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Today’s agenda

1. Current situation of Multi Regional Clinical Trial (MRCT)-related new drug development in Japan

2. Japan’s approach for promoting MRCT
Environment changes of drug development

### Target Diseases

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Lifestyle-related Disease</th>
<th>Unmet Medical Needs</th>
<th>Rare Disease Oncology</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

### Modality

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Small Molecule</th>
<th>Bio Pharmaceuticals</th>
<th>Cellular, Genomics</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
## MRCT - Pros & Cons

### Pros
- Simultaneous application/approval in the world
- Shortening development period
- Understanding ethnic difference in efficacy/safety
- Evaluating rare AE based on larger patients enrollment
- Impossible to conduct a study in single country

### Cons
- Similarity of dose response in each region
- Complicated global action for urgent issue
- Individual standard of care in each country
Trends of new drug application based on MRCTs in Japan

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>MRCT</th>
<th>Bridging Strategy</th>
<th>% of MRCT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FY2007</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY2008</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY2009</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY2010</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY2011</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>9.2</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>9.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY2012</td>
<td>134</td>
<td>14.2</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>14.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY2013</td>
<td>138</td>
<td>15.9</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>15.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY2014</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>26.9</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>26.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY2015</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>20.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Lag in drug development between US and Japan

Drug lag

Drugs used in other country is not approved in Japan

Development lag

Delayed period of new drug application to Japan
Lag in drug development between US and Japan

1,870 days

90 days 560 days

Median for all cases 1,111 days

Clinical development strategy

Today’s agenda

1. Current situation of Multi Regional Clinical Trial (MRCT)-related new drug development in Japan

2. Japan’s approach for promoting MRCT
Japanese guidance document for MRCT

2007 Guidance
Basic principles on Global Clinical Trials

2012 Addendum
Basic Principles on Global Clinical Trials (Reference Cases)

2014 Addendum
Basic Principles for Conducting Phase I Trials in the Japanese Population Prior to Global Clinical Trials

English:

English:

English:
How to evaluate the MRCT data from PMDA’s perspective?

- 2007 Guidance mentioned the following Q&A.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Q6. When conducting an exploratory trial like a dose-finding study or a confirmatory trial as a global clinical trial, how is it appropriate to determine a sample size and a proportion of Japanese subjects?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A global trial should be designed so that consistency can be obtained between results from the entire population and the Japanese population, and by ensuring consistency of each region, it could be possible to appropriately extrapolate the result of full population to each region</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
How to evaluate the MRCT data from PMDA’s perspective?

• 2007 Guidance mentioned the following Q&A.

Q6. When conducting an exploratory trial like a dose-finding study or a confirmatory trial as a global clinical trial, how is it appropriate to determine a sample size and a proportion of Japanese subjects?

• How to determine the number of Japanese subject

  Method 1:
  \[ \frac{D_{\text{Japan}}}{D_{\text{all}}} > 0.5 \] will occur with a probability of 80 % or higher

  \( D \) : difference between placebo and study drug

  \( D_{\text{all}} \) : difference in the entire study population across regions

  \( D_{\text{Japan}} \) : difference within the Japanese sub-population

  Method 2:
  each of the \( D_1, D_2, \) and \( D_3 \) show a similar tendency with a probability of 80 % or higher (e.g. \( D > 0 \Rightarrow D_1, D_2, D_3 > 0 \))

  \( D_1, D_2, D_3 \) : differences between placebo and study drug groups in each region
How to evaluate the MRCT data from PMDA’s perspective?

- 2007 Guidance mentioned the following Q&A.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Q6. When conducting an exploratory trial like a dose-finding study or a confirmatory trial as a global clinical trial, how is it appropriate to determine a sample size and a proportion of Japanese subjects?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>If results from a Japanese subgroup are markedly different from those in the entire study population, the reasons for it should be examined and in this case, because an additional clinical trial may be needed where necessary, it is recommended to utilize the clinical trial consultation with PMDA.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Trends of new drug application based on MRCTs in Japan

![Graph showing trends of new drug application based on MRCTs in Japan.](image)

**2007 Guidance**

- FY2007: 81
- FY2008: 79

**2012 Addendum**

- FY2009: 107
- FY2010: 114

**2014 Addendum**

- FY2011: 130
- FY2012: 134
- FY2013: 138
- FY2014: 119
- FY2015: 115

Number of Approved Drugs

- Total
- MRCT
- Bridging Strategy
- % of MRCT

Summary

1. The number of MRCTs conducted in Japan is increasing from 2007

2. Japan’s approach of issuing guidance for MRCT is thought to contribute to the increase of MRCTs involving Japan

Thank you for your attention!
PMDA-ATC MRCT Seminar 2017

- **Date**: 23 January - 26 January, 2017
- **Venue**: PMDA conference room 21-23
- **Number of participants**: 32 in total from 14 countries/regions (Brazil 2, China 1, Indonesia 3, Malaysia 5, Mexico 1, Myanmar 2, Nepal 1, Papua New Guinea 1, Peru 3, Philippines 4, Sri Lanka 2, Taiwan 3, Tanzania 2, Thailand 2)

- **Key Seminar Objectives**:
  - To build skilled human capacity in regulatory science to promote and facilitate Multi-Regional Clinical Trials (MRCTs)
  - To enhance regulatory cooperation in the APEC region on the evaluation and regulation of MRCTs

* Next MRCT Seminar is scheduled in January 2018
How to perform GCP Inspection for MRCT

Office of Non-clinical and Clinical Compliance
Atsushi Kawashima
Typical Schedule of Oversea Inspection

- NDA
- Close communication with applicant*
- Pre-submitted Documents
- (as needed) Inquiries/Reply
- Approval

Selection

Notification of Conducting Inspection

On-site Inspection**

Notification of Inspection Results

0 1.5 4 5 - 5.5 7 12 (Months)

* Arrangement of inspection schedule, F2F meeting
**Domestic sites → Foreign sites → Foreign sponsors → domestic sponsors
Selection of Clinical trials and Medical Institutions to be inspected (point to consider)

Clinical trials

- Priority in the clinical data package for J-NDA (e.g. pivotal trial, bridging trial)

Medical Institutions

- Sampling Number
  - The drugs with new active pharmaceutical ingredients (Excluding the drugs of quick/priority review, the orphan drugs) → Approximately 4 institutions
  - Others → Approximately 2 institutions

- The number of subjects
- Results of previous inspections

- Clinical trials and Medical Institutions to be inspected are decided on after discussing them with NDA reviewer.
- Additional institutions will be inspected if there are problems identified during review/inspection process.
Selection of Clinical trials and Medical Institutions in oversea inspection

Conduct Oversea Inspection?

Points to be considered

- (Pivotal trial in the package) was conducted in foreign countries?
- (Product) already approved by foreign authorities?
- (Trial/Institution) already inspected by foreign authorities?
- Others (total ratio/number of subject in Japanese sites, etc.)
Which country/medical institutions to be inspected?

Points to be considered

- Conducted clinical trials at the site
- The number of subjects
- Results of previous inspections
- Future inspection plan
- Inspection of foreign authorities
- Others (security situation, etc.)

Usually 2 medical institutions in 1 country are selected.
Submitted Documents at the application from applicant

PMDA request applicant to submit the report contains the following:

1. Outline of Application (Product name, Product code, applicator name etc.)
2. Date of Application
3. Information of the Sponsor/ sponsor-investigator (including CROs)
4. The list of the medical institution (PI name, duration, number of subjects, number of discontinued subject, number of subjects occurred adverse reactions)
5. Information of the prior inspection
6. Others (result of the inspection by the foreign agency)

Based on this report and CTD, we select clinical trails and medical institutions to be inspected.
Main points in the Checklist of Medical institution

Outline of Clinical Trials
Requirement of Medical institute
Control of Clinical Trials

Investigator
Requirement, work information transfer to the Staffs

Subjects
Selection of the Subjects
Informed consent

IRB
Organization, Management, review process to result notification

Control of Clinical Trials
AE information, Investigational Drugs control, Record keeping

Case Report
Consistency to the source documents
Investigator’s confirmation

Sponsor’s attendance at the medical institution is not permitted.

Checklist (Only Japanese) is available in the PMDA website
http://www.pmda.go.jp/files/000162584.doc
Main points in the Checklist of Sponsor

Confirm matters on the Medical Institute inspection at the Sponsor when it needed

Checklist (Only Japanese) is available in the PMDA website
http://www.pmda.go.jp/files/000162809.doc
Experience of Oversea On-site Inspection 1)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>The number of IPs inspected 2)</th>
<th>62</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The number of sponsors inspected (including CROs)</td>
<td>63 3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USA</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>China</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Korea</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>German</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UK</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taiwan</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Austria</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Breakdown by nations</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USA</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Switzerland</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Netherlands</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>China</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poland</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philippines</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Korea</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belgium</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>France</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>German</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spain</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Czech Republic</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UK</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brazil</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Italy</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taiwan</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Romania</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Austria</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>India</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The number of medical institutions inspected</td>
<td>86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USA</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Romania</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>France</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>China</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Czech Republic</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brazil</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Korea</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>India</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ukraine</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taiwan</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canada</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Netherlands</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UK</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hungary</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belgium</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>German</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philippines</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Australia</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spain</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Austria</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poland</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2) Notification No. of inspection results in every calendar year (per applicant)
3) 9 cases are coincident inspection of on-site inspection and document-based inspection
Number of Medical institutions
(Inspected and Finding(s) Notified)
(Oversea inspection)

Number of Medical institutions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Inspected Medical Institution</th>
<th>Finding(s)* Notified Medical Institution</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FY2011</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY2012</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY2013</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY2014</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY2015</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*including both General finding(s) and Finding(s) for individual subjects
Breakdown of **General finding(s)**

*(Oversea inspection)*

- **Clinical Trial Contract**
  - Incomplete Clinical Trial Contract (Article 13)

- **Investigational Product Control**
  - Incomplete Investigational Product Control/Accountability (Article 39)

- **Outsourcing Duties**
  - Incomplete contract with Outsourcing Duties (Article 39-2)

- **Subinvestigators etc.**
  - Incomplete delegation of Subinvestigators etc. (Article 43)

(tatal; 10 cases, FY2008-2012)
Breakdown of Finding(s) for individual subjects
(Oversea inspection)

- Record Keeping (Article 41-2)
  - Incomplete record keeping
    (Medical records, Examination report, etc.)

- Selection of Subjects (Article 44)
  - Noncompliance with inclusion/exclusion criteria

- Deviations from Protocol (Article 46-1)
  - Noncompliance with dosage/usage, use of prohibited concomitant medications

- Case Report Form (CRF) (Article 47-1)
  - Inaccurate preparation of CRF
    (Examination results • AE • Concomitant medication)

- Informed Consent of Subjects
  (Article 50, 51, 52, 53, 54)
  - Incomplete Informed consent (Article 50)
  - Incomplete consent to continue (Article 54) etc.

(Total: 55 cases, FY 2008-2012)
Communication with foreign agency

• When foreign inspectors inspect Japanese site/sponsor, PMDA consider the participation of their inspection as an observer.

• When PMDA inspect foreign site/sponsor, foreign inspectors can participate in our inspection as an observer, too.

• FDA and PMDA hold the meeting about inspection method using the data conformed CDISC standard.
2nd JAPAN-INDIA MEDICAL PRODUCTS REGULATION SYMPOSIUM

24th APRIL 2017

CLINICAL TRIAL SYSTEM & REVIEW IN INDIA
Clinical Trial Regulations

Overall Summary

- Clinical Trial on new drugs/ IND requires permission from Ethics Committee and DCG(I) in India
- Clinical Trials are required to follow Indian GCP guidelines which are equivalent to ICH guidelines
- The application format and data requirements are as per CTD document and are given on CDSCO website i.e. www.cdsco.nic.in
- For obtaining permission to conduct Clinical Trial
  - Complete CMC data
  - Preclinical study
    - Pharmacological data
    - Toxicological data
Clinical Trial Regulations

- Report of earlier phases of studies (Phase I, II & III)
- Protocol, IB, ICF, details of site, EC approval etc. need to be submitted
  - These are evaluated by Regulators and Subject Expert Committee (SEC) comprising of pharmacologist, toxicologist, relevant clinical subject expert (3 to 7) (Professor or Head of the Department of relevant therapeutic category from Government Medical Colleges)
  - which is then deliberated in Technical and / or Apex committees
  - Approval of protocol for the development of drugs/ vaccines for the diseases of relevance to Indian Health scenario are given fast track treatment
Requirements of Data in Animal Pharmacology

- Summary
- Specific pharmacological actions
- General pharmacological actions
- Follow-up and Supplemental Safety Pharmacology Studies
- Pharmacokinetics: Absorption, Distribution; Metabolism; Excretion
Requirements of Data in Animal Toxicology

- General Aspects
- Systemic Toxicity Studies
- Male Fertility Study
- Female Reproduction and Developmental Toxicity Studies
- Local toxicity
- Allergenicity /Hypersensitivity
- Genotoxicity
- Carcinogenicity
Phase I (Non therapeutic safety evaluation trial)

- In Normal Healthy Volunteers for deciding Maximum tolerated dose (MTD) i.e safety (by SAD, MAD study), additionally pharmacokinetics, pharmacodynamics, drug-drug and drug-food interaction may also be studied.
- Animal pharmacology and toxicology data are very important.
- NOAEL level and
- starting dose selected for First-in-human (FIH)
- MTD studies need to be reviewed for appropriateness
Phase II (Exploratory therapeutic trial)

- To evaluate efficacy of drug and to find appropriate dose in homogenous selected small patient group and to find out short term safety of drug.
- Aim is to generate sufficient data on efficacy, safety, dosage to be used for going in Phase III
Phase III-( Therapeutic Confirmatory trials)

- To demonstrate safety and efficacy in large number of patients about stated indication
- Statistics (non inferiority, superiority, equivalence trial)
- Multicenter enrolment of all ethnic groups
- Choice of comparator, treatment duration
- Efficacy and safety assessment criteria (scoring etc) are important for review
Phase IV

- For optimization of drug utilization, for evaluating residual safety and various changes in the prescribing information
Evaluation of CT applications

Application

CDSCO, HQ

Examination by the respective Division

Detailed Review by IND Committee /SECs

Technical committee and/or Apex Committee

Approval by DCG (I)
Key areas of evaluation in an application

- Risk Vs. Benefit
- Innovation Vs. Existing Therapy
- Unmet Medical Need
- Ethical Aspects For Patient Safety
- India Specific Concerns
Clinical Trial Regulations

Recent Changes

- Online submission and processing of Clinical trial applications is initiated by CDSCO.
- Expansion of Subject Expert Committee panels leading to reduction in the timeline.
- Training of Subject expert committee members and reviewers of CDSCO.
- Publication of “Handbook for Applicants and Reviewers of Clinical trials of New Drugs in India”.
Clinical Trial Regulations

Recent Changes

- Applicability of Audio Visual recording has been rationalized to match global and national requirements for conduct of good and quality clinical trial in India. It is now required for New Chemical Entities and in vulnerable populations only.

- Definitions of injury and compensation mechanism is rationalized.

- Timelines for SAE reporting by Investigator, Ethics Committee, Sponsor have been rationalized.

- Parallel submission of application of clinical trials of r-DNA based drugs/Vaccines to RCGM and CDSCO is now accepted.
Recent Changes

- Restriction of 3 trials per Investigators and requirement of 50 bedded hospital are removed with the condition that it shall be decided by Ethics Committee.
- Now Academic trials of approved drug formulation does not require DCG(I) permission in respect for any new claims including repurposing of drug & can be initiated on the basis of Ethics Committee approval.
- Import and export of biological Samples for testing etc does not require any permission (earlier it used to require HMSC and DCG(I) permission).
Clinical Trial Regulations

Recent Changes

- Inspection of clinical trial
- Registration of ethics committees
- Further regulation are under review and development in harmonisation with best practices
Thank You !
Strategies and challenges for drug development

April 24, 2017
SATOSHI KUNITADA, Ph.D.
Chairperson, Drug Evaluation Committee
Japan Pharmaceutical Manufacturers Association
Corporate Adviser, Daiichi Sankyo Co., Ltd
Today’s Agenda

• Surrounding Environment of Pharmaceutical Industries
  ✓ Targets and Modalities
  ✓ Drug Development

• Our forces
  ✓ Multi Regional Clinical Trial
  ✓ Alliance among industry, government and academy
  ✓ An Example of MRCT

• Key success factors for MRCT
  ✓ Everybody wins
Environmental Changes

Target Disease
- Lifestyle-related Disease
- Unmet Medical Needs
- Rare Disease Oncology

Medical Practice
- Standardized Medicine
- Personalized Medicine
- Precision Medicine

Modalities
- Low Molecular Synthetic Compounds
- Bio Pharmaceutical
- Antibody Cellular Genomics

Clinical Trials
- Randomized Controlled Trial
- Randomized Registry Trial
Our forces in drug development

- Multi regional clinical trial
- Interaction among industry, academy and government
- Science & Network in Academia
- Highly predictable PoC study
Clinical Trials – Japan used to be isolated –

Before 1990

1990～early 2000

mid 2000～now
MRCT - Pros & Cons

**Pros**
- Earlier launch possible
- Simultaneous Application/Approval in the world
- Shortening development – few Pts in each country
- Race difference in efficacy/safety understanding
- Rare AE based on larger patients enrolled
- Impossible to conduct a study in single country

**Cons**
- Good dose rationale in each region necessary
- Complicated global action for urgent issue
- Individual SOC in each countries
Top 30 countries participated in MRCT (2008 – 2012)

Note: The survey target is the cumulative of trials beginning from 2008 to 2012, with a total of 2,347 trials.

Report from Office of Pharmaceutical Industry Research No.5 (Dec, 2014)
MRCTs for New approved drugs in Japan

An Example of Multi Regional Clinical Trial
Clinical trials for Edoxaban (AF, DVT/PE)


Atrial Fibrillation

- Phase 2a (Japan)
- Phase 2b (Japan)
- Phase 2b (US/EU)
- Phase 3 (MRCT)

DVT/PE

- Phase 2b (Asia)
- Phase 3 (MRCT)

- Dec, 2013 JP SNDA
- Sep, 2014 Approved
- Apr, 2014 US NDA
- Jan, 2015 Approved
- Jan, 2014 EU NDA
- Jun, 2015 Approved
Hokusai-VTE: study design
Randomized, double-blind, event-driven study

N=8,292
439 sites in 37 countries

Objectively confirmed VTE

Stratified randomization:
- DVT / PE
- Dose of edoxaban
- Risk factors

All patients followed for 12-months regardless of treatment duration

Edoxaban 60 mg (30 mg)*

Day 1-5
Day 6-12†
3 mo
12 mo

Sham INR
INR
Warfarin (INR 2.0 – 3.0)

* Dose was halved to 30 mg in patients perceived to be at higher risk for bleeding due to potential overanticoagulation by predefined criteria
† During days 6-12 edoxaban or placebo edoxaban was started once heparin was stopped

Basic Considerations for a Project

Quality

MRCT

Cost  Speed
Rationale for Development activity in India: Comparison on Cost and Quality

- **Cost of clinical trials in India is ~40% lower than in the US**
- Inspections by international agencies such as FDA and EMEA have revealed **limited quality issues**
- PwC’s PRTM conducted the Asia clinical trials outsourcing survey in 2009-10 to assess the clinical trials industry on various parameters. Some of the key survey responses were:
  - Data quality in India is on par with that in the US
  - Local empowerment can be very effective. Pharmaceutical companies that assign local leadership teams to manage local operations for global trials tended to score better in managing multiple vendor relationships

### Overall Indexed Clinical Trial Costs

- **United States**: 1.00
- **Germany**: 1.58
- **Ireland**: 1.25
- **UK**: 1.09
- **Poland**: 0.77
- **Hungary**: 0.68
- **Czech Republic**: 0.61
- **Brazil**: 0.61
- **India**: 0.56
- **China**: 0.52
- **Argentina**: 0.48
- **Russia**: 0.40

Indexed to US = 1

### Performances of Clinical Trial Operation in Each Country - Level of Data Quality

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Data Quality Level</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Japan</td>
<td>0.67 Much higher</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>India</td>
<td>0.00 Same</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Korea</td>
<td>-0.25 Much lower</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taiwan</td>
<td>-0.30 Much lower</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>China</td>
<td>0.00 Same</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Average score as compared with US)

* Number of respondents = Japan: 3, China: 10, India: 5, Korea: 8, Taiwan: 8

**Source:**
1. AT Kearney Analysis; 2. Trends in Asia Clinical Outsourcing 2010 - insights from 2009–10 PwC’s PRTM industry survey
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Comparison of data queries

Drug Information Journal

- 26 multinational studies
- 10 therapeutic areas
- 4,721 enrolling sites
- 63,871 patients
- 7 global CROs
- From 2005 to 2010

→ No statistically significant differences in the query rate
Key factors enabling global Phase III study

- Phase I studies in EU, JP, Asia
  - confirmed PK/PD and safety in any population
- Phase IIb studies in US/EU, JP and Asia
  - confirmed optimum safe dose regimens for patients in all regions
- Common standard of care or standard guideline including globally available comparator
- Endorsement of Phase III protocol by RA
  - FDA : EOP2 meeting, SPA
  - CHMP: Scientific Advise meeting, SPA
  - PMDA : EOP2 meeting
MRCT – Another Key Factors

- ARO / CRO collaboration
  - right ARO and right CRO
  - clarify role and responsibility for three parties

- Role of National Lead Investigator (NLI)

- CRO management
  - intensive oversight of CRO is required in JP/Asia due to inexperienced CRAs and insufficient number of CTLs
  - Management of CRAs is solely performed by CRO CTLs, not by sponsor in US/EU
Four Way Partnership

- Sponsor
- ARO
- CRO
- Trial Organization
- Regulatory Agency
Multiple alliances for MRCT

**Academy**
- Science
- Network
- Statistics

**Industry**
- Study drug, IDB
- Safety management
- Document Mgmt

**CRO**
- Operation
- Monitoring

**PoC**

**PIII**

**PIIIb**

MHWL • PMDA • FDA • EMA
MRCT must be essential

- Single confirmatory study in the world
- Simultaneous development
- High Probability Success based on
  - large patient volume
  - multiple consultation with PMDA/FDA/EMA