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Ceftaroline Description

• A novel intravenous cephalosporin

• Broad-spectrum activity
  – Gram-positive bacteria (eg, *Streptococcus pneumoniae*, *Staphylococcus aureus*)
  – Gram-negative bacteria (eg, *Escherichia coli*, *Klebsiella pneumoniae*, *Haemophilus influenzae*)

• Potent activity vs contemporary resistant pathogens
  – MRSA, MDRSP

• Demonstrated efficacy in CABP and cSSSI

• Well tolerated with safety profile reflective of cephalosporin class
Proposed Indications

- Ceftaroline is indicated for patients with CABP caused by susceptible isolates of gram-positive and gram-negative microorganisms:
  - *S. pneumoniae* (including MDRSP and cases with concurrent bacteremia)
  - *S. aureus* (MSSA)
  - *H. influenzae*
  - *H. parainfluenzae*
  - *K. pneumoniae* (ceftazidime susceptible)
  - *E. coli* (ceftazidime susceptible)

- **Proposed dose**
  - 600 mg q12h IV over 1 hour
  - 400 mg q12h IV over 1 hour for subjects with moderate to severe renal impairment (CrCl < 50 mL/min)
## Program Overview

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>17 Studies</th>
<th>11 Phase 1 Studies</th>
<th>Two Phase 2 Studies</th>
<th>Four Phase 3 Studies</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Healthy adults</td>
<td>2 cSSSI Studies</td>
<td>2 CABP Studies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mild, moderate, severe renal impairment</td>
<td>Intravenous, Intramuscular</td>
<td>2 cSSSI Studies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ESRD receiving hemodialysis</td>
<td></td>
<td>P903-08, P903-09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Thorough ECG</td>
<td></td>
<td>P903-06, P903-07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Elderly</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Adolescents</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>IM administration</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Fecal microflora</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Regulatory History

- **December 2005**: IND submitted
- **February 2006**: Fast Track designation granted
- **October 2007**: End-of-Phase 2 meeting
- **January 2008**: SPA submitted for CABP studies
- **September 2008**: Agreement with FDA on 10% NI margin in CABP for PORT III and IV subjects
- **March 2009**: FDA updates CABP Draft Guidance for Industry
- **July 2009**: Pre-NDA meeting
- **December 2009**: NDA submitted
- **June 2010**: FDA requests exploratory populations & endpoints
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Community-Acquired Bacterial Pneumonia: Medical Need
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CABP: Burden of Illness

• 7th leading cause of death in US\textsuperscript{a}

• ~ 5.6 million cases occur annually\textsuperscript{b}
  – ~ 1.1 million require hospitalization
  – Over 75% treated as outpatients

• Costs exceed US $8.4 – $10 billion/year\textsuperscript{a}
  – Inpatient-care costs are ~ 25-times higher than outpatient-care costs

\textsuperscript{a} Mandell LA, et al. Clin Infect Dis 2007
\textsuperscript{b} Am J Respir Crit Care Med 2001
CABP: Pathogens & Antimicrobial Resistance

• Pathogens in moderate-to-severe CABP
  – *Streptococcus pneumoniae*
  – *Staphylococcus aureus*
  – *Haemophilus influenzae*
  – Enteric gram-negative bacilli

• Antibacterial resistance is common
  – Penicillin-nonsusceptible and multidrug-resistant *S. pneumoniae* (PRSP, PISP, MDRSP)
  – Nonvaccine *S. pneumoniae* serotypes (eg, 19A)

• Emerging threat
  – Community-acquired MRSA
The Problem with *S. pneumoniae* Serotype 19A
*Now Most Common Invasive Serotype in US and Canada*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Antimicrobial</th>
<th>MIC&lt;sub&gt;90&lt;/sub&gt;</th>
<th>% Susceptible</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Penicillin</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>46.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ceftriaxone</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>65.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cefuroxime</td>
<td>&gt;8</td>
<td>36.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Erythromycin</td>
<td>&gt;2</td>
<td>26.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clindamycin</td>
<td>&gt;2</td>
<td>43.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ceftaroline</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

189 of 894 isolates (21.1%) were 19A

JMI United States Surveillance Data 2008 (on file)
Sudden Emergence of Ceftriaxone-resistant Pneumococci:
Canadian Bacterial Surveillance Network, 1988-2009

*Non-meningitis breakpoints used
Canadian Bacterial Surveillance Network, March 2010
CABP – Summary

- CABP is one of most common infectious diseases, with heavy burden of illness
- Significant morbidity and mortality despite advances in medical care
- Emerging antimicrobial resistance threatens the utility of our first-line agents
  - MDRSP
  - CA-MRSA
- New safe and effective antibiotics are urgently needed for CABP
Microbiology and Clinical Pharmacology

Ian Critchley, PhD
Vice President, Microbiology
Cerexa, Inc.
Key Microbiology Attributes

• Broad-spectrum bactericidal activity
  – Resistant gram-positive bacteria and common gram-negative pathogens
  – Typical respiratory pathogens including *S. pneumoniae*, *H. influenzae*, and *M. catarrhalis*

• Higher affinity for penicillin-binding proteins (PBPs) than other β-lactams

• Low potential for resistance induction in vitro

• Excellent bactericidal activity against PRSP or MRSA / VISA in animal efficacy models
# Clinically Important Pathogens

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organism</th>
<th>Ceftaroline MIC (µg/mL)</th>
<th>No. tested</th>
<th>MIC Range</th>
<th>90%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>S. pneumoniae (All)</strong></td>
<td>894</td>
<td>≤ 0.008 – 0.5</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>S. pneumoniae (MDR)</strong></td>
<td>125</td>
<td>0.06 – 0.5</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>S. aureus (MSSA)</strong></td>
<td>1711</td>
<td>≤ 0.008 – 0.5</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>S. aureus (MRSA)</strong></td>
<td>2254</td>
<td>0.12 – 2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>H. influenzae (β-lactamase-negative)</strong></td>
<td>275</td>
<td>≤ 0.008 – 0.06</td>
<td>0.015</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>H. influenzae (β-lactamase-positive)</strong></td>
<td>106</td>
<td>≤ 0.008 – 0.12</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>E. coli (ceftazidime-susceptible)</strong></td>
<td>1036</td>
<td>0.015 – &gt; 16</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>K. pneumoniae (ceftazidime-susceptible)</strong></td>
<td>517</td>
<td>≤ 0.008 – &gt; 16</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2008 US Surveillance
Lower MICs than Comparators Against S. pneumoniae
US Surveillance Isolates from 2008

891 isolates

Arrows indicate MIC$_{90}$ values for each agent
# High Affinity for Modified PBPs in PRSP and MRSA

Higher affinity for modified PBPs results in lower MICs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Antibiotic</th>
<th>PRSP S. pneumoniae 2039</th>
<th>MRSA Strain 67-0</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>MIC (µg/mL)</td>
<td>PBP2x IC$_{50}$ (µg/mL)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ceftaroline</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>0.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ceftriaxone</td>
<td>1 – 2</td>
<td>0.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Penicillin</td>
<td>1 – 2</td>
<td>0.79</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Low Potential for Resistance Development In Vitro

- No MIC shifts > 2 dilutions following serial passage (10 – 50 passages)
- Low spontaneous mutation frequencies

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organism</th>
<th>Phenotype</th>
<th>4 x MIC</th>
<th>Initial MIC (µg/mL)</th>
<th>Final MIC After 10 Passages (µg/mL)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>S. aureus 2202</td>
<td>CA-MRSA</td>
<td>&lt; 1.10 x 10^{-10}</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S. pneumoniae 0869</td>
<td>PSSP</td>
<td>&lt; 6.80 x 10^{-9}</td>
<td>0.008</td>
<td>0.015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S. pneumoniae 0884</td>
<td>PRSP</td>
<td>&lt; 7.14 x 10^{-9}</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>0.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H. influenzae 1224</td>
<td></td>
<td>&lt; 4.98 x 10^{-9}</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>0.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H. influenzae 2797</td>
<td>BLNAR</td>
<td>&lt; 1.43 x 10^{-9}</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>0.12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Insignificant induction of AmpC β-lactamases at ≤ 1 x MIC among gram-negative bacilli
In Vivo Efficacy of Ceftaroline and Ceftriaxone Against *S. pneumoniae* in Rabbit Pneumonia Model

*Simulated human dose regimen*

MICs (µg/mL) for PSSP (0.015 vs. 0.06), PISP (0.125 vs. 1), and PRSP (0.25 vs. 4) for ceftaroline and ceftriaxone, respectively (Croisier-Bertin D et al. *19th ECCMID*, Helsinki 2009 Abstract O382).

**Bacterial Counts After 2 Days of Therapy** (mean log_{10} CFU/g lung tissue)

- **Control**
- **Ceftriaxone 1g/24h IV***
- **Ceftaroline 600mg/12h IV***

- **PSSP**
  - Ceftriaxone MIC = 4 µg/mL
  - Ceftaroline MIC = 0.25 µg/mL

- **PISP**
  - p < .001

- **PRSP**
  - p < .01
  - p < .001

* Simulated human dose regimen

MICs (µg/mL) for PSSP (0.015 vs. 0.06), PISP (0.125 vs. 1), and PRSP (0.25 vs. 4) for ceftaroline and ceftriaxone, respectively (Croisier-Bertin D et al. *19th ECCMID*, Helsinki 2009 Abstract O382).
Pharmacokinetics

• Rapid prodrug conversion to ceftaroline in plasma

• Approximately linear PK for doses of 50 – 1000 mg

• Half-life of 2.5 hours
  – No drug accumulation on repeated doses

• Low protein binding ~ 20%

• Low potential for drug-drug interactions
  – No CYP450-dependent metabolism
  – No inhibition or induction of CYP450 enzymes

• Elimination mainly through renal excretion
  – Dose adjustment for moderate and severe renal impairment
**S. pneumoniae PK/PD**

- %T>MIC is PK/PD parameter that best predicts efficacy for cephalosporins
- Murine neutropenic thigh/ bacteremia infection model standard for determining magnitude of %T>MIC
- %T>MIC predicts efficacy for ceftaroline
- ≥ 39% T>MIC required for efficacy for S. pneumoniae

PK/PD Target Attainment

Monte Carlo simulation-predicted probability (%) of target attainment for 600 mg q12h dose as function of MIC

*S. pneumoniae*

Organism Frequency, %

PK-PD Target Attainment, %

MIC (μg/mL)

- ≤ 0.008
- 0.015
- 0.03
- 0.06
- 0.125
- 0.25
- 0.5
- 1
- 2
- 4
- 8
- 16
- 32

* Bars represent percentage of isolates from US surveillance 2008

> 90% PTA for MIC of 1 μg/mL

> T>MIC = 39%

*S. pneumoniaes*
Summary

- Ceftaroline exhibits broad-spectrum antibacterial activity against important respiratory pathogens.
- Activity against resistant gram-positive bacteria mediated by high-affinity binding to modified PBPs.
- Low potential for resistance development in vitro.
- Approximately linear PK profile.
- Low potential for drug-drug interactions.
- Dosing regimen of 600 mg q12h provides adequate free-drug %T>MIC to cover key respiratory pathogens:
  - *S. pneumoniae* with MICs ≤ 0.5 µg/mL.
# Interpretive Criteria Proposed by Sponsor and Agency for CABP

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pathogen</th>
<th>Sponsor-proposed Interpretive Criteria</th>
<th>FDA-proposed Interpretive Criteria</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>S. aureus (excluding methicillin-resistant isolates)</td>
<td>≤ 2&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt; — —</td>
<td>≤ 0.25 — —</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S. pneumoniae</td>
<td>≤ 0.5 — —</td>
<td>≤ 0.008 — —</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H. influenzae</td>
<td>≤ 0.25&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt; — —</td>
<td>No interpretive criteria</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<sup>a</sup> Sponsor only proposed interpretive criteria for *S. aureus* regardless of indication

<sup>b</sup> Sponsor proposed interpretive criteria for *Haemophilus* spp.
Interpretive Criteria

- Important in guiding physicians in selecting most appropriate agent

- Susceptible implies a high probability that patient will respond to treatment with appropriate dosage of antimicrobial agent

- Current FDA-proposed breakpoints
  - Breakpoint divides wild-type MIC distribution
  - 51% of US *S. pneumoniae* isolates nonsusceptible despite adequate exposure and good clinical efficacy
Clinical Design and Efficacy

Dirk Thye, MD
CABP – Study Designs

*P903-08 and P903-09*

- Phase 3, multicenter, randomized, double-blind
- Noninferiority margin (10%) in clinical response at TOC
- All subjects in Study P903-08 in both groups received 2 doses adjunctive clarithromycin (500 mg q12h) on Day 1
- IV therapy only, no oral step-down therapy

![Diagram showing study designs with Ceftaroline and Ceftriaxone](image)
CABP Definition

• New or progressive infiltrate on chest radiograph

• Acute illness (≤ 7 days) with ≥ 3 signs or symptoms
  – Fever > 38°C oral or hypothermia < 35°C
  – WBC count > 10,000 cells/mm³ or < 4,500 cells/mm³
  – > 15% bands
  – New or increased cough
  – Purulent sputum or change in sputum character
  – Auscultatory findings consistent with pneumonia
  – Dyspnea, tachypnea, or hypoxemia
Main Inclusion Criteria

- Adults aged 18 years or older
- Infection requiring treatment with IV antibiotics
- Need for hospitalization
- Only PORT Risk Class III or IV included
  - PORT I / II  Low mortality, outpatient
  - PORT III / IV  Moderate mortality, hospitalization
  - PORT V  High mortality, ICU
Main Exclusion Criteria

• More than 1 dose of short-acting prior antibiotic

• Known or suspected ceftriaxone-resistant (eg, MRSA) or atypical pathogen

• Admission to ICU

• Healthcare- or hospital-acquired pneumonia

• Immediate life-threatening disease or evidence of significant hepatic, hematologic, or immunologic disease
Efficacy Endpoints

• **Primary Efficacy Endpoint**
  - Clinical cure rate at TOC

• **Secondary Efficacy Endpoints**
  - Clinical cure rate at EOT
  - Microbiological success rate at TOC
  - Clinical & microbiological response by pathogen at TOC
  - Relapse at LFU
  - Reinfection/ recurrence at LFU
Primary Endpoint Definitions
Determinated at TOC

• Clinical cure
  – Total resolution of all signs and symptoms of pneumonia or improvement to extent that further antimicrobial therapy not necessary

• Clinical failure (any of following):
  – Persistence, incomplete clinical resolution, or worsening in signs and symptoms of CABP that required alternative antimicrobial therapy
  – AE leading to discontinuation of study drug when subject required alternative antimicrobial therapy
  – All-cause mortality

• Indeterminate
Analysis Populations
*Phase 3 CABP Studies Combined*

**Study P903-08 (N = 613)**
- Ceftaroline = 304
- Ceftriaxone = 309

**Study P903-09 (N = 627)**
- Ceftaroline = 317
- Ceftriaxone = 310

- **ITT**
  - Failed evaluability criteria (eg, failed I / E, no outcome assessed, noncompliance), atypical pathogen only, or *Legionella pneumophila* infection

- **MITTE**
  - No drug received or PORT I, II, or V
  - No typical baseline pathogen, atypical pathogen only, or *Legionella pneumophila* infection

- **CE**

- **mMITTE**

- **ME**
### Demographics and Baseline Characteristics

**CABP Studies Combined**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Characteristic</th>
<th>MITTE Population</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ceftarolone N = 580</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Age</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean years ± SD</td>
<td>60.8 ± 16.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>≥ 65 years, %</td>
<td>47.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt; 50 years, %</td>
<td>75.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male, %</td>
<td>62.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>PORT Risk Class, %</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III</td>
<td>62.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV</td>
<td>37.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Met modified ATS severe CAP criteria, %</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>31.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Met SIRS criteria, %</strong></td>
<td>74.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Bacteremia, %</strong></td>
<td>4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em><em>Prior antibiotics</em>, %</em>*</td>
<td>40.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Single dose of a short-acting antibiotic*
## Baseline Pathogens

**Phase 3 CABP Studies Combined**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organism</th>
<th>Ceftaroline N = 580</th>
<th>Ceftriaxone N = 573</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Any pathogen</td>
<td>240 (41.4)</td>
<td>235 (41.0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Typical</td>
<td>170 (29.3)</td>
<td>175 (30.5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Atypical only</td>
<td>70 (12.1)</td>
<td>60 (10.5)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Key Baseline Pathogens
### Phase 3 CABP Studies Combined

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organism</th>
<th>mMITTE Population, n (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ceftaroline N = 165</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>S. pneumoniae</strong></td>
<td>69 (41.8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>S. aureus</strong></td>
<td>25 (15.2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>H. influenzae</strong></td>
<td>20 (12.1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>H. parainfluenzae</strong></td>
<td>17 (10.3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>K. pneumoniae</strong></td>
<td>15 (9.1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>E. coli</strong></td>
<td>12 (7.3)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Primary Endpoint

### Clinical Cure at TOC

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Study/Population</th>
<th>MITTE</th>
<th>CE</th>
<th>Favors Ceftriaxone</th>
<th>Favors Ceftaroline</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>P903-08</strong></td>
<td>Ceftaroline</td>
<td>Ceftriaxone</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MITTE</td>
<td>83.8 (244/291)</td>
<td>77.7 (233/300)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CE</td>
<td>86.6 (194/224)</td>
<td>78.2 (183/234)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>P903-09</strong></td>
<td>Ceftaroline</td>
<td>Ceftriaxone</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MITTE</td>
<td>81.3 (235/289)</td>
<td>75.5 (206/273)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CE</td>
<td>82.1 (193/235)</td>
<td>77.2 (166/215)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>COMBINED</strong></td>
<td>Ceftaroline</td>
<td>Ceftriaxone</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MITTE</td>
<td>82.6 (479/580)</td>
<td>76.6 (439/573)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CE</td>
<td>84.3 (387/459)</td>
<td>77.7 (349/449)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Treatment Difference (%)</th>
<th>(Ceftaroline-Ceftriaxone, 95% CI)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>-12 -10 -8 -6 -4 -2 0 2  4  6  8 10 12 14 16</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Primary Endpoint:
Clinical Cure at TOC*

- **Clinical Cure at TOC**
  - % (n/N)

- **Study/Population**
  - MITTE
  - CE

- **Favors Ceftriaxone**

- **Favors Ceftaroline**

- **Treatment Difference (%)**
  - (Ceftaroline-Ceftriaxone, 95% CI)
## Clinical Cure by Pathogen

**Phase 3 CABP Studies Combined**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organism</th>
<th>mMITTE Population, n/N (%)</th>
<th>Ceftaroline N = 165</th>
<th>Ceftriaxone N = 168</th>
<th>Difference (95% CI)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><em>S. pneumoniae</em></td>
<td></td>
<td>59/69 (85.5)</td>
<td>48/70 (68.6)</td>
<td>17.0 (2.9, 30.7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MDRSP*</td>
<td></td>
<td>4/4 (100)</td>
<td>2/9 (22.2)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>S. aureus</em></td>
<td></td>
<td>18/25 (72.0)</td>
<td>18/30 (60.0)</td>
<td>12.7 (-13.1, 36.3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>H. influenzae</em></td>
<td></td>
<td>17/20 (85.0)</td>
<td>20/24 (83.3)</td>
<td>1.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>H. parainfluenzae</em></td>
<td></td>
<td>16/17 (94.1)</td>
<td>15/18 (83.3)</td>
<td>10.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>K. pneumoniae</em></td>
<td></td>
<td>14/15 (93.3)</td>
<td>10/13 (76.9)</td>
<td>16.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>E. coli</em></td>
<td></td>
<td>10/12 (83.3)</td>
<td>9/13 (69.2)</td>
<td>14.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* MDRSP = multidrug resistant *S. pneumoniae*, resistant to ≥ 2 classes of antibiotics
Clinical Cure by Subgroup
Phase 3 CABP Studies Combined

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subgroup</th>
<th>CE Population % (n/N)</th>
<th>Favors Ceftriaxone</th>
<th>Favors Ceftaroline</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ceftaroline N = 459</td>
<td>Ceftriaxone N = 449</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PORT Risk Class</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III</td>
<td>86.8 (249/287)</td>
<td>79.2 (217/274)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV</td>
<td>80.2 (138/172)</td>
<td>75.4 (132/175)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>≤ 50</td>
<td>85.6 (83/97)</td>
<td>72.4 (71/98)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt; 50</td>
<td>84.0 (304/362)</td>
<td>79.2 (278/351)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bacteremia</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>84.9 (372/438)</td>
<td>78.5 (339/432)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>71.4 (15/21)</td>
<td>58.8 (10/17)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prior antibiotics</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes*</td>
<td>82.2 (152/185)</td>
<td>81.4 (158/194)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>85.8 (235/274)</td>
<td>74.9 (191/255)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Shaded area = High risk of mortality subgroups

* No more than 1 dose of short-acting antibiotic
FDA-defined Exploratory Primary Analysis
*FDA-mITT Population*

- **Subjects with ≥ 1 acceptable pathogen**
  - Isolated from blood, pleural fluid, BAL
  - Isolated from adequate sputum specimen (≤ 10 squamous epithelial cells/LPF and > 10 WBC/LPF)
  - Positive urinary antigen test for *S. pneumoniae*
  - Specific gram-negative rods and only if ≥ PORT III and isolate from appropriate sample

- **Subjects with *H. parainfluenzae* excluded**

- **Subjects with sole atypical pathogens**
  - *(L. pneumophila, M. pneumoniae, or C. pneumoniae)* excluded
FDA-defined Exploratory Primary Analysis
Clinical Responder at Study Day 4

• Clinically stable
  – Temperature $\leq 37.8^\circ$C
  – Heart rate $\leq 100$ bpm
  – Respiratory rate $\leq 24$ breaths per min
  – SBP $\geq 90$ mmHg
  – Oxygen saturation $\geq 90\%$
  – Confusion/ disorientation absent

AND

• Symptoms criteria success (compared to baseline)
  – None of 4 symptoms (cough, dyspnea, chest pain, sputum production) worsening
  – $\geq 1$ symptom improving
### FDA-defined Exploratory Primary Analysis

**Clinical Responders at Study Day 4**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Study</th>
<th>FDA-mMITT Population % (n/N)</th>
<th>Favors Ceftriaxone</th>
<th>Favors Ceftaroline</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ceftaroline</td>
<td>Ceftriaxone</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P903-08</td>
<td>71.0 (49/69)</td>
<td>56.9 (41/72)</td>
<td><img src="#" alt="Graph" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P903-09</td>
<td>69.5 (57/82)</td>
<td>60.5 (49/81)</td>
<td><img src="#" alt="Graph" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COMBINED</td>
<td>70.2 (106/151)</td>
<td>58.8 (90/153)</td>
<td><img src="#" alt="Graph" /></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Treatment Difference (%)**

(Ceftaroline-Ceftriaxone, 95% CI)

-32 -28 -24 -20 -16 -12 -8 -4 0 4 8 12 16 20 24 28 32
CABP Efficacy Conclusions

- Ceftaroline efficacious for treatment of CABP
  - Pre-specified, traditional primary endpoint (TOC)
  - Exploratory, FDA-defined early time point (Day 4)
  - Secondary and subgroup analyses provide robust support

- Efficacy demonstrated against important pathogens
  - *S. pneumoniae*
  - *S. aureus*
  - *H. influenzae*

- Totality of data demonstrates trends favoring ceftaroline over ceftriaxone for treatment of CABP
Clinical Safety

David Friedland, MD
Vice President, Clinical Sciences
Cerexa, Inc.
## Safety Population

**All Clinical Studies**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Study Grouping</th>
<th>Ceftarolone</th>
<th>Comparator</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Clinical Pharmacology</td>
<td>275</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>305*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Combined Phase 2 Studies</td>
<td>165</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>242</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Phase 3 CABP and cSSSI Studies</strong></td>
<td><strong>1305</strong></td>
<td><strong>1301</strong></td>
<td><strong>2606</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Combined Phase 3 CABP Studies</td>
<td>613</td>
<td>615</td>
<td>1228</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Combined Phase 3 cSSSI Studies</td>
<td>692</td>
<td>686</td>
<td>1378</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total All Studies</strong></td>
<td><strong>1745</strong></td>
<td><strong>1462</strong></td>
<td><strong>3153</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* 54 subjects in the TQT crossover study are counted only once in the total column.
## Adverse Event Overview

**Phase 3 CABP Studies**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Safety Event</th>
<th>Ceftaroline (N = 613)</th>
<th>Ceftriaxone (N = 615)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Any TEAE</td>
<td>47.0</td>
<td>45.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Any SAE</td>
<td>11.3</td>
<td>11.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discontinuations due to TEAE</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>4.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Death</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Adverse Events ≥ 2% in Ceftaroline Group
*Phase 3 CABP Studies*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Safety Event</th>
<th>Safety Population, %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ceftaroline N = 613</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diarrhea</td>
<td>4.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Headache</td>
<td>3.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Insomnia</td>
<td>3.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phlebitis</td>
<td>2.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hypertension</td>
<td>2.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hypokalemia</td>
<td>2.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nausea</td>
<td>2.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Serious Adverse Events

#### Phase 3 CABP Studies

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Safety Event</th>
<th>Safety Population, %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
|                           | Ceftaroline N = 613  | Ceftriaxone N = 615  
| Pneumonia                 | 1.5                  | 1.5                  
| Pleural effusion          | 0.8                  | 1.0                  
| Pulmonary embolism        | 0.8                  | 0.7                  
| COPD                      | 0.7                  | 1.0                  
| Respiratory failure       | 0.7                  | 0.2                  
| Pyothorax                 | 0.7                  | 0.0                  
| Lung abscess              | 0.3                  | 0.7                  


Adverse Events Leading to Discontinuation of Study Drug or Study
Phase 3 CABP Studies

• Low and similar incidences
  – 4.4% ceftaroline vs 4.1% ceftriaxone

• Few assessed as study drug related
  – 0.8% ceftaroline vs 1.0% ceftriaxone

• No individual AE leading to discontinuation in > 2 ceftaroline subjects
Summary of Deaths

Phase 3 CABP Studies

- Number of deaths low and similar between groups
  - 15 subjects (ceftaroline) vs 12 subjects (ceftriaxone)
  - Potentially drug-related equal (1 subject each group)
  - Primary infection-related similar (2 vs 3 subjects)

- Additional 5 deaths after LFU (1 vs 4 subjects)

- No predominant cause of death identified

- Timing of deaths
  - Few deaths while on therapy (2 vs 4 subjects)
  - Day 14 mortality similar (6 vs 7 subjects)
  - Day 30 mortality equal (12 subjects each group)
Organ Systems or Events of Interest Relevant to Cephalosporin Class

Combined CABP and cSSSI Phase 3 Safety Data

Comparator Agents: ceftriaxone (CABP)
vancomycin + aztreonam (cSSSI)
Summary of Organ Systems
Pooled Phase 3 CABP and cSSSI Studies

• Similar renal safety
  – TEAEs of potential renal impairment (1.5% vs 0.8%)
  – PCS Cr increase (1.4% vs 1.9%)
  – PCS CrCl decrease (0.7% vs 1.3%)

• Similar hematological safety
  – Increased Coombs seroconversion (10.7% vs 4.4%)
  – TEAEs of potential drug-induced anemia (1.2% vs 1.3%)
  – No hemolytic anemia or other hematological signals

• No evidence of cardiac toxicity
  – No cardiac signal (TEAEs and ECGs) in Phase 3 studies
  – No QT prolongation (supratherapeutic dose)

• Similar hepatic safety
  – TEAEs of potential hepatic toxicity (2.5% vs 3.6%)
  – No ceftaroline-treated subject met Hy’s Law
Events of Interest Relevant to Cephalosporin Class
*Pooled Phase 3 CABP and cSSSI Studies*

- **Seizures were uncommon (2 vs 1 subjects)**
  - None related to study drug

- **Lower incidence of potential allergic reactions**
  - TEAEs of potential allergic reactions (5.4% vs 8.5%)
  - Serious/ severe TEAEs (3 vs 6 subjects)

- **Similar incidence of antibiotic-associated diarrhea**
  - TEAEs of potential antibiotic-associated diarrhea (4.5% vs 3.2%)
  - *C. difficile*-associated diarrhea uncommon (2 vs 1 subjects)
Safety Conclusions

• Safety results similar between ceftaroline and ceftriaxone including:
  – TEAEs
  – SAEs
  – Discontinuations due to AE
  – Deaths

• No safety signal identified by Organ System or safety events of interest review

• Ceftaroline well tolerated and safety profile reflective of cephalosporin class
Ceftaroline in CABP
Therapeutic Perspective

Donald E. Low, MD, FRCPC
Ceftaroline Meets Urgent Medical Needs

- Broad spectrum of activity against gram-positives and gram-negatives
- Potent activity and proven effectiveness for treatment of CABP
- Treatment advantage over ceftriaxone for CABP including *S. pneumoniae* and *S. aureus*
- Good safety profile consistent with cephalosporin class
- Ceftaroline represents significant advancement in antibiotic treatment of CABP
Where Would I Use Ceftaroline

• **First-line empiric therapy for patients with moderate to severe CABP requiring hospitalization**

• **Alternative therapy for patients having failed on other antibiotics**
Anti-infective Drugs Advisory Committee (cSSSI)

Ceftaroline fosamil

Cerexa, Inc.
A subsidiary of Forest Laboratories, Inc.

07 September 2010
Proposed Indications

- Ceftaroline is indicated for patients with cSSSI caused by susceptible isolates of gram-positive and gram-negative microorganisms
  - *S. aureus* (including MSSA and MRSA)
  - *S. pyogenes, S. agalactiae, S. dysgalactiae, S. anginosus* group
  - *E. coli* (ceftazidime-susceptible)
  - *K. pneumoniae, K. oxytoea* (ceftazidime-susceptible)
  - *M. morganii* (ceftazidime-susceptible)

- Proposed dose
  - 600 mg q12h IV over 1 hour
  - 400 mg q12h IV over 1 hour for subjects with moderate to severe renal impairment (CrCl < 50mL/min)
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ABSSSI (cSSSI)
New Challenges in Treatment

G. Ralph Corey, MD
Professor of Medicine
Duke Clinical Research Institute
The Ongoing Epidemic of MRSA-induced ABSSSI

- 14 million medical visits annually
  - 600,000 hospitalizations each year

- Most caused by *S. aureus* USA300
  - Reproduces every 30 mins (1 to 1 trillion in 20 hrs)
  - Genetically promiscuous and acquisitive
    - Resulting increase in virulence/ resistance

Hersh et al. 2008; DeFrances et al. 2008.
MRSA among 422 ED Patients with ABSSSI
August 2004

ABSSSI Includes Primarily Moderate Infections
However, Occasionally Moderate Infections Develop Severe, Life-threatening Complications
Vancomycin: The Gold Standard for Rx of MRSA

- A large hydrophilic molecule
  - Slowly bactericidal
  - Poor tissue penetration

- Increasing resistance with worsening outcomes
  - VISA (1996), hVISA (1997), VRSA (2002), ↑MICs

- Increasing nephrotoxicity with high serum levels
  - 22% with levels > 20 μg/L

Clearly new antibiotics are needed to treat infections caused by a resistant, evolving *Staphylococcus aureus*
Microbiology

Ian Critchley, PhD

Vice President, Microbiology
Cerexa, Inc.
# Broad Spectrum Activity vs Clinically Important Gram-positive Cocci and Gram-negative Pathogens

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organism</th>
<th>Ceftaroline MIC (µg/mL)</th>
<th>No. tested</th>
<th>MIC Range</th>
<th>90%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><em>S. aureus</em> (MSSA)</td>
<td></td>
<td>1711</td>
<td>≤ 0.008 – 0.5</td>
<td>0.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>S. aureus</em> (MRSA)</td>
<td></td>
<td>2254</td>
<td>0.12 – 2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>S. pyogenes</em></td>
<td></td>
<td>132</td>
<td>≤ 0.008 – 0.015</td>
<td>≤ 0.008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>S. agalactiae</em></td>
<td></td>
<td>157</td>
<td>≤ 0.008 – 0.03</td>
<td>0.015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>S. dysgalactiae</em></td>
<td></td>
<td>12</td>
<td>≤ 0.008 – 0.03</td>
<td>0.015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Viridans group streptococci</td>
<td></td>
<td>110</td>
<td>≤ 0.008 – 1</td>
<td>0.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>E. coli</em> (ceftazidime-susceptible)</td>
<td></td>
<td>1036</td>
<td>0.015 – &gt; 16</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>K. pneumoniae</em> (ceftazidime-susceptible)</td>
<td></td>
<td>517</td>
<td>≤ 0.008 – &gt; 16</td>
<td>0.25</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2008 US Surveillance
Activities of Ceftaroline, Vancomycin and Linezolid Against 2008 US Surveillance Isolates of S. aureus

3965 isolates

Arrows indicate MIC$_{90}$ values for each agent
Data from 2008 US Surveillance, JMI Laboratories
### Active Against Contemporary Resistant Phenotypes of *S. aureus*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Antimicrobial Agent</th>
<th>CA-MRSA (n = 92)</th>
<th>VISA (n = 23)</th>
<th>VRSA (n = 10)</th>
<th>DAP-NS (n = 7)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>MIC&lt;sub&gt;90&lt;/sub&gt;</td>
<td>MIC&lt;sub&gt;90&lt;/sub&gt;</td>
<td>MIC Range</td>
<td>MIC Range</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ceftaroline</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.12 – 1</td>
<td>0.25 – 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vancomycin</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>32 – &gt; 64</td>
<td>1 – 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daptomycin</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.5 – 1</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linezolid</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1 – 4</td>
<td>1 – 2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

High Affinity for Modified PBP2a in MRSA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Antibiotic</th>
<th>MIC (μg/mL)</th>
<th>PBP2a IC₅₀ (μg/mL)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ceftaroline</td>
<td>0.5 – 1</td>
<td>0.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ceftriaxone</td>
<td>&gt; 128</td>
<td>677</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oxacillin</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>408</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Ceftaroline Resistance Development for cSSSI Pathogens During Serial Passage

- No MIC shifts > 2 dilutions following 50 serial passages

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organism</th>
<th>Phenotype</th>
<th>Ceftaroline MIC (µg/mL)</th>
<th>Initial MIC</th>
<th>MIC After 50 passages</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>S. aureus 1449</td>
<td>CA-MRSA</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S. aureus 873</td>
<td>hVISA</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S. aureus 555</td>
<td>VISA (DAP-NS)</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S. aureus 543</td>
<td>MSSA</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S. pyogenes 2132</td>
<td>Macrolide-S</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.004</td>
<td>0.004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S. pyogenes 2368</td>
<td>Macrolide-R</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.004</td>
<td>0.004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S. pyogenes 1077</td>
<td>Macrolide-R</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.004</td>
<td>0.004</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Efficacy of Ceftaroline and Comparators Against *S. aureus* in Rabbit Endocarditis Model

**Simulated Human Dosing**

**MRSA**

- Control
- Linezolid
- Vancomycin
- CEFTAROLINE (MIC = 1 µg/mL)

**hVISA**

- Control
- Linezolid
- Vancomycin
- CEFTAROLINE (MIC = 2 µg/mL)

* p ≤ 0.001 versus control and linezolid

** p ≤ 0.001 versus control, linezolid, and vancomycin
S. aureus PK/PD

- %T>MIC is PK/PD parameter that best predicts efficacy for cephalosporins

- Murine neutropenic thigh/ bacteremia infection model standard for determining magnitude of %T>MIC

- %T>MIC predicts efficacy for ceftaroline

- ≥ 26% T>MIC required for efficacy for S. aureus

PK/PD Target Attainment

Monte Carlo simulation-predicted probability (%) of target attainment for the 600 mg q12h dose as a function of MIC

S. aureus

MIC (µg/mL)

Organism Frequency, %

PK-PD Target Attainment, %

0 10 20 30 40 50 60 70 80 90 100

≤ 0.008 0.015 0.03 0.06 0.125 0.25 0.5 1 2 4 8 16 32

> 90% PTA for MIC of 2 µg/mL

* Bars represent percentage of isolates from US surveillance 2008

* MRSA*

* MSSA*

T>MIC = 26%
## Interpretive Criteria Proposed by Sponsor and Agency for *S. aureus*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pathogen</th>
<th>Sponsor-proposed Interpretive Criteria</th>
<th>FDA-proposed Interpretive Criteria</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>S</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>S. aureus</em> (includes methicillin-resistant isolates)</td>
<td>≤ 2</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Summary

- Ceftaroline exhibits broad-spectrum antibacterial activity against important skin pathogens
- Activity against resistant gram-positive bacteria mediated by high-affinity binding to modified PBPs
- Low potential for resistance development in vitro
- Dosing regimen of 600 mg q12h provides adequate free-drug %T>MIC to cover key skin pathogens
- Data support breakpoint of ≤ 2 μg/mL for *S. aureus*
Clinical Design and Efficacy

Dirk Thye, MD

Cerexa, Inc.
cSSSI – Study Design

- Phase 3, multinational, randomized, double-blind
- Noninferiority margin (10%) in clinical response at TOC
- IV therapy only, no oral step-down therapy

**Flowchart**

- **Baseline Assessment**: -24h
- **5-14 days of therapy**
  - IV Ceftaroline 600 mg q12h
  - IV Vancomycin 1 g q12h plus IV aztreonam 1 g q12h
- **EOT**
- **TOC**: 8-15 days after EOT
- **LFU**: 21-35 days after EOT
cSSSI Definition

• Involving deep soft tissue or requiring significant surgical intervention
  – Major abscess required ≥ 2 cm of cellulitis extending from abscess margin

  OR

Involving cellulitis/abscess of lower extremity in subjects with DM or PVD

• In addition: ≥ 3 clinical signs and symptoms
  – Fever > 38°C oral or hypothermia < 35°C
  – WBC count > 10,000/mm³
  – > 10% bands
  – Purulent or seropurulent drainage
  – Erythema
  – Fluctuance
  – Heat
  – Pain or tenderness to palpation
Main Inclusion Criteria

- Adults aged 18 years or older
- Need for hospitalization or treatment in emergency room or urgent care setting
- Expected to require ≥ 5 days of IV antimicrobial therapy
Main Exclusion Criteria

- > 24 hours of prior antibiotics for treatment of current cSSSI
  - Unless treatment failure with microbiological persistence

- Decubitus ulcers and diabetic foot ulcers involving osteomyelitis or requiring surgery

- Necrotizing fasciitis or gangrene

- Immediate life-threatening disease or evidence of significant hepatic, hematologic, or immunologic disease
Efficacy Endpoints

• **Primary Efficacy Endpoint**
  - Clinical cure rate at TOC in MITT and CE Populations

• **Secondary Efficacy Endpoints**
  - Clinical cure rate at EOT
  - Microbiological success rate at TOC
  - Clinical and microbiological response by pathogen at TOC
  - Relapse at LFU
  - Reinfection / recurrence at LFU
Primary Endpoint Definitions

Determined at TOC

- **Clinical cure**
  - Total resolution of signs and symptoms or improvement to extent that further antibiotics not necessary

- **Clinical failure (any of the following)**
  - Persistence, incomplete resolution, or worsening that requires alternative antibiotics
  - Surgical intervention due to failure of study drug
  - New signs and symptoms at infection site
  - AE leading to study drug discontinuation when subject required alternative antimicrobial therapy
  - Death wherein cSSSI considered causative

- **Indeterminate**
**Analysis Populations**

*Phase 3 cSSSI Studies Combined*

- **Study P903-06 (N = 702)**
  - Ceftaroline = 353
  - Vanco/Az = 349

- **Study P903-07 (N = 694)**
  - Ceftaroline = 348
  - Vanco/Az = 346

- **ITT**
  - Failed evaluability criteria (e.g., failed I/E, no outcome assessed, non-compliance)
  - No drug received

- **MITT**
  - No baseline pathogen

- **CE**

- **mMITT**

- **ME**
# Demographics and Baseline Characteristics

## Phase 3 cSSSI Studies Combined

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Characteristic</th>
<th>MITT Population</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ceftaroline N = 693</td>
<td>Vanco/Az N = 685</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mean years ± SD</td>
<td>47.5 ± 17.0</td>
<td>48.4 ± 16.6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>≥ 65 years, %</td>
<td>17.3</td>
<td>19.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male, %</td>
<td>64.1</td>
<td>61.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BMI, mean kg/m² ± SD</td>
<td>28.4 ± 7.1</td>
<td>28.7 ± 7.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diabetes, %</td>
<td>17.6</td>
<td>17.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PVD, %</td>
<td>13.4</td>
<td>13.6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bacteremia, %</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Baseline Infection Type: Wound, Abscess, Cellulitis

Individual Phase 3 cSSSI Studies (MITT)

Study P903-06

- Cellulitis: 40%
- Abscess: 14%
- Infected wound: 14%
- Infected ulcer: 8%
- Infected burn: 2%
- Infected bite: <1%
- Other: 6%
- Total: 100%

Study P903-07

- Cellulitis: 36%
- Abscess: 13%
- Infected wound: 8%
- Infected ulcer: 2%
- Infected burn: 1%
- Infected bite: <1%
- Other: 6%
- Total: 100%
## Key Baseline Pathogens

### Phase 3 cSSSI Studies Combined

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organism</th>
<th>Ceftaroline N = 540</th>
<th>Vanco/Az N = 522</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>S. aureus</strong></td>
<td>425 (78.7)</td>
<td>409 (78.4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>MSSA</strong></td>
<td>245 (45.4)</td>
<td>258 (49.4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>MRSA</strong></td>
<td>179 (33.1)</td>
<td>151 (28.9)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>S. pyogenes</strong></td>
<td>63 (11.7)</td>
<td>62 (11.9)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>S. agalactiae</strong></td>
<td>27 (5.0)</td>
<td>21 (4.0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>E. coli</strong></td>
<td>23 (4.3)</td>
<td>21 (4.0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>K. pneumoniae</strong></td>
<td>18 (3.3)</td>
<td>19 (3.6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>S. anginosus group</strong></td>
<td>15 (2.8)</td>
<td>18 (3.4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>S. dysgalactiae</strong></td>
<td>14 (2.6)</td>
<td>17 (3.3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>K. oxytoca</strong></td>
<td>12 (2.2)</td>
<td>8 (1.5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>M. morganii</strong></td>
<td>12 (2.2)</td>
<td>7 (1.3)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Primary Endpoint Analysis

**Clinical Cure at TOC**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Study/Population</th>
<th>Ceftaroline</th>
<th>Vanco/Az</th>
<th>Favors Vanco/Az</th>
<th>Favors Ceftaroline</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CE</td>
<td>86.6% (304/351)</td>
<td>85.6% (297/347)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MITT</td>
<td>91.1% (288/316)</td>
<td>93.3% (280/300)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P903-06</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CE</td>
<td>85.1% (291/342)</td>
<td>85.5% (289/338)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MITT</td>
<td>92.2% (271/294)</td>
<td>92.1% (269/292)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P903-07</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COMBINED</td>
<td>85.9% (595/693)</td>
<td>85.5% (586/685)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CE</td>
<td>91.6% (559/610)</td>
<td>92.7% (549/592)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Treatment Difference (%)

(Ceftaroline-Vanco/Az., 95% CI)
Clinical Cure by Pathogen
Phase 3 cSSSI Studies Combined

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pathogen</th>
<th>mMITT Population, n/N (%)</th>
<th>Difference (95% CI)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ceftaroline N = 540</td>
<td>Vanco/Az N = 522</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Difference</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(95% CI)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S. aureus</td>
<td>377/425 (88.7)</td>
<td>356/409 (87.0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MSSA</td>
<td>221/245 (90.2)</td>
<td>233/258 (90.3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MRSA</td>
<td>155/179 (86.6)</td>
<td>124/151 (82.1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S. pyogenes</td>
<td>56/63 (88.9)</td>
<td>57/62 (91.9)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Clinical Cure by Pathogen (cont’d)
### Phase 3 cSSSI Studies Combined

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organism</th>
<th>mMITT Population, n/N (%)</th>
<th>Ceftaroline N = 540</th>
<th>Vanco/Az N = 522</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>S. agalactiae</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>25/27 (92.6)</td>
<td>19/21 (90.5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>E. coli</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>21/23 (91.3)</td>
<td>19/21 (90.5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>K. pneumoniae</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>17/18 (94.4)</td>
<td>14/19 (73.7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>S. anginosus group</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>12/15 (80.0)</td>
<td>16/18 (88.9)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>S. dysgalactiae</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>14/14 (100.0)</td>
<td>15/17 (88.2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>K. oxytoca</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>10/12 (83.3)</td>
<td>7/8 (87.5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>M. morganii</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>11/12 (91.7)</td>
<td>5/7 (71.4)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
FDA-defined Exploratory Primary Analysis

Clinical Response at Study Day 3

- **FDA-MITT Population**
  - Lesion size $\geq 75 \text{ cm}^2$
  - Infection type:
    - Infected wound
    - Major abscess (surrounding erythema $\geq 5 \text{ cm}$)
    - Deep/ extensive cellulitis
    - Lower extremity SSSI in subjects with DM or PVD

- **Clinical responders**
  - Cessation of lesion spread at Day 3 (based on both length and width compared to baseline)
  - Afebrile at Day 3 ($\leq 37.6^{\circ}\text{C}$)

**AND**
### FDA-defined Exploratory Primary Analysis

**Clinical Responders at Study Day 3**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Study</th>
<th>FDA-MITT Population</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ceftaroline (%)</td>
<td>Vanco/Az (%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(n/N)</td>
<td>(n/N)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>P903-06</strong></td>
<td>74.0% (148/200)</td>
<td>64.6% (135/209)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>P903-07</strong></td>
<td>74.0% (148/200)</td>
<td>68.1% (128/188)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>COMBINED</strong></td>
<td>74.0% (296/400)</td>
<td>66.2% (263/397)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Favors**

- **Vanco/Az**
- **Ceftaroline**

**Treatment Difference (%)**

(Ceftaroline-Ceftriaxone, 95% CI)
cSSSI Efficacy Conclusions

- Ceftaroline noninferior to vancomycin + aztreonam for treatment of cSSSI
  - Pre-specified, traditional primary endpoint (TOC)
  - Exploratory, FDA-defined early time point (Day 3)
  - Secondary and subgroup analyses supportive

- Efficacy demonstrated against important pathogens
  - *S. aureus*, including MRSA
  - *S. pyogenes* and other *Streptococcus* spp.
  - *Enterobacteriaceae*

- Totality of data provides robust evidence for the effectiveness of ceftaroline for treatment of cSSSI
Clinical Safety

David Friedland, MD

Vice President, Clinical Sciences
Cerexa, Inc.
## Safety Population

### All Clinical Studies

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Study Grouping</th>
<th>Ceftaroline</th>
<th>Comparator</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Clinical Pharmacology</td>
<td>275</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>305*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Combined Phase 2 Studies</td>
<td>165</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>242</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Phase 3 CABP and cSSSI Studies</td>
<td>1305</td>
<td>1301</td>
<td>2606</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Combined Phase 3 CABP Studies</td>
<td>613</td>
<td>615</td>
<td>1228</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Combined Phase 3 cSSSI Studies</td>
<td>692</td>
<td>686</td>
<td>1378</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total All Studies</td>
<td>1745</td>
<td>1462</td>
<td>3153</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* 54 subjects in the TQT crossover study are counted only once in the total column
## Adverse Event Overview

### Phase 3 cSSSI Studies

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Safety Event</th>
<th>Safety Population, %</th>
<th>Ceftaroline N = 692</th>
<th>Vancomycin + Aztreonam N = 686</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Any TEAE</td>
<td>44.7</td>
<td>47.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Any SAE</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discontinuations Due to TEAE</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Death</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Adverse Events ≥ 2% in Ceftaroline Subjects

*Phase 3 cSSSI Studies*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Safety Event</th>
<th>Safety Population, %</th>
<th>Ceftaroline N = 692</th>
<th>Vancomycin + Aztreonam N = 686</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Nausea</td>
<td>5.9</td>
<td>5.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Headache</td>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diarrhea</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pruritus</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>8.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rash</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vomiting</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constipation</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Insomnia</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pruritus generalized</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dizziness</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Serious Adverse Events
*Phase 3 cSSSI Studies*

- **Low and similar incidence**
  - 4.3% ceftarolone vs 4.1% vancomycin + aztreonam

- **Few were assessed as study drug related**
  - 0.6% ceftarolone vs 0.4% vancomycin + aztreonam

- **No individual SAE occurred in > 2 ceftarolone subjects**
AEs Leading to Discontinuation of Study Drug or Study
*Phase 3 cSSSI Studies*

- **Low and similar incidence**
  - 3.0% ceftaroline vs 4.8% vancomycin + aztreonam

- **Skin and Subcutaneous Tissue Disorders was only body system with incidence > 1%**
  - 1.2% ceftaroline vs 2.5% vancomycin + aztreonam

- **Only AE leading to discontinuation in > 2 subjects in ceftaroline group was hypersensitivity**
  - 0.4% ceftaroline vs 0.9% vancomycin + aztreonam
Summary of Deaths
Phase 3 cSSSI Studies

• 3 deaths prior to LFU visit
  – 3 ceftaroline vs 0 vancomycin + aztreonam
  – None study drug related
  – Due to underlying disease:
    • Single cases of: respiratory failure; neoplasm progression; cardiopulmonary failure
    – Deaths occurred between 3 and 23 days after EOT

• Additional 4 deaths after LFU visit
  – 2 ceftaroline vs 2 vancomycin + aztreonam
  – None study drug related
Safety Conclusions

Phase 3 cSSSI Studies

- Safety results similar between ceftaroline and vancomycin + aztreonam including:
  - TEAEs
  - SAEs
  - Discontinuations due to AE
  - Deaths

- No safety signal identified by review of Organ System or safety events of interest

- Ceftaroline well tolerated and safety profile reflective of cephalosporin class
Ceftarolene in ABSSSI
Therapeutic Perspective

G. Ralph Corey, MD
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Ceftaroline Characteristics

• Demonstrated Efficacy
  – Against wide range of pathogens
  – Across varying infections and populations
  – Protocol-defined endpoints
  – New FDA-defined early endpoints
    • Cessation of spread and resolution of fever
    • Percent reduction in infection area

• Safe and well tolerated
When Would I Use Ceftaroline for ABSSSI?

• In community-acquired infections
  – When MRSA suspected
  – When gram-negative bacilli suspected

• In nosocomial infections when MRSA is suspected

• As a replacement for double coverage for patients with suspected/proven MRSA infections involving SSS

• I would use in patients in my practice
Bad Bugs Need Drugs

10x '20

Ten new ANTIBIOTICS by 2020