



Clinical Pharmacology Study Protocol: Appendix B

Drug Substance	AZD9668
Study Code	D0520C00001
Appendix Edition Number	1
Appendix Date	██████████

THIS IS A PRINTED COPY OF AN ELECTRONIC DOCUMENT. PLEASE CHECK ITS VALIDITY BEFORE USE.

Appendix B
Additional Safety Information

FURTHER GUIDANCE ON THE DEFINITION OF A SERIOUS ADVERSE EVENT (SAE)

Life threatening

‘Life-threatening’ means that the subject was at immediate risk of death from the AE as it occurred or it is suspected that use or continued use of the product would result in the subject’s death. ‘Life-threatening’ does not mean that had an AE occurred in a more severe form it might have caused death (eg, hepatitis that resolved without hepatic failure).

Hospitalisation

Out-patient treatment in an emergency room is not in itself a serious AE, although the reasons for it may be (eg, bronchospasm, laryngeal oedema). Hospital admissions and/or surgical operations planned before or during a study are not considered AEs if the illness or disease existed before the subject was enrolled in the study, provided that it did not deteriorate in an unexpected way during the study.

Important medical event or medical intervention

Medical and scientific judgement should be exercised in deciding whether a case is serious in situations where important medical events may not be immediately life-threatening or result in death, hospitalisation, disability or incapacity but may jeopardize the subject or may require medical intervention to prevent one or more outcomes listed in the definition of serious. These should usually be considered as serious.

Simply stopping the suspect drug does not mean that it is an important medical event; medical judgement must be used.

Examples of such events are:

- *Angioedema not severe enough to require intubation but requiring iv hydrocortisone treatment*
- *Hepatotoxicity caused by paracetamol (acetaminophen) overdose requiring treatment with N-acetylcysteine*
- *Intensive treatment in an emergency room or at home for allergic bronchospasm*
- *Blood dyscrasias (eg, neutropenia or anaemia requiring blood transfusion, etc) or convulsions that do not result in hospitalisation*
- *Development of drug dependency or drug abuse.*

A GUIDE TO INTERPRETING THE CAUSALITY QUESTION

The following factors should be considered when deciding if there is a “reasonable possibility” that an AE may have been caused by the drug.

- Time Course. Exposure to suspect drug. Has the subject actually received the suspect drug? Did the AE occur in a reasonable temporal relationship to the administration of the suspect drug?
- Consistency with known drug profile. Was the AE consistent with the previous knowledge of the suspect drug (pharmacology and toxicology) or drugs of the same pharmacological class? OR could the AE be anticipated from its pharmacological properties?
- Dechallenge experience. Did the AE resolve or improve on stopping or reducing the dose of the suspect drug?
- No alternative cause. The AE cannot be reasonably explained by another aetiology such as the underlying disease, other drugs, other host or environmental factors.
- Rechallenge experience. Did the AE reoccur if the suspected drug was reintroduced after having been stopped? AstraZeneca would not normally recommend or support a rechallenge.
- Laboratory tests. A specific laboratory investigation (if performed) has confirmed the relationship?

A “reasonable possibility” could be considered to exist for an AE where one or more of these factors exist.

In contrast, there would not be a “reasonable possibility” of causality if none of the above criteria apply or where there is evidence of exposure and a reasonable time course but any dechallenge (if performed) is negative or ambiguous or there is another more likely cause of the AE.

In difficult cases, other factors could be considered such as:

- Is this a recognised feature of overdose of the drug?
- Is there a known mechanism?

Ambiguous cases should be considered as being a “reasonable possibility” of a causal relationship unless further evidence becomes available to refute this. Causal relationship in cases where the disease under study has deteriorated due to lack of effect should be classified as no reasonable possibility.