TRANSMITTAL OF ADVERTISEMENTS AND PROMOTIONAL LABELING FOR DRUGS AND BIOLOGICS FOR HUMAN USE		1. DATE SUBMITTED 11/26/2012 2. LABEL REVIEW NO. (Bit	ologics) Number: 202- Single product For multiple specimen of a application of addressing item	ation Date: September 30, 2014; see OMB Statement on Pa 3. NDA/ANDA/AADA OR BLA/PLA/PMA Number: 202-236 Single product Multiple products For multiple products, submit completed form specimen of advertising/promotional materials to application of choice, and attach separate s addressing items 3-5 for remainder of products. Refe No. 3 on instruction sheet.		
NOTE: F	Form 2253 is require	d by law. Repo	rts are required for ap	proved NDAs and AND	As (21 CFR 314.81)	
4. PROPRIETARY NAME			5. ESTABLIS			
DYMISTA			Prod. Coo		sone propionate	
6. PACKAGE INSERT DA (Latest final printed labe				TURER NAME: armaceuticals, MEDA Ph	armaceuticals Inc.	
IN-023A6-01	04/2012		(Biologics)			
REVIEWED BY		DATE	FDA/CBER USE ONLY RETURNED I	ЗҮ	DATE	
8.		ADVERTISEMEN	T / PROMOTIONAL LABELI	NG MATERIALS		
Please check only on	e: X Professional	Consun	ner			
Material Type	Dissemination/ Publication Date	Applicant's Ma	terial ID Code and/or descrip	tion Previous review N if applicable / dat	B	
(use FDA codes) a.	Publication Date b.		C.	(PLA Submissions) d,		
PSL	11/26/2012	DUDING	: AAM Physician's Dec	1		
9. TYPED NAME AND TIT			10. SIGNATU	814 RE OF RESPONSIBLE OFFICI	Add Continuation Pag	
Kimberly Skopitz, R.			N	donat 1	AN	
Manager, Regulatory			12 RESPONS	SIBLE OFFICIAL'S	R	
MEDA Pharmaceutic			a. PHONE			
200 North Cobb Park		428	770.916	5.3918		
Marietta, GA 30062			170.71			
			b. FAX NO	D.		
			678-71	8.3253		
			13. FOR CBE	R PRODUCTS ONLY: (Check o	ne)	
				Part I/Draft	Part II/Final	
FORM FDA 2253 (9/11)	PREVIOUS EDITIO	N IS OBSOLETE	Page 1 of 3		PSC Publishing Services: (301) 443-674	
			ſ	PLAINTIFFS' TRIAL EXHIBIT		

# PTX0917-00807

TRANSMITTA	L OF ADVERT		1. DATE SU	BMITTED	3. NDA/ANDA/AADA Number: 202-23	OR BLA/PLA/	
AND PROMO	TIONAL LABE S AND BIOLOG R HUMAN USE	LING FOR	11/26/20 2. LABEL RI	12 EVIEW NO. (Biologics)	specimen of adv application of cl	ducts, submit ertising/promo noice, and 8-5 for remain	oducts
NOTE: F	orm 2253 is require	d by law. Repor	ts are req	uired for approve	d NDAs and ANDA	s (21 CFR	314.81)
4. PROPRIETARY NAME DYMISTA				5. ESTABLISHED NAM azelastine hydroc Prod. Code No.	ME hloride and fluticaso	ne propiona	te
6. PACKAGE INSERT DAT (Latest final printed label IN-023A6-01				License No.	NAME: suticals, MEDA Phan	maceuticals	Inc.
			EDA/CRER	(Biologics)		_	
REVIEWED BY		DATE	PDAICDER	RETURNED BY			DATE
8.		ADVEDTICEMEN	T / DROMOT	ONAL LABELING MAT	FRIALS		
Please check only one	Professional			UNAL LABELING MAT	ERIALS		
Material Type (use FDA codes) a.	Dissemination/ Publication Date b.			and/or description	Previous review No. if applicable / date (PLA Submissions) d.	COMMENT	
PSL	11/26/2012	DYM-12-0240	: AAM Ph	ysician's Deck		1	
						1	
						1	
						-	
						-	
						-	
						Add Co	ontinuation Page
9. TYPED NAME AND TITL Kimberly Skopitz, RA Manager, Regulatory	C	ICIAL OR AGENT		10. SIGNATURE OF RI	ESPONSIBLE OFFICIAL	JA	
1. APPLICANT'S RETURN				12. RESPONSIBLE OF	FICIALS		
MEDA Pharmaceutica 200 North Cobb Parky Marietta, GA 30062		128		a. PHONE NO. 770.916.3918			
				6. FAX NO.			
				678-718.3253			
				13. FOR CBER PRODU	JCTS ONLY: (Check one)		
					Part I/Draft	Part II/F	inal

HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL -SUBJECT TO STIPULATED PROTECTIVE ORDER

#### MEDA\_APTX03478898

# PTX0917-00002



Cover Slide Customized by Speaker and Date per meeting

MEDA\_APTX03478899



We are now going to look at the unmet medical needs and some patient perspectives on SAR collected from market research.

2



#### Many patients do not respond sufficiently to treatment

There are many patients who do not respond to therapy regardless of what is used to treat their symptoms.

There exists several challenges when treating our AR patients. They include:

1. Onset-Patients want something that works fast

2. Approximately 75% of patients suffering from AR use multiple therapies, increasing costs— Patients want something that is effective

 Patient dissatisfaction with current treatment is a leading cause of increased costs and adherence—Patients are still experiencing severe symptoms and are still seeking relief

#### Survey Methodology:

Harris Interactive conducted the online survey on behalf of AAFA from October 10-17, 2005, using its Chronic Illness Panel database. Total survey sampling includes a national sample of 1214 U.S. adults aged ≥18 years who have been diagnosed with seasonal allergies and are currently using prescription allergy medication to treat their allergies.

Data are weighted to be representative of adults aged  $\geq 18$  years who have been diagnosed with seasonal allergies and are currently using prescription allergy medication. Weighting was based on age within sex, education, race/ethnicity, region, income, and propensity to be online. In theory, with probability samples of this size, one can say with 95% certainty that the overall results have a sampling error of  $\pm 4.3$  percentage points.

Sampling error for the sub-samples of patients who see a health care professional for seasonal

allergies (n=1194), patients who are not satisfied with their current prescription allergy medication (n=348), and patients who are not satisfied with the allergy care provided by their doctor or health care provider (n=242) is higher and varies. This online sample is not a probability sample.

MEDA\_APTX03478902



We will now review some of the current therapeutic options to treat and manage SAR.

4



As noted previously, as many as 75% of patients use multiple therapies to achieve symptom control.

These are the major therapeutic classes of drugs used to treat SAR.

Speaker opens a discussion with the audience:

What are the agents you routinely employ? Why?

MEDA\_APTX03478904



#### Can you provide some insight on your therapy selection?

Recall—Approximately 75% of patients suffering from AR use multiple therapies, leading to issues of increased costs.

How can we become more efficient in our management of SAR?

MEDA\_APTX03478905

Oral Antihistamines Plus Intranasal Antihistamine Lack of Additive Benefit	
<ul> <li>Studies have examined the benefit of using an intranasal antihistamine with oral antihistamines in rhinitis:         <ul> <li>Loratadine + Azelastine<sup>1</sup></li> <li>Fexofenadine + Azelastine<sup>2</sup></li> </ul> </li> <li>The 2 studies above did not show improvement over the monotherapy with Azelastine in any of the study efficacy variables</li> </ul>	
<ul> <li>Studies have examined the benefit of using an intranasal steroid with an oral antihistamine or leukotriene antagonists in rhinitis:         <ul> <li>Beclomethasone + astemizole<sup>3</sup></li> <li>Fluticasone + loratadine<sup>4</sup></li> <li>Fluticasone + levocetirizine<sup>5</sup></li> <li>Fluticasone + cetirizine, and fluticasone + montelukast<sup>6</sup></li> </ul> </li> </ul>	
<ul> <li>None of the 4 studies listed above concluded that the use of multiple agents was more effective than a nasal steroid alone         <ol> <li>LaForce CF, et al. Ann Allergy Asthma Immunol. 2003;91:205-21</li> <li>LaForce CF, et al. Ann Allergy Asthma Immunol. 2003;91:205-21</li> <li>Jamper EF, et al. A Margy Cfe Immunol. 1999;83:27:43</li> <li>Rather Pil, et al. / Fam Pract. 1998;47:113:125.</li> <li>Barnes ML, et al. Clin Exp Afergy. 2004;34:255-267.</li> </ol> </li> </ul>	
Confidential. Not to be distributed, reproduced or electronically transmitted. DYM 12-0240	A

Speaker Note: Please briefly review the methodology, primary efficacy variable, and results with the audience. It is important for them to appreciate the lack of added benefits to polypharmacy for SAR patients.

#### Study Designs:

#### Berger

Two-week, multicenter, placebo-controlled, randomized, double-blind study in patients with moderate-to-severe symptoms of seasonal allergic rhinitis.

Following a 1-week, open-label lead-in period, during which the patients received loratadine 10 mg daily, those patients who met the symptom qualification criteria (<25% to 33% improvement taking loratadine) were randomized to treatment with (1) azelastine nasal spray 2 sprays per nostril twice daily plus placebo capsule once daily, (2) azelastine nasal spray 2 sprays per nostril twice daily plus placebo ace daily, (3) desloratadine 5 mg tablets once daily plus placebo nasal spray 2 sprays per nostril twice daily, or (4) placebo nasal spray 2 sprays per nostril twice daily.

The primary efficacy variable was the change from baseline to day 14 in the total nasal symptom score, consisting of runny nose, sneezing, itchy nose, and nasal congestion symptom scores recorded twice daily (am and pm) in patient diary cards.

1. Berger WE, et al. Ann Allergy Asthma Immunol. 2003;91:205-211.

#### LaForce:

This was a multicenter, randomized, double blind, placebo controlled, 2-week study in patients with moderate-tosevere seasonal allergic rhinitis.

The study began with a 1-week, open-label lead-in period, during which patients received fexofenadine, 60 mg twice daily. Patients who improved less than 25% to 33% with fexofenadine were randomized to treatment with (1) azelastine nasal spray 2 sprays per nostril twice daily plus placebo capsules twice daily, (2) azelastine nasal spray 2 sprays per nostril twice daily plus fexofenadine 60 mg tablets twice daily, or (3) placebo nasal spray 2 sprays per nostril twice daily plus twice daily.

The primary efficacy variable was the change from baseline to day 14 in the total nasal symptom score (TNSS), consisting of runny nose, sneezing, itchy nose, and nasal congestion symptom scores.

2. LaForce CF, et al. Ann Allergy Asthma Immunol. 2004;93:154-159.

MEDA\_APTX03478906

Speaker Note: Please initiate a discussion around these therapeutic choices for treating AR.

Have you experienced similar results?

What agents do you think would provide a benefit to your patients? Why?

7



Is there a reason why we do this?

# PTX0917-00012



We will now review some of the clinical data on Dymista<sup>™</sup>.

MEDA\_APTX03478909

# PTX0917-00013



The 3 pivotal studies were designed to evaluate the efficacy and safety of Dymista<sup>™</sup> to the 2 components of Dymista<sup>™</sup>, azelastine HCl and fluticasone propionate, in a **head-to-head comparison** for rapid and more complete symptom relief of SAR.

A long-term safety (12-month) study was conducted comparing Dymista™ to commercially available fluticasone propionate.

The FDA recently provided guidance to industry on the clinical trial design for new formulations of 2 or more drugs when <u>each drug alone has activity and can</u> be administered individually.<sup>1</sup>

Reference

1. Center for Drug Evaluation and Research Guidance for Industry. Codevelopment of Two or More Unmarketed Investigational Drugs for Use in Combinations. December 2010.

HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL -SUBJECT TO STIPULATED PROTECTIVE ORDER MEDA\_APTX03478910



The clinical development program for Dymista<sup>™</sup> enrolled over 4000 patients, surpassing the clinical programs used for approval of the 4 most recently approved drugs for the treatment of AR.

\*The 4 most recent drugs approved for AR had the following number of patients enrolled in their pivotal clinical trials: Patanase (1598); Veramyst (1829); Xyzal (2412); Astepro 0.15% (3077). None of these clinical trials involved head-to-head comparisons to current therapies.<sup>1</sup>

Each of the clinical trials designed for Dymista<sup>™</sup> involved active comparators. The next slide provides a listing of the comparators used in each trial. The total enrollment for the Dymista<sup>™</sup> clinical trials totaled 4617 for all comparator trials.

HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL -SUBJECT TO STIPULATED PROTECTIVE ORDER MEDA\_APTX03478911

11



The clinical trial program for Dymista<sup>™</sup> Nasal Spray included four 2-week, randomized, double-blind, placebo- and active-controlled, parallel-group, clinical studies: MP4001, MP4002, MP4004, and MP4006. These studies share several characteristics:

- Study population: patients aged ≥12 years with symptomatic seasonal allergic rhinitis
- All had positive skin-prick tests to relevant pollen
- All patients had rTNSS scores of at least 8 out of 12 and a nasal congestion score of 2 out 3
- At least one of the following: disruption of sleep, emotional distress, work and school interference

Speaker review rTNSS with the audience if needed



#### Efficacy and Tolerability of DYMISTA Were Evaluated in 3 Well-Designed, Head-to-Head, Pivotal Studies 1. Dymista PI. Sect 14.1/p15/17-

10	T 1	
Key	Takeaway	/:

2

In a robust clinical development program, DYMISTA was evaluated in 3 head-to-head studies that enrolled more than 3300 patients with SAR<sup>1,2</sup>

Efficacy and tolerability of DYMISTA were compared with those of fluticasone, azelastine, and placebo (total of 4 study arms)

# Additional Information:

Note that in these studies, fluticasone and azelastine were delivered using the same vehicle as DYMISTA

In all studies, DYMISTA, fluticasone, and azelastine were administered as4 1 spray per nostril twice daily 4004 CSR. Synopsis. P 4.//17;

The study population was 12 to 78 years of age

# **References:**

1. Dymista [package insert]. Somerset, NJ: MEDA Pharmaceuticals Inc; 2012.

13

**MEDA APTX03478913** 

8 & p17/11 & table

2. DOF, 4002 CSR, Synopsis. P

p 5/¶3 & 6.

4004 CSR Synopsis. P 4./16; p 5/¶2 & 5.

4./¶5 & 10; p5/¶1

2. Data on file. MEDA Pharmaceuticals Inc.



Primary endpoint: change from baseline to Day 14 in combined 12-hour AM and PM rTNSS

Baseline-average of all combined rTNSS scores over 7-day placebo lead-in period, including the AM day 1 diary scores (predosing)

Patients used diary cards to record severity of their symptoms

MEDA\_APTX03478915



#### Selected secondary endpoints:

Change from baseline to Day 14 in individual symptom scores

Onset of action

Change from baseline in the RQLQ (overall score and 7 individual domains) in subjects aged ≥18 years

**Individual symptom scores**—Recorded change from baseline for individual symptom (nasal congestion, runny nose, itchy nose, and sneezing)

**Onset of action**—Determined at the first office visit for each patient-nasal symptoms were scored at 15- to 30-minute intervals after the first dose of study medication during a 4-hour observation period.

# Rhinoconjunctivitis Quality of Life Questionnaire (RQLQ)

28 items in 7 domains (activities, sleep, non-nose/eye symptoms, practical problems, nasal symptoms, eye symptoms, and emotional) evaluated on a 7-point scale where 0=no impairment and 6=maximum impairment.

Administered to patients aged ≥18 years.

MEDA\_APTX03478916

An overall RQLQ score is calculated from the mean of all items in the instrument.

A change from baseline of at least 0.5 points is considered a clinically meaningful improvement.

MEDA\_APTX03478917

# PTX0917-00021



This graph represents the first part of the combination rule that Dymista<sup>™</sup> was to be compared to placebo.

It also represents the typical study design of recently approved AR therapies.<sup>1</sup> 1. http://www.centerwatch.com/, Accessed 8.30.12

Dymista<sup>™</sup> showed improvement in rTNSS regardless of the allergy season when compared to placebo.

MEDA\_APTX03478918

#### PTX0917-00022



This slide represents the findings of the 3 pivotal studies with respect to the primary endpoint rTNSS.

- Across the 3 pivotal clinical trials, the improvement with Dymista<sup>™</sup> ranged from 40% to 67% greater improvement relative to either comparator<sup>1,2</sup>
- The azelastine HCI and fluticasone propionate comparators used the same device and vehicle as Dymista<sup>™</sup> and are not commercially marketed<sup>2</sup>

Results shown are placebo subtracted

Speaker Note: You may initiate a discussion on the data seen in the slide above.

What are your thoughts regarding this data?

Are there patients under your care that may be candidates for Dymista<sup>™</sup> now? Why?

What would Dymista<sup>™</sup> be replacing? Why?

- 1. Dymista [package insert]. Somerset, NJ: Meda Pharmaceuticals Inc; 2012.
- 2. Data on file. Meda Pharmaceuticals.

MEDA\_APTX03478919

17



The FDA recognized that creating formulations of existing agents used together as a new single agent holds great promise for advancing patient care. Innovative drug, biological product, device combinations have the potential to make treatments safer, more effective, or more convenient or acceptable to patients.

MEDA\_APTX03478920



Within 30 minutes of administration of Dymista<sup>™</sup>, patients began to experience significant relief of their nasal symptoms.

How important is rapid relief to your patients? What impact will this have on your practice/prescribing for SAR?

#### References

1. Marple BF, Fornadley JA, Patel AA, et al. Keys to successful management of patients with allergic rhinitis: focus on patient confidence, compliance, and satisfaction. *Otolaryngol Head Neck Surg.* 2007;136:S107-S124.

2. Dymista [package insert]. Somerset, NJ: Meda Pharmaceuticals Inc; 2012.

3. Data on file. Meda Pharmaceuticals Inc.

HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL -SUBJECT TO STIPULATED PROTECTIVE ORDER MEDA\_APTX03478921

#### PTX0917-00025



Are these typical quality of life issues that your AR patients present with? How do you address them currently?

This information is supportive of the more complete symptom relief seen with Dymista™.

In the 3 pivotal trials, Dymista<sup>™</sup> demonstrated a statistically significant greater decrease from baseline in the overall RQLQ than placebo

Ranged from -0.55 (95% CI: -0.72, -0.39) to -0.80 (95% CI: -1.05, -0.55)

The treatment differences between Dymista<sup>™</sup> Nasal Spray and the monotherapies were less than the minimum important difference of 0.5 points.

HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL -SUBJECT TO STIPULATED PROTECTIVE ORDER MEDA\_APTX03478922



DYMISTA Delivers Substantially Less Spray Volume Than Concomitantly Administered Fluticasone and Azelastine

# Key Takeaway:

In comparison with the combination of fluticasone and azelastine administered as 2 separate sprays— DYMISTA delivers substantially less volume in a single spray, which can minimize throat rundown and nose runout<sup>1-4</sup>

# Additional Information:

Patient surveys show that throat rundown and nose runout can affect patient preferences and adherence to treatment<sup>4,5</sup>

It should be noted that practice guidelines state that there are inadequate data about the optimal interval between administration of an intranasal corticosteroid and an intranasal antihistamine, when administered as 2 separate sprays<sup>6</sup>

# **References:**

1. Dymista [package insert]. Somerset, NJ: MEDA Pharmaceuticals Inc; 2012.

21

HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL -SUBJECT TO STIPULATED PROTECTIVE ORDER

# MEDA\_APTX03478923

# PTX0917-00027

1. Dymista Pl.

Sect 3/p2/16

2. Flonase Pl. 2004. p1/line 25;

p11/lines 424-428.

4 Astelin PL

2011. p1/¶3; p8/¶4.

3. Meltzer 2007. p 18/c2/¶4;

> 6. Wallace 2008. p S19/table VI.

p19/c1/11.

- Flonase [package insert]. Research Triangle Park, NC: GlaxoSmithKline; 2003.
- 3. Meltzer EO. Formulation considerations of intranasal corticosteroids for the treatment of allergic rhinitis. *Ann Allergy Asthma Immunol.* 2007;96:12-21.
- 4. Astelin [package insert]. Somerset, NJ: MEDA Pharmaceuticals Inc; 2011.
- 5. Mahadevia PJ, Shah S, Leibman C, Kleinman L, O'Dowd L. Patient preferences for sensory attributes of intranasal corticosteroids and willingness to adhere to prescribed therapy for allergic rhinitis: a conjoint analysis. *Ann Allergy Asthma Immunol.* 2004;93:345-350.
- 6. Wallace DV, Dykewicz MS, Bernstein DI, et al. The diagnosis and management of rhinitis: an updated practice parameter. *J Allergy Clin Immunol.* 2008;122(2):S1-S84.

A	dverse React	ions—≥2% Incidence Dymista™ Nasal S		th	
Adverse Reactions	1 spray per nostril twice daily				
	Dymista™ Nasal Spray (n=835)*	Azelastine Hydrochloride Nasal Spray (n=851) <sup>†</sup>	Fluticasone Propionate Nasal Spray (n=846)†	Vehicle Placebe (n=861	
Dysgeusia	30 (4%)	44 (5%)	4 (1%)	2 (>1%	
Headache	16 (2%)	20 (2%)	20 (2%)	10 (1%	
Epistaxis	18 (2%)	14 (2%)	14 (2%)	15 (2%	
wit		e was reported in <1% of sal Spray (6 of 853) or veh			

This table contains adverse reactions reported with frequencies greater than or equal to 2% and more frequently than placebo in patients treated with Dymista<sup>™</sup> Nasal Spray in the seasonal allergic rhinitis controlled clinical trials.

In these trials, somnolence was reported in <1% of patients treated with Dymista<sup>™</sup> Nasal Spray (6 of 853) or vehicle placebo (1 of 861).

MEDA\_APTX03478925



 Study Design—randomized, 12-month, open-label, active-controlled, parallel-group study in subjects with perennial allergic rhinitis or vasomotor rhinitis

1-week screening period preceded the 12-month treatment period

Qualified subjects were randomized in a 2:1 ratio to treatment with:

Dymista™ (1 spray per nostril twice daily= total daily dose 548 mcg AZE; 200 mcg FP)

Fluticasone (2 sprays per nostril once daily=total daily dose 200 mcg)

- Clinic visits at months 1, 3, 6, 9, and 12
- Phone contact at months 2, 4, 5, 7, 8, 10, and 11
- Frequency of subject-reported adverse events Monthly contact to review diary cards
- Focused nasal examinations Baseline, months 1, 3, 6, 9, and 12
- Slit-lamp examination by an ophthalmologist Baseline, months 6 and 12
- Laboratory assessments Hematology, chemistry, urinalysis
   Fasting AM serum cortisol levels at selected sites
   Baseline, months 6 and 12

MEDA\_APTX03478926

Efficacy assessment

PM rTNSS baseline, daily over entire study period



• The overall incidence of adverse reactions was 47% in the Dymista<sup>™</sup> Nasal Spray treatment group and 44% in the fluticasone propionate nasal spray group.

• The most frequently reported adverse reactions (≥ 2%) with Dymista<sup>™</sup> Nasal Spray were headache, pyrexia, cough, nasal congestion, rhinitis, dysgeusia (2.5%), viral infection, upper respiratory tract infection, pharyngitis, pain, diarrhea, and epistaxis.

• In the Dymista<sup>™</sup> Nasal Spray treatment group, 7 patients (2%) had mild epistaxis and 1 patient (<1%) had moderate epistaxis. In the fluticasone propionate nasal spray treatment group, 1 patient (<1%) had mild epistaxis. No patients had reports of severe epistaxis.

- Somnolence was reported in <1% of patients treated with Dymista<sup>™</sup> Nasal Spray
- · Less then 1% of treatment groups had adverse ocular effects
  - In the Dymista<sup>™</sup> treatment group, 1 patient had increased intraocular pressure at Month 6. In addition, 3 patients had evidence of posterior subcapsular cataract at Month 6 and 1 at Month 12 (end of treatment).

In the fluticasone propionate treatment group, 3 patients had evidence of posterior subcapsular cataract at Month 12 (end of treatment).

- Effects of Dymista<sup>™</sup> on the HPA axis were evaluated in a subset of patients
  - Mean fasting serum cortisol levels were similar between patients treated with Dymista<sup>™</sup> and patients treated with fluticasone at baseline, Month 6, and Month 12

24

MEDA\_APTX03478928



 Previous clinical studies have shown that there is not an additional benefit in using an:

Intranasal steroid with an oral antihistamine

Intranasal antihistamine with an oral antihistamine

· Market research has shown that patients want:

Rapid (under 30 minute) relief from their symptoms of SAR

Are willing to use multiple therapies to seek a more complete relief from the symptoms of SAR

Are dissatisfied with their current therapies, especially during severe episodes

Dymista<sup>™</sup> has demonstrated in clinical trials:

Rapid onset of relief within 30 minutes compared to placebo

Across the 3 pivotal clinical trials, Dymista has shown more complete relief vs. active comparators

Treatment with Dymista also resulted in significant improvement in health-related quality of life (QoL) variables vs placebo

#### MEDA\_APTX03478929

# PTX0917-00033



Dymista<sup>™</sup> is a unique fine mist formulation that contains both the antihistaminic properties of azelastine HCI and anti-inflammatory properties of fluticasone propionate

Dymista<sup>™</sup> demonstrated significant improvement in:

TNSS vs monotherapy comparators\*

RQLQ vs placebo

Onset of action vs placebo

Adverse reactions: In each of the 2-week pivotal trials, incidence and types of adverse reactions were comparable in all treatment groups (N=3411)

#### Conclusion:

Dymista<sup>™</sup> provides <u>rapid and more complete relief</u> from seasonal allergic rhinitis symptoms vs. fluticasone propionate or azelastine HCI

\*The azelastine HCI and fluticasone propionate comparators used the same device and vehicle as Dymista and are not commercially marketed.

MEDA\_APTX03478930



We will now review some highlights of the prescribing information (PI) for Dymista<sup>™</sup>.

PIs to be distributed to the attendees.



Dymista<sup>™</sup> Nasal Spray is indicated for the relief of the symptoms of seasonal allergic rhinitis (SAR) in patients 12 years of age and older who require treatment with both azelastine hydrochloride and fluticasone propionate for symptomatic relief.

MEDA\_APTX03478932

28



The recommended dosage is 1 spray in each nostril administered 2 times per day (b.i.d).

29



#### Important Risk Information

 Patients may experience somnolence. Caution patients against engaging in hazardous occupations requiring complete mental alertness, such as driving or operating machinery

• Patients should avoid concurrent use of alcohol or other central nervous system (CNS) depressants because additional reductions in alertness and additional impairment of CNS performance may occur

• Because of the inhibitory effect of corticosteroids on wound healing, avoid use in patients with recent nasal ulcers, nasal surgery, or nasal trauma until healed

 Glaucoma, cataracts, and increased intraocular pressure may be associated with nasal corticosteroid use; therefore, close monitoring is warranted in patients with a change in vision and/or with a history of increased intraocular pressure, glaucoma, and/or cataracts

• Patients using corticosteroids may be susceptible to infections and may experience a more serious or even fatal course of chicken pox or measles. Dymista should be used with caution in patients with active or quiescent tuberculosis; fungal, bacterial, viral, or parasitic infections; or ocular herpes simplex

30

MEDA\_APTX03478934



Important Risk Information

• Systemic corticosteroid effects, such as hypercorticism and adrenal suppression, may occur with very high dosages or at the regular dosage in susceptible individuals. If such changes occur, discontinue Dymista gradually, under medical supervision

 Potent inhibitors of cytochrome P450 (CYP) 3A4 may increase blood levels of fluticasone propionate

Ritonavir: coadministration is not recommended

Other potent CYP3A4 inhibitors, such as ketoconazole: use caution with coadministration

 Intranasal corticosteroids may cause a reduction in growth velocity when administered to pediatric patients. Monitor the growth routinely of pediatric patients receiving Dymista

• In clinical trials, the most common adverse reactions that occurred with Dymista Nasal Spray, azelastine hydrochloride nasal spray, fluticasone nasal spray, and vehicle placebo groups, respectively were dysgeusia (4%, 5%, 1%, <1%), epistaxis (2% for each group), and headache (2%, 2%, 2%, and 1%)

· Pregnancy Category C: based on animal data; may cause fetal harm

MEDA\_APTX03478935



Speaker opens up to the audience a discussion on the information just presented.

MEDA\_APTX03478936