Comparison of intra-articular sham and vehicle injections from a Phase 2b trial of lorecivivint (LOR; SM04690), a smallmolecule Wnt pathway inhibitor for knee osteoarthritis

Yazici Y, <u>Tambiah J</u>, Swearingen C, Kennedy S, Strand V, Cole B, Hochberg M, Bannuru R, McAlindon T

All authors are employees or shareholders of Samumed, LLC

Potential pain effect of IA saline on IA therapies



Red lines depict the range of plausible MCID cutoff values for clinical significance.

Does IA vehicle show symptomatic benefit over dry needle?

Hypothesis: There is no difference in treatment response between PBO and sham

- In a prospective, randomized, 24-week Phase 2b study of lorecivivint (LOR; SM04690)
 - Effects of IA vehicle PBO were compared to sham (dry needle) injection
 - Potential unblinding impact was also tested
 - Full study results from LOR, a potential disease-modifying knee OA drug, are presented separately

Lorecivivint Phase 2b study design



- Clinical assessments: Daily Pain NRS, WOMAC Function, WOMAC Pain, Patient Global Assessment, Physician Global Assessment, KOOS, KOOS-PS, daily NSAID
- L Imaging: Knee X-ray
- ••• Safety assessments: AEs, vital signs, physical exam, laboratory panels

Main study results

- Primary endpoints of Pain NRS, WOMAC Pain/Function, and PtGA at 24 weeks were met for LOR 0.23 mg and 0.07 mg doses (Pain NRS only) compared to PBO
- Incidence of adverse events was similar between groups
- PBO vs. sham: N=233; 207 subjects [89%] completed the study

Subject Characteristics								
		Vehicle	Sham					
Ν		116	117					
Age at Consent (years)*		60.1 (9.0)	59.0 (8.0)					
BMI (kg/m²)*		28.62 (4.29)	28.97 (3.84)					
Female		63 (55.3)	72 (60.0)					
Race	White	89 (78.1)	86 (71.7)					
	Black / AA	16 (14.0)	27 (22.5)					
	Asian	6 (5.3)	3 (2.5)					
Hispanic / Latino		16 (14.0)	24 (20.0)					
KL3		71 (62.3)	59 (49.2)					

*Mean (SD) reported. Otherwise n (%) reported.

No differences in PROs between PBO and sham

Pain NRS



WOMAC Pain

Observations over time depicting baseline-adjusted mean improvements in PROs of PBO compared to sham injections (FAS)

24

N₂₄=93

N₂₄=92

No differences in PROs between PBO and sham



Observations over time depicting baseline-adjusted mean improvements in PROs of PBO compared to sham injections (FAS)

Bang's Blinding Index

- Immediately following injection and at Week 24, subjects were asked to identify which treatment (PBO, sham, or LOR) they thought they had received
 - Subject responses were compared using Bang's Blinding Index (BBI)
 - BBI scale is $-1 \le 0 \le +1$



No differences were detected between PBO and sham

	Subject Response								
Visit	Planned Treatment	SM04690	Vehicle	Sham	Don't Know	Total	Bang's BI		
Day 1	SM04690	111	17	13	321	462	0.175		
	Vehicle	23	2	4	87	116	-0.216		
	Sham	29	7	3	78	117	-0.282		
	Total	163	26	20	486	695	NA		
Week 24	SM04690	193	50	37	147	427	0.248		
	Vehicle	47	16	7	32	102	-0.373		
	Sham	43	13	11	38	105	-0.429		
	Total	283	79	55	217	634	NA		

^a Bang's Blinding Index (BI) determines the percentage of unblinding that is beyond chance

BI = 1 represents complete unblinding
BI = 0 represents random guessing

• BI = –1 represents opposite guessing

Subjects were unable to discern which treatment they received

In PBO and sham subjects

 No meaningful differences were evident between groups' changes in Pain NRS, WOMAC Pain and Function, or PtGA

 Both demonstrated statistically significant changes (>MCID¹ at all time points) compared to baseline

BBI did not indicate unblinding

IA PBO effects on PROs were "contextual"



- This is the first prospective comparison of PBO vs. sham IA injections
- Observed PRO effects appeared to be "contextual," meaning they resulted from the injection procedure rather than from therapeutic effects of saline

