# A Phase 1, Ascending-Dose Study to Assess the Potential Effects of Trofinetide on QTc Interval, Safety and Tolerability, and Pharmacokinetics in Healthy Adults

# INTRODUCTION

- Trofinetide is an investigational drug developed for the treatment of Rett syndrome (RTT), a debilitating genetic neurodevelopmental disorder for which there is no approved treatment
- In the phase 3 LAVENDER study (NCT04181723) in which trofinetide was administered orally or via gastrostomy tube twice daily using weight-based dosing (up to 12 g for participants weighing >50 kg) to achieve the target exposure (area under the concentration-time curve from 0 to 12 at steady state  $[AUC_{0-12 \text{ ss}}] = 800-1200 \,\mu\text{g}\cdot\text{h/mL})$ , statistically significant improvements were demonstrated with trofinetide over placebo in caregiver- and clinician-rated efficacy measures, and trofinetide was well tolerated in females with RTT 5–20 years of age<sup>1</sup>
- In nonclinical and clinical studies in healthy participants, trofinetide doses associated with exposures similar to or higher than those anticipated in phase 3 studies were not associated with clinically significant changes in QT/QTc interval or other electrocardiogram (ECG) parameters (data on file)
- There is evidence of an increased risk of QTc prolongation in individuals with RTT,<sup>2-4</sup> which may manifest over time<sup>5</sup>; thus, it is important to assess the potential impact of trofinetide on QTc prolongation at doses that target the therapeutic exposure range (12 g) and at supratherapeutic doses associated with exposures beyond the target range (18 g and 24 g)

# **OBJECTIVES**

- To provide a formal evaluation of the safety and tolerability, including effects on the QTc interval using Fridericia's correction method (QTcF) and other ECG parameters and the pharmacokinetics (PK) of single therapeutic (12 g) and supratherapeutic doses (18 g and 24 g) of trofinetide in healthy adults
- The QTcF shows the best-rate correction, prediction of all-cause mortality, and estimates of potentially dangerous QT prolongation compared with Bazett's QT correction formula<sup>6</sup>

## **METHODS**

- This was a phase 1, randomized, double-blind, placebo-controlled, ascending-dose, nested crossover study that was conducted at a single study center and consisted of a screening period, treatment period, and safety follow-up period with an overall maximum duration of 14 weeks
- Eligible participants were 18–45 years of age, weighed >50 kg and <100 kg at screening, did not have a history of acute or chronic cardiac and/or cardiovascular disease or surgery, and did not have cardiac conduction abnormalities at screening
- A total of 40 healthy adult participants were enrolled and randomized in a 1:1:1:1 ratio to cohorts 1A, 1B 2A, and 2B for the treatment period, during which each participant received 1 treatment in each of the 5 dosing periods (Figure 1)
- During Dosing Periods 2–4, each participant received single therapeutic (12 g [60 mL]) and supratherapeutic (18 g [90 mL] and 24 g [120 mL]) orally administered doses of trofinetide (provided as a 200-mg/mL solution) or matching placebo, and in Dosing Periods 1 and 5, each participant received oral doses of moxifloxacin 400 mg (positive control for assay sensitivity) or matching placebo
- A minimum of 4 days of washout was required between all administrations of study drug; continuous ECG monitoring was conducted from predose to 24 hours postdose (Dosing Periods 2–4), or predose to 6 hours postdose (Dosing Periods 1 and 5); PK blood sampling was conducted predose and for 48 hours postdose (Dosing Periods 2–4 only)

### Figure 1. Schematic of study design



ECG, electrocardiogram; EOT, end of treatment; PK, pharmacokinetics; Placebo<sub>MOXI</sub>, placebo-matching moxifloxacin; Placebo-matching trofinetide

- significant effect on QT prolongation

### **Demographics and Baseline Characteristics**

### Pharmacokinetics

- is negligible

	Trofinetide 12 g	Trofinetide 18 g	Trofinetide 24 g					
PK parameter	(n = 20)	(n = 18)	(n = 14)					
C <sub>max</sub> , μg/mL	146 (21.8)	183 (22.7)	206 (32.9)					
AUC <sub>last</sub> , µg•h/mL	837 (124)	1097 (105)	1330 (181)					
AUC <sub>0-∞</sub> , μg•h/mL	848 (125)	1110 (107)	1342 (181)					
AUC <sub>extrap</sub> , %	1.28 (0.34)	1.20 (0.33)	0.89 (0.26)					
T <sub>max</sub> , <sup>a</sup> h	2.51 (2.00, 4.01)	2.51 (1.99, 3.30)	3.00 (2.00, 4.00)					
t <sub>½</sub> , h	12.3 (1.50)	12.1 (1.11)	11.0 (1.23)					
λ <sub>z</sub> , 1/h	0.057 (0.008)	0.058 (0.005)	0.064 (0.007)					
CL/F, L/h	14.4 (1.99)	16.4 (1.69)	18.2 (2.51)					
	255 (45.9)	286 (41.3)	290 (51.4)					
The PK analysis set consisted of all participants who received ≥1 dose of study drug and had sufficient blood concentration data to calculate ≥1 PK parameter: units are mean (SD) unless otherwise noted								

<sup>a</sup>Median (min, max) λ<sub>7</sub>, terminal phase elimination rate constant; AUC<sub>n-∞</sub>, area under the concentration-time curve from 0 to infinity; AUC<sub>extrap</sub>, extrapolated area under the concentration-time curve; AUC<sub>last</sub>, area under the concentration-time curve from time 0 to the last detectable pncentration; Cmax maximum observed drug concentration; CL/F, apparent systemic clearance following oral administration; PK, pharmacokinetics; SD, standard deviation; tw, apparent terminal elimination half-life; Tmax, time to maximum observed drug concentration V<sub>z</sub>/F, apparent volume of distribution following oral administration



PK, pharmacokinetics; SE, standard error

### Mona Darwish, James M. Youakim, Daryl DeKarske, Serge Stankovic

Acadia Pharmaceuticals Inc., San Diego, CA, USA

• The primary analysis utilized concentration-QTc (C-QTc) modeling to assess the QTc prolongation risk and included change from time-matched baseline in QTcF ( $\Delta$ QTcF) as the dependent variable, with time, treatment, and period as fixed effects, and the corresponding time-matched blood concentrations and predose QTcF as covariates, with subject and subject-by-period interaction as the random effects

• The primary endpoints were the evaluation of safety and tolerability (treatment-emergent adverse events [TEAEs], clinically significant findings on ECG parameters, vital signs, laboratory tests, and physical examination) and the relationship between ΔQTcF and trofinetide blood concentrations (C-ΔQTcF) and placebo-adjusted ΔQTcF (ΔΔQTcF) and trofinetide blood concentrations (C- $\Delta\Delta$ QTcF) using linear mixed-effects modeling

• The mixed-effects model was used to estimate the population mean  $\Delta\Delta$ QTcF and its corresponding 2-sided 90% confidence interval (CI) at the mean maximum observed drug concentration ( $C_{max}$ ) for each trofinetide dose

• If the upper bounds of the 2-sided 90% CI of the predicted mean  $\Delta\Delta$ QTcF was <10 ms (the threshold of concern for cardiac repolarization) at the largest observed mean  $C_{max}$ , then it was concluded that trofinetide did not have a clinically

 Secondary and other endpoints included change from time-matched baseline in ECG parameters (heart rate, PR interval, QRS interval, QTcF interval, and ECG morphological patterns) and trofinetide PK in blood

 Clinically meaningful changes in ECG parameters were defined using the following criteria: heart rate <50 bpm and ≥25%</li> decrease or >100 bpm and ≥25% increase from baseline; PR interval >200 ms and ≥25% increase from baseline; QRS interval >120 ms and ≥25% increase from baseline; QTcF interval ≤450, >450 to ≤480, >480 to ≤500, and >500 ms;  $\leq$ 30, >30 to  $\leq$ 60, and >60 ms change from baseline

### RESULTS

• Of the 40 randomized participants, 15 participants (37.5%) were White and 25 participants (62.5%) were Black or African American (62.5%); 35 participants (87.5%) completed the study

• Mean age at screening was 33.9 years, and the majority of participants were male (60%)

• The PK profiles of trofinetide were qualitatively similar across dose groups (**Table 1** and **Figure 2**) • Trofinetide was rapidly absorbed into the circulation (median time to maximum observed drug concentration  $[T_{max}]$ approximately 2.5–3 hours), with an initial rapid decline followed by a relatively slow elimination phase; the apparent terminal elimination half-life  $(t_{1/2})$  representing the rapid decline is considered the effective  $t_{1/2}$ , as the contribution of the terminal phase

• At supratherapeutic doses, the increase in exposure to trofinetide was slightly less than dose-proportional

Table 1. Mean (SD) PK parameters in blood for trofinetide following a single dose of trofinetide (PK analysis set)

The PK analysis set consisted of all participants who received ≥1 dose of study drug and had sufficient blood concentration data to calculate ≥1 PK parameter

### Primary ECG Analyses: Concentration-Effect Modeling

- There was no clinically relevant effect on ECG parameters at single trofinetide doses ≤24 g as determined by concentration-effect modeling
- C-QTc analysis showed the upper 90% 2-sided confidence bounds for C-ΔQTcF and C- $\Delta\Delta$ QTcF were <10 ms for each of the 3 trofinetide doses
- trofinetide doses were all  $\leq 2.36$  ms, with upper 90% CIs of  $\leq 6.010$  ms (Table 2)
- The C-ΔQTcF and C-ΔΔQTcF regressions for the 24-g dose of trofinetide are shown in Figure 3

### Table 2. Summary of C-ΔQTcF analyses (PK/PD analysis set)

Model parameter predictions	N	Estimateª (SE)	90% CI				
ΔQTcF-blood trofinetide concentration (slope)	40	0.0121	0.0003 to 0.0239				
ΔΔQTcF trofinetide 12 g							
Mean C <sub>max</sub> (146 µg/mL)	20	1.96 (2.109)	-1.555 to 5.473				
Maximum BC (179 µg/mL)	20	2.36 (2.195)	-1.295 to 6.010				
ΔΔQTcF trofinetide 18 g							
Mean C <sub>max</sub> (183 µg/mL)	20	1.87 (2.150)	-1.706 to 5.455				
Maximum BC (212 µg/mL)	20	2.22 (2.237)	-1.496 to 5.945				
ΔΔQTcF trofinetide 24 g							
Mean C <sub>max</sub> (206 µg/mL)	18	-0.31 (2.213)	-3.989 to 3.376				
Maximum BC (268 μg/mL)	18	0.44 (2.424)	-3.582 to 4.466				
The PK/PD analysis set consisted of participants in the ECG analysis set with time-matched blood concentrations to $\geq 1$ baseline and $\geq 1$ 1- to 23-hour postdose triplicate continuous ECG data extraction; the ECG analysis set consisted of all participants who were randomized, received $\geq 1$ dose of study drug (trofinetide, moxifloxacin, or placebo), and had $\geq 1$ baseline and $\geq 1$ 1- to 23-hour postdose triplicate triplica							

continuous ECG data extraction Estimates were obtained using a linear mixed-effects model as ΔECG = Timepoint + Treatment + Concentration + Predose ECG, with Subject as a random effect and Subject•Period as a repeated effect

using unstructured covariance structure

ΔQTcF, change from the time-matched baseline in QTcF; ΔΔQTcF, placebo-adjusted change from time-matched baseline in QTcF; BC, blood concentration; CI, confidence interval; C<sub>max</sub>, maximum observed drug concentration; ECG, electrocardiogram; PD, pharmacodynamic; PK, pharmacokinetics; QTcF, QT interval using Fridericia's correction method; SE, standard error

#### Figure 3. ΔQTcF (top) and ΔΔQTcF (bottom) blood concentration regressions with trofinetide 24 g (PK/PD analysis set)



The PK/PD analysis set consisted of participants in the ECG analysis set with time-matched blood concentrations to ≥1 baseline and ≥1 1- to 23-hour postdose triplicate continuous ECG data extraction; the ECG analysis set consisted of all participants who were randomized, received ≥1 dose of study drug (trofinetide, moxifloxacin, or placebo), and had ≥1 baseline and ≥1 1- to 23-hour postdose triplicate continuous ECG data extrac ΔQTcF, change from the time-matched baseline in QTcF; ΔΔQTcF, placebo-adjusted change from time-matched baseline in QTcF; CI, confidence interval; ECG, electrocardiogram; PD, pharmacodynamic; PK, pharmacokinetics

• The model-predicted  $\Delta\Delta$ QTcF at the mean C<sub>max</sub> and at the individual C<sub>max</sub> values of the 3

#### Safety

- A single oral dose of 12 g, 18 g, or 24 g of trofinetide was well tolerated in healthy adult participants • There were no deaths reported during the study; 1 serious TEAE of COVID-19 that required hospitalization (cohort 1B, Dosing Period 4) was reported and was not considered to be related to study drug, and there were no participants with TEAEs leading to study discontinuation
- TEAEs were reported in 28 of 40 participants (70.0%), and the majority (70.0%) were mild in severity
- The most common TEAEs (≥4 participants in any preferred term) were diarrhea and nausea (n = 12; 30.0%) each); headache (n = 10; 25.0%); constipation and medical device site irritation (n = 6; 15.0% each); abdominal pain and COVID-19 (n = 5; 12.5% each); and upper abdominal pain, vomiting, and vessel puncture site reaction (n = 4; 10.0% each) (**Table 3**)
- Diarrhea, nausea, vomiting, and headache were more frequent in participants treated with trofinetide, and the frequency of gastrointestinal-related TEAEs increased in a dose-dependent manner
- There were no TEAEs suggestive of proarrhythmic potential and no clinically significant cardiovascular TEAEs
- There were no clear trends or clinically meaningful changes in the ECG parameters of heart rate, PR interval, QRS interval, QTcF interval, and cardiac morphology from baseline to 3 and 48 hours postdose between trofinetide and matching placebo, and there were no clinically meaningful changes in individual laboratory tests, vital signs, or physical examination

#### Table 3. TEAEs reported by $\geq$ 4 participants for any preferred term (safety analysis set)

		PBO	Trofinetide		Placebo-matching trofinetide					
MedDRA preferred term, n (%)	MOXI (n = 39)	MOXI (n = 37)	12 g (n = 20)	18 g (n = 20)	24 g (n = 18)	12 g (n = 20)	18 g (n = 20)	24 g (n = 20)	All (n = 20)	Overall (N = 40)
Any TEAE	6 (15.4)	12 (32.4)	6 (30.0)	11 (55.0)	11 (61.1)	6 (30.0)	10 (50.0)	9 (45.0)	14 (70.0)	28 (70.0)
Abdominal pain	0	0	0	1 (5.0)	0	0	1 (5.0)	3 (15.0)	4 (20.0)	5 (12.5)
Abdominal pain upper	0	0	0	0	3 (16.7)	0	0	1 (5.0)	1 (5.0)	4 (10.0)
Constipation	0	0	0	0	2 (11.1)	2 (10.0)	1 (5.0)	2 (10.0)	4 (20.0)	6 (15.0)
Diarrhea	1 (2.6)	1 (2.7)	1 (5.0)	5 (25.0)	7 (38.9)	0	0	1 (5.0)	1 (5.0)	12 (30.0)
Nausea	0	0	1 (5.0)	6 (30.0)	10 (55.6)	1 (5.0)	0	0	1 (5.0)	12 (30.0)
Vomiting	0	0	0	2 (10.0)	4 (22.2)	0	0	0	0	4 (10.0)
Medical device site irritation	0	3 (8.1)	1 (5.0)	3 (15.0)	0	0	1 (5.0)	0	1 (5.0)	6 (15.0)
Vessel puncture site reaction	0	0	1 (5.0)	0	0	0	0	3 (15.0)	3 (15.0)	4 (10.0)
COVID-19	1 (2.6)	1 (2.7)	0	0	2 (11.1)	0	0	1 (5.0)	1 (5.0)	5 (12.5)
Headache	2 (5.1)	2 (5.4)	2 (10.0)	5 (25.0)	2 (11.1)	0	3 (15.0)	0	3 (15.0)	10 (25.0)
Headache	1 (2.6) 2 (5.1)	1 (2.7) 2 (5.4)	U 2 (10.0)	U 5 (25.0)	2 (11.1) 2 (11.1)	U O	0 3 (15.0)	1 (5.0) 0	1 (5.0) 3 (15.0)	5 (12.5) 10 (25.0)

matching placebo) and once overall. Denominators for the percentages are the number of participants in each treatment group

Adverse events were coded using MedDRA Version 23.0. A TEAE is an adverse event that occurred on or after the first administration of study dru

MedDRA, Medical Dictionary for Regulatory Activities; MOXI, moxifloxacin; PBO MOXI, placebo-matching moxifloxacin; TEAE, treatment-emergent adverse event

### CONCLUSIONS

- The upper 90% confidence bounds for  $\Delta QTcF$  and  $\Delta \Delta QTcF$  were <10 ms (below the threshold of concern for cardiac repolarization); thus, no evidence of cardiac repolarization following therapeutic or supratherapeutic trofinetide doses was observed
- There were no clinically meaningful effects on ECG parameters
- Trofinetide was safe and well tolerated, with no unexpected safety findings or negative trends

#### REFERENCES

- 1. Neul JL, et al. Neurology. 2022;99(3):e304.
- 2. McCauley MD, et al. Sci Transl Med. 2011;3(113):113ra25.
- 3. Kerr AM, et al. *Eur Child Adolesc Psychiatry*. 1997;6(Suppl 1):71–74.
- 4. Crosson J, et al. Am J Med Genet A. 2017;173(6):1495-1501.
- 5. Clark BC, et al. Dev Med Child Neurol. 2020;62(7):833-836.
- 6. Vandenberk B, et al. J Am Heart Assoc. 2016;5(6):e003264.

#### ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The study was supported by Acadia Pharmaceuticals Inc. (San Diego, CA, USA). The authors would like to thank Mark Forman, MD (CMO, Passage Bio Wynnewood, PA, USA), for leading the medical aspect of the study and Jim Harlick, who led the clinical operation for execution; they are both former employees of Acadia Pharmaceuticals Inc. Medical writing support was provided by Stuart Murray, MSc, of Evidence Scientific Solutions, Inc. and funded by Acadia Pharmaceuticals Inc.

#### DISCLOSURES

MD, JMY, DD, and SS are employees of and stakeholders in Acadia Pharmaceuticals Inc



By requesting this content, you agree to receive a one-time communication using automated technolo Message and data rates may apply. Links are valid for 30 days after the congress presentation.



To receive a copy of this poster, scan QR code via barcode reader application

Α C A D Ι Α΄