

Corrections in FDA Clinical Briefing Materials for July 27 ODAC Meeting

1) Clinical: Section II. B, Page 6, (Efficacy)

Present text:

"Thirty fewer docetaxel treated patients received post-study chemotherapy compared to LY231514 treated patients (randomized and treated population [RT]).

Correction:

"Nineteen fewer docetaxel treated patients received post-study chemotherapy compared to LY231514 treated patients (randomized and treated population [RT]).

Rationale:

Table 9 on Page 31 of the Clinical Section of the FDA Clinical Review lists 126 LY231514 patients receiving post-study chemotherapy and 107 Docetaxel patients receiving post-study chemotherapy, a difference of 19 patients. Based on Table 10, page 32, it is correct to say that thirty more docetaxel treated patients received no post-study chemotherapy.

The same correction is made in the following locations:

Clinical, Section VI, A, Page 18 (Brief Statement of Conclusions)

Clinical, Section VI, D, Page 35 1st paragraph

Clinical, Section X. A, Page 49 (Conclusions), 1st paragraph

2) Clinical: Section VI, C, Page 28, Primary Efficacy Analysis, (Overall Survival), first paragraph

Present text:

"Two statistical tests for the primary endpoint were defined in the protocol amendment: (1) Test for superiority of alimta relative to docetaxel ($H_{01}: HR \geq 1$), and (2) Test for non-inferiority based on a protocol-defined fixed margin ($H_{02}: HR \geq 1.11$)."

Correction:

"Two statistical tests for the primary endpoint were defined in the original protocol: (1) Test for superiority of alimta relative to docetaxel ($H_{01}: HR \geq 1$), and (2) Test for non-inferiority based on a protocol-defined fixed margin ($H_{02}: HR \geq 1.11$)."

Rationale:

The two tests (superiority and non-inferiority based on a protocol-defined fixed margin) were specified in the original protocol used for enrolling patients (JMEI amendment (a) submitted to FDA on February 19, 2001).

3) Clinical, Page 30, Table 7 (Exploratory Analyses of Overall Survival)

Present text:

"Estimate of control effect 0.59"

Correction:

"Estimate of control effect 0.555"

Rationale:

FDA lists the estimate of control effect for non-inferiority fraction retention that was used by Lilly as 0.59. Lilly actually used 0.555. (The log estimate of the control effect is 0.59).

4) Clinical, Page 11, 2nd paragraph:

Present text:

"Study JM BR , a second-line NSCLC trial.....(unpublished data)"

Clarification:

Study JM BR is published; (Smit EF, Mattson K, von Pawel J, Manegold C, Clarke S, Postmus PE. ALIMTA (Alimta disodium) as second-line treatment of non-small-cell lung cancer: a phase II study. Ann Oncol 14:455-460, 2003).

5) Clinical Section: Table 2 Pg 20 Study investigators.

Present text:

A Canadian investigator, David Stewart, was footnoted indicating that he was disqualified.

Clarification:

The footnote relating to David Stewart was not correct. He was not disqualified. The correct footnote should have stated that "a Scott Laurie replaced David Stewart as Primary Investigator during the trial". Footnote "a" was correctly used for a U.S. investigator, Dr. J.A. Ellerton. Lilly chose to not use data from Dr. Ellerton's site because of regulatory violations at his site (Dr. Ellerton was using a sub-investigator who was on the FDA disqualified list).