

Communicating Complex Information in Drug Product Labeling

Norman Stockbridge Division of Cardiovascular and Renal Products FDA

Forest plot of effects by subgroup

Figure 5 Stroke and Systemic Embolism Hazard Ratios by Baseline Characteristics*

	Stro	ke/SEE, study	period, rand	fomized set		
Subgroup	Patients	PRADAXA 1	50 W	arfarin	PRADAXA 150 vs Warfarin	HR (95%CI)
	Total no.	n NC% pe	n yr) n	N(% per yr)	Hazard ratio & 95%CI	
All patients	18113	135 6076 (1.	12) 203	6022(1.72)	_ + _	0.65 (0.52, 0.81)
VKA use at entry						
Naive (50 4%)	9126	62 3028(1)	090 97	3093(1.69)		0.64 (0.47, 0.88)
Experienced (49.6	%) 8984	73 3047 (1.	15) 106	2929(1.75)	_ i	0.66 (0.49, 0.88)
Age (years)						
< 65 (16.5%)	2981	14 1030(0)	69) 25	953 (1.35)		0.51 (0.26.0.98
>65 and < 75 (43)	6%) 7894	51 2580(0)	98) 77	2646(1.47)		0.67 (0.47, 0.95)
≥ 75 (40.0%)	7238	70 2466 (1)	46) 101	2423 (2.15)		0.68 (0.50, 0.92)
Gender						
Male (63.6%)	11514	85 3840(1)	11) 116	3809(1.54)		0.72 (0.54, 0.95)
Female (36.4%)	6598	50 2238(1.	14) 87	2213 (2.03)		0.56 (0.40, 0.79)
Weight (kg)						
≤ 60 (10.9%)	1967	20 647 (1)	68) 41	684 (3.32)	i	0.50 (0.29, 0.85)
> 60 (89.1%)	16137	115 5428 (1/	06) 161	5334 (1.53)	- -	0.69 (0.55, 0.88)
History of stroke/TIA						
No (80.0%)	14489	84 4843 (0.	88) 138	4827 (1.46)	_ _	0.60 (0.46, 0.79)
Yes (20.0%)	3623	51 1233 (2	07) 65	1195 (2.78)		0.74 (0.52, 1.07)
Diabetes at baseline						
No (76.7%)	13891	95 4674 (1)	02) 139	4612(1.53)	-	0.67 (0.51, 0.87)
Yes (23.3%)	4221	40 1402(1/	46) 64	1410 (2.35)		0.62 (0.41, 0.91)
CHADS2 score						
≤1 (31.9%)	5783	27 1961 (0.	68) 41	1862(1.11)		0.61 (0.38, 1.00)
= 2 (35.6%)	6453	35 2136 (0.	84) 60	2229 (1.38)	•;	0.61 (0.40, 0.92)
≥3 (32:4%)	5876	73 1979(1/	89) 102	1931 (2.73)		0.69 (0.51, 0.93)
CrCL (mL/min)						
< 30 (0.4%)	77	4 32(7)	51) 2	30(3.75)		2.03 (0.37,11.08)
≥30 and ≤50 (18.	5%) 3343	29 1156 (1.	32) 53	1051 (2.69)		0.48 (0.31, 0.76)
> 50 and < 80 (45	.8%) 8297	66 2777(1.	21) 102	2806(1.87)		0.65 (0.47, 0.88)
> 80 (31.2%)	5658	28 1882 (0.	73) 40	1877 (1.06)		0.69 (0.43, 1.12)
Region						
USA (29.7%)	5383	43 1815(1.	15) 61	1788 (1.67)		0.69 (0.47, 1.02)
OUS (70.3%)	12730	92 4261 (1.	11) 142	4234 (1.75)		0.63 (0.49, 0.82)
ASA use at baseline						
No (60.5%)	10960	76 3738(1)	01) 113	3591 (1.57)	i	0.64 (0.48, 0.86)
Yes (39.5%)	7153	59 2338 (1.	31) 90	2431 (1.96)		0.67 (0.48, 0.93)
				1		
				0.	1 0.5 1	1.5 2
					PRADAXA Better	vvartarin Better

Forest plot of effects by subgroup

Figure 5 Stroke and Systemic Embolism Hazard Ratios by Baseline Characteristics*



Forest plot of effects by subgroup

- Good
 - Consistency, usually
 - Disclaimer re overinterpretation
 - Supports "personalized medicine"
 - Works as well for prominent safety findings

- Bad
 - Despite disclaimer, hard to ignore discrepancies
 - Based on naïve subgroups;
 you cannot use to estimate
 response in a patient
 whose corresponding
 factor levels you know
 - No multiplicity adjustment

Forest plot for drug interactions



Figure 2. Impact of Coadministered Drugs on the Pharmacokinetics of Corlanor

Figure 3.2 Effect of Non-P-gp Inhibitor or Inducer, Other Drugs, on Peak and Total Exposure to Dabigatran (Cmax and AUC). Shown are the Geometric Mean Ratios (Ratio) and 90% Confidence Interval (90% CI). The Perpetrator and Dabigatran Etexilate Dose take Dosing Frequency are given as well as the Time of Perpetrator Dosing in Relation to Dabigatran Etexilate Dose (Time Difference)



www.fda.gov

Forest plot for drug interactions

- Good
 - Compact DDI information
 - Each section is separate study
 - No confounding
 - No multiplicity issue
 - Accommodates advice

- Bad
 - Hides study details
 - Can't tell how much of the variability is related to sample size

Distribution of responses—waterfall



Distribution of responses—waterfa

- Good
 - Individuals resolvable
 - Works for any continuous data
 - Can mark a clinically important or responder level

- Bad
 - Side-by-side makes
 comparison difficult of
 distributions are similar



Distribution of responses—cumulative

Figure 1: Patients Achieving Various Levels of Improvement in Pain Intensity - Study DPN 1



Distribution of responses—cumulative

- Good
 - Similar patterns easier to distinguish
 - Works for any continuous data
 - Can mark a clinically important or responder level

- Bad
 - Not intuitive?



Modeled response



Figure 3: Probability of Achieving Systolic Blood Pressure <130 mmHg at Week 8

Figure 4: Probability of Achieving Diastolic Blood Pressure <80 mmHg at Week 8

www.fda.gov

FDA

Modeled response

- Good
 - Based on factorial trial data
 - Intended to advise on when starting two drugs is useful

- Bad
 - Model
 - Hides assumptions
 - Hides confidence intervals
 - Suspect interpretability



General concerns

- No testing of comprehension by target audience
- Potential misfit of analytic approach with intended use
- Complex graphics not compatible with
 - Portable devices
 - Decision support systems

