



HAL
open science

A 300 IR sublingual tablet is an effective, safe treatment for house dust mite–induced allergic rhinitis: An international, double-blind, placebo-controlled, randomized phase III clinical trial

Pascal Demoly, Jonathan Corren, Peter Creticos, Frédéric de Blay, Philippe Gevaert, Peter Hellings, Krzysztof Kowal, Martine Le Gall, Natalia Nenasheva, Giovanni Passalacqua, et al.

► To cite this version:

Pascal Demoly, Jonathan Corren, Peter Creticos, Frédéric de Blay, Philippe Gevaert, et al.. A 300 IR sublingual tablet is an effective, safe treatment for house dust mite–induced allergic rhinitis: An international, double-blind, placebo-controlled, randomized phase III clinical trial. *Journal of Allergy and Clinical Immunology*, 2021, 147 (3), pp.1020 - 1030.e10. 10.1016/j.jaci.2020.07.036 . hal-03613293

HAL Id: hal-03613293

<https://hal.science/hal-03613293>

Submitted on 23 Mar 2022

HAL is a multi-disciplinary open access archive for the deposit and dissemination of scientific research documents, whether they are published or not. The documents may come from teaching and research institutions in France or abroad, or from public or private research centers.

L'archive ouverte pluridisciplinaire **HAL**, est destinée au dépôt et à la diffusion de documents scientifiques de niveau recherche, publiés ou non, émanant des établissements d'enseignement et de recherche français ou étrangers, des laboratoires publics ou privés.

The Journal of Allergy and Clinical Immunology

A 300°IR sublingual tablet is an effective, safe treatment for house-dust-mite-induced allergic rhinitis: an international, double-blind, placebo-controlled, randomized Phase III clinical trial.

--Manuscript Draft--

Manuscript Number:	
Article Type:	Original Article
Section/Category:	Biologics and immunotherapy
Keywords:	allergen immunotherapy, allergic rhinitis, allergy, house dust mite, sublingual immunotherapy, tablet, total combined score, symptom score, medication score, quality of life
Corresponding Author:	Pascal Demoly, MD PhD University Hospital of Montpellier Montpellier, CEDEX 5 France
First Author:	Pascal Demoly, MD PhD
Order of Authors:	Pascal Demoly, MD PhD Jonathan Corren, MD Peter Creticos, MD Frédéric De Blay, MD, PhD Philippe Gevaert, MD, PhD Peter Hellings, MD, PhD Krzysztof Kowal, MD, PhD Martine Le Gall Natalia Nenasheva, MD, PhD Giovanni Passalacqua, MD Oliver Pfaar, MD Miguel Tortajada-Girbés, MD, PhD Carmen Vidal, MD, PhD Margitta Worm, MD Thomas B. Casale, MD
Manuscript Region of Origin:	FRANCE
Abstract:	<p>Background : Allergic rhinitis (AR) induced by house dust mites (HDMs) is a highly prevalent but often underdiagnosed and undertreated/untreated chronic disease. It often has a negative impact on sleep, work, leisure activities, and health-related quality of life. Allergen immunotherapy is a proven, safe treatment for respiratory allergies.</p> <p>Methods : Adolescents (aged ≥ 12) and adults with moderate-to-severe HDM-induced AR were included in an international, double-blind, placebo-controlled, randomized Phase III trial of approximately 12 months of treatment with placebo or a 300 index of reactivity (IR) sublingual tablet formulation of <i>Dermatophagoides pteronyssinus</i> : <i>Dermatophagoides farinae</i> 1:1 extract. The primary endpoint was the average total combined score (aTCS) during 4 weeks at the end of the treatment period.</p> <p>Results : A total of 1,607 participants were randomized, and 1,476 (including 555 (37.6%) with concomitant mild controlled asthma at inclusion) comprised the full analysis set. Over the primary evaluation period, the least squares mean aTCS in the 300°IR group (3.62) was significantly lower ($p < 0.0001$) than in the placebo group (4.35), with a relative least squares mean difference of -16.9% [95% confidence interval: -24.0%; -9.2%]. All pre-specified secondary endpoints were consistently</p>

improved in the 300°IR group, relative to placebo. The 300°IR tablet was generally well tolerated. Treatment-related adverse events (mainly mild or moderate local reactions) were reported for 51.0% of the patients in the 300°IR group and 14.9% in the placebo group.

Conclusions : The 300°IR sublingual HDM tablet is an effective, safe treatment for HDM-induced AR.

Original Article

Title: A 300°IR sublingual tablet is an effective, safe treatment for house-dust-mite-induced allergic rhinitis: an international, double-blind, placebo-controlled, randomized Phase III clinical trial.

Short title: Sublingual house dust mite tablet for allergic rhinitis

Pascal Demoly, MD, PhD,^{a,b} Jonathan Corren, MD,^c Peter Creticos, MD,^{d,e} Frédéric De Blay, MD, PhD,^f Philippe Gevaert, MD, PhD,^g Peter Hellings, MD, PhD,^h Krzysztof Kowal, MD, PhD,ⁱ Martine Le Gall,^j Natalia Nenasheva, MD, PhD,^k Giovanni Passalacqua, MD,^l Oliver Pfaar, MD,^m Miguel Tortajada-Girbés, MD, PhD,^{n,o,p} Carmen Vidal, MD, PhD,^q Margitta Worm, MD,^r and Thomas B. Casale, MD^s

- a. Department of Pulmonology and Addictology, Arnaud de Villeneuve Hospital, Montpellier University, Montpellier, France
- b. Sorbonne Université, UMR-S 1136 INSERM, IPLESP, EPAR Team, Paris, France
- c. Departments of Medicine and Pediatrics, David Geffen School of Medicine at the University of California, Los Angeles, California, United States
- d. Division of Allergy & Clinical Immunology, Johns Hopkins Medicine, Baltimore, Maryland, United States
- e. Creticos Research Group with Charleston Allergy & Asthma, Charleston, South Carolina, United States
- f. Allergy Division, Chest Diseases Department, Strasbourg University Hospital, Strasbourg, France
- g. Upper Airways Research Laboratory, Ghent University, Ghent, Belgium
- h. Department of Otorhinolaryngology, University Hospitals Leuven, Leuven, Belgium
- i. Department of Experimental Allergology and Immunology, Medical University of Bialystok, Bialystok, Poland
- j. Global Clinical Development Department, Stallergenes Greer, Antony, France
- k. Russian Medical Academy of Continuous Professional Education of the Ministry of Health of the Russian Federation, Moscow, Russia

- l. Upper Airways Research Laboratory, Genoa, Italy
- m. Department of Otorhinolaryngology, Head and Neck Surgery, Section of Rhinology and Allergy, University Hospital Marburg, Marburg, Germany
- n. Pediatric Pulmonology and Allergy Unit, Department of Pediatrics, Dr. Peset University Hospital, Valencia, Spain
- o. Department of Pediatrics, Obstetrics and Gynecology. University of Valencia, Valencia, Spain.
- p. IVI Foundation, Valencia, Spain
- q. Allergy Department, Complejo Hospitalario Universitario de Santiago, Faculty of Medicine, University of Santiago de Compostela, Santiago de Compostela, Spain
- r. Division of Allergy and Immunology, Department of Dermatology, Allergy and Venerology, Charité, Universitätsmedizin, Berlin, Germany
- s. Division of Allergy and Immunology, University of South Florida, Tampa, FL, United States

Corresponding Author:

Professor Pascal Demoly, Département de Pneumologie et Addictologie, Hôpital Arnaud de Villeneuve, 371 rue du doyen Gaston Giraud, F-34295 Montpellier cedex 5, France

E-mail: pascal.demoly@inserm.fr

Word count of abstract: 249

Word count of text (not including abstract and references): ~3950

Figures: 5

Tables: 3

Supplemental material: 1 Appendix and 8 Supplemental Tables

References: 65

ABSTRACT

Background: Allergic rhinitis (AR) induced by house dust mites (HDMs) is a highly prevalent but often underdiagnosed and undertreated/untreated chronic disease. It often has a negative impact on sleep, work, leisure activities, and health-related quality of life. Allergen immunotherapy is a proven, safe treatment for respiratory allergies.

Methods: Adolescents (aged ≥ 12) and adults with moderate-to-severe HDM-induced AR were included in an international, double-blind, placebo-controlled, randomized Phase III trial of approximately 12 months of treatment with placebo or a 300 index of reactivity (IR) sublingual tablet formulation of *Dermatophagoides pteronyssinus*:*Dermatophagoides farinae* 1:1 extract. The primary endpoint was the average total combined score (aTCS) during 4 weeks at the end of the treatment period.

Results: A total of 1,607 participants were randomized, and 1,476 (including 555 (37.6%) with concomitant mild controlled asthma at inclusion) comprised the full analysis set. Over the primary evaluation period, the least squares mean aTCS in the 300°IR group (3.62) was significantly lower ($p < 0.0001$) than in the placebo group (4.35), with a relative least squares mean difference of -16.9% [95% confidence interval: -24.0%; -9.2%]. All pre-specified secondary endpoints were consistently improved in the 300°IR group, relative to placebo. The 300°IR tablet was generally well tolerated. Treatment-related adverse events (mainly mild or moderate local reactions) were reported for 51.0% of the patients in the 300°IR group and 14.9% in the placebo group.

Conclusions: The 300°IR sublingual HDM tablet is an effective, safe treatment for HDM-induced AR. (NCT02443805, EudraCT 2014-004223-46)

Clinical Implications: A 300 index of reactivity sublingual tablet formulation of *Dermatophagoides pteronyssinus*:*Dermatophagoides farinae* extract is a safe, effective treatment for moderate-to-severe house-dust-mite-induced allergic rhinitis.

Capsule summary

- In a 13-country Phase III clinical trial, an approximately 12-month course of sublingual

immunotherapy with a 300 index of reactivity tablet formulation of a house dust mite extract was associated with reductions in allergic rhinitis symptoms, symptomatic medication use (vs. placebo) and a better quality of life.

- The sublingual immunotherapy tablet's efficacy profile was particularly well suited to the often troublesome nasal symptoms experienced in house-dust-mite-induced allergic rhinitis.

Key words: allergen immunotherapy, allergic rhinitis, allergy, house dust mite, sublingual immunotherapy, tablet, total combined score, symptom score, medication score

Abbreviations:

AE: Adverse event

AIT: Allergen immunotherapy

AR: Allergic rhinitis

CI: Confidence interval

CSMS: Combined symptom and medication score

CV: Coefficient of variation

Dfar: *Dermatophagoides farinae*

Dpte: *Dermatophagoides pteronyssinus*

FAS: Full analysis set

GINA: Global Initiative for Asthma

HDM: House dust mite

IP: Investigational product

IR: Index of reactivity

ISS: Individual rhinoconjunctivitis symptom score

LS: Least squares

PSCD: Proportion of symptom-controlled days

QoL: Quality of life

RCTSS: Rhinoconjunctivitis total symptom score

RMS: Rescue medication score

RQLQ12+: Standardized Rhinoconjunctivitis Quality of Life Questionnaire for 12 years and older

RTSS: Rhinitis total symptom score

SPT: Skin prick test

SS: Safety set

TCS: Total combined score

TEAE: Treatment-emergent adverse event

V: Visit

Allergic rhinitis (AR) is a highly prevalent but often underdiagnosed and undertreated/untreated chronic disease.(1-7) The symptoms - mainly nasal congestion, nasal pruritus, clear rhinorrhoea, and sneezing - are triggered by exposure to aeroallergens found outdoors and/or indoors (e.g. pollen, house dust mite (HDM) allergens, animal dander, and mould allergens). House dust mite allergy is particularly troublesome, given (i) the almost ubiquitous and often perennial presence of HDMS in indoor environments worldwide (and thus the limited efficacy of allergen eviction and avoidance measures), and (ii) the wide range of allergenic components produced by HDMS (i.e. cuticle and faeces components, digestive tract enzymes, etc.).(8-10)

If not treated or only ineffectively treated, the symptoms of moderate-to-severe AR can have a negative impact on sleep and thus induce daytime drowsiness; in turn, this can impair work productivity, academic, sporting and leisure activities, and health-related quality of life (QoL), increase the risk of road accidents, and hasten the onset of other diseases (such as allergic asthma) as part of the “allergic march”.(11-18)

The symptoms of AR can be treated with symptomatic medications, such as H1 antihistamines, corticosteroids, chromones, and leukotriene receptor antagonists.(1-3) However, symptomatic medications may be unwanted, poorly tolerated or ineffective, and do not act on the underlying atopic disease mechanism.(19-22)

Allergen immunotherapy (AIT) is a proven, safe treatment for respiratory allergies; it exerts a systemic action, and can thus potentially affect both the upper and lower airways.(23-27) Various allergen


formulations and administration routes have been tested and approved for the treatment of moderate-to-severe AR or mild-to-moderate allergic asthma induced by HDMs.(20, 28-34) In clinical trials conducted in Europe, Canada and Japan, a 300 index of reactivity (IR) sublingual tablet of *Dermatophagoides pteronyssinus* (Dpte) and *Dermatophagoides farinae* (Dfar) extract (total allergenic activity ratio: 1:1) has shown efficacy and safety in adults and adolescents with HDM-induced AR (irrespective of mono- or polysensitization status or the concomitant presence of mild asthma), and has been approved for commercialization in the Asia-Pacific region.(29, 30, 33-35) The overall goal of the present clinical trial was to confirm the efficacy and safety of a 12-month course of treatment with 300°IR sublingual tablets vs. placebo in adults and adolescents with HDM-induced AR in a broad set of patient populations (in Europe, the USA, Canada, Israel, and Russia). The primary clinical objective was to determine the tablet's efficacy over four weeks at the end of the treatment period (referred to henceforth as the primary evaluation period), as quantified by the average total combined score (aTCS, where the TCS was defined as the sum of the patient's daily rhinitis total symptom score (RTSS) and a daily rescue/relief medication score (RMS)). The secondary objectives were to confirm the 300°IR tablet's efficacy according to a range of endpoints (symptom scores, medication scores, symptom control, QoL, etc.) during the primary evaluation period and during interim evaluation periods (months 3, 6 and 9), and to describe the tablet's safety throughout the treatment and follow-up periods.

METHODS

Trial design

This international, double-blind, placebo-controlled, Phase III randomized clinical trial comprised a screening phase lasting 6 weeks to 6 months (including a 5-week, single-blind, placebo run-in period), a double-blind treatment phase lasting approximately 12 months, and a 2-week post-treatment follow-up phase (Fig 1).

FIG 1. Study design



FU: follow-up; M: month; V: visit.

All participants meeting the selection criteria entered the 5-week, placebo run-in period, and were provided with rescue medications. Rhinoconjunctivitis symptoms and rescue/relief medication use were noted in an electronic patient diary. Patients with an aTCS of ≥ 5 out of 15 over the last 4 weeks of the 5-week run-in period were randomized 1:1 to receive HDM AIT or placebo for approximately 12 months. The total planned duration of the study for an individual patient was between 14 and 20 months, with a total of 10 study visits: a screening visit (V1), a run-in visit (V2), a randomization visit (V3), six regular visits (at months 1, 3, 6, 9, 11, and 12; V4 to V9, respectively) and a post-treatment visit (month 12.5; V10). The study was performed at 231 centres in 13 countries: Belgium, Bulgaria, Canada, Czech Republic, France, Germany, Israel, Italy, Poland, Russian Federation, Slovakia, Spain, and the USA.

Trial population

The study's main inclusion criteria were as follows: (i) males or females aged between 12 and 65, (ii) physician-diagnosed, HDM-induced AR (with or without concomitant asthma, as recorded in a clinical assessment by the investigating physician) for at least the 12 months prior to inclusion in the study, with self-reported troublesome symptoms with regard to leisure, sports, academic or work activities and/or

sleep disturbance requiring regular symptomatic treatment; and (iii) sensitization to Dpte and/or Dfar, as confirmed by a skin prick test (SPT) wheal diameter at least 5 mm greater than the negative control, and an HDM-specific serum IgE level ≥ 3.5 kU/L. Serum-specific immunoglobulin assays were performed centrally.

The main exclusion criteria were (i) a potentially confounding allergy likely to result in AR symptoms during the primary evaluation period, (ii) recent nasal surgery or nasal or oral disease, (iii) partly controlled or uncontrolled asthma (as defined in the 2014 revision of the Global Initiative for Asthma (GINA) guidelines) (36), (iv) regular use of asthma medication consistent with GINA treatment steps 3, 4 or 5, (v) a previous life-threatening asthma attack or exacerbation that resulted in admission to an intensive care unit, (vi) HDM AIT within the previous 5 years or other AIT within the previous 6 months, and (vii) the standard contraindications to AIT.(2, 3, 37)

Randomization

Only eligible patients with an aTCS ≥ 5 during the last 4 weeks of the run-in period were to be randomized. Patients were allotted a screening number via an interactive web/voice response system. A computer-generated randomization list (stratified by study site) was prepared by a statistician not involved in study data analyses. The randomization list was supplied to a contract manufacturing organization, which packaged the investigational product (IP). All randomized participants received an epinephrine auto-injector for use in the event of a severe allergic reaction.

Study treatments

Participants took placebo tablets during the single-blind run-in phase. After randomization, patients received either HDM AIT (a sublingual tablet formulation of standardized, purified, freeze-dried, sieved Dpte and Dfar extracts for daily administration) or placebo. The regimen during the dose escalation phase consisted of one 100°IR tablet on day 1, two 100°IR tablets on day 2, and one 300°IR tablet on day 3, or matching placebo tablets. The first dose of the study medication was taken under medical supervision for 30 minutes.

Endpoints and assessments

The primary efficacy variable was the average of the non-missing daily TCSs during the 4-week primary evaluation period. The daily TCS (ranging from 0 (best possible score) to 15 (worse possible score)) was

the sum of the patient's daily RTSS over the previous 24 hours (scale: 0-12; 0 = least severe symptoms to 12 = most severe symptoms) and daily RMS score in which only the "strongest" type of medication taken on a given day was taken into account (scale: 0-3; 0 = no treatment, 1 = an oral H1 antihistamine, 2 = an intranasal corticosteroid, 3 = an oral corticosteroid). The RTSS was the sum of four rhinitis symptom scores (nasal pruritus, sneezing, rhinorrhoea, and nasal congestion), evaluated on a 4-point scale (0 = no symptoms; 1 = mild symptoms, 2 = moderate symptoms, 3 = severe symptoms).

The secondary endpoints included the RTSS, the RMS, the rhinoconjunctivitis total symptom score (RCTSS), the combined symptom and medication score (CSMS), six individual rhinoconjunctivitis symptom scores (ISSs), the proportion of symptom-controlled days (PSCD, days with RTSS \leq 2 and RMS=0), and disease-specific QoL (the Standardized Rhinoconjunctivitis Quality of Life Questionnaire, RQLQ12+) (38) (Table S1). The safety variables were adverse events, routine laboratory tests, data from physical examinations, and vital signs.

Sample size calculation and statistical analysis

A sample size of 739 patients per treatment group was determined to provide a power of 99% for detecting a relative difference of -20% in the active group (relative to placebo) at a level of significance of 0.05 (two-sided), assuming a mean aTCS in the placebo group of 3.65 and a CV of 75%. Based on a drop-out rate of 15%, a total study population of 1,740 randomized patients (870 in each treatment group) was planned. It was also determined that this sample size was sufficient to fulfil the requirements recommended by the US Food and Drug Administration (FDA) (relative difference versus placebo \leq -15% and upper bound of the 95%CI \leq -10%) with a probability of about 80%.⁽³⁹⁾⁽³⁹⁾

The full analysis set (FAS) comprised all participants who received at least one dose of the IP and had at least one evaluation of the aTCS during the overall treatment period. For the primary endpoint, an analysis of covariance was performed on the square root of the aTCS with the following prespecified factors: treatment group as the main effect, and the pooled centre, square root of the baseline aTCS, age, gender, asthma status and sensitization status as covariates. The absolute and relative differences were calculated from the back-transformed least squares (LS) means. All 95%CIs were calculated using the bootstrap

method with 10,000 replications. The per-protocol set was defined as all participants in the FAS with a valid TCS for at least 14 days during the primary evaluation period and no major deviations.

The multiplicity issue resulting from the analysis of one primary endpoint and six key secondary endpoints was addressed by employing a fixed-sequence procedure at a significance level of 0.05 with the following hierarchical order after the primary endpoint: average RTSS (aRTSS), overall RQLQ12+ score, average rhinoconjunctivitis total symptom score (aRCTSS), average nasal congestion score, PSCD and average RMS (aRMS). The secondary endpoints were analysed similarly to the primary endpoint, except for the RQLQ12+ score (analysed using the same model but without square root transformation) and PSCD (analysed using a Wilcoxon rank-sum test).

The safety analysis was conducted on the safety set (SS) comprising all randomized patients having received at least one dose of the IP.

Statistical analyses were performed with SAS® (version 9.4, SAS Institute, Cary, NC).

Ethics


All participants (or for adolescents, their parents) gave their written consent to participation after having been informed of the study's objectives and procedures. The study was approved by the appropriate independent ethics committees or institutional review boards, and complied with local regulatory and legislative requirements and the Declaration of Helsinki. The study was registered in the European Clinical Trials Database (EudraCT 2014-004223-46) and at ClinicalTrials.gov (NCT 02443805).

Results

Study patients

Patient enrolment started in September 2015. A total of 4,267 participants were screened, 1,607 were randomized and 1,601 were treated (Fig 2). There were 1,476 patients in the FAS (312 adolescents and 1,164 adults). The last patient completed the trial in June, 2018.

FIG 2. Patient disposition



IR: index of reactivity; FAS: full analysis set, SS: safety set

In the FAS, the mean age was 29.6 overall, 14.2 for adolescents, and 33.7 for adults (Table I, Table S2). There was male predominance in the adolescent population, and slight female predominance in the adult population. Overall, just over a third of the participants (37.6%) had concomitant asthma (50.0% of the adolescents, and 34.3% of the adults). After HDM allergens, the next most frequently observed sensitizing allergens (according to an SPT) were cat dander (in 23.1% of the participants) and grass pollen (in 18.7%) (Table S3). In line with the study's inclusion criteria, the mean (SD) aRTSS at baseline was 7.01 (1.936) in the 300°IR group and 6.92 (1.880) in the placebo group (Table S4). The mean (SD) baseline aTCS was 7.84 (2.067) in the 300°IR group and 7.71 (1.961) in the placebo group. The mean (SD) overall RQLQ12+ score was 2.64 (1.106) in the 300°IR group and 2.64 (1.065) in the placebo group - testifying to moderate QoL (14).

There were no significant differences between the 300°IR and placebo groups with regard to baseline sociodemographic variables, allergen sensitization, clinical characteristics and immunological parameters (serum Dpte- or Dfar-specific IgG4 and IgE levels. (Tables 1, S2, S3, S4, S6 and S7).

In the SS, the median overall exposure to the study treatment was 362 days in the 300°IR group and 363 days in the placebo group. Compliance was good throughout the treatment period; 90.2% of the patients in the 300°IR group and 92.3% of those in the placebo group were compliant (i.e. with $\geq 80\%$ of the planned medication intake).

TABLE I. Baseline characteristics (FAS)

	300°IR	Placebo	Overall
	N=711	N=765	N=1,476
Gender [n (%)]			
Male	351 (49.4)	369 (48.2)	720 (48.8)
Female	360 (50.6)	396 (51.8)	756 (51.2)
Age (years)			
Mean (SD)	29.5 (13.07)	29.6 (12.58)	29.6 (12.81)
Median	27.0	29.0	28.0
Geographical region [n (%)]			
North America (USA & Canada)	212 (29.8)	240 (31.4)	452 (30.6)
Europe, Israel, Russia	499 (70.2)	525 (68.6)	1,024 (69.4)
Race [n (%)]			
White	660 (92.8)	701 (91.6)	1,361 (92.2)
Black or African American	25 (3.5)	37 (4.8)	62 (4.2)
American Indian or Alaska Native	0	1 (0.1)	1 (0.1)
Asian	21 (3.0)	20 (2.6)	41 (2.8)
Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander	2 (0.3)	0	2 (0.1)
Multiple	2 (0.3)	3 (0.4)	5 (0.3)
Unknown	1 (0.1)	3 (0.4)	4 (0.3)
Duration of HDM-induced allergic rhinitis (years)			
Mean (SD)	11.38 (10.747)	11.40 (9.768)	11.39 (10.248)
Median	7.28	9.02	8.09
Range	0.8–58.9	0.4–50.2	0.4–58.9
Baseline sensitization status [n (%)]			
Monosensitized	397 (55.8)	413 (54.0)	810 (54.9)

	300°IR N=711	Placebo N=765	Overall N=1,476
Polysensitized	314 (44.2)	352 (46.0)	666 (45.1)
Average TCS at baseline			
Mean (SD)	7.84 (2.067)	7.71 (1.961)	7.77 (2.014)
95%CI	[7.69; 8.00]	[7.57; 7.85]	[7.67; 7.88]
Median	7.54	7.36	7.44
Range	3.8–14.4	4.4–14.0	3.8–14.4
Overall RQLQ12+ score at baseline			
Mean (SD)	2.64 (1.106)	2.64 (1.065)	2.64 (1.085)
Median	2.59	2.63	2.61
Range	0.1–5.7	0.2–5.8	0.1–5.8
Concomitant asthma [n (%)]			
Presence	273 (38.4)	282 (36.9)	555 (37.6)
Absence	438 (61.6)	483 (63.1)	921 (62.4)

CI: confidence interval; FAS: full analysis set; IR: index of reactivity; RQLQ12+: Standardized Rhinoconjunctivitis Quality of Life Questionnaire, overall score (scale 0-6); SD: standard deviation; TCS: total combined score (scale 0-15)

Primary endpoint

The FAS comprised 711 participants from the 300°IR group and 765 from the placebo group. Patients in the FAS with no efficacy evaluation during the primary evaluation period were not taken into account in the primary analysis. Hence, the analysis of the primary endpoint covered 586 participants in the 300°IR group and 676 in the placebo group (Table II).

TABLE II. Primary endpoint (aTCS) during the primary evaluation period (FAS)

Treatment	n ^a	Difference in LS means vs. Placebo				Relative LS mean difference ^d	
		LS mean ^b	Point estimate ^c	[95%CI]	p-value	%	[95%CI]
300°IR	586	3.62	-0.74	[-1.08; -0.38]	<0.0001	-16.9	[-24.0; -9.2]
Placebo	676	4.35					

CI: confidence interval; FAS: full analysis set; IR: index of reactivity; LS: least squares; n: number of patients with data; TCS: total combined score (scale 0-15)

^a Patients in the FAS with no efficacy evaluation during the primary evaluation period were excluded from the primary analysis

^b LS mean: back-transformed LS mean obtained from an analysis of covariance of the square root of the aTCS during the primary evaluation period


^c Point estimate: LS mean difference between 300°IR and placebo

^d Relative LS mean difference: $[(300^\circ\text{IR LS mean} - \text{placebo LS mean}) / \text{placebo LS mean}] * 100$

All CIs were calculated using the bootstrap method with 10,000 replications

During the primary evaluation period, the LS mean aTCS was significantly lower in the 300°IR group than in the placebo group (Table II). The relative LS mean difference between the two groups (-16.9% vs. placebo) was greater than the pre-specified threshold of -15%, and the 95%CI was [-24.0%; -9.2%]. This significant difference was confirmed in the per-protocol set (point estimate = -0.72, relative LS mean difference = -16.8%; p=0.0003). The point estimate in the adolescents was -0.71 (relative LS mean difference = -15.5%). The aTCS fell over time in both groups but fell more in the 300°IR group. A significant 300°IR vs. placebo difference was observed from the third month of treatment onwards (Fig. 3).

FIG 3. aTCS during treatment (FAS)



FAS: full analysis set; IR: index of reactivity; M = Month. The aTCS is the mean at baseline and the LS means from a mixed model with repeated measures at M3, M6, M9 and M12; *: $p < 0.05$

Secondary endpoints

During the primary evaluation period, all the 300°IR vs. placebo differences in the secondary endpoints (notably the aRTSS and the aRMS - the two components of the primary efficacy endpoint) were consistent with the results for the primary endpoint, i.e. significantly better in the 300°IR group (Table III and Fig 4). Hence, the difference in LS means of the aCSMS during the primary period between the 300 IR group and the placebo group was statistically significant (point estimate= -0.26, relative LS mean difference -18.0%; $p < 0.0001$). Furthermore, the meanPSCD was 31.82% in the 300°IR group and 25.44% in the placebo group. The LS mean overall RQLQ12+ score at the end of the treatment period was 1.42 in the 300°IR group and 1.62 in the placebo group (with a mean of 2.64 at baseline in both groups). In both the 300°IR and placebo groups, the change from baseline (assessed in a post-hoc analysis) in the overall RQLQ12+ score (-1.20 and -1.00 points, respectively) exceeded the value of -0.5

points determined to be the minimal clinically important difference.(38)). The 300°IR group and placebo groups differed significantly with regard to the overall RQLQ12+ score and all the individual RQLQ12+ domain scores at the end of the treatment period (FIG 4).

During the primary evaluation period, statistically significant differences between the 300°IR group and the placebo group were observed for each of the six ISSs: nasal pruritus, sneezing, rhinorrhoea, nasal congestion, ocular pruritus and tearing (Table S4).

At the end of the treatment period, the IgE and IgG4 levels had increased significantly in the 300°IR group but not in the placebo group (Tables S6 and S7).

TABLE III. Secondary endpoints (FAS)

	Treatment	n ^a	LS Mean ^b	Difference in LS means vs. placebo			Relative LS mean difference ^e
				Point estimate ^c	[95%CI]	p-value ^d	%
Average nasal congestion symptom score during the primary evaluation period	300°IR	586	0.85	-0.19	[-0.28; -0.10]	<0.0001	-18.3
	Placebo	676	1.04				
Overall RQLQ12+ score at the end of the treatment period	300°IR	625	1.42	-0.19	[-0.30; -0.09]	0.0004	-12.0
	Placebo	678	1.62				
Average RMS during the primary evaluation period	300°IR	586	0.21	-0.09	[-0.14; -0.04]	0.0004	-29.7
	Placebo	676	0.30				
Average CSMS during the primary evaluation period	300°IR	586	1.19	-0.26	[-0.38; -0.14]	<0.0001	-18.0
	Placebo	676	1.45				
	Treatment	n ^a	LS Mean ^b	Difference in LS means vs. placebo			Relative LS mean difference ^e

Average RCTSS during the primary evaluation period				Point estimate^c	[95%CI]	p-value^d	%	
	300°IR	586	4.22	-0.81	[-1.24; -0.39]	0.0002	-16.1	
	Placebo	676	5.04					
PSCD ₂₋₀ during the primary evaluation period	Treatment	n^a	Mean	[95%CI] of the mean	Median	p-value^f	Q1	Q3
	300 IR	586	31.82	[28.59; 35.06]	4.35	0.0082	0.00	74.07
	Placebo	676	25.44	[22.72; 28.15]	0.00		0.00	50.00

CI = confidence interval; CSMS = Combined Symptom and Medication Score (scale 0-6); FAS = full analysis set; IR = index of reactivity; LS = least squares; n = number of patients with data; Nasal congestion symptom score (scale 0-3) ; Q1 = First quartile (25%); Q3 = Third quartile (75%); RQLQ12+ = Standardized Rhinoconjunctivitis Quality of Life Questionnaire, overall score (scale 0-6); RCTSS = rhinoconjunctivitis total symptom score (scale 0-18) ; RMS = rescue/relief medication score (scale 0-3); RTSS = rhinitis total symptom score (scale 0-12)

^a Patients in the FAS with no efficacy evaluation during the primary evaluation period were excluded from the analysis

^b LS mean = back-transformed LS mean obtained from an analysis of covariance of the square root of the average score during the primary evaluation period

^c Point estimate = LS mean difference between 300°IR and placebo


^d Analysis of covariance

^e Relative LS mean difference: [(300°IR LS mean – placebo LS mean) / placebo LS mean] *100

CI's for differences in LS means and relative LS mean differences are calculated using the bootstrap method on 10,000 replications

^f Wilcoxon rank-sum test /

FIG 4. RQLQ12+ domain scores at the end of the treatment period (FAS)




FAS = full analysis set; IR = index of reactivity; LS = least squares; RQLQ12+ = Standardized Rhinoconjunctivitis Quality of Life Questionnaire (domain scores, scale 0-6), *p<0.05

Safety

During the 12-month treatment period, 561 (70.1%) of the patients in the 300°IR group and 440 (54.9%) of the patients in the placebo group reported at least one treatment-emergent adverse event (TEAE) (Table S8). As expected, the most common drug-related TEAEs associated with the 300°IR tablet were mild or moderate application-site reactions typically associated with AIT (oral pruritus, throat irritation, ear pruritus, and mouth oedema) (Fig 5). The incidence and distribution of TEAEs were similar among the

adolescents and the adults (Table S8). The presence of concomitant asthma did not appear to influence the safety profile in either study group, and the 300 IR HDM tablet was not associated with the appearance of asthma-related AEs.

FIG 5. Treatment-emergent adverse events suspected to be drug-related with incidence of at least 5% in the 300°IR HDM or placebo group (SS)



No deaths occurred during the study. Details of serious TEAEs (35 events reported by 21 patients in the 300°IR group and by 9 in the placebo group) and epinephrine injections (4 in the 300°IR group and 2 in the placebo group) are provided as Supplemental Material. Of the 4 injections in the 300°IR group, 2 were administered for an event that was suspected to be drug-related.

Overall, TEAEs led to premature study withdrawal by 99 (12.4%) patients in the 300 IR group (75 adults and 24 adolescents) and 17 (2.1%) in the placebo group (15 adults and 2 adolescents). Most of these premature study withdrawals in the 300°IR group were due to administration site reactions that occurred early in the study: 68 of the 99 (68.7%) withdrawals occurred during the first month after randomization. In the placebo group, this was the case for 6 of the 17 (35.3%) patients.

DISCUSSION

In this international Phase III clinical trial, the efficacy and safety of ~12 months of treatment with a 300°IR sublingual tablet (vs. placebo) were assessed in a large population of adults and adolescents with HDM-induced AR. The study's design enabled the accurate identification of highly symptomatic HDM-allergic patients with a clear history of perennial symptoms requiring medication, thanks to a relatively long placebo run-in period.

Treatment with the 300°IR tablet was associated with a significantly lower aTCS during the primary evaluation period, relative to placebo. The findings for the primary endpoint confirmed the literature data on the efficacy of the 300°IR tablet (29, 30, 33-35), and were supported by the secondary endpoints, such as the aCSMS and the six ISSs. Interestingly, the greatest difference vs. placebo was observed for nasal congestion; the latter is typically reported in the literature to be the most bothersome feature of HDM-induced AR, and contributes strongly to poor QoL.(11) The 300°IR tablet was also effective (vs. placebo) for secondary endpoints related to AR control (e.g. PSCD) and QoL (e.g. RQLQ12+). In the field of respiratory allergy, QoL scores can serve as clinically relevant, supporting primary endpoints.(40, 41) The overall and domain-specific RQLQ12+ scores showed that improvement in QoL was significantly greater in the 300°IR tablet than in the placebo group.

With regard to the level of clinical efficacy, the relative LS mean 300°IR vs. placebo difference in the aTCS (-16.9%) for the primary evaluation period exceeded the value of -15% for clinical relevance defined in the protocol and recommended by the FDA(42). This relative difference of -16.9% is greater than that associated with some types of symptomatic medication (such as leukotriene receptor antagonists and oral antihistamines) used to treat seasonal and perennial AR.(43, 44). The magnitude of the treatment effect is consistent with that reported in the literature for a different sublingual tablet formulation of an HDM extract.(20, 32)

It is noteworthy that the 300°IR tablet's beneficial effect increased over the 12-month treatment period, as has been observed with other AIT formulations (45-48). The mean aTCS in the 300°IR group (FAS) fell from 7.84 at baseline to 3.62 after ~12 months of treatment. The relative LS mean difference in the aTCS vs. placebo increased from -8.5% at Month 3 to -16.6% at Month 12. This increase over time may be of value, given that AIT is a long-term treatment typically prescribed for 3 to 5 years. Further, another study of 12 months of treatment of the 300°IR tablet showed that efficacy was maintained during a treatment-free follow-up year (29). Consistently with the findings for clinical efficacy, the significant increase in IgE and IgG4 levels over the treatment period in the 300°IR group but not in the placebo group supports the tablet's immunologic activity.(49-54).

The use of a placebo run-in period (during which rescue/relief medication was authorized) enabled the selection of patients with truly moderate-to-severe AR symptoms. Although rescue/relief medication use during the primary evaluation period was low overall, it was significantly lower in the 300°IR group than in the placebo group (LS mean average RMS was 0.30 in the placebo group and 0.21 in the 300°IR group). However, this low level of rescue/relief medication use was consistent with previous clinical studies of the 300°IR tablet.(29, 33, 34) It should be borne in mind that trial participants were instructed to take rescue/relief medication only when necessary, and so may have taken less medication than they would have outside the context of a clinical trial.

As expected from the literature data on AIT and despite the placebo run-in period, we observed a strong placebo effect; clinical benefit was observed in the placebo group over the 12-month treatment period as a whole and during the primary evaluation period.(55) This benefit may have been due to improved care, the Hawthorne effect, and the patients' expectations.

Consistently with previous observations, the 300°IR HDM tablet had a reassuring safety profile and was generally well tolerated. As expected, the TEAEs in the 300 IR group were primarily mild or moderate local reactions that arose early in the course of treatment and that resolved without specific management. There were no severe anaphylactic reactions. Two of the four epinephrine injections in the 300°IR group were administered for events (one local and one systemic) suspected to be drug-related. When considering the number of participants from the 300°IR group in the SS (800) and the mean number of days of treatment (297.5), this corresponds to two treatment-related epinephrine injections for ~240,000 administrations of the 300°IR sublingual tablet, or one per ~120,000 administrations. This value is in line with the literature data; in an analysis of epinephrine use in clinical trials of SLIT tablets (grass pollen, ragweed pollen, and HDM formulations), Nolte et al. reported that the number of epinephrine injections was 1.8 per 100,000 tablets (i.e. one per ~ 55,500 administrations). (56, 57)

The study had some limitations - most of which are inherent to placebo-controlled studies of AIT in which participants are exposed to confounding allergens and non-allergic irritants. Secondly, the duration of treatment was only 1 year; this is shorter than the period of several years typically recommended in clinical practice.(58) Nevertheless, many trials of HDM AIT have featured treatment periods of just a few months.(59) Thirdly, the premature study withdrawal rate during the first month of treatment was higher than expected; this emphasizes the need for physician-patient dialogue on what are often transient local administration site reactions.

In conclusion, our present results confirmed that a 12-month course of treatment with a 300°IR sublingual HDM tablet was effective for the treatment of moderate-to-severe HDM-induced AR (with or without concomitant mild controlled asthma). The safety profile was consistent with the literature data on

sublingual HDM AIT, with no newly identified or unexpected risks. HDM sensitivity is a chronic, burdensome disease that often results in daily use of several medications for often inadequate or partial control. A therapeutic agent capable of suppressing the patient's allergic process and offering lasting clinical benefit is clearly desirable for both the patient and the healthcare system. The 300°IR sublingual HDM tablet is a treatment option that minimizes the need for rescue/relief medication and provides effective symptom relief.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

We thank all the investigators and the members of the SL75.14 clinical project team, including the biostatisticians, for their commitment to the study. Medical writing and editorial assistance was provided by David Fraser (Biotech Communication SARL) and Catherine Bos (Stallergenes Greer). This assistance was funded by Stallergenes Greer

CONFLICTS OF INTEREST

Pascal Demoly has received consulting fees, honoraria for lectures and/or research funding from ALK, ASIT Biotech, AstraZeneca, Bausch & Lomb, Chiesi, IQVIA, Ménarini, Mylan, Novartis, Sanofi, Stallergenes Greer and ThermoFisher Scientific. Jonathan Corren has received consulting fees, honoraria for lectures and/or research funding from AstraZeneca, Genentech, Novartis, Regeneron Pharmaceuticals, Inc., Sanofi and Stallergenes Greer. Peter Creticos has received consulting fees, honoraria for lectures and/or research funding from Stallergenes Greer, Allergy Therapeutics, ALK, and ASIT, and royalties from UpToDate. Frédéric De Blay has received consulting fees, honoraria for lectures and/or research funding from ALK, Astra Zeneca, GSK, Novartis, Teva, Sanofi and Stallergenes Greer. Philippe Gevaert has received consulting fees, honoraria for lectures and/or research funding from Stallergenes Greer, 3NT, Ablynx, ALK, Argenx, Bekaert Textiles, Genentech, Hal Allergy, Medtronic, Novartis, Regeneron, Roche, Sanofi-Genzyme, Teva, and Thermo Fisher. Peter Hellings has received consulting fees, honoraria for lectures and/or research funding from Mylan, Sanofi, Allergopharma and Stallergenes Greer. Krzysztof Kowal has received consulting fees, honoraria for lectures and/or research funding from Alk Abello, Astra Zeneca, Berlin Chemie, Chiesi, Hal Allergy, Meda Pharma, Merk

Allergopharma, and Orion Pharma. Martine Le Gall is an employee of Stallergenes Greer. Natalia Nenasheva has received consulting fees, honoraria for lectures and/or research funding from AstraZeneca, Chiesi, MSD, Novartis, Sanofi and Stallergenes Greer. Giovanni Passalacqua has received consulting fees, honoraria for lectures and/or research funding from Stallergenes, Lofarma, Alk-Abellò, and Allergofarma. Oliver Pfaar has nothing to disclose. Miguel Tortajada-Girbés has received consulting fees, honoraria for lectures and/or research funding from Stallergenes Greer, Novartis, GSK, Sanofi-Genzyme, and Allergopharma. Carmen Vidal has received consulting fees, honoraria for lectures and/or research funding from ALK, Stallergenes Greer; Allergy Therapeutics, Chiesi, GSK, and Astra-Zeneca. Margitta Worm has received consulting fees, honoraria for lectures and/or research funding from ALK-Abelló Arzneimittel GmbH, Meda Pharma GmbH & Co. KG, Allergopharma GmbH & Co. KG, Bencard Allergie GmbH, Sanofi-Aventis Deutschland GmbH, Regeneron Pharmaceuticals Inc. and Stallergenes Greer. Thomas B. Casale has received consulting fees, honoraria for lectures and/or research funding from Stallergenes.

The study was sponsored and funded by Stallergenes Greer (Antony, France).

AUTHORS' CONTRIBUTIONS

All authors made substantial contributions to the study conception and design and to data acquisition, analysis and/or interpretation. All authors contributed to drafting the article or revising it critically for important intellectual content, and all have given their final approval of the version submitted for publication.

REFERENCES

1. Bousquet J, Van Cauwenberge P, Khaltaev N, Aria Workshop G, World Health O. Allergic rhinitis and its impact on asthma. *J Allergy Clin Immunol*. 2001;108(5 Suppl):S147-334.
2. Bousquet J, Khaltaev N, Cruz AA, Denburg J, Fokkens WJ, Togias A, et al. Allergic Rhinitis and its Impact on Asthma (ARIA) 2008 update (in collaboration with the World Health Organization, GA(2)LEN and AllerGen). *Allergy*. 2008;63 Suppl 86:8-160.
3. Brozek JL, Bousquet J, Baena-Cagnani CE, Bonini S, Canonica GW, Casale TB, et al. Allergic Rhinitis and its Impact on Asthma (ARIA) guidelines: 2010 revision. *J Allergy Clin Immunol*. 2010;126(3):466-76.
4. Bauchau V, Durham SR. Prevalence and rate of diagnosis of allergic rhinitis in Europe. *Eur Respir J*. 2004;24(5):758-64.
5. Nathan RA, Meltzer EO, Derebery J, Campbell UB, Stang PE, Corrao MA, et al. The prevalence of nasal symptoms attributed to allergies in the United States: findings from the burden of rhinitis in an America survey. *Allergy Asthma Proc*. 2008;29(6):600-8.
6. Katelaris CH, Lee BW, Potter PC, Maspero JF, Cingi C, Lopatin A, et al. Prevalence and diversity of allergic rhinitis in regions of the world beyond Europe and North America. *Clin Exp Allergy*. 2012;42(2):186-207.
7. Wang Y, Zhu R, Liu G, Li W, Chen H, Daures JP, et al. Prevalence of uncontrolled allergic rhinitis in Wuhan, China: a prospective cohort study. *Am J Rhinol Allergy*. 2014;28(5):397-403.
8. Zock JP, Heinrich J, Jarvis D, Verlato G, Norback D, Plana E, et al. Distribution and determinants of house dust mite allergens in Europe: the European Community Respiratory Health Survey II. *J Allergy Clin Immunol*. 2006;118(3):682-90.
9. Thomas WR. Geography of house dust mite allergens. *Asian Pac J Allergy Immunol*. 2010;28(4):211-24.
10. Thomas WR, Hales BJ, Smith WA. House dust mite allergens in asthma and allergy. *Trends Mol Med*. 2010;16(7):321-8.
11. Meltzer EO, Blaiss MS, Naclerio RM, Stoloff SW, Derebery MJ, Nelson HS, et al. Burden of allergic rhinitis: allergies in America, Latin America, and Asia-Pacific adult surveys. *Allergy Asthma Proc*. 2012;33 Suppl 1:S113-41.
12. Ozdoganoglu T, Songu M. The burden of allergic rhinitis and asthma. *Ther Adv Respir Dis*. 2012;6(1):11-23.
13. Linneberg A, Dam Petersen K, Hahn-Pedersen J, Hammerby E, Serup-Hansen N, Boxall N. Burden of allergic respiratory disease: a systematic review. *Clin Mol Allergy*. 2016;14:12.
14. Blaiss MS, Hammerby E, Robinson S, Kennedy-Martin T, Buchs S. The burden of allergic rhinitis and allergic rhinoconjunctivitis on adolescents: A literature review. *Ann Allergy Asthma Immunol*. 2018;121(1):43-52 e3.
15. Leger D, Bonnefoy B, Pigearias B, de La Giclais B, Chartier A. Poor sleep is highly associated with house dust mite allergic rhinitis in adults and children. *Allergy Asthma Clin Immunol*. 2017;13:36.
16. Demoly P, Maigret P, Elias Billon I, Allaert FA. Allergic rhinitis increases the risk of driving accidents. *J Allergy Clin Immunol*. 2017;140(2):614-6.

17. Udaka T, Suzuki H, Kitamura T, Shiomori T, Hiraki N, Fujimura T, et al. Relationships among nasal obstruction, daytime sleepiness, and quality of life. *Laryngoscope*. 2006;116(12):2129-32.
18. Vuurman EF, Vuurman LL, Lutgens I, Kremer B. Allergic rhinitis is a risk factor for traffic safety. *Allergy*. 2014;69(7):906-12.
19. Demoly P, Matucci A, Rossi O, Vidal C. "A year-long, fortnightly, observational survey in three European countries of patients with respiratory allergies induced by house dust mites: Methodology, demographics and clinical characteristics". *BMC Pulm Med*. 2016;16(1):85.
20. Nolte H, Bernstein DI, Nelson HS, Kleine-Tebbe J, Sussman GL, Seitzberg D, et al. Efficacy of house dust mite sublingual immunotherapy tablet in North American adolescents and adults in a randomized, placebo-controlled trial. *J Allergy Clin Immunol*. 2016;138(6):1631-8.
21. Rodrigo GJ, Neffen H. Efficacy of fluticasone furoate nasal spray vs. placebo for the treatment of ocular and nasal symptoms of allergic rhinitis: a systematic review. *Clin Exp Allergy*. 2011;41(2):160-70.
22. Scadding GK, Richards DH, Price MJ. Patient and physician perspectives on the impact and management of perennial and seasonal allergic rhinitis. *Clin Otolaryngol Allied Sci*. 2000;25(6):551-7.
23. Calderon MA, Simons FE, Malling HJ, Lockey RF, Moingeon P, Demoly P. Sublingual allergen immunotherapy: mode of action and its relationship with the safety profile. *Allergy*. 2012;67(3):302-11.
24. Jutel M, Agache I, Bonini S, Burks AW, Calderon M, Canonica W, et al. International Consensus on Allergen Immunotherapy II: Mechanisms, standardization, and pharmacoeconomics. *J Allergy Clin Immunol*. 2016;137(2):358-68.
25. Jutel M, Bartkowiak-Emeryk M, Breborowicz A, Cichocka-Jarosz E, Emeryk A, Gawlik R, et al. Sublingual immunotherapy (SLIT)--indications, mechanism, and efficacy: Position paper prepared by the Section of Immunotherapy, Polish Society of Allergy. *Ann Agric Environ Med*. 2016;23(1):44-53.
26. Jutel M, Agache I, Bonini S, Burks AW, Calderon M, Canonica W, et al. International consensus on allergy immunotherapy. *J Allergy Clin Immunol*. 2015;136(3):556-68.
27. Bonertz A, Roberts GC, Hoefnagel M, Timon M, Slater JE, Rabin RL, et al. Challenges in the implementation of EAACI guidelines on allergen immunotherapy: A global perspective on the regulation of allergen products. *Allergy*. 2018;73(1):64-76.
28. Calderon MA, Kleine-Tebbe J, Linneberg A, De Blay F, Hernandez Fernandez de Rojas D, Virchow JC, et al. House Dust Mite Respiratory Allergy: An Overview of Current Therapeutic Strategies. *J Allergy Clin Immunol Pract*. 2015;3(6):843-55.
29. Bergmann KC, Demoly P, Worm M, Fokkens WJ, Carrillo T, Tabar AI, et al. Efficacy and safety of sublingual tablets of house dust mite allergen extracts in adults with allergic rhinitis. *J Allergy Clin Immunol*. 2014;133(6):1608-14 e6.
30. Roux M, Devillier P, Yang WH, Montagut A, Abiteboul K, Viatte A, et al. Efficacy and safety of sublingual tablets of house dust mite allergen extracts: Results of a dose-ranging study in an environmental exposure chamber. *J Allergy Clin Immunol*. 2016;138(2):451-8 e5.
31. Virchow JC, Backer V, Kuna P, Prieto L, Nolte H, Villesen HH, et al. Efficacy of a House Dust Mite Sublingual Allergen Immunotherapy Tablet in Adults With Allergic Asthma: A Randomized Clinical Trial. *JAMA*. 2016;315(16):1715-25.
32. Demoly P, Emminger W, Rehm D, Backer V, Tommerup L, Kleine-Tebbe J. Effective treatment of house dust mite-induced allergic rhinitis with 2 doses of the SQ HDM SLIT-tablet:

Results from a randomized, double-blind, placebo-controlled phase III trial. *J Allergy Clin Immunol.* 2016;137(2):444-51 e8.

33. Okamoto Y, Fujieda S, Okano M, Hida H, Kakudo S, Masuyama K. Efficacy of house dust mite sublingual tablet in the treatment of allergic rhinoconjunctivitis: A randomized trial in a pediatric population. *Pediatr Allergy Immunol.* 2019;30(1):66-73.
34. Okamoto Y, Fujieda S, Okano M, Yoshida Y, Kakudo S, Masuyama K. House dust mite sublingual tablet is effective and safe in patients with allergic rhinitis. *Allergy.* 2017;72(3):435-43.
35. Demoly P, Okamoto Y, Yang WH, Devillier P, Bergmann KC. 300 IR HDM tablet: a sublingual immunotherapy tablet for the treatment of house dust mite-associated allergic rhinitis. *Expert Rev Clin Immunol.* 2016;12(11):1141-51.
36. Asthma Gf. Global Strategy for Asthma Management and Prevention, Revised 2014 Vancouver, GINA, 2014: Global Initiative for Asthma; 2014 [Available from: www.ginasthma.org.
37. Pitsios C, Demoly P, Bilo MB, Gerth van Wijk R, Pfaar O, Sturm GJ, et al. Clinical contraindications to allergen immunotherapy: an EAACI position paper. *Allergy.* 2015;70(8):897-909.
38. Juniper EF, Thompson AK, Ferrie PJ, Roberts JN. Validation of the standardized version of the Rhinoconjunctivitis Quality of Life Questionnaire. *J Allergy Clin Immunol.* 1999;104(2 Pt 1):364-9.
39. Nelson HS, Calderon MA, Bernstein DI, Casale TB, Durham SR, Andersen JS, et al. Allergen Immunotherapy Clinical Trial Outcomes and Design: Working Toward Harmonization of Methods and Principles. *Current allergy and asthma reports.* 2017;17(3):18.
40. Calderon MA, Casale TB, Demoly P. Validation of Patient-Reported Outcomes for Clinical Trials in Allergic Rhinitis: A Systematic Review. *J Allergy Clin Immunol Pract.* 2019;7(5):1450-61 e6.
41. Pfaar O, Demoly P, Gerth van Wijk R, Bonini S, Bousquet J, Canonica GW, et al. Recommendations for the standardization of clinical outcomes used in allergen immunotherapy trials for allergic rhinoconjunctivitis: an EAACI Position Paper. *Allergy.* 2014;69(7):854-67.
42. Nelson HS, Calderon MA, Bernstein DI, Casale TB, Durham SR, Andersen JS, et al. Allergen Immunotherapy Clinical Trial Outcomes and Design: Working Toward Harmonization of Methods and Principles. *Curr Allergy Asthma Rep.* 2017;17(3):18.
43. Devillier P, Dreyfus JF, Demoly P, Calderon MA. A meta-analysis of sublingual allergen immunotherapy and pharmacotherapy in pollen-induced seasonal allergic rhinoconjunctivitis. *BMC Med.* 2014;12:71.
44. Durham SR, Creticos PS, Nelson HS, Li Z, Kaur A, Meltzer EO, et al. Treatment effect of sublingual immunotherapy tablets and pharmacotherapies for seasonal and perennial allergic rhinitis: Pooled analyses. *J Allergy Clin Immunol.* 2016;138(4):1081-8 e4.
45. Didier A, Worm M, Horak F, Sussman G, de Beaumont O, Le Gall M, et al. Sustained 3-year efficacy of pre- and coseasonal 5-grass-pollen sublingual immunotherapy tablets in patients with grass pollen-induced rhinoconjunctivitis. *J Allergy Clin Immunol.* 2011;128(3):559-66.
46. Dahl R, Kapp A, Colombo G, de Monchy JG, Rak S, Emminger W, et al. Sublingual grass allergen tablet immunotherapy provides sustained clinical benefit with progressive immunologic changes over 2 years. *J Allergy Clin Immunol.* 2008;121(2):512-8 e2.

47. Durham SR, Emminger W, Kapp A, Colombo G, de Monchy JG, Rak S, et al. Long-term clinical efficacy in grass pollen-induced rhinoconjunctivitis after treatment with SQ-standardized grass allergy immunotherapy tablet. *J Allergy Clin Immunol*. 2010;125(1):131-8 e1-7.
48. Worm M, Rak S, de Blay F, Malling HJ, Melac M, Cadic V, et al. Sustained efficacy and safety of a 300IR daily dose of a sublingual solution of birch pollen allergen extract in adults with allergic rhinoconjunctivitis: results of a double-blind, placebo-controlled study. *Clin Transl Allergy*. 2014;4(1):7.
49. van de Veen W, Stanic B, Yaman G, Wawrzyniak M, Sollner S, Akdis DG, et al. IgG4 production is confined to human IL-10-producing regulatory B cells that suppress antigen-specific immune responses. *J Allergy Clin Immunol*. 2013;131(4):1204-12.
50. Nelson HS, Nolte H, Creticos P, Maloney J, Wu J, Bernstein DI. Efficacy and safety of timothy grass allergy immunotherapy tablet treatment in North American adults. *J Allergy Clin Immunol*. 2011;127(1):72-80, e1-2.
51. Feng M, Su Q, Lai X, Xian M, Shi X, Wurtzen PA, et al. Functional and Immunoreactive Levels of IgG4 Correlate with Clinical Responses during the Maintenance Phase of House Dust Mite Immunotherapy. *J Immunol*. 2018;200(12):3897-904.
52. Creticos PS, Norman PS. Immunotherapy with allergens. *JAMA*. 1987;258(20):2874-80.
53. Creticos PS, Van Metre TE, Mardiney MR, Rosenberg GL, Norman PS, Adkinson NF, Jr. Dose response of IgE and IgG antibodies during ragweed immunotherapy. *J Allergy Clin Immunol*. 1984;73(1 Pt 1):94-104.
54. Lichtenstein LM, Norman PS, Winkenwerder WL. A single year of immunotherapy for ragweed hay fever. Immunologic and clinical studies. *Ann Intern Med*. 1971;75(5):663-71.
55. Frew AJ, Pfaar O. Placebo effects in allergen immunotherapy: an experts' opinion. *Allergo J Int*. 2018;27(6):162-6.
56. Nolte H, Casale TB, Lockey RF, Fogh BS, Kaur A, Lu S, et al. Epinephrine Use in Clinical Trials of Sublingual Immunotherapy Tablets. *J Allergy Clin Immunol Pract*. 2017;5(1):84-9 e3.
57. Portnoy J, Cox LS. Is the Benefit From Prescribing Epinephrine Autoinjectors for Sublingual Immunotherapy Worth the Cost? Lessons Learned From Clinical Trials. *J Allergy Clin Immunol Pract*. 2017;5(1):90-1.
58. Penagos M, Eifan AO, Durham SR, Scadding GW. Duration of Allergen Immunotherapy for Long-Term Efficacy in Allergic Rhinoconjunctivitis. *Curr Treat Options Allergy*. 2018;5(3):275-90.
59. Calderon MA, Casale TB, Nelson HS, Demoly P. An evidence-based analysis of house dust mite allergen immunotherapy: a call for more rigorous clinical studies. *J Allergy Clin Immunol*. 2013;132(6):1322-36.

Supplemental Material

Supplementary safety data

As expected, the most common TEAEs associated with the investigational product (IP) in the 300°IR group were mild or moderate application-site reactions typically associated with AIT (oral pruritus, throat irritation, ear pruritus, or mouth oedema) and resolved without specific management or discontinuation of the IP (Fig S1).

No deaths occurred during the study. Thirty-five serious TEAEs were reported in 30 patients (21 in the 300°IR group and 9 in the placebo group) but only two serious pharyngeal disorders (both in the 300 IR group) were suspected to be drug-related. A 17-year-old female experienced a severe laryngopharyngeal reaction on treatment day 1, three minutes after taking the IP. She received an intramuscular epinephrine injection (administered by the investigator), inhaled salbutamol, and oral cetirizine. The AE had resolved about an hour later. The patient discontinued the study on the same day. A 25-year-old male experienced a severe pharyngeal reaction on treatment day 2 immediately after taking the IP. He took cetirizine tablets, and the AE had resolved one hour later. The patient discontinued the study on the same day. In the context of sublingual AIT, these serious, severe laryngopharyngeal reactions were not unexpected.

Six patients received epinephrine by self-injection or otherwise. Of the 4 cases in the 300°IR group (severe pharyngeal disorder, as described above for the 17-year-old female patient; severe tongue oedema; moderate acute urticaria; and severe nasal congestion/fatigue), only the first two were suspected to be treatment-related. In the case of severe tongue oedema, a female patient decided to use her epinephrine auto-injector on treatment day 8. Neither of the two cases with epinephrine administration in the placebo group (an allergic reaction of unknown aetiology, and moderate food allergy to peanuts) was suspected to be drug-related.

There were three cases of autoimmune disease (a case of coeliac disease in the 300°IR group and cases of polymyalgia rheumatica and rheumatoid arthritis in the placebo group, none of which was considered to be related to the IP), two cases of eosinophilic esophagitis (neither serious, and both in the 300°IR group) and three cases of laryngopharyngeal disorder (all in the 300°IR group). Both cases of eosinophilic esophagitis and two of the three cases of laryngopharyngeal disorder (the two cases mentioned above, associated with epinephrine administration) were suspected to be drug-related.

Table S1 **Secondary and exploratory variables**

Rhinitis total symptom score (RTSS, scale: 0-12)
Rescue medication score (RMS, scale: 0-3)
The rhinoconjunctivitis total symptom score (RCTSS, scale: 0-18) was the sum of the four rhinitis symptom scores and the two ocular symptom scores.
The combined symptom and medication score (CSMS, scale: 0-6) combined the RTSS and the RMS, which were given equal weightings. Hence, the CSMS was calculated as follows: $\text{CSMS} = \text{RTSS}/4 + \text{RMS}$
The six individual symptom scores (ISSs, each scored on a scale of 0-3): nasal pruritus, sneezing, rhinorrhoea, nasal congestion, ocular pruritus and tearing
Proportion of symptom-controlled days (PSCD), defined for each patient during an evaluation period as the proportion of days with RTSS ≤ 2 and no use of rescue/relief medication
Standardized Rhinoconjunctivitis Quality of Life Questionnaire (RQLQ12+) overall and RQLQ12+domain scores (scale: 0 to 6)
Immunological markers: Dpte- and Dfar-specific serum IgE (kU/L) and IgG ₄ (mgA/L) levels

TABLE S2. Baseline characteristics by age class (FAS)

	Adolescents (N=312)		Adults (N=1,164)	
	300°IR N=155	Placebo N=157	300°IR N=556	Placebo N=608
Gender [n (%)]				
Male	91 (58.7)	99 (63.1)	260 (46.8)	270 (44.4)
Female	64 (41.3)	58 (36.9)	296 (53.2)	338 (55.6)
Age (years)				
Mean (SD)	14.1 (1.75)	14.2 (1.72)	33.8 (11.51)	33.6 (11.03)
Median	14.0	14.0	32.0	32.0
Geographical region [n (%)]				
North America (USA & Canada)	28 (18.1)	31 (19.7)	184 (33.1)	209 (34.4)
Europe, Israel, Russia	127 (81.9)	126 (80.3)	372 (66.9)	399 (65.6)
Race [n (%)]				
White	146 (94.2)	147 (93.6)	514 (92.4)	554 (91.1)
Black or African American	3 (1.9)	5 (3.2)	22 (4.0)	32 (5.3)
American Indian or Alaska Native	0	0	0	1 (0.2)
Asian	5 (3.2)	3 (1.9)	16 (2.9)	17 (2.8)
Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander	0	0	2 (0.4)	0
Multiple	1 (0.6)	2 (1.3)	1 (0.2)	1 (0.2)
Unknown	0	0	1 (0.2)	3 (0.5)
Duration of HDM-induced allergic rhinitis (years)				
Mean (SD)	5.29 (3.552)	5.27 (3.387)	13.08 (11.446)	12.98 (10.243)
Median	4.70	4.37	9.46	10.87

Range	0.8–14.4	0.9–16.0	1.0–58.9	0.4–50.2
Baseline sensitization status				
[n (%)]				
Monosensitized	104 (67.1)	95 (60.5)	293 (52.7)	318 (52.3)
Polysensitized	51 (32.9)	62 (39.5)	263 (47.3)	290 (47.7)
Average TCS at baseline				
Mean (SD)	8.00 (1.978)	7.95 (1.979)	7.80 (2.091)	7.65 (1.954)
95%CI	[7.69; 8.31]	[7.64; 8.26]	[7.63; 7.97]	[7.49; 7.80]
Median	7.61	7.65	7.49	7.30
Range	3.8–14.0	4.9–14.0	4.0–14.4	4.4–14.0
Overall RQLQ12+ score at baseline				
Mean (SD)	2.32 (1.120)	2.31 (1.050)	2.73 (1.087)	2.73 (1.053)
Median	2.21	2.27	2.68	2.68
Range	0.1–5.4	0.3–5.0	0.3–5.7	0.2–5.8
Concomitant asthma [n (%)]				
Presence	80 (51.6)	76 (48.4)	193 (34.7)	206 (33.9)
Absence	75 (48.4)	81 (51.6)	363 (65.3)	402 (66.1)

CI: confidence interval; FAS: full analysis set; IR: index of reactivity; RQLQ12+: Standardized Rhinoconjunctivitis Quality of Life Questionnaire, overall score (scale: 0-6); SD: standard deviation; TCS: total combined score (scale: 0-15)

Table S3 Positive SPT results on allergens with incidence of at least 5% in the placebo or 300 IR group (FAS)

	300°IR	Placebo	Overall
	N=711	N=765	N=1,476
	n (%)	n (%)	n (%)
<i>D. pteronyssinus</i> or <i>D. farinae</i>	711 (100)	765 (100)	1,476 (100)
<i>D. pteronyssinus</i>	696 (97.9)	750 (98.0)	1,446 (98.0)
<i>D. farinae</i>	689 (96.9)	732 (95.7)	1,421 (96.3)
Cat	141 (19.8)	200 (26.1)	341 (23.1)
Grass	135 (19.0)	141 (18.4)	276 (18.7)
Birch	93 (13.1)	89 (11.6)	182 (12.3)
Ragweed	65 (9.1)	66 (8.6)	131 (8.9)
Dog	51 (7.2)	64 (8.4)	115 (7.8)
Mugwort	59 (8.3)	56 (7.3)	115 (7.8)
Alder	42 (5.9)	43 (5.6)	85 (5.8)
Oak	21 (3.0)	41 (5.4)	62 (4.2)

D.: *Dermatophagoides*; FAS: full analysis set; IR: index of reactivity; n: number of patients with data; SPT: skin prick test. Note: a patient could have more than one positive SPT.

Table S4. Rhinoconjunctivitis symptom scores and a rescue medication score at baseline (FAS)

	300°IR n=711	Placebo n=765	Overall n=1,476
Average RTSS			
Mean (SD)	7.01 (1.936)	6.92 (1.880)	6.96 (1.907)
95%CI	[6.87; 7.15]	[6.79; 7.06]	[6.87; 7.06]
Median	6.68	6.59	6.63
Range	2.6–12.0	2.8–12.0	2.6–12.0
Average RMS			
Mean (SD)	0.83 (0.767)	0.79 (0.754)	0.81 (0.760)
95%CI	[0.78; 0.89]	[0.73; 0.84]	[0.77; 0.85]
Median	0.65	0.57	0.63
Range	0.0–3.0	0.0–3.0	0.0–3.0
Average ISS: Nasal pruritus			
Mean (SD)	1.63 (0.615)	1.60 (0.630)	1.61 (0.623)
95%CI	[1.58; 1.67]	[1.55; 1.64]	[1.58; 1.64]
Median	1.58	1.59	1.59
Range	0.0–3.0	0.0–3.0	0.0–3.0
Average ISS: Sneezing			
Mean (SD)	1.62 (0.629)	1.61 (0.608)	1.62 (0.618)
95%CI	[1.58; 1.67]	[1.57; 1.65]	[1.58; 1.65]
Median	1.59	1.58	1.58
Range	0.0–3.0	0.0–3.0	0.0–3.0

	300°IR n=711	Placebo n=765	Overall n=1,476
Average ISS: Rhinorrhoea			
Mean (SD)	1.84 (0.578)	1.82 (0.556)	1.83 (0.566)
95%CI	[1.79; 1.88]	[1.78; 1.86]	[1.80; 1.86]
Median	1.85	1.80	1.82
Range	0.0–3.0	0.0–3.0	0.0–3.0
Average ISS: Nasal congestion			
Mean (SD)	1.92 (0.604)	1.89 (0.612)	1.91 (0.608)
95%CI	[1.88; 1.96]	[1.85; 1.94]	[1.88; 1.94]
Median	1.96	1.92	1.93
Range	0.0–3.0	0.1–3.0	0.0–3.0
Average ISS: Ocular pruritus			
Mean (SD)	1.36 (0.756)	1.33 (0.752)	1.34 (0.754)
95%CI	[1.30; 1.41]	[1.27; 1.38]	[1.30; 1.38]
Median	1.32	1.29	1.31
Range	0.0–3.0	0.0–3.0	0.0–3.0
Average ISS: Tearing			
Mean (SD)	1.18 (0.784)	1.12 (0.770)	1.15 (0.777)
95%CI	[1.13; 1.24]	[1.07; 1.18]	[1.11; 1.19]
Median	1.12	1.08	1.11
Range	0.0–3.0	0.0–3.0	0.0–3.0

CI: confidence interval; FAS: full analysis set; IR: index of reactivity; ISS: individual rhinoconjunctivitis symptom score (scale 0-3); RMS: rescue/relief medication score (scale 0-3); RTSS: rhinitis total symptom score (scale 0-12); SD: standard deviation

Table S5. Average individual rhinoconjunctivitis symptom scores (ISSs) during the primary evaluation period (FAS)

Treatment	n ^a	LS mean ^b	Difference in LS means vs. Placebo			Relative LS mean difference ^d	
			Point estimate ^c	[95%CI]	p-value	%	[95%CI]
Average nasal pruritus							
300°IR	586	0.61	-0.15	[-0.23; -0.07]	0.0004	-19.7	[-28.9; -9.5]
Placebo	676	0.76					
Average sneezing							
300°IR	586	0.66	-0.16	[-0.24; -0.08]	0.0002	-19.5	[-28.2; -9.9]
Placebo	676	0.82					
Average rhinorrhoea							
300°IR	586	0.81	-0.16	[-0.25; -0.07]	0.0004	-16.5	[-24.7; -7.8]
Placebo	676	0.97					
Average nasal congestion							
300°IR	586	0.85	-0.19	[-0.28; -0.10]	<0.0001	-18.3	[-26.1; -9.7]
Placebo	676	1.04					
Average ocular pruritus							
300°IR	586	0.47	-0.09	[-0.16; -0.02]	0.0161	-15.4	[-26.2; -3.4]
Placebo	676	0.56					
Average tearing							
300°IR	586	0.34	-0.08	[-0.14; -0.02]	0.0138	-18.2	[-30.4; -4.1]
Placebo	676	0.42					

CI = confidence interval; FAS = full analysis set; IR = index of reactivity; ISS: individual rhinoconjunctivitis symptom score (scale 0-3), LS = least squares; n = number of patients with data

^a Patients in the FAS with no efficacy evaluation during the primary evaluation period were excluded from the analysis

^b LS mean = back-transformed LS mean obtained from an analysis of covariance of the square root of the average ISS during the primary evaluation period

^c Point estimate = LS mean difference between 300°IR and placebo

^d Relative LS mean difference: [(300°IR LS mean – placebo LS mean) / placebo LS mean] *100

All CIs are calculated using the bootstrap method on 10,000 replications

Table S6. Serum *Dermatophagoides pteronyssinus*- and *Dermatophagoides farinae*-specific IgG4 levels at baseline and at the end of the treatment period (FAS)

Statistic		300°IR n=711	Placebo n=765
<i>Dermatophagoides pteronyssinus</i>-specific serum IgG₄			
Baseline (mg _A /L)	n	709	763
	Geometric mean	0.27	0.27
	[95%CI]	[0.26; 0.29]	[0.26; 0.29]
	Median	0.27	0.28
	Range	0.0–10.0	0.0–6.1
Endpoint (mg _A /L)	n	664	725
	Geometric mean	0.95	0.26
	[95%CI]	[0.86; 1.04]	[0.24; 0.28]
	Median	0.98	0.26
	Range	0.0–29.2	0.0–7.1
Fold-change from baseline	n	662	723
	Geometric mean	3.49	0.95
	[95%CI]	[3.20; 3.80]	[0.91; 0.99]
	Median	3.25	0.99
	Range	0.0–179.8	0.1–35.4
<i>Dermatophagoides farinae</i>-specific serum IgG₄			
Baseline (mg _A /L)	n	709	763
	Geometric mean	0.22	0.22
	[95%CI]	[0.20; 0.23]	[0.20; 0.23]
	Median	0.22	0.22
	Range	0.0–9.8	0.0–7.3
Endpoint (mg _A /L)	n	664	725

Statistic		300°IR n=711	Placebo n=765
Geometric mean		0.89	0.22
[95%CI]		[0.80; 0.98]	[0.21; 0.23]
Median		0.91	0.22
Range		0.0–30.0	0.0–8.5
Fold-change from baseline	n	662	723
Geometric mean		4.12	1.01
[95%CI]		[3.78; 4.19]	[0.98; 1.05]
Median		3.70	1.00
Range		0.1–166.8	0.1–94.1

CI: confidence interval; FAS: full analysis set; IR: index of reactivity

Table S7. Serum *Dermatophagoides pteronyssinus*- and *Dermatophagoides farinae*-specific IgE levels at baseline and at the end of the treatment period (FAS)

Statistic		300°IR n=711	Placebo n=765
<i>Dermatophagoides pteronyssinus</i>-specific serum IgE			
Baseline (kU/L)	n	711	765
	Geometric mean	16.27	17.80
	[95%CI]	[14.91; 17.76]	[16.37; 19.34]
	Median	14.81	16.87
	Range	0.8–499.5	0.5–714.3
Endpoint (kU/L)	n	663	723
	Geometric mean	42.46	15.61
	[95%CI]	[38.20; 47.19]	[14.24; 17.12]
	Median	44.01	14.99
	Range	0.1–1366.4	0.1–893.2
Fold-change from baseline	n	663	723
	Geometric mean	2.62	0.88
	[95%CI]	[2.42; 2.84]	[0.85; 0.92]
	Median	2.54	0.89
	Range	0.0–158.4	0.0–7.5
<i>Dermatophagoides farinae</i>-specific serum IgE			
Baseline (kU/L)	n	711	765
	Geometric mean	16.20	17.92
	[95%CI]	[14.93; 17.58]	[16.58; 19.38]
	Median	15.43	16.74
	Range	1.2–600.0	0.5–992.5
Endpoint (kU/L)	n	663	723

Statistic		300°IR n=711	Placebo n=765
Geometric mean		41.24	15.32
[95%CI]		[37.16; 45.77]	[14.05; 16.70]
Median		42.10	14.77
Range		0.1–1225.4	0.1–811.9
Fold-change from baseline	n	663	723
	Geometric mean	2.53	0.86
	[95%CI]	[2.34; 2.74]	[0.82; 0.89]
	Median	2.49	0.86
	Range	0.0–126.6	0.0–6.8

CI: confidence interval; FAS: full analysis set; IR: index of reactivity

Table S8. Overview of TEAEs by age class (SS)

	Adolescents N=341		Adults N=1,260		Whole population N=1,601	
	300°IR N=178 n (%)	Placebo N=163 n (%)	300°IR N=622 n (%)	Placebo N=638 n (%)	300°IR N=800 n (%)	Placebo N=801 n (%)
TEAE	124 (69.7)	89 (54.6)	437 (70.3)	351 (55.0)	561 (70.1)	440 (54.9)
TEAE suspected to be drug-related	88 (49.4)	21 (12.9)	320 (51.4)	98 (15.4)	408 (51.0)	119 (14.9)
Serious TEAE	4 (2.2)	1 (0.6)	17 (2.7)	8 (1.3)	21 (2.6)	9 (1.1)
Serious TEAE suspected to be drug-related	1 (0.6)	0	1 (0.2)	0	2 (0.3)	0
TEAE leading to premature study withdrawal	23 (12.9)	2 (1.2)	74 (11.9)	15 (2.4)	97 (12.1)	17 (2.1)
TEAE leading to premature study withdrawal suspected to be drug-related	21 (11.8)	1 (0.6)	63 (10.1)	6 (0.9)	84 (10.5)	7 (0.9)

IR = index of reactivity; N = number of patients in each group; n = number of patients with at least one event; SS: safety set; TEAE = treatment-emergent adverse event. A patient could have more than one event.

Note: two additional patients in the 300°IR group (1 adolescent and 1 adult) did not complete the treatment period or the study due to an AE, although the 300°IR tablet was not withdrawn by the investigators.