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Measuring Safety and Tolerability in Cancer Clinical Trials

- Fundamental to conclusions about the effectiveness of cancer therapies, including comparative effectiveness
  - Evaluated using Common Terminology Criteria for Adverse Events (CTCAE)
- 10% of the 800 adverse events listed in CTCAE are symptoms
  - Validity of symptoms reports is eroded when filtered through research staff and clinicians
  - Staff-based adverse event reporting occurs at clinic visits; adverse events that occur between visits may be missed
- Real-time ascertainment of symptom adverse events using patient-reported outcomes (PROs) could improve the precision and reproducibility of adverse event reporting

- NCI's Patient-Reported Outcomes Version of the Common Terminology Criteria for Adverse Events (PRO-CTCAE™)
  - PRO measure of the frequency, severity and/or interference of symptoms experienced by patients participating in cancer clinical trials
  - Designed to be used as a companion to the CTCAE to capture the patient experience of symptomatic toxicities

# PRO-CTCAE™ Measurement System

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1. Item Library</th>
<th>2. Software</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• 78 symptomatic adverse events drawn from CTCAE</td>
<td>• Creates customized surveys; manages survey administration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Items evaluate frequency, severity, interference, amount, presence of these symptoms</td>
<td>• Patient interface: paper, web or IVR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Conditional branching (skip patterns)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Write-ins with automatic mapping to standardized terminology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Automated alerts</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

For more information about PRO-CTCAE visit: [http://healthcaredelivery.cancer.gov/pro-ctcae/](http://healthcaredelivery.cancer.gov/pro-ctcae/)
**PATIENT-REPORTED OUTCOMES VERSION OF THE COMMON TERMINOLOGY CRITERIA FOR ADVERSE EVENTS (PRO-CTCAE™) ITEM LIBRARY (Version 1.0)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Oral</th>
<th>Cardio/Circulatory</th>
<th>Neurological</th>
<th>Sleep/Wake</th>
<th>Sexual</th>
<th>Miscellaneous</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dry mouth</td>
<td>Swelling</td>
<td>Numbness &amp; tingling</td>
<td>Insomnia</td>
<td>Achieve and maintain erection</td>
<td>Breast swelling and tenderness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Difficulty swallowing</td>
<td>Heart palpitations</td>
<td>Dizziness</td>
<td>Fatigue</td>
<td>Ejaculation</td>
<td>Bruising</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mouth/throat sores</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Increased sweating</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cracking at the corners of the mouth (cheilosis/cheilitis)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Hot flashes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Voice quality changes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Nosebleed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hoarseness</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Pain and swelling at injection site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gastrointestinal</td>
<td>Cutaneous</td>
<td>Visual/Perceptual</td>
<td>Mood</td>
<td>Unable to have orgasm</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taste changes</td>
<td>Rash</td>
<td>Blurred vision</td>
<td>Anxious</td>
<td>Pain w/sexual intercourse</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decreased appetite</td>
<td>Skin dryness</td>
<td>Flashing lights</td>
<td>Discouraged</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nausea</td>
<td>Acne</td>
<td>Visual floaters</td>
<td>Sad</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vomiting</td>
<td>Hair loss</td>
<td>Watery eyes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heartburn</td>
<td>Itching</td>
<td>Ringing in ears</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gas</td>
<td>Hives</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bloating</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hiccups</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constipation</td>
<td>Hand-foot syndrome</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diarrhea</td>
<td>Nail loss</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abdominal pain</td>
<td>Nail ridging</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fecal incontinence</td>
<td>Nail discoloration</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Respiratory</td>
<td>Sensitivity to sunlight</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shortness of breath</td>
<td>Bed pressure sores</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cough</td>
<td>Radiation skin reaction</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wheezing</td>
<td>Skin darkening</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Stretch marks</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Dimensions**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>F: Frequency</th>
<th>I: Interference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>S: Severity</td>
<td>P: Presence/Absence/Amount</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

For more information about PRO-CTCAE visit: http://healthcaredelivery.cancer.gov/pro-ctcae/
### CTCAE vs. PRO-CTCAE™ Item Structures

#### CTCAE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Adverse Event</th>
<th>Grade</th>
<th>Grade</th>
<th>Grade</th>
<th>Grade</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mucositis oral</td>
<td>Asymptomatic or mild symptoms; intervention not indicated</td>
<td>Moderate pain; not interfering with oral intake; modified diet indicated</td>
<td>Severe pain; interfering with oral intake</td>
<td>Life-threatening consequences; urgent intervention indicated</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### PRO-CTCAE

Please think back over the past 7 days:

- **What was the severity of your MOUTH OR THROAT SORES at their WORST?**
  - None / Mild / Moderate / Severe / Very severe

- **How much did MOUTH OR THROAT SORES interfere with your usual or daily activities?**
  - Not at all / A little bit / Somewhat / Quite a bit / Very much
• Psychometrically robust library of items
• Electronic system fits data collection smoothly into trials workflow and offers favorable user-experience
• Accommodate patients with limited English proficiency/digital literacy
• Supply meaningful data to improve understanding of symptomatic AEs
PRO-CTCAE Content Validity

- 78 symptomatic AEs identified from ~800 CTCAE terms for patient self-reporting
  - Plain-language AE terms identified
- Each symptomatic AE has 1 to 3 items\(^1\)
  - Frequency, severity, interference w/ activities
- Content validity established during three interview rounds with semi-structured interview using structured and open-ended probes (N=127)\(^2\)
  - 63/80 symptom terms generated no cognitive difficulties; 17 modified and re-tested without further difficulties

\(^1\)Basch et al., (2014). Development of the National Cancer Institute’s Patient-Reported Outcomes Version of the Common Terminology Criteria for Adverse Events (PRO-CTCAE). *Journal of the National Cancer Institute*, 106(9). pii: dju244

Results demonstrate favorable validity, reliability, and responsiveness of PRO-CTCAE in a large, heterogeneous sample of patients undergoing cancer treatment (n=940)\(^1\)

- Most PRO-CTCAE items (119/124) reached a statistically significant ($p<0.05$) and meaningful effect size on one or more validity criteria
- Majority of the items tested (n=27 items) exhibited acceptable test-retest reliability
- All tested items (n=27 items) were sensitive to differences between groups
Mode Equivalence

• N=112 patients completed 28 PRO-CTCAE items by each of the three modes of administration at a single clinic visit

• Average time to complete an item:
  – Web: 11.1 seconds (SD = ±8.4)
  – Interactive Voice Response (IVRS): 16.3 seconds (SD = ±6.3)
  – Paper: 10.3 seconds (SD = ±5.8)

Between modes, item-level mean differences were very small, and the corresponding effect sizes were all less than 0.20

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Median ICC (Range)</th>
<th>Median (range) between-mode item-level mean difference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Web vs IVRS</td>
<td>0.78 (0.56 - 0.90)</td>
<td>-0.04 (-0.16 - 0.22)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Web vs paper</td>
<td>0.81 (0.61 - 0.96)</td>
<td>-0.02 (-0.11 - 0.14)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IVRS vs paper</td>
<td>0.78 (0.59 - 0.91)</td>
<td>0.02 (-0.07 - 0.19)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comparison of Recall Periods

- N=110 patients completed 27 PRO-CTCAE items (14 symptomatic A/Es)
  - Comparison of 28 daily ratings to 1-, 2-, 3-, and 4-week recalled ratings
  - 1-week recall corresponds well to daily reporting. Differences between daily and longer recall periods widen with 2, 3, and 4 week recall

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Recall Period</th>
<th>Effect Size of the Difference (compared to max. daily score within that period)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7 day</td>
<td>-0.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14 day</td>
<td>-0.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21 day</td>
<td>-0.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Past month</td>
<td>-0.40</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
• >100 early adopters in 12 countries are testing PRO-CTCAE in treatment trials and observational studies

• Collaborations with leading national and international organizations to promote implementation and testing in cancer clinical trials and observational studies
  • NCI National Clinical Trials Network (NCTN) and Early Therapeutics Clinical Trials Network (ETCTN)
  • US Food and Drug Administration
  • International: NHS in UK, Italian NCI, Japanese NCI, Danish Cancer Society, European Medicines Agency, Swedish Medical Products Agency
PRO-CTCAE in Cancer Clinical Research: Item Selection and Timing of Assessment

If I had an hour to solve a problem and my life depended on it, I would use the first 55 minutes determining the proper questions to ask.

Albert Einstein
PRO-CTCAE in Cancer Clinical Research

• Item selection and timing of assessment are critical designs decisions to manage risk of bias and maximize interpretability and utility of results
  • Study aims and hypotheses
  • Apply what is known about side effects profile to select items and informative timepoints
  • Trial phase (early phase vs. randomized), study design (e.g. observational cohort, case-control)
  • Thoughtfully manage patient and investigator burden
• Decisions about item selection and timing must consider
  • Ascertainment bias
    • A systematic distortion in measuring the true frequency of a phenomenon due to the way in which the data are collected
      • What you ask about and when affect prevalence estimates
  • Sampling bias
    • Introduced when some members of the intended population are less likely to be included in the sample than others
      • Low literacy, language, missing data not at random from those patients with the greatest toxicity or who have early disease progression, small samples
  • Recall period: trade-off between longer recall and measurement error
  • Variable conditions of administration (in clinic, between visits)
  • Anticipated patterns of drop-out (e.g. short duration of therapy anticipated with early phase trials)
  • Data analytic approach
PRO Assessment of Symptomatic Adverse Events

Paul G. Kluetz, M.D.
Office of Hematology and Oncology Products
US Food and Drug Administration
FDA’s Use of PRO Data

• While all PRO data will be reviewed as supportive data, we focus on proximal concepts closest to the effect of the therapy on the disease (efficacy) and the patient (safety)

• For Labeling purposes, FDA requires well-defined and reliable assessments that can be accurately interpreted
  – Most PRO results in oncology labeling have been Symptom and Function measures
What Trial Objectives can PRO Measures Address?

• **Efficacy**: Does the drug provide superior improvement in disease related symptoms or functional deficits?
  – Pain, Total Symptom Score, Performance related outcomes
  – Supports a claim of treatment benefit
  – Substantial evidence from formal statistical analysis (statistical superiority)

• **Safety/Tolerability**: Describe the patient’s experience while exposed to anti-cancer therapy?
  – Patient-reported symptomatic toxicities
  – If not claiming a treatment benefit of comparative safety, may use descriptive statistics as is done with CTCAE data
Challenges in Assessing **Efficacy** with PRO Measures in Cancer Clinical Trials

- Many patients enrolled on cancer trials are asymptomatic with good performance status
  - Time to deterioration endpoints typically utilized
  - Enriching for symptomatic patients to measure symptom improvement/palliation should also be considered

- Trials supporting regulatory approval more often **single arm** or **open-label** in contemporary drug development
  - Degree of open-label bias is not well understood
  - Research is needed to characterize the magnitude of potential overestimation of treatment benefit
Safety / Tolerability = PRO Measurement Opportunity

- Symptomatic adverse events are proximal to the therapy’s effect on the patient

- Symptoms are best assessed by patients

- Safety and Tolerability- important in all phases of development

- PRO results may offer different but complementary data to current clinician reported safety data

- PRO measures can be systematically and longitudinally obtained including a baseline measure
Existing PRO Tools: 
Assessment of Symptomatic AEs

• Health-Related Quality of Life Instruments and Disease Specific Modules can assess some common symptomatic adverse events
  – Strengths: Translations, accumulated data, established measurement characteristics in some cases

• Key limitation is lack of flexibility
  – Same questions regardless of therapies under study
  – Can miss important toxicities or assess toxicities not expected to occur with a particular therapy
  – Often inadequate assessment frequency
  – Risk of a biased assessment if comparing drugs of different classes
Safety in a Changing Therapeutic Context

**Prior** Drug Development Era:
- Mechanism: Cytotoxic Chemotherapy
- Intermittent Intravenous Administration
- Shorter Duration of Treatment
- Adverse events typically Neuropathy, Mucositis, Bone Marrow Suppression, Fatigue, Nausea/vomiting, Diarrhea, Hair Loss, Taste Changes

**Current** Drug Development Era:
- Mechanism: Diverse, including Cytotoxic, Immune, Antibodies, Small Molecule targeting Various Pathways.
- Continuous Daily Oral Administration becoming more common
- More Prolonged Duration of Treatment
- Adverse events can differ depending on mechanism and target.

Can lead to cumulative low grade but bothersome symptomatic toxicities

There is a need for systematic PRO assessment of symptomatic adverse events with a standard yet flexible PRO instrument
Flexible Approach Would be Desirable

• An item library where questions and assessment frequency can be tailored to the toxicity of the agents under study is attractive for cancer drug development

• The National Cancer Institute Patient-Reported Outcome version of the Common Terminology Criteria for Adverse Events (PRO-CTCAE) is a promising tool for this purpose

• Could provide well-defined descriptive PRO data to complement existing clinician reported safety data

• Significant work remains, but early adoption of PRO-CTCAE in commercial trials is underway
Summary

• Safety and tolerability: important trial objective across drug development

• Symptomatic adverse events can be bothersome and symptoms are best assessed by patients

• Existing PRO tools have some important limitations when assessing symptomatic adverse events

• PRO-CTCAE is a promising tool that can provide needed flexibility and involve patients in the assessment of safety and tolerability

• An unbiased selection of the most important items to assess is critical
PRO-CTCAE™:
STUDY DESIGN CONSIDERATIONS FOR PATIENT-REPORTED SYMPTOMATIC ADVERSE EVENTS

Lori Minasian, MD
Deputy Director, Division of Cancer Prevention, NCI
Adverse Event Reporting

- Common Terminology Criteria for Adverse Event (CTCAE)
  - Standard terminology (~ 800 items) for NCI trials
  - All Items NOT required for use, but available for use
  - Items are selected to be monitored over the course of the trial including baseline.

- Items are collected and reviewed for patient **SAFETY**
- Any **unexpected events** are reported/reviewed in real time
- All adverse events reviewed during the course of the trial
- Serious unexpected reports are reported/reviewed in expedited manner
- Clinical and protocol specific decisions made based upon AE events occurrence and outcomes
Health Related Quality of Life (HRQOL)

- Intended to capture overall effects of the cancer and its treatment upon the patient.

- Validated tools have specific questions
  - Questions do not vary over the course of the trial
  - All the questions to be answered at designated intervals
  - Questions may ask about work life, social impact or other topics not immediately related to the treatment itself.

- Results analyzed at the trial completion
- Comparison of HRQOL between 2 arms
HRQOL ≠ Toxicity Reporting

• PRO-CTCAE is designed to bridge the gap

• PRO-CTCAE needs a different approach from HRQOL to item selection and assessment timing

• BUT, PRO-CTCAE is ONLY for descriptive reporting at this time
  • Not ready for clinical and protocol specific decision-making based upon individual PRO-CTCAE scores
How to Use PRO-CTCAE

• PRO-CTCAE intended to be complementary to CTCAE
  - Timeframes for reporting by patients & clinicians are comparable

• Recall period is 7 days
  - Anticipate weekly reporting
  - Currently, data to demonstrate ~ 90% compliance for weekly reporting up to 20 weeks with reminders.
  - Baseline and off-study assessment are essential
  - Assessment times need to be balanced with data quality

• Translations
  - English and Spanish available now
  - *German, Japanese, Danish*, coming soon
PRO-CTCAE vs. CTCAE

• PRO-CTCAE responses are scored from 0 to 4
  • Up to three questions per AE Item
    • Frequency, Severity, Interference

• Clinician CTCAE Grade
  • Bundles the constructs of severity, frequency and interference
  • Grading dependent upon clinician judgement of medical significance

• Clinician Grade ≠ PRO-CTCAE Score
  • One grade by clinician
  • Up to three patient reported scores per Item
  • CTCAE Grade 4 does not exist for most of the PRO-CTCAE items
PRO-CTCAE Item Selection

• PRO-CTCAE items selected based upon earlier data for Adverse Events
  • As with CTCAE items, identify those items which need to be monitored for safety and tolerability based upon previous clinical or pre-clinical data.
    • AE items from early clinical data
    • Mechanism based or drug class effects

• Choose limited number of symptomatic adverse events to prospectively monitor
  • Use all the dimensions available for a symptomatic toxicity
• Need baseline and off-study assessments
• Allow for unanticipated symptomatic adverse events to be reported through a write-in feature
PRO-CTCAE Item Selection

• Early (non-randomized) phase trials
  • Limited number of cycles given to patients with different diseases
  • Start with a provisional list of items
    • Incorporate additional items as study develops
  • Baseline assessment
  • Unexpected reports may due to toxicity, disease progression or previous treatment
  • Clinical information at off-study is essential for attribution of event
PRO-CTCAE Item Selection

- Randomized trials
  - Better defined cohort of patients
  - Identify agent/regimen specific symptomatic toxicities associated with each arm
  - Include same items in all arms irrespective of expectation in order to define and confirm relative symptomatic toxicity profiles of each arm

- Arm A has 5 symptomatic AEs
- Arm B has 4 symptomatic AEs, (one of which is in A)
- Use $5 + 4 - 1 = 8$ symptomatic AEs
Summary

• PRO-CTCAE is ONLY for descriptive reporting
• CTCAE Grade ≠ PRO-CTCAE score

• Item Selection
  • Anticipated symptomatic toxicities from agents/regimens

• Time-points of assessment
  • Baseline and off-study is required
  • Frequency of assessments depends on the study design and aims
  • Timeframes should be consistent with clinician grading
Practical Considerations for Implementation of PRO-CTCAE in Clinical Trials

Ethan Basch, MD and Amylou Dueck, PhD
April, 2016
Study Design Questions

- **Item selection**
  - What approaches can be used to pick PRO-CTCAE items from the broader PRO-CTCAE item library for use in a given trial?

- **Frequency**
  - How often should items be administered?

- **How can PRO response rates be optimized?**
  - Reminders and backup data collection

- **How can PRO-CTCAE results be tabulated and reported?**

- *Will use examples from multicenter cooperative group trials supported by NCI contract HHSN261201000063C*
78 Symptomatic Adverse Events in PRO-CTCAE Item Library
(Represented by 124 Items)
78 Symptomatic Adverse Events in PRO-CTCAE Item Library
(Represented by 124 Items)

Cross-Cutting (“Core”)
- Anorexia (appetite loss)
- Constipation
- Dyspnea
- Diarrhea
- Fatigue
- Nausea
- Pain
- Sensory neuropathy
- Sleep disturbance
- Vomiting

- Prevalent across advanced cancers, based on systematic review (Support Care Cancer, 2013: PMID 23314601)
- Recommended by NCI clinical trials planning meeting consensus (JNCI, 2014: PMID 25006191)
- These 10 AEs are represented by 17 PRO-CTCAE items
Item Selection

78 Symptomatic Adverse Events in PRO-CTCAE Item Library
(Represented by 124 Items)

Cross-Cutting (“Core”)
• Anorexia (appetite loss)
• Constipation
• Dyspnea
• Diarrhea
• Fatigue
• Nausea
• Pain
• Sensory neuropathy
• Sleep disturbance
• Vomiting

Identified in Prior Clinical Studies
• XXX
• XXX
• XXX
• XXX

• Reported/published AEs for products in all arms of planned trial
  (Clin Ther, 2016: PMID 27045992)
• Ideally based on interviews/surveys in study population prior to pivotal trial, and/or structured literature review
Item Selection

78 Symptomatic Adverse Events in PRO-CTCAE Item Library
(Represented by 124 Items)

Cross-Cutting (“Core”)
• Anorexia (appetite loss)
• Constipation
• Dyspnea
• Diarrhea
• Fatigue
• Nausea
• Pain
• Sensory neuropathy
• Sleep disturbance
• Vomiting

Identified in Prior Clinical Studies
• XXX
• XXX

Mechanism of Action/Preclinical
• XXX
• XXX

• Based on safety profile of all study drugs and/or other in-class therapeutics
Phase 3 trial comparing drug derived from natural product with anti-microtubule properties vs. standard of care (taxane) as first- or second-line therapy in a metastatic solid tumor type

Clinical investigative team worked with PRO expert to select PRO-CTCAE items for the trial
Example from Ongoing Trial Using PRO-CTCAE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cross-Cutting (&quot;Core&quot;)</th>
<th>Additional Based on Prior Studies</th>
<th>Study Drug</th>
<th>Control Arm Drug</th>
<th>Mechanism of Action/Preclinical</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Anorexia (appetite loss)</td>
<td></td>
<td>• Hair loss</td>
<td>• Mucositis</td>
<td>• No additional</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Constipation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Dyspnea</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Diarrhea</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Fatigue</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Nausea</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Pain</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Sensory neuropathy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Sleep disturbance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Vomiting</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- **Total: 12 AEs, represented by 20 PRO-CTCAE items**

Supported by NCI contract HHSN261201000063C
Patient-Reported Outcomes version of the Common Terminology Criteria for Adverse Events (PRO-CTCAE™)

This site was designed to provide you with information about the PRO-CTCAE, a patient-reported outcome measurement system developed by the National Cancer Institute to capture symptomatic adverse events in patients on cancer clinical trials.

The site includes an overview of the methods used to develop this measurement system, and resources and references for further information.

- What Is PRO-CTCAE?
- How Do I Use PRO-CTCAE?
- Overview
- Instrument
- Permission to Use
- Build a Custom Form
- Development Team
- PRO-CTCAE Scientific Leadership at NCI
- Resources
- Frequently Asked Questions

Build a Custom Form
How Often Should PRO-CTCAE Be Collected?

• During active treatment
  – Include baseline assessment
  – Ideally weekly, through electronic data collection remotely

• During post-treatment follow-up
  – Less frequent, e.g., every 3 or 6 months, depending on population/context

• Considerations:
  – If in-clinic data collection is unavoidable during active treatment, can space out to every 2-, 3-, or 4-week reporting to match study visit frequency
  – In such cases, the recall period of the PRO-CTCAE items should be adjusted to match the questionnaire administration frequency; it can be adjusted up to 4-weeks, but testing shows some loss of information
  – Frequency should be the same in all study arms
Optimizing Response Rates

• Without central monitoring and backup data collection, PRO-CTCAE self-report adherence is 80-85% at any given time point, whether in-clinic or between visits

• When central monitoring and backup human phone calls are added, adherence rises to 90-95%

• Adherence rates are durable over time during active treatment (i.e., little attrition)

• Rates are lower during post-treatment follow-up
Example from Actual Trial: Compliance over Time

Weekly reporting from home via Web or IVRS (patient choice), with central monitoring and backup human telephone calls

Supported by NCI contract HHSN261201000063C
Approaches to Reporting Results

- Can report like AEs in general
  - Maximum grade post-baseline at the patient level, expressed as proportions
## Example from Clinical Trial: CTCAE & PRO-CTCAE Together

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Adverse Event</th>
<th>Any Level (&gt;0)</th>
<th>High-Level*</th>
<th>p†</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Arm A</td>
<td>Arm B</td>
<td>Arm A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anorexia</td>
<td>CTCAE</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>35%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PRO-CTCAE: Severity</td>
<td>66%</td>
<td>84%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Interference</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>71%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anxiety</td>
<td>CTCAE</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>36%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PRO-CTCAE: Frequency</td>
<td>58%</td>
<td>71%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Severity</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>69%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Interference</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constipation</td>
<td>CTCAE</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>43%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PRO-CTCAE: Severity</td>
<td>58%</td>
<td>83%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Depression</td>
<td>CTCAE</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PRO-CTCAE: Frequency</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>48%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Severity</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>46%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Interference</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>41%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diarrhea</td>
<td>CTCAE</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>36%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PRO-CTCAE: Frequency</td>
<td>95%</td>
<td>88%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dysphagia</td>
<td>CTCAE</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PRO-CTCAE: Severity</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>64%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dyspnea</td>
<td>CTCAE</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PRO-CTCAE: Severity</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>57%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Interference</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>49%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* High-level for CTCAE: ≥Gr3. High-level for PRO-CTCAE: score level 3 or 4 (severe or very severe; frequently or almost constantly; quite a bit or very much).

†Based on Fisher’s exact test comparing rate of Grade or Score >0 between arms.
Neuropathy & Diarrhea: CTCAE and PRO-CTCAE

CTCAE Maximum Grade Post-baseline

Neuropathy A

Neuropathy B

Diarrhea A

Diarrhea B

% of patients
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PRO-CTCAE Maximum Score Post-baseline

Neuropathy (S) A

Neuropathy (S) B

Neuropathy (I) A

Neuropathy (I) B

Diarrhea (F) A

Diarrhea (F) B
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PRO-CTCAE Baseline Scores

- Neuropathy (S) A
- Neuropathy (S) B
- Neuropathy (I) A
- Neuropathy (I) B
- Diarrhea (F) A
- Diarrhea (F) B

Legend:
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- Score 2
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PRO-CTCAE with/without Subtraction of Baseline Scores
Treatment Arm A vs B

### PRO-CTCAE Maximum Score Post-baseline
- **Neuropathy (S) A**
- **Neuropathy (S) B**
- **Neuropathy (I) A**
- **Neuropathy (I) B**

### Same Using Baseline “Subtraction”
- **Neuropathy (S) A**
- **Neuropathy (S) B**
- **Neuropathy (I) A**
- **Neuropathy (I) B**

- **Diarrhea (F) A**
- **Diarrhea (F) B**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Score 1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Score 2</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Score 3</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Score 4</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

% of patients
 Approaches to Reporting Results

- Can report distributions of PRO-CTCAE scores at successive time points for a more granular understanding
  - Assists in understanding dynamics of AEs over time
  - Assists understanding baseline symptoms not attributable to study drug
PRO-CTCAE Distributions at Successive Time Points

Example: Diarrhea between Arms

Arm A

Arm B
Conclusions

- Use of the PRO-CTCAE in clinical trials calls on approaches both from standard adverse event assessment, and from PRO questionnaire administration.

- Consensus around best practices is quickly emerging.

- Optimal approaches will increasingly be refined as the PRO-CTCAE comes into more common use, as with any measure.
Experiences of PRO-CTCAE in oncology clinical trials -
A Sponsor early perspective and first impressions

Katarina Halling, MSc
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• Benefit – risk assessment from patients’ perspective is critical in oncology
• Evolving regulatory oncology landscape
  • symptoms
  • tolerability
  • different aspects of HRQL, e.g. physical function
• The existing PRO instruments in oncology include side effects
  • not always the most relevant ones
  • often analysed in clusters with symptoms and impact
  • lack information on impact and bothersomeness
• No existing PRO instrument fit for purpose to assess tolerability
• AstraZeneca entered collaboration with NCI in 2014
Scope of this presentation

• To share the initial learnings and how these are shaping how we plan and execute oncology clinical trials moving forward
### Number of studies where we included the PRO-CTCAE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cancer type</th>
<th>Phase (1,2,3)</th>
<th>Approx. number of patients</th>
<th>Status (planned, ongoing, completed)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Non-Small Cell Lung Cancer</td>
<td>2, 3</td>
<td>950*</td>
<td>ongoing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Small Cell Lung Cancer</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>675*</td>
<td>ongoing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Small Cell Lung Cancer</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>795*</td>
<td>planned</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bladder</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>525*</td>
<td>ongoing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pancreas</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>375*</td>
<td>planned</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Head and Neck Cancer</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>720*</td>
<td>ongoing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Head and Neck Cancer</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>628*</td>
<td>ongoing</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Interest internally

• The opportunity of this data to feed into treatment decisions recognised
• Help set the expectations for patients
• Useful in management of toxicity symptoms
• Understanding low-grade toxicities and the impact to patients
• Few projects have been resistant
• In general, easier to implement than we expected
Principles applied for including the PRO-CTCAE in clinical trials

• Agreement with NCI
• **Selection of items**
• **Assessment schedule**
• Endpoint hierarchy
• Communication of available translations
• Mode of administration
• Analytical approach
Agreement with NCI

• Agreement per study
• Overview of study design
• Discuss and agree on items selected
• Discuss translations needed
• NCI provides only items selected for specific study
Selection of items

- Gather AE information for each treatment in the trial – active & comparator (from safety reports, publications etc)

- Summarize AE information to guide discussions and decision-making

- Ensure capture of toxicities appearing early and later during treatment

- Input from key stakeholders: medical science director, study physician, medical scientist, safety physician etc

- In general, avoid overlap of items in other PROs

- Be focused in the selection of items, less is more
Challenges with selection of items

• Wish to keep the number of symptoms low – ”pick a hand-full”

• In phase 1, we know little about the side effect profile

• In oncology phases overlap – phase 3 often start before read-out of phase 1

• Beneficial if we could lock down the toxicity symptoms to focus analyses on when phase 3 SAP is finalised in discussions with FDA
Endpoint hierarchy

- The PRO-CTCAE items are included as exploratory endpoint

- The CTCAE is still the formal reporting for AEs
Assessment schedule

- Given the expected tolerability profile, weekly assessments during peak and then less frequent

- Consider the treatment cycles and when AEs might be expected
Mode of administration

• ePRO – on the same device as the other PRO assessments

• Paper not recommended – no time stamp, difficult with skip patterns
### Analytical approach

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Side effect</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Patient - BASELINE</th>
<th>TREATMENT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Nausea</td>
<td>Frequency</td>
<td>n (%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Severity</td>
<td>MILD n (%)</td>
<td>MODERATE n (%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- There is no established analytical approach at the moment, ongoing collaboration with NCI
- We have started with descriptive statistics and using graphs to facilitate interpretation
- There is ongoing work to establish analytics
Some initial reflections on results

• It may not be as bad as predicted

• Some side toxicity symptoms better tolerated IF the treatment has effect

• The pattern of different toxicity symptoms can clearly be described

• The information will help patients and physicians to make decisions and manage expectations
Key learnings - challenges

• Mixed reactions in study teams – overall positive with some initial skepticism
  – Some confusion about the aim and overlap with CTCAE
  – Payer/ HE and medical concerns

• Cross-functional collaboration

• The item selection approach has been helpful

• Assessment schedules (consider Early versus Late AEs)

• Limited availability of languages, demographic pre-selection

• Modes of administration (all ePRO or mixed)

• Scalability
Putting early results into context

• If indications in early development of unbearable toxicities to patients, it is better to know

• Development of drugs exceeding certain toxicity grades have historically been recommended by KOLs to be stopped
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