

Table 29: Nausea Efficacy, Study 302, 0-4 hrs.

Treatment Group Symptom	HOURS POST-DOSE				
	0.0	1.0	2.0	3.0	4.0
<b>Trexima (N=364)</b>					
Absent	188 ( 52%)	189 ( 52%)	260 ( 71%)	285 ( 78%)	295 ( 81%)
Present	176 ( 48%)	175 ( 48%)	104 ( 29%)	79 ( 22%)	69 ( 19%)
<b>Sumatriptan (N=361)</b>					
Absent	194 ( 54%)	185 ( 51%)	238 ( 66%)	260 ( 72%)	257 ( 71%)
Present	167 ( 46%)	176 ( 49%)	123 ( 34%)	101 ( 28%)	104 ( 29%)
<b>Naproxen (N=356)</b>					
Absent	182 ( 51%)	216 ( 61%)	248 ( 70%)	249 ( 70%)	240 ( 67%)
Present	174 ( 49%)	140 ( 39%)	108 ( 30%)	107 ( 30%)	116 ( 33%)
<b>Placebo (N=360)</b>					
Absent	211 ( 59%)	221 ( 61%)	233 ( 65%)	217 ( 60%)	199 ( 55%)
Present	149 ( 41%)	139 ( 39%)	127 ( 35%)	143 ( 40%)	161 ( 45%)
<b>P-Values<sup>1</sup></b>					
Trexima vs. Placebo			0.056		<0.001
Trexima vs. Sumatriptan			0.141		0.002
<b>P-Values<sup>2</sup></b>					
Trexima vs. Placebo			0.007		<0.001
Trexima vs. Sumatriptan			0.070		<0.001

<sup>1</sup> P-Values are from the Cochran-Mantel-Haenszel test, with pooled investigator site as the strata.  
<sup>2</sup> P-Values are from Logistic Regression, with pooled investigator site and baseline nausea as covariables.

Appears This Way  
 On Original

Photophobia

Trexima was statistically superior to placebo for photophobia at 2 hours in both study 301 (50% photobia-free vs. 32% for placebo)(Table 30), and study 302 (58% photophobia-free, versus 36% for placebo)(Table 31).

Table 30: Photophobia, 0-4 hrs, study 301

Table 14.2.3.1  
 Photophobia by Time Post-Dose  
 All Subjects in the Intent-to-Treat Population

Treatment Group Symptom	HOURS POST-DOSE				
	0.0	1.0	2.0	3.0	4.0
<b>Trexima (N=362)</b>					
Absent	62 ( 17%)	91 ( 25%)	180 ( 50%)	230 ( 64%)	248 ( 69%)
Present	300 ( 83%)	271 ( 75%)	182 ( 50%)	132 ( 36%)	114 ( 31%)
<b>Sumatriptan (N=362)</b>					
Absent	60 ( 17%)	91 ( 25%)	166 ( 46%)	200 ( 55%)	213 ( 59%)
Present	302 ( 83%)	271 ( 75%)	196 ( 54%)	162 ( 45%)	149 ( 41%)
<b>Naproxen (N=364)</b>					
Absent	63 ( 17%)	87 ( 24%)	148 ( 41%)	172 ( 47%)	185 ( 51%)
Present	301 ( 83%)	277 ( 76%)	216 ( 59%)	192 ( 53%)	179 ( 49%)
<b>Placebo (N=382)</b>					
Absent	72 ( 19%)	83 ( 22%)	122 ( 32%)	140 ( 37%)	144 ( 38%)
Present	310 ( 81%)	299 ( 78%)	260 ( 68%)	242 ( 63%)	238 ( 62%)
<b>P-Values<sup>1</sup></b>					
Trexima vs. Placebo			<.001		<.001
Trexima vs. Sumatriptan			0.220		0.004

<sup>1</sup> P-Values are from the Cochran-Mantel-Haenszel test, with pooled investigator site as the strata.

Table 31: Photophobia, 0-4 hrs, Study 302

Table 14.2.3.1  
 Photophobia by Time Post-Dose  
 All Subjects in the Intent-to-Treat Population

POZEN, Inc. Study Number MT400-302

Treatment Group Symptom	HOURS POST-DOSE				
	0.0	1.0	2.0	3.0	4.0
<b>Trexima (N=364)</b>					
Absent	76 ( 21%)	105 ( 29%)	211 ( 58%)	254 ( 70%)	271 ( 74%)
Present	288 ( 79%)	259 ( 71%)	153 ( 42%)	110 ( 30%)	93 ( 26%)
<b>Sumatriptan (N=361)</b>					
Absent	65 ( 18%)	102 ( 28%)	173 ( 48%)	210 ( 58%)	221 ( 61%)
Present	296 ( 82%)	259 ( 72%)	188 ( 52%)	151 ( 42%)	140 ( 39%)
<b>Naproxen (N=356)</b>					
Absent	69 ( 19%)	100 ( 28%)	166 ( 47%)	189 ( 53%)	202 ( 57%)
Present	287 ( 81%)	256 ( 72%)	190 ( 53%)	167 ( 47%)	154 ( 43%)
<b>Placebo (N=360)</b>					
Absent	74 ( 21%)	89 ( 25%)	131 ( 36%)	131 ( 36%)	137 ( 38%)
Present	286 ( 79%)	271 ( 75%)	229 ( 64%)	229 ( 64%)	223 ( 62%)
<b>P-Values<sup>1</sup></b>					
Trexima vs. Placebo			<.001		<.001
Trexima vs. Sumatriptan			0.007		<.001

<sup>1</sup> P-Values are from the Cochran-Mantel-Haenszel test, with pooled investigator site as the strata.

- Phonophobia

Trexima was statistically superior to placebo for phonophobia in study 301 (56% phonophobia-free, vs. 34% for placebo)(Table 32), and in study 302 (61% phonophobia-free, vs. 38% for placebo)(Table 33).

Table 32: Phonophobia, 0-4 hrs, Study 301

Treatment Group Symptom	HOURS POST-DOSE				
	0.0	1.0	2.0	3.0	4.0
Table 14.2.4.1 Phonophobia by Time Post-Dose All Subjects in the Intent-to-Treat Population					
Trexima (N=362)					
Absent	69 ( 19%)	115 ( 32%)	204 ( 56%)	239 ( 66%)	259 ( 72%)
Present	293 ( 81%)	247 ( 68%)	158 ( 44%)	123 ( 34%)	103 ( 28%)
Sumatriptan (N=352)					
Absent	76 ( 21%)	111 ( 31%)	188 ( 52%)	219 ( 60%)	224 ( 62%)
Present	286 ( 79%)	251 ( 69%)	174 ( 48%)	143 ( 40%)	138 ( 38%)
Naproxen (N=364)					
Absent	68 ( 19%)	97 ( 27%)	159 ( 44%)	179 ( 49%)	193 ( 53%)
Present	296 ( 81%)	267 ( 73%)	205 ( 56%)	185 ( 51%)	171 ( 47%)
Placebo (N=382)					
Absent	66 ( 17%)	85 ( 22%)	128 ( 34%)	138 ( 36%)	146 ( 38%)
Present	316 ( 83%)	297 ( 78%)	254 ( 66%)	244 ( 64%)	236 ( 62%)
P-Values <sup>1</sup>					
Trexima vs. Placebo			<.001		<.001
Trexima vs. Sumatriptan			0.137		0.003

<sup>1</sup> P-Values are from the Cochran-Mantel-Haenszel test, with pooled investigator site as the strata.

**Appears This Way  
 On Original**

Table 33: Phonophobia, 0-4 hrs, Study 302

Treatment Group Symptom		HOURS POST-DOSE				
		0.0	1.0	2.0	3.0	4.0
Trexima (N=364)						
Absent		83 ( 23%)	127 ( 35%)	223 ( 61%)	261 ( 72%)	274 ( 75%)
Present		281 ( 77%)	237 ( 65%)	141 ( 39%)	103 ( 28%)	90 ( 25%)
Sumatriptan (N=361)						
Absent		75 ( 21%)	107 ( 30%)	180 ( 50%)	210 ( 58%)	226 ( 63%)
Present		286 ( 79%)	254 ( 70%)	181 ( 50%)	151 ( 42%)	135 ( 37%)
Naproxen (N=356)						
Absent		91 ( 26%)	117 ( 33%)	181 ( 51%)	196 ( 55%)	215 ( 60%)
Present		265 ( 74%)	239 ( 67%)	175 ( 49%)	160 ( 45%)	141 ( 40%)
Placebo (N=360)						
Absent		82 ( 23%)	99 ( 28%)	138 ( 38%)	145 ( 40%)	148 ( 41%)
Present		278 ( 77%)	261 ( 73%)	222 ( 62%)	215 ( 60%)	212 ( 59%)
P-Values*						
Trexima vs. Placebo				<.001	<.001	
Trexima vs. Sumatriptan				0.002	<.001	

\* P-Values are from the Cochran-Mantel-Haenszel test, with pooled investigator site as the strata.

Appears This Way  
 On Original

Primary endpoint, 24 hour time point

Trexima claims efficacy as a combination product of sumatriptan and naproxen, and was therefore required to show that the combination is statistically superior to the individual components for at least one clinically meaningful endpoint. The endpoint agreed to with the Division was sustained efficacy against migraine, termed ‘sustained pain-free 2-24 hours.’ (choice of endpoint discussed in section 6.1.2, *General Discussion of Endpoints*). Trexima was not required to show superiority versus its components for associated migraine symptoms, but was expected to be no worse.

- Sustained pain-free 2-24 hours

In both study 301 and 302, Trexima was statistically superior for this endpoint to its components, sumatriptan and naproxen, and to placebo (Table 34). The margin of superiority was clinically significant: patients taking Trexima who were pain free at 2 hours had a ≈25% chance of being pain free through 24 hours, while for sumatriptan (85 mg RT), Naproxen (500 mg), and placebo, this chance was, respectively, ≈15%, ≈10%, and ≈8% (average results from the two studies).

Note that the percentage of patients that were pain free at 24 hours is probably ‘artificially’ low because only those patients pain free at 2 hours were measured for the “pain free between 2 and 24 hour” time point. In actual clinical practice, many patients probably experience long-lasting relief, but with initial onset of relief later than 2 hours, or experience some residual pain, but relief appears adequate, at least insofar as rescue medication is not taken (presumably because it is not subjectively necessary)(see Figure 7: Percent Taking Rescue Medication, All Treatments).

Table 34: Sustained pain-free 2-24 hours, 301, 302

	Trexima	Sumatriptan 85 mg	Naproxen Sodium 500 mg	Placebo
<b>MT400-302</b>	25% <sup>†</sup> (90/364)	16% (59/361)	10% (37/356)	8% (30/360)
<b>MT400-301</b>	23% <sup>‡</sup> (83/362)	14% (51/362)	10% (37/364)	7% (25/382)

<sup>†</sup> p<0.001 versus placebo, sumatriptan and naproxen sodium

<sup>‡</sup> p<0.001 versus placebo and naproxen sodium; p=0.009 versus sumatriptan.

**Appears This Way  
On Original**

# Explore Litigation Insights

Docket Alarm provides insights to develop a more informed litigation strategy and the peace of mind of knowing you're on top of things.

## Real-Time Litigation Alerts



Keep your litigation team up-to-date with **real-time alerts** and advanced team management tools built for the enterprise, all while greatly reducing PACER spend.

Our comprehensive service means we can handle Federal, State, and Administrative courts across the country.

## Advanced Docket Research



With over 230 million records, Docket Alarm's cloud-native docket research platform finds what other services can't. Coverage includes Federal, State, plus PTAB, TTAB, ITC and NLRB decisions, all in one place.

Identify arguments that have been successful in the past with full text, pinpoint searching. Link to case law cited within any court document via Fastcase.

## Analytics At Your Fingertips



Learn what happened the last time a particular judge, opposing counsel or company faced cases similar to yours.

Advanced out-of-the-box PTAB and TTAB analytics are always at your fingertips.

## API

Docket Alarm offers a powerful API (application programming interface) to developers that want to integrate case filings into their apps.

## LAW FIRMS

Build custom dashboards for your attorneys and clients with live data direct from the court.

Automate many repetitive legal tasks like conflict checks, document management, and marketing.

## FINANCIAL INSTITUTIONS

Litigation and bankruptcy checks for companies and debtors.

## E-DISCOVERY AND LEGAL VENDORS

Sync your system to PACER to automate legal marketing.