# Clinical trial designs for combination therapy

 Need for monotherapy arms

### Pathophysiology of NASH and combination therapies



Given the complexity of the pathophysiology of NASH, it may take the engagement of several targets to obtain clinically meaningful improvements , especially in more advanced stages of the disease

## Purpose:

Develop **combination therapies** to address multiple drivers of liver dysfunction and cardiometabolic disease in patients with NASH

#### Specific considerations in NASH studies

- Liver histology requirements balanced with need to minimize risk burden on patients
- Minimize patients receiving placebo or less effective therapy during clincial trial given lack of available therapies
- Consider trial design for new therapies vs standard of care or other investigational therapies

## Trial design: Example in Phase 3

Combination therapy targeting non -cirrhotic NASH



#### Key endpoints

• **Primary:** Surrogate endpoints (histologic) demonstrating resolution or improvement in disease

#### **Major Challenges**

- High screen failure rate (histology required for enrolment)
- High number of patients needed and receiving placebo
- Treatments may be synergistic and not effective alone
- Higher cost/longer time until drug approval

## Can we remove one or more monotherapy arms in Phase 3?



#### Novo Nordisk ®

## Aspects to deliberate in the working group

Pros	Points to consider and discuss
<ul> <li>Less complicated study design</li> <li>Less burdensome on patients</li> <li>Fewer patients needed on study to reach study objectives</li> <li>Builds on design of phase 2 study</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>Impact on drug approval pathway (for NASH and beyond)</li> <li>Use of historical information and/or phase 2 results in phase 3 design</li> <li>What other data sources can be considered to eliminate the need for monotherapy arms?</li> <li>What use of NITs will be acceptable for monotherapy arm?</li> <li>True placebo vs monotherapy as placebo?</li> </ul>