

Central Research Sandwich, Kent

Memorandum

7th December 1992 Date:

Dr H Krish, Germany To: Dr R Alvart, France cc:

Dr M Guttadauria, New York Dr A J Grace Dr P Hodges

Ms V M Marshall

Dr J A Milson Dr R H Swift

Mr D I Shannon Dr S J Felstead From:

Sertraline Study STL-CR-90-002 Subject:



In reply to your phone call, I attach the following analyses of the sertraline, clomipramine, placebo in-patient study.

- Overall HAM-D analysis 1)
- 2) HAM-D item 1 analysis
- 3) HAM-D item 3 analysis

The total analysis comprises over 70 patients per group, therefore the study achieves its required power reported to BGA (Table 1).

These analyses have been undertaken both by hand from listing and direct from the provided SAS datasets. They have been reviewed and checked by 2 statisticians and a physician. They include all data currently available, over seventy patients per group. The analyses are all intentto-treat rather than evaluable, because very few patients would be excluded (i.e. nearly all received the minimum of 11 days therapy).

The findings from the analyses of the entire available database, is that clomipramine is significantly superior to both sertraline and placebo, and that sertraline shows no trend to be better than placebo. This is true for total HAM-D score (Table 2), HAM-D-1 score (specific for depression (Table 3)) and for HAM-D-3 (suicidal ideation (Table 4)). In fact the latter shows a trend for placebo to be better than sertraline. Randomisation and drug supplies have been checked and appear to accord. Further analyses have been conducted and appear to show a centre/time effect.

In brief the study started as a 70 patient/group study (=210) and 24 centres were activated. The study was then extended at the behest of Central Research to 300 patients. Therefore a further 12 then 8 centres (total=20) were added to allow an increase in both rate of and total recruitment (Table 5). The first 24 centres data (c150/220 patients available than placebo and clomipramine better than placebo (Table 6).

(c70/220 patients), show sertraline to be equivalent to clomipramine, both better than placebo (Table 7). Therefore there is a centre or time effect seen with sertraline. I should note that the placebo and clomipramine responses in the first 24 centres and the last 20 centres are near identical, so the effect is confined to sertraline alone.

We predict that if this trend is repeated through to the full 300 patient study that sertraline should at least show a trend to be better than placebo, although it will not achieve statistical significance.

At present however 75% of the available data is from the first 24 centres therefore there is <u>no</u> <u>way</u> of distinguishing sertraline from placebo.

The Central Research regulatory assessment is that these data are not currently helpful in achieving registration and that further time to complete the study and investigate centre effects (assuming they are maintained) is necessary.

I hope this clarifies the data so far.

Best Regards,

Dr S J Felstead

SJFIkw/CD8

Number of Patients Included in ITT Analysis Treatment Group PLACEBO 71 Total 223 218

SERTRALINE STUDY 90-002

TABLE 3/1A

	Source	Analysis of Variance		SUMMARY TABLE FOR BASELINE TO ENDPOINT CHANGE OF HAMD 17 ITEMS
		Ar	,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,	OR BASELINE
ì	df	aly		0.7
1	Mean Square	Analysis of Variance		ENDPOINT
1		rlance		CHANGE
į	43	į		약
1				HAMD
	שי			17
				ITEMS

Treatment Residual

215

625.8 84.2

7.44

0.0008

CONFIDENTIAL

Treatment Comparison
Sertraline-Clomipramine

Comparison

Difference Between Adjusted Means

95% Confidence Limits on Difference Between Means Lower Upper CONTRAST

Placebo

Adjusted Mean Std. Dev.

-10.25 8.65 71 Adjusted Mean Std. Dev. N

-14.87 9.26 76 Adjusted Mean Std. Dev. N

-9.51 9.59 71

Clomipramine

Sertraline

Sertraline-Placebo
Clomipramine-Placebo
------Run date-04DEC92

-4.61

2.38, -2.29, -7.60,

8.34 3.78 -1.63

20.02

5.36

Analysis of Variance	Analys	Analysis of Variance	nce	
Source df Square F P	df	Mean Square	 	df Square F P
Treatment Residual	215	1.50	5.27	0.0058

SUMMARY TABLE FOR BASELINE TO ENDPOINT CHANGE OF HAMD ITEM 1

CONFIDENTIAL

Placebo

Adjusted Mean Std. Dev.

-1.37 1.29 71 Clomipramine

Adjusted Mean Std. Dev.

-1.93 1.16 76

Adjusted Mean Std. Dev. N

Sertraline

Treatment Comparison
Sertraline-Clomipramine
Sertraline-Placebo
Clomipramine-Placebo

-0.57

-0.41,

0.97 0.41 -0.17

b > 0.02

50.07

0.17,

0.57

Run date=04DEC92

Comparison

Difference Between Adjusted Means

95% Confidence Limits on Difference Between Means Lower Upper CONTRAST

SUMMARY TABLE FOR BASELINE TO ENDPOINT CHANGE OF HAMD ITEM 3 Analysis of Variance df Mean Square

Treatment Residual

2 215

3.25

0.0405

Source

Sertraline

Clomipramine

Adjusted Mean Std. Dev.

-1.00 1.05 76

Adjusted Mean Std. Dev. N

-0.51 1.26 71

6 > 0.0 Z 50.07 P>0.05

Run date=04DEC92

Clomipramine-Placebo Sertraline-Placebo Sertraline-Clomipramine Treatment Comparison

> 0.25 0.49

-0.62, -0.13,

0.11,

0.87 0.64

Difference Between Adjusted Means

95% Confidence Limits on Difference Between Means Lower Upper

CONTRAST

Placebo

Adjusted Mean Std. Dev.

| Number of | Patients | Included in | ITT Analysis | Number of | Patients Included in ITT Analysis SERTRALINE | Treatment Group |CLOMIPRAMI~| PLACEBO Total

BLE FOR BASELINE	, 6		
only = 14 (2.)	TABLE 3/1E		
	TO ENDPOINT CHANGE	OF HAMD	17 ITEMS
	is of Variance	Ce	1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1
	Mean Square	raj	טי
Residual 146	690.4 86.5	7.98 0.	0.0005
	\$ 1 1 2 2 3 4 6	1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1	
Sertraline Adjusted Std. Dev. N	d Mean v.	-7.35 9.69 49	!
Clomipramine Adjusted Std. Dav N	d Mean	-14.75 9:31 51	i
Placebo Adjusted Std. Dev. N	d Mean	-10,49 8.88 49	!
·			•
	CONTRAST	1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1	2
İs	nce Between ted Means	95% Confidence Difference Bet Lower	Between Means
e 28	1 1 1 1 1 1		
Sertraline-Clomipramine 7	7.40	3.71,	11.08
Sertraline-Placebo 3	3.14	-0.58,	6.86
Clomipramine-Placebo -4	4.26	-7.94,	-0.57
Run date=04DEC92			

TABLE 31 TF

Treatment Residual	Source		SUMMARY TABLE FOR BASELINE TO ENDPOINT CHANGE OF HAMD 17 ITEMS Centres 2+3 only = 20 (D.T. C.
66 2	df	Analys	BASELINE TO E
192.4 71.4	Mean Square	Analysis of Variance	NDPOINT C
2,69	; ; ; ; ; ; ;	Lance	HANGE OF HA
0.0751	df Square F P	Analysis of Variance	IFOR BASELINE TO ENDPOINT CHANGE OF HAMD 17 ITEMS
i	i	ii	

CONFIDENTIAL

Comparison

Difference Between Adjusted Means

95% Confidence Limits on Difference Between Means Lower Upper

CONTRAST

Placebo

Adjusted Mean Std. Dev. N

Adjusted Mean Std. Dev. N

Adjusted Mean Std. Dev. N

Clomipramine

Sertraline

Run date=04DEC92

Sertraline-Placebo Sertraline-Clomipramine Treatment Comparison

-4.59 -5.39

-10.31, -9.66,

0.48

P> 0.05 10.00

50.07

0.80

Clomipramine-Placebo