

Clinical Trial Methodology Challenges in a Device Used in Chronic Neurological/Psychiatric Disorders

Stephen Brannan, M.D.
Senior Medical Director
Novartis Neuroscience

February 26, 2008

What kind of device?

- An implantable device for use in neurological and psychiatric disorders that provides continuous, intermittent, stimulation of certain neural pathways
 - Its use in these disorders is in late (Algorithm) stages for chronic use
 - Approval via PMA route (one prior indication)
 - Small company with limited resources
-

What constitutes the right treatment?

- What is the right stimulus?
 - Stimulation, Inhibition, Disruption
 - Unilateral or bilateral?
 - What is an adequate dose?
 - The best way to deliver the stimulus
 - At what levels? For how long?
 - What constitutes adequate duration?
 - Continuous versus intermittent
 - Immediate effects versus modulating neural systems (and how long is required to do so?)
-

- What are appropriate animal models for the Central Nervous System?
 - With pharmaceuticals, rats are often used and appear adequate for basic pharmacology
 - For neural devices, the complexity of the CNS is inadequate
 - Primates are closer to the human CNS (e.g. insular circuits, self awareness), but expensive
 - Some circuitry may be uniquely human
-
-

- What constitutes an adequate dose?
 - Transmission of stimulus to the neural circuitry
 - Charge density (Pulse width, current)
 - Frequency
 - Interruption vs stimulation vs pacing
 - Minimal effective dose vs suprathreshold
 - How can you be sure the “dose” is biologically relevant
-
-

What constitutes adequate duration?

- Time to first appreciable effects
 - Side effects do not connote beneficial effects are occurring
 - Biomarker proxies?
 - Do early effects predict long-term outcome?
 - Time to adequate/optimal dosing
 - Does the neural circuit respond instantaneously?
 - If not, how long is required?
-
-



ISCTM

THE INTERNATIONAL SOCIETY FOR CNS
CLINICAL TRIALS AND METHODOLOGY

Problems with surgery

- Surgery itself has risks
 - Adverse events
 - Poor placements
 - In addition surgery:
 - Requires expertise in the proper placement of the device
 - Adds to the costs
 - Adds to the logistical/coordination load
 - Can complicate “placebo” arms
 - Makes interpretation of early adverse events more difficult
-

- How relevant is the previous safety of the device in the other disorder?
 - Are there unique safety issues in the new d/o?
 - A new device with unknown (or incompletely known) mechanism of action leads to difficulties in assessing causation
 - “I don’t know that it doesn’t cause these things!” (e.g. skin cancer in Florida)
 - Early effects due to surgery or the device?
 - Need to properly educate/train in an environment sensitive to “coercion”
-

- Can it be “safely” done?
 - Often difficult to provide an adequate “placebo” arm in device studies
 - Not turning the device on
 - Using a subthreshold dose
 - Using intermittent stimulation spaced too far apart to be effective
 - Need for blinding the raters?
 - Programmers separate from the rater?
-
-

The problems of long duration trials:

- Inability to standardize conditions for all subjects
 - Interference of other conditions
 - Life events
 - Use of medications/treatments
 - How often should f/u occur?
 - Does it decrease the effect of placebo?
-
-

The implications of being used late in treatment algorithms:

- Can placebo treatment be safely used?
 - “Add-on” trial design
 - Treatments were continued (but not controlled)
 - Usually on multiple treatments
 - Different illness durations and responsiveness
 - If subjects respond, can one then withdraw the treatment?
-
-

Early results here were not as good as in the initial pilot study, why?

- By increasing the sites:
 - Adequate stimulation was lost
 - Quality of subjects decreased
 - Other problems:
 - Different substudies at different sites
 - No attention paid to the timing of the pivotal outcomes versus the timing of substudy components
-
-



The trial was designed as an “add-on” to “treatment as usual” (TAU)

- Beyond the initial time period of a few months, subjects were free to change Rxs
 - How does one then know if subsequent changes in status are due to the device or to the change in the other Rxs?
 - Confound of the need/desire to change Rx when things are not going well
-
-

- Animal models are often inadequate to fully anticipate human CNS responses and function
 - Use an adequate “dose” for an adequate duration
 - Take surgical issues into account
 - Anticipate disorder specific safety issues
 - Device trials often cannot easily compare with placebo treatment
 - With this device special issues came into play because of the late stage use and need for long Rx duration
 - The use of multiple uncontrolled treatments over the duration of the trial
-
-