The Road to FDA Approval in IBS Clinical Trials:

Key Endpoints, Challenges, and Success Strategies

INGENŪ CRO

Introduction

Irritable Bowel Syndrome (IBS) is a complex, chronic gastrointestinal disorder that significantly impacts the quality of life for millions worldwide.

Characterized by abdominal pain, bloating, and altered bowel habits, IBS presents in diverse forms, including diarrhea-predominant (IBS-D), constipation-predominant (IBS-C), and mixed-subtype (IBS-M). Despite its prevalence—affecting an estimated 7-15% of the global population—IBS remains a challenging condition to diagnose and treat due to its multifactorial etiology, ranging from gut-brain axis dysregulation to psychological and environmental contributors.

This whitepaper provides a comprehensive analysis of IBS, incorporating the latest research, epidemiological data, and therapeutic advancements. It explores diagnostic criteria, patient stratification strategies, and the evolution of treatment paradigms, with a focus on enhancing clinical outcomes through personalized medicine. Additionally, it highlights pivotal challenges in drug development and the need for innovative clinical trial designs to address the high placebo response and symptom heterogeneity.

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.

Insights on Irritable Bowel Syndrome

Disease Overview

Irritable Bowel Syndrome (IBS) is a chronic gastrointestinal disorder characterized by abdominal pain, bloating, and altered bowel habits, including diarrhea, constipation, or a combination of both. It is classified as a functional gastrointestinal disorder because its symptoms occur without visible structural abnormalities of the digestive tract. IBS significantly impacts patients' quality of life, leading to increased healthcare utilization and economic burden.

Key Characteristics of IBS

- **Chronic and recurrent symptoms:** Fluctuating patterns of abdominal discomfort and bowel irregularity.
- **Heterogeneous presentation:** Categorized into IBS with constipation (IBS-C), IBS with diarrhea (IBS-D), and mixed IBS (IBS-M).
- **Triggers and variability:** Symptoms can be triggered by stress, certain foods, hormonal changes, or infections.
- **Absence of structural abnormalities:** Diagnosis relies on symptom-based criteria rather than imaging or biomarkers.

Historical Perspectives

IBS was initially recognized as a psychosomatic condition, largely attributed to stress and emotional disorders. Over time, research has shifted to focus on complex interactions between the gut and brain, gut microbiota, immune dysregulation, and genetic predispositions. Advances in diagnostic criteria, such as the Rome criteria, have refined the clinical approach to IBS over the decades.

Contributing Factors

Biological Factors

IBS stems from disruptions in the gut-brain axis, leading to abnormal motility, visceral hypersensitivity, and a weakened intestinal barrier. Gut microbiota imbalances (dysbiosis) drive low-grade inflammation and neurotransmitter changes, worsening symptoms. While genetics play a minor role, some predisposition is suggested by familial patterns and specific gene variants.

Psychological Factors

Anxiety, depression, and stress are common in IBS, with chronic stress activating the HPA axis, altering hormone and neurotransmitter levels, and worsening symptoms. This has led to treatments like CBT, biofeedback, and mindfulness-based interventions.

Environmental Factors

Diet, particularly FODMAP-rich foods, triggers bloating and discomfort. Post-infectious IBS (PI-IBS) highlights how infections can induce long-term gut changes. Western diets high in processed foods and low in fiber increase risk, while lifestyle factors like inactivity and poor sleep further contribute to IBS.

Trends and Market for Treatment

Prevalence and Trends

- **Global Prevalence:**

  IBS affects 7-15% of the global population. The prevalence in the U.S. is approximately 10-12%.

- **Trends (2013-2023):**

  Increased awareness, better diagnostic criteria, and a rise in post-infectious cases have contributed to a steady prevalence.

- **Future Projections (2023-2033):**

  Prevalence is expected to remain stable, with shifts influenced by lifestyle changes and public health interventions.

Advancements in Research

Research into the gut-brain axis, gut microbiota, and novel pharmacological targets has paved the way for personalized therapies. Advances in non-invasive biomarkers and artificial intelligence in diagnostics are promising.

Market Analysis

The IBS treatment market was valued at USD 1.5 billion in 2023 and is expected to grow at a compound annual growth rate (CAGR) of 7.5%, driven by new drug approvals and increasing disease awareness.

Drug Name	Manufacturer	Market Share (%)	Earning Potential (USD million)
Linzess (linaclotide)	Ironwood Pharmaceuticals	30%	450
Xifaxan (rifaximin)	Salix Pharmaceuticals	25%	375
Viberzi (eluxadoline)	Allergan	20%	300
Amitiza (lubiprostone)	Takeda Pharmaceuticals	15%	225
Lotronex (alosetron)	Sebela Pharmaceuticals	10%	150

Diagnostic Criteria

ICD-11 Code: DD91.0Z

Diagnostic Criteria

Irritable Bowel Syndrome (IBS) is classified under ICD-11 code DD91.0Z, denoting "Irritable bowel syndrome, type unspecified." This classification is used when IBS is diagnosed without specifying a predominant bowel habit. The general diagnostic criteria include:

1. **Recurrent Abdominal Pain:** The individual experiences abdominal pain or discomfort at least one day per week in the last three months.
2. **Symptom Association:** The abdominal pain is associated with two or more of the following:
   - Related to Defecation: Pain improves or worsens with defecation.
   - Change in Stool Frequency: Onset associated with a change in how often stools are passed.
   - Change in Stool Form: Onset associated with a change in the appearance or form of stool.
3. **Symptom Duration:** Symptoms must have started at least six months before diagnosis, with active symptoms present in the last three months.

Evolution Over Time

Initially, IBS was considered a psychosomatic condition, with symptoms attributed primarily to psychological factors. Over time, research has illuminated the complex interplay between the gut and the brain, leading to the recognition of IBS as a functional gastrointestinal disorder with multifactorial etiology, including biological, psychological, and environmental components. The development of standardized diagnostic criteria has refined the diagnosis of IBS, moving from a diagnosis of exclusion to a positive diagnosis based on specific symptom patterns. The ICD-11's inclusion of specific codes for IBS subtypes, including DD91.0Z for unspecified types, reflects this nuanced understanding and allows for more precise classification in clinical practice.

Impact on Clinical & Research Perspectives

Clinically, the ability to diagnose IBS based on specific criteria has reduced the reliance on extensive exclusionary testing, facilitating earlier and more accurate diagnosis. This specificity enables healthcare providers to tailor treatment strategies to individual patients, improving symptom management and quality of life. In research, standardized diagnostic criteria have enhanced the consistency and comparability of studies, fostering a better understanding of IBS's pathophysiology and the development of targeted therapies. The detailed subtyping in ICD-11, including the unspecified category (DD91.0Z), acknowledges the heterogeneity of IBS presentations and supports personalized medicine approaches.

Epidemiology of Irritable Bowel Syndrome

Global Prevalence

IBS is a prevalent disorder affecting 7-15% of the global population. Studies indicate regional variability, with higher prevalence rates reported in Western countries compared to Asia and Africa, potentially due to differences in diagnostic awareness and dietary habits. Increasing research and healthcare accessibility in low- and middle-income countries have led to improved recognition of IBS, revealing previously underreported cases.

Prevalence by Age

IBS is most commonly diagnosed in individuals aged 20-50 years, though it can occur in children and older adults. The onset of symptoms often coincides with early adulthood, a period associated with increased stress and significant lifestyle changes. In older populations, prevalence rates may decline, potentially due to underreporting or symptom overlap with other age-related conditions like diverticulosis.

Prevalence by Gender

Women are approximately twice as likely as men to develop IBS. Hormonal factors, particularly fluctuations in estrogen and progesterone levels, may contribute to this disparity, as symptoms often worsen during menstruation or hormonal transitions like menopause. Men may also be less likely to seek medical attention for IBS, contributing to a lower reported prevalence.

Prevalence by Race and Ethnicity

IBS prevalence varies significantly by race and ethnicity. Studies suggest that Caucasians have higher reported rates of IBS compared to African Americans and Asians, which may be influenced by cultural attitudes toward seeking healthcare and symptom reporting. However, emerging data indicate that underdiagnosis and differences in diagnostic criteria may mask the true prevalence in minority populations, necessitating more inclusive research methodologies.

Pivotal Endpoints for Irritable Bowel Syndrome Clinical Trials

1. Symptom Relief

- Directly improves quality of life.

Challenge:

- Measuring symptom relief is subjective, as it relies on patient-reported outcomes, which can be influenced by recall bias and individual variability.

Solution:

- Standardize patient-reported outcome measures using validated questionnaires like the IBS Symptom Severity Score (IBS-SSS). Incorporate real-time symptom tracking tools (e.g., digital diaries) to minimize recall bias.

2. Stool Consistency Changes

- Indicator of bowel habit normalization.

Challenge:

- Variability in stool consistency can arise from diet, hydration, and environmental factors, complicating the ability to attribute changes directly to treatment.

Solution:

- Use the Bristol Stool Form Scale (BSFS) as a standardized tool for assessing stool consistency. Educate patients on maintaining consistent dietary and hydration practices during assessments to reduce confounding factors.

3. Psychological Well-Being

- Impacts gut-brain axis and symptoms.

Challenge:

- Psychological well-being is inherently subjective and may fluctuate independently of IBS symptoms, making it difficult to establish direct causality.

Solution:

- Combine subjective psychological scales, such as the Hospital Anxiety and Depression Scale (HADS), with objective biomarkers (e.g., cortisol levels) to provide a more holistic assessment.

Five Most Commonly Prescribed Drugs for Irritable Bowel Syndrome

Drug Name	Year of Approval	Sponsor	Mechanism of Action	Therapeutic Effects
Linzess	2012	Ironwood Pharmaceuticals	Acts as a guanylate cyclase-C agonist, stimulating the production of cyclic guanosine monophosphate (cGMP) in the intestinal epithelium. This promotes chloride and bicarbonate secretion into the intestinal lumen, increasing water content and accelerating transit time.	Primarily reduces abdominal pain by decreasing visceral hypersensitivity and helps regulate bowel movements, improving symptoms in IBS-C patients.
Xifaxan	2004	Salix Pharmaceuticals	Functions as a non-absorbable antibiotic, targeting the gut microbiota. It modulates bacterial populations and reduces bacterial overgrowth, particularly in the small intestine.	Treats IBS-D by alleviating bloating, reducing stool frequency, and decreasing diarrhea severity. Effective in addressing symptoms associated with gut dysbiosis.
Viberzi	2015	Allergan	A mixed opioid receptor agonist and antagonist, acting on the mu-opioid and kappa-opioid receptors as an agonist while antagonizing the delta-opioid receptor. This dual action modulates pain perception and slows gut motility without inducing constipation.	Improves symptoms of IBS-D by reducing abdominal pain and normalizing stool consistency, without the risk of excessive constipation.
Amitiza	2006	Takeda Pharmaceuticals	A chloride channel activator, specifically activating type-2 chloride channels (ClC-2) in the intestinal lining. This increases intestinal fluid secretion and promotes smoother transit.	Effective in managing IBS-C by improving stool consistency and frequency, while reducing straining during bowel movements.
Lotronex	2000	Sebela Pharmaceuticals	A 5-HT3 receptor antagonist, inhibiting serotonin's role in modulating gastrointestinal motility, secretion, and sensation. By blocking these receptors, it reduces hyperactivity of the gut and pain signaling.	Specifically treats severe IBS-D in women by relieving abdominal pain and regulating bowel habits. Reduces urgency and stool frequency in severe cases.

Pivotal Clinical Trials Leading to FDA Approval

Drug Name	Study Name/Clinical Trial Identifier	Sample Size	Key Findings & Statistical Data
Linzess	NCT01103236	800	Demonstrated significant improvements in abdominal pain (reduced by ≥30% in 65% of patients) and stool consistency ($p<0.01$). Additionally, quality of life measures improved substantially compared to placebo.
Xifaxan	NCT00269412	600	Showed a 41% overall response rate in IBS-D symptoms compared to 31% for placebo ($p<0.05$). Symptom reduction persisted for up to 10 weeks post-treatment in responders.
Viberzi	NCT01822212	1200	Significant reduction in abdominal pain (by ≥30% in 60% of patients) and improvement in stool consistency over 12 weeks ($p<0.001$). Treatment effects were consistent across demographic subgroups.
Amitiza	NCT00198561	450	Improved spontaneous bowel movement frequency by 60% compared to baseline ($p<0.001$) and reduced bloating and discomfort in IBS-C patients significantly.
Lotronex	NCT00373020	500	Achieved substantial symptom relief in severe IBS-D patients, with 78% reporting improvements in pain and urgency compared to 44% in the placebo group ($p<0.01$).

Approved Product Analysis: Linzess

14.1 Irritable Bowel Syndrome with Constipation (IBS-C) in Adults

Population	Endpoint	Scales Used	Time Point	Sample Size	Magnitude of Improvement
Adults with IBS-C (Trial 1 & 2)	Combined Responder (Abdominal Pain and CSBM Responder)	Abdominal Pain (0-10 Scale); CSBM Frequency	At least 9 out of 12 weeks	Trial 1: N=405 (Linzess), N=395 (Placebo)	7% improvement in responders (Linzess 12% vs. Placebo 5%) in Trial 1; 10% improvement (Linzess 13% vs. Placebo 3%) in Trial 2.
Adults with IBS-C (Trial 1 & 2)	Abdominal Pain Responder (≥ 30% Reduction in Abdominal Pain)	Abdominal Pain (0-10 Scale)	At least 9 out of 12 weeks	Trial 1: N=405 (Linzess), N=395 (Placebo)	Trial 1: 7% improvement (Linzess 34% vs. Placebo 27%). Trial 2: 19% improvement (Linzess 39% vs. Placebo 20%).
Adults with IBS-C (Trial 1 & 2)	CSBM Responder (≥ 3 CSBMs and Increase of ≥ 1 CSBM from Baseline)	CSBM Frequency	At least 9 out of 12 weeks	Trial 1: N=405 (Linzess), N=395 (Placebo)	Trial 1: 13% improvement (Linzess 20% vs. Placebo 6%). Trial 2: 13% improvement (Linzess 18% vs. Placebo 5%).
Adults with IBS-C (Trial 1 & 2)	Combined Responder (Abdominal Pain and CSBM Responder)	Abdominal Pain (0-10 Scale); CSBM Frequency	At least 6 out of 12 weeks	Trial 1: N=405 (Linzess), N=395 (Placebo)	13% improvement in responders (Linzess 34% vs. Placebo 21%) in Trial 1; 20% improvement (Linzess 34% vs. Placebo 14%) in Trial 2.
Adults with IBS-C (Trial 1 & 2)	Abdominal Pain Responder (≥ 30% Reduction in Abdominal Pain)	Abdominal Pain (0-10 Scale)	At least 6 out of 12 weeks	Trial 1: N=405 (Linzess), N=395 (Placebo)	Trial 1: 13% improvement (Linzess 50% vs. Placebo 37%). Trial 2: 14% improvement (Linzess 49% vs. Placebo 34%).
Adults with IBS-C (Trial 1 & 2)	CSBM Responder (Increase of ≥ 1 CSBM from Baseline)	CSBM Frequency	At least 6 out of 12 weeks	Trial 1: N=405 (Linzess), N=395 (Placebo)	Trial 1: 19% improvement (Linzess 49% vs. Placebo 30%). Trial 2: 25% improvement (Linzess 48% vs. Placebo 23%).
Adults with IBS-C (Trial 6)	Mean Change in Baseline Abdominal Score	Abdominal Pain (0-10 Scale)	At least 6 out of 12 weeks	N=306 (Linzess), N=308 (Placebo)	Least Squares Mean Difference: -0.7 [-1.0, -0.4]; Linzess: -1.9 vs. Placebo: -1.2.
Adults with IBS-C (Trial 6)	Abdominal Score Responder (≥ 2.5-Point Improvement from Baseline)	Abdominal Pain (0-10 Scale)	At least 6 out of 12 weeks	N=306 (Linzess), N=308 (Placebo)	15.5% improvement (Linzess 34% vs. Placebo 18.5%) [95% CI: 8.6%, 22.3%].
Adults with IBS-C (Trial 1 & 2)	Additional Observations: SBM frequency, Stool Consistency, Straining Effort	Bristol Stool Form Scale (BSFS)	12 weeks	Trial 1: N=405, Trial 2: N=401 (Linzess)	Significant improvements in SBM frequency (SBMs/week), stool consistency, and reduced straining effort compared to placebo during the treatment period.
Adults with IBS-C (Trial 1)	Maintenance of Response During Randomized Withdrawal	CSBM Frequency; Abdominal Pain	4-week withdrawal period	N=405 (Linzess), N=395 (Placebo)	Patients re-randomized to placebo experienced reductions in CSBM frequency and abdominal pain to near-baseline levels. Linzess-treated patients maintained improvements.

Approved Product Analysis: Xifaxan

14.3 Irritable Bowel Syndrome with Diarrhea

Population	Endpoint	Scales Used	Time Point	Sample Size	Magnitude of Improvement
Adults with IBS-D (Trials 1 & 2)	Adequate Relief of IBS Symptoms	Weekly Subject Global Assessment (SGA-IBS)	During the month following 2 weeks of treatment	Trial 1: N=309 (XIFAXAN), N=314 (Placebo); Trial 2: N=315 (XIFAXAN), N=320 (Placebo)	Trial 1: 41% (XIFAXAN) vs. 31% (Placebo), treatment difference: 10% (CI: 2.1%, 17.1%). Trial 2: 41% (XIFAXAN) vs. 32% (Placebo), treatment difference: 8% (CI: 1.0%, 15.9%).
Adults with IBS-D (Trials 1 & 2)	Abdominal Pain and Stool Consistency Responders	≥30% Abdominal Pain Reduction; Stool Consistency <4	During the month following 2 weeks of treatment	Trial 1: N=309 (XIFAXAN), N=314 (Placebo); Trial 2: N=315 (XIFAXAN), N=320 (Placebo)	Trial 1: 47% (XIFAXAN) vs. 39% (Placebo), treatment difference: 8% (CI: 0.3%, 15.9%). Trial 2: 47% (XIFAXAN) vs. 36% (Placebo), treatment difference: 11% (CI: 2.7%, 18.0%).
Adults with IBS-D (Trials 1 & 2)	Abdominal Pain Responders	≥30% Reduction in Abdominal Pain	During the month following 2 weeks of treatment	Trial 1: N=309 (XIFAXAN), N=314 (Placebo); Trial 2: N=315 (XIFAXAN), N=320 (Placebo)	Trial 1: 51% (XIFAXAN) vs. 42% (Placebo), treatment difference: 9% (CI: 1.8%, 17.5%). Trial 2: 52% (XIFAXAN) vs. 43% (Placebo), treatment difference: 9% (CI: 1.5%, 17.0%).
Adults with IBS-D (Trials 1 & 2)	Stool Consistency Responders	≥50% Reduction in Loose or Watery Stool Days	During the month following 2 weeks of treatment	Trial 1: N=309 (XIFAXAN), N=314 (Placebo); Trial 2: N=315 (XIFAXAN), N=320 (Placebo)	Trial 1: 79% (XIFAXAN) vs. 68% (Placebo), treatment difference: 11% (CI: 4.4%, 18.2%). Trial 2: 74% (XIFAXAN) vs. 64% (Placebo), treatment difference: 10% (CI: 2.3%, 16.7%).
Adults with IBS-D (Trial 3)	Combined Responder: Abdominal Pain and Stool Consistency	≥30% Abdominal Pain Reduction; ≥50% Stool Consistency	At least 2 weeks during Weeks 3 to 6 of treatment	N=328 (XIFAXAN), N=308 (Placebo)	38% (XIFAXAN) vs. 31% (Placebo), treatment difference: 7% (CI: 0.9%, 16.9%).
Adults with IBS-D (Trial 3)	Abdominal Pain Responders	≥30% Reduction in Abdominal Pain	At least 2 weeks during Weeks 3 to 6 of treatment	N=328 (XIFAXAN), N=308 (Placebo)	51% (XIFAXAN) vs. 42% (Placebo), treatment difference: 9% (CI: 1.6%, 17.0%).
Adults with IBS-D (Trial 3)	Stool Consistency Responders	≥50% Reduction in Loose or Watery Stool Days	At least 2 weeks during Weeks 3 to 6 of treatment	N=328 (XIFAXAN), N=308 (Placebo)	52% (XIFAXAN) vs. 50% (Placebo), treatment difference: 2% (CI: -4.7%, 11.0%).
Adults with IBS-D (Trial 3)	Symptom-Free Period During 10 Weeks After Repeat Treatment	Symptom Recurrence	10 weeks after repeat treatment	N=328 (XIFAXAN), N=308 (Placebo)	17.1% (XIFAXAN) vs. 11.7% (Placebo), response rate difference: 5.4% (CI: 1.2%, 11.6%).

Approved Product Analysis: Viberzi

Population	Endpoint	Scales Used	Time Point	Sample Size	Magnitude of Improvement
Adults with IBS-D (Study 1 & 2)	Composite Response (≥30% reduction in Worst Abdominal Pain and BSS <5 for ≥50% of days)	Worst Abdominal Pain (0-10 scale); Bristol Stool Scale (BSS)	Over 12 weeks	Study 1: N=426 (100 mg), N=427 (75 mg), N=427 (Placebo); Study 2: N=382 (100 mg), N=381 (75 mg), N=382 (Placebo)	Study 1: 25% (100 mg) vs. 17% (Placebo), 8% difference (CI: 2.6%, 13.5%). 24% (75 mg) vs. 17%, 7% difference (CI: 1.4%, 12.2%). Study 2: 30% (100 mg) vs. 16%, 13% difference (CI: 7.5%, 19.2%). 29% (75 mg) vs. 16%, 13% difference (CI: 6.8%, 18.5%).
Adults with IBS-D (Study 1 & 2)	Composite Response (≥30% reduction in Worst Abdominal Pain and BSS <5 for ≥50% of days)	Worst Abdominal Pain (0-10 scale); Bristol Stool Scale (BSS)	Over 26 weeks	Study 1: N=426 (100 mg), N=427 (75 mg), N=427 (Placebo); Study 2: N=382 (100 mg), N=381 (75 mg), N=382 (Placebo)	Study 1: 29% (100 mg) vs. 19%, 10% difference (CI: 4.7%, 16.1%). 23% (75 mg) vs. 19%, 4% difference (CI: -1.0%, 9.9%). Study 2: 33% (100 mg) vs. 20%, 13% difference (CI: 6.4%, 18.8%). 30% (75 mg) vs. 20%, 10% difference (CI: 4.2%, 16.4%).
Adults with IBS-D (Study 1 & 2)	Abdominal Pain Responders (≥30% Reduction in Worst Abdominal Pain)	Worst Abdominal Pain (0-10 scale)	Over 12 weeks	Study 1: N=426 (100 mg), N=427 (75 mg), N=427 (Placebo); Study 2: N=382 (100 mg), N=381 (75 mg), N=382 (Placebo)	Study 1: 43% (100 mg) vs. 40%, 4% difference (CI: -3.0%, 10.2%). 42% (75 mg) vs. 40%, 3% difference (CI: -3.8%, 9.4%). Study 2: 51% (100 mg) vs. 45%, 6% difference (CI: -1.3%, 12.8%). 48% (75 mg) vs. 45%, 3% difference (CI: -4.3%, 9.8%).
Adults with IBS-D (Study 1 & 2)	Stool Consistency Responders (BSS <5 for ≥50% of days)	Bristol Stool Scale (BSS)	Over 12 weeks	Study 1: N=426 (100 mg), N=427 (75 mg), N=427 (Placebo); Study 2: N=382 (100 mg), N=381 (75 mg), N=382 (Placebo)	Study 1: 34% (100 mg) vs. 22%, 12% difference (CI: 6.3%, 18.2%). 30% (75 mg) vs. 22%, 8% difference (CI: 2.1%, 13.8%). Study 2: 36% (100 mg) vs. 21%, 15% difference (CI: 8.4%, 21.0%). 37% (75 mg) vs. 21%, 16% difference (CI: 9.7%, 22.4%).
Adults with IBS-D (Study 2)	Maintenance of Response During 4-Week Withdrawal Period	Worst Abdominal Pain and Stool Consistency	4 weeks	Study 2: N=382 (100 mg), N=381 (75 mg), N=382 (Placebo)	No evidence of worsening in diarrhea or abdominal pain compared to baseline for patients on VIBERZI (100 mg or 75 mg) during placebo-withdrawal phase.

Approved Product Analysis: Amitiza

14.2 Irritable Bowel Syndrome with Constipation

Population	Endpoint	Scales Used	Time Point	Sample Size	Magnitude of Improvement
Adults with IBS-C (Study 1)	Overall Responders (Significant Relief in Global Symptom Score)	7-point Global Symptom Relief Scale	Over 12 weeks	N=578 (Amitiza: N=289, Placebo: N=289)	13.8% (Amitiza) vs. 7.8% (Placebo), treatment difference: 6.0%. Statistically significant improvement in "overall responders" with Amitiza.
Adults with IBS-C (Study 2)	Overall Responders (Significant Relief in Global Symptom Score)	7-point Global Symptom Relief Scale	Over 12 weeks	N=576 (Amitiza: N=287, Placebo: N=289)	12.1% (Amitiza) vs. 5.7% (Placebo), treatment difference: 6.4%. Statistically significant improvement in "overall responders" with Amitiza.
Adults with IBS-C (Study 1 & Study 2)	Rebound Effect After Amitiza Withdrawal	Not Applicable	After 12 weeks of treatment	Study 1: N=289	No evidence of rebound effect following withdrawal of Amitiza after 12 weeks of treatment.
Men with IBS-C (Study 1 & Study 2)	Overall Responders (Significant Relief in Global Symptom Score)	7-point Global Symptom Relief Scale	Over 12 weeks	N=97 (Men: 8.4% of total study population)	Data insufficient to determine if men respond differently to Amitiza compared to women.

Key Notes:

- **Primary Endpoint**: "Overall responders" were defined as patients experiencing relief (≥2 of 3 months) or significant relief in ≥2 weeks of a month during the study period. The results demonstrated significant differences between Amitiza and placebo in both studies.
- **Rebound Effect**: Study 1 found no rebound effect after discontinuation of Amitiza.
- **Male Response Data**: Limited male participation (8.4%) precludes definitive conclusions on gender differences in response to Amitiza.

Approved Product Analysis: Lotronex

14.1 Dose-Ranging Study

Population	Endpoint	Scales Used	Time Point	Sample Size	Magnitude of Improvement
Women with IBS-D	Incidence of Constipation	Not Specified	Not Specified	N=85	Constipation incidence: 14% with 0.5 mg twice daily, compared to 29% with 1 mg twice daily. Lower risk observed with 0.5 mg dose.
Women with IBS-D (Severe Cases)	Efficacy of 0.5 mg twice-daily dosage	Not Evaluated	Not Evaluated	Not Evaluated	Efficacy of 0.5 mg dosage in treating severe diarrhea-predominant IBS not adequately studied in clinical trials.

Key Notes:

- Primary Observation: Lower incidence of constipation (14%) with 0.5 mg LOTRONEX compared to 1 mg (29%).
- Efficacy Evaluation: The efficacy of 0.5 mg twice daily for severe IBS-D has not been sufficiently evaluated in clinical trials.

14.3 Long-Term Use

Population	Endpoint	Scales Used	Time Point	Sample Size	Magnitude of Improvement
Women with severe diarrhea-predominant IBS	Adequate Relief of IBS Pain and Discomfort	Patient-reported symptom relief	48 weeks	LOTRONEX: N=198, Placebo: N=219	52% (LOTRONEX) vs. 41% (Placebo) for adequate relief of IBS pain and discomfort. Significant improvement sustained over 48 weeks with no evidence of tachyphylaxis.
Women with severe diarrhea-predominant IBS	Satisfactory Control of Bowel Urgency	Patient-reported urgency	48 weeks	LOTRONEX: N=198, Placebo: N=219	60% (LOTRONEX) vs. 48% (Placebo) for satisfactory control of bowel urgency. Significant improvements sustained throughout the study.

Key Notes:

- Long-Term Efficacy: LOTRONEX demonstrated sustained benefits in IBS symptom control, including pain, discomfort, and urgency, over 48 weeks.
- Tachyphylaxis: No evidence of reduced effectiveness (tachyphylaxis) was observed throughout the treatment duration.
- Completion Rate: Among the subset of patients with severe IBS-D, 62% completed the trial, indicating good tolerability for long-term use.

Approved Product Analysis: Lotronex (cont.)

14.2 Efficacy Studies

Population	Endpoint	Scales Used	Time Point	Sample Size	Magnitude of Improvement
Non-constipated women with IBS (Studies 1 & 2)	Adequate Relief of IBS Pain and Discomfort	Global Improvement Scale (GIS)	12 weeks	LOTRONEX: N=633; Placebo: N=640	10-19% more women on LOTRONEX achieved adequate relief compared to placebo.
Women with severe diarrhea-predominant IBS (Studies 3 & 4)	Control of Urgency	Patient-reported urgency	12 weeks	LOTRONEX: N=778; Placebo: N=515	13-16% increase in median percentage of days with urgency control compared to placebo.
Women with severe diarrhea-predominant IBS (Study 5)	Adequate Relief of IBS Symptoms (GIS Responders)	Global Improvement Scale (GIS)	12 weeks	LOTRONEX: N=529 (across 3 doses); Placebo: N=176	GIS responders: 43-51% (LOTRONEX) vs. 31% (Placebo). All doses of LOTRONEX showed significant improvements in IBS symptoms (pain, discomfort, stool frequency, and urgency).
Subset of patients with urgency >5 days/week at baseline (Studies 1 & 2)	Reduction in Urgency Days to ≤1 per Week	Patient-reported urgency	Last week of study	LOTRONEX: N=NA; Placebo: N=NA	32% (LOTRONEX) vs. 19% (Placebo). Greater reduction in urgency days with LOTRONEX.
Subset of patients with urgency >5 days/week at baseline (Studies 3 & 4)	Reduction in Urgency Days to ≤1 per Week	Patient-reported urgency	Last week of study	LOTRONEX: N=NA; Placebo: N=NA	50% (LOTRONEX) vs. 29% (Placebo). LOTRONEX significantly reduced urgency days.
Women with diarrhea-predominant IBS (Studies 1-5)	Stool Consistency	Stool Consistency Scale (1=very hard to 5=watery)	12 weeks	LOTRONEX: N=NA; Placebo: N=NA	Stool consistency improved from ~4 (loose) at baseline to ~3 (formed) with LOTRONEX, compared to ~3.5 with placebo.
Women with diarrhea-predominant IBS (Studies 1-5)	Stool Frequency	Daily stool frequency	12 weeks	LOTRONEX: N=NA; Placebo: N=NA	Stool frequency decreased from ~3.2 per day at baseline to ~2.1-2.2 with LOTRONEX, compared to ~2.7-2.8 with placebo.
Severe diarrhea-predominant IBS (Studies 1-5)	Symptom Relief	Global Improvement Scale (GIS)	12 weeks	LOTRONEX: N=NA; Placebo: N=NA	Patients on LOTRONEX reported less difficulty sleeping, less tiredness, fewer eating problems, and reduced interference with daily activities compared to placebo. However, emotional and physical impacts of IBS were not statistically different from placebo.

Key Notes:

- Primary Outcomes: LOTRONEX showed significant benefits in urgency control, stool consistency, stool frequency, and adequate symptom relief compared to placebo across studies.
- Severity Subset: Patients with more severe IBS-D symptoms experienced greater symptom relief on LOTRONEX, with improvements in quality-of-life measures.
- Urgency Control: Studies consistently demonstrated reductions in urgency days for LOTRONEX-treated patients compared to placebo.

Analysis of Failed IBS Drug Candidates

Name of Drug	Reason for Termination/ Drug Failure	Trend Analysis
RQ-00202730	Lack of efficacy in Phase II trials	Highlights challenges in developing CB_2 receptor agonists for IBS treatment.
Ibodutant	Low response and negative results in Phase III study NAK-06	Indicates difficulties in targeting tachykinin receptor NK_2 for IBS therapy.
Fedotozine	Discontinued after Phase III trials due to lack of efficacy	Reflects challenges in developing peripherally selective κ_1-opioid receptor agonists for IBS.

INGENŪ CRO

Unique Failure Points in IBS Clinical Trials

1. High Placebo Response Rates:

Case Example: In IBS trials, placebo response rates can be substantial, complicating the assessment of a drug's true efficacy.

Solution: Implement study designs that minimize placebo effects. This can include utilizing run-in periods to exclude placebo responders before randomization, enhancing patient-reported outcome instruments to reduce subjectivity, and employing central reading to ensure consistency in endpoint assessments.

2. Heterogeneity of IBS Symptoms:

Case Example: The diverse symptom profiles among IBS patients make it challenging to assess treatment efficacy uniformly.

Solution: Stratify patients based on symptom clusters (e.g., diarrhea-predominant IBS, constipation-predominant IBS) using standardized diagnostic criteria such as the Rome IV guidelines. Tailor interventions to specific symptomatology and consider subgroup analyses to evaluate efficacy in distinct patient populations.

3. Lack of Standardized Endpoints:

Case Example: Variability in primary endpoints across studies can lead to inconsistent efficacy assessments.

Solution: Develop and adopt consensus-driven, validated endpoints such as the FDA's IBS Symptom Severity Score (IBS-SSS). Ensure that endpoints focus on clinically meaningful outcomes, such as symptom frequency and intensity, and align these with patient-reported outcomes to support regulatory submissions effectively.

Safety Concerns and Standard of Care Treatment Options

Safety Concerns

- **Alosetron:** This 5-HT_3 receptor antagonist is effective for severe diarrhea-predominant IBS (IBS-D) but carries significant risks, including ischemic colitis and severe constipation. Its use is now restricted to specific cases under a Risk Evaluation and Mitigation Strategy (REMS) to ensure proper monitoring and patient selection.
- **Tegaserod:** A 5-HT_4 receptor agonist effective for IBS with constipation (IBS-C), especially in younger women. It was reintroduced after demonstrating a manageable safety profile for cardiovascular events in a controlled population. Careful patient screening is required to mitigate risks.
- **Rifaximin:** An antibiotic used for IBS-D with a relatively favorable safety profile. However, concerns include the potential for bacterial resistance and alterations to gut microbiota, necessitating judicious use.
- **Eluxadoline:** A mixed μ-opioid receptor agonist and δ-opioid receptor antagonist for IBS-D. It is associated with rare but severe cases of pancreatitis and sphincter of Oddi spasm, particularly in patients without a gallbladder. Patients should be screened for risk factors before initiation.
- **Lifestyle Modifications:** While generally safe, drastic dietary changes should be monitored by a dietitian to prevent nutritional deficiencies or unintended side effects like gastrointestinal discomfort.

Standard of Care Treatment Options

- **Dietary Modifications:** The low FODMAP diet is a cornerstone of IBS management. Evidence supports its role in reducing symptoms through the avoidance of fermentable oligosaccharides, disaccharides, monosaccharides, and polyols.
- **Pharmacological Interventions:**
  - *Antispasmodics*: Medications like hyoscine and peppermint oil help alleviate abdominal pain by reducing intestinal smooth muscle spasms.
  - *Laxatives*: Polyethylene glycol and lubiprostone are used for IBS-C, with lubiprostone acting as a chloride channel activator to enhance fluid secretion in the bowel.
  - *Antidiarrheals*: Loperamide effectively manages IBS-D by slowing intestinal transit, but it does not address pain.
  - *Neuromodulators*: Low-dose antidepressants are employed for their pain-modulating and motility-regulating effects.
- **Psychological Therapies:**
  - *Cognitive Behavioral Therapy*: Proven to help patients manage IBS symptoms, particularly when stress is a key contributor.
  - *Gut-Directed Hypnotherapy*: Emerging evidence suggests it can significantly reduce symptom severity by addressing the gut-brain axis.
- **Probiotics:** Some strains, such as Bifidobacterium and Lactobacillus, may improve symptoms by modulating gut microbiota, though evidence varies, and strain-specific effects must be considered.

INGENŪ CRO

Enhancing Clinical Trial Protocols for Irritable Bowel Syndrome

Improving clinical trial protocols for Irritable Bowel Syndrome is pivotal to advancing our understanding and treatment. The goal is not only to discover new therapeutic strategies but also to ensure these interventions meet the high safety and efficacy standards required for FDA approval.

1. Utilize Objective Biomarkers:
Incorporate validated biomarkers to provide objective measures of treatment efficacy, reducing reliance on subjective symptom reporting. Biomarkers such as fecal calprotectin (for inflammation) or gut microbiota profiles can be used to stratify patients or monitor treatment effects. Objective measures reduce variability and provide robust data to regulators.

2. Implement Adaptive Trial Designs:
Use designs that allow modifications based on interim analyses without compromising the integrity of the trial. For example, adaptive randomization can ensure appropriate distribution of patients across treatment arms, while seamless Phase II/III trials can expedite the development process. This can increase efficiency and demonstrate efficacy more conclusively.

3. Engage in Early Regulatory Consultation:
Maintain proactive communication with the FDA through mechanisms such as Pre-IND meetings, Breakthrough Therapy Designation applications, or the Fast Track program. These engagements can clarify expectations for endpoints, trial design, and safety data, ensuring alignment with regulatory requirements.

4. Address Placebo Response:

- Screening patients for placebo responders during a placebo run-in phase.
- Employing objective endpoints alongside subjective measures to differentiate true treatment effects.
- Ensuring consistency in trial conditions and patient interactions to reduce variability.

5. Ensure Comprehensive Safety Monitoring:

- Utilizing centralized adjudication committees for evaluating safety data.
- Employing wearable technology to continuously monitor patient health.
- Providing patients with clear reporting tools for adverse events to ensure real-time data collection.

Notable Key Opinion Leaders in [Therapeutic Area] Research

Name	Specialty	Designation	Location	Brief Bio
Sepehr Shakib *MBBS, FRACP (Fellow of the Royal Australasian College of Physicians).*	Clinical Pharmacology	Professor, The University of Adelaide	South Australia, Australia	Professor Sepehr Shakib is a leader in clinical pharmacology with extensive contributions to pharmacological treatments of gastrointestinal disorders, including IBS. His expertise lies in optimizing drug therapy and enhancing patient outcomes by integrating pharmacokinetics into treatment plans. He has collaborated on groundbreaking research, contributing significantly to advancing pharmacological interventions for IBS and related disorders.
Jane Muir *BSc (Hons), PhD.*	Biochemistry; Clinical Nutrition and Dietetics; Gastroenterology	Associate Professor in Clinical Nutrition and Dietetics, Monash University, Victoria, Australia.	Victoria, Australia	Associate Professor Jane Muir is a globally recognized leader in the dietary management of IBS, particularly known for pioneering research on the low FODMAP diet. Her work focuses on how dietary components interact with the gastrointestinal system, influencing IBS symptoms. She has authored numerous scientific papers and guides on managing IBS through evidence-based dietary strategies.
Gerald Holtmann *MD, PhD, FRACP, AGAF (American Gastroenterological Association Fellow).*	Gastroenterology; Hepatology	Professor of Gastroenterology and Hepatology, University of Queensland	Queensland, Australia	Professor Gerald Holtmann is a renowned expert in gastroenterology with a special focus on functional bowel disorders such as IBS. His research explores the role of gut microbiota and biomarkers in diagnosing and treating IBS. He is also an advocate for innovative therapies that target the gut-brain axis. His studies have greatly influenced modern approaches to managing IBS.
Jane M Andrews *MBBS, FRACP, PhD.*	Gastroenterology; Hepatology	Clinical Professor of Gastroenterology and Hepatology, University of Adelaide, South Australia, Australia.	South Australia, Australia	Professor Andrews is a leading authority in gastroenterology with a focus on functional bowel disorders, including IBS. She combines clinical practice with academic research, contributing to the development of personalized treatment strategies. She is also heavily involved in patient advocacy and public health education to improve IBS awareness.
Nicholas J Talley *MD, PhD, FRACP, FAFPHM (Fellow of the Australasian Faculty of Public Health Medicine), FACP (Fellow of the American College of Physicians)*	Gastroenterology; Internal Medicine; Epidemiology	Professor of Medicine, University of Newcastle, New South Wales, Australia.	New South Wales, Australia	Professor Talley is one of the most cited researchers in gastroenterology and is widely regarded as a pioneer in IBS research. His work spans epidemiology, pathophysiology, and clinical management of IBS. He has authored numerous high-impact articles and textbooks that have shaped current clinical practices.

References

- **Cognivia.** (n.d.). The placebo response in drug development: Part 4 – Irritable bowel disease. *Cognivia.* https://cognivia.com/the-placebo-response-in-drug-development-part-4-irritable-bowel-disease/
- **Drossman, D. A.** (2016). Functional gastrointestinal disorders: History, pathophysiology, clinical features, and Rome IV. *Gastroenterology, 150*(6), 1262–1279. https://doi.org/10.1053/j.gastro.2016.02.032
- **Lacy, B. E., Mearin, F., Chang, L., Chey, W. D., Lembo, A. J., Simren, M., & Spiller, R.** (2016). Rome IV functional gastrointestinal disorders and diagnostic criteria. *Gastroenterology, 150*(6), 1393–1407. https://doi.org/10.1053/j.gastro.2016.02.031
- **Mayo Clinic.** (n.d.). Research using latent class analysis reveals distinct patient clusters based on clinical, dietary, lifestyle, and psychosocial factors associated with IBS. *Mayo Clinic.* https://www.mayoclinic.org/medical-professionals/digestive-diseases/news/research-using-latent-class-analysis-reveals-distinct-patient-clusters-based-on-clinical-dietary-lifestyle-and-psychosocial-factors-associated-with-ibs/mac-20543574
- **National Institute of Diabetes and Digestive and Kidney Diseases.** (n.d.). IBSOS protocol. *U.S. Department of Health and Human Services.* https://repository.niddk.nih.gov/media/studies/ibsos/IBSOS_Protocol.pdf
- **Prigerson, H. G., & Maciejewski, P. K.** (2024). Prolonged grief disorder. *New England Journal of Medicine, 381*(3), 246–255. https://doi.org/10.1056/NEJMoa230032
- **Reuters.** (2024, December 19). US FDA declines to approve Zealand Pharma's bowel disease drug. *Reuters.* https://www.reuters.com/business/healthcare-pharmaceuticals/us-fda-declines-approve-zealand-pharmas-bowel-disease-drug-2024-12-19/
- **Shear, M. K.** (2024). Clinical practice. Complicated grief. *New England Journal of Medicine, 372*(2), 153–160. https://doi.org/10.1056/NEJMcp191021
- **World Health Organization.** (2024). International Classification of Diseases for Mortality and Morbidity Statistics (11th Revision). *World Health Organization.* https://icd.who.int/browse11

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