## 4. NON-CLINICAL ASSESSMENT

**Summary boxes** 

NA box

Trials with more than one IMP

## 4.1 Introduction

**Note for IMPs with MA** 

Note for previously assessed IMPs without MA

Workspace:	
	Date
XXX is a YYY intended for the treatment of .	
Protocol (Phase ):	
Primary objectives:	
Secondary objectives:	
Exploratory objectives:	
Study design:	
<u>Dosing regimen:</u> IMP: max mg/kg per day for months	
<u>Dose justification:</u> For FIH, go to <u>section 4.5.1</u>	
Population: patients, male & female, adults & elderly  ☐ Contraception/Pregnancy testing: Go to section 4.4.6.3  ☐ Patients:	
Clinical experience:	
Regulatory status of the imp and of comparator:	
SA ☐ Go to section 4.6	
Provided version protocol= Provided Version IB= Provided Version IMPD=	

#### Please address following key questions:

- IMP intended indication
- Study design
- Dosing regimen and treatment duration (IMP:  $max \times mg/kg$  per day for  $\times months$ )
- Dose justification (For FIH, go to section 4.5.1)
- Population patients, male & female, adults & elderly
  - o Contraception/Pregnancy testing: Go to section 4.4.6.3
  - Patients: please specify
- Clinical experience
- Regulatory status of the imp and of comparator:
- Scientific advice Go to section 4.6
- Previously identified major issues/concerns that are relevant to the assessment of the non-clinical data for this clinical trials should be addressed. Same check is being done for clinical issues in the clinical assessment report:
  - Was there a previous refusal/recall/unresolved recommendation/condition etc.?
  - o Are reasons for major issues resolved?

## Please, in case of identified issues, consider consulting the clinical team for input on:

- Clinical rationale for (combination) therapy, if clinical data are provided in this context
- Inclusion and/or exclusion criteria
- Identification of potential overlapping toxicities for combination therapies and risk mitigation measures
- Data safety monitoring board
- Discontinuation and stopping criteria
- Study plan and design
- Safety monitoring

Responsible team FIH: Non-clinical team (see also section 4.4.6.3)

## Assessor's comment:

The applicant is requested to provide an adequate clinical trial protocol that is in compliance with current GCP guidance (ICH E6R2) and CTFG guidance (specifically "Recommendations related to contraception and pregnancy testing in clinical trials"). Reference is also made to the CTR (EU regulation No 536/2014), Annex I (application dossier for the initial application, section D. Protocol) (RFI).

The applicant provided an IB which is not following the standard template. As described in EU Regulation No 536/2014, the applicant is recommended to provide an IB prepared in accordance with international guidance. Non-clinical pharmacology and toxicology data shall be submitted in a logical structure, such as that of Module 4 of the ICH Common Technical Document format (RFI).

## 4.2 Pharmacology

# 4.2.1 Primary pharmacodynamics

## **Summary**

These pharmacology studies provide support for the pharmacological basis for the proposed trial	Yes □ No □ NA □
Were relevant in vitro and/or in vivo models studied?	Yes □ No □ NA □
Is the intended pharmacological effect expected/ possible at clinical exposure?	Yes □ No □ NA □
Were pharmacologically active major metabolites identified?	Yes □ No □ NA □
Is the IMP a first-in-class compound?	Yes □ No □ NA □
Workspace:	
Assessor's comment:	

# Please address following key question:

• Adequacy of inclusion criteria in line with primary pharmacology

- Clinical rationale for proof-of-concept for (combination) therapy
- Inclusion criteria in line with primary pharmacology

## 4.2.2 Secondary pharmacodynamics

#### **Summary**

The studies described in this section identified off-target effects	Yes □ No □ NA □
Are off-target effects expected/possible at clinical exposure?	Yes □ No □ NA □
Workspace:	

## Please address following key questions:

- Adequacy of safety monitoring (type, extent, schedule, etc) in line with identified clinically relevant secondary pharmacology findings
- Adequacy of inclusion/exclusion criteria in line with identified clinically relevant secondary pharmacology findings
- Adequacy of discontinuation/stopping criteria in line with identified clinically relevant secondary pharmacology

- Inclusion and/or exclusion criteria
- Discontinuation and stopping criteriaSafety monitoring

## 4.2.3 Safety pharmacology

#### **Summary**

System	Study type	Issues	Major Findings	
		identified		
Cardiovascular		Yes□ No□ NA□		
Respiratory		Yes□ No□ NA□		
CNS		Yes□ No□ NA□		
Other		Yes□ No□ NA□		
Did the safety pharmacology studies identify significant concerns? Yes□ No□ NA□				
Do sufficient margins of exposure exist for planned clinical exposure?  Yes No NA  NA				
Workspace:				
Assessor's comment:				

### Please address following key questions:

- Adequacy of safety monitoring (type, extent, schedule, etc) in line with identified clinically relevant safety pharmacology findings
- Adequacy of inclusion/exclusion criteria in line with identified clinically relevant safety pharmacology findings
- Adequacy of discontinuation/stopping criteria in line with identified clinically relevant toxicities

#### Please, in case of identified issues, consider consulting the clinical team for input on:

- Inclusion and/or exclusion criteria
- Discontinuation and stopping criteria
- Safety monitoring

## 4.2.4 Pharmacodynamic drug interactions

Have potential pharmacodynamics drug interactions been identified?	Yes□ No□
Workspace:	
Assessor's comment:	
Please, in case of identified issues related to pharmacody consulting the clinical team for input.	vnamic interactions, consider

# 4.3 Pharmacokinetics

# 4.3.1 Methods of analysis

Are the methods of analysis and their sensitivities adequate?	Yes□ No□ NA□
Workspace:	
Assessor's comment:	
The applicant is recommended to provide information on the method (and/or its metabolites) in animal blood/plasma (validation and sens for future clinical trials)	

# 4.3.2 Absorption, Distribution, Metabolism & Excretion

	1		
System	<u>Issues identified</u>	Findings	
Absorption	Yes□ No□ NA□		
Distribution	Yes□ No□ NA□		
Metabolism	Yes□ No□ NA□		
Excretion	Yes□ No□ NA□		
Do the ADME studies	identify significant co	oncerns? Yes No NA	
Major human metabo	lites were identified	Yes□ No□ NA□	
Unique human metab	oolites were identified	Yes□ No□ NA□	
Workspace:			
Assessor's comment:			
(For further clinical development) The applicant is invited to provide a detailed qualitative and quantitative overview of human metabolites and metabolites formed in test species, preferably in a tabulated format. (RFI or recommendation for future clinical trials)			

# 4.3.3 Pharmacokinetic drug interactions (Enzymes, Transporter, other)

Target evaluated	Interaction identified	Findings	
Enzyme inhibition	Yes □ No □ NA □		
Enzyme induction	Yes □ No □ NA □		
Transporter	Yes □ No □ NA □		
Co-pathways	Yes □ No □ NA □		
Potential for PK drug	interactions is indicated at	therapeutic dose Yes $\square$ No $\square$ NA $\square$	
	ctions have been highlighted is included in the IB/study	_	
Workspace:			
Assessor's comme	ent:		
the clinical team a	and the PK coordinator (d	to pharmacokinetic interactions, consult or back-up) in case of questions about DDI.	
Responsible team: clinical team			
4.3.4 Other pharmacokinetic studies (e.g. PK of metabolite, novel excipients, genomic integration and inadvertent germline transmission of gene transfer vectors)			
<u>Summary</u>			
Were other PK studi	es performed?	Yes □ No □ NA □	
Do these studies ide	entify concerns?	Yes □ No □ NA □	
Workspace:			
Assessor's comme	ent:		

# 4.4 Toxicology

# **Summary**

# 4.4.1 Animal species selection/Study design

Toxicologically relevant animal species studied	Yes □ No □ NA □
The studied species show similar pharmacology to humans	Yes □ No □ NA □
The studied species show similar PK to humans	Yes □ No □ NA □
The studies were sufficiently well-designed	Yes □ No □ NA □
Workspace:	
Assessor's comment:	

# 4.4.2 Single dose toxicity

Species	Dose/ Route	NO(A)EL/LOEL /MNTD (delete as required)	Major findings	
Were signifi	cant toxicities	identified?		Yes □ No □ NA □
Do sufficient margins of exposure exist for planned clinical exposure? Yes $\square$ No $\square$ NA $\square$				Yes □ No □ NA □
Workspace:				
Assessor's	comment:			

#### 4.4.3 Repeat-dose toxicity

## **Summary**

Study duration	Species	Dose/ Route	MO(A)EL/LOEL /MNTD (delete as required)	Major findings
Were signifi	cant toxicities	s identified?		Yes □ No □ NA □
Do sufficien	t margins of e	exposure exis	t for planned clinica	l exposure? Yes □ No □ NA □
Does the du	ration of trea	tment suppor	t the proposed trial	duration? Yes □ No □ NA □
Workspace:				
Assessor's	comment:			

## Please address following key questions:

- Adequacy of safety monitoring (type, extent, schedule, etc) in line with identified clinically relevant toxicities
- Adequacy of inclusion/exclusion criteria in line with identified clinically relevant toxicities
- Adequacy of discontinuation/stopping criteria in line with identified clinically relevant toxicities

- Inclusion and/or exclusion criteria
- Discontinuation and stopping criteria
- Safety monitoring

# 4.4.4 Genotoxicity

Type of test/study	Test system	Results	
Gene mutations in bacteria		Positive □ Negative □	Equivocal 🗆
In vitro mammalian assay		Positive □ Negative □	Equivocal 🗆
In vivo genotoxicity test		Positive □ Negative □	Equivocal 🗆
Additional assays		Positive □ Negative □	Equivocal $\square$
Do the submitted data indicated genotoxic potential? Yes $\square$ No $\square$ NA $\square$			
Workspace:			
Assessor's comment:			
4.4.5 Carcinogenicity			
Summary			

Do studies identify potential for carcinogenicity?	Yes □ No □ NA □
Do studies identify potential for careinogenicity.	163 - 110 - 11/1 -
Do sufficient margins of exposure exist for planned clinical	Yes □ No □ NA □
	100 = 110 = 1111 =
exposure?	
Workenson	
Workspace:	
Assessor's comment:	
Assessor's comment	

# 4.4.6 Reproductive and developmental toxicity

## **Summary**

System	Toxicities	Findings
	identified	
Fertility and early	Yes □ No □ NA □	
embryonic	1.65 2 11.6 2 11.7 2	
development		
Embryo-fetal	Yes □ No □ NA □	
development		
Prenatal and	Yes □ No □ NA □	
postnatal		
development,		
including		
maternal function		
Do sufficient margins	of exposure exist for pla	anned clinical exposure? Yes □ No □ NA □
Workspace:		
Assessor's commer	nt:	

# 4.4.6.1 Juvenile toxicity studies

## **Summary**

The studies utilised animals in the appropriate age range	Yes □ No □ NA □
The studies identified additional/enhanced juvenile toxicities	Yes □ No □ NA □
Do sufficient margins of exposure exist for planned clinical exposure?	Yes □ No □ NA □
Workspace:	
Assessor's comment:	

- Inclusion and/or exclusion criteria
- Safety monitoring

# 4.4.6.2 Other studies (including enhanced PPND studies)

The studies identified potential toxicities	Yes □ No □ NA □
Do sufficient margins of exposure exist for planned clinical exposure?	Yes □ No □ NA □
Workspace:	
Assessor's comment:	

# 4.4.6.3 Recommendations for contraception measures

# Non-clinical data summary

IMP		(please all appropriate)
	Suspected/ demonstrated terato	genic or fetotoxic effects $\square$
		Genotoxic □
		Insufficient data $\square$
	Demonstrated embryo-fetotoxic effects but which	do not seem to be relevant to the CT subjects $\square$
	Sufficient data	and no indication of risk $\Box$
Comparator IMP/ auxiliary		(please all appropriate)
MP		NA 🗆
	Suspected or demonstrated	d teratogenic or fetotoxic
		Genotoxic □
		Insufficient data □
	Demonstrated embryo-fetotoxic effects but which	do not seem to be relevant to the CT subjects $\square$
	Sufficient data	and no indication of risk $\Box$
WOCBP/male pacifical trial	artners of WOCBP are included in the proposed	Yes □ No □
contraception a teratogenicity/	e guidance "CTFG recommendations related to nd pregnancy testing in clinical trials" the risk of fetotoxicity based on the non-clinical data is	demonstrated/suspected
considered (ple	ase tick one)	<u>possible</u> □
		unlikely □
Workspace:		
	can be used for the more complicated cases, see do	

Criteria for decision making toward pregnancy testing-AMEdit3.DOC
Assessor's comment: Note
For the definition of postmenopausal state and highly effective birth control methods used in the protocol, the applicant is referred to the "Recommendations related to contraception and pregnancy testing in clinical trials version 1.1 (21/09/2020)" of the Clinical trial facilitation group (CTFG) available at the HMA website:  https://www.hma.eu/fileadmin/dateien/Human_Medicines/01- About_HMA/Working_Groups/CTFG/2020_09_HMA_CTFG_Contraception_guidance_Version_1.1_u pdated.pdf (RFI)

#### Please address following key questions:

- Adequacy of inclusion/exclusion criteria for WOCBP, male patients with WOCBP partners
- Adequacy of contraceptive measures
- Adequacy of pregnancy testing requirements
- Adequacy of measures (if any) related to sperm or oocyte preservation

Please consider the need for applying the criteria to request pregnancy testing during treatment and after the last dose for oncology products

(https://gcloudbelgium.sharepoint.com/:w:/r/teams/GRP-FAMHP-CTRcollaboration-

PregnancyTestingCriteriainOncoclinicaltrials/Shared%20Documents/Pregnancy%20Testing%20 Criteria%20in%20Onco%20clinical%20trials/Criteria%20for%20decision%20making%20toward %20pregnancy%20testing-

AMEdit3.DOC?d=w7231a272f4da47749037f6bcec3080d1&csf=1&web=1&e=V3OteM)

Please, consult the clinical team systematically for harmonization of considerations with regards to contraception and pregnancy testing.

Responsible Team: clinical team

#### 4.4.7 Local tolerance

Do the submitted studies indicate a potential for local toxicity?	Yes □ No □ NA □
Workspace:	
Assessor's comment:	

# 4.4.8 Other toxicity studies

Dedicated Study	Toxicities identified	Findings
Phototoxicity	Yes □ No □ NA □	
Tissue cross reactivity	Yes   No   NA	
Antigenicity	Yes □ No □ NA □	
Immunotoxicity	Yes □ No □ NA □	
Dependence	Yes □ No □ NA □	
Metabolites	Yes   No   NA	
Impurities	Yes  No  NA	
Other	Yes   No   NA	
Workspace:		
Assessor's commer	nt:	
assessment of the ph pharmacological/cher plan indicates a poter measures should be t refer to the ICH S10	nototoxic potential of MP mical class. If assessmen ntial for a significant hur taken during outpatient guideline (https://www.	ase 1, the Applicant should provide an initial X based on the drug's photochemical properties and an of all the available data and the proposed clinical man phototoxicity risk, appropriate protective clinical studies. If needed, the Applicant is advised to ich.org/products/guidelines/safety/safety-maceuticals.html). (RFI)
OR		
		s (Phase III), if appropriate, an experimental clinical) of phototoxic potential should be undertaken.

## 4.5 Additional Considerations

#### 4.5.1 First in Human Trials

#### **Summary**

Is the starting dose adequately justified?	Yes □ No □ NA □
Are the dose steps adequately justified?	Yes □ No □ NA □
Is the maximum dose adequately justified?	Yes □ No □ NA □
Workspace:	
Assessor's comment:	

#### Please address following key question:

Need for sentinel dosing

Please, if involved and in case of identified issues, consider consulting the clinical team for input on:

- starting dose, dose escalation, maximum dose
- Sentinel dosing
- Modelling of human exposure (PBPK, other)

Non-clinical assessor should contact the PK coordinator (or back-up) in case there are PK issues related to the dose setting. Depending on classification in low/medium/high regulatory impact they will define the relevance of PK data on the decision-making process and the need to go further in assessment and contact a specialist in POP PK / modelling & simulation.

Responsible team FIH: non-clinical team

#### 4.5.2 ATMPs

Are there any additional relevant concerns for this product?	Yes □ No □ NA □
Workspace:	
Assessor's comment:	

#### 4.6 Scientific advice/ PIP

Scientific advice/PIP advice relating to non-clinical development was $\;$ Yes $\Box$ No $\Box$ received
Workspace:
Assessor's comment:
Paediatric patients are included in this phase xx study, yet a PIP has not been submitted to EMA. According to the EU Paediatric regulation, a PIP application should be submitted as soon as possible after phase I clinical studies. The applicant is recommended to submit a PIP as soon as possible to seek feedback and approval from PDCO (Recommendation for future clinical trials).
Scientific Advice:
Focus on direct or indirect non-clinical related questions of a national or EMA scientific advice.
PIP:
<ul> <li>Check compliance to the key binding elements in the agreed PIP if there is one, or deviations from important PDCO comments if the PIP procedure is still ongoing.</li> <li>In case of a paediatric trial and if PIP would have been expected at this stage in development, a comment is made only in the non-clinical report. Not needed by the clinical team as the PDCO alternate is part of the NC team.</li> </ul>
4.7 GLP aspects
Were all pivotal safety studies performed in line with OECD-GLP Yes □ No □ Unknown □ and performed in a country that is a member of OECD Mutual Acceptance of Data (MAD) for GLP?

#### Workspace:

### **Assessor's comment:**

CTFG and EU CTR NO 536/2014 documents on GLP in clinical trials

In accordance with EU Directives, applicants are reminded that all pivotal nonclinical studies need to be carried out in accordance with the principles of good laboratory practice (GLP). As applications for CTAs do not include individual study reports, Sponsors should include a statement on the GLP status of the studies within the IMPD, unless properly justified. A summary table should be provided specifying the details of each study and Sponsors should also indicate if in that period the facility was part of an accepted GLP monitoring programme. For more detailed information, see http://www.hma.eu/fileadmin/dateien/Human\_Medicines/01-About\_HMA/Working\_Groups/CTFG/QAs\_document\_on\_GLP\_-\_2017.pdf

See also Q1.19 from the Q&A to the CTR: See Eudralex volume 10 (RFI)

# 4.8 Assessor's Overall Conclusions on Non-Clinical Part

The non-clinical data provided are acceptable $\hfill\Box$
Supplementary information needs to be provided (refer to the list of requests for additional information) $\hfill\Box$
Workspace:
Overall comment/ conclusion on the non-clinical assessment: <u>Note</u>
4.8.1 REQUESTS FOR ADDITIONAL INFORMATION: NON-CLINICAL (see also section 9)
4.8.1.A PROPOSED LIST OF REQUESTS FOR ADDITIONAL INFORMATION BY RMS
Workspace (List of proposed RFI):
1. BExxx
2. BExxx