

# I.R.I.S.

INSTITUT DE RECHERCHES INTERNATIONALES SERVIER

Document title	Abbreviated clinical study report
Study title	Clinical efficacy of VALDOXAN in everyday practice conditions (efficiency) in depressed patients, on a treatment-naive or switch basis. Phase-IV, multicentre, open, interventional clinical study. VALDOXAN D-CHANGE Study
Study drug	agomelatine (S20098)
	Valdoxan®
Studied indication	Major depressive episode according to DSM-IV-TR criteria
Development phase	Phase IV
Protocol code	DM4-20098-108
Study initiation date	20 April 2009
Study completion date	04 August 2010
Main coordinator	
Company / Sponsor	LES LABORATOIRES SERVIER
	Euthérapie 35 rue de Verdun 92284 Suresnes
Responsible medical officer	
GCP	This study was performed in accordance with the principles of Good Clinical Practice including the archiving of essential documents.
Date of the report	Final version of 30 September 2011
Volume number	No. 1/1
	CONFIDENTIAL

# 2. SYNOPSIS

Name of Commonse	In dividual Studer Table	(For National Authority Use
Name of Company: LES LABORATOIRES SERVIER	Individual Study Table Referring to Part of the	(For National Authority Use Dossier only)
	U	
Name of Finished Product:	Volume:	
VALDOXAN® (France)	Deserv	
Name of Active Ingredient:	Page:	
agomelatine (S20098)		
		actice conditions (efficiency) in depressed
	ch dasis. Phase-IV, multi	centre, open, interventional clinical study.
VALDOXAN D-CHANGE Study Protocol No.: DM4-20098-108		
National Coordinator:		
National Cool dillator.		
Study centre(s)		
852 French hospital and community psych	niatric centres - 620 centres	having included at least one natient
<b>Publication:</b> Not applicable	name centres – 626 centres	naving included at least one patient
Studied period:	Dhasa	of development of the study:
Initiation date: 20 April 2009	IV IV	of development of the study:
Completion date: 04 August 2010	1 v	
Objectives:		
	to describe the efficiency	of Valdoxan after 6 weeks of treatment, in
		tion of treatment) and in different patient sub-
		inic, selective serotonin reuptake inhibitor,
		ine, other antidepressant), using a composite
		assessment criteria: CGI-I (Clinical Global
		-Improvement scale) (protocol appendix 3),
LSEQ (Leeds Sleep Evaluation Questionn		
The secondary objectives were		
	kan after 6 weeks of treatm	ent, in the different sub-groups of therapeutic
		osite evaluation of the clinical response as a
function of the following factors	8	······································
. the intensity of the depression at	t inclusion.	
. the intensity of sleep disorders a		
. the Body Mass Index (BMI),	,	
. the number of previous episodes	s of major depression,	
. the extent of the impact of the d		
. the presence of undesirable side	effects of the previous treat	ment at inclusion
. the reason for stopping the previ		
- To describe the efficiency of Valdoz	kan after 6 weeks of treatm	ent, in the different therapeutic situations and
previous treatment sub-groups, ana	lysing separately the four	criteria that constitute the composite main
criterion (CGI-I, PGI-I, LSEQ and t	he patient's willingness to c	
the factors described above.		ontinue the study treatment), as a function of
		ontinue the study treatment), as a function of
		of the illness on the patient's daily activities
(work, social life - leisure activities,	family life - domestic task	- //
(work, social life - leisure activities, questionnaire (Sheehan Disability Sc	family life - domestic task cale).	of the illness on the patient's daily activities s) in the different sub-groups, using the SDS
<ul> <li>(work, social life - leisure activities, questionnaire (Sheehan Disability Sc</li> <li>To describe the effects of Valdoxar</li> </ul>	family life - domestic task cale). a treatment on the patient's	of the illness on the patient's daily activities s) in the different sub-groups, using the SDS mood in the different sub-groups, using the
<ul> <li>(work, social life - leisure activities, questionnaire (Sheehan Disability Sc</li> <li>To describe the effects of Valdoxar MAThyS scale (Multidimensional A</li> </ul>	family life - domestic task cale). In treatment on the patient's ssessment of Thymic State	of the illness on the patient's daily activities s) in the different sub-groups, using the SDS mood in the different sub-groups, using the and 2 visual analogue scales (one measuring
<ul> <li>(work, social life - leisure activities, questionnaire (Sheehan Disability Sc</li> <li>To describe the effects of Valdoxar MAThyS scale (Multidimensional A the patient's mood, and the other how</li> </ul>	family life - domestic task cale). In treatment on the patient's assessment of Thymic State v (s)he experiences any side	of the illness on the patient's daily activities s) in the different sub-groups, using the SDS mood in the different sub-groups, using the and 2 visual analogue scales (one measuring effects of the treatment), as a function of the
<ul> <li>(work, social life - leisure activities, questionnaire (Sheehan Disability Sc</li> <li>To describe the effects of Valdoxar MAThyS scale (Multidimensional A the patient's mood, and the other how change in symptoms, assessed using</li> </ul>	family life - domestic task cale). In treatment on the patient's assessment of Thymic State v (s)he experiences any side	of the illness on the patient's daily activities s) in the different sub-groups, using the SDS mood in the different sub-groups, using the and 2 visual analogue scales (one measuring
<ul> <li>(work, social life - leisure activities, questionnaire (Sheehan Disability Sc</li> <li>To describe the effects of Valdoxar MAThyS scale (Multidimensional A the patient's mood, and the other how change in symptoms, assessed using Clinician rating).</li> </ul>	family life - domestic task cale). In treatment on the patient's ssessment of Thymic State w (s)he experiences any side g the QIDS-C scale (Quick	of the illness on the patient's daily activities s) in the different sub-groups, using the SDS mood in the different sub-groups, using the and 2 visual analogue scales (one measuring effects of the treatment), as a function of the Inventory of Depressive Symptomatology -
<ul> <li>(work, social life - leisure activities, questionnaire (Sheehan Disability Sc</li> <li>To describe the effects of Valdoxar MAThyS scale (Multidimensional A the patient's mood, and the other how change in symptoms, assessed using Clinician rating).</li> <li>To investigate the timing and the negative statement of the symptom of</li></ul>	family life - domestic task cale). In treatment on the patient's ssessment of Thymic State w (s)he experiences any side g the QIDS-C scale (Quick	of the illness on the patient's daily activities s) in the different sub-groups, using the SDS mood in the different sub-groups, using the and 2 visual analogue scales (one measuring effects of the treatment), as a function of the
<ul> <li>(work, social life - leisure activities, questionnaire (Sheehan Disability Sc</li> <li>To describe the effects of Valdoxar MAThyS scale (Multidimensional A the patient's mood, and the other how change in symptoms, assessed using Clinician rating).</li> <li>To investigate the timing and the n Impressions - Efficacy Index).</li> </ul>	family life - domestic task cale). In treatment on the patient's ssessment of Thymic State w (s)he experiences any side g the QIDS-C scale (Quick mature of the improvement	of the illness on the patient's daily activities s) in the different sub-groups, using the SDS mood in the different sub-groups, using the and 2 visual analogue scales (one measuring effects of the treatment), as a function of the Inventory of Depressive Symptomatology - obtained, using the CGI-EI (Clinical Global
<ul> <li>(work, social life - leisure activities, questionnaire (Sheehan Disability Sc</li> <li>To describe the effects of Valdoxar MAThyS scale (Multidimensional A the patient's mood, and the other how change in symptoms, assessed using Clinician rating).</li> <li>To investigate the timing and the n Impressions - Efficacy Index).</li> </ul>	family life - domestic task cale). In treatment on the patient's ssessment of Thymic State v (s)he experiences any side g the QIDS-C scale (Quick nature of the improvement number of days of sick lea	of the illness on the patient's daily activities s) in the different sub-groups, using the SDS mood in the different sub-groups, using the and 2 visual analogue scales (one measuring effects of the treatment), as a function of the Inventory of Depressive Symptomatology - obtained, using the CGI-EI (Clinical Global we, number of days of hospitalisation, nature

Name of Company:	Individual Study Table	(For National Authority Use
LES LABORATOIRES SERVIER	Referring to Part of the Dossier	only)
Name of Finished Product:	Volume:	<i>v</i> /
VALDOXAN® (France)		
Name of Active Ingredient:	Page:	
agomelatine (S20098)		
Objectives (cont'd)		
	plerance profile of Valdoxan from the	adverse events reported the change
	ion parameters, the incidence of withdr	
CGI-EI - Efficacy Index.	ion parameters, the merdenee of withdr	awais due to adverse events and the
Methodology:		
National, multicentre, phase-IV, interve	entional study carried out as an open	study with flexible doses (25 or
50 mg/day of Valdoxan).	chilonal study carried out as an open	i study with hexible doses (25 bi
Study carried out in depressed outpati	ents corresponding to the DSM IV-7	<b>FR</b> criteria for a major depressive
episode, who were either untreated o		
antidepressant treatment that was eithe		
group), evaluated during 3 visits:	i insumcientity effective and/or poor	ly tolerated (treatment switch sub-
	Treatment provided: in the treatment-i	initiation sub group Valdovan (one
	ening of visit W0; in the switching-trea	
	reatment and the Investigator's decision	
	0, or after, at most, 3 days on the previou	
	tarting the treatment with Valdoxan, d	
	lay, if there had been no improvement i	
	e beginning of treatment, end of study v	visit during which the main criterior
of the study was evaluated. At the and of which $W(x)$ the notion to which $W(x)$	a in the Increation tends an initian had an	in ad a sure the man autic has a fit from
At the end of visit W6, the patients, wh		
the six weeks of treatment (improvement		), were proposed to take part in an
extension study, if they wished to continu	ue taking the treatment.	
Number of patients:	-1-1-2020	
Planned: 4000 – Selected: 2943 – Incl		
Diagnosis and main criteria for inclusi	on:	
Inclusion criteria		
- Man or woman, at least 18 years of		
- Presenting with a major depressive		
. according to DSM-IV-TR crite		
<ul> <li>single or recurrent episode</li> </ul>		
- 'devoid of melancholia',	so modified by protocol amendment N	No. 1: 'with or without melancholic
characteristics according t		
<ul> <li>with no psychotic character</li> </ul>		
<ul> <li>with no catatonic character</li> </ul>		
<ul> <li>having started at least 2 w</li> </ul>		
	I-Severity score of $\geq 4$ (at least "moder"	rately ill") and a total QIDS-C score
of $\geq 16$ .		
- Requiring treatment with an antidep		
- Patient not taking any antidepress	sant treatment on the day of inclusion	on, i.e. who has not received any
antidepressant treatment for the cu	urrent episode and/or who has stoppe	ed the treatment prescribed for the
previous episode since at least 2 mo	onths before the beginning of the current	nt episode.
Or patient taking antidepressant tr	eatment on the day of inclusion, for t	the current episode or to prevent a
recurrence of a previous episode,	this treatment being either poorly to	lerated, or insufficiently effective
according to the opinion of the Inve	stigator and/or the patient.	-
Non-inclusion criteria		
	e disorder (with no concomitant MDE	
	, mental retardation, a delirious state or	
	drug (other than dependence on tobacco	
	or not at all to at least two antidepressa	
		-
4 weeks at an effective dose for the	current episode.	
	a previous treatment with agomelatine	
- Patients who have not responded to		

	Individual Study Table	(For National Authority Use
LES LABORATOIRES SERVIER Name of Finished Product:	Referring to Part of the Dossier Volume:	only)
Name of Finished Froduct: VALDOXAN® (France)	voiume:	
Name of Active Ingredient:	Page:	
agomelatine (S20098)	l'age.	
Non-inclusion criteria (cont'd)		
	e (congenital galactosemia, lactase	deficiency glucose and lactos
malabsorption syndrome).	e (congential galactosentia, lactase	deficiency, gracose and factor
<ul> <li>Patients with liver failure (cirrhosis</li> </ul>	or active hepatic disease)	
	nhibitor (fluvoxamine: Floxyfral®; cipr	ofloxacin: Ciflox®).
	severe somatic disorder that, in the	
	d could interfere with the patient's follo	
- Refusal to sign the informed conser		1
- Pregnant or lactating woman.		
- Woman of childbearing potential	and not using effective contraception	(oral contraceptives, intra-uterin
devices, contraceptive implant or c	ondoms).	· · · ·
- Patient unlikely to cooperate fully i	n the study and/or to be compliant.	
	in another clinical trial, or who has tak	
	isit or patient who has already been incl	
	lerstanding and completing the self-ration	ng questionnaires him/herself.
Study drug:		
agomelatine 25 mg tablet (Valdoxan): 1		
the dose to 50 mg per day (2 tablets as a	n evening dose), after two weeks of trea	tment if there is no improvement
the symptoms.		
Batch No. R12007 and S02011		
<b>Reference product:</b> <i>not applicable</i>		
<b>Duration of treatment:</b> 6 weeks		
Criteria for evaluation:		
Effectiveness criteria:		
The main criterion was a composite as	sessment of the clinical response after 6	weeks of treatment, established of
the basis of 4 assessment criteria:	-	
- CGI-I (Clinical Global Impression	of Improvement),	
- PGI-I (Patient Global Impression o	f Improvement),	
- LSEQ (Leeds Sleep Evaluation Qu	estionnaire),	
100 mm VAS avaluating the nation	the multiple and an experimental the stored as two.	atmont
- 100 mill VAS evaluating the patient	t's willingness to continue the study trea	aunont.
The clinical response was defined as:	t's willingness to continue the study trea	aunent.
The clinical response was defined as: - A CGI-I score of $\leq 2$ ("obviously in	nproved" or "considerably improved")	
The clinical response was defined as: - A CGI-I score of $\leq 2$ ("obviously in		
The clinical response was defined as: - A CGI-I score of $\leq 2$ ("obviously in - And a PGI-I score of $\leq 2$ ("obvious - And a score of $\leq 40$ mm for the	nproved" or "considerably improved") sly improved" or "considerably improve assessment of sleep quality (items	d") 2.a and 2.b on the LSEQ), scor
<ul> <li>The clinical response was defined as:</li> <li>A CGI-I score of ≤ 2 ("obviously in</li> <li>And a PGI-I score of ≤ 2 ("obviously in a score of ≤ 40 mm for the corresponding to the mean of the score sponding to the score sponding</li></ul>	nproved" or "considerably improved") sly improved" or "considerably improve assessment of sleep quality (items the be 2 individual scores, each of the	d") 2.a and 2.b on the LSEQ), score n being $\leq 40 \text{ mm}$ , expressing a
<ul> <li>The clinical response was defined as:</li> <li>A CGI-I score of ≤ 2 ("obviously in</li> <li>And a PGI-I score of ≤ 2 ("obvious</li> <li>And a score of ≤ 40 mm for the corresponding to the mean of t improvement of at least 10 mm, a t</li> </ul>	nproved" or "considerably improved") sly improved" or "considerably improve assessment of sleep quality (items 2 he 2 individual scores, each of the hreshold considered to be clinically per	d") 2.a and 2.b on the LSEQ), score n being $\leq 40 \text{ mm}$ , expressing a tinent.
<ul> <li>The clinical response was defined as:</li> <li>A CGI-I score of ≤ 2 ("obviously in</li> <li>And a PGI-I score of ≤ 2 ("obvious</li> <li>And a score of ≤ 40 mm for the corresponding to the mean of t improvement of at least 10 mm, a t</li> <li>And an affirmative response to the</li> </ul>	nproved" or "considerably improved") sly improved" or "considerably improve assessment of sleep quality (items 2 he 2 individual scores, each of the hreshold considered to be clinically per e question "If your doctor thinks it is n	d") 2.a and 2.b on the LSEQ), sco n being $\leq 40$ mm, expressing a tinent. ecessary to continue the treatment
<ul> <li>The clinical response was defined as:</li> <li>A CGI-I score of ≤ 2 ("obviously in</li> <li>And a PGI-I score of ≤ 2 ("obvious</li> <li>And a score of ≤ 40 mm for the corresponding to the mean of t improvement of at least 10 mm, a t</li> <li>And an affirmative response to the are you willing to do so", i.e. a score</li> </ul>	nproved" or "considerably improved") sly improved" or "considerably improve assessment of sleep quality (items 2 he 2 individual scores, each of the hreshold considered to be clinically perfect e question "If your doctor thinks it is no re of $\geq$ 50 mm on the corresponding VA	d") 2.a and 2.b on the LSEQ), score n being $\leq 40$ mm, expressing a tinent. ecessary to continue the treatment
<ul> <li>The clinical response was defined as:</li> <li>A CGI-I score of ≤ 2 ("obviously in</li> <li>And a PGI-I score of ≤ 2 ("obvious</li> <li>And a score of ≤ 40 mm for the corresponding to the mean of t improvement of at least 10 mm, a t</li> <li>And an affirmative response to the are you willing to do so", i.e. a score</li> </ul>	nproved" or "considerably improved") sly improved" or "considerably improved" assessment of sleep quality (items 2 he 2 individual scores, each of then hreshold considered to be clinically perfect e question "If your doctor thinks it is no re of $\geq$ 50 mm on the corresponding VA ed on:	d") 2.a and 2.b on the LSEQ), score n being $\leq 40$ mm, expressing a tinent. ecessary to continue the treatment S.
<ul> <li>The clinical response was defined as:</li> <li>A CGI-I score of ≤ 2 ("obviously in</li> <li>And a PGI-I score of ≤ 2 ("obviously in</li> <li>And a score of ≤ 40 mm for the corresponding to the mean of t improvement of at least 10 mm, a t</li> <li>And an affirmative response to the are you willing to do so", i.e. a score The secondary criteria were scores bas</li> <li>The SDS questionnaire (Sheehan I</li> </ul>	nproved" or "considerably improved") sly improved" or "considerably improve assessment of sleep quality (items 2 he 2 individual scores, each of then hreshold considered to be clinically pert e question "If your doctor thinks it is n re of $\geq$ 50 mm on the corresponding VA ed on: Disability Scale), which assesses the im	d") 2.a and 2.b on the LSEQ), score n being $\leq 40$ mm, expressing a tinent. ecessary to continue the treatment S. npact of the illness on the patient
<ul> <li>The clinical response was defined as:</li> <li>A CGI-I score of ≤ 2 ("obviously in</li> <li>And a PGI-I score of ≤ 2 ("obviously in</li> <li>And a score of ≤ 40 mm for the corresponding to the mean of t improvement of at least 10 mm, a t</li> <li>And an affirmative response to the are you willing to do so", i.e. a score the SDS questionnaire (Sheehan I daily activities (work, social life - 1</li> </ul>	nproved" or "considerably improved") sly improved" or "considerably improve assessment of sleep quality (items 2 he 2 individual scores, each of then hreshold considered to be clinically perfe- e question "If your doctor thinks it is n re of $\geq 50$ mm on the corresponding VA ed on: Disability Scale), which assesses the in- eisure activities, family life –domestic t	d") 2.a and 2.b on the LSEQ), score n being $\leq 40$ mm, expressing a tinent. ecessary to continue the treatment S. npact of the illness on the patient asks).
<ul> <li>The clinical response was defined as:</li> <li>A CGI-I score of ≤ 2 ("obviously in</li> <li>And a PGI-I score of ≤ 2 ("obvious</li> <li>And a score of ≤ 40 mm for the corresponding to the mean of the improvement of at least 10 mm, at</li> <li>And an affirmative response to the are you willing to do so", i.e. a score</li> <li>The secondary criteria were scores bas</li> <li>The SDS questionnaire (Sheehan I daily activities (work, social life - 1)</li> <li>The MATHyS scale (Multidimensity)</li> </ul>	nproved" or "considerably improved") sly improved" or "considerably improve assessment of sleep quality (items 2 he 2 individual scores, each of then hreshold considered to be clinically pert e question "If your doctor thinks it is n re of $\geq$ 50 mm on the corresponding VA ed on: Disability Scale), which assesses the im	d") 2.a and 2.b on the LSEQ), score n being $\leq 40$ mm, expressing a tinent. ecessary to continue the treatment S. npact of the illness on the patient asks).
<ul> <li>The clinical response was defined as:</li> <li>A CGI-I score of ≤ 2 ("obviously in</li> <li>And a PGI-I score of ≤ 2 ("obvious</li> <li>And a score of ≤ 40 mm for the corresponding to the mean of the improvement of at least 10 mm, at</li> <li>And an affirmative response to the are you willing to do so", i.e. a score</li> <li>The secondary criteria were scores bas</li> <li>The SDS questionnaire (Sheehan I daily activities (work, social life - 1)</li> <li>The MATHyS scale (Multidimensing patient.</li> </ul>	nproved" or "considerably improved") sly improved" or "considerably improve assessment of sleep quality (items 2 he 2 individual scores, each of the hreshold considered to be clinically perte e question "If your doctor thinks it is n re of $\geq$ 50 mm on the corresponding VA ed on: Disability Scale), which assesses the in eisure activities, family life –domestic t onal Assessment of Thymic State), wh	d") 2.a and 2.b on the LSEQ), scor n being $\leq 40$ mm, expressing a tinent. eccessary to continue the treatmen S. npact of the illness on the patient asks). ich assesses the thymic state of the
<ul> <li>The clinical response was defined as:</li> <li>A CGI-I score of ≤ 2 ("obviously in</li> <li>And a PGI-I score of ≤ 2 ("obviously in a score of ≤ 40 mm for the corresponding to the mean of the improvement of at least 10 mm, at</li> <li>And an affirmative response to the are you willing to do so", i.e. a score The secondary criteria were scores bas</li> <li>The SDS questionnaire (Sheehan I daily activities (work, social life - 1) the MATHyS scale (Multidimensing patient.</li> <li>Two 100 mm VAS, one assessing</li> </ul>	nproved" or "considerably improved") sly improved" or "considerably improve assessment of sleep quality (items 2 he 2 individual scores, each of then hreshold considered to be clinically perfe- e question "If your doctor thinks it is n re of $\geq 50$ mm on the corresponding VA ed on: Disability Scale), which assesses the in- eisure activities, family life –domestic t	d") 2.a and 2.b on the LSEQ), score n being $\leq 40$ mm, expressing a tinent. eccessary to continue the treatment S. npact of the illness on the patient asks). ich assesses the thymic state of the
<ul> <li>The clinical response was defined as:</li> <li>A CGI-I score of ≤ 2 ("obviously in</li> <li>And a PGI-I score of ≤ 2 ("obviously in a score of ≤ 40 mm for the corresponding to the mean of the improvement of at least 10 mm, at the are you willing to do so", i.e. a score The secondary criteria were scores bas</li> <li>The SDS questionnaire (Sheehan I daily activities (work, social life - 1 the MATHyS scale (Multidimensing patient.</li> <li>Two 100 mm VAS, one assessing treatment as rated by the patient.</li> </ul>	nproved" or "considerably improved") sly improved" or "considerably improve assessment of sleep quality (items 2 he 2 individual scores, each of there hreshold considered to be clinically perfect e question "If your doctor thinks it is no e of $\geq$ 50 mm on the corresponding VA ed on: Disability Scale), which assesses the im- eisure activities, family life –domestic to onal Assessment of Thymic State), wh- the patient's mood, and, the other, the	d") 2.a and 2.b on the LSEQ), scor n being $\leq 40$ mm, expressing a tinent. eccessary to continue the treatmen S. npact of the illness on the patient asks). ich assesses the thymic state of the intensity of the side effects of the
<ul> <li>The clinical response was defined as:</li> <li>A CGI-I score of ≤ 2 ("obviously in</li> <li>And a PGI-I score of ≤ 2 ("obviously in</li> <li>And a score of ≤ 40 mm for the corresponding to the mean of the improvement of at least 10 mm, at</li> <li>And an affirmative response to the are you willing to do so", i.e. a score</li> <li>The secondary criteria were scores bas</li> <li>The SDS questionnaire (Sheehan I daily activities (work, social life - 1</li> <li>The MATHyS scale (Multidimensing patient.</li> <li>Two 100 mm VAS, one assessing treatment as rated by the patient.</li> <li>The QIDS-C scale (Quick Inventor)</li> </ul>	nproved" or "considerably improved") sly improved" or "considerably improved" assessment of sleep quality (items 2 he 2 individual scores, each of there hreshold considered to be clinically perfe- e question "If your doctor thinks it is no e of $\geq$ 50 mm on the corresponding VA ed on: Disability Scale), which assesses the in- eisure activities, family life –domestic to onal Assessment of Thymic State), which the patient's mood, and, the other, the ry of Depressive Symptomatology - C	d") 2.a and 2.b on the LSEQ), score n being $\leq 40$ mm, expressing a tinent. ecessary to continue the treatment S. npact of the illness on the patient asks). ich assesses the thymic state of the intensity of the side effects of the linician rating), which assesses the
<ul> <li>The clinical response was defined as:</li> <li>A CGI-I score of ≤ 2 ("obviously in</li> <li>And a PGI-I score of ≤ 2 ("obviously in a score of ≤ 40 mm for the corresponding to the mean of the improvement of at least 10 mm, at</li> <li>And an affirmative response to the are you willing to do so", i.e. a score The secondary criteria were scores bas</li> <li>The SDS questionnaire (Sheehan I daily activities (work, social life - 1)</li> <li>The MATHyS scale (Multidimensing patient.</li> <li>Two 100 mm VAS, one assessing treatment as rated by the patient.</li> <li>The QIDS-C scale (Quick Inventor intensity of the 9 symptoms included)</li> </ul>	nproved" or "considerably improved") sly improved" or "considerably improved" assessment of sleep quality (items 2 he 2 individual scores, each of then hreshold considered to be clinically perte e question "If your doctor thinks it is n to of $\geq$ 50 mm on the corresponding VA ed on: Disability Scale), which assesses the in eisure activities, family life –domestic t onal Assessment of Thymic State), wh the patient's mood, and, the other, the ry of Depressive Symptomatology - C ed in the diagnostic criteria of DSM-IV-	d") 2.a and 2.b on the LSEQ), scor n being $\leq 40$ mm, expressing a tinent. ecessary to continue the treatmen S. npact of the illness on the patient asks). ich assesses the thymic state of th intensity of the side effects of th linician rating), which assesses the TR for an MDE.
<ul> <li>The clinical response was defined as:</li> <li>A CGI-I score of ≤ 2 ("obviously in</li> <li>And a PGI-I score of ≤ 2 ("obviously in a score of ≤ 40 mm for the corresponding to the mean of the improvement of at least 10 mm, at t</li> <li>And an affirmative response to the are you willing to do so", i.e. a score The secondary criteria were scores bas</li> <li>The SDS questionnaire (Sheehan I daily activities (work, social life - 1) the MATHyS scale (Multidimensing patient.</li> <li>Two 100 mm VAS, one assessing treatment as rated by the patient.</li> <li>The QIDS-C scale (Quick Inventor intensity of the 9 symptoms include and assessment)</li> </ul>	nproved" or "considerably improved") sly improved" or "considerably improve assessment of sleep quality (items 2 he 2 individual scores, each of the hreshold considered to be clinically perte e question "If your doctor thinks it is n re of $\geq$ 50 mm on the corresponding VA ed on: Disability Scale), which assesses the in eisure activities, family life –domestic t onal Assessment of Thymic State), wh the patient's mood, and, the other, the ry of Depressive Symptomatology - C ed in the diagnostic criteria of DSM-IV- nt of the therapeutic efficacy and the s	d") 2.a and 2.b on the LSEQ), scor n being $\leq 40$ mm, expressing a tinent. ecessary to continue the treatmen S. npact of the illness on the patient asks). ich assesses the thymic state of th intensity of the side effects of th linician rating), which assesses th TR for an MDE.
<ul> <li>The clinical response was defined as:</li> <li>A CGI-I score of ≤ 2 ("obviously in</li> <li>And a PGI-I score of ≤ 2 ("obviously in a score of ≤ 40 mm for the corresponding to the mean of the improvement of at least 10 mm, at a a affirmative response to the are you willing to do so", i.e. a score The secondary criteria were scores bas</li> <li>The SDS questionnaire (Sheehan I daily activities (work, social life - 1) the MATHyS scale (Multidimensity patient.</li> <li>Two 100 mm VAS, one assessing treatment as rated by the patient.</li> <li>The QIDS-C scale (Quick Inventor intensity of the 9 symptoms include)</li> <li>The CGI-EI, which is an assessme can be used to calculate a benefit/rite</li> </ul>	nproved" or "considerably improved") sly improved" or "considerably improved assessment of sleep quality (items 2 he 2 individual scores, each of there hereshold considered to be clinically perfect equestion "If your doctor thinks it is no e of $\geq$ 50 mm on the corresponding VA ed on: Disability Scale), which assesses the in- eisure activities, family life –domestic to onal Assessment of Thymic State), which the patient's mood, and, the other, the ry of Depressive Symptomatology - C ed in the diagnostic criteria of DSM-IV- nt of the therapeutic efficacy and the sisk ratio.	d") 2.a and 2.b on the LSEQ), scor n being $\leq 40$ mm, expressing a tinent. eccessary to continue the treatment S. npact of the illness on the patient asks). ich assesses the thymic state of the intensity of the side effects of the linician rating), which assesses the TR for an MDE. side effects of the treatment, which
<ul> <li>The clinical response was defined as:</li> <li>A CGI-I score of ≤ 2 ("obviously in</li> <li>And a PGI-I score of ≤ 2 ("obviously in a score of ≤ 40 mm for the corresponding to the mean of the improvement of at least 10 mm, at a a affirmative response to the are you willing to do so", i.e. a score The secondary criteria were scores bas</li> <li>The SDS questionnaire (Sheehan I daily activities (work, social life - 1) the MATHyS scale (Multidimensity patient.</li> <li>Two 100 mm VAS, one assessing treatment as rated by the patient.</li> <li>The QIDS-C scale (Quick Inventor intensity of the 9 symptoms include)</li> <li>The CGI-EI, which is an assessme can be used to calculate a benefit/rite</li> </ul>	nproved" or "considerably improved") sly improved" or "considerably improve assessment of sleep quality (items 2 he 2 individual scores, each of the hreshold considered to be clinically perte e question "If your doctor thinks it is n re of $\geq$ 50 mm on the corresponding VA ed on: Disability Scale), which assesses the in eisure activities, family life –domestic t onal Assessment of Thymic State), wh the patient's mood, and, the other, the ry of Depressive Symptomatology - C ed in the diagnostic criteria of DSM-IV- nt of the therapeutic efficacy and the s	d") 2.a and 2.b on the LSEQ), scor n being $\leq 40$ mm, expressing a tinent. eccessary to continue the treatment S. npact of the illness on the patient asks). ich assesses the thymic state of th intensity of the side effects of th linician rating), which assesses the TR for an MDE. side effects of the treatment, which
<ul> <li>The clinical response was defined as:</li> <li>A CGI-I score of ≤ 2 ("obviously in</li> <li>And a PGI-I score of ≤ 2 ("obviously in a score of ≤ 40 mm for the corresponding to the mean of the improvement of at least 10 mm, at a a affirmative response to the are you willing to do so", i.e. a score The secondary criteria were scores bas</li> <li>The SDS questionnaire (Sheehan I daily activities (work, social life - 1) the MATHyS scale (Multidimensity patient.</li> <li>Two 100 mm VAS, one assessing treatment as rated by the patient.</li> <li>The QIDS-C scale (Quick Inventor intensity of the 9 symptoms include)</li> <li>The CGI-EI, which is an assessme can be used to calculate a benefit/rite</li> </ul>	nproved" or "considerably improved") sly improved" or "considerably improved assessment of sleep quality (items 2 he 2 individual scores, each of there hreshold considered to be clinically perfect e question "If your doctor thinks it is in re of $\geq$ 50 mm on the corresponding VA ed on: Disability Scale), which assesses the in- eisure activities, family life –domestic to onal Assessment of Thymic State), which the patient's mood, and, the other, the ry of Depressive Symptomatology - C ed in the diagnostic criteria of DSM-IV- ent of the therapeutic efficacy and the sisk ratio. f days of sick leave, number of days of	d") 2.a and 2.b on the LSEQ), scor n being $\leq 40$ mm, expressing a tinent. eccessary to continue the treatmen S. npact of the illness on the patient asks). ich assesses the thymic state of th intensity of the side effects of th linician rating), which assesses the TR for an MDE. side effects of the treatment, which

Name of Company:	Individual Study Table	(For National Authority Use
LES LABORATOIRES SERVIER	<b>Referring to Part of the Dossier</b>	only)
Name of Finished Product:	Volume:	
VALDOXAN® (France)		
Name of Active Ingredient:	Page:	
agomelatine (S20098)		

#### Criteria for evaluation (cont'd)

#### Safety criteria:

The safety criteria were the adverse events reported, the change in vital signs and liver function parameters, the incidence of unscheduled discontinuation due to the adverse events, and the CGI-EI.

#### Statistical methods:

Analyses were descriptive on the period W0-W6. The two-sided 95% confidence interval of the response rate at W6 and for last value was provided for response criteria.

Efficacy criteria were analysed in the Full Analysis set (all included patients having taken at least one dose of study treatment, and with at least one efficacy criterion available after inclusion visit ) and in 3 subgroups of therapeutic situation ("Treatment initiation": patients who were not receiving any antidepressant treatment during the two months preceding the first study drug intake, "Treatment change": patients who stopped their previous antidepressant treatment between 3 days before and 3 days after the first study drug intake date, "Wash-out": patients who received an antidepressant treatment during the two months preceding the first study drug intake) and, among the subgroup Treatment Change, in 5 subgroups of previous antidepressant class (SSRI, SNRI, imipraminic, mirtazapin/mianserin, other).

Primary efficacy criteria were also analysed as a function of different factors (the intensity of the depression at inclusion based on the CGI-S, the intensity of sleep disorders at inclusion based on the QIDS-C sleep items, the Body Mass Index at inclusion, the number of previous major depressive episodes, the extent of the impact of the disorder on daily activities at inclusion visit based on the SDS, the reason for stopping the previous antidepressant treatment).

# SUMMARY - CONCLUSIONS

#### STUDY POPULATION AND OUTCOME

Disposition of patients		
Selected	2943	
Included	2938	
Withdrawn	770 *	
due to adverse event	432	
due to consent withdrawal	176	
due to lost to follow up	88	
due to investigator's decision	66	
due to unknown reason	8 *	
Completed	2168	
Safety Set	2852	
Full Analysis Set (FAS)	2780	

(\*) Including 6 patients with unknown status at the end of the study

Demographic characteristics			Included Set $(N = 2938)$
Age (years)		N	2932
		Mean $\pm$ Std dev	$46.9 \pm 12.5$
		Median (Min ; Max)	47.0 (17; 90)
	< 25 years	n (%)	120 ( 4.1 %)
	[ 25 ; 45 [ years	n (%)	1122 ( 38.3 %)
	[ 45 ; 60 [ years	n (%)	1241 ( 42.3 %)
	[ 60 ; 75 [ years	n (%)	408 ( 13.9 %)
	$\geq$ 75 years	n (%)	41 ( 1.4 %)
Gender		Ν	2937
	Female	n (%)	1966 ( 66.9 %)
Smoking habit		N	2937
	Smoker	n (%)	934 ( 31.8 %)
Has sto	pped smoking	n (%)	229 (7.8%)
Alcohol habit	a.n	N	2937
	Yes	n (%)	412 ( 14.0 %)
	Has stopped	n (%)	124 ( 4.2 %)

Name of Company:	Individual Study Table	(For National Authority Use	
LES LABORATOIRES SERVIER	<b>Referring to Part of the Dossier</b>	only)	
Name of Finished Product:	Volume:		
VALDOXAN® (France)			
Name of Active Ingredient:	Page:		
gomelatine (S20098)			
SUMMARY - CONCLUSIONS			
<b>STUDY POPULATION AND OUTCOME (CON</b>	T'D)		
Main baseline characteristics		<b>Included Set</b> (N = 2938)	
History of previous MDE	N	2935	
	n (%)	2075 ( 70.7 %)	
Time since the first MDE (years)	N	2905	
0)	Mean $\pm$ Std dev	$9.36 \pm 10.50$	
	Median (Min ; Max)	5.69 (0.0; 62.2)	
Number of previous MDE	N	2793	
*	Mean $\pm$ Std dev	$2.0 \pm 2.8$	
	Median (Min ; Max)	1.0 (0 ; 32)	
Family history of psychiatric disorders	n (%)	1175 ( 40.0 %)	
Current episode duration (months)	Ν	2927	
	Mean $\pm$ Std dev	8.90 ± 16.52	
	Median (Min ; Max)	3.94 (0.0 ; 241.1)	
Sick leave due to the current episode	N	2931	
	n (%)	936 ( 31.9 %)	
Hospitalization due to the current episode	N	2936	
	n (%)	228 ( 7.8 %)	
Psychotropic therapy <sup>(1)</sup> ongoing at inclusion	n (%)	2011 ( 68.4 %)	
		1100 ( 10 5 0()	
	n (%)	1190 ( 40.5 %)	
Other concomitant treatments ongoing at inclus	sion <sup>(2)</sup> n (%)	1589 ( 54.1 %)	
Other concomitant treatments ongoing at inclus <i>Drugs other than antidepressants or psych</i>	sion <sup>(2)</sup> n(%) notherapy (psychotherapy: 33.6 % of the IS pa	1589 ( 54.1 %)	
Other concomitant treatments ongoing at inclus           1)         Drugs other than antidepressants or psych           2)         Concomitant treatments other than psycho	sion <sup>(2)</sup> n (%) hotherapy (psychotherapy: 33.6 % of the IS pa htropic treatments ongoing at inclusion	1589 ( 54.1 %) tients).	
2) Concomitant treatments other than psycho Baseline values for CGI-S, SDS and MAThy	sion <sup>(2)</sup> n(%) notherapy (psychotherapy: 33.6 % of the IS pa thropic treatments ongoing at inclusion S	1589 ( 54.1 %) tients). Included Set(N = 2938)	
Other concomitant treatments ongoing at inclus           1)         Drugs other than antidepressants or psych           2)         Concomitant treatments other than psycho	sion <sup>(2)</sup> n(%) notherapy (psychotherapy: 33.6 % of the IS pa thropic treatments ongoing at inclusion S N	<u>1589 (54.1 %)</u> tients). Included Set(N = 2938) 2936	
Other concomitant treatments ongoing at inclus           1)         Drugs other than antidepressants or psych           2)         Concomitant treatments other than psycho           Baseline values for CGI-S, SDS and MAThy	$\frac{(2)  n(\%)}{n(\%)}$ $\frac{(3)}{n(\%)}$	$\frac{1589 (54.1 \%)}{\text{tients}}$ <b>Included Set</b> (N = 2938) 2936 4.9 ± 0.6	
Other concomitant treatments ongoing at inclus 1) Drugs other than antidepressants or psych 2) Concomitant treatments other than psycho Baseline values for CGI-S, SDS and MAThy	$\frac{(2)  n(\%)}{n(\%)}$ $\frac{(2)  n(\%)}{notherapy} (psychotherapy: 33.6 \% of the IS participation of the$	$\frac{1589(54.1\%)}{\text{tients}}$ <b>Included Set</b> (N = 2938) 2936 4.9 ± 0.6 5.0	
Other concomitant treatments ongoing at inclus 1) Drugs other than antidepressants or psych 2) Concomitant treatments other than psycho Baseline values for CGI-S, SDS and MAThy CGI-Severity of illness score <sup>(1)</sup>	$\frac{(2)  n(\%)}{n(\%)}$ $\frac{(3)}{n(\%)}$	$\frac{1589(54.1\%)}{\text{tients}}$ $\frac{\text{Included Set}(N = 2938)}{2936}$ $4.9 \pm 0.6$ $5.0$ $3; 7$	
Other concomitant treatments ongoing at inclus 1) Drugs other than antidepressants or psych 2) Concomitant treatments other than psycho Baseline values for CGI-S, SDS and MAThy CGI-Severity of illness score <sup>(1)</sup>	sion <sup>(2)</sup> n (%) notherapy (psychotherapy: 33.6 % of the IS pa thropic treatments ongoing at inclusion S N Mean ± Std dev Median Min ; Max N	1589 (54.1 %) tients). Included Set(N = 2938) 2936 4.9 ± 0.6 5.0 3;7 1859	
Other concomitant treatments ongoing at inclus Drugs other than antidepressants or psych Concomitant treatments other than psycho Baseline values for CGI-S, SDS and MAThy CGI-Severity of illness score <sup>(1)</sup>	$\frac{(2)  n(\%)}{n(\%)}$ $\frac{(3)  n(\%)}{notherapy} (psychotherapy: 33.6\% of the IS participation of the $	1589 (54.1 %) tients). Included Set(N = 2938) 2936 4.9 ± 0.6 5.0 3;7 1859 6.9 ± 2.5	
Other concomitant treatments ongoing at inclus Drugs other than antidepressants or psych Concomitant treatments other than psycho Baseline values for CGI-S, SDS and MAThy CGI-Severity of illness score <sup>(1)</sup>	sion <sup>(2)</sup> n (%) notherapy (psychotherapy: 33.6 % of the IS pa thropic treatments ongoing at inclusion S N Mean ± Std dev Median Min ; Max N Mean ± Std dev	1589 (54.1 %) tients). Included Set(N = 2938) 2936 4.9 ± 0.6 5.0 3;7 1859 6.9 ± 2.5 7.0	
Other concomitant treatments ongoing at inclus 1) Drugs other than antidepressants or psych 2) Concomitant treatments other than psycho Baseline values for CGI-S, SDS and MAThy CGI-Severity of illness score <sup>(1)</sup> SDS Work/studies <sup>(2)</sup>	sion <sup>(2)</sup> n (%) notherapy (psychotherapy: 33.6 % of the IS pa thropic treatments ongoing at inclusion S N Mean ± Std dev Median Min ; Max N Mean ± Std dev Median	1589 (54.1 %) tients). Included Set(N = 2938) 2936 4.9 ± 0.6 5.0 3;7 1859 6.9 ± 2.5 7.0 0;10	
Other concomitant treatments ongoing at inclus 1) Drugs other than antidepressants or psych 2) Concomitant treatments other than psycho Baseline values for CGI-S, SDS and MAThy CGI-Severity of illness score <sup>(1)</sup> SDS Work/studies <sup>(2)</sup>	sion <sup>(2)</sup> n (%) notherapy (psychotherapy: 33.6 % of the IS pa thropic treatments ongoing at inclusion S N Mean ± Std dev Median Min ; Max N Mean ± Std dev Median	1589 (54.1 %) tients). Included Set(N = 2938) 2936 4.9 ± 0.6 5.0 3;7 1859 6.9 ± 2.5 7.0 0;10 2793	
Other concomitant treatments ongoing at inclus 1) Drugs other than antidepressants or psych 2) Concomitant treatments other than psycho Baseline values for CGI-S, SDS and MAThy CGI-Severity of illness score <sup>(1)</sup> SDS Work/studies <sup>(2)</sup>	sion <sup>(2)</sup> n (%) notherapy (psychotherapy: 33.6 % of the IS pa stropic treatments ongoing at inclusion (S N Mean ± Std dev Median Min ; Max N Mean ± Std dev Median Min ; Max N	1589 (54.1 %) tients). Included Set(N = 2938) 2936 4.9 ± 0.6 5.0 3;7 1859 6.9 ± 2.5 7.0 0;10	
Other concomitant treatments ongoing at inclus         1)       Drugs other than antidepressants or psych         2)       Concomitant treatments other than psycho         Baseline values for CGI-S, SDS and MAThy         CGI-Severity of illness score (1)         SDS Work/studies (2)	sion <sup>(2)</sup> n (%) notherapy (psychotherapy: 33.6 % of the IS pa stropic treatments ongoing at inclusion (S N Mean ± Std dev Median Min ; Max N Mean ± Std dev Median Min ; Max N Mean ± Std dev Median	1589 (54.1 %) tients). Included Set(N = 2938) 2936 4.9 ± 0.6 5.0 3;7 1859 6.9 ± 2.5 7.0 0;10 2793 7.3 ± 2.1	
Other concomitant treatments ongoing at inclus         1)       Drugs other than antidepressants or psych         2)       Concomitant treatments other than psycho         Baseline values for CGI-S, SDS and MAThy         CGI-Severity of illness score <sup>(1)</sup> SDS Work/studies <sup>(2)</sup>	sion <sup>(2)</sup> n (%) notherapy (psychotherapy: 33.6 % of the IS pa stropic treatments ongoing at inclusion (S N Mean ± Std dev Median Min ; Max N Mean ± Std dev Median Min ; Max N Mean ± Std dev	1589 (54.1 %) tients). $1589 (54.1 %)$ 1589 (54.1 %) 100 2936 4.9 ± 0.6 5.0 3;7 1859 6.9 ± 2.5 7.0 0;10 2793 7.3 ± 2.1 8.0	
Other concomitant treatments ongoing at inclus 1) Drugs other than antidepressants or psych 2) Concomitant treatments other than psycho Baseline values for CGI-S, SDS and MAThy CGI-Severity of illness score <sup>(1)</sup> SDS Work/studies <sup>(2)</sup> SDS Social life <sup>(2)</sup>	sion <sup>(2)</sup> n (%) notherapy (psychotherapy: 33.6 % of the IS pa stropic treatments ongoing at inclusion (S N Mean ± Std dev Median Min ; Max N Mean ± Std dev Median Min ; Max N Mean ± Std dev Median	$1589 (54.1 \%)$ tients). $1589 (54.1 \%)$ $2936$ $4.9 \pm 0.6$ $5.0$ $3; 7$ $1859$ $6.9 \pm 2.5$ $7.0$ $0; 10$ $2793$ $7.3 \pm 2.1$ $8.0$ $0; 10$	
Other concomitant treatments ongoing at inclus 1) Drugs other than antidepressants or psych 2) Concomitant treatments other than psycho Baseline values for CGI-S, SDS and MAThy CGI-Severity of illness score <sup>(1)</sup> SDS Work/studies <sup>(2)</sup> SDS Social life <sup>(2)</sup>	sion <sup>(2)</sup> n (%) notherapy (psychotherapy: 33.6 % of the IS pa stropic treatments ongoing at inclusion (S N Mean ± Std dev Median Min ; Max N Mean ± Std dev Median Min ; Max N Mean ± Std dev Median Min ; Max N Mean ± Std dev Median Min ; Max	$1589 (54.1 \%)$ tients). $1589 (54.1 \%)$ tients). $2936$ $4.9 \pm 0.6$ $5.0$ $3;7$ $1859$ $6.9 \pm 2.5$ $7.0$ $0;10$ $2793$ $7.3 \pm 2.1$ $8.0$ $0;10$ $2792$	
Other concomitant treatments ongoing at inclus         1)       Drugs other than antidepressants or psych         2)       Concomitant treatments other than psycho         Baseline values for CGI-S, SDS and MAThy         CGI-Severity of illness score <sup>(1)</sup> SDS Work/studies <sup>(2)</sup> SDS Social life <sup>(2)</sup> SDS Family life and Home responsibilities <sup>(2)</sup>	sion <sup>(2)</sup> n (%) notherapy (psychotherapy: 33.6 % of the IS pa stropic treatments ongoing at inclusion (S N Mean ± Std dev Median Min ; Max N Mean ± Std dev Median Min ; Max N Mean ± Std dev Median Min ; Max N Mean ± Std dev Median Min ; Max	$1589 (54.1 \%)$ tients). $1589 (54.1 \%)$ tients). $2936$ $4.9 \pm 0.6$ $5.0$ $3;7$ $1859$ $6.9 \pm 2.5$ $7.0$ $0;10$ $2793$ $7.3 \pm 2.1$ $8.0$ $0;10$ $2792$ $7.1 \pm 2.2$ $7.0$ $0;10$	
Other concomitant treatments ongoing at inclus         1)       Drugs other than antidepressants or psych         2)       Concomitant treatments other than psycho         Baseline values for CGI-S, SDS and MAThy         CGI-Severity of illness score <sup>(1)</sup> SDS Work/studies <sup>(2)</sup> SDS Social life <sup>(2)</sup> SDS Family life and Home responsibilities <sup>(2)</sup>	sion <sup>(2)</sup> n (%) notherapy (psychotherapy: 33.6 % of the IS pa stropic treatments ongoing at inclusion (S N Mean ± Std dev Median Min ; Max N Mean ± Std dev Median Min ; Max N Mean ± Std dev Median Min ; Max N Mean ± Std dev Median Min ; Max N N Mean ± Std dev Median Min ; Max N N Mean ± Std dev Median Min ; Max N	$1589 (54.1 \%)$ tients). $1589 (54.1 \%)$ tients). $2936$ $4.9 \pm 0.6$ $5.0$ $3;7$ $1859$ $6.9 \pm 2.5$ $7.0$ $0;10$ $2793$ $7.3 \pm 2.1$ $8.0$ $0;10$ $2792$ $7.1 \pm 2.2$ $7.0$ $0;10$ $2792$ $7.1 \pm 2.2$ $7.0$ $0;10$ $2511$	
Other concomitant treatments ongoing at inclus           1)         Drugs other than antidepressants or psych           2)         Concomitant treatments other than psycho           Baseline values for CGI-S, SDS and MAThy	sion <sup>(2)</sup> n (%) notherapy (psychotherapy: 33.6 % of the IS pa stropic treatments ongoing at inclusion (S N Mean ± Std dev Median Min ; Max N Mean ± Std dev Median Min ; Max	$1589 (54.1 \%)$ tients). $1589 (54.1 \%)$ tients). $2936$ $4.9 \pm 0.6$ $5.0$ $3;7$ $1859$ $6.9 \pm 2.5$ $7.0$ $0;10$ $2793$ $7.3 \pm 2.1$ $8.0$ $0;10$ $2792$ $7.1 \pm 2.2$ $7.0$ $0;10$ $2792$ $7.1 \pm 2.2$ $7.0$ $0;10$ $2511$ $81.62 \pm 22.36$	
Other concomitant treatments ongoing at inclus         1)       Drugs other than antidepressants or psych         2)       Concomitant treatments other than psycho         Baseline values for CGI-S, SDS and MAThy         CGI-Severity of illness score <sup>(1)</sup> SDS Work/studies <sup>(2)</sup> SDS Social life <sup>(2)</sup> SDS Family life and Home responsibilities <sup>(2)</sup>	$\frac{1}{100} \frac{1}{100} \frac{1}$	$1589 (54.1 \%)$ tients). $1589 (54.1 \%)$ tients). $2936$ $4.9 \pm 0.6$ $5.0$ $3;7$ $1859$ $6.9 \pm 2.5$ $7.0$ $0;10$ $2793$ $7.3 \pm 2.1$ $8.0$ $0;10$ $2792$ $7.1 \pm 2.2$ $7.0$ $0;10$ $2792$ $7.1 \pm 2.2$ $7.0$ $0;10$ $2511$ $81.62 \pm 22.36$ $82.60$	
Other concomitant treatments ongoing at inclus         1)       Drugs other than antidepressants or psych         2)       Concomitant treatments other than psycho         Baseline values for CGI-S, SDS and MAThy         CGI-Severity of illness score (1)         SDS Work/studies (2)         SDS Social life (2)         SDS Family life and Home responsibilities (2)         MAThyS Dimension total score (3)	sion <sup>(2)</sup> n (%) notherapy (psychotherapy: 33.6 % of the IS pa obtropic treatments ongoing at inclusion <b>'S</b> N Mean ± Std dev Median Min ; Max N Mean ± Std dev Median Min ; Max	$1589 (54.1 \%)$ tients). $1589 (54.1 \%)$ tients). $1589 (54.1 \%)$ $2936$ $4.9 \pm 0.6$ $5.0$ $3; 7$ $1859$ $6.9 \pm 2.5$ $7.0$ $0; 10$ $2793$ $7.3 \pm 2.1$ $8.0$ $0; 10$ $2792$ $7.1 \pm 2.2$ $7.0$ $0; 10$ $2792$ $7.1 \pm 2.2$ $7.0$ $0; 10$ $2511$ $81.62 \pm 22.36$ $82.60$ $7.1; 170.3$	
Other concomitant treatments ongoing at inclus 1) Drugs other than antidepressants or psych 2) Concomitant treatments other than psycho Baseline values for CGI-S, SDS and MAThy CGI-Severity of illness score <sup>(1)</sup> SDS Work/studies <sup>(2)</sup> SDS Social life <sup>(2)</sup> SDS Family life and Home responsibilities <sup>(2)</sup> MAThyS Dimension total score <sup>(3)</sup>	sion <sup>(2)</sup> n (%) notherapy (psychotherapy: 33.6 % of the IS pa stropic treatments ongoing at inclusion (S N Mean ± Std dev Median Min ; Max N Mean ± Std dev Median Min ; Max N	$1589 (54.1 \%)$ tients). $1589 (54.1 \%)$ tients). $2936$ $4.9 \pm 0.6$ $5.0$ $3;7$ $1859$ $6.9 \pm 2.5$ $7.0$ $0;10$ $2793$ $7.3 \pm 2.1$ $8.0$ $0;10$ $2792$ $7.1 \pm 2.2$ $7.0$ $0;10$ $2792$ $7.1 \pm 2.2$ $7.0$ $0;10$ $2511$ $81.62 \pm 22.36$ $82.60$ $7.1;170.3$ $2743$	
Other concomitant treatments ongoing at inclus         1)       Drugs other than antidepressants or psych         2)       Concomitant treatments other than psycho         Baseline values for CGI-S, SDS and MAThy         CGI-Severity of illness score (1)         SDS Work/studies (2)         SDS Social life (2)         SDS Family life and Home responsibilities (2)         MAThyS Dimension total score (3)	sion <sup>(2)</sup> n (%) notherapy (psychotherapy: 33.6 % of the IS pa stropic treatments ongoing at inclusion (S N Mean ± Std dev Median Min ; Max N Mean ± Std dev Median Min ; Max	$1589 (54.1 \%)$ tients). $1589 (54.1 \%)$ tients). $2936$ $4.9 \pm 0.6$ $5.0$ $3; 7$ $1859$ $6.9 \pm 2.5$ $7.0$ $0; 10$ $2793$ $7.3 \pm 2.1$ $8.0$ $0; 10$ $2792$ $7.1 \pm 2.2$ $7.0$ $0; 10$ $2792$ $7.1 \pm 2.2$ $7.0$ $0; 10$ $2511$ $81.62 \pm 22.36$ $82.60$ $7.1; 170.3$ $2743$ $12.2 \pm 3.7$	
Other concomitant treatments ongoing at inclus         1)       Drugs other than antidepressants or psych         2)       Concomitant treatments other than psycho         Baseline values for CGI-S, SDS and MAThy         CGI-Severity of illness score <sup>(1)</sup> SDS Work/studies <sup>(2)</sup> SDS Social life <sup>(2)</sup> SDS Family life and Home responsibilities <sup>(2)</sup>	sion <sup>(2)</sup> n (%) notherapy (psychotherapy: 33.6 % of the IS pa stropic treatments ongoing at inclusion (S N Mean ± Std dev Median Min ; Max N Mean ± Std dev Median Min ; Max N	$1589 (54.1 \%)$ tients). $1589 (54.1 \%)$ tients). $2936$ $4.9 \pm 0.6$ $5.0$ $3;7$ $1859$ $6.9 \pm 2.5$ $7.0$ $0;10$ $2793$ $7.3 \pm 2.1$ $8.0$ $0;10$ $2792$ $7.1 \pm 2.2$ $7.0$ $0;10$ $2792$ $7.1 \pm 2.2$ $7.0$ $0;10$ $2511$ $81.62 \pm 22.36$ $82.60$ $7.1;170.3$ $2743$	

CGI Severity score is from 1 (normal) through to 7 (extremely ill).
 SDS score varies from 0 (no disruption) to 10 (extreme disruption).

(3) The first part of the MAThyS scale comprises 20 visual analogical items related to scores from 0 (inhibition) to 10 (excitement). 5 subscores are calculated by adding the scores related to the measured dimension: Emotional reactivity (from 0 to 40), Thought processes (from 0 to 40), Psychomotor function (from 0 to 30), Motivation (from 0 to 40), Sensory perception (from 0 to 50). The dimension total score (from 0 to 200) is calculated as the sum of the 5 sub-scores.

(4) The second part of the MAThyS scale estimates 7 emotions (Sadness, Joy, Irritability, Panic, Anxiety, Anger, Exaltation). The emotion total score (from 0 to 28) is calculated as the sum of the 7 emotions coded from 0 (Never) to 4 (Constantly).

Name of Company: In	ndividual Study	y Table	(For National Authority Use
LES LABORATOIRES SERVIER R	eferring to Pai	t of the Dossier	only)
Name of Finished Product: V	olume:		
VALDOXAN® (France)			
Name of Active Ingredient:Parametersagomelatine (S20098)	age:		
SUMMARY - CONCLUSIONS			
STUDY POPULATION AND OUTCOME (CONT'D)	)		
Baseline values for VAS of patient's mood and (	QIDS-C		<b>Included Set</b> ( $N = 2938$ )
Patient's mood score (mm) <sup>(5)</sup>	-	Ν	2709
		Mean $\pm$ Std dev	$21.3 \pm 17.5$
		Median	17.0
		Min ; Max	0;100
QIDS-C Total score <sup>(6)</sup>		Ν	2932
		Mean $\pm$ Std dev	$18.8 \pm 2.4$
		Median	19.0
		Min ; Max	4;27
Intensity of the depression according to QIDS-C	total score	N	2932
	score 0 to 5)	n (%)	1 ( 0.0 %)
Mild (sc	ore 6 to 10)	n (%)	3 ( 0.1 %)
Moderate (sco	re 11 to 15)	n (%)	45 ( 1.5 %)
	ore 16 to 20)	n (%)	2187 (74.6 %)
Very severe (sco	,	n (%)	696 (23.7 %)

(5) The VAS evaluates the answer to the question 'How is your mood today?'. It varies from 0 (Low mood) to 100 mm (Good mood).
(6) The QIDS-C comprises 16 questions to rate the 9 symptoms included in the diagnostic criteria for an MDE in DSM-IV-TR. Each of the 16 items is rated from 0 (symptom absent) to 3 (maximum intensity/frequency). The total score is obtained by adding the highest score for the 4 items exploring sleep, the highest score for the 4 items exploring weight and appetite, the highest score for the 2 items exploring psychomotor agitation and the scores for the other 6 items (Mood, Concentration / Decision Making, Self image, Suicidal Ideation, Involvement in activities, Energy/fatigability). It varies from 0 to 27.

Overall, no clinically significant difference was observed between the Included Set and the FAS for main baseline characteristics and baseline values of efficacy criteria.

#### Study treatment

The treatment duration, known for 2801 patients in the Included Set and for 2772 patients in the Safety Set, was similar in both populations:  $37.0 \pm 13.1$  days (median: 42 days) in the IS and  $37.4 \pm 12.6$  days (median: 42 days) in the SS. The treatment compliance was excellent and similar in the Included Set and Safety Set. Only 4.6 % of the 2753 patients with available observance in the Included Set and 3.6 % of the 2852 patients with available observance in the total dose they should have taken.

At the end of the study, 63.9% of the patients in the Included Set and 64.8% in the Safety Set continued agomelatine (i.e. inclusion in D-Extension study or prescription of the commercial form when available). Agomelatine was replaced by another antidepressant for 22.5% of the patients in the Included Set and 22.4% in the Safety Set, and the stop of any antidepressant was decided for 13.5% of the patients in the Included Set and 12.8% in the Safety Set.

linical response (compos	site evaluation)	Full Analysis Set (N = 2780)
W6	Ν	2265
	n ( %)	634 ( 28.0 %)
Statistical analysis	Clinical response rate	28.0
	95% CI *	[26.1; 29.8] %
Last value	Ν	2726
	n ( %)	665 ( 24.4 %)
Statistical analysis	Clinical response rate	24.4
	95% CI *	[22.8; 26.0] %

Name of Compa	iny:	Individ	ual Study Tab	le (.	For National Au	thority Use
	OIRES SERVIER		ng to Part of tl		only)	2
Name of Finishe		Volume	e:			
VALDOXAN® (	France)					
Name of Active	Ingredient:	Page:				
agomelatine (S2	0098)					
SUMMARY - C	ONCLUSIONS					
EFFICACY RESU						
Primary efficacy	y criterion in the FAS	S subgroups	of therapeutic	situations		
			FAS subgroup	FAS sul	bgroup FA	AS subgroup
			reatment initiati			Wash out
· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	ponse (composite evalua	ation)	(N = 1123)	(N = 1		(N = 252)
W6	N		931	110		194
	n ( %)		307 ( 33.0 %)	270 ( 2-	,	51 ( 26.3 %)
Statistical analysi	•	se rate	33.0	24		26.3
	95% CI *		[30.0; 36.0] %	[21.9; 2		0.1; 32.5] %
Last value	Ν		1094	134		244
	N ( %)		321 ( 29.3 %)	284 ( 2		64 ( 22.1 %)
Statistical analysi		se rate	29.3	21		22.1
	95% CI *		[26.6; 32.0] %	[18.9; 2	3.3] % [1	6.9; 27.3] %
· ·	e interval of the rate of clinic	1	•			
Primary efficacy	v criterion in FAS sub	group "Trea	tment Change'	' according to	previous antide	pressant classe
					FAS subgroup	
			p FAS subgroup			
	(	SNRI	SSRI	antidepressant		antidepressant
	(composite evaluation)		(N = 646)	(N = 93)	(N = 130)	(N = 169)
W6	N	304	540	71	105	143
	n (%)		123 ( 22.8 %)	· · · ·	25 ( 23.8 %)	44 ( 30.8 %)
Statistical analysi	s Clinical response rate	27.0	22.8	12.7	23.8	30.8
	95% CI *				[15.7; 32.0] %	
Last value	N	392	636	93	129	167
	n ( %)		131 ( 20.6 %)	· /	28 ( 21.7 %)	44 ( 26.3 %)
Statistical analysi	s Clinical response rate	21.7	20.6	9.7	21.7	26.3
	95% CI *	[17.6; 25.8] %	6 [17.5; 23.7] %	[3.7; 15.7] %	[14.6; 28.8] %	[19.7; 33.0] %

(\*) 95% confidence interval of the rate of clinical response (asymptotic method)

Secondary analyses showed no impact of the majority of the studied factors on the clinical response rate at W2, W6 and last evaluation. An impact has been observed for only two factors: the rate of clinical response at W6 and last evaluation was higher in the obese patients in the FAS overall and in the subgroup "Treatment change", and higher in the patients with no previous MDE in the subgroup "Treatment initiation"

### Secondary efficacy criteria

#### - Clinical response according each of the four criteria defining main criterion

CGI-I response (Score <= 2)		Full Analysis Set (N = 2780)
W6	N	2412
	n (%)	1424 ( 59.0 %)
Statistical analysis	Rate of response - 95% CI *	59.0 % [57.1; 61.0]
Last value	Ν	2773
	n (%)	1468 ( 52.9 %)
Statistical analysis	Rate of response - 95% CI *	52.9 % [51.1; 54.8]
*) 95% confidence interval of the	he rate of clinical response (asymptotic method)	
PGI-I re	sponse (Score <= 2)	Full Analysis Set (N = 2780)
W6	N	2107
	n (%)	1197 ( 56.8 %)
Statistical analysis	Rate of response - 95% CI *	56.8 % [54.7; 58.9]
Last value	N	2496
	n (%)	1289 ( 51.6 %)
Statistical analysis	Rate of response - 95% CI *	51.6 % [49.7; 53.6]
*) 95% confidence interval of th	he rate of clinical response (asymptotic method)	

Individual Study Table	(For National Authority Use
<b>CRVIER</b> Referring to Part of the D	ossier only)
t: Volume:	
t: Page:	
IONS	
'D)	
	criterion (cont'd)
	Full Analysis Set $(N = 2780)$ 2005
	2095
	1049 ( 50.1 %)
*	50.1 % [47.9; 52.2]
Ν	2495
n (%)	1170 ( 46.9 %)
Rate of response - 95% CI *	46.9 % [44.9; 48.9]
he rate of clinical response (asymptotic method)	
Patient's willingness to continue the study treatment (VAS >=50)	
Ν	2137
n (%)	1688 ( 79.0 %)
Rate of response - 95% CI *	79.0 % [77.3; 80.7]
N	2546
N n (%)	
	RVIER       Referring to Part of the D         ::       Volume:         t:       Page:         IONS       Po)         ing each of the four criteria defining main         sponse (items 2.a and 2.b $\leq$ 40mm)         N         n (%)         Rate of response - 95% CI *         N         n (%)         Rate of response - 95% CI *         the rate of clinical response (asymptotic method)         tinue the study treatment (VAS >=50)         N         n (%)

(\*) 95% confidence interval of the rate of clinical response (asymptotic method)

The same differences in the response rate that were showed between the subgroups of therapeutic situations (higher in the subgroup "Treatment initiation") and between the "Treatment Change" subgroups of previous antidepressant classes (lower in the subgroup "imipraminics") for the primary criterion were observed for the CGI-I response rate, PGI-I response rate and LSEQ Quality of sleep response rate, while no difference between subgroups of therapeutic situations or previous antidepressant classes was observed for the rate of patients wishing to continue the study treatment.

#### - Analysis of other secondary efficacy criteria showed:

- a global improvement of patients' status (decrease of the CGI-S score, CGI-Improvement, PGI-Improvement and increase of CGI-Efficacy Index score),
- an improvement of depressive symptoms (increase of VAS measuring the patient's mood, decrease of QIDS-C total score)
- an improvement of sleep disorders (Getting off to sleep score, Quality of sleep score, Sleep awakening score and Integrity of behaviour score less than 50),
- a decrease of the impact of the disease on daily activities (decrease of SDS Work/Studies score, Social life score and Family life and Home responsibilities score),
- a normalisation of thymic state (increase of MAThyS Dimension total score from "inhibition" to normal status),
- a stability of the **willingness to continue the treatment** for the majority of the patients during the study (mean VAS superior to 65 at each time-point).

For the majority of these criteria, no clinically significant difference was observed between subgroups of therapeutic situations or between subgroups of previous antidepressant classes.

Differences most often observed were **better results** in the subgroup **"Treatment initiation**" (for decrease of CGI-S score, CGI-I score, PGI-I score, increase of CGI-EI, decrease of SDS Work/Studies score and QIDS-C total score) and **less good results** in the Treatment Change subgroup **"imipraminics"** (for decrease of CGI-S score, CGI-I score, PGI-I score, increase of CGI-EI, decrease of SDS Work/Studies score, QIDS-C total score, LSEQ-Quality of sleep score and patient's willingness to continue the treatment).

Name of Company:	Individual Study Table	(For National Auth	ority Use
LES LABORATOIRES SERVIER	<b>Referring to Part of the Dossier</b>	only)	
Name of Finished Product:	Volume:		
VALDOXAN® (France)			
Name of Active Ingredient:	Page:		
agomelatine (S20098)			
SUMMARY - CONCLUSIONS			
SAFETY RESULTS			
Overall summary of safety results		Safety set	(N = 2852)
At least one		n *	% *
Adverse event emergent under treatment <sup>(1)</sup>		1170	41.02 %
Adverse event emergent under treatment <sup>(1)</sup> tre	atment-related	800	28.05 %
Adverse event emergent under treatment <sup>(1)</sup> lea	ding to study drug withdrawal	434	15.22 %
Severe emergent adverse event under treatmen	nt <sup>(1)</sup>	351	12.31 %
Adverse event emergent after treatment <sup>(2)</sup>		29	1.02 %
Bastrointestinal disorder emergent under treat		385	13.50 %
Gastrointestinal disorder emergent under treatment <sup>(1)</sup> and treatment-related		300	10.52 %
Gastrointestinal disorder emergent under treatment <sup>(1)</sup> leading to study drug withdrawal		138	4.84 %
Psychiatric disorders emergent under treatment <sup>(1)</sup>		380	13.32 %
Psychiatric disorders emergent under treatment <sup>(1)</sup> and treatment-related		241	8.45 %
Psychiatric disorders emergent under treatment <sup>(1)</sup> leading to study drug withdrawal		203	7.12 %
Nervous system disorders emergent under treatment <sup>(1)</sup>		332	11.64 %
Nervous system disorders emergent under treatment <sup>(1)</sup> and treatment-related		257	9.01 %
Vervous system disorders emergent under trea	tment <sup>(1)</sup> leading to study drug withdrawal	96	3.37 %
Serious Adverse Event during the study		85	2.98 %
Emergent <sup>(3)</sup> Serious Adverse Event		80	2.80%
Emergent <sup>(3)</sup> fatal Serious Adverse Event		1	0.03 %
Emergent <sup>(3)</sup> non-fatal Serious Adverse Event		79	2.77 %
Emergent <sup>(3)</sup> psychiatric Serious Adverse Event		56	1.96 %
Emergent <sup>(3)</sup> Suicidal event with acting out <sup>(4)</sup>		10	0.35 %
Emergent <sup>(3)</sup> Suicidal event with acting out treatment-related		0	0 %
Emergent <sup>(3)</sup> Suicidal event with acting out related to lack of efficacy		3	0.11 %
Emergent <sup>(3)</sup> aggravation of depression with hospitalisation		30	1.05 %
Emergent <sup>(3)</sup> aggravation of depression with hospitalisation treatment-related		0	0 %
Emergent <sup>(3)</sup> aggravation of depression with hospitalisation related to lack of efficacy		13	0.46 %
Emergent <sup>(3)</sup> other ERIN <sup>(5)</sup>		12	0.42 %
lepatic disorder with transaminases increase		27	0.95 %
Emergent <sup>(3)</sup> hepatic disorder with transaminas		21	0.74 %
Emergent <sup>(3)</sup> hepatic disorder with transaminases increase treatment-related		12	0.42 %

adverse event which occurred between the first study drug intake date and the last study drug intake date + 1 day or which occurred before the first study drug intake date and the last study drug intake date and the last study drug intake date.

before the first study drug intake date and worsened or became serious between the first study drug intake date and the last study drug intake date + 1 day
(2) adverse event which occurred after the last study drug intake date + 1 day or which occurred between the first study drug intake date and

(2) adverse event which occurred after the last study drug intake date + 1 day or which occurred between the first study drug intake date and the last study drug intake date + 1 day and worsened or became serious after the last study drug intake date + 1 day.

(3) Emergent adverse event: adverse event which occurred after the first study drug intake date or which occurred before the first study drug intake and worsened or became serious after the first study drug intake, without limit of time after the last study drug intake.

(4) suicidal events with acting out: completed suicide (1 patient), suicide attempt (7 patients), intentional overdose (2 patients).

(5) emergent other ERIN: increase of transaminases ≥ 3 ULN at two successive determinations (10 patients), pregnancy (1 patient) and overdose (1 patient).

(6) MedDRA PT: hepatitis, hepatic steatosis, cytolytic hepatitis, transaminases increased, alanine aminotransferase increased

No clinically significant change in the mean systolic and diastolic blood pressure, heart rate, weight and body mass index was observed at W2, W6 and last post-baseline evaluation.

Name of Company: LES LABORATOIRES SERVIER	Individual Study Table Referring to Part of the Dossier	(For National Authority Use only)
Name of Finished Product: VALDOXAN® (France)	Volume:	
Name of Active Ingredient: agomelatine (S20098)	Page:	

# CONCLUSION

In this study, of which the main objective was to describe the efficiency of Valdoxan after 6 weeks of treatment under different therapeutic situations, and in different sub-groups of patients defined by the class of antidepressant used previously, the clinical response rate (composite criterion) was 14.4 % of the patients at W2, 28.0 % (CI  $_{95\%}$  [26.1; 29.8]) at W6 and 24.4 % (CI  $_{95\%}$  [22.8; 26.0]) at the last post-baseline evaluation. The response rates according each of the four criteria defining main criterion were at W6 and at last post-baseline evaluation about 50 % for the CGI-I response, PGI-I response and LSEQ Quality of sleep response, and at least 75 % for the response rate for patient's willingness to continue the study treatment. Analysis of secondary efficacy criteria showed a global improvement of patients' status, an improvement of depressive symptoms and sleep disorders, a decrease of the impact of the disease on daily activities, a normalisation of thymic state, and a stability of the patients' willingness to continue the study. Overall, efficacy results tended to be better in the subgroup of patients who had not taken antidepressant for the two months preceding the study and less good in the subgroup of patients previously treated with imipraminics.

The nature and the frequency of emergent adverse events were in accordance with the safety profile of agomelatine. Most frequent emergent adverse events were gastrointestinal disorders (13.5%) of the patients), psychiatric disorders (13.3%) and nervous system disorders (11.6%). Emergent serious adverse events were reported in 2.8% of the patient and emergent hepatic disorders with transaminases increase in 0.7% of the patients. Most frequent serious adverse events were psychiatric disorders (2.0%), mainly hospitalisations for aggravation of depression (1.1%), or anxiety (0.5%), and suicidal events with acting out (0.4% - 1 suicide, 7 suicide attempts, 2 intentional overdoses).

#### Date of the report: 30 September 2011