due to the development of a CFTR
11 modulators. However, there will still be a large
12 portion of the population who will require
13 symptom-based treatments such as mucolytics to
14 clear their airways from mucus plugging.

15 Several previous speakers mentioned the
16 treatment burden. The treatment burden in CF is
17 what really drives poor adherence, and poor
18 adherence is what results in poor outcomes. The
19 end result with poor adherence -- a typical daily
20 treatment routine, you've heard described, can be
21 up to 2 and a half hours a day, dedicated to
22 treatment, and oftentimes that's not accomplished

1 successfully. It leads to morbidity such as
2 pulmonary exacerbation, IV antibiotics, and a need
3 for prolonged hospitalization.

4 Among the various treatments we ask our CF
5 population to perform each day, mucolytics and
6 airway clearance requires the greatest amount of
7 time, and it's frequently neglected. The approval
8 of a novel mucolytic agent, which is safe and
9 effective that can thin mucus and hydrate CF
10 airways, especially one that requires less time in
11 is highly portable, should improve airway clearance
12 adherence and ultimately outcomes.

13 We know that with poor adherence we go from
14 proactive care to reactive care and higher resource
15 utilization. Now, it's been 25 years since the FDA
16 approved the only other approved mucolytic in our
17 toolbox, and that would be Pulmozyme in 1994 to
18 address the issue of mucus plugging.

19 About 15 years ago, 7 percent hypertonic
20 saline started being used routinely in a population
21 of CF patients who could tolerate it. However, in
22 my population, 40 to 50 percent of my patients do

1 not tolerate hypertonic saline. Additionally,
2 Pulmozyme and hypertonic saline are very cumbersome
3 to administer. They're both delivered by
4 nebulization, and they're two of the least favorite
5 treatments when I poll my CF patients.

6 The average CF patient, we believe, doing
7 as best as they can with adherence loses 1 to
8 3 percent of their FEV1 every year. Agents
9 that are available for approval that have any
10 positive impact on FEV1, whether it be slowing or
11 reversing this ongoing process, are essential.
12 Drugs such as Bronchitol offer the potential to
13 improve adherence and attenuate loss of lung
14 function.

15 Approval of Bronchitol with a unique
16 mechanism of action would empower both our patients
17 and care teams to individualize airway clearance
18 treatment plans based on each patient's needs and
19 tolerability.

20 With those, there are going to be a subset
21 of patients who are intolerant of Bronchitol,
22 however, the same could be said for other

1 respiratory medications. Providers will identify
2 those patients with tolerability issues through
3 standardized testing and symptom history, and avoid
4 use of the drug in those patients. But by adding
5 Bronchitol to our options to maximize airway
6 clearance, we can have the ability to improve mucus
7 clearance and increase it here.

8 So in summary, CF outlook for both
9 patients, families, and care teams are certainly
10 brightened. According to the 2017 CF Foundation
11 registry, patients born in the 2013-17 birth cohort
12 are expected to live to 47 years of age. When I
13 started my career in CF, it was 20 years of age.
14 And infants born this year with CF, estimates are
15 will live into their early 50s.

16 So certainly we've increased the quantity
17 of CF patients' lives, however many still suffer
18 poor quality of life. The approval of Bronchitol
19 will allow our CF patients to continue their quest
20 for a better and longer life. Thank you for the
21 opportunity to be part of these important
22 proceedings today.

1 Thank you. Will speaker number 5 step up
2 to the podium and introduce yourself? Please state
3 your name in any organization you are representing
4 for the record. Thank you.

5 DR. FOX-RAWLINGS: Thank you for the
6 opportunity to speak today on behalf of the
7 National Center for Health Research. I am
8 Dr. Stephanie Fox-Rawlings. Our center analyzes
9 scientific and medical data to provide objective
10 health information to patients, health providers,
11 professionals, and policymakers. We do not accept
12 funding from drug or medical device companies, so I
13 have no of interests.

14 We all agree that new treatments to improve
15 lung function and quality of life for patients with
16 cystic fibrosis are needed. It's equally important
17 that the new treatments should have a clear benefit
18 and a well-defined risk profile. Mannitol was not
19 approved during its first application due to
20 concerns about safety and efficacy, and even though
21 the new clinical trial addresses some of the issues
22 with your original clinical trials, there are still

1 central questions that haven't been answered about
2 both safety and efficacy.

3 The new clinical trial found that patients
4 taking the 400 milligrams had statistically
5 significant improvement in FEV1 compared to
6 patients taking a subtherapeutic dose. However,
7 this improvement was modest and was similar to the
8 improvements seen in previous trials. It is
9 unclear if this translates into a meaningful
10 outcome for patients.

11 In addition, secondary efficacy endpoints
12 related to exacerbations and respiratory symptoms
13 did not support efficacy. Since there was no
14 improvement in the functional outcomes, it seems
15 that the small changes in FEV1 may not be
16 meaningful for patients' lives. Furthermore, FDA
17 raised concerns that this modest improvement may
18 decline over time.

19 In addition to questionable efficacy, the
20 mannitol may also increase the risk for serious
21 exacerbations particularly in U.S. patients since
22 21 percent of U.S. patients taking mannitol had a

1 serious exacerbation compared to 11 percent of U.S.
2 controls, or either of the treatment arms outside
3 the U.S.

4 At least part of this difference could be
5 due to differences in patients and medical
6 practices between the U.S. and other countries.
7 Unfortunately, that means that including the rates
8 of adverse events from all countries may
9 underestimate the risk of patients in the U.S.

10 We are concerned that if subtherapeutic
11 doses of mannitol used by the controlled group had
12 an increased risk for adverse advents, in the
13 control group, it could also bias the results to
14 make the risks of the drug seemed lower than it
15 really is.

16 In summary, it is uncertain if the benefits
17 outweigh the risks based on the data discuss today,
18 however, there should be sufficient evidence for
19 both safety and efficacy before approval.
20 Post-approval regulatory methods would be
21 insufficient to determine if the benefits outweigh
22 the risks.

1 Perhaps this is a good treatment option for
2 some patients, but if so, this should be determined
3 prior to approval and specified in the indication
4 on the label. Finally, if mannitol is eventually
5 approved, we agree that the label should require a
6 mannitol tolerance test prior to starting
7 treatment. Thank you for your time.

8 DR. AU: Thank you. Will speaker number 6
9 step up to the podium and introduce yourself?
10 Please state your name and any organization you are
11 representing for the record. Thank you.

12 MS. HURLEY: [Inaudible - mic fades] -- a
13 new -- should I restart?

14 My name is Zoe Hurley, and I would like to
15 think Chiesi for reimbursing my travel here today.
16 I have CF, but I'm relatively new to this
17 diagnosis. It wasn't until I started attending
18 Michigan State and contracted pneumonia at the age
19 of 20 that I was first diagnosed. I had a lot to
20 get used to in the year and a half since, and
21 here's a day in my life.

22 I spend an hour in the morning and an hour

1 at night on breathing treatments. I fill my lungs
2 with medications to help me breathe. These
3 treatments include bronchodilators to open my
4 lungs, hypertonic saline to produce mucus,
5 Pulmozyme to break down sticky mucus, and finally
6 an antibiotic that is used to treat and prevent
7 infections.

8 I have to do this each morning and each
9 night so that I can clear out mucus from my lungs
10 and to prevent infections. As part of my
11 treatments, I also wear a vest that shakes me to
12 help get mucus out of my lungs. This takes
13 approximately 15 minutes in the morning and 15
14 minutes again each night after each treatment.

15 After this, I must disassemble and hand
16 wash my nebulizers with soapy water, let them soak
17 for at least 15 minutes, then rinse them again with
18 tap water.

19 After this, I soak them in distilled water
20 for another 10 minutes to make sure all germs are
21 gone, and then place the parts of the nebulizer on
22 a special mat to air dry, and every 3 days, I have

1 to sanitize them in a baby bottle cleaner. I do
2 the same cleaning routine after my night treatment.

3 This adds about an hour daily to my
4 routine, and in order to get these treatments done,
5 I have to wake up an extra hour and a half early
6 every day, and this is all while in college.

7 I also have to take several pills a day,
8 and these include 2 specific multivitamins, and I
9 also take up to 3 enzyme pills with every meal. I
10 have to take these because my body doesn't absorb
11 nutrients naturally. This is possibly the most
12 uncomfortable part of my treatment and the part I
13 struggle with the most because it causes me a great
14 deal of discomfort and bloating.

15 I also take a gene therapy drug called
16 Symdeko, designed to help slow the progression of
17 my disease.

18 If I travel, for instance like coming here,
19 I have to take a portable nebulizer and its
20 attachments with me to do my treatments. I also
21 have to purchase dish soap to clean them, distilled
22 water to soak them, and just something to hold them

1 in, along with the water and distilled water. And
2 I have to clean them while I'm away, just like I do
3 while at home.

4 When I travel or when I'm away from home, I
5 use a device called an Aerobika in place of a vest.
6 This is a small plastic device that I have to
7 forcibly breathe into, and this is meant to
8 simulate the effects of the vest. This takes
9 approximately 15 minutes in the morning and 15
10 minutes again at night. Sometimes I will combine
11 with my nebulizer to be more efficient.

12 I have to be extremely careful in my
13 everyday life to protect my health, as catching a
14 cold can put me in the hospital and further
15 complicate my life. I wear masks in public places,
16 such as in planes when I travel, and sometimes at
17 school, and especially at the doctor. And I'm very
18 careful to keep my hands clean, and I'm always
19 cautious of my surroundings. On a daily basis, I
20 struggle with feeling well, and I don't remember
21 the last time I didn't cough or have stomach pain.

22 For those of us dealing with this disease

1 every day, finding a cure would obviously be ideal,
2 and I do believe that this will happen. But until
3 then, having medications that are less time
4 intensive while keeping our FEV1 numbers stable or
5 better, would be greatly appreciated. Thank you,
6 and thank you to the FDA for providing me this
7 platform to share my story.

8 DR. AU: Great. Thank you very much. Will
9 speaker number 7 step up to the podium and
10 introduce yourself? I believe it's a video, so
11 will you introduce the --

12 MS. HURLEY: Hi. I'm back. Okay. So I'm
13 Zoe, and I'm introducing a video testimony from
14 Emily Grumbine. She's a CF patient, and she is one
15 of only two people in the U.S. who is on Bronchitol
16 through compassionate use. If you could please
17 start the video.

18 (Video played and transcribed.)

19 MS. GRUMBINE: "I'm excited to tell you
20 about my experience with inhaled mannitol. Health
21 stability is not something anyone wants to let go
22 of, but when you live with cystic fibrosis and you

1 find something that gives you health stability,
2 it's better than winning the lottery
3 [indiscernible - audio interference].

4 "My name is Emily, and I'm 38 years old,
5 and I was born with cystic fibrosis. About three
6 and a half years ago, I asked my CF doctor about
7 the possibility of applying for compassionate use
8 of inhaled mannitol. I had been in a clinical
9 trial for the potential treatment and experienced a
10 significant increase in my lung function during the
11 study. I would granted compassionate use of
12 inhaled mannitol.

13 "So for three years now, I've been
14 religiously taking inhaled mannitol twice a day,
15 every day. I've never missed a dose in three
16 years. I believe this treatment has been the
17 reason I've experienced stability in my lung
18 function and overall health. It's been a very
19 effective tool for me. It helps me clear my lungs
20 morning and night. I don't cough as much
21 throughout the day because I'm able to clear more
22 out of my lungs during my treatment time.

1 "Not having to constantly cough throughout
2 the day gives me more energy to invest in other
3 important things like work, volunteering, the lives
4 of my family and friends, and exercise. In the
5 three years that I've been taking inhaled mannitol,
6 I have not experienced any negative side effects,
7 and I've only needed IV antibiotics once a year.

8 "I'm convinced that without inhaled
9 mannitol, I would have more mucus plugs and
10 infections, which would lead to more IV antibiotics
11 and hospitalizations because I wouldn't be able to
12 clear my lungs like I'm able to now.

13 "I realize that inhaled mannitol might not
14 be the right treatment option for all cystic
15 fibrosis patients, but it's been a great option for
16 me for three years now, and I'm convinced that it
17 is an effective treatment option for many more
18 people living with cystic fibrosis, and the cystic
19 fibrosis community desperately needs more effective
20 treatment options. Thank you."

21 DR. AU: Thank you very much. Will
22 speaker number 8 step up to the podium and

1 introduce yourself? Please state your name and any
2 organization you're representing for the record.

3 DR. BOYLE: Great. Thanks. Good afternoon,
4 everybody. My name is Dr. Michael Boyle. I'm the
5 senior vice president of therapeutics development
6 at the Cystic Fibrosis Foundation, as well as an
7 adjunct professor of medicine at Johns Hopkins.

8 Prior to joining the foundation in 2015, I
9 founded the Johns Hopkins adult CF program, served
10 as its director for 15 years. I still see patients
11 at Hopkins, which cares for over 300 adults making
12 it one of the largest CF care programs in the
13 country. I don't have any conflicts of interest to
14 declare.

15 I'm here today, really, on behalf of the CF
16 foundation, and more importantly, on behalf of
17 people with CF and their families, really to talk
18 about my perspective on the impact that inhaled
19 Mannitol or Bronchitol could have on the cystic
20 fibrosis community.

21 I'd really like to focus my comments around
22 two main points. First, Bronchitol has the

1 potential to address an important need for those
2 people with CF who can't take hypertonic saline.
3 As a physician, I would just love to have another
4 option for those patients to help really optimize
5 their health and to maintain their lung function,
6 and give them the best health possible.

7 Second, Bronchitol is a great option for
8 people who struggle with treatment adherence due to
9 the substantial time burden of the treatments.
10 Bronchitol we know is both more convenient. It's
11 easier to use in the current available treatments.
12 And because of this, it has a power to really
13 alleviate some of the barriers that prevent some
14 patients with CF from achieving optimal health
15 outcomes.

16 Now, as we all know, clearance of mucus
17 from the airways is essential for individuals with
18 CF, but unfortunately there've been relatively few
19 advances in this area in the recent years. The
20 main advancement has been introduction of inhaled
21 hypertonic saline, which is actually, if you look
22 at the CF registry, prescribed over 70 percent of

1 patients with CF over the age of 6 because it's
2 been shown to help maintain lung function as
3 measured by FEV1.

4 However, there is a significant problem
5 with hypertonic saline. It's often our patients'
6 least favorite drug. This is due to a combination
7 of tolerance and time issues.

8 We know from clinical trials that
9 hypertonic saline can be effective. In fact, one
10 of the key trials demonstrating this was conducted
11 by Dr. Scott Donaldson, who we heard from earlier.
12 While the good news is that this clinical trial
13 showed how hypertonic saline can be effective, the
14 not so good news is that in real life, we know that
15 the effectiveness of hypertonic saline can be
16 limited by tolerance and adherence issues.

17 Several studies have described the low
18 prescription refill rates and adherence for
19 hypertonic saline, including in this study by Lin
20 and group in 2017, where the self-reported
21 adherence for hypertonic saline among participating
22 patients was only 47 percent.

1 Treatment adherence we know is impacted by
2 the fact that some patients find hypertonic saline
3 irritating and have difficulty tolerating the long
4 treatment durations required to administer a
5 meaningful dose. I have a few patients that have
6 given basically unrepeatable nicknames to their
7 hypertonic saline for this exact reason.

8 We know that treatment adherence, as well,
9 is integral for improving health outcomes in people
10 with CF. The poor adherence has been linked to
11 increased need for IV antibiotics and worsening
12 lung function. For these individuals having an
13 alternative treatment available like Bronchitol
14 would be a key advance and optimize their
15 maintenance regimens, and then ultimately
16 increasing their chances of achieving their best
17 health.

18 Based on the data presented, Bronchitol
19 appears to be safe, and the totality of the data
20 suggest effectiveness as an alternative therapy,
21 particularly for patients who can't tolerate
22 hypertonic saline. The totality of this data

1 supports the efficacy that both clinical studies
2 and use by patients in the real world have
3 demonstrated a good safety profile.

4 We know since its approval in 2001 in
5 Australia, it's been approved in 35 countries.
6 Making an additional therapy like Bronchitol
7 available would help enable patients with CF and
8 their physicians to make the best care decisions
9 based on individual needs.

10 We also know the duration of time taken for
11 treatment can have a substantial impact on
12 patients' adherence. A typical prescription for
13 hypertonic saline is 20 minutes per administration
14 twice a day. The 40 minutes of treatment time
15 comes on top of an already very lengthy and
16 burdensome regimen that we've heard quite a bit
17 about earlier.

18 In contrast to hypertonic saline,
19 Bronchitol takes only about 5 minutes to
20 administer, uses a disposable inhaler that doesn't
21 require all the maintenance and cleaning. Because
22 the burden of care is so high in CF, patients

1 balancing daily therapies with their school, with
2 work, with other life circumstances, often
3 compromise in the amount of time they spend on
4 disease management. For these individuals,
5 reducing treatment time for 40 minutes to
6 10 minutes for Bronchitol can make the difference
7 in finding time to actually maintain their daily
8 regimen.

9 In summary, I ask the members of the
10 advisory committee to consider these two important
11 factors during the committee's review of
12 Bronchitol; one that we know some patients are
13 going to be unable to tolerate hypertonic saline;
14 the other is there are individuals in the community
15 who will greatly benefit from reduced treatment
16 burden.

17 So making Bronchitol available could give
18 back a sense of agency and empowerment to adults
19 with CF who are struggling with available
20 therapies. Thank you very much in advance for your
21 consideration.

22 DR. AU: Thank you. Will speakers number 9

1 step up to the podium and introduce yourselves?
2 Please state your name and any organization you are
3 representing for the record. Thank you.

4 MS. A. ROCK: Good afternoon. My name is
5 Angelica Rock. I'm 18 years old, and I have cystic
6 fibrosis. My travel is being reimbursed by Chiesi
7 so I can be here today.

8 I look just like any other 18 year old and
9 can fix every problem I encounter, except for
10 cystic fibrosis. My CF is omnipresent. I cannot
11 wish it away, cure it with a few pills like a
12 common cold, or pretend it does not exist, but I
13 don't let it define me.

14 When people hear cystic fibrosis, they
15 think death, sickness, and struggles, especially
16 since the median age for living with CF is early
17 40s. But I don't think of it as any handicap or
18 any kind of prison. I think life, opportunities,
19 perseverance, and the freedom to be myself.

20 A disease that can cut the average human
21 life expectancy in half has allowed me to live my
22 life to the fullest for valor, optimism, and

1 curiosity. My day starts with 2 puffs of an
2 inhaler 10 minutes before my therapy. While
3 waiting the 10 minutes, I get dressed for school,
4 and before I know it, I end up rushing downstairs
5 to start my therapy.

6 I lug the 15-pound vest machine over to the
7 couch and go in and grab my nebulizer so I can
8 complete them at the same time. It takes me 20
9 minutes to finish the vest and nebulizers, and I
10 still have to sterilize my equipment. Thirty
11 minutes later, I finally complete my therapy, and
12 it's not even 7:00 a.m.

13 My pulmonologist recommends that I complete
14 my therapy twice a day, but due to time constraints
15 in my schedule, I confess that I only do my therapy
16 once. I know my therapy is required, but the
17 mentality of doing therapy for 2 hours a day is
18 tough. On top of managing the disease, I have to
19 set aside time for therapy while sometimes fitting
20 in school, running practice, work, family meals,
21 and time to sleep.

22 Completing a task so time consuming and

1 mundane for 18 years of my life is not motivating.
2 Next year, I'll be moving 2,600 miles away to the
3 University of California, San Diego. With no
4 family over there, I'll be completely responsible
5 for adhering to my therapy; no one to remind me to
6 complete it after a long day and no one telling me
7 I need to do my therapy when I don't feel like
8 doing it. With Bronchitol approved, I can be able
9 to prioritize my therapy to complete it twice a day
10 because it only takes about 5 minutes.

11 For 18 years, I've been told, no, you can't
12 and you won't. Most people would succumb to these
13 comments and accept failure. I will not. People
14 have told me that my lung function is declining,
15 and I can't fix that because it just happens with
16 age. But I raised my FEV1 by 10 points, and I'm
17 very proud of that. I was told I'd most likely
18 have a lung infection for the rest of my life, but
19 I got rid of it 2 months later.

20 A social worker refused to believe that I
21 could be a fast runner just because I had CF, but I
22 won states, went to nationals, and I am one of the

1 top runners on my team. My neighbor told me I
2 would never get accepted into a college in
3 California, but I was accepted at UC San Diego, one
4 of the top 15 colleges in the country.

5 After all these times I've been told no, I
6 hope you can say yes to Bronchitol. I know I need
7 help prioritizing my therapy to consistently
8 complete it twice a day. With Bronchitol approved,
9 it could give me an option I've been looking
10 forward to talk with my doctor about. I am hoping
11 you can help me by voting to approve Bronchitol.

12 Thank you.

13 MS. M. ROCK: Good afternoon. My name is
14 Mary Beth Rock, and I'm here to share my story as a
15 CF parent. My travel is being reimbursed by Chiesi
16 so I can be here. My time is not being reimbursed,
17 and I have no financial stake in the company.

18 You've heard from my daughter Angelica and
19 what she goes through as someone living with CF.
20 So that's the patient's perspective. Now I want to
21 share with you a parent's perspective.

22 My husband Mike and I learned of Angelica's

1 CF diagnosis at birth when she was born with an
2 obstruction of her small bowel. Hours later, she
3 was operated, so I was not able to see her right
4 after her birth.

5 Fast forward to today. You can see
6 Angelica looks like any other healthy 18-year-old
7 young woman, and despite her having CF, Angelica
8 has been living a very healthy life; that is thanks
9 to the treatments that are available for people
10 with cystic fibrosis. What you don't see are the
11 lungs of a person with CF. They can lose up to 2
12 percent of their lung function every year of their
13 lives.

14 Angelica is one of the few that has been
15 able to maintain her lung function primarily due to
16 her running and of course the treatments that she
17 does every day. Many are not so lucky. As you
18 know, the median age for living with CF is in the
19 mid 40s. Although this has come a long way since
20 Angelica's birth, this badge is unacceptable to me
21 as a parent of my beautiful daughter. If you have
22 children, you would agree.

1 People with CF are at a greater risk of
2 getting lung infections because thick, sticky mucus
3 builds up in their lungs, allowing germs thrive and
4 multiply. Despite significant progress for
5 treating CF, infections remain a serious problem
6 and can lead to worsening lung functions and even
7 death. Bronchitol is a treatment that will help
8 with this.

9 Data shows that when young people 18 and
10 older enter college or the workplace, there tends
11 to be a decline in therapy adherence, and
12 consequently lung function and overall health.
13 Angelica will be attending college in California in
14 September, and my biggest worry is her adherence.
15 I feel confident if Bronchitol was an option, this
16 would cut her therapy down substantially and allow
17 her to do her recommended therapy twice a day.

18 It's great that Bronchitol is inhaled using
19 a small hand-held device that is convenient and
20 portable. This is just what a college student
21 needs. Having good options for treatments that
22 serve a patient's time schedules, living

1 arrangements, and personal style, and reducing the
2 burden of care of this very difficult disease is
3 important to the person who is living with CF and
4 their families.

5 How effective is a treatment if it's too
6 challenging to use consistently? Good options are
7 important, and CF patients need options that will
8 make their therapy shorter, so they will adhere to
9 their therapy. You can make this happen with your
10 vote today. I know that Angelica and the 30,000
11 people living with CF in the United States would
12 love the opportunity of using Bronchitol.

13 Another fun fact of people with CF you may
14 not know is that the guidelines from the CF
15 Foundation advises that if they are attending an
16 indoor function like the one here today, no two
17 people with CF should be in the same room. If they
18 are attending and outside function, a 6-foot
19 distance should be maintained at all times. Can
20 you imagine being told this?

21 This morning, Angelica and I have been in a
22 holding room. She has the chance to be infected by

1 another CF patient here today. The CF Foundation
2 advises we should not attend this hearing, but we
3 are here because it's important to us, and we were
4 taking this risk.

5 Every day, people with CF and their
6 families, healthcare professionals, researchers,
7 donors, and volunteers work together to advance the
8 search for a cure and improve the quality of life
9 for those with cystic fibrosis. If Bronchitol gets
10 approved in the U.S., I feel confident this will
11 increase Angelica's lung function. My hope is that
12 this will increase her lifespan of living past the
13 median age of 40.

14 Do the right thing and vote yes today to
15 approve Bronchitol, this much needed therapy for CF
16 patients. Thank you for letting me speak with you
17 today.

18 DR. AU: Thank you very much. Will speaker
19 number 11 step up to the podium and introduce
20 yourself? I'm sorry, 10. I apologize, 10. Please
21 state your name and any organization you're
22 representing for the record.

1 MS. A. ROCK: Hi. I'm Angelica. I'm
2 introducing the video for Tess Dunn. She's a CF
3 patient who wanted to participate, and opted to do
4 so with a video.

5 (Video played and transcribed.)

6 "MS. DUNN: Hello, members of the FDA
7 Pulmonary Allergy Drugs Advisory Committee. My
8 name is Tess Dunn, and I thank you for this
9 opportunity to speak and share my views on
10 Bronchitol via video and for providing time for the
11 patient voice to be shared on this issue. I'm sure
12 I do not need to give you the scientific breakdown
13 of how mutated CFTR devastates my body and those of
14 my CF peers.

15 "What I do want to emphasize is that there
16 are many, many CF mutations, and a therapy that
17 works for one person with CF may not work for me.
18 We need new therapies and we need options. You are
19 in the position to make this possible.

20 "I am 24 and live in California. I was
21 diagnosed with cystic fibrosis when I was 5 months
22 old. At the time, I weighed less than 10 pounds,

1 had pneumonia, and had already endured numerous
2 invasive and painful tests. Since then, it has
3 been a daily battle to stay healthy in the face of
4 CF, which is a bit of a misnomer, as healthy for me
5 means that I'm spending only 3 hours a day doing my
6 respiratory therapy instead of 5; that I can speak
7 for more than a few minutes without coughing; that
8 I am not in the hospital; and that I do not have a
9 PICC line in my arm.

10 "I'm stating the obvious when I say that
11 cystic fibrosis is a capricious disease and that it
12 has managed to impact nearly every part of my body.
13 Before I talk about the respiratory issues, I will
14 share that I am pancreatic insufficient due to my
15 disease, meaning that I must take 8 capsules of
16 replacement enzymes every time I eat, which adds up
17 to nearly 10,000 pills per year. Even with
18 enzymes, by absorption of nutrients is compromised,
19 and while only 24, I already have been diagnosed
20 with osteopenia.

21 "My pancreas is damaged, and I was
22 diagnosed with cystic fibrosis related diabetes

1 when I was 11 years old, which requires regular
2 blood testing and insulin injection. My sinuses
3 are also impacted, and I have had 5 surgeries to
4 remove recurring polyps. And it is no surprise
5 that my mental health suffers because the impact of
6 my own disease, coupled with the death of friends
7 with CF, causes depression and anxiety.

8 "All this, and I haven't even begun to
9 mention the respiratory challenges, the reason we
10 are here today. I have battled lung infection
11 since my diagnosis. My lungs are filled with
12 thick, sticky mucus and provide a perfect breeding
13 ground for infection. Collectively, I have spent
14 months in the hospital to treat these exacerbations
15 and many more months doing IVs at home.

16 "These infections happen no matter what I
17 do. I am extremely adherent to my medical regimen
18 and spend at least 3 hours a day doing my
19 respiratory therapy. Very little has changed with
20 the drugs that I nebulize and inhale each day.
21 There has been no exciting breakthrough for airway
22 clearance since hypertonic saline became part of

1 the standard protocol years ago.

2 "I know many people with CF who are
3 desperate for new therapies to thin and clear
4 mucus. For many of us, hypertonic saline can be
5 irritating and cause bronchospasms. For many
6 people, they have no alternative drug to use to
7 help clear their lungs.

8 "Bronchitol is exciting for all of us in
9 the CF community. The safety of the drug has been
10 proven, and it has been shown to improve FEV1
11 during the phase 3 trials. I know there are some
12 people who may say that the increase in FEV1 was
13 not very significant. To those people, I say look
14 at the charts. My friends and I are going to have
15 a decline in lung function no matter what. To stop
16 the decline is a win. To actually show improvement
17 is a big victory.

18 "I am one of the lucky ones. Because my
19 mutations, I am able to use the new CFTR modulator
20 drugs. Even with these drugs, I have experienced a
21 significant lung exacerbation. My heart aches from
22 my CF peers who feel like they are out in the cold,

1 still waiting for new drugs that can improve their
2 health and quality of life.

3 "Many people talk about the increases in
4 life expectancy for those with CF. I wanted to
5 clarify that these numbers are based on those who
6 are born in recent years. The sad truth is that
7 last year the median age of death was only 30. I
8 am 24 and acutely aware of my mortality. I am a
9 writer, a musician, a friend, a daughter. I want
10 to live.

11 "I implore you to please advance Bronchitol
12 through the approval process. We are a very
13 diverse community, and there is no
14 one-size-fits-all therapy. Our community is
15 suffering, and we need new options. Please help us
16 make this a possibility. Thank you."

17 DR. AU: Thank you. Will speaker number 11
18 step up to the podium and introduce yourself?
19 Please state your name and any organization you are
20 representing for the record. Thank you.

21 MS. M. ROCK: Good afternoon. I'm
22 introducing a patient video who decided to

1 participate in this important meeting via recorded
2 video. I'm Mary Beth Rock, and the video I'm
3 introducing is from Emily Schaller. Thank you.

4 (Video played and transcribed.)

5 "MS. SCHALLER: Good afternoon. My name is
6 Emily Schaller. I'm a resident of Grosse Pointe
7 Woods, Michigan, and I'd like to thank the FDA for
8 letting me speak today in support of Bronchitol. I
9 was born on February 21, 1982, the third of three
10 children to my awesome parents.

11 "This was 1982 in the '80s before we had
12 any form of newborn screening or anything, and when
13 my mom held me for the first time, she knew
14 something just wasn't quite right, but I appeared
15 to be healthy. I was a 6 pound 10 ounce cute baby,
16 and I was sent home with no diagnosis.

17 "For the first few months of my life, I had
18 chronic ear infections, runny nose, and failure to
19 thrive, so my pediatrician sent me for a sweat test
20 for cystic fibrosis. My parents really didn't know
21 what cystic fibrosis was because we had no family
22 history and nobody really talked about it or knew

1 about it.

2 "The first test came back negative, so my
3 parents were super relieved that their cute baby
4 didn't have CF. But as much months progressed, I
5 began to develop more symptoms and more severe
6 symptoms. So they tested me again at the age of 18
7 months, and this time, the test came back positive
8 for cystic fibrosis. Again, this is 1983 at the
9 time, and there were just not a lot of treatments
10 for my parents. So the prognosis was that I
11 probably wouldn't live long enough to graduate from
12 high school.

13 "Today it's a different story. I'm 37
14 years old and doing great and thriving, but it's
15 because of those medications that we have available
16 today. In the '80s, they told my parents to pound
17 on my chest and my back and my side several times a
18 day to loosen that mucus up in my lungs because the
19 mucus is what holds bacteria and causes lung
20 infection and loss of lung function.

21 "I was started immediately on digestive
22 enzymes, which I still take today and most of my

1 friends with CF also take, and vitamins. Those are
2 the only three options we had in 1983, frankly, to
3 1993 or so. So now I'm 37 years old, and I've
4 lived through three decades with cystic fibrosis.
5 I've been in the dark ages when our treatments were
6 incredibly minimal and barely touched our symptoms,
7 to now the side where we are treating CF at the
8 underlying cause.

9 "I'm fortunate enough to benefit from some
10 of these new medical advancements that treat the
11 underlying cause, which has allowed me to have high
12 lung function, have a new look on life, a new lease
13 on life, buy a house, set up a retirement fund, and
14 work full-time, run marathons, and love my life.

15 "But I still have cystic fibrosis, and my
16 burden of care is still there. Each day I wake up
17 and put on a vest that shakes up the mucus in my
18 lungs. So my parents used to have to pound me, but
19 now I have this vest that can do it for me, so
20 that's a great medical advancement. I have to
21 inhale medication to thin the mucus in my lungs. I
22 have to inhale antibiotics to treat the

1 Pseudomonas aeruginosa in my lungs. I have to take
2 digestive enzymes and take probably 40 or 50 pills
3 a day when I eat right.

4 "So the burden of care is still there, even
5 though the median age of survival has increased,
6 and my quality of life has increased beyond
7 something that I could ever imagine. But we still
8 have this enormous burden of care. These inhaled
9 antibiotics can take 20 minutes or longer.
10 Sterilizing the nebulizers for those can take just
11 as long, and you're doing those a few times a day.

12 "So we need more tools in our toolbox. I'm
13 an advocate for CF with my Rock CF Foundation.
14 When I speak around the country, I hear from
15 parents that the burden of care is one of the
16 hardest things about living with CF. And as
17 somebody who has CF, I agree. We spend hours a day
18 on these treatments to stay alive.

19 "So if there's anything that can help ease
20 that burden with a dry powder such as mannitol,
21 something that's Bronchitol, something that's easy
22 to use, it doesn't take the time to disinfect after

1 but it's effective, we need that. CF patients
2 still have a slow rate of decline, so a drug like
3 Bronchitol would help potentially decrease that
4 decline.

5 "Things are really changing in the world of
6 CF, but we still need drugs everyday to help us
7 stay alive, and live, and run marathons, and work
8 full-time. So I'm here today to advocate for
9 Bronchitol as someone with CF who still uses all
10 the treatments but has lived through three decades
11 of CF, where we've gone from nothing to my second
12 decade, where all these drugs started to come out,
13 to now this third decade where we have medications
14 to treat the underlying cause. We need to all of
15 it."

16 DR. AU: Thank you. The open public
17 hearing portion of this meeting has now concluded
18 and we will no longer take comments from the
19 audience. The committee now will turn to its
20 attention to the task at hand, the careful
21 consideration of the data before the committee, as
22 well as the public comments.

1 Dr. Lim will now provide us with a charge
2 to the committee.

3 **Charge to the Committee - Robert Lim**

4 DR. LIM: Good afternoon. It's me again.
5 I'd like to thank all of you for the very fruitful
6 discussion this morning. As well, I would like to
7 specifically thank those who spoke at the open
8 public hearing and who submitted comment, public
9 comments, with regard to this advisory committee.

10 As we move into the next part of this
11 meeting and prepare for further discussion and
12 voting, I would like to use the next few minutes to
13 provide a brief reminder and overview of the issues
14 of the regulatory framework upon which our
15 decision-making is based and the questions to be
16 discussed and voted on.

17 Now that you've heard all the presentations
18 and have had an opportunity to ask clarifying
19 questions, we ask that you carefully consider
20 whether the efficacy results are robust. In your
21 assessment, we ask that you consider that only one
22 study demonstrated a clear statistically

1 significant improvement in FEV1 in the adult
2 population, and while subgroup analyses of adult
3 patients from studies 301 and 302 also suggested a
4 positive benefit on FEV1, these were post hoc
5 analyses of a trial that failed and one that had
6 statistical issues.

7 Additionally, taking the FEV1 point
8 estimates in the adults at face value, the effect
9 size was also consistently relatively modest and
10 were small. And for clearly clinically meaningful
11 secondary endpoints such as exacerbations, across
12 all studies, the results were not supportive of
13 efficacy with some concerning trends, which were
14 somewhat accentuated in the U.S. population.

15 With regard to safety considerations, there
16 were some numerical imbalances in adverse events as
17 reviewed by Dr. Puthawala. The two major safety
18 concerns were the historical concern for hemoptysis
19 events. The second concern, newly raised in this
20 review cycle, was for the numerical differences
21 noted for exacerbation that were accentuated in the
22 U.S. subpopulation and also consistent with the

1 exacerbation related endpoint trends observed in
2 302 and 303.

3 With that brief review to frame this
4 discussion, the next few slides will provide an
5 overview of the governing regulations. FDA's
6 decision to approve an application depends on the
7 determination that the drug meets the statutory
8 standards for safety and effectiveness,
9 manufacturing controls, and labeling. The focus of
10 today's meeting is on the safety and effectiveness
11 piece of this application.

12 In the questions that follow, you'll see
13 that you'll have the opportunity to vote on the
14 adequacy of the efficacy and safety data
15 separately. For the risk-benefit assessment and
16 approval question, your vote should reflect your
17 assessment of both safety and efficacy together for
18 the proposed indication.

19 The efficacy standard describes the need
20 for substantial evidence from adequate and
21 well-controlled investigation supporting the
22 language in the labeling. The relevant regulation

1 is quoted in this slide, but I won't read that word
2 for word.

3 There are also a number of safety reasons I
4 could underlie a refusal to approve an application,
5 and these are summarized on this slide. These
6 could include (b) (2), a lack of adequate tested
7 document safety; (b) (3) that results show the
8 product is outright unsafe, or that results simply
9 do not show that the product is safe for the
10 proposed use, or finally, (b) (4) that there's
11 insufficient information to determine whether the
12 product is safe for the proposed use.

13 So this brings us to our questions. The
14 first question to put forth to the AC panel members
15 is a discussion question, and is as follows.

16 Question 1. Discuss the efficacy of dry powder
17 mannitol, or DPM, for the proposed indication of
18 the management of cystic fibrosis to improve
19 pulmonary function in patients aged 18 years and
20 older in conjunction with standard of care, and
21 include in your discussion the following topics:
22 effect on FEV1, including effect size and

1 durability; secondary endpoints, particularly
2 exacerbations and CFQ-RRD; and statistical
3 persuasiveness.

4 The second discussion question gets into
5 the safety and is as follows. Discuss the safety
6 data for dry powder mannitol for the proposed use
7 in patients with cystic fibrosis age 18 years and
8 older, particularly including exacerbation and
9 hemoptysis.

10 The remaining three questions are voting.
11 Question 3, the first voting question is, do the
12 data provide substantial evidence of efficacy for
13 dry powder mannitol for the proposed indication of
14 the management of cystic fibrosis to improve
15 pulmonary function in patients 18 years of age and
16 older in conjunction with standard-of-care
17 therapies? If no, what further data are needed?

18 Question 4, also voting, is, are the safety
19 data adequate to support approval of DPM for the
20 proposed indication of the management of cystic
21 fibrosis to improve pulmonary function in patients
22 18 years of age and older in conjunction with

1 standard therapies? If no, what further data are
2 needed?

3 Question 5, and the final question to the
4 AC committee, is where you're asked to bring
5 together both the safety and efficacy data, and the
6 question is as follows.

7 Does the benefit-risk profile support
8 approval of DPM for the proposed indication of the
9 management of cystic fibrosis to improve pulmonary
10 function in patients 18 years of age and older in
11 conjunction with standard therapies? If no, what
12 further data are needed?

13 Thank you. That ends the FDA presentation,
14 and we really look forward to your thoughts and
15 discussion of these questions.

16 **Questions to the Committee and Discussion**

17 DR. AU: Thank you.

18 We will now proceed with questions to the
19 committee and panel discussions. I'd like to
20 remind the public observers that while the meeting
21 is open for public observation, public attendees
22 may not participate except at the specific request

1 of the panel.

2 We will be using an electronic voting
3 system for this meeting. Once we begin the vote,
4 the buttons will start to flash and will continue
5 to flash even after you've entered your vote.

6 Please press the button friendly that
7 corresponds to your vote. If you are unsure of
8 your vote or you wish to change your vote, you may
9 press the corresponding button until the vote is
10 closed.

11 After everyone has completed their vote,
12 the vote will be locked in. The vote will then be
13 displayed on the screen. The DFO will read the
14 vote from the screen into the record. Next, we
15 will go around the room and each individual who
16 voted will state their name and their vote into the
17 record. You can also state the reason why you
18 voted as you did if you want to. We will continue
19 the same until all questions have been answered or
20 discussed.

21 I'd like to take this opportunity right now
22 to -- there were a number of questions that came up

1 previously, and the sponsor has taken the time to
2 address the questions on behalf of the committee.
3 So I wanted to present an opportunity for the
4 sponsor to discuss some of the questions at hand.

5 DR. PARRY-BILLINGS: Thank you. We will
6 try to go as fast as possible in the interest of
7 time.

8 One of the first questions was initiated I
9 think by a question from Dr. Emerson around
10 focusing on us exacerbations. There was a question
11 relating to stratification, and I'd like to ask
12 Dr. Flume to address that particular point. Thank
13 you.

14 DR. FLUME: Thank you. Patrick Flume.
15 Essentially, Dr. Emerson had suggested whether
16 there was stratification in the group based upon
17 that increased risk of SAEs. Without going through
18 all the math, I'd say your math was pretty good.
19 But your question was really directed towards, is
20 there increased risk of those patients who already
21 have a higher risk; is the Bronchitol magnifying
22 that risk? The short answer to that I believe is

1 no, and I wanted to provide some perspective
2 regarding this, so I've merged some data from
3 slides.

4 The first is that second line, which is the
5 SAEs. These are serious adverse events for
6 pulmonary exacerbation in which it was raised that
7 the U.S. group had a higher rate at 21 percent
8 versus the 11 percent.

9 We have to be cautious because this is
10 actually a small number of events which is driving
11 this difference in the SAE rates. So I point to
12 the first line, that any adverse event listed as a
13 pulmonary exacerbation, as you can see
14 between -- the Bronchitol and control groups, are
15 essentially similar.

16 So the issue is about what makes it an SAE,
17 and essentially that's hospitalization. What's the
18 difference between these groups we've talked about,
19 and the past history of events, but also the
20 pseudomonas rate.

21 In patients who had a history of prior
22 hospitalization, they're more likely to get IV

1 antibiotics in the hospital in future settings.
2 That's the way we provide care. And as I mentioned
3 earlier today, the prevalence of pseudomonas, if
4 you have pseudomonas presence, you don't have many
5 drug options. Most of which we have our
6 intravenous only, and our practice is generally to
7 begin to initiate that therapy in the hospital
8 setting. So hospitalization makes those adverse
9 events suddenly become a serious adverse event.

10 I also want to make sure people understand
11 an SAE is not necessarily a severe event, and when
12 we look at those events, the majority of these
13 events were reported to be mild or moderate. So in
14 my view, we have explanations for why we're seeing
15 that imbalance of SAEs for that particular
16 exacerbation, that adverse event, and I don't think
17 it actually is provoked by Bronchitol.

18 DR. PARRY-BILLINGS: As a follow-up to that
19 and to further elaborate on the discussion this
20 morning in relation to the sensitivity analysis, if
21 we could have a look at the forest plot of the
22 ratio as presented this morning with the value at

1 the top, which has been the focus of attention at
2 around 1.5. But below it, you'll see the series of
3 sensitivity analyses conducted, which present a
4 rather consistent and slightly different rate ratio
5 closer to unity.

6 The third point that we'd like to cover, if
7 there's time, there were a series of questions and
8 discussions in relation to hypertonic saline, the
9 number of patients on hypertonic saline before, and
10 the switches and non-switches, et cetera.

11 More than 50 percent of patients coming
12 into the trial -- and this was balanced between the
13 two arms -- used hypertonic saline. If we look at
14 the FEV1 response between users and non-users in
15 the trial, there isn't really a difference.

16 To put the hypertonic saline point into
17 some clinical context for the committee, if I may,
18 I'd like to ask Dr. Schwarz to speak to that. As
19 you heard this morning, he has now seven years of
20 experience of treating patients with these two
21 agents together.

22 Dr. Schwarz, thank you.

1 DR. SCHWARZ: Carsten Schwarz. Thank you.
2 So as mentioned, I think we always look on an
3 individual base to the patients. In our
4 experience, there are patients tolerating
5 Bronchitol but not tolerating hypertonic saline.
6 Then there are patients who are tolerating
7 hypertonic saline and not tolerating Bronchitol.
8 Then there are patients, they are taking both, so
9 they're tolerating Bronchitol and hypertonic
10 saline.

11 We have patients, for example, who inhale
12 both therapies only 2 or 3 days per week, and then
13 they have no expektoration anymore, so that shows
14 that we, I think, need more therapeutics, make
15 available for the patients. I think it's very
16 important, so I think it's saying this. It's logic
17 to have more opportunities, as the patients also
18 said. Thank you.

19 DR. PARRY-BILLINGS: Thank you.

20 DR. AU: Thank you very much.

21 DR. EMERSON: I'd also ask for data on the
22 standard deviations of the change from baseline.

1 Do we have that per chance by day? And this,
2 again, is important for judging the importance of
3 the magnitude of the 0.1 tipping point.

4 DR. AU: Sure. We'll ask that of the
5 sponsor.

6 DR. PARRY-BILLINGS: I apologize. We
7 didn't have time to collect those data for you.

8 DR. MARSHALL: There were a couple of us
9 that had questions this morning that you were
10 deferring to this afternoon.

11 DR. AU: Yes. We'll start getting into
12 them I think now.

13 The questions for discussion are discuss
14 the efficacy of dry powder mannitol for the
15 proposed indication of the management of cystic
16 fibrosis to improve pulmonary function in patients
17 18 years of age and older in conjunction with
18 standard therapies. Include the following topics
19 in your discussion: the effect of FEV1, including
20 effect size and durability; secondary endpoints,
21 particularly exacerbations; the Cystic Fibrosis
22 Questionnaire-Revised respiratory domain score; and

1 statistical persuasiveness.

2 I don't know what the questions were from
3 this morning, so if your question's actually
4 pertaining to this topic, now is the time to raise
5 them.

6 DR. MARSHALL: Gillen Marshall. It's a
7 background question that speaks to this, a very
8 straight-up background question.

9 That's fine.

10 DR. MARSHALL: The question is for
11 Drs. Donaldson and Flume. The FDA appropriately
12 makes a concern about splitting the U.S. and
13 non-U.S. data because of their charge to take care
14 of the U.S. component, and I fully appreciate that.
15 But in your roles as acknowledged international
16 experts in cystic fibrosis, your pedigrees and your
17 credentials speak for themselves.

18 Do either or both of you believe that there
19 are any fundamental differences in pathophysiology,
20 clinical course, or approach to medical management,
21 generally speaking, between the CF community in the
22 United States and other parts of the world?

1 DR. FLUME: Patrick Flume. I thank you for
2 that question. With respect to pathophysiology, I
3 don't think there are any differences between our
4 patients and those around the world. In terms of
5 different approaches to treatment, we have worked
6 very hard with the CF Foundation, the European CF
7 Society, CF Australia, CF Canada, to continue to
8 work together to develop standards of care that
9 would be used across the world. I would say the
10 only differences are really just about how well
11 resourced a country might be.

12 DR. PARRY-BILLINGS: Dr. Donaldson?

13 DR. DONALDSON: Scott Donaldson. Very
14 briefly, I would concur with what's been said
15 already. I do not see differences in populations
16 that would explain the observed differences in
17 exacerbation; rather, in my opinion, seeing the
18 data, the imbalanced randomization within the U.S.
19 population explains what we saw.

20 DR. AU: Dr. Brittain?

21 DR. BRITTAIN: I have a question I guess
22 either for the FDA, or the sponsor, or both. One

1 of the questions I keep thinking is, since the
2 observed treatment effect is pretty small, or at
3 least I don't really understand -- I don't know
4 that it's small because I'm not a clinician in this
5 area, but that's what I keep hearing.

6 Could it be that there are some people who
7 benefit a lot and some people who don't benefit at
8 all? We haven't really seen
9 anything -- distribution of the benefits, I can't
10 really tell if there are clusters or what's
11 happening. But I'm wondering is it possible to
12 identify a subgroup that does benefit more?

13 We heard about a group that had I think a
14 difference in a 5 percent predicted. Is it
15 possible to identify a group that's more likely to
16 observe a substantial treatment effect and also has
17 favorable results on the exacerbation? I know that
18 would be hard to do in a study this size, but I'm
19 just wondering has that been anything that anyone
20 has you considered.

21 DR. LIM: This is a Bob from the FDA. To
22 your point, I think with regard to FEV1, there were

1 probably some subgroups of people that potentially
2 might have a larger effect size with regard to the
3 exacerbation. I don't think we looked at that
4 specifically for every subgroup, but just given the
5 number of events, I don't think we would probably
6 see too much.

7 I also want to remind the committee, you're
8 getting hung up on the U.S. versus non-U.S., and it
9 is a concern because we are a U.S. regulatory body.
10 But even when you look at the entire population,
11 the effect on exacerbation, even in the slide, they
12 showed where they had multiple sensitivity
13 analysis.

14 The point estimates are never on the right
15 side of 1. Those confidence intervals are wide,
16 but typically, and as we told the sponsor before,
17 if we were going to see -- we wanted to see a big
18 effect on FEV1, and we wanted to see secondaries
19 trending. And what we're seeing now is a small
20 effect on FEV1, although as the patients have said
21 during the open public hearing, some of them feel
22 like that really does make a difference. But we're

1 not seeing the needle really move at all on
2 exacerbation.

3 So that is one of the concerns where we're
4 coming back and -- we can slice and dice that stuff
5 up as much as we want to, but it's kind of getting
6 into small numbers if we're trying to identify
7 those groups.

8 DR. AU: Is your point along this point
9 or --

10 DR. EMERSON: [Inaudible - off mic].

11 DR. AU: Okay. Why don't you go ahead, and
12 then I'm going to move on.

13 DR. EMERSON: I have the same problem
14 always. I advise everybody, yes, use means because
15 that's the best thing to look for in an effect in
16 an omnibus sense, and I hate the term "personalized
17 medicine," but I'm going to use it right now.
18 We've always done personalized medicine -- in the
19 sense that we always entertain that a treatment
20 doesn't work for everybody; it's really a mixture,
21 and the idea is how many people can potentially
22 benefit.

1 So I always think about that. And the
2 responder analysis is the best measure, to me, as a
3 general rule, and the continuous responder analysis
4 presented by the FDA was extremely helpful along
5 those regards.

6 I still don't know how to interpret it
7 entirely because of the different patterns we see
8 and because of the problems with the 301 study can
9 be substantially biasing. But it was of interest
10 to me that if we seized on that 0.1 threshold,
11 which the sponsor didn't seize on, the idea is that
12 we saw very similar results across the three
13 studies. Again, one of them might be biasing.

14 That is roughly a 4 percent improvement
15 with roughly an estimated 10 percent additional
16 part of the population that achieved that on
17 treatment rather than on the control. That's a
18 number needed to treat of 10. We do that all the
19 time. That's something that makes it hard, is the
20 fact that, yes, people can do this.

21 The other problem that I have in all of
22 this is there are so many ways we could have done

1 this study. You could have restricted the
2 population, if we knew it in advance, to just those
3 people who absolutely would have gained this
4 benefit, and we would have seen a larger effect
5 across the board, and we might not have these
6 concerns.

7 So there's the difficulty between the
8 clinical estimand, as I stated earlier. I
9 definitely believe we're interested in how does
10 this treatment work in those people who are most
11 prone to take it for a long time, but that's a very
12 difficult clinical trial to do, and we have to deal
13 with the regulatory and the scientific aspects of
14 it must be a per-randomization analysis.

15 But again, to some extent, the responder
16 analysis helps us there. I don't totally agree
17 with the idea of saying everybody who stopped
18 taking therapy obviously didn't respond because the
19 control group had a 25 percent response rate. But
20 when you say it's not going to be differential,
21 well, that sort of comes out in the wash.

22 So just from the efficacy side and just on

1 the FEV1, I think there's a very plausible idea
2 that this treatment is helping a respectable
3 portion of the population, again, on FEV1. But
4 then going to these other points of saying, but why
5 can't we see this on all the secondary outcomes,
6 and why have we turned one of the secondary
7 efficacy outcomes into a safety outcome? And that
8 then detracts.

9 Now, the tipping point analysis, that 0.1
10 is not that big of a delta. I'm forced to just
11 come up with my own back -- calling it a
12 back-of-the-envelope analysis is giving too much
13 credit to it. But just as I can try to guess,
14 based on the estimates, and the confidence
15 intervals, and what the correlation might be,
16 roughly, if you believe that the patients' missing
17 data were randomly selected from -- and my latest
18 calculation says 65 percent; other ones I came up
19 with 85 percent. But the bottom 65 percent or the
20 bottom 85 percent of the distribution of patients,
21 that's not that hard to believe.

22 It's not that hard to believe that patients

1 who -- if they were doing better, they would have
2 stayed on the treatment, but if they weren't doing
3 well, they didn't. Arguing against that is the
4 fact that the patients couldn't tell they were
5 doing better based on the respiratory
6 quality-of-life thing. But that's not much of a
7 reach to say there might be that much bias, in
8 which case the statistical persuasiveness is
9 problematic, to say that that missing data is
10 there.

11 DR. AU: Actually, this is a great
12 conversation, but there are a lot of people who
13 have questions, so I'm going to continue to move on
14 if that's okay.

15 Loretta?

16 DR. QUE: Thank you. Loretta Que. Going
17 back to slide 17, which shows the change from
18 baseline and FEV1 over time for study 303, can the
19 sponsor just clarify, in the beginning of the slide
20 at 0.0, you have 209 on DPM and you have 214 on
21 control.

22 When you look at 614 and 26 weeks, does

1 this include patients that may have dropped out the
2 FEV1 scores in that?

3 I'm trying to look at the durability of the
4 effect over time, and I want to make sure I
5 understand whether or not, when you go from 209 to
6 183 for the DPM, if these values here are including
7 those patients that might have dropped out and
8 their numbers are still being included.

9 DR. PARRY-BILLINGS: May we see the slide
10 just so we are sure that we're addressing exactly
11 the question.

12 DR. AU: I actually think it's in the FDA
13 book. Is that the FDA book?

14 DR. QUE: Yes, FDA book, slide 17, change
15 from baseline in FEV1 over time, study 303.

16 DR. AU: Sorry. We're trying to figure out
17 what section.

18 DR. TORRES: I think it's slide 17.

19 DR. QUE: Yes.

20 DR. PARRY-BILLINGS: While we're waiting,
21 I'll ask my colleague Dr. Muraro to address this
22 just to make sure we are clear for you.

1 DR. MURARO: Annamaria Muraro, Chiesi
2 statistician. Indeed, this analysis is based on
3 the ITT that includes all patients so they are then
4 evaluated during the 26 weeks; for patients who
5 drop from this study due to reason related to
6 treatment meaning lack of efficacy, adverse event,
7 physician decision, and imputation as being done;
8 while for patients who discontinued for other
9 reasons are considered related to treatment like
10 relocation or lost to follow-up, a formal
11 imputation was not done, meaning that we are
12 assuming that those patients had the same behavior
13 than a patient who remained in the study.

14 In all sensitivity analyses, all patients
15 are included. We have sensitivity
16 analysis -- maybe we can even show the
17 slides -- with multiple imputation and several
18 different methods and assumptions that provide very
19 consistent results, as shown in this slide.

20 DR. AU: Did that adequately address your
21 question?

22 DR. QUE: To clarify then, subjects that

1 were enrolled, if they dropped out and they still
2 had data, that data was included in this or the
3 data was imputed in this?

4 DR. MURARO: For any patient who dropped,
5 data were used until evaluable, and then was in the
6 primary analysis imputed with the baseline values.
7 Then are other statistical analyses that use
8 different assumptions and different imputation
9 methods.

10 DR. PARRY-BILLINGS: But I think, if I may,
11 the message from the data analysis is that,
12 independently of the imputation method used, the
13 last graphic shown in the forest plot, the effect
14 size was rather consistent.

15 DR. AU: Dr. Redlich, did you have a
16 question?

17 DR. REDLICH: Well, I had a similar
18 question -- I had a related question. Maybe it
19 would help clarification with slide 16. There were
20 26 people that had early study withdrawal. Were
21 most of those complications that you said you were
22 included or the ones that you imputed? Which group

1 did those 26 fall into?

2 DR. AU: I'm sorry. Can you clarify what
3 you're looking at?

4 DR. REDLICH: Oh, sorry. It was slide 16
5 that just gave the number that were early study
6 withdrawal and the number that were early treatment
7 discontinuation.

8 DR. AU: That's in the FDA book.

9 DR. REDLICH: Yes, FDA book, slide 16, page
10 8 of the handout, of the booklet, page 8 and slide
11 16. Again, this relates to the question of the
12 durability of the effect and trying to understand
13 what impact either study withdrawal or early
14 treatment discontinuation might have had on those
15 results. Maybe the stats people could help me with
16 this.

17 DR. LIM: This is Bob Lim again. I think
18 to understand the missing data and how it was
19 imputed, I think it's probably best to have
20 Dr. Torres respond to that.

21 Doctor, when you were referring to slide 17
22 regarding the effect over time, you were referring

1 to the FDA slide and not the slide that was brought
2 up by the sponsor, correct?

3 DR. REDLICH: Yes.

4 DR. LIM: Were your answers [sic] regarding
5 that slide answered? Were your questions regarding
6 that slide answered? I wasn't clear if they were.

7 DR. REDLICH: I could use further
8 clarification.

9 DR. AU: So why don't we go to this one,
10 and then we'll go over to the next slide as well.
11 Thank you.

12 DR. PUTHAWALA: So this was my slide. This
13 is Khalid Puthawala. I guess there may be some
14 confusion, but the middle two rows add up to a
15 hundred percent. I'm not sure if some of that
16 confusion was there. The bottom row is simply to
17 show treatment discontinuation and how -- it's
18 sitting around 20 percent, and this is study 303,
19 and the early study withdrawal was around 10, 11,
20 12 percent.

21 So that difference is what I was
22 highlighting. This difference did not exist in the

1 older studies where treatment discontinued.

2 DR. REDLICH: So is that there a total of
3 30 percent of people that did not complete the
4 study either because they dropped out or
5 discontinued, or is there some overlap between
6 those last two?

7 DR. LIM: Those are sort of separate
8 groups. You could discontinue from treatment but
9 still continue in study. Like 18 percent of
10 patients discontinued treatment in the DPM arm,
11 whereas only 12 percent withdrew from the study
12 early. So you have 37 patients who discontinued
13 treatment, but 26 still continued through despite
14 being off treatment.

15 Does that make sense?

16 DR. REDLICH: Yes. So I guess at the final
17 time point of that 6 months -- at the 26 weeks, do
18 you have just 30 percent of the original cohort
19 that started or is it actually somewhere less? You
20 have a higher number, I mean, because that would be
21 the most --

22 DR. PUTHAWALA: I mean, 88 percent is --

1 DR. REDLICH: The completed, that completed
2 the study, and you have data that they had their
3 FEV1.

4 DR. LIM: I'm going to defer that question
5 to Dr. Torres.

6 DR. REDLICH: I'm just wondering how much
7 data is missing at that final time point, and how
8 that might impact the longer term efficacy.

9 DR. TORRES: So we have 88 percent
10 89 percent in the arms, respectively, that
11 completed the study. That means that we have data
12 on 88 percent and 89 percent of the patients
13 through week 26.

14 DR. REDLICH: But not all of them took the
15 medication.

16 DR. TORRES: Yes. Some of them withdrew
17 from the treatment. Yes, they discontinued
18 treatment prematurely. We don't have the exact
19 breakdowns as to how many stayed on treatment and
20 how many discontinued early.

21 DR. REDLICH: So I guess simplistically
22 putting it, and I defer also to the statistician,

1 how much confidence do people have in the last time
2 point? Because this is a chronic medication that
3 someone might -- a chronic disease.

4 DR. TORRES: This is Cesar. When we were
5 evaluating this application, we were interested in
6 the treatment policy estimand. So the question we
7 were trying to address is, with respect to the
8 primary endpoint, what is the treatment effect
9 difference of prescribing DPM to them as opposed to
10 prescribing control to them? And in that regard,
11 we have the data -- well, we have most of the data,
12 about 88 to 89 percent.

13 So with regard to that, I think we have
14 fairly good confidence when targeting the treatment
15 policy estimand.

16 DR. REDLICH: Just so I understand this, if
17 you were to do the analysis and look at the effect
18 at the last time point, that would not be
19 statistically significant, but it is when you take
20 into account all of the time points. Is that --

21 DR. TORRES: If the primary endpoint had
22 been changed from baseline at week 26, then we

1 would see -- and we had formerly done a hypothesis
2 test for that, that would have failed to reject the
3 null hypothesis.

4 As I noted in my presentation, the primary
5 endpoint in this study, and in studies 301 and 302,
6 gave over two-thirds weight to change occurring
7 during the first 14 weeks of the 26-week period,
8 and less than one-third weight to the last 12 weeks
9 of the 26-week period.

10 DR. AU: Great.

11 DR. REDLICH: Thank you.

12 DR. AU: I think I saw Dr. Emerson's hand
13 go first.

14 DR. BRITTAIN: Maybe not. I just want to
15 make sure we're clear on what -- well, going back
16 to page 17, slide 17 -- I want to remember, though,
17 those numbers. It was 12 percent and 11 percent in
18 those two groups that had missing data at week 26.

19 So just to be clear, about 90 percent in
20 both groups have their data that are represented
21 there. Some of them might not be on treatment
22 anymore, but that's still the intent-to-treat

1 estimate that we're interested in.

2 So of that roughly 11 percent in each arm,
3 some of them -- and make sure I have it right.

4 Some of them, the ones you had bad outcomes, are
5 basically being imputed roughly by their baseline
6 value. Is that correct? And the ones that didn't
7 have bad outcomes, they moved or whatever, they're
8 being imputed based on the whole population.

9 Am I correct about that? There are a lot
10 of different imputation rules going around here.
11 I'm hoping to make it really concrete to see, of
12 those 12 percent, what's happening there. You have
13 data on most -- most of the people have data here,
14 so most of it is real data.

15 DR. TORRES: This is Cesar. The results on
16 this slide reflect those using the pattern mixture
17 model approach. Per our briefing package, once we
18 did the imputation to have monotone missingness,
19 then we did two separate sets of multiple
20 imputation where patients who withdrew to adverse
21 events, physician decision or lack of efficacy were
22 imputed using a regression model for the baseline

1 FEV1, including covariates, rhDnase use, pooled
2 country, and FEV1 at screening, estimated on data
3 from patients with non-missing baseline FEV1
4 values.

5 So the trajectory was going to go kind of
6 to like a baseline level, while still having some
7 uncertainty in the imputation process.

8 For everyone else, they were imputed using
9 a regression model, including rhDnase use, pooled
10 country, FEV1 at screening, baseline, and at
11 weeks 6, 14, and 26 using data from patients in the
12 same treatment group who completed the study.

13 DR. BRITTAIN: Again, I'm trying to make it
14 simple, although it isn't simple.

15 (Laughter.)

16 DR. BRITTAIN: Of the 11 percent who don't
17 have data, who data are being imputed here at
18 week 26, can you tell us what proportion are in
19 that category that are essentially being imputed by
20 their baseline or an estimate of their baseline,
21 and what -- is it like half-half roughly, in that
22 ballpark?

1 DR. TORRES: I don't have those numbers.

2 DR. BRITTAIN: You don't know. Okay.

3 DR. EMERSON: I did look at what those
4 numbers would break down to, and it is the
5 half-half. Of the patients -- again, we saw that
6 there were patients who stopped therapy, so this is
7 a simplistic view. But if you believed the
8 treatment worked, and then they stopped taking the
9 treatment, in essence, by going to an intent to
10 treat, those patients' measurements that we do have
11 would tend to go back towards the null group, and
12 that's how they're being measured. They're being
13 measured that way.

14 The patients that we don't have data for
15 fell in two camps, and they were roughly equal of
16 those that arbitrarily was decided that if it was
17 loss of efficacy, adverse events, position,
18 decision, you would presume that they would go back
19 down to not having data. And the other ones, you
20 presumed that if they had stayed on, they would
21 have stayed on taking the treatment and having
22 whatever benefit they were having at the time.

1 So that's the one that's biasing, and the
2 other ones, we can say, well, that that's
3 attenuating any effects that there really was. But
4 it is just that the -- I'm always most concerned
5 about pretending that people will continue on their
6 same course when they stop therapy and stop getting
7 their measurements, and that's a relatively small
8 amount in this thing; that that we've imputed them
9 as if they would continue on what could be a good
10 trajectory or could be a bad trajectory. We don't
11 know. They didn't tell us that.

12 DR. BRITTAIN: So it seems like -- one of
13 the bottom lines --

14 DR. AU: I'm going to let you make this
15 point, and then I'm going to move on.

16 DR. BRITTAIN: Okay. One of the bottom
17 lines, again to answer the question from the panel,
18 is that if you're worried that a lot of that data
19 were imputed at week 26, it's a relatively modest
20 proportion, 10 percent.

21 DR. KIM: This is Yongman. I just found
22 from the briefing document that about 60 percent

1 discontinued due to adverse event or low efficacy,
2 so a little more than half.

3 DR. AU: Okay. If I could get the summary
4 of this particular discussion, just because I think
5 it's complicated for the clinicians, the
6 non-statisticians in the room, is there a summary
7 of the discussion that you could make for us, for
8 the non-statisticians in the room, of this kind of
9 conclusion, of this discussion that we've just
10 participated in?

11 What is the effect? What is the magnitude
12 effect that we might anticipate on FEV1?

13 DR. EMERSON: So one answer to that
14 question is we don't know because we don't have
15 enough of the breakdown about what happens. Then,
16 even if we did have the breakdown, we'd just have
17 to go with some subjective feel about what's there.

18 But again, I'm feeling -- and my esteemed
19 colleagues to my right might be way, way smarter
20 than me in this. But there are enough questions
21 about what the pattern of missingness was and what
22 the impact was.

1 I do trust the tipping-point analysis the
2 most, so then that just boils it down to, do you
3 believe that 0.1 difference describes what the
4 average effect would have been in those people?
5 And if you felt that that's implausible, well then,
6 we don't have to worry about it.

7 DR. AU: Great. I'm going to move on if
8 that's okay with the group. Dr. Kelso has been
9 waiting for a long time.

10 DR. TORRES: I know we're trying to move
11 on, but I just wanted to put it out there that the
12 FDA has a backup slide with that table for the
13 two-dimensional tipping point analysis, if you guys
14 would find that helpful, if we have time.

15 DR. BRITTAIN: I would really like to see
16 that.

17 MALE VOICE: We'd really like to
18 [inaudible - off mic].

19 DR. AU: Yes. I'll let you find that
20 document. Let's move on to Dr. Kelso, and then
21 we'll come back and show that slide.

22 Go, Dr. Kelso.

1 DR. KELSO: I have a question and a
2 comment. The question is, I understand the
3 intention to treat and the importance of that. Do
4 we have a per-protocol analysis of that same slide?

5 DR. AU: Are you asking that of the
6 sponsor?

7 DR. KELSO: I'm asking of the sponsor. Do
8 you have a per-protocol analysis of that same
9 change in FEV1 slide that we've all been talking
10 about?

11 DR. PARRY-BILLINGS: We don't have a
12 per-protocol slide to show you. We can show a
13 completer's analysis, but not the per protocol.

14 DR. KELSO: Okay. Then the comment is I
15 absolutely appreciate, particularly from the folks
16 who gave public comment, the seriousness of this
17 disease and the burden of treatment. And it seems
18 like, both from clinicians and patients, people are
19 thinking of this as sort of a substitute for
20 hypertonic saline or a drug that can be used in
21 people who don't tolerate that, but that would
22 somehow do the same thing with much less burden on

1 the patients. And if that were the case, I think
2 that would be wonderful.

3 But we're being asked did this thing
4 increase people's lung function? I mean, we're
5 really on the edge of that. It's a tiny little
6 increase. We're not sure it's durable over time.
7 I'm not convinced that we've stopped somebody's
8 decline in lung function or certainly not that
9 we're improving it, compared to the control group.

10 So you say, well, gee, if that's not so
11 good, what else you got? Well, we'd like to
12 decrease exacerbations. Even if we say, well,
13 there are reasons to explain the possible increase
14 in exacerbations, and that's not real -- we
15 certainly haven't shown any decrease in
16 exacerbations. Well, gee, what else you've got?
17 Well, we'd like people to feel better. The
18 patients were absolutely compelling. We want
19 people's quality of life to be improved, but that
20 wasn't shown either.

21 MALE VOICE: Although maybe it was.

22 DR. KELSO: I think the reason we're all

1 struggling with this is we need -- I agree with the
2 patients that there's a need, but I don't think
3 we've seen that met.

4 DR. AU: I'm going to take control of this,
5 so we'll put you on the list. Dr. Lederer?

6 DR. LEDERER: Thanks. Actually, I want to
7 build on what Dr. Kelso was saying, and maybe
8 direct this at the FDA. The proposed indication is
9 to improve pulmonary function, yet we're also asked
10 to look at the secondary endpoints in which
11 probably they were grossly underpowered with very
12 low event rates for exacerbation in the control arm
13 and relatively high CRQ -- I think it's the CRQ,
14 CFQ -- scores. So there's kind of a ceiling
15 effect.

16 If you're asking us, does this improve
17 FEV1, I think we can all decide for ourselves if
18 the evidence strongly supports that or supports
19 that. And I know you always include the word
20 "substantial" in your voting, which I struggle
21 with.

22 I guess back when you were having the

1 conversations about the design of 303, was the
2 indication to improve pulmonary function part of
3 that discussion or did that come later?

4 DR. LIM: This is Bob Lim. I wasn't here
5 during those discussions or I was not involved in
6 those discussions. But typically, when we're
7 talking about how you design the trial, we're not
8 necessarily having the exact indication in mind,
9 and that's something we often will talk about or
10 negotiate once it comes in.

11 I think that while the indication here may
12 say improvement in pulmonary function -- and this
13 is just my opinion -- sometimes because of the size
14 of the effect, then whether or not that's a real or
15 clinically meaningful endpoint, a clinically
16 meaningful improvement, it almost forces you to
17 look at the secondaries.

18 DR. LEDERER: But that's a matter of
19 opinion, right? I mean, that's why we're here.

20 DR. LIM: Yes, that is why we're here, and
21 that's why

22 we're here to seek you guys' advice because

1 FDA can get

2 mine whenever they want.

3 DR. LEDERER: Okay. And I don't disagree.
4 I think you guys have done a great job. But maybe
5 can I just follow up with one?

6 DR. AU: Sure.

7 DR. LEDERER: If the original charge or
8 recommendations from the FDA were FEV1's primary
9 endpoint, we'd like to see trends in the secondary
10 endpoints, and the sponsor has this data and come
11 back to you and they say, I just want the
12 indication for pulmonary function, from my
13 perspective, I feel like I should be looking at
14 pulmonary function to drive my vote on the efficacy
15 question.

16 Am I misguided in that thinking or is that
17 also a matter of opinion?

18 DR. SEYMOUR: Hi. This is Dr. Seymour. I
19 think it depends, right? If we saw a tremendous
20 FEV1 treatment effect, we may not be here. But we
21 have something that's on the cusp, or the edge I
22 think are the words that you used. So in that

1 case, when we're looking at an effect size that is
2 much lower than some of the other drugs that we've
3 approved, we're going to be looking at some of
4 those secondary endpoints.

5 We look at the totality of data regardless,
6 but in some respect, it depends upon the effect
7 size that program would have shown. If it had had a
8 big treatment effect, we may not be here.

9 DR. LEDERER: Thank you.

10 DR. AU: Thank you. Dr. Blake?

11 DR. BLAKE: Thank you. As a pharmacist,
12 I'm just surprised that FEV1 is the primary
13 endpoint for a drug that's not a bronchodilator.
14 But given that I heard someone say that the rate of
15 decline of pulmonary function is 1 to 3 percent per
16 year, and this drug at least maintained that over
17 the 6-month period, that to me speaks that it does
18 have some clinical efficacy.

19 It would have been nice to have seen some
20 dispersion of the responses with means and standard
21 deviations as been described before.

22 But we do have your responder rate

1 analysis -- and this is on your slides CO-50 -- and
2 I'm interested in knowing how many, the number of
3 patients who actually did have an increase of
4 0.1 liters.

5 Yes, so that's slide. What is the number
6 that's associated with that 34 percent, the number
7 of patients in the trial?

8 DR. PARRY-BILLINGS: That's 34 percent of
9 the patients randomized in study 303.

10 DR. BLAKE: But if you -- okay. Alright.
11 So it also includes those who had greater than 0.75
12 and 0.5, so it's not like a range.

13 DR. PARRY-BILLINGS: The higher cut, the
14 greater or equal to 100, is quite discrete from the
15 lower cuts.

16 DR. BLAKE: Right. So that 34 --

17 DR. PARRY-BILLINGS: Sorry. Let me -- I'm
18 sorry to interject. The 34 percent of patients who
19 had an improvement greater than a hundred mLs would
20 also be included in the lower cuts because they're
21 greater than or equal to.

22 Sorry --

1 DR. BLAKE: No --

2 DR. PARRY-BILLINGS: I apologize. I'm
3 confusing --

4 DR. BLAKE: That would be if we said less
5 than.

6 DR. PARRY-BILLINGS: Yes. I'm sorry.

7 DR. BLAKE: So what's the number for those
8 that had -- I'm really interested in those who do
9 respond well. So how many were in that final
10 column?

11 DR. PARRY-BILLINGS: Thirty-four percent of
12 patients randomized to Bronchitol had an
13 improvement equal to or greater than a hundred mLs.
14 That's the take-home message from the right-hand
15 set of data here, as compared to only 24 in the
16 controls.

17 DR. BLAKE: So I've forgotten how many were
18 randomized to each arm. So what number is that?

19 DR. PARRY-BILLINGS: I'll just check with
20 my colleague, so I give you the precise number.

21 DR. LIM: I'll just interject --

22 DR. GILLEN: It should be the 183, the

1 completed study. It was 34 percent of the 183, the
2 completed study.

3 DR. BLAKE: Thirty-four percent of 183.
4 Okay.

5 DR. GILLEN: 183 completed studies. That's
6 what this has got to be on, correct? That week 26.

7 (Crosstalk.)

8 DR. BRITTAIN: They said non-responders.
9 Patients with that data are non-responders.

10 (Crosstalk.)

11 DR. LIM: Dr. Au?

12 DR. AU: Sorry about that. I kept on
13 pressing it.

14 DR. TORRES: We have the count from our
15 analyses with regard to the responder analyses for
16 these three different thresholds, and we had backup
17 slides prepared, slide number 15 from the slides
18 that we prepared previously.

19 DR. BLAKE: So it's 72 patients.

20 DR. PARRY-BILLINGS: Thank you.

21 DR. BLAKE: Is that what I'm looking at?

22 DR. PARRY-BILLINGS: Yes, and thank you.

1 Thank you very much for clarifying.

2 DR. BLAKE: Thank you.

3 FEMALE VOICE: [Inaudible - off mic].

4 DR. BLAKE: Right.

5 DR. AU: Just let me clarify. This gets
6 back to Dr. Emerson's point earlier of the NNT of
7 10, to get to 100, to get to 100 mL effect.

8 Okay. Dr. Parad, you had a comment
9 earlier. I'm sorry to interrupt you.

10 DR. PARAD: Getting back to Dr. Kelso and
11 Dr. Lederer, I think pulling out that group that
12 had -- it seems like there's a hidden group in
13 there, and it is what it is. We can't go back and
14 do it over again, and figure out who they are. But
15 it seems like a substantial number did have a
16 response, and I think we saw some extra data before
17 from the sponsor that said that the CFQ-R scores
18 were higher in a subgroup of patients that seemed
19 to have response.

20 So again, that may be diluted out by this
21 other two-thirds that maybe aren't having such a
22 big response and have hit the ceiling on their

1 score.

2 I wish there was a way to make the
3 indication more specific, that we had data to say,
4 okay, if your percent predicted FEV1 started at 40
5 percent, and you were a male and whatever, that
6 this drug is going to really get you up there, but
7 we're kind of stuck spinning our wheels with these
8 data. But that doesn't mean that it might not be
9 hidden in these numbers somewhere, that some
10 patients actually are feeling better after getting
11 the drug, and we just can't see it the way the data
12 are being presented to us.

13 DR. AU: Dr. Tracy?

14 DR. TRACY: Dr. Tracy. I'll kind of follow
15 up on that a little bit, along with Dr. Kelso.
16 This is my third CF meeting for the FDA, and one of
17 the questions that continuously comes up is both
18 the relevance of FEV1 as a measure and the clinical
19 significance of whatever number that is. It seems
20 to be fairly universal.

21 So when we looked at the CFTR modifiers, a
22 few years back, we had a very similar conversation,

1 and then obviously it moved forward, and ultimately
2 got approved.

3 I went back and I actually talked to some
4 of my patients about this. I'm not a statistician,
5 thank God.

6 (Laughter.)

7 DR. TRACY: But I really asked this; what
8 does a 2 percent improvement in year FEV1 mean?
9 And I asked this of three, and they all happened to
10 be 30-year-old-ish mothers of at least one or two
11 kids. And they all basically mentioned it's the
12 difference between walking upstairs or not,
13 sometimes, depending on where they are in their
14 disease process.

15 So 50, 60, 2-mL change in your FEV1, for
16 most of us, it wouldn't measure at all, but for
17 these people, this is a big deal. Absolutely, this
18 is not a drug for everybody, but it certainly
19 sounds to me like it's a drug for somebody.
20 Speaking as a clinician, I'd like to have that
21 chance to make that call myself.

22 These cystic fibrosis patients are followed

1 by doctors and staff that do this all the time.
2 That's just what they do. I think trying to slice
3 and dice an FEV1 of 50 mLs doesn't really get to
4 the heart of why we do this.

5 I mean, ultimately, we have to make that
6 decision. Actually, ultimately, the FDA has to
7 make that decision. But I do think we need to
8 remember that we're dealing with -- we study
9 populations, but we really take care of people.
10 And if you can't remember that at the end of the
11 day, then I think we kind of get lost in some of
12 the numbers. So you just do the best you can, and
13 maybe the data's not perfect, but so far it looks
14 not too bad for me, at least for some people.

15 Thank you.

16 DR. AU: Dr. Schell?

17 DR. SCHELL: Thank you, Dr. Tracy. I was
18 just going to say, working with patients and doing
19 daily PFTs on them, they may not have significant
20 number changes, but how they feel from one moment
21 to the next, after they've improved their numbers,
22 is what we have to consider. To me, as you stated,

1 small numbers won't make that much difference, but
2 for them can really make a difference in their day.
3 I just wanted to thank you for bringing it up.

4 DR. AU: Great. I had one other point that
5 I was going to follow up with Dr. Kelso. I agreed
6 with everything you said. I heard that the -- and
7 this is going to express concern, which is that
8 we've heard that hypertonic saline is a burden to
9 patients in that the regimens are burdensome to
10 them.

11 We've heard, I think, that loud and clear.
12 In contrast, though, there's a robust evidence base
13 that shows that hypertonic saline actually reduces
14 exacerbation rates and improves FEV1 at a magnitude
15 that's greater than what's been described.

16 There's no direct head-to-head comparison.
17 There's no comparative effectiveness directly to
18 it, but I do have some concerns that we're going to
19 start substituting therapy with this substance, for
20 another substance that actually may have better
21 efficacy. It may not be better effective, maybe
22 not more effective, but certainly has better

1 efficacy data. So I just wanted to put that out.

2 Are there any other comments about these?

3 Otherwise, I will do my best to summarize this very
4 difficult conversation.

5 (No response.)

6 DR. AU: Great. Yes?

7 DR. BRITTAIN: We were interested, though,
8 in seeing that tipping point; at least I was.

9 Thank you.

10 DR. TORRES: Sure. So we have a backup
11 slide previous to today that we prepared, slide 14;
12 backup slides previous to today.

13 DR. AU: Would the FDA mind walking us
14 through this?

15 DR. TORRES: Sure. This is Cesar. This
16 table displays estimated differences between DPM
17 and control, and the mean change from baseline of
18 FEV over 26 weeks, regardless of adherence, with
19 varying assumptions about data missingness.

20 Because in the majority of the scenarios
21 considered on the table, the lower bound of the 95
22 percent confidence interval is greater than or

1 close to zero, the tipping point sensitivity
2 analysis largely supports the finding of the
3 primary efficacy analysis for this endpoint in
4 study 303.

5 For example, if FEV1 values, after study
6 discontinuation in the control arm, follow the same
7 trend as those of comparable control patients who
8 remained in the study through week 26 -- in other
9 words, if the shift for control was zero
10 milliliters, then in order to tip to a lack of
11 statistical significance, FEV1 values, after study
12 discontinuation in the DPM arm, on average would
13 have had to be 100 milliliters lower than those of
14 comparable DPM patients who remained in the study
15 through week 26.

16 DR. MARSHALL: Gailen Marshall. I simply
17 would point out that the number 100 mLs is the
18 cutpoint that we use in asthma responsiveness,
19 where numbers are clearly established. So this
20 issue of trivial changes, maybe not.

21 DR. AU: I'm sorry. Can you clarify that
22 one more time?

1 DR. MARSHALL: The point that was just made
2 about the 100 mLs necessary for the tipping point
3 to be there, that 100 mLs in FEV1, that becomes
4 very significant because it's the number we use as
5 a cutpoint for responsiveness is asthma, and no one
6 argues that a 100 mLs is trivial.

7 DR. AU: Any other discussion?
8 Dr. Redlich?

9 DR. REDLICH: This is a question for the
10 FDA -- [Off mic].

11 DR. AU: Could you turn on your mic,
12 please?

13 DR. REDLICH: When you had mentioned that
14 other studies have found a 3 to 13 percent
15 improvement in FEV1, in that setting, what effects
16 have you seen in terms of the secondary
17 questionnaire, symptoms, exacerbations, in terms of
18 how those two relate?

19 DR. PUTHAWALA: Generally, they had
20 secondary endpoints support, exacerbations -- and
21 this is really referring to the CFTR modulators.
22 They had trends in the right direction from an

1 exacerbation standpoint, so they had secondary
2 support. They also looked at BMI. They also
3 looked at CFQ-R.

4 What we're asking for today is not too
5 different than what we have asked for before.

6 DR. GILLEN: This is outside of the --

7 DR. AU: Could you introduce yourself for
8 the record?

9 DR. GILLEN: -- oh, sorry; Dan
10 Gillen -- outside of the technical aspects. But
11 one thing that wasn't really discussed a lot, and I
12 realize we focused a lot on 303 and for very good
13 reasons, but 301 and 302 had an open-label
14 extension and I wanted to ask this earlier when you
15 did your presentation.

16 What was that open-label extension open to?
17 Was that open to everyone, and people could
18 self-select back into it? Because as I look at the
19 numbers -- and I'm trying to get a gauge for how
20 enthusiastic people were to stay on this therapy
21 after they had finished the blinded portion of the
22 study.

1 My numbers, anyways, that I've kind of
2 taken from the document are that there were about
3 221 people that were previously treated with
4 Bronchitol; 130 of those elected to stay in and go
5 into the open-label portion of those studies. So
6 that's about 59 percent.

7 Do I have those numbers correct, that about
8 60 percent of patients -- and I realize that's a
9 biased sample. Those are people that made it to 26
10 weeks that were still on therapy that went through,
11 but is that correct? I'm trying to, again, gauge
12 enthusiasm for people using this drug after they've
13 been on it for six months.

14 DR. PARRY-BILLINGS: Yes. The proportion
15 of patients in the Bronchitol arm, the Bronchitol
16 arm, who elected to continue therapy was -- I'm
17 sorry. I don't have the number immediately at
18 hand, but it was between 30 to 40 percent. I think
19 the larger percentage you've calculated may include
20 those patients who are on placebo who elected to
21 continue.

22 DR. GILLEN: I don't think so, no. On

1 placebo, you had 145 and you had 94 that went on to
2 the open label. That's 65 percent of those.

3 DR. PARRY-BILLINGS: I'll ask my colleague,
4 Dr. Alexander, to clarify that point.
5 Nevertheless, if I may just make the general point
6 that cystic fibrosis patients, as I'm sure you'll
7 appreciate from some of the discussions today, are
8 invited, and indeed encouraged perhaps, to take
9 part in many trials with many emerging new
10 therapies.

11 So this type of percentage -- we'll clarify
12 the numbers for the committee -- whether it's 30 to
13 40 or 60, is not untypical for these patients who
14 tend to switch between trials.

15 But, Dr. Alexander, please, we should
16 clarify the specifics. Thank you.

17 DR. ALEXANDER: Thank you. This is Jim
18 Alexander from Chiesi medical affairs. In study
19 301 plus 302, those are the studies that had the
20 open label, there were 70 patients in each of those
21 studies who had been on Bronchitol and completed
22 the study. That's 140; 130 of those, or 93

1 percent, entered the open-label study.

2 In those two studies, there were 102
3 patients who had been on the control group. Of the
4 102, 94, or 92 percent, entered the open-label
5 study, 301, 302.

6 DR. GILLEN: In 301, 302, how many subjects
7 completed 26 weeks in that study that were on
8 control, combined 301 and 302?

9 DR. PARRY-BILLINGS: Dr. Alexander, please?

10 DR. ALEXANDER: Jim Alexander, Chiesi. I
11 have 102, one-hundred-and-two. There were 52
12 patients in one study and 50 in the other.

13 DR. PARRY-BILLINGS: If I may offer another
14 comment, which may help this discussion that the
15 panel's having with regard to longevity and there
16 was reference earlier to FEV1 decline --

17 DR. AU: I'm sorry. Can I interrupt you
18 for a moment, please?

19 DR. PARRY-BILLINGS: Certainly.

20 DR. AU: I'm going to request that the
21 sponsor wait until we make formal requests for more
22 information. Thank you.

1 Dr. Gillen, are you satisfied? You seem to
2 be digging in.

3 (Laughter.)

4 DR. GILLEN: Yes, because the numbers
5 aren't jiving with what is reported in the
6 sponsor's document, and multiple different places
7 about controls that have completed the 301-302.

8 To be honest, those numbers, those
9 percentages that you just quoted at 40 percent are
10 worse than the 60 percent that I'd come up with
11 from your briefing document numbers. What you are
12 saying is about 40 percent of individuals that
13 completed the 26 week endpoint, that were still on
14 treatment at that time, in 301 and 302, and on
15 Bronchitol, chose to go into the open-label study;
16 40 percent.

17 Is that what I heard?

18 DR. PARRY-BILLINGS: I confirm.

19 DR. AU: Great. Any other discussion?

20 (No response.)

21 DR. AU: Great. Let me first try to
22 summarize the discussion. The questions that we

1 were asked to really focus on were what is the
2 effect on FEV1, including the effect size and
3 durability.

4 What I heard was a little bit of competing
5 issues around the size of the total effect size, on
6 an average basis as being quite small, 50 mLs, but
7 there was approximately a number needed to treat of
8 10 that would receive a benefit of 100 mLs. We
9 heard that perhaps those kind of decisions might be
10 best led to clinicians to make decisions about
11 whether or not to use a medication or not.

12 Around secondary endpoints, I think the
13 data is relatively robust that we did not see
14 effects that were in general support of the
15 secondary endpoints around exacerbations and the CF
16 questionnaire, the revised version.

17 In comment to that, though, there were
18 questions about whether or not there could have
19 been ceiling effects applied to that, and whether
20 or not the city population was designed to actually
21 be able to adequately address it, given the overall
22 low rates of events.

1 In terms of persuasiveness, including the
2 long, drawn-out discussion that we had around the
3 missingness of data, at least to my ears, it seems
4 like there is a preponderance of data to support
5 the overall idea of statistical persuasiveness in
6 terms of the FEV1 effect size, but there I think
7 there still remains questions around the issues of
8 how missing data were addressed and the -- well,
9 I'll leave it at that.

10 The last part of the discussion was really
11 around this open-label issue and some ambiguity in
12 differences between data that was being presented
13 in terms of our information book as well as what
14 was presented to us verbally today.

15 Does everyone feel like I gave a reasonable
16 summary? Okay.

17 We're due for a break in 4 minutes. The
18 advice I was just given is that we should probably
19 just go ahead and take a break now, which I think
20 is a good idea.

21 Why don't we go ahead and take a 15-minute
22 break. We'll come back, and we'll do some voting,

1 and then we'll continue on with the next set of
2 questions. Thank you very much. Remember, no
3 discussion, about these very interesting points,
4 outside the committee.

5 (Whereupon, at 3:09 p.m., a recess was
6 taken.)

7 DR. AU: Why don't we go ahead and get
8 started again? Just to follow up at one point,
9 that Dr. Gillen had some questions about open-label
10 follow-up, and the sponsor has that information.

11 Do you mind just presenting that quickly?

12 DR. PARRY-BILLINGS: Dr. Gillen, thank you
13 again for the question. Your question was, for
14 those patients who completed 6 months of treatment
15 in 301 and 302 -- and you emphasized, and we agree
16 this is a selected population because we had the
17 high dropout, et cetera, that's been much
18 discussed.

19 The number of patients that completed 301
20 and 302 on Bronchitol was 141; 1-4-1 got through
21 those two studies, completing treatments for
22 6 months; 130 went on.

1 So the message is that 92 percent of those
2 that made it through those first two studies, 92
3 percent, actually were -- yes. were, I apologize,
4 again, for mixing the numbers, but I was thinking
5 peds. Anyway, the number is 92 percent, so thanks
6 for the question.

7 DR. AU: Great. So it turns out
8 statisticians can count. Right?

9 (Laughter.)

10 DR. AU: Is that the message we should
11 take?

12 With that little bit of humor, I think
13 we're ready to go on to discuss question number 2.
14 I'll read question number 2. Discuss the safety
15 data for DPM for the proposed use in patients with
16 cystic fibrosis, 18 years of age or older,
17 particularly exacerbation and hemoptysis; so
18 discuss the safety data.

19 I'm sorry.

20 DR. MARSHALL: No problem. Gailen
21 Marshall. I would like to ask a question.

22 Maybe, Dr. Lim, if you could comment on

1 this? The message I got from you all in your
2 presentations is related to the safety issue, and
3 as we talked about, the p-values also, was that
4 there was a signal there, and the signal was of
5 concern as a possible safety issue. But yet, you
6 also acknowledge that the numbers were small, so it
7 was one of those gray areas; what do you do?

8 Correct my thinking if it's wrong, but it
9 is my sense that in other situations that I'm aware
10 of other drug developments in the past, the FDA has
11 indicated that there would be things such as
12 postmarketing studies that would address these
13 concerns, or black-box labels, or other things that
14 would acknowledge the concern without clear
15 evidence to confirm what that concern is.

16 Is my thinking completely off on that or is
17 that a correct assessment of potentials that can be
18 done when a concern exists, but the evidence is in
19 the gray area?

20 DR. LIM: So there are multiple ways that a
21 safety concern that's raised during the review
22 cycle can be addressed. It can be resolved, and we

1 believe that there's not really an issue, so it
2 doesn't require anything additional. Depending on
3 the level of concern, there can be warnings and
4 precautions, box warnings and things of that
5 nature.

6 So it really depends. There are a variety
7 of things, but it usually depends on the level of
8 concern with the potential safety issue.

9 DR. AU: Dr. Lederer?

10 DR. LEDERER: Thanks. My take on
11 safety -- and it builds a little bit off of what
12 you're bringing up, Dr. Marshall -- is that
13 statistical and trends testing may not be as
14 important. The burden here is to convince
15 ourselves that we have enough data, there's
16 adequate data and adequate testing, and that there
17 is enough reassurance and confirmation that it's
18 safe regardless of any statistical hypothesis
19 testing. At least that's my take on it, and I
20 think that's the burden of proof. It's not did you
21 show harm; it's are we concerned there may be harm?

22 DR. AU: I don't know which one of you two

1 were first. You can choose.

2 DR. BRITTAIN: I have a question rather
3 than an answer here. I guess I'm a little confused
4 about the exacerbation that's on the efficacy side
5 and then the exacerbation data that you analyze as
6 AEs. Obviously, they're linked, and I'm a little
7 confused about how to think about that.

8 DR. PUTHAWALA: This is Khalid Puthawala.
9 On the safety side, this was investigator
10 determined. This is simply recorded in the
11 database. There's no prerequisites. On the
12 efficacy side, PDPE, protocol-defined pulmonary
13 exacerbations, the patient had to be on IV
14 antibiotics and meet 4 of 12 criteria.

15 I'm not sure if that answers your question.

16 DR. BRITTAIN: At least in study 303, there
17 was some concern about imbalance that you've seen
18 somewhat in 302 on the efficacy version of
19 exacerbation. Now I can't remember if in the
20 safety slide, were we only seeing the pooled
21 data -- is that correct -- where it didn't look
22 terribly different on exacerbation?

1 DR. PUTHAWALA: The difference was about 2
2 percent difference overall. The numbers are very
3 similar, though. So the consistency of the signal
4 is there, or rather, the concern is there. I would
5 say it's corroborating information.

6 DR. BRITTAIN: Finally, the final question,
7 the efficacy version of the exacerbation, is that a
8 small subset of the AE or not? How do they relate?

9 DR. LIM: I think there are probably
10 patients who had investigator reported CF
11 exacerbations who probably had events that would
12 fall into the PDPE definition. We haven't had a
13 breakdown of what that overlap was. I think
14 exacerbation is one of those endpoints where we can
15 view it, and it's often viewed, as an efficacy
16 endpoint. But if we see something concerning going
17 in the other direction, it can kind of become a
18 safety concern.

19 So it's a little bit of both -- it can be
20 both safety and efficacy driven. However, when
21 we're thinking about it to demonstrate efficacy, we
22 usually use the protocol-defined exacerbation

1 rather than the investigative reported.

2 DR. PUTHAWALA: Sorry. Let me just add one
3 thing. If you look at table 24 on the briefing
4 document, that's the essay that I also showed on my
5 slides, the numbers for the DPM arm of 55 patients
6 and then the control having 39, they don't match
7 up, obviously, entirely, and they're not going to
8 because we're talking about two different methods
9 in which exacerbation was determined. But there
10 are some similarities there between the increase.
11 You wouldn't come up with a rate ratio based on
12 that, but you can look at it and see that it's
13 generally consistent.

14 DR. AU: Dr. Emerson?

15 DR. EMERSON: I'd just like to add a
16 comment to Dr. Marshall's and Dr. Lederer's. Not
17 only on safety do we not act on we've proven harm.
18 It's just that this is a concern. But in clinical
19 practice, and for the labeling, and as I look at it
20 from the regulatory standpoint, if we can label
21 correctly to say this is something to watch out
22 for, that's the most we can ever do, because every

1 clinician has to -- we don't necessarily have in
2 this clinical trial the entire patient population
3 that the people would be considering on.

4 So this is something that I don't really
5 know how to judge. And to Dr. Au's comment early,
6 one of the major ways a treatment can be harmful or
7 non-effective is if you shift people away from
8 effective therapies into something that turns out
9 to be ineffective. It's sort of like if you
10 promise me that -- I have no knowledge, but if
11 hypertonic saline truly is effective in some
12 people, and if you promise me that those people
13 will keep using that, and the only people we'll go
14 to is the people that couldn't do that, well then,
15 I will react differently than if I think there can
16 be some swap.

17 But this is where I have trouble with this
18 exacerbation and hemoptysis. I'm going to say I'm
19 underwhelmed by the hemoptysis in the adult
20 population. I look at it as this is a confirmatory
21 study that's not really too much of a concern.

22 I consider it quite plausible that there

1 can be potentiation of an underlying exacerbation
2 risk from this treatment, and it might be a
3 misdiagnosis of the exacerbation. It might be
4 something about the treatment in some people that's
5 being called an exacerbation, but is really, if
6 we'll say, getting used to the treatment.

7 I have no idea, but if you put something
8 solid in my lungs, I'm going to cough, and maybe
9 not cough it all out, and I can imagine that. But
10 I think it is something of concern, and I'm going
11 to do the very bad thing here, the very, very bad
12 thing on subgroups of subgroups, and
13 stratifications and unplanned analysis. I'm going
14 to tell you what a p-value is if it were a
15 legitimate p-value.

16 It isn't, but if we had done a clinical
17 trial in those people who had a prior history of an
18 exacerbation within the past 12 months, and we
19 randomized them roughly in the 4 to 5, it would
20 have ended up with what was the imbalance in this
21 study, and we looked at those results where there
22 were of the 50 people that we put on

1 Bronchitol -- and this, by the way, is also just
2 the U.S. population.

3 If we looked at the 21 people out of the 50
4 versus the 6 out of 35 -- and I computed a p-value,
5 so Drs. Brittain and Gillen are taking away my
6 union card -- it's 0.078. The trouble is the
7 multiple comparison here. We're looking at that,
8 and I'm doing this p-value precisely because I
9 looked at the data, and it's surprising, but the
10 idea of calling it a randomized comparison apart
11 from the multiple comparison is correct.

12 So that's what I'm concerned at, and I
13 don't know whether there's a possibility of
14 misdiagnosis. I don't know how well this could be
15 handled by saying watch out for this and getting it
16 in the labeling, but I think something needs to be
17 thought about.

18 DR. AU: Great. Let me just get a point
19 clear.

20 Dr. Lederer to respond, and then Dr. Kelso.

21 DR. LEDERER: So that's very helpful. Can
22 I ask maybe either the sponsor or the FDA, was

1 there a test for interaction between U.S. and times
2 treatment done for that subgroup analysis? Because
3 that p-value I think would be really helpful for me
4 rather than the p-value for the subgroup.

5 DR. LIM: I don't think we did that.

6 DR. LEDERER: Okay.

7 DR. TORRES: I think, in general, such a
8 test would not have been very informative since the
9 power to detect such a difference would be very
10 low.

11 DR. LEDERER: And I agree it would be low,
12 but I really would still like to see it.

13 DR. EMERSON: You're right that looking for
14 that p-value in the presence of me going after so
15 many multiple comparisons is correcting, but rather
16 than testing for interactions, if you have pre-
17 identified the groups, it's better to just do the
18 subgroup analysis and not demand significance on
19 the interaction.

20 DR. AU: Great. Dr. Kelso?

21 DR. KELSO: This thought that if there's a
22 potential bad thing here and we're going to in some

1 way describe to clinicians that it's something they
2 need to watch out for, I think what we're talking
3 about here is not easily addressed by that because
4 if what you're saying is that with some drug,
5 there's this very rare but unusual thing that might
6 happen, so just keep it in mind, and when it
7 happens, somebody can notice it; what we're talking
8 about here is something that happens to these
9 patients all the time anyway.

10 So we're telling them they might have more
11 exacerbations. Well, they have exacerbations
12 anyway, and if they only have one or two a year or
13 whatever, it's going to be hard to describe that in
14 a way to say watch out for exacerbations when it's
15 something that happens to the patients anyway.

16 We kind of got a little better handle on
17 the FEV1 thing when we finally clung on to the
18 100-mL increase and the number needed to treat of
19 10 to get that. That is a little reassuring in
20 some way. Is there a same way to apply some other
21 crude logic like number needed to harm to this bad
22 thing that we're talking about, to get a little

1 better handle on that, or is that not doable or not
2 appropriate statistically?

3 DR. EMERSON: Well, the number needed to
4 harm would be the natural thing, except for into
5 such of a subgroup of a subgroup that I don't know
6 how many -- to talk about what will be the
7 prevalence of that among the population.

8 To me, and who knows, maybe this is this
9 thing that, yes, it's only the people who are at
10 risk, and if we were to treat a bunch of people and
11 prevented their tendency to have exacerbations,
12 they'd never have the problem. I don't know. I
13 just don't know how to come up with a number needed
14 to harm that factors in that there may be differing
15 numbers of people that are being treated.

16 DR. GILLEN: I think there's that. And to
17 go with your point earlier about the multiple
18 comparisons, it's a biased estimate likely that you
19 have anyway. After you've gone digging through all
20 of the subgroups of subgroups, you've found this
21 high rate.

22 DR. AU: Dr. Parad?

1 DR. PARAD: Could we just be reminded of
2 what the phase 4 rules are for -- if the FDA
3 approves this, is it automatic that there's a
4 postmarketing process or does it have to be -- does
5 the opinion

6 of the committee direct the FDA to say,
7 okay, now you've got to collect some data on SAEs,
8 AEs, pulmonary function tests?

9 DR. AU: Would FDA like to comment?

10 DR. SEYMOUR: Sure. This is Dr. Seymour.
11 We have options for phase 4 postmarketing type
12 data. It's something we can request. It's
13 something we can require, too. We can require it
14 if we think there's a safety issue that's serious
15 that needs to be evaluated that's a postmarketing
16 requirement.

17 In these meetings, if there is concern
18 about a safety issue, or the community thinks
19 there's a need for a postmarketing study, it is
20 something that can be brought up in the discussion,
21 and we'll take that back and deliberate about that.
22 But there are options to get postmarketing data.

1 DR. PARAD: It just seems to me with 8,000
2 patients having been treated outside of the United
3 States, that there were opportunities already
4 missed to try to answer some of these questions,
5 and it might make sense to think about this going
6 forward.

7 DR. AU: Dr. Brittain?

8 DR. BRITTAIN: If you're talking about the
9 exacerbation, I think it would be awfully hard to
10 evaluate that outside of a randomized study. I
11 think it would be pretty tough to do that in a
12 postmarketing setting. Maybe I'm wrong.

13 DR. AU: My apologies. Any other
14 discussions from the group?

15 (No response.)

16 DR. AU: Okay. No other discussion about
17 safety? Let me see if I can summarize what we
18 talked about. I think it might be a little easier
19 discussion.

20 In terms of specifically around
21 exacerbations and hemoptysis, there is some
22 potential safety concern in the U.S. population

1 that there was an increased risk of exacerbation in
2 the AE reporting, and that the AE reporting and the
3 primary efficacy endpoints of exacerbation were
4 measured slightly differently. But nonetheless,
5 there is general agreement that on the overall
6 population, there was a small signal, or if not
7 balanced, around exacerbations. The hemoptysis
8 question seems like it was resolved with this.

9 In terms of other discussion points, there
10 was some concern that had been raised previously
11 about whether or not a drug that is easier to use
12 but is less efficacious would then be substituted
13 for a medication that was more efficacious.

14 There were also discussions around
15 postmarketing surveillance and whether or not that
16 was possible. There was no specific
17 recommendations to FDA about if this drug were
18 approved, what postmarketing surveillance would be
19 required. One point that was made was that any
20 comparison of exacerbations would be challenging to
21 measure over time.

22 Were there any other points that the panel

1 felt like I missed or would like to further
2 clarify? Scott?

3 DR. EMERSON: This is just a procedural
4 thing. I'll note that it's not uncommon in
5 clinical trials where you have really an efficacy
6 endpoint that's been protocolized, and it could be
7 listed as an AE, but it's not really supposed to
8 be. This is like progression in cancer.

9 It's not uncommon that there are bizarre
10 patterns in the way people do that, and that adds a
11 little bit more noise to this AE in the presence of
12 a protocolized collection of the data, that just
13 people reporting it will be very bad. I've many
14 times seen them go in opposite directions.

15 DR. AU: Right. Okay. That's very good.
16 So there are issues around potential measurements
17 of AE events that were less well protocolized than
18 the primary efficacy data of exacerbations.

19 Any other discussions?

20 (No response.)

21 DR. AU: We're moving to the voting phase.
22 We will have three votes. Question 3 is a vote,

1 and I will read it out loud. Do the data provide
2 substantial evidence of efficacy for DPM for the
3 proposed indication of management of cystic
4 fibrosis to improve pulmonary function in patients
5 18 years of age and older in conjunction with
6 standard therapies? If no, what further data are
7 needed?

8 I think we're ready to vote on question 3.
9 Are we ready to vote? There we go. Okay, now it's
10 flashing. So everyone vote their conscience.

11 (Voting.)

12 LCDR CHEE: For question number 3, we have
13 10 yeses; 6 nos; and zero abstain.

14 DR. AU: Why don't we start on this side of
15 the room?

16 DR. GILLEN: Sure. I voted no for a couple
17 of reasons. One is obviously the small effect that
18 we're observing on FEV. I was struck by the 1.2
19 percent-predicted difference and the fact that
20 recently approved drugs, as noted by the FDA, are
21 in the 3 to 13 range.

22 Also, the lack of sustained effect truly

1 bothered me over the 26-point time range, and if
2 you looked at truly the zero to 26, it's a question
3 of how much that's really going to move the needle,
4 given that there is no effect, at least that's been
5 observed on exacerbations or other key more
6 clinical endpoints.

7 So to me, it comes down to the clinical
8 relevance. I understand that statistically we have
9 significance in testing the FEV level, but it's not
10 clear to me that that's the clinically relevant
11 difference that we would be looking for here.

12 DR. BRITTAIN: Erica Brittain. I voted no.
13 I do think there's a statistically significant
14 difference on the FEV1, but the effect size, my
15 colleagues tell me is modest, and we see some
16 indication that it wanes over time.

17 To be substantial evidence, it sounded like
18 with a modest treatment effects, you needed some
19 support from those secondary endpoints. We didn't
20 see that. In fact, the FDA study 30-3 exacerbation
21 analysis was particularly concerning. So it just
22 did not seem to pass the threshold that the FDA

1 established, which it sounded like they established
2 at the time the study was designed.

3 I feel bad voting this way after hearing
4 the public open session because I feel great
5 sympathy for the hardships of these patients.
6 Perhaps the way out of this is finding -- if there
7 is some way to identify the subgroup that benefits
8 most from this therapy, that might be a way
9 forward.

10 Normally, we wouldn't say, oh, just look at
11 a subgroup, and that's okay, but here's a scenario
12 where we have a significant result on the primary
13 endpoint, so that feels better than the normal case
14 when we don't have a significant result overall and
15 we'd find a subgroup. That's not okay. This is
16 sort of different from that.

17 DR. EMERSON: This is Scott Emerson. I
18 voted no. It was a hard decision because of the
19 way things were phrased. I do think there's a very
20 good chance that there's an effect on FEV. I'm not
21 convinced that it's of the magnitude that's
22 commensurate with what we've done with other

1 treatments.

2 I am more inclined to go with responder
3 analyses, but I'm worried about something that's
4 quite chronic treatment, but that we started with a
5 large population of people who would never go on to
6 this chronic treatment as evidenced by the fact
7 that they stopped the treatment. I don't know how
8 much of the waning of the effect is due to the drop
9 out of that, but there are other trial designs that
10 might be able to sort this out better.

11 In that inclusion of lots of different
12 populations that maybe aren't getting the benefit,
13 that that's exactly the case where you could say,
14 well, the secondary endpoints won't shine through,
15 but let's design a study where they will shine
16 through, whether it's by a randomized withdrawal or
17 something like that to enrich the population with
18 the people who are really going to benefit over a
19 long period of time.

20 As I say, I came close to voting yes, and I
21 would have said all of these same comments that I
22 was worried about it. But I really came down on

1 the side of the lack of the secondary endpoints
2 that would support it, and that's just increasing
3 the chance that this is a false positive. That's
4 the problem that we have to face.

5 DR. PARAD: Richard Parad. I voted yes. I
6 think the FDA set the primary outcome, and
7 statistically that was passed. So the effect size,
8 in my own mind, is small, but I believe if a third
9 of the patients really were in the range of
10 100 mLs, then that's a lot of patients who will
11 benefit. I think we have to put some faith in the
12 CF clinicians that they will figure out how to
13 appropriately use this.

14 Having said that, it would be really nice
15 to have more information and drill down on the best
16 patients to give this to, and I certainly wouldn't
17 want to interfere with another drug that works
18 better. So if there's some way that the FDA can
19 approve this but look into things more, maybe
20 through phase 4 data and warn the clinician
21 appropriately, then I think, yes, it's the right
22 decision.

1 MS. MOORE: This is Erin Moore. I voted
2 yes. I think 1.2 percent increase in lung function
3 is showing us that we're actually decreasing the
4 rate of decline, which can mean years to some of
5 these patients. Like Dr. Tracy had said earlier,
6 it's the difference between being able to go up a
7 flight of steps or go to your child's soccer game.

8 I did consider the challenge of folks
9 wanting to substitute this type of treatment for
10 something like hypertonic saline. In the
11 personalized medicine space, a patient who is only
12 doing her medication treatments one time a day
13 because of the burden of it may actually increase
14 her adherence if she's given this as an alternative
15 and can do both.

16 I think we're making an assumption about it
17 being a replacement for hypertonic, and a concern
18 that I did have is that it adds to the burden. As
19 a parent of somebody with cystic fibrosis, thinking
20 about adding something else to our plate is
21 daunting, but if I can do hypertonic once a day and
22 this once a day, that already saves me 25 minutes.

1 So I think I think that there is enough data to
2 show efficacy for this.

3 DR. SCHELL: Hi. Karen Schell. I voted
4 yes. As a clinician and seeing the difference in
5 patients in their pulmonary function, how they feel
6 afterwards and an improvement in the study showed
7 that FEV is improved. I had to vote yes because
8 those patients are the ones that I care for and how
9 they feel is part of it.

10 DR. WEBER: Richard Weber. I voted yes,
11 although I had concerns about the other direction
12 of the secondary endpoints. But it may well be
13 that there is a subgroup that we haven't cleanly
14 identified, which may be more responsive to this.
15 The question is also how much of an effect is
16 really clinically helpful. I'm used to dealing
17 with asthma, where I expect that you need -- I'd
18 like to see a much bigger effect, but here we're
19 dealing with a different disease that may not have
20 that much variability. So therefore, small amount
21 of improvement may be a good thing.

22 The other issue is patient adherence. I

1 think we heard from some of the tapes that the
2 hypertonic saline is probably fairly obnoxious, and
3 probably many patients avoid taking it as often as
4 they should because of that, whereas this appears
5 to be very easy to use. Ease of use I think has a
6 big impact on patient adherence, so therefore,
7 again, that's why I voted yes.

8 DR. REDLICH: Carrie Redlich. I voted no,
9 also with some angst for the reasons that have
10 already been stated: the duration of effect, the
11 magnitude, concern about diversion from a
12 potentially more efficacious treatment, and also
13 that this was a larger study but showed a smaller
14 effect than the prior studies.

15 DR. QUE: Loretta Que. I voted yes for
16 some of the reasons stated earlier,
17 improved -- there is an effect size, albeit small.
18 But for reasons stated earlier, adherence is a huge
19 factor for these patients, and if we can at least
20 get them to use a medication, I think they're going
21 to see benefit.

22 DR. KELSO: John Kelso, and I voted yes. I

1 also struggled. It sounds like everybody's right
2 on the line, and I'm right there as well. I
3 focused in, I guess, on was there a difference in
4 FEV1 because that's kind of the primary question,
5 and, yes, there is a difference in FEV1.

6 I don't know where that fits in the big
7 scheme of taking care of patients with CF. The
8 secondary endpoints were not there. But just in
9 answering and focusing in on that one question,
10 there is a difference, and for some subset of
11 patients, it's a larger difference. I'm really
12 counting on the CF clinicians who do this for a
13 living to figure out where do you use this in their
14 armamentarium, with good reason, I think; that
15 people who do this will in fact find a place, the
16 patients for whom this is appropriate.

17 DR. AU: This is David Au. I voted no for
18 a number of the reasons that are similar that have
19 been previously stated. In addition to those, the
20 effect size was, in my view, very small and likely
21 not clinically meaningful for a number of patients,
22 which was then also supported by the preponderance

1 of data across the other outcome measures they had.

2 DR. AU: If I were to ask to see additional
3 studies done, I'd like to see this done on patients
4 who were either non-adherent to hypertonic saline
5 or inability to take hypertonic saline. Then also,
6 I'd be interested in seeing it in patients with
7 more severe FEV1 because think a 50 mL difference
8 in someone who's percent predicted is around 60
9 percent is going to have small, if any, clinical
10 effect, and I think that might be what we're seeing
11 here.

12 Yeah.

13 DR. LEDERER: Hi. David Lederer. I voted
14 yes. Actually, Dr. Kelso, you were speaking the
15 words I was thinking, so I won't repeat what you
16 said, and I agree with that. If I were able to
17 suggest if there were a future study, I agree
18 people with more advanced disease, people with more
19 symptoms, people at higher risk for exacerbation so
20 that we could effects on these other endpoints
21 would be helpful.

22 DR. MARSHALL: Gailen Marshall, and I voted

1 yes. I wasn't anywhere near the line. It was
2 clearly yes for me. The yes for me relates to the
3 idea of the potential use for this. The people
4 taking care of these patients are not generalists;
5 they're very sub-sub specialists, very focused,
6 very well defined in what they do.

7 I'm incredibly impressed with the
8 sophistication of the cystic fibrosis patient
9 community, including their support groups.

10 The word's going to get out there very
11 quickly, here's this new opportunity for them to
12 treat, and if there is a significant adverse effect
13 that's there, it will be picked up probably in the
14 community about as quick as it will be by the
15 clinicians themselves. It will get to the meetings
16 that they speak at. It will be in refereed,
17 peer-reviewed publications, and the drug will be
18 altered in terms of its utility, accordingly.

19 I won't belabor it, but I think all of us
20 that have practiced medicine for any period of time
21 know of drugs that were approved, they got into
22 practice, and they really didn't have a use, and

1 they died off.

2 In terms of the next question that we'll
3 ask about the safety benefit ratio, but in terms of
4 the absolute parameter that was met, the primary
5 endpoint that was met, it's a clear yes for me in
6 terms of its potential to be effective.

7 DR. BLAKE: Kathryn Blake. I voted yes.
8 Again, I come down to that this is not a
9 bronchodilator, so I was impressed that the FEV1
10 was maintained and slightly higher over the 26-week
11 period. Also, when I looked at about 22 to 24
12 percent of the population enrolled in 303 had an
13 FEV one less than 50 percent, and that was the
14 group that had the greatest response rate with an
15 estimate of 0.13 liters.

16 So there's clearly, to me, a population
17 that would respond, and I think that these are the
18 sickest patients and they should be given the
19 opportunity t have the drug.

20 DR. TRACY: Jim Tracy. I also voted yes.
21 I do believe quite strongly that the primary
22 endpoint was met. Obviously, it would have been

1 nice to see better results on the secondary
2 endpoints. I've kind of reflected on the change in
3 therapy and the issues with hypertonic saline, but
4 I kind of reconciled that under the general heading
5 of shared decision-making at the clinical level.

6 I'm like Dr. Marshall and Kelso. The
7 amount of clinical oversight for this group of
8 individuals in this disease state is just amazing.
9 I have great confidence that this will help a
10 significant number of individuals. Thank you.

11 DR. CATALETTO: I voted no, and the reason
12 I did so I had to do with the way the question was
13 formatted. Substantial evidence, statistically
14 significant, borderline yes, but also saying in
15 conjunction with standard therapies.

16 As I listened to the experts that are here,
17 there were a number of comments that some patients
18 may do better with one choice of hypertonic saline
19 or with the Bronchitol, and sometimes with both. I
20 hear patients and people on the committee who were
21 saying, well, I could cut time back if I gave one
22 of these in the morning and one of those at night.

1 There's a lot of flexibility in this, and I
2 understand that that's what we do in practice, and
3 that may be the way this goes, in which case maybe
4 we should be talking about a noninferiority trial,
5 or we should be talking about an open label with
6 multiple arms. But I don't think the way the
7 question is written that I was comfortable with a
8 yes.

9 DR. AU: Thank you very much.

10 It was a very productive discussion. I
11 will now read the second voting question or the
12 fourth question overall. Are the safety data
13 adequate to support approval of DPM for the
14 proposed indication of the management of cystic
15 fibrosis to improve pulmonary function in patients
16 18 years of age and older in conjunction with
17 standard therapies? If no, what further data are
18 needed?

19 I think we're ready to vote, please. Thank
20 you.

21 (Voting.)

22 LCDR CHEE: Question 4, you have 10 yeses;

1 6 nos; and zero abstain.

2 DR. AU: We're nothing if not consistent.

3 (Laughter.)

4 DR. AU: Why don't we start on this side of
5 the room?

6 DR. CATALETTO: I actually switched and
7 said yes for this one.

8 (Laughter.)

9 DR. CATALETTO: And I did so --

10 DR. AU: I'm sorry. Could you say your
11 name for the record?

12 DR. CATALETTO: Oh, sorry. Mary Cataletto.
13 And I did so because of the issue of exacerbation,
14 and I think that's part and parcel of advanced
15 disease, and unless you're doing a comparison in a
16 static disease, that's a hard marker to use. So I
17 said yes.

18 DR. AU: Thank you. Dr. Tracy?

19 DR. TRACY: Jim Tracy. I also said yes.
20 Once I went through this and in my own mind cleared
21 the hemoptysis issue out of my out of my head, I
22 looked at the exacerbations. And like the previous

1 speaker, I think this is, a bit, part of the
2 natural history of this disease. I do think there
3 is a place here for some postmarketing
4 surveillance, and I have no doubt that that will
5 happen informally. It would be nice to see it
6 formally.

7 DR. BLAKE: So I switched, and I voted no
8 for this one, and mainly because I didn't feel like
9 I had enough information to know who would be at
10 risk of exacerbations with this treatment. So I
11 would have liked to have had more information to
12 know who those people might be to aid in the
13 clinical use of the drug.

14 DR. MARSHALL: Gailen Marshall. I voted
15 yes for three reasons. Number one, absolutely
16 respecting the FDA's responsibility to be concerned
17 of these signals, there's clearly no statistically
18 significant increase in adverse effects, and yet
19 that was put in a different context when it related
20 to the primary endpoint.

21 The second point is that, as was mentioned
22 previously, the major one that people seem to be

1 most concerned about is increase in exacerbations,
2 and this is a disease that's characterized by
3 exacerbations. It's hard for me to imagine that a
4 clinician is going to put this into practice with
5 his or her patient, and over a 6-month period of
6 time, their clear perception, and the patient and
7 family perception, is that they're having more
8 exacerbations, and that would be fed back.

9 Number three is that I'm quite comforted,
10 particularly in the words of the experts that I
11 asked specific questions, that an 8,000-patient
12 world experience with no clear safety signals
13 reassures me that this is safe. It doesn't prove
14 it; I recognize that. But it reassures me and
15 helped dictate my decision to vote yes.

16 DR. LEDERER: Hi. Dave Lederer. I voted
17 no. I feel very strongly about this. We have a
18 drug that is modestly effective. Remember, I voted
19 yes for efficacy, but I am not reassured about
20 safety at all based on the data that was presented
21 regarding exacerbations. In good conscience, I
22 can't vote anything other than no as a person. If

1 there were more studies, I think this is a
2 critical, critical measure, and that it be
3 carefully thought out how it's measured and how
4 long patients are followed.

5 DR. AU: This is David Au. I voted no for
6 the same reasons that Dr. Lederer did, but also for
7 the fact that the U.S. population I think is
8 actually different than other populations. The
9 pathophysiology may be the same, but I think
10 treatment patterns and treatment adoption within
11 the U.S. is different.

12 I think the foundation is incredibly strong
13 here and deserves a huge amount of applause for the
14 efforts that they champion for individuals with
15 cystic fibrosis, but on the other hand, I actually
16 do think that care is very different in other
17 countries, not just Europe, but eastern Europe and
18 the like.

19 So I have concern about safety signals. I
20 think it befalls us to consider not only the
21 potential benefits, but the potential harms,
22 especially in a medication that I think is of

1 limited efficacy.

2 DR. KELSO: John Kelso, and I voted yes.
3 Again, just as with the effectiveness, I think
4 there probably is a subset of people where this is
5 going to be effective, and clearly there's
6 potential harm, the signal, if it's real, there are
7 some subset of those patients that we also can't
8 identify or know about.

9 For the same reason on the upside, I'm
10 counting on the clinicians who take care of these
11 patients to recognize that this is not necessarily
12 causing more exacerbations, since that's what
13 they're already seeing anyway, and it would be hard
14 to pick out an exacerbation that was due to the
15 drug versus one that was going to happen anyway,
16 but that would be seen as a lack of effectiveness.
17 Once the patient gets put on the drug and keeps
18 having exacerbations, that a clinical decision
19 would be made, this drug isn't for you. We need to
20 go back to the hypertonic saline or do something
21 different. So I think that for most patients, this
22 would not cause harm.

1 DR. QUE: Loretta Que. I switched here as
2 well. I just need to see more data. There was a
3 clear consistent signal showing that there might be
4 harm, and I wanted to make sure that before moving
5 forward, I would see that we knew more about which
6 patient population might be affected. And I agree
7 with Dr. Au. I think that we do have different
8 practice patterns within the United States.

9 DR. REDLICH: Carrie Redlich. I also voted
10 no for the reasons stated, a concern about the U.S.
11 population, the challenge of doing any sort of
12 postmarketing analysis to figure out side effects.
13 Also, there were a reasonable number of people that
14 stopped taking the medication or dropped out that I
15 didn't really fully understand.

16 DR. WEBER: Richard Weber. I voted yes.
17 Although, again, the exacerbation rate is a little
18 bothersome, the question is how much of this is
19 natural history of the disease? How much of this
20 is not so much that the drug is bad, but that it's
21 ineffective in some? So I strongly feel that
22 what's going to happen is we're going to see a

1 subset of patients who are more responsive to this
2 and some that are distinctly less responsive. But
3 in any case, I did vote yes.

4 DR. SCHELL: Karen Schell, and I voted yes
5 for all the reasons stated by previous yeses.

6 MS. MOORE: This is Erin Moore. I voted
7 yes. I think one of the challenges that I had is
8 about exacerbation equaling harm when exacerbation
9 for me is a natural part of the disease
10 progression, so similar to what Dr. Marshall was
11 stating. And the question asked if it's adequate
12 to support approval, and I believe that it's
13 adequate to support approval.

14 DR. PARAD: I said yes. I think the
15 hemoptysis issue was related to the pediatric group
16 that was treated before, where I think there was a
17 2- or 3-fold greater risk in that group. That
18 doesn't seem to be the case anymore in the older
19 patients.

20 I am concerned about the issues of
21 exacerbation, but because of the skewing of the
22 randomization, the bad luck of that, and maybe just

1 a little bit too much smoke and mirrors for me in
2 terms of trying to manipulate the data into an
3 answer, I wasn't completely convinced that I knew
4 what the right answer was to that. So I remain
5 concerned and do feel that more information needs
6 to be collected if this drug is made available.

7 DR. EMERSON: This is Scott Emerson. I
8 voted no. I am unashamed in my focus on clinical
9 trials because that's where I get to answer
10 questions such as when does a treatment cause a
11 risk by potentiating an underlying risk, and it
12 happens with great regularity. So therefore, if
13 you're depressed, the worst case is suicide. So
14 take this drug; warning, may cause suicide.

15 There are so many situations like that; the
16 same with cancers. Cancer is a fatal condition,
17 yet I've worked on many clinical trials where
18 death, well, that's a natural part of the cancer
19 progression, but why should it be higher on the
20 treatment group?

21 So I always consider the fact that the
22 hardest thing to find out about a drug is when it

1 does not act in the expected manner and actually
2 makes it worse, because there's too great of a
3 tendency for everybody to say, well, yes, you had a
4 heart attack, but then you were male, and, again,
5 it's well known that males are at higher risk. No.
6 It's the question of has it made it worse?

7 So it's just uncertain in my mind. If I
8 had to bet, I don't think it is that magnitude, but
9 I say, well, what if there is a group that
10 exacerbations are worse, was that enough to explain
11 why an apparent effect on FEV was not shining
12 through on the secondary outcomes that should have
13 moved in that same direction? I don't know, but on
14 safety, I don't have to prove harm. All I have to
15 do is prove that I'm not sure, and that's easy.

16 DR. BRITTAIN: Erica Brittain. I voted
17 yes, maybe for a funny reason. I was already using
18 exacerbation in my previous vote. When I wasn't
19 comfortable with the efficacy, a lot of it was
20 about the exacerbation. So I decided, okay, I'm
21 going to ignore exacerbation for this question to
22 make the two questions independent, and I wasn't

1 concerned about anything else, particularly on the
2 safety. But to be clear, I do think we do not know
3 if there is a subgroup for which there is harm with
4 respect to exacerbation. It definitely could be.

5 DR. GILLEN: Dan Gillen. I voted yes for a
6 couple of reasons. One is I think that the
7 concerns on the exacerbation are being driven by
8 the protocol-defined efficacy definition of
9 exacerbation. When we look at the AEs and SAEs, we
10 see balanced there. I do agree that we don't have
11 to prove harm, absolutely, for safety signals, but
12 I also think that we never are certain that we
13 don't have safety signals either, but we look at
14 the preponderance of evidence, as we've seen.

15 I think that what we have seen to this
16 point are multiple data-driven analyses around an
17 event that is likely going to be very closely
18 monitored through regular care as well, so to me
19 that's less of a concern.

20 DR. AU: Thank you very much. We are now
21 two our fifth question and third voting question,
22 and this is one where we integrate efficacy and

1 risk.

2 Does the benefit-risk profile support the
3 approval of DPM for the proposed indication of the
4 management of cystic fibrosis to improve pulmonary
5 function in patients 18 years and older in
6 conjunction with standard therapies? If no, what
7 further data are needed?

8 (Voting.)

9 DR. AU: Anyone left to vote? It looks
10 like everyone's voted. There we go; locked in.

11 LCDR CHEE: Question 5, we have 9 yeases; 7
12 nos; and zero abstain.

13 DR. AU: Why don't we start back on the
14 right? Dr. Gillen?

15 DR. GILLEN: Sure. I voted no on
16 substantial evidence of efficacy. I voted yes on
17 adequate safety data. For me, thinking about the
18 benefit-risk profile and going back to my previous
19 statement about me never being absolutely certain
20 that something is totally safe, I need to know that
21 it's certainly going to be efficacious to outweigh
22 any kind of doubt or uncertainty, realizing that

1 we're dealing with finite samples in a controlled
2 clinical trial setting.

3 So for me, it's really the lack of
4 substantial evidence of efficacy in terms of
5 clinical impact on patients as we're going through;
6 drove my answer here, if the numerator is zero.

7 DR. AU: I understand.

8 DR. BRITTAIN Erica Brittain. I voted no,
9 again, primarily because of the seemingly
10 inadequate efficacy data, or disappointing efficacy
11 results. However, it's a difficult no. I want to
12 vote yes, and I do wonder if -- I keep wondering if
13 A, as I said before, is there some subgroup that
14 makes this a better risk-benefit profile that could
15 be identified, and maybe the data could be
16 re-examined for that? Also, at patient level, is
17 it also possible for patients to be given the drug
18 and then see if they are the patient who really
19 does respond.

20 One thing that we didn't actually hear
21 anything about is if there's any relationship
22 between a change in FEV1 and people who get

1 exacerbations. I think that might also be
2 something interesting to look at.

3 DR. AU: Thank you.

4 DR. EMERSON: Scott Emerson. I voted no.
5 In addition to the things that I've said before,
6 I'll note that on this, there have been times that
7 drugs that I thought maybe had a safety problem,
8 but I thought that labeling could handle it -- but
9 I will say that I'm going somewhat on Dr. Kelso's
10 testimony to say that this would be a hard thing to
11 label where the uncertainty is.

12 The additional data that I would really
13 love to see is I would love to see a randomized
14 withdrawal in which you treated people for
15 6 months, and the people who were still on the
16 trial at 6 months, that then you randomized
17 withdrawal, so that we got some measure of whether
18 there was continued efficacy and what the longer
19 term effects were. I usually go with randomizing
20 the first 6 months, too, but I don't know that
21 that's as crucial on this.

22 We're talking about taking this hopefully

1 for 50 years, and we're acting right now on
2 6 months worth of data and don't really know
3 whether the effect is there. So this would go a
4 long way of having a 6-month trial on a randomized
5 withdrawal and would help me a whole lot.

6 DR. PARAD: Richard Parad. I voted yes.
7 Again, primary endpoint was met. I'm not happy
8 there wasn't more secondary support, but we've
9 already talked about that. I really find it hard
10 to believe that the biology of this disease is any
11 different in Germany or Australia than it is in the
12 United States. I would have a little difficulty in
13 believing that the treatment approaches differ. So
14 that makes me feel a little -- maybe makes me feel
15 better inappropriately, but I'm hoping that if it's
16 something different about the way we treat patients
17 here, that we're going to figure that out quickly.

18 MS. MOORE: This is Erin Moore. I voted
19 yes. I think the one outstanding thing that I
20 think is important to see, as Dr. Emerson had
21 stated, is a longer term look at this because we
22 saw an improvement and then a slight decline. So I

1 think I'd like to see that over the long run,
2 especially because something that struck me was the
3 idea that this is put into a class with other drugs
4 designed for airway clearance of which coughing is
5 a critical component. When you're defining an
6 exacerbation, cough is one of the indicators for
7 that.

8 So perhaps exacerbation isn't being
9 appropriately defined in these patients to say, is
10 it decreasing the rate of exacerbation? Is it
11 slowing the rate of FEV1 decline instead of just
12 looking at it at those points in time?

13 DR. SCHELL: Karen Schell, and I voted yes
14 as well or with the increase of the FEV1 indicated.
15 Also, as people are living longer with this
16 disease, the longevity and the progression of the
17 disease, I think we're not only responsible for the
18 improvement of the symptoms, but I was particularly
19 moved by the patient's voice and their quality of
20 life and how we can improve their quality of life.
21 And if they're willing to take the risk with the
22 benefits, I think we have to give them a chance to

1 do that.

2 DR. WEBER: Richard Weber. I voted yes,
3 and the prime reason was internal consistency with
4 my previous responses --

5 (Laughter.)

6 DR. WEBER: -- to be honest. But it also
7 struck me that in some cases in the past, adverse
8 effects or some undesirable side effects have come
9 to light only through postmarketing data. So it
10 will certainly be interesting to see what U.S.
11 postmarketing data does show us, if any adverse
12 signals show up.

13 DR. REDLICH: Carrie Redlich. I voted no,
14 also for internal consistency. I previously
15 expressed concerns about both efficacy and safety.
16 The key question in terms of what data would be
17 useful, I think that's probably a little bit
18 complicated and maybe beyond this meeting, thinking
19 about what really would be the best study design to
20 address.

21 I think all of us feel that there probably
22 is a subgroup that would benefit and how to

1 identify that, and/or how to identify if there
2 really is a problem with exacerbations or other
3 adverse events. Usually a more severely affected
4 group gives you greater opportunity to identify
5 both improvement and adverse effects, but I would
6 defer, really, on that question; especially, I
7 think people who have a lot of experience managing
8 these patients, because of all these other issues
9 of hypertonic saline, and who's included, and those
10 sort of factors, and the duration is obviously
11 another issue in terms of wanting a treatment that
12 will last.

13 DR. QUE: Loretta Que. I voted yes. I
14 think there is a subset of patients that will
15 benefit from this, and I'm hoping that our CF
16 clinicians will figure that out.

17 DR. KELSO: John Kelso, and I voted yes.
18 I'm hoping that the FDA, if they approve this drug,
19 has some way to transmit, both in the labeling and
20 advertising of this drug, the ambivalence, personal
21 and collective of this group that has been
22 expressed in terms of it's a very tiny effect size;

1 is it durable; is there a signal about
2 exacerbations?

3 I don't know how you do that, but somehow
4 that needs to be communicated either in the
5 labeling or advertising of this to reflect the
6 struggle that we have all had here today.

7 Finally, I hope the next time you have us
8 come to town, you can ask easier questions.

9 (Laughter.)

10 DR. AU: David Au. I voted no. It was
11 challenging. It was a challenging vote, I have to
12 say, overall. I'm impressed with an NNT of 10, but
13 I agree with this issue of durability and overall
14 effect. I'm pretty unsatisfied with the idea of
15 unintended consequences of drug, And I was very
16 impressed by the conversations that we heard from
17 the community about how this is going to be viewed
18 as a substituted drug.

19 As I mentioned before, I think we have a
20 responsibility to do our best for the public good.
21 I have concerns when I hear that one approach to
22 this agent will be as a simpler agent, but it will

1 lead to potentially greater exacerbations, less
2 FEV1, which actually is associated with mortality.
3 So before we make the leap of faith on 50 mLs and
4 an NNT of 10, I think we have to better understand
5 how it's going to be used.

6 The other thing I'll comment on is I
7 actually do think that I don't have the same degree
8 of faith in terms of heterogeneity and practice
9 patterns across providers. I think there's huge
10 practice variation. I'd be surprised if you don't
11 see it very much in the cystic fibrosis. Even in
12 the cystic fibrosis registry, that should be
13 examined because I would bet that you'd see large
14 practice variation within that group.

15 DR. LEDERER: Hi. Dave Lederer. I voted
16 no. I really, really hope that this drug is safe,
17 and I hope that if it is not approved, I hope there
18 is more work done to show us that it's safe with
19 regard to exacerbations because I do think we need
20 more drugs in our armamentarium for these patients.
21 So my vote really all revolves around unresolved or
22 uncertainty about safety.

1 DR. MARSHALL: Gailen Marshall, and I voted
2 yes. I guess, to me, one of the words that I've
3 heard others speak about is "effectiveness" as
4 opposed to efficacy, and the idea that this agent,
5 as it's been presented today, is going to clearly
6 be easier to use. Whether it's used complementary
7 in an augmented way or whether it's used in
8 substitutionary way, I think is going to be a
9 decision between the patient and family and the
10 provider.

11 I guess with Dr. Au, I have a little bit
12 more faith in the homogeneity of how the experts,
13 the cystic fibrosis experts, several which are in
14 this room, practice with consistency.

15 Yes, obviously all of us, we could all talk
16 about a fever of 101, and however many physicians
17 there are in here, there would be that plus one
18 different opinion on how to deal with it. But
19 there would be a certain consistency of that as
20 well. The world experience to me is very much a
21 tipping point, and the idea that these are experts,
22 both in our country and others, that get together

1 on a regular basis is reassuring.

2 Having said all that, I fully support that
3 the FDA would do some sort of continued
4 surveillance of this to help guide the use of it in
5 the United States, which is their responsibility
6 and ours, as to what is the right population to use
7 it in and how to use it in the best way, whether
8 it's similar or different than what's done
9 worldwide.

10 DR. BLAKE: This is Kathryn Blake. I voted
11 yes, and again, I voted yes because I feel like
12 there is going to be a population of patients that
13 this benefits, and I think that the ease of use is
14 quite important. I was concerned about the risk of
15 pulmonary exacerbations, but I was also reassured
16 by the fact that it's available in these other
17 countries and has been used in over 8,000 patients.

18 I, too, would like to see some additional
19 long-term data on exacerbations for the population
20 in the U.S. to try and better understand those at
21 risk, but I do also think that this is a population
22 of patients that are carefully monitored by their

1 physicians, and if there's a change in their
2 exacerbation frequency, I would expect that those
3 physicians and the patients themselves would pick
4 up on that fairly quickly, and then decide maybe at
5 that point to discontinue this particular
6 treatment.

7 DR. TRACY: Jim Tracy. I always struggle
8 with balancing the regulatory component along with
9 the human piece, but I voted yes. I think this is
10 going to be help to a significant number of
11 individuals. I'm not sure exactly who they are
12 yet. I do believe that surveillance postmarketing
13 is a necessity.

14 DR. CATALETTO: Mary Cataletto. I voted
15 no. I think we've covered a good number of those
16 topics. But I think when all is said and done,
17 we're going to need to look to our colleagues
18 abroad and see how do you choose -- whether using
19 hypertonic saline or the mannitol, how do you
20 decide when you're going to make a switch? How do
21 you decide when you're going to stop? What number
22 of exacerbations is too much? There are a lot of

1 things that were not in this protocol that I think
2 we need to look at, and that's why I voted no.
3 Thank you.

4 DR. AU: Does the FDA have any comments?

5 DR. SEYMOUR: I just wanted to thank the
6 committee for your discussion on today's topic. It
7 was certainly a good discussion for us and a
8 challenging application for us, and I think it
9 also, based upon the discussion, was challenging
10 for you. We don't bring the easy questions to you,
11 so don't count on that in the future --

12 (Laughter.)

13 DR. SEYMOUR: -- but we appreciate the time
14 and input on this application.

15 **Adjournment**

16 DR. AU: Thank you. I'll take the chair's
17 prerogative by saying thank you to the discussants
18 and the panel members. It was a fantastic
19 discussion. I respect everyone's opinions here and
20 value them all. I think we all kind of expressed
21 different opinions and were able to incorporate
22 them in a thoughtful, meaningful way.

1 I'd like to also thank the sponsor. I
2 thought they worked very well with us today, and I
3 appreciate their efforts at this meeting.

4 If there are no other order to business,
5 just as a reminder, once we're done and we all
6 leave, everything in this room will be cleaned up
7 and thrown away, or recycled, so please make sure
8 that you take the stuff that you want to take, and
9 everything else will be dealt with appropriately.

10 I wanted to thank everyone for their time
11 and energy, and safe travels on the way home.

12 Thank you so much.

13 (Whereupon, at 4:33 p.m., the meeting was
14 adjourned.)

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22