Rheumatoid Arthritis Clinical Trials:
Navigating Diagnosis, Endpoints, and Protocol Enhancements

INGENŪ CRO

Introduction

Rheumatoid arthritis (RA) is a chronic inflammatory disorder that primarily affects the joints, but can also extend to other tissues and organs.

As an autoimmune condition, RA occurs when the immune system mistakenly targets the body's own tissues, especially the synovium—the lining of the membranes surrounding the joints. The hallmark of RA is persistent symmetric polyarthritis, typically involving the small joints of the hands and feet. Without timely treatment, RA can lead to significant morbidity, including joint destruction, deformity, and loss of function, along with systemic complications like cardiovascular disease, pulmonary fibrosis, and vasculitis.

RA is classified as a systemic autoimmune disease due to its widespread effects beyond the joints. Patients may experience extra-articular manifestations such as rheumatoid nodules, lung disease, and pericarditis, further complicating the clinical picture. The disease significantly impacts quality of life, often leading to chronic pain, fatigue, and disability, which can severely limit daily activities and reduce life expectancy.

iNGENŪ CRO

Book a Discovery Call to learn how iNGENū can deliver high-quality, cost-efficient, FDA-compliant research for your next clinical trial

Why Choose iNGENū CRO?

iNGENū is the FDA-centric Australian CRO championing disruptive, innovative biotech firms. We are physician-led, providing access to the full spectrum of clinical and non-clinical research services.

Local Trials, Global Approvals

Australian expertise combined with direct FDA submission capabilities, offering a streamlined path for global approval.

Disciplined, Cost-Efficient Execution

Every dollar is strategically allocated, eliminating unnecessary costs while maintaining the highest quality.

Australian Headquartered, Asia-Pacific Reach

Access high-quality trials in the Asia-Pacific region, enhancing speed and scalability.

Expertise From the Start

Engage directly with our team of highly qualified doctors and PhD scientists from the outset.

Ready to discuss your Clinical Trial?
For further information on how iNGENū can assist you to conduct your clinical trial, book a Discovery Call with one of our Advisors.

Historical Perspective and Evolution of Understanding

Historical Perspectives

The understanding of RA has evolved significantly over time. The earliest documented symptoms resembling RA appear in the Ebers Papyrus from ancient Egypt around 1800 BC, where joint pain and swelling were noted. However, RA was only distinguished from other types of arthritis in the 19th century. The term "rheumatoid arthritis" was first introduced by British rheumatologist Dr. Alfred Baring Garrod in 1859.

Initial treatment approaches were empirical and included methods like leech therapy and opium use. A significant milestone was the discovery of rheumatoid factor (RF) in 1940 by Dr. Erik Waaler, providing a serological marker for RA. The identification of anti-citrullinated protein antibodies (ACPA) in the 1990s, which are more specific to RA, became crucial for diagnostic criteria.

The late 20th and early 21st centuries witnessed the advent of disease-modifying antirheumatic drugs (DMARDs), which transformed the disease course for many patients. Methotrexate, introduced in the 1980s, remains a cornerstone of RA treatment. The introduction of biologic DMARDs, such as tumor necrosis factor (TNF) inhibitors in the late 1990s, revolutionized RA management, offering hope for patients unresponsive to traditional therapies.

Contributing Factors

- **Biological Factors:** The etiology of RA is multifactorial, involving a combination of genetic and environmental factors. The most significant genetic factor is the presence of the HLA-DRB1 gene, particularly alleles that encode the "shared epitope," which is associated with an increased risk of developing RA. Autoimmunity plays a central role in RA pathogenesis, where the immune system's attack on synovial joints leads to chronic inflammation and the formation of pannus.
- **Environmental Factors:** Chronic diseases like RA can have a significant psychological impact. Persistent pain, disability, and fatigue associated with RA often lead to depression and anxiety, exacerbating physical symptoms and reducing treatment efficacy. The psychological burden is crucial in disease management and patient outcomes, with stress implicated in symptom exacerbation.
- **Psychological Factors:** Environmental factors also play a significant role in RA development. Smoking is the most well-established environmental risk factor, particularly among individuals with a genetic predisposition (e.g., those carrying the HLA-DRB1 gene). Infections are implicated in RA development. Hormonal factors and dietary habits, though less conclusively, are also considered risk factors.

Prevalence and Analysis

Statistics on Prevalence & Future Projections

- RA affects approximately 1% of the global population, with regional variations. In the United States, the prevalence ranges from 0.6% to 1.3% among adults, affecting about 1.3 million individuals. Women are disproportionately affected, with a female-to-male ratio of about 3:1. RA incidence increases with age, peaking between 30 and 60 years, though it can occur at any age.

Trend Analysis

- Over the past decade, RA prevalence in the United States has remained stable, with a slight upward trend in older adults and regions with higher smoking and obesity rates. Advances in treatment and early diagnosis have improved outcomes, reducing the overall burden of severe disability associated with RA. The prevalence of RA is expected to increase slightly over the next decade, driven by an aging population and ongoing exposure to environmental risk factors such as smoking. Projections suggest that by 2033, RA prevalence in the U.S. will reach approximately 1.5 million individuals.

Market Analysis & Economic Impact

- The market for RA treatments has grown significantly over the past few decades, driven by the introduction of biologic DMARDs and targeted synthetic DMARDs. As of 2023, the U.S. market for RA treatments is valued at approximately $24 billion, dominated by biologic agents, particularly TNF inhibitors like Humira (adalimumab), the best-selling drug globally for several years.

Future Market Projections

- The RA treatment market is projected to continue growing, reaching an estimated $30 billion by 2030. Factors driving this growth include advancements in therapeutics, increased patient awareness leading to earlier diagnosis, and the expansion of indications for RA medications. These trends suggest that the market will continue to evolve with the introduction of new therapies targeting novel pathways like Janus kinase (JAK) inhibitors.

Drug Name	Year of Approval	Manufacturer	2023 Revenue (USD)	Mechanism of Action
Humira	2002	AbbVie	~$19 billion (declining)	TNF-alpha inhibitor
Enbrel	1998	Amgen	~$4.9 billion	TNF-alpha inhibitor
Xeljanz	2012	Pfizer	~$2.4 billion	JAK inhibitor
Rinvoq	2019	AbbVie	~$2.2 billion	JAK inhibitor
Orencia	2005	Bristol-Myers Squibb	~$3.0 billion	T-cell activation inhibitor

Diagnostic Codes and Criteria

ICD-11 Code: FA20

According to the ICD-11, rheumatoid arthritis is defined as a persistent and/or erosive disease, confirmed by the presence of synovitis in at least one joint. The diagnosis of RA is contingent upon the following criteria:

1. **Confirmed Presence of Synovitis:** Synovitis, or inflammation of the synovial membrane, must be present in at least one joint. This can be confirmed through clinical examination or imaging techniques like ultrasound or MRI. Synovitis is the primary feature of RA and is typically characterized by joint swelling, tenderness, and pain.
2. **Exclusion of Alternative Diagnoses:** RA diagnosis requires the exclusion of other conditions that might better explain the synovitis. This includes ruling out other types of arthritis such as osteoarthritis, psoriatic arthritis, or gout, which can present with similar symptoms but require different management strategies.
3. **Scoring System:** The diagnosis of RA involves a scoring system, where a total score of 6 or greater (out of a possible 10) is necessary. This score is derived from the following four domains:
    - Number and Site of Involved Joints
    - Serologic Abnormality
    - Elevated Acute-Phase Response
    - Symptom Duration

Evolution of Diagnostic Criteria Over Time

The diagnostic criteria for rheumatoid arthritis have evolved significantly, reflecting advancements in understanding the disease and developing new diagnostic tools. The 1987 American College of Rheumatology (ACR) criteria, which primarily focused on clinical symptoms, have been significantly refined over time. The 2010 ACR/EULAR criteria, which introduced the scoring system now reflected in ICD-11, marked a pivotal shift towards earlier and more accurate diagnosis by including serologic markers and imaging findings.

The inclusion of a structured scoring system enhances the precision of diagnosis, ensuring that patients are accurately diagnosed and appropriately managed.

Impact of Changes on Clinical and Research Perspectives

The ICD-11 criteria for RA, with their emphasis on early diagnosis and a comprehensive scoring system, have had a significant impact on both clinical practice and research. Clinically, these criteria allow for earlier identification of RA, enabling prompt initiation of disease-modifying antirheumatic drugs (DMARDs), which can slow disease progression and prevent joint damage. This shift towards early intervention is associated with improved long-term outcomes for patients.

In the research context, the refined criteria facilitate more accurate patient selection for clinical trials, ensuring that study participants meet stringent diagnostic standards. This precision helps in developing targeted therapies that address specific aspects of RA pathogenesis, leading to more effective treatments and better patient outcomes

Epidemiology

1. Age

- RA can occur at any age, but it most commonly presents between the ages of 30 and 60, with a peak incidence in the fifth decade of life. The age of onset is slightly earlier in women compared to men. Juvenile idiopathic arthritis (JIA), which is a distinct but related condition, can affect children under the age of 16, but adult-onset RA typically begins in middle age. The risk of developing RA increases with age, particularly in individuals over 60, likely due to the cumulative effects of environmental exposures and changes in immune function associated with aging.

2. Gender

- Women are approximately 2 to 3 times more likely to develop RA than men. This gender disparity is thought to be due to hormonal factors, particularly the role of estrogen. Estrogen is believed to modulate immune responses, and fluctuations in estrogen levels — such as those occurring during pregnancy, menopause, or with the use of oral contraceptives — can influence the onset and course of RA.

3. Race and Ethnicity

- The prevalence of RA is higher among certain ethnic groups, such as Native American people, as mentioned earlier. African American and Hispanic people tend to have similar or slightly lower prevalence rates compared to Caucasian people, though the differences are not as pronounced as those seen with gender or geography. However, African American people with RA are more likely to experience severe disease and worse outcomes, which may be related to disparities in healthcare access, socioeconomic factors, and potential genetic differences.

4. Genetic Predisposition

- The most significant genetic risk factor is the presence of specific alleles of the HLA-DRB1 gene, particularly those encoding the "shared epitope." The shared epitope refers to a specific amino acid sequence found in the HLA-DRB1 molecule that is associated with an increased risk of developing RA. Individuals who carry these alleles are more likely to develop RA, especially when exposed to certain environmental triggers, such as smoking.
- Family studies have shown that the risk of RA is higher among first-degree relatives of individuals with the disease. Twin studies further support the genetic basis of RA, with concordance rates of around 15% in monozygotic (identical) twins, compared to about 4% in dizygotic (fraternal) twins. These findings suggest that while genetic factors are important, environmental factors also play a significant role in the pathogenesis of RA.

5. Gene-Environment Interactions

- The interplay between genetic and environmental factors is crucial in understanding the epidemiology of RA. For example, smoking is a well-established environmental risk factor that interacts with the HLA-DRB1 shared epitope to significantly increase the risk of developing RA. Smokers with the shared epitope are up to 20 times more likely to develop RA than non-smokers without this genetic predisposition.
- Infections, particularly with Epstein-Barr virus (EBV) and Porphyromonas gingivalis (a bacterium associated with periodontal disease), have also been implicated as potential environmental triggers for RA. These infections may trigger an autoimmune response in genetically susceptible individuals, leading to the development of RA.

Epidemiology (cont.)

6. Environmental and Lifestyle Factors

Smoking:

- Smoking is the most significant modifiable risk factor for RA. It not only increases the risk of developing the disease but also exacerbates disease severity and reduces the effectiveness of treatments. Smoking is particularly harmful in individuals who are genetically predisposed to RA, such as those carrying the HLA-DRB1 shared epitope. The exact mechanisms by which smoking contributes to RA are not fully understood, but it is believed to involve immune modulation, increased production of pro-inflammatory cytokines, and the promotion of citrullination — a process that leads to the formation of ACPA, a key autoantibody in RA.

Diet and Nutrition:

- Some studies suggest that a diet high in red meat, processed foods, and sugars may increase the risk of RA, while a diet rich in fruits, vegetables, and omega-3 fatty acids (found in fish) may be protective. The Mediterranean diet, which is high in anti-inflammatory nutrients, has been associated with a reduced risk of RA and improved outcomes in patients with the disease.
- Obesity is another important risk factor for RA. Obesity not only increases the risk of developing RA but also contributes to worse disease outcomes, including higher levels of inflammation, more severe joint damage, and reduced response to treatment. The link between obesity and RA is thought to be mediated by adipose tissue, which produces pro-inflammatory cytokines such as TNF-alpha and IL-6, key players in RA pathogenesis.

7. Infections

- As mentioned earlier, infections, particularly with certain viruses and bacteria, have been implicated in the development of RA. The exact role of these infections in RA pathogenesis is still under investigation, but they are believed to trigger autoimmune responses in genetically susceptible individuals. For example, EBV has been suggested as a potential trigger for RA due to its ability to modulate the immune system and its association with other autoimmune diseases. Periodontal disease, caused by the bacterium Porphyromonas gingivalis, has also been linked to RA. This bacterium is capable of inducing citrullination, a process that is central to the autoimmune response in RA. Individuals with severe periodontal disease have been found to have a higher risk of developing RA, and RA patients with periodontal disease tend to have more severe disease.

8. Hormonal Factors

- Hormonal changes, particularly those related to estrogen, play a significant role in the epidemiology of RA. The higher prevalence of RA in women suggests that estrogen may influence the immune response in ways that promote autoimmunity. The risk of developing RA increases after childbirth and decreases during pregnancy, likely due to the immunomodulatory effects of pregnancy-related hormonal changes. Conversely, the onset of menopause is associated with an increased risk of RA, possibly due to the decline in estrogen levels.
- Oral contraceptives and hormone replacement therapy (HRT) have been studied for their potential protective effects against RA, but the results have been mixed. Some studies suggest that these therapies may reduce the risk of RA, while others have found no significant effect.

Pivotal Endpoints in Rheumatoid Arthritis Clinical Trials

1. American College of Rheumatology (ACR) Response Criteria
2. Disease Activity Score 28 (DAS28)
3. Patient-Reported Outcomes (PROs)
4. Radiographic Progression
5. Clinical Remission
6. Safety Endpoints

INGENŪ CRO

1. Endpoint: ACR Response Criteria

- The American College of Rheumatology response criteria are among the most commonly used endpoints in RA clinical trials. The criteria measure the percentage improvement in the number of tender and swollen joints, as well as improvements in three of the five following parameters: patient pain assessment, patient global assessment, physician global assessment, patient self-assessed disability, and levels of acute-phase reactants like erythrocyte sedimentation rate (ESR) or C-reactive protein (CRP).
- ACR20, ACR50, ACR70: These measures represent a 20%, 50%, and 70% improvement, respectively, in the number of tender and swollen joints and other key measures.

Challenges:

- **Variability in Patient Response:** RA symptoms can fluctuate, making it difficult to assess consistent improvement.
- **Threshold Sensitivity:** Minor differences in joint counts or pain assessments can significantly impact whether a patient meets the ACR criteria, potentially leading to either underestimation or overestimation of treatment efficacy.

Solutions:

- **Stratified Analysis:** Utilizing ACR50 and ACR70 alongside ACR20 can provide a more comprehensive view of a treatment's efficacy.
- **Standardization:** Consistent training and calibration of investigators can reduce variability in assessments, improving the reliability of the ACR criteria.

2. Endpoint: Disease Activity Score 28

- The DAS28 is a composite score used to assess the severity of RA. It combines the number of swollen and tender joints (out of a total of 28), ESR or CRP levels, and the patient's global assessment of health.

Challenges:

- **Composite Nature:** The DAS28 score is influenced by multiple factors, and a change in one component (e.g., CRP levels) can disproportionately affect the overall score, leading to potential misinterpretation of disease activity.
- **Sensitivity to Change:** DAS28 may not always capture small but clinically significant changes in disease activity, particularly in patients with low disease activity.

Solutions:

- **Use of DAS28-CRP vs. DAS28-ESR:** CRP is a more specific marker of inflammation than ESR, and using DAS28-CRP may reduce variability and improve the accuracy of the disease activity assessment.
- **Integration with Other Measures:** Combining DAS28 with patient-reported outcomes or imaging results can provide a more holistic view of disease activity.

INGENŪ CRO

3. Endpoint: PROs

- Patient-Reported Outcomes are increasingly recognized as critical endpoints in RA trials, as they directly measure the patient's perspective on their symptoms, treatment impact, and overall quality of life. Common PROs include the Health Assessment Questionnaire (HAQ) and visual analog scales (VAS) for pain, fatigue, and overall health.

Challenges:

- **Subjectivity:** PROs are inherently subjective and can be influenced by a patient's mood, expectations, and external factors unrelated to the disease or treatment.
- **Variability:** Different patients may interpret the scales differently, leading to variability in the results.

Solutions:

- **Standardization of Instruments:** Using validated and standardized PRO instruments can reduce variability and improve the reliability of these endpoints.
- **Frequent Assessments:** Regular collection of PRO data throughout the trial can help capture the true impact of the treatment on the patient's quality of life.

4. Endpoint: Radiographic Progression

- Radiographic assessment of joint damage is a critical endpoint in RA trials, often used to evaluate the long-term efficacy of a treatment in preventing structural damage to the joints. This is typically measured using X-rays and scoring systems like the Sharp/van der Heijde method.

Challenges:

- **Slow Progression:** Radiographic changes can take years to develop, making it challenging to assess treatment efficacy in short-term trials.
- **Inter-Reader Variability:** Scoring radiographs is somewhat subjective, and variability between readers can affect the consistency of results.

Solutions:

- **Blinded Central Reading:** Using blinded central readers to assess radiographs can reduce inter-reader variability and improve the reliability of the endpoint.
- **Use of MRI and Ultrasound:** These imaging modalities are more sensitive to early joint changes than X-rays and can be used in conjunction with radiographs to provide a more comprehensive assessment of joint health.

INGENŪ CRO

5. Endpoint: Clinical Remission

- Clinical remission is the ultimate goal in RA treatment and is defined as the absence of significant disease activity. Remission can be assessed using various criteria, such as the DAS28, ACR/EULAR Boolean definition, or simplified disease activity index (SDAI).

Challenges:

- **Stringency of Criteria:** The criteria for remission are stringent, and achieving them can be difficult, particularly in patients with long-standing RA or those with comorbidities.
- **Sustainability:** Even if remission is achieved, maintaining it over the long term is challenging and often requires ongoing therapy.

Solutions:

- **Treat-to-Target (T2T) Approach:** This strategy involves regular monitoring and adjusting therapy to achieve and maintain remission. It has been shown to improve remission rates in clinical practice.
- **Use of Biomarkers:** Incorporating biomarkers that predict sustained remission can help tailor treatment strategies and improve the likelihood of achieving this endpoint

6. Endpoint: Safety Endpoints

- Safety is a critical component of any clinical trial, particularly in RA, where long-term immunosuppression can lead to significant risks, including infections, malignancies, and cardiovascular events.

Challenges:

- **Balancing Efficacy and Safety:** The challenge lies in demonstrating that a treatment is both effective and safe over the long term, especially when adverse events may take years to manifest.
- **Detection of Rare Events:** Rare but serious adverse events may not be detected in small or short-term trials, necessitating longer follow-up and larger patient populations.

Solutions:

- **Long-Term Follow-Up:** Including long-term safety monitoring in the trial design can help detect late-emerging adverse events.
- **Pharmacovigilance Plans:** Post-marketing surveillance and robust pharmacovigilance plans are essential to monitor and manage safety risks after the drug is approved and used in broader populations.

FDA Approved Drugs

Conventional DMARDs (Disease-Modifying Antirheumatic Drugs)

- **Methotrexate (1988):** Dihydrofolate reductase inhibitor, used to reduce inflammation and slow disease progression.
- **Hydroxychloroquine (1955):** Toll-like receptor inhibitor, used for mild to moderate RA management.
- **Sulfasalazine (1950):** Immune system modulator, often used in combination therapy for mild to moderate RA.
- **Leflunomide (1998):** Pyrimidine synthesis inhibitor, reduces inflammation and slows joint damage.

Biologic DMARDs

- **Adalimumab (Humira, 2002):** TNF-alpha inhibitor, reduces inflammation, pain, and prevents joint damage.
- **Etanercept (Enbrel, 1998):** TNF-alpha inhibitor, similar effects as Humira.
- **Infliximab (Remicade, 1999):** TNF-alpha inhibitor, used in combination with methotrexate for more severe cases.
- **Rituximab (Rituxan, 2006):** CD20 inhibitor, reduces B cell-mediated autoimmunity, used in refractory cases.
- **Tocilizumab (Actemra, 2010):** IL-6 receptor antagonist, reduces inflammation and joint damage.
- **Abatacept (Orencia, 2005):** T-cell activation inhibitor, prevents T-cell mediated inflammation.

Targeted Synthetic DMARDs

- **Tofacitinib (Xeljanz, 2012):** JAK inhibitor, reduces inflammation and modulates immune response, used in refractory cases.
- **Baricitinib (Olumiant, 2018):** JAK inhibitor, similar to tofacitinib, used in refractory cases.
- **Upadacitinib (Rinvoq, 2019):** JAK inhibitor, provides similar therapeutic effects as other JAK inhibitors

Other FDA-Approved Drugs

- **Anakinra (Kineret, 2001):** IL-1 receptor antagonist, less commonly used due to the availability of more effective biologics

Top 5 Most Commonly Prescribed Drugs for Rheumatoid Arthritis

Drug Name	Year of Approval	Sponsor	Mechanism of Action	Therapeutic Effects
Methotrexate	1988	Multiple Generics	Dihydrofolate reductase inhibitor	Reduces inflammation and slows disease progression
Adalimumab (Humira)	2002	AbbVie	TNF-alpha inhibitor	Reduces inflammation, pain, and prevents joint damage
Etanercept (Enbrel)	1998	Amgen	TNF-alpha inhibitor	Reduces inflammation, pain, and prevents joint damage
Tocilizumab (Actemra)	2010	Roche/Genentech	IL-6 receptor antagonist	Reduces inflammation and joint damage
Leflunomide	1998	Sanofi	Pyrimidine synthesis inhibitor	Reduces inflammation and slows joint damage

Pivotal Trials that Demonstrated the Efficacy of FDA Approved Drugs

Drug Name	Clinical Identifier/ Trial Acronym	Key Findings and Statistical Data
Methotrexate	MIRA (Methotrexate in Rheumatoid Arthritis), COBRA trial.	• **Efficacy in RA:** The MIRA trial demonstrated that Methotrexate significantly reduced RA symptoms and slowed the progression of joint damage. It became the gold standard for RA treatment because it provided superior disease control compared to other DMARDs available at the time. • **Long-Term Disease Control:** The COBRA trial further supported Methotrexate's role in long-term disease management, showing that it could be effectively combined with other therapies to achieve and maintain low disease activity.
Adalimumab (Humira)	ARMADA Trial (Anti-TNF Research Study Program of the Monoclonal Antibody D2E7 in RA), DE019 trials and STAR studies.	• **Efficacy in RA:** • **ARMADA Trial:** Showed that Adalimumab led to significant improvements in RA symptoms, with a higher proportion of patients achieving ACR20, ACR50, and ACR70 responses compared to placebo. This trial was crucial in showing the benefit of adding Adalimumab to methotrexate therapy for enhanced symptom control. • **DE019 Trial:** Highlighted Adalimumab's ability to reduce the rate of joint damage, as measured by radiographic progression. The trial demonstrated that patients receiving Adalimumab experienced less joint damage and better maintenance of physical function compared to those on methotrexate alone. • **STAR Trial:** Focused on the safety profile of Adalimumab, confirming its long-term safety in patients with RA. The study observed that while infections were a concern, the overall benefit-to-risk ratio remained favorable for long-term use in reducing RA symptoms and slowing disease progression.
Etanercept (Enbrel)	TEMPO (Trial of Etanercept and Methotrexate with Radiographic Patient Outcomes) and ERA (Etanercept Rheumatoid Arthritis) trial.	• **TEMPO Trial:** The study found that 77% of patients on the combination therapy of Etanercept and Methotrexate achieved significant improvement according to the American College of Rheumatology (ACR) criteria (ACR 20), compared to 59% with Etanercept alone. Importantly, the combination therapy also showed a marked reduction in the progression of joint damage as measured by radiographic scoring. • **ERA Trial:** Demonstrated that Etanercept monotherapy was effective in reducing RA symptoms and inhibiting joint damage in patients with early RA. The study highlighted that early intervention with Etanercept could significantly alter the disease's progression.
Tocilizumab (Actemra)	LITHE, OPTION, and AMBITION trials	• **LITHE Trial:** Showed that patients receiving Tocilizumab experienced significant reductions in the rate of joint damage progression, as measured by radiographic outcomes. It also demonstrated substantial improvements in physical function and disease activity scores, leading to its approval for RA patients with inadequate responses to other DMARDs. • O**PTION Trial:** Found that Tocilizumab, when combined with methotrexate, led to greater reductions in RA symptoms compared to methotrexate alone. The combination therapy also resulted in higher remission rates, underscoring Tocilizumab's role as an effective add-on treatment for RA. • **AMBITION Trial:** This trial highlighted that Tocilizumab as monotherapy was more effective in reducing RA symptoms and improving physical function compared to methotrexate alone. This was significant because it demonstrated that Tocilizumab could be a viable option for patients who are unable to tolerate methotrexate.
Leflunomide	MN301, US301, and the Leflunomide Trial in Early Rheumatoid Arthritis (LETIRA) study.	• **MN301 and US301 Trials:** These studies demonstrated that Leflunomide was significantly more effective than placebo in reducing RA symptoms and inhibiting the progression of structural joint damage, with efficacy comparable to methotrexate. Leflunomide was particularly noted for its ability to improve physical function and reduce joint swelling and pain. • **LETIRA Study:** The study confirmed that Leflunomide was effective as a first-line treatment in early RA, showing similar efficacy to methotrexate in controlling disease activity and slowing joint damage. This was crucial in establishing Leflunomide as a viable alternative for patients who could not tolerate methotrexate.

Approved Product Analysis: Adalimumab

14.1 Rheumatoid Arthritis

Population	Endpoint	Scales Used	Time Point	Sample Size	Magnitude of Improvement
Adults with Active RA (Study RA-II)	ACR 20, ACR 50, ACR 70 responses, Physical Function	ACR response criteria, HAQ-DI	26 weeks	N=267 (110 Placebo, 113 HUMIRA 40 mg QOW, 103 HUMIRA 40 mg QW)	ACR 20: 46% (QOW) / 53% (QW) vs 19% (Placebo) **p<0.01** ACR 50: 22% (QOW) / 35% (QW) vs 8% (Placebo) **p<0.01** ACR 70: 12% (QOW) / 18% (QW) vs 2% (Placebo) **p<0.01** HAQ-DI: Significant improvement compared to placebo.
Adults with Active RA (Study RA-III)	ACR 20, ACR 50, ACR 70 responses, Radiographic Progression, Physical Function	ACR response criteria, Sharp Score, HAQ-DI	24, 52 weeks	N=407 (200 Placebo/MTX, 207 HUMIRA/MTX)	ACR 20: 63% (HUMIRA/MTX) vs 30% (Placebo/MTX) at 24 weeks **p<0.01** ACR 50: 39% (HUMIRA/MTX) vs 10% (Placebo/MTX) at 24 weeks **p<0.01** Sharp Score: 0.1 vs 2.7 at 12 months **p<0.001** HAQ-DI: Significant improvement compared to placebo.
Adults with Active RA (Study RA-IV)	ACR 20, ACR 50, ACR 70 responses, Physical Function	ACR response criteria, HAQ-DI, SF-36	24 weeks	N=636	ACR 20: 53% (HUMIRA) vs 35% (Placebo) **p<0.001** HAQ-DI: Significant improvement compared to placebo.
Adults with Active RA (Study RA-V)	ACR 20, ACR 50, ACR 70 responses, Radiographic Progression, Physical Function	ACR response criteria, Sharp Score, HAQ-DI	52, 104 weeks	N=799 (257 MTX, 274 HUMIRA, 268 HUMIRA/MTX)	ACR 20: 54% (HUMIRA) vs 63% (MTX) vs 73% (HUMIRA/MTX) at 52 weeks **p<0.05** ACR 50: 41% (HUMIRA) vs 46% (MTX) vs 62% (HUMIRA/MTX) at 52 weeks **p<0.05** Sharp Score: 3.0 (HUMIRA) vs 5.7 (MTX) vs 1.3 (HUMIRA/MTX) at 52 weeks **p<0.001** HAQ-DI: Significant improvement compared to placebo.

Approved Product Analysis: Etanercept

14.1 Adult Rheumatoid Arthritis

Population	Endpoint	Scales Used	Time Point	Sample Size	Magnitude of Improvement
Adults with Active RA (Study I)	ACR 20, ACR 50, ACR 70 responses	ACR response criteria	3, 6 months	N=158 (80 Placebo, 78 Enbrel)	ACR 20: 62% vs 23% (Month 3); 59% vs 11% (Month 6) **p < 0.01** Enbrel vs Placebo ACR 50: 41% vs 8% (Month 3); 40% vs 5% (Month 6) **p < 0.01** Enbrel vs Placebo ACR 70: 15% vs 4% (Month 3); 15% vs 1% (Month 6) **p < 0.01** Enbrel vs Placebo
Adults with Active RA on MTX (Study II)	ACR 20, ACR 50, ACR 70 responses	ACR response criteria	3, 6 months	N=89 (30 MTX/Placebo, 59 MTX/Enbrel)	ACR 20: 66% vs 33% (Month 3); 71% vs 27% (Month 6) **p < 0.01** Enbrel vs MTX/Placebo ACR 50: 42% vs 0% (Month 3); 39% vs 3% (Month 6) **p < 0.01** Enbrel vs Placebo ACR 70: 15% vs 0% (Month 3); 15% vs 0% (Month 6) **p < 0.01** Enbrel vs Placebo
Adults with Early Active RA (Study III)	ACR 20, ACR 50, ACR 70 responses	ACR response criteria	3, 6, 12 months	N=424 (217 MTX, 207 Enbrel)	ACR 20: 62% vs 56% (Month 3); 65% vs 58% (Month 6); 72% vs 65% (Month 12) **p < 0.05** Enbrel vs MTX (ACR 70 at Month 12: 25% vs 22%)
Adults with RA of 6 Months to 20 Years (Study IV)	ACR 20, ACR 50, ACR 70 responses, Major Clinical Response (ACR 70 sustained)	ACR response criteria	12 months	N=682 (228 MTX, 223 Enbrel, 231 Enbrel/MTX)	ACR 20: 47% (Enbrel) vs 40% (MTX) vs 63% (Enbrel/MTX) ACR 50: 43% (Enbrel) vs 36% (MTX) vs 63% (Enbrel/MTX) ACR 70: 22% (Enbrel) vs 17% (MTX) vs 40% (Enbrel/MTX) **p < 0.05**
Adults with Active RA (Study I - Components)	Components of ACR response: Number of tender/swollen joints, Pain, CRP, etc.	Tender/Swollen Joints, VAS, ESR, CRP, HAQ	3 months	N=158 (80 Placebo, 78 Enbrel)	Significant reduction in tender joints: 10.0 vs 29.5 (Enbrel vs Placebo), CRP levels: 0.9 vs 3.9 mg/dL **p < 0.01** Enbrel vs Placebo
Adults with Active RA	Symptom Return and Reintroduction of Enbrel, Long-term response	N/A	Up to 60 months	N/A	Symptoms generally return within a month after discontinuation. Reintroduction after up to 18 months showed the same magnitude of response. Durable responses seen for over 60 months without interruption. Many patients reduced or discontinued MTX or corticosteroids while maintaining response.
Adults with Active RA (Physical Function)	Physical function and disability using HAQ, SF-36	HAQ, SF-36	6, 12 months	N/A	Significant improvement in HAQ scores across studies. Enbrel showed greater improvement in physical function and disability measures compared to placebo and MTX. All domains improved with Enbrel.
Adults with Active RA (Radiographic Response)	Radiographic progression (Total Sharp Score, Erosion Score, JSN Score)	Total Sharp Score, Erosion Score, JSN Score	6, 12, 24 months	N=424 (Study III: 217 MTX, 207 Enbrel)	Study III: Enbrel showed significant reduction in TSS and Erosion Score compared to MTX at 6 and 12 months **p < 0.05**. Continued inhibition of structural damage observed at 24 months.
Adults with Active RA of 6 Months to 20 Years (Radiographic Response)	Radiographic progression (Total Sharp Score, Erosion Score, JSN Score)	Total Sharp Score, Erosion Score, JSN Score	12 months	N=642 (Study IV: 212 MTX, 212 Enbrel, 218 Enbrel/MTX)	Study IV: Enbrel showed significant reduction in TSS and Erosion Score compared to MTX **p < 0.05**. Combination therapy (Enbrel/MTX) showed further reduction in radiographic progression.

Approved Product Analysis: Tocilizumab

14.1 Rheumatoid Arthritis – Intravenous Administration

Population	Endpoint	Scales Used	Time Point	Sample Size	Magnitude of Improvement
Adults with moderate to severe active rheumatoid arthritis, MTX-naïve	Proportion achieving ACR 20/50/70 responses	ACR 20, ACR 50, ACR 70	Week 24, Week 52	Study I: N=286 (ACTEMRA 8 mg/kg) vs N=284 (MTX)	Week 24: ACR 20 (70% vs 53%), ACR 50 (44% vs 34%), ACR 70 (28% vs 15%)
Adults with moderate to severe active rheumatoid arthritis, inadequate response to MTX	Proportion achieving ACR 20/50/70 responses, Change in Sharp-Genant Score, HAQ-DI improvement	ACR 20, ACR 50, ACR 70, Sharp-Genant Score, HAQ-DI	Week 24, Week 52, Week 104	Study II: N=353 (ACTEMRA 8 mg/kg) vs N=343 (ACTEMRA 4 mg/kg) vs N=294 (Placebo)	Week 24: ACR 20 (47% vs 30% vs 27%), Week 52: Sharp-Genant Score (-0.90 vs -0.83 vs 1.17), HAQ-DI (≥0.3 units improvement in 63% and 60% vs 53%)
Adults with moderate to severe active rheumatoid arthritis, inadequate response to MTX	Proportion achieving ACR 20/50/70 responses	ACR 20, ACR 50, ACR 70	Week 24	Study III: N=205 (ACTEMRA 8 mg/kg) vs N=213 (ACTEMRA 4 mg/kg) vs N=204 (Placebo)	Week 24: ACR 20 (48% vs 32% vs 27%), ACR 50 (44% vs 23% vs 10%), ACR 70 (21% vs 11% vs 2%)
Adults with inadequate response to existing therapy, including DMARDs	Proportion achieving ACR 20 response	ACR 20	Week 24	Study IV: N=803 (ACTEMRA 8 mg/kg) vs N=413 (Placebo)	Week 24: ACR 20 (61% vs 24%)
Adults with inadequate response or intolerance to TNF antagonists	Proportion achieving ACR 20 response	ACR 20	Week 24	Study V: N=170 (ACTEMRA 8 mg/kg) vs N=161 (ACTEMRA 4 mg/kg) vs N=158 (Placebo)	Week 24: ACR 20 (30% vs 12% vs 10%)
Adults with moderate to severe active rheumatoid arthritis, inadequate response to MTX	Proportion achieving DAS28-ESR < 2.6	DAS28-ESR	Week 52	Study II: N=399 (ACTEMRA 4 mg/kg) vs N=398 (ACTEMRA 8 mg/kg) vs N=393 (Placebo)	DAS28-ESR < 2.6: 32% (8 mg/kg) vs 18% (4 mg/kg) vs 3% (Placebo)
Adults with moderate to severe active rheumatoid arthritis, inadequate response to MTX	Change from baseline in Sharp-Genant Score	Sharp-Genant Score, Erosion Score, Joint Space Narrowing	Week 52, Week 104	Study II: N=353 (ACTEMRA 8 mg/kg) vs N=343 (ACTEMRA 4 mg/kg) vs N=294 (Placebo)	Significant reduction in radiographic progression (Sharp-Genant: -0.90 vs -0.83 vs 1.17 at Week 52)
Adults with moderate to severe active rheumatoid arthritis, inadequate response to MTX	Improvement in physical function and disability	HAQ-DI	Week 52	Study II: N=353 (ACTEMRA 8 mg/kg) vs N=343 (ACTEMRA 4 mg/kg) vs N=294 (Placebo)	Clinically significant improvement in HAQ-DI (63% vs 60% vs 53% ≥0.3 units improvement)

Approved Product Analysis: Tocilizumab (cont.)

14.2 Rheumatoid Arthritis–Subcutaneous Administration

Population	Endpoint	Scales Used	Time Point	Sample Size	Magnitude of Improvement
Adults with Active RA, Moderate to Severe (Study SC-I)	ACR 20, ACR 50, ACR 70 responses, DAS28 < 2.6	ACR response criteria, DAS28	24 weeks	N=1,095 (558 ACTEMRA SC 162 mg weekly + DMARD, 537 ACTEMRA IV 8 mg/kg + DMARD)	ACR 20: 69% (SC 162 mg) vs 73.4% (IV 8 mg/kg) **95% CI: -4.0, 1.2** ACR 50: 47% (SC 162 mg) vs 49% (IV 8 mg/kg) **95% CI: -7.5, 4.0** ACR 70: 24% (SC 162 mg) vs 28% (IV 8 mg/kg) **95% CI: -9.0, 1.3** DAS28 < 2.6: 38.4% (SC 162 mg) vs 36.9% (IV 8 mg/kg) **95% CI: 0.9, 6.8**
Adults with Active RA, Moderate to Severe (Study SC-II)	ACR 20, ACR 50, ACR 70 responses, DAS28 < 2.6, Radiographic Progression	ACR response criteria, DAS28, mTSS	24 weeks	N=656 (437 ACTEMRA SC 162 mg every other week + DMARD, 219 Placebo + DMARD)	ACR 20: 61% (ACTEMRA SC 162 mg) vs 32% (Placebo) **95% CI: 22.0, 37.0** ACR 50: 40% (SC 162 mg) vs 12% (Placebo) **95% CI: 21.5, 34.4** ACR 70: 20% (SC 162 mg) vs 5% (Placebo) **95% CI: 9.8, 19.9** DAS28 < 2.6: 32% (SC 162 mg) vs 4% (Placebo) **95% CI: 22.0, 35.2** Radiographic: mTSS mean change: 0.62 (SC 162 mg) vs 1.23 (Placebo) **95% CI: -1.1, -0.1**
Adults with Active RA, Moderate to Severe (Study SC-I & SC-II)	Physical function and disability using HAQ-DI	HAQ-DI	24 weeks	N=1,751 (SC-I & SC-II combined populations)	Mean HAQ-DI change: 0.6 (SC every week), 0.6 (IV 8 mg/kg), 0.4 (SC every other week), 0.3 (Placebo). Clinically relevant improvement in HAQ-DI: 65% (SC every week), 67% (IV 8 mg/kg), 58% (SC every other week), 47% (Placebo)

Approved Product Analysis: Leflunomide

Population	Endpoint	Scales Used	Time Point	Sample Size	Magnitude of Improvement
Adults with active RA (≥18 years, ARA functional class I-III)	Reduction of signs and symptoms	ACR 20, ACR 50, ACR 70	12 months	Trial 1: N=178 (ARAVA), N=180 (MTX), N=118 (Placebo)	ACR 20: 52% (ARAVA) vs 46% (MTX) vs 26% (Placebo); ACR 50: 34% (ARAVA) vs 23% (MTX) vs 8% (Placebo); ACR 70: 20% (ARAVA) vs 9% (MTX) vs 4% (Placebo)
Adults with active RA (≥18 years, ARA functional class I-III)	Reduction of signs and symptoms	ACR 20, ACR 50, ACR 70	6 months	Trial 2: N=130 (ARAVA), N=132 (Sulfasalazine), N=91 (Placebo)	ACR 20: 55% (ARAVA) vs 57% (Sulfasalazine) vs 29% (Placebo); ACR 50: 33% (ARAVA) vs 30% (Sulfasalazine) vs 14% (Placebo); ACR 70: 10% (ARAVA) vs 8% (Sulfasalazine) vs 2% (Placebo)
Adults with active RA (≥18 years, ARA functional class I-III)	Reduction of signs and symptoms	ACR 20, ACR 50, ACR 70	12 months	Trial 3: N=495 (ARAVA), N=489 (MTX)	ACR 20: 51% (ARAVA) vs 65% (MTX); ACR 50: 31% (ARAVA) vs 44% (MTX); ACR 70: 10% (ARAVA) vs 16% (MTX)
Adults with active RA (≥18 years, ARA functional class I-III)	Inhibition of structural damage	Sharp Score	12 months	Trial 1: N=178 (ARAVA), N=180 (MTX), N=118 (Placebo)	Change in Sharp Score: -0.53 (ARAVA) vs -0.89 (MTX) vs 2.16 (Placebo)
Adults with active RA (≥18 years, ARA functional class I-III)	Inhibition of structural damage	Sharp Score	6 months	Trial 2: N=130 (ARAVA), N=132 (Sulfasalazine), N=91 (Placebo)	Change in Sharp Score: -2.32 (ARAVA) vs -5.88 (Sulfasalazine) vs 1.23 (Placebo)
Adults with active RA (≥18 years, ARA functional class I-III)	Inhibition of structural damage	Sharp Score	12 months	Trial 3: N=495 (ARAVA), N=489 (MTX)	Change in Sharp Score: -2.48 (ARAVA) vs -1.62 (MTX)
Adults with active RA (≥18 years, ARA functional class I-III)	Improvement in physical function	HAQ-DI, SF-36 PCS	12 months	Trial 1: N=178 (ARAVA), N=180 (MTX), N=118 (Placebo)	HAQ-DI: -0.45 (ARAVA) vs -0.26 (MTX) vs -0.03 (Placebo); SF-36 PCS: Significant improvement with ARAVA ($p < 0.05$)
Adults with active RA (≥18 years, ARA functional class I-III)	Improvement in physical function	HAQ-DI, SF-36 PCS	6 months	Trial 2: N=130 (ARAVA), N=132 (Sulfasalazine), N=91 (Placebo)	HAQ-DI: -0.56 (ARAVA) vs -0.37 (Sulfasalazine) vs -0.08 (Placebo)
Adults with active RA (≥18 years, ARA functional class I-III)	Improvement in physical function	HAQ-DI, SF-36 PCS	12 months	Trial 3: N=495 (ARAVA), N=489 (MTX)	HAQ-DI: -0.54 (ARAVA) vs -0.44 (MTX)

Summary of Failed Drug Candidates for Rheumatoid Arthritis

Name of Drug	Clinical Trial Identifier	Reason for Termination / Drug Failure
Fostamatinib disodium	NCT01264770	• The trial was terminated due to AstraZeneca's decision to discontinue the development of fostamatinib for rheumatoid arthritis (RA) • Rights to fostamatinib were returned to Rigel Pharmaceuticals
Sirukumab	NCT01856309	• The trial was completed and findings suggested that there was no dose relationship or dose effect of sirukumab on neutropenia and more adverse events were reported during week 0-18
Baricitinib (4 mg dose)	NCT01721057	• Findings suggested increased thromboembolic events at higher doses
Filgotinib	MANTA studies	• Findings suggested concerns over male fertility impacts
Tregalizumab	NCT01999192	• Findings showed lack of efficacy in achieving primary endpoints

INGENŪ CRO

Unique Failure Points in Rheumatoid Arthritis Clinical Trials

1. Heterogeneity of Disease Presentation:

RA is a highly variable disease, with symptoms ranging from mild joint pain to severe systemic inflammation affecting multiple organs. This variability makes it difficult to design trials that can accurately capture the efficacy of a treatment across the entire spectrum of the disease.

2. Placebo Effect & Patient Expectations:

RA patients are typically well-informed about their condition and the potential benefits of emerging therapies, which can lead to an exaggerated placebo response. This effect can make it challenging to demonstrate the true efficacy of a new treatment, as improvements seen in the placebo group may diminish the perceived effectiveness of the investigational drug.

3. Endpoints Selection & Measurement Challenges:

Traditional endpoints, such as the ACR response criteria, DAS28, and PROs, may not fully capture the multifaceted nature of RA. For instance, while ACR20 (a 20% improvement according to ACR criteria) is a commonly used endpoint, it may not reflect significant clinical improvement in more severe cases of RA.

4. Patient Recruitment & Retention:

Recruitment and retention of patients in RA trials can be particularly challenging. RA patients are often enrolled in long-term, multi-center trials that require frequent visits, laboratory tests, and imaging studies. The burden of participation, combined with the chronic nature of RA, can lead to high dropout rates, which can compromise the validity of the trial results.

5. Safety Concerns & Adverse Events:

Safety is a critical concern in RA trials, particularly for biologic DMARDs and JAK inhibitors, which can increase the risk of infections, malignancies, and other serious adverse events. The need for extensive safety monitoring and the potential for severe adverse events can lead to early termination of trials or delays in drug approval.

6. Regulatory & Ethical Considerations:

The need to balance patient safety with the desire to bring new treatments to market quickly can result in stringent regulatory requirements that are difficult to meet. For example, the FDA may require additional safety data or post-marketing studies, which can delay approval or lead to the withdrawal of a drug from the market if concerns arise after approval.

Key Safety Concerns in Rheumatoid Arthritis Treatment

1. Infection Risk:

- RA treatments, particularly biologics and JAK inhibitors, suppress the immune system to reduce inflammation and prevent joint damage. However, this immunosuppression increases the risk of infections, including serious ones such as tuberculosis (TB), bacterial infections, and opportunistic infections like fungal infections.
- Management Strategies: Pre-treatment Screening, Regular Monitoring, and Vaccinations.

2. Cardiovascular Risk:

- RA itself is associated with an increased risk of cardiovascular disease (CVD) due to chronic systemic inflammation. Some RA treatments, particularly JAK inhibitors like tofacitinib (Xeljanz), have been linked to an elevated risk of cardiovascular events such as heart attacks and strokes, especially in patients with pre-existing risk factors.
- Management Strategies: Risk Assessment, Lifestyle Modifications, and Monitoring.

3. Malignancy Risk:

- RA itself is associated with an increased risk of cardiovascular disease (CVD) due to chronic systemic inflammation. Some RA treatments, particularly JAK inhibitors like tofacitinib (Xeljanz), have been linked to an elevated risk of cardiovascular events such as heart attacks and strokes, especially in patients with pre-existing risk factors.
- Management Strategies: Screening, Sun Protection, Patient Education.

4. Thromboembolic Events:

- JAK inhibitors like baricitinib (Olumiant) and tofacitinib have been associated with an increased risk of venous thromboembolism (VTE), including deep vein thrombosis (DVT) and pulmonary embolism (PE). This risk is particularly concerning in patients with a history of clotting disorders or cardiovascular risk factors.
- Management Strategies: Risk Stratification, Prophylaxis, and Monitoring.

5. Liver Toxicity:

- Drugs like methotrexate and leflunomide are metabolized by the liver and can cause hepatotoxicity, leading to elevated liver enzymes, fatty liver disease, or, in severe cases, liver failure.
- Management Strategies: Regular Liver Function Tests (LFTs), Alcohol Abstinence, and Alternative Therapies.

6. Gastrointestinal Issues:

- Drugs like methotrexate and leflunomide are metabolized by the liver and can cause hepatotoxicity, leading to elevated liver enzymes, fatty liver disease, or, in severe cases, liver failure.
- Management Strategies: Prophylactic Use of Proton Pump Inhibitors (PPIs), Folic Acid Supplementation, and GI Monitoring.

Standard of Care Treatment Options

1. Methotrexate as First-Line Therapy:

- Methotrexate remains the cornerstone of RA treatment due to its proven efficacy and long-term safety profile when used appropriately. It is usually the first DMARD prescribed, either alone or in combination with other DMARDs or biologics.

2. Biologics and Targeted DMARDs:

- For patients who do not respond adequately to methotrexate, biologics (e.g., TNF inhibitors like adalimumab and etanercept) or targeted synthetic DMARDs (e.g., JAK inhibitors like tofacitinib) are often added to the treatment regimen. These drugs are highly effective but require careful monitoring due to their associated risks.

3. Combination Therapy:

- Combination therapy, involving methotrexate with either another DMARD, a biologic, or a JAK inhibitor, is common in patients with moderate to severe RA. This approach can improve efficacy while potentially allowing for lower doses of each drug, thereby reducing the risk of side effects.

4. Patient Education and Lifestyle Modifications:

- Educating patients about their treatment options, potential side effects, and the importance of adherence is a critical component of RA management. Patients should be encouraged to adopt a healthy lifestyle, including regular exercise, a balanced diet, and smoking cessation, to complement their pharmacologic treatment and reduce overall disease burden.

5. Regular Monitoring and Follow-Up:

- Due to the chronic nature of RA and the potential for serious side effects, regular follow-up appointments are essential. This includes monitoring disease activity, assessing treatment response, and conducting regular blood tests to detect any early signs of adverse effects.

6. Corticosteroids and NSAIDs for Symptom Control:

- While corticosteroids and NSAIDs are not considered disease-modifying, they are often used for short-term symptom control, particularly during disease flares. Corticosteroids can be administered orally, intravenously, or as intra-articular injections, while NSAIDs are used primarily for pain relief. Long-term use of these medications is generally avoided due to their side effect profiles, including the risk of osteoporosis, hypertension, and GI complications.

INGENŪ CRO

Strategies for Expediting the FDA Approval Process

To expedite FDA approval for a new drug, various strategies can streamline the regulatory process while upholding safety and efficacy standards. This section highlights key methods for accelerating approval.

1. Fast Track Designation

Fast Track designation is intended for drugs that treat serious conditions and demonstrate the potential to address unmet medical needs.

How to Apply for Fast Track Designation:

1. Determine Eligibility
2. Prepare Your Request
3. Submit the Request
4. FDA Review
5. Post-Approval Engagement with FDA

2. Accelerated Approval Pathway

FDA regulatory mechanism that allows for the expedited approval of drugs that treat serious conditions and fill an unmet medical need based on a surrogate endpoint.

Key Features:

1. Use of Surrogate Endpoints: These are markers which are not directly a measure of clinical benefit but are believed to predict clinical benefit.
2. Conditional Approval: Drugs approved under the Accelerated Approval Pathway are required to undergo confirmatory trials after approval.
3. Eligibility Criteria: The drug must treat a serious condition, and there must be an unmet medical need.

3. Priority Review:

Priority Review designation directs the FDA to take action on an application within six months instead of the standard ten months.

Key Features of Priority Review:

1. Reduced Review Time: The FDA aims to review Priority Review applications within 6 months instead of the standard 10 months
2. Eligibility Criteria: To qualify, a drug must treat a serious condition and demonstrate the potential to provide a significant improvement in safety or effectiveness over existing therapies.
3. Application Process: The drug sponsor must request Priority Review when submitting a New Drug Application (NDA) or Biologics License Application (BLA) to the FDA.

Notable Key Opinion Leaders in Rheumatoid Arthritis Research

Name	Specialty	Designation	Location	Brief Bio
Peter T Nash (MBBS, FRACP)	Rheumatology	Professor, Griffith University	Queensland, Australia	Professor Peter T Nash is a leading rheumatologist based in Queensland, Australia. He is well-regarded in the field of rheumatology, with a particular focus on rheumatoid arthritis and other inflammatory joint diseases. He is frequently involved in clinical trials and has contributed significantly to the development of new therapies for rheumatic diseases. Professor Nash has published extensively in peer-reviewed journals and is a regular speaker at international conferences. He has received various awards for his contributions to the field.
Graeme Jones (MBBS, MD, FRACP)	Internal Medicine; Rheumatology	Professor, University of Tasmania	Tasmania, Australia	Professor Graeme Jones is a leading rheumatologist and epidemiologist with a focus on osteoporosis, osteoarthritis, and rheumatoid arthritis. He is the Head of the Musculoskeletal Unit at the Menzies Institute for Medical Research. Professor Jones is well-published in the field of rheumatology, particularly in the epidemiology and treatment of arthritis. He has been awarded the Distinguished Scientist Award from the Australian Rheumatology Association.
Ranjeny Thomas (MBBS, MD, FRACP)	Rheumatology	Professor, University of Queensland Diamantina Institute	Queensland, Australia	Professor Ranjeny Thomas is a respected authority in the field of immunology and rheumatology, particularly known for her work in rheumatoid arthritis. She is a pioneering researcher in the development of immunotherapies for autoimmune diseases. Professor Thomas has published over 150 peer-reviewed papers and holds multiple patents in the area of immunotherapy. She has received several accolades, including being named a Fellow of the Australian Academy of Health and Medical Sciences.
Flavia M Cicuttini (MBBS, PhD, FRACP)	Epidemiology; Rheumatology ;Preventive Medicine	Professor, Monash University	Victoria, Australia	Professor Flavia Cicuttini is a leading rheumatologist and clinical epidemiologist specializing in the study of osteoarthritis and rheumatoid arthritis. Based at Monash University in Victoria, she heads the Musculoskeletal Unit and has been instrumental in advancing research on the epidemiology and management of arthritis. Professor Cicuttini has received numerous accolades, including being named an Honorary Fellow of the American College of Rheumatology.
Rachelle Buchbinder (MBBS, MSc, FRACP)	Epidemiology; Preventive Medicine; Rheumatology	Professor, Monash University	Victoria, Australia	Professor Rachelle Buchbinder is a globally recognized rheumatologist and clinical epidemiologist based in Victoria, Australia. She is known for her research on the management of musculoskeletal disorders, including rheumatoid arthritis. Professor Buchbinder has authored numerous influential studies that have shaped clinical guidelines and policy. She is a Fellow of the Australian Academy of Health and Medical Sciences and has received multiple awards for her contributions to medical research, including the Australian Rheumatology Association's Distinguished Service Award.

References

- AstraZeneca. (n.d.). Discontinuation of fostamatinib for rheumatoid arthritis (RA). Clinical trial identifier: NCT01264770.
- Ebers Papyrus. (n.d.). Early documentation of joint pain and swelling symptoms resembling rheumatoid arthritis from ancient Egypt.
- Filgotinib MANTA studies. (n.d.). Effects of filgotinib on semen parameters and sex hormones in male patients with inflammatory diseases. PubMed. https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov
- Global burden of COPD: Systematic review and meta-analysis. (n.d.). PubMed. https://nih.gov
- Leflunomide Trial in Early Rheumatoid Arthritis (LETIRA) study. (n.d.). Effectiveness as a first-line treatment in early RA. Clinical trial identifier: MN301 & US301.
- MIRA (Methotrexate in Rheumatoid Arthritis) trial. (n.d.). Efficacy in reducing RA symptoms and long-term disease control.
- MANTA studies. (n.d.). Results from the phase 2 randomized, double-blind, placebo-controlled trials on filgotinib. PubMed. https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov
- Methotrexate in Rheumatoid Arthritis (MIRA), COBRA trial. (n.d.). Methotrexate's long-term disease control. Clinical trial identifier: MIRA.
- Remicade pivotal trial. (1999). TNF-alpha inhibitor treatment for severe cases of RA. Clinical trial identifier: ERA.
- Sirukumab clinical trials. (n.d.). Findings on neutropenia and adverse events during RA treatment. Clinical trial identifier: NCT01856309.
- SpringerLink & Frontiers. (n.d.). Studies showing the correlation between TNF inhibitors and tuberculosis risks during post-approval phases.
- Star Trial. (n.d.). Long-term safety profile of adalimumab for rheumatoid arthritis.

iNGENū CRO

The Australian CRO championing innovative biotech firms for global success.
Delivering high-quality, FDA-compliant clinical research.

If you would like further information on how iNGENū CRO can assist you to conduct your clinical trial, please contact Dr Sud Agarwal or Adam Moodie:

Dr Sud Agarwal
Chief Executive Officer
BSc (Hons), MB ChB FANZCA DDU
dr.sudhanshu@ingenucro.com

Adam Moodie
Director, Scientific Engagement
BSc
adam.moodie@ingenucro.com

Unit 22, 456 St Kilda Road, Melbourne, 3004

www.ingenuCRO.com