Drug Discovery Today • Volume 00, Number 00 • December 2017 PERSPECTIVE

feature

European regulatory use and impact of subgroup evaluation in marketing authorisation applications

Julien Tanniou[1,2], j.tanniou@umcutrecht.nl, Steven Teerenstra[2,3], Sagal Hassan[2], Andre Elferink[2], Ingeborg van der Tweel[1], Christine Gispen-de Wied[2] and Kit C.B. Roes[1,2]

Marketing authorisation application dossiers relating to medicinal products containing new active substances and evaluated by the European Medicines Agency (EMA) over the period 2012–2015 were examined. Major objections and other concerns relating to efficacy and safety of the day 80 assessment reports were reviewed. Overall, approved products have more subgroup concerns than nonapproved products, which seems to be a consistent pattern. Subgroup analyses are mainly assessed to have the insurance that subgroups of patients that might lack a positive benefit: risk ratio will not be wrongly included in the approved treatment indication.

Introduction

Before a medicine can be sold or prescribed to citizens across the European Union (EU), a marketing authorisation must be obtained. The European regulation offers several options for the authorisation of medicinal products: the centralised procedure, the mutual recognition procedure, the decentralised procedure and the national procedure. Today, the majority of new, innovative medicines passes through the centralised procedure to be marketed in the EU, with the objective to ensure their efficacy, safety and quality. Confirmatory (pivotal) clinical trials are usually performed to inform a benefit–risk decision, the results of which will be the basis for a treatment recommendation (labelling). It is well recognised that the balance of benefits and risks can vary across the patient population [1–4]. Therefore, subgroup analyses constitute a fundamental step in the assessment of a marketing authorisation application (MAA) so as to make optimal decisions at the population level and for each patient. As recently outlined by the draft guideline on the investigation of subgroups in confirmatory clinical trials [5], the role of subgroup analyses might differ depending on the overall results of the trial(s). If the presented clinical data are convincing overall, this general trend should be confirmed across subgroups of clinical importance. By contrast, if the overall results are borderline (positive) it might be of interest to identify a subgroup with persuasive results. These investigations have potentially important consequences for the medicinal product licensing, labelling, reimbursement and treatment decisions, when results from analyses of the overall (pooled) trial population might not hold for important subpopulations. It is therefore of interest to investigate how the regulatory evaluation of subgroups impacts MAAs.

Regulatory evaluation of subgroups over the period 2012–2015

All MAAs of new active substances (NAS) evaluated by the EMA through the centralised procedure between 1 January 2012 and 31 December 2015 were included in the study. The Dutch Medicines Evaluation Board (MEB) annual reports (Appendix A) have been used to retrieve the NAS status of each approved application [6–9]. With respect to the nonapproved products, the EMA website was consulted to obtain the list of 'refused' products [10]. Because the number of nonapproved products was rather small, all applications withdrawn before final Committee for Medicinal Products for Human Use (CHMP) decision on marketing authorisation were also

http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.drudis.2017.09.012

Please cite this article in press as: Tanniou, D.T.D. et al. European regulatory use and impact of subgroup evaluation in marketing authorisation applications, Drug Discov Today (2017), http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.drudis.2017.09.012

taken into account [11]. Each European Public Assessment Report (EPAR) was examined to see whether the active substance was originally considered as a NAS.

In the European assessment procedure, two member-states are appointed to take the lead: their respective CHMP members are then the so-called rapporteur and co-rapporteur. The first preliminary assessment reports from rapporteur and co-rapporteur are sent to the applicant at day 80 (i.e., 80 days after the official start of the procedure). In the day 80 reports, a specific section is dedicated to a 'list of questions' with a subsection about 'clinical aspects' which contains distinct efficacy and safety parts. Two types of criticisms: major objections (MOs) and other concerns (OCs), are reported. The MOs and OCs relating to efficacy and safety of the day 80 reports constitute the raw data of this study, because these reports were considered the most exhaustive available regarding potential issues raised. We identified all MOs and OCs related to subgroup evaluations. We defined a broad automatic (text mining) search strategy, performed by SH, based on various keywords: sub(-)group(s), sub(-)population(s), sub(-)set(s), mutation(s) or marker(s). Because MOs are the most relevant criticisms, J.T. read all efficacy and safety MOs to be reassured not to miss any important objections related to subgroup assessments. All selected MOs and OCs were reviewed by J.T. and S.T. to decide which should be retained for the analysis. As illustrated by their nonconsideration in the draft guideline on the investigation of subgroups in confirmatory clinical trials [5], subgroup MOs/OCs related to either treatment regimen (doses, duration, etc.), subgroups based on post-randomisation variables (e.g., the subgroup of responders) and subgroups for which the concern was a lack of data (e.g., elderly) or were the possibility/validity of extrapolation to that subgroup not retained as not directly related to subgroup analysis from a statistical or methodological point of view. All MOs and OCs were classified to one of the three categories: (i) consistency or heterogeneity of the subgroup results compared to the overall result; (ii) proposal to search for a subgroup with better efficacy and/or better safety; or (iii) statement that the indication should be restricted to a subgroup. J.T. and S.T. first performed this task independently. When J.T. and S.T. had a divergent opinion they discussed to reach a final agreement.

For each approved application, the proposed indication by the applicant as well as the final approved indication were compared to assess whether a change in the indication had been observed. J.T. and A.E. independently made their own classification to decide on whether the proposed indication and the approved indication were similar. They also compared their results and, when a divergent opinion arose, a final agreement was made between these authors. All results presented are provided in contingency tables containing absolute and relative numbers. These results are counts at the application level (i.e., the number of applications with, for example, at least one efficacy MO related to subgroup evaluation). The same holds for efficacy OCs, safety MOs and safety OCs. Finally, a distinction has been made between approved (with or without restriction of indication) and nonapproved applications, orphan and non-orphan status.

Review of subgroup assessments in MAAs

According to the Dutch MEB annual reports, there were 43 authorised medicinal products for human use with a NAS status in 2015, 35 in 2014, 47 in 2013 and 26 in 2012. A limited number of products had to be removed (13) because they either could not be found in the database or were considered as known active substance in their respective EPARs. The dataset is therefore composed of 138 authorised applications. In total, 15 applications were refused. By looking at each EPAR individually, we found that one product was a generic and four were considered to be known active substances. These five were therefore not retained in our dataset. Nine requested the active substance to be considered as a NAS, but the EMA CHMP was of the opinion that it was not appropriate to conclude on the NAS status at that time, in light of the negative recommendation, and one was qualified as a NAS by the CHMP. Following the applicant's original request or CHMP qualification regarding NAS, we decided to keep these ten refused applications. Because the number of refused applications was limited, we considered the applications that were withdrawn by the applicant before final CHMP decision on marketing authorisation. Between 2012 and 2015 there were 39 such applications, of which 25 were considered as known active substances and were therefore not retained. Eleven applications were qualified as a NAS and three requested the active substance to be considered as a NAS but did not receive an answer at the time of the withdrawal. These 14 applications were kept for analysis. All retained applications (authorised, refused and withdrawn before final CHMP decision on marketing authorisation) are listed (see Appendix A in Supplementary material, available online).

According to Table 1, subgroup MOs/OCs are often present in day 80 reports (68%). They are however more prominent in authorised applications than in refused/withdrawn applications (70% vs 58%). Regarding efficacy MOs, efficacy OCs and safety OCs, subgroup criticisms are approximately twice as frequent in authorised applications as in refused/withdrawn applications. By contrast, safety MOs are more common in refused/withdrawn applications than in authorised applications (21% vs 9%).

Regarding orphan medicinal products, almost no difference is observed (24% vs 29%) regarding efficacy MOs between authorised and refused/withdrawn applications, whereas authorised applications have more safety MOs than refused/withdrawn applications (9% vs 0%) (Table 2). Concerning non-orphan medicinal products, the difference between efficacy MOs is more pronounced (25% vs 6%) in favour of authorised applications, even though there is an opposite effect with more safety MOs in refused/withdrawn applications (10% vs 29%).

TABLE 1

Subgroup MOs/OCs in authorised and refused/withdrawn applications

	Authorised applications (n = 138)	Refused/withdrawn applications (n = 24)	All applications(n = 162)
At least one efficacy MO	34 (25%)	3 (12%)	37 (23%)
At least one efficacy OC	82 (59%)	8 (33%)	90 (56%)
At least one safety MO	13 (9%)	5 (21%)	18 (11%)
At least one safety OC	31 (22%)	3 (12%)	34 (21%)
Any MO or OC	96 (70%)	14 (58%)	110 (68%)

Please cite this article in press as: Tanniou, D.T.D. et al. European regulatory use and impact of subgroup evaluation in marketing authorisation applications, Drug Discov Today (2017), http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.drudis.2017.09.012