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Scientific Background

- Rapid progress in the molecular analysis of diseases.
- Increasing numbers of molecularly defined sub-entities of various diseases, particularly cancers.
- Hypotheses, that molecular subtypes are more relevant than histology or traditional disease entities.
- Huge number of new pharmacological substances and potential modes of action.
- Dissatisfaction with the current phase I – III clinical trial system, too slow and too many futile trials.
Umbrella Trial and Basket Trial.

Potential Design of a Platform Trial Involving a Single Disease.

### Types of Master Protocols.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Trial</th>
<th>Objective</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Umbrella</td>
<td>To study multiple targeted therapies in the context of a single disease</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Basket</td>
<td>To study a single targeted therapy in the context of multiple diseases or disease subtypes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Platform</td>
<td>To study multiple targeted therapies in the context of a single disease in a perpetual manner, with therapies allowed to enter or leave the platform on the basis of a decision algorithm</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Basket / Bucket trial design

2015: 1st publication of a basket trial (NEJM).

https://www.mskcc.org/blog/clinical-trial-shows-promise-basket-studies-drugs?
Objectives: Evaluation of a targeted therapy in pts. with genetically defined characteristics, independent of the disease / cancer type.

- Combinable with randomisation and prolongation of study cohorts*
- Allows for the inclusion of very rare diseases.
- Combinable with stopping rules à la phase II/III trials \(\rightarrow\)* Adaptive Design

Example: Vemurafenib tested in 9 different cancers with BRAF V600-mutation.
Schematic example of a basket trial.

8 cohorts $BRAF^{V600}$ positive cancers:
- Metastatic solid tumors
- Multiple myeloma

$BRAF^{V600}$ testing
- All $BRAF^{V600}$ mutations
- Tested by local routine methods
- Retrospective optional evaluation with cobas 4800 $BRAF$ mutation test

Drug

- Target A
  - Tumor type X
  - Tumor type Y
- Target B
  - Tumor type Z
  - Tumor type W

Vemurafenib
(960 mg orally twice daily)
Basket / Bucket trial design

➢ One trial protocol only, but with complete sub-group protocols incl. eligibility criteria, stopping rules, risk-benefit assessment and informed consent material for each disease entity
➢ Valid biomarkers and cutpoints essential
➢ Targeted treatment may differ re efficacy & safety across diseases. -> no global analyses.
➢ No shared control group -> different diseases
➢ May be useful for phase I/II studies
Das Umbrella Trial Design

- Umbrella protocol infrastructure
- Centralized screening and identification of patients
- Biomarker profiling

Biomarker defined Cohort 1
  - RCT (Phase 2/3 or Phase 3)
    - Targeted Agent
    - Placebo / Std. of care

Biomarker defined Cohort 2
  - RCT (Phase 2/3 or Phase 3)
    - Targeted Agent
    - Placebo / Std. of care

Biomarker defined Cohort N
  - RCT (Phase 2/3 or Phase 3)
    - Targeted Agent
    - Placebo / Std. of care

Biomarker unclassified cohort
  - Standard of care or RCT (not biomarker driven)
Umbrella Design

Approach: One disease gets molecularly analysed, each subtype receives a different targeted treatment, either in a cohort (phase I or II) or in a RCT (phase III)

- One trial protocol for as many targeted treatment options as available.
- Suitable for all phases, flexible for ADs; similar to an Enrichment-Design.
- Often used with surrogate endpoints only.
- Often control groups can be pooled.
- Advantages from a patients’ and biometrical point of view.
Master protocols - Interim result

- Umbrella-Trials: Potential for advantages for patient care and combinable control groups.
- Basket-Trials: Less obvious advantages given that a basket trial is highly complex and a challenge re logistics, coordination etc. Single trials may be easier to do.
- All master protocols are typically combined with adaptive design elements. → a.a.r. Risk of bias increased.
Promise of Adaptive Designs (ADs) - Speed-up

Traditional Phase II and III Studies

- Group A
- Group B
- Group C
- Placebo Group

- Data analysis
- Planning Phase III
- Phase II results available
- End of Phase III

Adaptive design – combined Phase II/III

- Group A: Drop Group A
- Group B
- Group C: Drop C
- Placebo

- Interim Analysis I
- Interim Analysis II
- End of Phase III

Seamless
**Adaptive Designs (ADs)**

Adaptive (engl.) = learning

**Aim:** To combine the ‘exploratory’ and the ‘confirmatory’ part of a study (program) in such a way that valid, bias-free results (and drug approval) are achieved with less patients and in less time.

→ Seamless drug trials/development
Traditional vs. adaptive approach

Traditional:
- A priori hypotheses and endpoints
- Sample size estimation
- Fixed trial protocol, small risk of bias

Adaptive Design:
Prospectively planned modifications of the trial protocol, based on first results
→ Risk of bias
Adaptation: Risks

Not only the astute investigator can often draw conclusions from the type of adaptation re efficacy / safety of the IND. By this the integrity of the trial conduct and the data is at risk.

Validity at risk → endangers the legitimacy of the trial from an ethical point of view.
Inspection Order of Ethics-Committees

- The scientific quality of the investigation
- The lawfulness
- the ethical acceptability
- the medical acceptability
Adaptive Designs – Definition FDA

An *adaptive design clinical study* is defined as a study that includes a *prospectively planned* opportunity for modification of one or more specified aspects of the study design and hypotheses based on analysis of data (usually interim data) from subjects in the study. Analyses of the accumulating study data are performed at *prospectively planned* timepoints within the study, can be performed in a fully blinded or in an unblinded manner, and can occur with or without formal statistical hypothesis testing.
A study design is called ‘adaptive’ if statistical methodology allows the modification of a design element (e.g. sample size, randomisation ratio, number of treatment arms) at an interim analysis with full control of the type I error.

→ AD has to be prospectively planned. This requirement is stressed by CTFG 2019 too.
Scheme of Adaptive Designs

Flexible Designs

Adaptive Designs

Learning Phase

Combined (Seamless) Phase

Adaptive Dose Response (Toxicity)

Adaptive Dose Response (Efficacy)

Phase I/IIa

Phase IIb/III

confirmatory Phase

Adaptive Randomization

Group Sequential

Sample Size Re-estimation

Combinations of GS and SSR

Studies with Unknown Properties

Planned

Unplanned
Adaptive Designs: Requirements

Any adaptations have to be prospectively defined and should be based on traceable blinded interim analysis only, otherwise the study cannot be considered as an 'adequate and well-controlled effectiveness (A&WC) study'.

Even prospectively planned ADs may increase the risk of bias!
The FDA accepts, based on prospectively planned, blinded interim analyses, adaptations re

- the eligibility criteria
- the sample size*
- secondary endpoints without an association with efficacy parameters
- groupsequentiel plans und futility
- the Data Analysis Plan*

DSMB/DMC essential, where required blinded

FDA: Adaptive Design Clinical Trials for Drugs and Biologics. 2010

* only aggregated data analyses permitted
Ethical issues of ADs, MPs and Seamlessness

➢ How to guarantee that the patient information (leaflet) provides at all times comprehensive, accurate and up to date information, e.g. re safety, given that the study is planned to be seamless?

➢ How to guarantee that the risk-benefit assessment is kept up to date and that decisions re continuation or stop of the study are properly performed, given the considerable time pressure?

➢ How to safeguard the methodological integrity of the study and the data (bias, type I error)?
Ethics Committees Checklist

• Clear description and justification of CCT-design?
• Scientific integrity given? Prospectiveness?
• Quality of trial conduct and clinical feasibility ensured?
• Safety of trial subjects maintained?
• Data integrity maintained?
• Reassessment of benefit-risk balance at critical steps throughout clinical trial warranted?
• Companion diagnostics validated?
• Data transparency issues considered?
Ethics Committees Checklist

• Up to date informed consent material provided?
• DMC/DSMB with competent and independent members provided?
Practical Issues

• MPs ask for a central competent and powerfull infrastructure, e.g. for the molec. screening, administration, and organisation.

• Seamless Designs shorten the time available for the analysis und interpretation of the data → Risk for wrong assessments and interpretations.

• Often excessively complex and voluminess protocols (>500 p.) – serious problem for authorities, RECs, investigators und sponsors.

• MPs not planned for in the current laws and regulations.
Conclusions

- MPs and ADs offer interesting new concepts for clinical research.
- They are highly complex however and a challenge for all stakeholders.
- ADs increase the risk of bias.
- All adaptations have to be prespecified in the study protocol.
- It is not yet clear how the legal requirements re patient information can be properly met.
- When planning a MP/AD early scientific advice of EMA and competent REC is advised.
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