SYNOPSIS

| Name of Finished Product Name of Finished Product Name of Active Ingredient Laniamivir Octanoate Hydrate (JAN) A Phase 3 Study of CS-8958 (Postexposure Prophylaxis) — A randomized, double-blind, placebo-controlled study to confirm efficacy in the prevention of influenza virus infection— Investigators Study Centre(s) Publication (reference) Not published. Studied Period Phase of Development Objectives A randomized, double-blind, placebo-controlled, comparative study was conducted to investigate the efficacy of 1 inhaled treatment a week (2 inhaled treatments total) of CS-8958 20 mg or 40 mg for the prevention of influenza virus infection in household members of patients with influenza virus infection. The primary efficacy endpoint was the proportion of participants with clinical influenza virus infection, and the objective was to evaluate superiority of CS-8958 to placebo. For safety, the incidence of adverse events was compared between the treatment groups. The optimal clinical dose was investigated on the basis of the results of the efficacy and safety of inhaled treatments of CS-8958 20 mg or 40 mg. Methodology Methodology A multicenter, randomized, double-blind, , parallel-group, placebo-controlled, comparative study Number of Patients (planned and analyzed) 600 participants (200 in the CS-8958 20 mg group, 200 in the CS-8958 40 mg group, and 200 in the placebo group) Analyzed: Full analysis set (FAS): 610 participants (207 in the CS-8958 20 mg group, and 198 in the | Name of Sponsor/Company | Daiichi Sankyo Co., Ltd. |
|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Name of Active Ingredient Title of Study A Phase 3 Study of CS-8958 (Postexposure Prophylaxis) — A randomized, double-blind, placebo-controlled study to confirm efficacy in the prevention of influenza virus infection— Investigators Study Centre(s) Publication (reference) Not published. Studied Period Phase of Development Phase 3 Objectives A randomized, double-blind, placebo-controlled, comparative study was conducted to investigate the efficacy of 1 inhaled treatment a week (2 inhaled treatments total) of CS-8958 20 mg or 40 mg for the prevention of influenza virus infection in household members of patients with influenza A or B virus infection. The primary efficacy endpoint was the proportion of participants with clinical influenza virus infection, and the objective was to evaluate superiority of CS-8958 to placebo. For safety, the incidence of adverse events was compared between the treatment groups. The optimal clinical dose was investigated on the basis of the results of the efficacy and safety of inhaled treatments of CS-8958 20 mg or 40 mg. Methodology A multicenter, randomized, double-blind, , parallel-group, placebo-controlled, comparative study Number of Patients (planned and analyzed) Flanned: 600 participants (200 in the CS-8958 20 mg group, 200 in the CS-8958 40 mg group, and 200 in the placebo group) Analyzed: Full analysis set (FAS): 610 participants (207 in the CS-8958 | 1 1 | - |
| Title of Study A Phase 3 Study of CS-8958 (Postexposure Prophylaxis) — A randomized, double-blind, placebo-controlled study to confirm efficacy in the prevention of influenza virus infection— Investigators Study Centre(s) Publication (reference) Not published. Studied Period Phase of Development Objectives A randomized, double-blind, placebo-controlled, comparative study was conducted to investigate the efficacy of 1 inhaled treatment a week (2 inhaled treatments total) of CS-8958 20 mg or 40 mg for the prevention of influenza virus infection. The primary efficacy endpoint was the proportion of participants with clinical influenza virus infection, and the objective was to evaluate superiority of CS-8958 to placebo. For safety, the incidence of adverse events was compared between the treatment groups. The optimal clinical dose was investigated on the basis of the results of the efficacy and safety of inhaled treatments of CS-8958 20 mg or 40 mg. Methodology Methodology A multicenter, randomized, double-blind, , parallel-group, placebo-controlled, comparative study Number of Patients (planned and analyzed) 600 participants (200 in the CS-8958 20 mg group, 200 in the CS-8958 40 mg group, and 200 in the placebo group) Analyzed: Full analysis set (FAS): 610 participants (207 in the CS-8958 | | |
| A randomized, double-blind, placebo-controlled study to confirm efficacy in the prevention of influenza virus infection— Investigators Study Centre(s) Publication (reference) Not published. Studied Period Phase of Development Objectives A randomized, double-blind, placebo-controlled, comparative study was conducted to investigate the efficacy of 1 inhaled treatment a week (2 inhaled treatments total) of CS-8958 20 mg or 40 mg for the prevention of influenza virus infection. The primary efficacy endpoint was the proportion of participants with clinical influenza virus infection, and the objective was to evaluate superiority of CS-8958 to placebo. For safety, the incidence of adverse events was compared between the treatment groups. The optimal clinical dose was investigated on the basis of the results of the efficacy and safety of inhaled treatments of CS-8958 20 mg or 40 mg. Methodology A multicenter, randomized, double-blind, , parallel-group, placebo-controlled, comparative study Number of Patients (planned and analyzed) Planned: 600 participants (200 in the CS-8958 20 mg group, 200 in the CS-8958 40 mg group, and 200 in the placebo group) Analyzed: Full analysis set (FAS): 610 participants (207 in the CS-8958 | | • |
| Investigators Study Centre(s) Publication (reference) Not published. Studied Period Phase of Development Objectives A randomized, double-blind, placebo-controlled, comparative study was conducted to investigate the efficacy of 1 inhaled treatment a week (2 inhaled treatments total) of CS-8958 20 mg or 40 mg for the prevention of influenza virus infection in household members of patients with influenza A or B virus infection. The primary efficacy endpoint was the proportion of participants with clinical influenza virus infection, and the objective was to evaluate superiority of CS-8958 to placebo. For safety, the incidence of adverse events was compared between the treatment groups. The optimal clinical dose was investigated on the basis of the results of the efficacy and safety of inhaled treatments of CS-8958 20 mg or 40 mg. Methodology Methodology A multicenter, randomized, double-blind, , parallel-group, placebo-controlled, comparative study Number of Patients (planned and analyzed) 600 participants (200 in the CS-8958 20 mg group, 200 in the CS-8958 40 mg group, and 200 in the placebo group) Analyzed: Full analysis set (FAS): 610 participants (207 in the CS-8958 | The of Study | |
| Investigators Study Centre(s) Publication (reference) Not published. Studied Period Phase of Development Objectives A randomized, double-blind, placebo-controlled, comparative study was conducted to investigate the efficacy of 1 inhaled treatment a week (2 inhaled treatments total) of CS-8958 20 mg or 40 mg for the prevention of influenza virus infection in household members of patients with influenza A or B virus infection. The primary efficacy endpoint was the proportion of participants with clinical influenza virus infection, and the objective was to evaluate superiority of CS-8958 to placebo. For safety, the incidence of adverse events was compared between the treatment groups. The optimal clinical dose was investigated on the basis of the results of the efficacy and safety of inhaled treatments of CS-8958 20 mg or 40 mg. Methodology A multicenter, randomized, double-blind, , parallel-group, placebo-controlled, comparative study Number of Patients (planned and analyzed) 600 participants (200 in the CS-8958 20 mg group, 200 in the CS-8958 40 mg group, and 200 in the placebo group) Analyzed: Full analysis set (FAS): 610 participants (207 in the CS-8958 | | |
| Study Centre(s) Publication (reference) Not published. Studied Period Phase of Development Phase 3 Objectives A randomized, double-blind, placebo-controlled, comparative study was conducted to investigate the efficacy of 1 inhaled treatment a week (2 inhaled treatments total) of CS-8958 20 mg or 40 mg for the prevention of influenza virus infection in household members of patients with influenza A or B virus infection. The primary efficacy endpoint was the proportion of participants with clinical influenza virus infection, and the objective was to evaluate superiority of CS-8958 to placebo. For safety, the incidence of adverse events was compared between the treatment groups. The optimal clinical dose was investigated on the basis of the results of the efficacy and safety of inhaled treatments of CS-8958 20 mg or 40 mg. Methodology A multicenter, randomized, double-blind, , parallel-group, placebo-controlled, comparative study Number of Patients (planned and analyzed) 600 participants (200 in the CS-8958 20 mg group, 200 in the CS-8958 40 mg group, and 200 in the placebo group) Analyzed: Full analysis set (FAS): 610 participants (207 in the CS-8958 | Investigators | committee and the prevention of influenza virus infection |
| Publication (reference) Studied Period Phase of Development Phase 3 Objectives A randomized, double-blind, placebo-controlled, comparative study was conducted to investigate the efficacy of 1 inhaled treatment a week (2 inhaled treatments total) of CS-8958 20 mg or 40 mg for the prevention of influenza virus infection in household members of patients with influenza A or B virus infection. The primary efficacy endpoint was the proportion of participants with clinical influenza virus infection, and the objective was to evaluate superiority of CS-8958 to placebo. For safety, the incidence of adverse events was compared between the treatment groups. The optimal clinical dose was investigated on the basis of the results of the efficacy and safety of inhaled treatments of CS-8958 20 mg or 40 mg. Methodology A multicenter, randomized, double-blind, , parallel-group, placebo-controlled, comparative study Number of Patients (planned and analyzed) 600 participants (200 in the CS-8958 20 mg group, 200 in the CS-8958 40 mg group, and 200 in the placebo group) Analyzed: Full analysis set (FAS): 610 participants (207 in the CS-8958 | | |
| Phase of Development Phase 3 Objectives A randomized, double-blind, placebo-controlled, comparative study was conducted to investigate the efficacy of 1 inhaled treatment a week (2 inhaled treatments total) of CS-8958 20 mg or 40 mg for the prevention of influenza virus infection in household members of patients with influenza A or B virus infection. The primary efficacy endpoint was the proportion of participants with clinical influenza virus infection, and the objective was to evaluate superiority of CS-8958 to placebo. For safety, the incidence of adverse events was compared between the treatment groups. The optimal clinical dose was investigated on the basis of the results of the efficacy and safety of inhaled treatments of CS-8958 20 mg or 40 mg. Methodology A multicenter, randomized, double-blind, , parallel-group, placebo-controlled, comparative study Number of Patients (planned and analyzed) 600 participants (200 in the CS-8958 20 mg group, 200 in the CS-8958 40 mg group, and 200 in the placebo group) Analyzed: Full analysis set (FAS): 610 participants (207 in the CS-8958 | | Not published |
| Phase of Development Objectives A randomized, double-blind, placebo-controlled, comparative study was conducted to investigate the efficacy of 1 inhaled treatment a week (2 inhaled treatments total) of CS-8958 20 mg or 40 mg for the prevention of influenza virus infection in household members of patients with influenza A or B virus infection. The primary efficacy endpoint was the proportion of participants with clinical influenza virus infection, and the objective was to evaluate superiority of CS-8958 to placebo. For safety, the incidence of adverse events was compared between the treatment groups. The optimal clinical dose was investigated on the basis of the results of the efficacy and safety of inhaled treatments of CS-8958 20 mg or 40 mg. Methodology A multicenter, randomized, double-blind, , parallel-group, placebo-controlled, comparative study Number of Patients (planned and analyzed) Planned: 600 participants (200 in the CS-8958 20 mg group, 200 in the CS-8958 40 mg group, and 200 in the placebo group) Analyzed: Full analysis set (FAS): 610 participants (207 in the CS-8958 | | Not published. |
| Objectives A randomized, double-blind, placebo-controlled, comparative study was conducted to investigate the efficacy of 1 inhaled treatment a week (2 inhaled treatments total) of CS-8958 20 mg or 40 mg for the prevention of influenza virus infection in household members of patients with influenza A or B virus infection. The primary efficacy endpoint was the proportion of participants with clinical influenza virus infection, and the objective was to evaluate superiority of CS-8958 to placebo. For safety, the incidence of adverse events was compared between the treatment groups. The optimal clinical dose was investigated on the basis of the results of the efficacy and safety of inhaled treatments of CS-8958 20 mg or 40 mg. Methodology A multicenter, randomized, double-blind, , parallel-group, placebo-controlled, comparative study Number of Patients (planned and analyzed) Planned: 600 participants (200 in the CS-8958 20 mg group, 200 in the CS-8958 40 mg group, and 200 in the placebo group) Analyzed: Full analysis set (FAS): 610 participants (207 in the CS-8958 | | DI 2 |
| study was conducted to investigate the efficacy of 1 inhaled treatment a week (2 inhaled treatments total) of CS-8958 20 mg or 40 mg for the prevention of influenza virus infection in household members of patients with influenza A or B virus infection. The primary efficacy endpoint was the proportion of participants with clinical influenza virus infection, and the objective was to evaluate superiority of CS-8958 to placebo. For safety, the incidence of adverse events was compared between the treatment groups. The optimal clinical dose was investigated on the basis of the results of the efficacy and safety of inhaled treatments of CS-8958 20 mg or 40 mg. Methodology A multicenter, randomized, double-blind, , parallel-group, placebo-controlled, comparative study Number of Patients (planned and analyzed) Planned: 600 participants (200 in the CS-8958 20 mg group, 200 in the CS-8958 40 mg group, and 200 in the placebo group) Analyzed: Full analysis set (FAS): 610 participants (207 in the CS-8958 | - | |
| treatment a week (2 inhaled treatments total) of CS-8958 20 mg or 40 mg for the prevention of influenza virus infection in household members of patients with influenza A or B virus infection. The primary efficacy endpoint was the proportion of participants with clinical influenza virus infection, and the objective was to evaluate superiority of CS-8958 to placebo. For safety, the incidence of adverse events was compared between the treatment groups. The optimal clinical dose was investigated on the basis of the results of the efficacy and safety of inhaled treatments of CS-8958 20 mg or 40 mg. Methodology A multicenter, randomized, double-blind, , parallel-group, placebo-controlled, comparative study Number of Patients (planned and analyzed) 600 participants (200 in the CS-8958 20 mg group, 200 in the CS-8958 40 mg group, and 200 in the placebo group) Analyzed: Full analysis set (FAS): 610 participants (207 in the CS-8958 | Objectives | |
| 40 mg for the prevention of influenza virus infection in household members of patients with influenza A or B virus infection. The primary efficacy endpoint was the proportion of participants with clinical influenza virus infection, and the objective was to evaluate superiority of CS-8958 to placebo. For safety, the incidence of adverse events was compared between the treatment groups. The optimal clinical dose was investigated on the basis of the results of the efficacy and safety of inhaled treatments of CS-8958 20 mg or 40 mg. Methodology A multicenter, randomized, double-blind, , parallel-group, placebo-controlled, comparative study Number of Patients (planned and analyzed) Planned: 600 participants (200 in the CS-8958 20 mg group, 200 in the CS-8958 40 mg group, and 200 in the placebo group) Analyzed: Full analysis set (FAS): 610 participants (207 in the CS-8958 | | |
| members of patients with influenza A or B virus infection. The primary efficacy endpoint was the proportion of participants with clinical influenza virus infection, and the objective was to evaluate superiority of CS-8958 to placebo. For safety, the incidence of adverse events was compared between the treatment groups. The optimal clinical dose was investigated on the basis of the results of the efficacy and safety of inhaled treatments of CS-8958 20 mg or 40 mg. Methodology A multicenter, randomized, double-blind, , parallel-group, placebo-controlled, comparative study Number of Patients (planned and analyzed) 600 participants (200 in the CS-8958 20 mg group, 200 in the CS-8958 40 mg group, and 200 in the placebo group) Analyzed: Full analysis set (FAS): 610 participants (207 in the CS-8958 | | |
| The primary efficacy endpoint was the proportion of participants with clinical influenza virus infection, and the objective was to evaluate superiority of CS-8958 to placebo. For safety, the incidence of adverse events was compared between the treatment groups. The optimal clinical dose was investigated on the basis of the results of the efficacy and safety of inhaled treatments of CS-8958 20 mg or 40 mg. Methodology A multicenter, randomized, double-blind, , parallel-group, placebo-controlled, comparative study Number of Patients (planned and analyzed) Planned: 600 participants (200 in the CS-8958 20 mg group, 200 in the CS-8958 40 mg group, and 200 in the placebo group) Analyzed: Full analysis set (FAS): 610 participants (207 in the CS-8958 | | |
| with clinical influenza virus infection, and the objective was to evaluate superiority of CS-8958 to placebo. For safety, the incidence of adverse events was compared between the treatment groups. The optimal clinical dose was investigated on the basis of the results of the efficacy and safety of inhaled treatments of CS-8958 20 mg or 40 mg. Methodology A multicenter, randomized, double-blind, , parallel-group, placebo-controlled, comparative study Number of Patients (planned and analyzed) 600 participants (200 in the CS-8958 20 mg group, 200 in the CS-8958 40 mg group, and 200 in the placebo group) Analyzed: Full analysis set (FAS): 610 participants (207 in the CS-8958 | | members of patients with influenza A or B virus infection. |
| evaluate superiority of CS-8958 to placebo. For safety, the incidence of adverse events was compared between the treatment groups. The optimal clinical dose was investigated on the basis of the results of the efficacy and safety of inhaled treatments of CS-8958 20 mg or 40 mg. Methodology A multicenter, randomized, double-blind, , parallel-group, placebo-controlled, comparative study Number of Patients (planned and analyzed) Planned: 600 participants (200 in the CS-8958 20 mg group, 200 in the CS-8958 40 mg group, and 200 in the placebo group) Analyzed: Full analysis set (FAS): 610 participants (207 in the CS-8958 | | The primary efficacy endpoint was the proportion of participants |
| incidence of adverse events was compared between the treatment groups. The optimal clinical dose was investigated on the basis of the results of the efficacy and safety of inhaled treatments of CS-8958 20 mg or 40 mg. Methodology A multicenter, randomized, double-blind, , parallel-group, placebo-controlled, comparative study Number of Patients (planned and analyzed) Planned: 600 participants (200 in the CS-8958 20 mg group, 200 in the CS-8958 40 mg group, and 200 in the placebo group) Analyzed: Full analysis set (FAS): 610 participants (207 in the CS-8958 | | with clinical influenza virus infection, and the objective was to |
| groups. The optimal clinical dose was investigated on the basis of the results of the efficacy and safety of inhaled treatments of CS-8958 20 mg or 40 mg. Methodology A multicenter, randomized, double-blind, , parallel-group, placebo-controlled, comparative study Number of Patients (planned and analyzed) Planned: 600 participants (200 in the CS-8958 20 mg group, 200 in the CS-8958 40 mg group, and 200 in the placebo group) Analyzed: Full analysis set (FAS): 610 participants (207 in the CS-8958 | | evaluate superiority of CS-8958 to placebo. For safety, the |
| The optimal clinical dose was investigated on the basis of the results of the efficacy and safety of inhaled treatments of CS-8958 20 mg or 40 mg. Methodology A multicenter, randomized, double-blind, , parallel-group, placebo-controlled, comparative study Number of Patients (planned and analyzed) Planned: 600 participants (200 in the CS-8958 20 mg group, 200 in the CS-8958 40 mg group, and 200 in the placebo group) Analyzed: Full analysis set (FAS): 610 participants (207 in the CS-8958 | | incidence of adverse events was compared between the treatment |
| results of the efficacy and safety of inhaled treatments of CS-8958 20 mg or 40 mg. Methodology A multicenter, randomized, double-blind, , parallel-group, placebo-controlled, comparative study Number of Patients (planned and analyzed) Planned: 600 participants (200 in the CS-8958 20 mg group, 200 in the CS-8958 40 mg group, and 200 in the placebo group) Analyzed: Full analysis set (FAS): 610 participants (207 in the CS-8958 | | groups. |
| Methodology A multicenter, randomized, double-blind, , parallel-group, placebo-controlled, comparative study Number of Patients (planned and analyzed) Planned: 600 participants (200 in the CS-8958 20 mg group, 200 in the CS-8958 40 mg group, and 200 in the placebo group) Analyzed: Full analysis set (FAS): 610 participants (207 in the CS-8958 | | The optimal clinical dose was investigated on the basis of the |
| Methodology A multicenter, randomized, double-blind, , parallel-group, placebo-controlled, comparative study Number of Patients (planned and analyzed) Planned: 600 participants (200 in the CS-8958 20 mg group, 200 in the CS-8958 40 mg group, and 200 in the placebo group) Analyzed: Full analysis set (FAS): 610 participants (207 in the CS-8958 | | results of the efficacy and safety of inhaled treatments of CS-8958 |
| Number of Patients (planned and analyzed) Planned: 600 participants (200 in the CS-8958 20 mg group, 200 in the CS-8958 40 mg group, and 200 in the placebo group) Analyzed: Full analysis set (FAS): 610 participants (207 in the CS-8958 | | 20 mg or 40 mg. |
| Number of Patients (planned and analyzed) Planned: 600 participants (200 in the CS-8958 20 mg group, 200 in the CS-8958 40 mg group, and 200 in the placebo group) Analyzed: Full analysis set (FAS): 610 participants (207 in the CS-8958 | Methodology | A multicenter, randomized, double-blind, , parallel-group, |
| and analyzed) 600 participants (200 in the CS-8958 20 mg group, 200 in the CS-8958 40 mg group, and 200 in the placebo group) Analyzed: Full analysis set (FAS): 610 participants (207 in the CS-8958 | | placebo-controlled, comparative study |
| CS-8958 40 mg group, and 200 in the placebo group) Analyzed: Full analysis set (FAS): 610 participants (207 in the CS-8958 | Number of Patients (planned | Planned: |
| Analyzed: Full analysis set (FAS): 610 participants (207 in the CS-8958 | and analyzed) | 600 participants (200 in the CS-8958 20 mg group, 200 in the |
| Full analysis set (FAS): 610 participants (207 in the CS-8958 | | CS-8958 40 mg group, and 200 in the placebo group) |
| | | Analyzed: |
| 20 mg group, 205 in the CS-8958 40 mg group, and 198 in the | | Full analysis set (FAS): 610 participants (207 in the CS-8958 |
| | | 20 mg group, 205 in the CS-8958 40 mg group, and 198 in the |
| placebo group) | | placebo group) |
| Diagnosis and Main Criteria Index patients: | Diagnosis and Main Criteria | Index patients: |
| for Inclusion 1) Positive result on the influenza rapid diagnostic test | for Inclusion | 1) Positive result on the influenza rapid diagnostic test |
| 2) No household members with influenza A or B virus infection in | | 2) No household members with influenza A or B virus infection in |

| | 4- 4 |
|-----------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------|
| | the 4 weeks prior to informed consent |
| | Participants: |
| | 1) Household member of a patient with influenza A or B virus |
| | infection |
| | 2) Negative result on the influenza rapid diagnostic test |
| | 3) Body temperature (axillary) at informed consent ≤ 36.9°C |
| | 4) No symptoms that cannot be distinguished from |
| | influenza(headache, myalgia/arthralgia, fatigue, |
| | chills/perspiration, nasal symptoms, sore throat, or cough) at |
| | informed consent |
| | 5) Investigator has determined that the individual will be able to |
| | use the provided inhaler |
| Test Product, Dose and Mode | CS-8958-20TC (containing 20 mg as CS-8958) |
| of Administration, Batch | CS-8958-20PTC (placebo, externally indistinguishable from the |
| Number | CS-8958) |
| | In the CS-8958 20 mg group: Participants inhaled one |
| | CS-8958-20TC and one CS-8958-PTC per week, and a total of two |
| | times. In the CS-8958 40 mg group: Participants inhaled two |
| | CS-8958-20TC per week, and a total of two times. In the placebo |
| | group, Participants inhaled two CS-8958-PTC per week, and a total |
| | of two times. |
| Duration of Treatment | Once a week for 2 weeks, and a total of 2 times |
| Reference Therapy, Dose and | - |
| Mode of Administration, | |
| Batch Number | |
| Criteria for Evaluation | Primary Endpoint: |
| | Proportion of participants with clinical influenza virus infection |
| | A participant with clinical influenza virus infection was defined |
| | as having a clinical influenza virus infection when a positive |
| | virus test result was obtained, body temperature was 37.5°C or |
| | more, and at least 2 of the 7 influenza symptoms (headache, |
| | myalgia/arthralgia, fatigue, chills/perspiration, nasal symptoms, |
| | sore throat, and cough) were observed. |
| Statistical Method | Primary analysis (efficacy): |
| Sadistical Michiga | The CS-8958 20 mg group and 40 mg group were compared with |
| | |
| | the placebo group using the Fisher exact test. A significance level |
| | of 5%, 2-sided, was used, and the Holm method was used for |

| | multiplicity adjustment. In addition, the relative risk compared |
|----------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------|
| | with the placebo group as well as their 95% confidence intervals |
| | (CIs) were calculated. |
| | Safety analysis: |
| | The numbers and proportions of participants with all-cause and |
| | drug-related adverse events were calculated by treatment group. |
| Summary - Conclusion | The proportion of participants with clinical influenza virus |
| | infection was 4.8% (10 of 207) in the CS-8958 20 mg group, 4.9% |
| | (10 of 205) in the CS-8958 40 mg group, and 8.6% (17 of 198) in |
| | the placebo group. Although the proportion was lower in both the |
| | CS-8958 20 mg group and the CS-8958 40 mg group than in the |
| | placebo group, the differences were not statistically significant (P |
| | = 0.1633 [CS-8958 20 mg group], <i>P</i> = 0.1643 [CS-8958 40 mg |
| | group] by the Fisher exact test). The relative risk reduction (95% |
| | CI) compared to placebo was 43.7% (-19.9 to 73.6) in the |
| | CS-8958 20 mg group and 43.2% (-21.0 to 73.3) in the CS-8958 |
| | 40 mg group. |
| | The incidence of adverse events was similar among all the |
| | treatment groups, and no major safety concerns were noted in |
| | either of the CS-8958 group. |
| | The aforementioned results suggested that CS-8958 is effective for |
| | the prevention of influenza virus infection in household members |
| | of patients with influenza virus infection; however, superiority to |
| | placebo could not be confirmed, and it was concluded that further |
| | study to evaluate appropriate dosage for the prophylaxis of |
| | influenza virus infection would be necessary. |
| Date of Report | Sep, 2014 |
| | |