African Vaccine Regulatory Forum (AVAREF)

NON-CLINICAL ASSESSMENT

Study's full title	
Short title	
Protocol No.	
Version No.	
Investigational	
medical product	
Date of the	
review	
Reviewer's	
name	

Version	Date	Comments
Version 1	September 2018	Endorsed by Avaref's steering
		committee in Entebbe, Uganda,
Version 2	October 2019	To be tabled for adoption at the
		Avaref Assembly in Victoria Falls,
		Zimbabwe

General information for reviewers:

- Summary boxes are provided in relevant sections and can be completed at the assessor's discretion. They intent to outline the studies submitted and describe key aspects of the results
- The not applicable (NA) box should be checked off when the studies are either not performed or not required. A justification from the sponsor is expected in this case. The assessor is to comment on the acceptability of the information
- IMPs with an MA: indicate if the IMP is going to be used according to the marketing authorization, of if the population/dose/dosing regimen/indication/duration is different. If the latter, describe the supporting information in the relevant sections
- Text provided in blue and in the footnotes is indicative and aims to highlight aspects that need to be taken into account during the assessment. It should be deleted prior to sending the final assessment to the sponsor

1.1 Introduction

- Provide a brief overview of the preclinical package and any relevant preclinical issues identified in previous assessments
- IMPs with an MA: indicate if the IMP is going to be used according to the marketing authorization, of if the population/dose/dosing regimen/indication/duration is different. If the latter, describe the supporting information in the relevant sections

1.2 Pharmacology

1.2.1 Primary pharmacodynamics

Summary	
The pharmacology studies provide the pharmacological basis for the proposed trial	Yes □ No □ NA □
Were relevant in vitro and/or in vivo models studied?	Yes □ No □ NA □
Is the intended pharmacological effect expected/ possible at clinical exposure?	Yes □ No □ NA □
Were pharmacologically active major metabolites identified?	Yes □ No □ NA □
Is the IMP a first-in-class compound?	Yes □ No □ NA □
Workspace:	

Provide a brief outline of the invivo/invitro studies performed to evaluate primary pharmacodynamics and the results			
Comments:			
1.2.2 Secondary	y pharmacodyna	amics	
Summary			
The studies descr effects	ibed in this section	on identified off-targe	et Yes 🗆 No 🗆 NA 🗆
Are off-target effe exposure?	ects expected / p	ossible at clinical	Yes □ No □ NA □
Workspace:			
Comments:			
1.2.3 Safety pho	Study type	Issues identified	Major findings
Cardiovascular		Yes□ No□ NA□	
Respiratory		Yes□ No□ NA□	
CNS		Yes□ No□ NA□	
Other		Yes□ No□ NA□	
Did the safety pharmacology studies identify significant Yes□ No□ NA□ concerns?			
Do sufficient margins of exposure exist for planned Yes \square No \square NA \square clinical exposure?			
Workspace:			

¹ In case of integrated safety pharmacology/repeat dose studies as per ICHS6, cross-reference to section 4.4.3 in the comment box below. The assessment can be described in this section to avoid duplication

1.2.4 Pharmacodynamic drug interactions

Summary	1
---------	---

Have potential pharmacodynamics drug interactions Yes \square No \square been identified?
Workspace:
Describe briefly any invitro/invivo studies performed and their results if any was performed
Comments:
1.3 Pharmacokinetics 1.3.1 Methods of analysis
Are the methods of analysis and their sensitivities $ Yes \square \ No \square \ NA \square $ adequate?
Workspace:
Comments:

1.3.2 Absorption, distribution, metabolism & excretion

Summary

System	Issues identified	Findings
Absorption	Yes□ No□ NA□	
Distribution	Yes□ No□ NA□	
Metabolism	Yes□ No□ NA□	
Excretion	Yes□ No□ NA□	
Do the ADME stud	lies identify significa	nt concerns? Yes□ No□ NA□
Major human metabolites were identified		fied Yes□ No□ NA□

Г			
Unique human n	fied Yes□ No□ NA□		
Workspace:			
Add a brief desc	ription of the studies p	erformed and the results. A cross-reference	
to sections 4.4.3	3, 4.4.5, and 4.4.6 (tox	kicokinetics) is enough	
Comments:			
1.3.3 Pharmac	okinetic drug interac	ctions (enzymes, transporter, other)	
		, , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , ,	
Summary			
Target	Interaction	Findings	
evaluated	identified		
Enzyme	Yes □ No □ NA □		
inhibition			
Enzyme	Yes □ No □ NA □		
induction			
Transporter	Yes □ No □ NA □		
Co-pathways	Yes □ No □ NA □		
Potential for PK	drug interactions is ind	│ licated at therapeutic Yes □ No □ NA □	
Potential for PK drug interactions is indicated at therapeutic Yes \square No \square NA \square dose			
The potential interactions have been highlighted to Yes \square No \square NA \square			
investigators and relevant information is included in the			
IB/study protocol			
Workspace:			
Doscribo briofly	the invitre/invive studi	inc performed and discuss the results	
Describe briefly the invitro/invivo studies performed and discuss the results			

Comments:

1.3.4 Other pharmacokinetic studies (e.g. PK of metabolite, novel excipients, genomic integration and inadvertent germline transmission of gene transfer vectors)

Were other PK studies performed?	Yes □ No □ NA □	
Do these studies identify concerns?	Yes □ No □ NA □	
Workspace:		
Describe briefly any additional invitro/invivo studies performed and the results		
Comments:		

1.4 Toxicology

Summary

1.4.1 Animal species selection/study design

Toxicologically relevant animal species studied	Yes □ No □ NA □			
The studied species show similar pharmacology to humans	Yes □ No □ NA □			
The studied species show similar PK to humans	Yes □ No □ NA □			
The studies were sufficiently well-designed	Yes □ No □ NA □			
Workspace:				
Describe briefly the preclinical toxicity studies performed, the relevant guidelines (ICH M3 (R2), S6 (R1), S9) used, and any deviations for any guidelines. Any study-specific guidelines should be discussed in this section				
Comments:				

1.4.2 Single dose toxicity

Summary

Species	Dose/ Route	NO(A)EL/L OEL /MNTD (delete as appropriate)	Major findings	
Were significant toxicities identified? Yes \square No \square NA \square				
Do sufficient margins of exposure exist for planned clinical Yes \square No \square NA \square exposure?				
Workspace:				
Brief description of any studies performed. The results should be presented in the tables				
Comments:				

1.4.3 Repeat-dose toxicity

Summary

Study duration	Species	Dose/ Route	NO(A)EL / LOEL /MNTD (delete as appropriate)	Major findings
Were signi	ficant toxic	ities identifie	ed?	Yes □ No □ NA □

Do sufficient m exposure?	argins of exposure exis	t for planned clinical Yes \square No \square NA \square	
Does the durat duration?	on of treatment suppor	t the proposed trial Yes \square No \square NA \square	
Workspace:			
tables	n of any studies perforr	med. The results should be presented in the	
Comments:			
1.4.4 Genotox Type of test/study	Test system	Results	
Gene			
mutations in bacteria		Positive □ Negative □ Equivocal □	
In vitro mammalian assay		Positive □ Negative □ Equivocal □	
In vivo genotoxicity test		Positive □ Negative □ Equivocal □	
Additional assays		Positive □ Negative □ Equivocal □	
Do the submitted data indicate genotoxic potential? Yes \square No \square NA \square			
Workspace:			
Comments:			
1.4.5 Carcino	genicity		
Summary			
Do studies identify potential for carcinogenicity? Yes \square No \square NA \square			
Do sufficient m clinical exposur	argins of exposure exis	t for planned Yes \square No \square NA \square	
Workspace:			

Add a brief description of the studies performed and the results			
Comments:			
1.4.6 Reproduct Summary	ive and developme	ental toxicity	
System	Toxicities identified	Findings	
Fertility and early embryonic	Yes □ No □ NA □		
development Embryo-fetal development	Yes No NA		
Prenatal and postnatal development, including maternal	Yes □ No □ NA □		
No □ NA □	jins of exposure exis	t for planned clinica	al exposure? Yes □
Workspace: Add a brief description Comments:	otion of the studies p	performed and the	results
1.4.6.1 Juvenile toxicity studies			
Summary			
	animals in the appro		Yes □ No □ NA □
The studies identification toxicities	fied additional/enhar	nced juvenile	Yes □ No □ NA □
Do sufficient marg clinical exposure?	ins of exposure exis	t for planned	Yes □ No □ NA □

Workspace:				
Add a brief des	scription of the studies performed and the	e results		
Comments:				
1.4.6.2 O	ther studies (including enhanced PP	ND studies)		
Summary				
The studies ide	entified potential toxicities	Yes □ No □ NA □		
	Do sufficient margins of exposure exist for planned Yes \square No \square NA \square clinical exposure?			
Workspace:				
	scription of the ePPND studies performed invitro or invivo studies, and the results	in line with ICHS6(R1) and		
Comments:				
	Recommendations for contraception i	measures		
IMP	(check off all that apply)			
	Suspected/ demonstrated terate	ogenic or fetotoxic effects \square		
		Genotoxic □		
		Insufficient data \Box		

Comparator

IMP/

MP

auxiliary

Demonstrated embryo-fetotoxic effects, which do not seem

Suspected or demonstrated teratogenic or fetotoxic \Box

relevant to the CT participants \Box

(check off all that apply)

Sufficient data and no indication of risk \square

NA 🗆

		Genotoxic □	
	Insufficient data \Box		
		xic effects, which do not seem evant to the CT participants \square	
		ata and no indication of risk \Box	
WOCBP ² /male the proposed c	partners of WOCBP are included in linical trial	Yes □ No □	
	e guidance issued by the Clinical on Group on "Recommendations	demonstrated/suspected \Box	
related to conti	raception and pregnancy testing in	<u>possible</u> □	
	ne risk of teratogenicity/ led on the non-clinical data is lease tick one)	unlikely 🗆	
Workspace:			
the clinical asse	recommendations/comments in this seessor in the completion of section 5.3. tion to embryo-fetal risk minimization	7.4 on the assessment of the	
Comments:			
1.4.7 Local to	lerance		
Summary			
Do the submitte toxicity?	ed studies indicate a potential for loca	l Yes □ No □ NA □	
Workspace:			
Add a brief sun	nmary of the studies performed and th	ne results	
Comments:			

 $^{^{\}rm 2}$ women of childbearing potential

1.4.8 Other toxicity studies

Dedicated	Toxicities	Findings
	identified	
Study	identified	
Phototoxicity	Yes □ No □ NA □	
Pilototoxicity	Tes - NO - NA -	
Tissue cross	Yes □ No □ NA □	
reactivity		
Antigenicity	Yes □ No □ NA □	
Immuno-	Yes □ No □ NA □	
toxicity		
Dependence	Yes □ No □ NA □	
Metabolites	Yes □ No □ NA □	
Impurities	Yes □ No □ NA □	
impunices	Tes - No - NA -	
	V = N = NA =	
Effect on the	Yes □ No □ NA □	
HERC channels		
Other	Yes □ No □ NA □	
Workspace:		
Comments:		
Comments.		

1.5 Additional considerations

1.5.1 First-in human trials

Summary

Is the starting dose adequately justified?	Yes □ No □ NA □	
Are the dose steps adequately justified?	Yes □ No □ NA □	
Is the maximum dose adequately justified?	Yes □ No □ NA □	
Workspace:		
Describe the starting dose , dose steps, and maximum dose expected for		

first-in-human trials	
Comments:	
1.6 GLP aspects	
Were all pivotal safety studies performed in line with the good laboratory practices (GLP) of the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development? Were the studies performed in a country that is a member of OECD Mutual Acceptance of Data (MAD) for GLP?	Yes □ No □ Unknown □
Workspace:	
Comments:	
1.7 Assessor's overall conclusions on the non-cli	nical part
The non-clinical data provided are acceptable	
Supplementary information needs to be provided (refer to the list of requests for additional information)	r 🗆
Overall comment/ conclusion on the non-clinical	assessment³:

1.7.1 Requests for additional information: non-clinical

³ Are all nonclinical findings of clinical relevance considered by the sponsor in the overall benefit/risk assessment of the trial?