

Telaprevir in Combination with Peginterferon Alfa-2a/Ribavirin in HCV/HIV Co-infected Patients: A 24-Week Treatment Interim Analysis

KE Sherman¹, JK Rockstroh², DT Dieterich³, V Soriano⁴, PM Girard⁵, S McCallister⁶, N Adda⁶, M Bsharat⁶, BS Adiwijaya⁶, L Mahnke⁶, MS Sulkowski⁷ ¹University of Cincinnati College of Medicine, Cincinnati, OH, United States ⁴Hospital Carlos III, Madrid, Spain; ⁵Hôpital St Antoine, Paris, France; ⁶Vertex Pharmaceuticals Incorporated, Cambridge, MA, United States; ⁷Johns Hopkins University School of Medicine, Baltimore, MD, United States.

BACKGROUND

- INCIVEK (telaprevir, TVR) is an inhibitor of the hepatitis C virus (HCV) protease NS3/4A whose use in combination with pegylated interferon-alfa-2a (P) and ribavirin (R) was recently approved by the Food and Drug Administration (FDA) for the treatment of chronic genotype 1 HCV mono-infected patients in the US, Europe, and Canada.¹⁻³
- In genotype 1 mono-infected patients, telaprevir with peginterferon alfa-2a/ ribavirin (T/PR) led to substantial improvements in SVR in phase 3 studies^{1, 4-6}: - Treatment-naïve patients (ADVANCE trial, N=1088),⁴
 - 79% vs 46% in patients treated with 12-week telaprevir combination treatment vs peginterferon/ribavirin alone
- Treatment-experienced patients (REALIZE trial, N=662)⁶:
- 32% vs 5% in control (prior null responders)
- 59% vs 15% in control (prior partial responders)
- 86% vs 22% in control (prior relapsers)
- Modest DDI between TVR and ART (EFV, ATV/r and TDF) was observed, no dose adjustment for ART was deemed necessary⁷
- Higher TVR dose (1125 mg q8h) could partly offset TVR interactions with EFV⁷, no other TVR dose adjustment was deemed necessary

METHODS

STUDY OBJECTIVES

Primary Objectives:

- To assess the safety and tolerability of telaprevir, peginterferon, and ribavirin in chronic HCV genotype 1/HIV co-infected patients
- To evaluate the proportion of patients with HCV RNA undetectable after a total of 24 weeks treatment with telaprevir, peginterferon, and ribavirin

Secondary Objectives:

- To evaluate the efficacy of telaprevir combination treatment 24 weeks after last dose (SVR)
- To assess the pharmacokinetics of telaprevir, peginterferon and ribavirin
- To analyze the selection of HCV resistant variants
- In Part B only, to assess the pharmacokinetics of pre-specified ART medications Principal Eligibility Criteria
- Male and female patients, 18 to 65 years of age with chronic HCV genotype 1/ HIV 1 co-infection, and treatment-naïve for HCV
- Liver biopsy within 1 year; compensated cirrhosis permitted • Part A: up to 20 patients not receiving ART, with CD4 count \geq 500 cells/mm³, and HIV RNA \leq 100,000 copies/mL
- Part B: up to 48 patients receiving a stable ART regimen
- EFV/TDF/FTC, or
- ATV/r with TDF and FTC or 3TC, with CD4 count ≥300 cells/mm³, and HIV RNA ≤50 copies/mL

Figure 1: Study 110 Desigr			
Part A: no ART		Follow-up	SVR
T/PR Pbo + PR	PR		
PR48 (Control) Pbo + PR	PR	Follow-up	SVR
Part B: ART (EFV/TDF/FTC or ATV	/r + FTC or 3TC)	F allow we	SVR
T/PR Pbo + PR	PR	Follow-up	
PR48 (Control) Pbo + PR	PR	Follow-up	SVR ———
0 12 24	36 48	}	72 Weeks

(EFV)=efavirenz; (TDF)=tenofovir; (FTC)=emtricitabine; (ATV/r)=ritonavir-boosted atazanavir; (3TC)=lamivudine; (T) TVR=telaprevir 750 mg q8h or 1125 mg q8h (with EFV); Pbo=Placebo; (P) Peg-IFN=pegylated interferon alfa-2a (40 kD) 180 µg/wk; (R) RBV=ribavirin 800 mg/day or weight-based (1000 mg/day if weight <75 kg, 1200 mg/day for if weight ≥75 kg; France, Germany). Roche COBAS TaqMan HCV test v2.0, LLOQ of 25 IU/mL, LOD of <10 IU/mL

• There were 5 patients in Part B who had weight-based ribavirin per country requirements (France and Germany). All patients in Part B received FTC.

ASSESSMENTS

- HIV RNA Day 1, Week 4, 8, 12, 24, 36, 48, and at safety follow-up (4 weeks after last dose of study drug)
- CD4: Day 1, (Week 4 and 8 for Part B), Week 12, 24, 36, 48, and at safety followup (4 weeks after last dose of study drug)
- HCV RNA: Day 1 (1 predose, 2 postdose), 2, 4, and Week 1, 2, 3, 4, 8, 12, 16, 20, 24, 36, 48 during TVR/Pbo during and at follow-up.
- Proportion of patients with undetectable HCV RNA undetectable at Weeks 4, 12, Weeks 4 and 12, and Week 24
- Pharmacokinetic assessments were as follows: For telaprevir, samples were taken at the following timepoints: Days 1 (1 predose, 6 postdose), 8, 15, 29 (1 predose, 6 postdose), and 85. For pre-specified ART medications, Days -1, 1, 8, 15, 29, and 85.

PREDEFINED STOPPING RULES

PATIENT POPULATION

RESULTS

Table 1: Der

Gender, n (%): N
Caucasian ⁺ , n(%
Black/African A
Ethnicity [†] : Hispa
Age, median ye
BMI, median kg
HCV RNA ≥800
HCV Subtype 1a
HCV Subtype 1
Bridging Fibrosi
Cirrhosis, n (%)
HIV RNA media
CD4+ median c
Page and athrighty ware a



	% of Patients with Undetectable HCV F
(C)	% of Patients with Undetectable HCV RNA

• Viral breakthrough (in all patients), defined as HCV RNA > 100 IU/mL after HCV RNA undetectable or a 1 log₁₀ increase from nadir at Week 4, 8, and 12, patients to discontinue all study drugs

• At Week 4 and 8, if HCV RNA >1000 IU/mL, T/PR patients to discontinue telaprevir, continue PR. At Week 12, if HCV RNA >1000 IU/mL in T/PR patients with ≥ 1000 IU/mL at Weeks 4 and 8, patients to discontinue all study drugs. In all other patients, if HCV RNA <2 log₁₀ decline, patients to discontinue all study drugs. At Weeks 24 and 36, in all patients, if HCV RNA detectable, patients to discontinue all study drugs.

• Interim analysis based on 60 patients receiving at least one dose of study drug out of 62 enrolled patients; 44/60 patients had reached Week 24 on study drug at time of analysis. Thirteen patients were in Part A. Forty-seven patients from Part B: 24 patients (EFV/TDF/FTC), 23 patients (ATV/r/TDF/FTC or 3TC) • Among 16 patients that did not reach Week 24 on study drug: 6 met a stopping rule (Table 2), 1 was lost to follow-up, 1 discontinued due to a serious adverse event of hemolytic anemia, 2 withdrew consent, and 6 patients did not reach Week 24 on study drug for other reasons.

Part A Part B									
	No	ART	EFV/TI	OF/FTC	ATV/r + TDF	F + FTC/3TC			
	T/PR N=7	PR N=6	T/PR N=16	PR N=8	T/PR N=15	PR N=8			
/lale	6 (86)	4 (67)	16 (100)	7 (87)	13 (87)	7 (87)			
)	2 (29)	3 (50)	12 (75)	5 (62)	13 (87)	7 (87)			
merican, n(%)	4 (57)	3 (50)	3 (19)	3 (37)	2 (13)	1 (12)			
anic, n (%)	3 (43)	2 (33)	5 (31)	1 (12)	3 (20)	3 (37)			
ars (range)	39 (34-51)	48 (43-65)	48 (31-57)	47 (31-53)	52 (37-60)	39 (26-53)			
/m² (range)	29 (22-37)	31 (26-37)	24 (21-32)	23 (19-29)	24 (23-33)	25 (22-30)			
,000 IU/mL**, n (%)	7 (100)	5 (83)	13 (81)	7 (88)	12 (80)	7 (88)			
a*, n (%)	3 (43)	3 (50)	12 (75)	6 (75)	12 (80)	5 (62)			
o*, n (%)	4 (57)	2 (33)	4 (25)	1 (12)	3 (20)	3 (38)			
s, n (%)	1 (14)	0 (0)	2 (12)	1 (12)	0 (0)	1 (13)			
	0 (0)	0 (0)	2 (12)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)			
n copies/mL (range)	1495 (155-53,450)	267 (50-21,950)	25	25	25	25			
ells/µL (range)	604 (496-759)	672 (518-1189)	533 (299-1075)	514 (323-1034)	514 (279-874)	535 (302-772)			

Race and ethnicity were self-reported 5'NC InnoLipa line probe assay Roche COBAS TagiMan HCV test v2.0, LLOQ of 25 IU/mL and LLOD of 10 IU/mL



 1 receiving EFV/TDF/FTC and 1 receiving ATV/ 1 receiving EFV/TDF/FTC and 1 receiving ATV. 2 receiving EFV/TDF/FTC and 1 receiving ATV,

FAILURE	Table 3: Discontinuation from Study Drug Due to Stopping Rules								
		Par	τA	Part B					
uah:		Νο		EFV/TDF/FTC		ATV/r + TDF + FTC/3TC			
//r + TDF/FTC at Week 4		T/PR	PR	T/PR	PR	T/PR	PR		
//r + TDF/FTC at Week 8		N=7	N=6	N=16	N=8	N=15	N=8		
/r + TDF/FTC at Week 12	Week 4	0	0	0	0	1 (7)	0		
	Week 8	0	0	1 (6)	0	0	0		
	Week 12	0	2 (33)	0	1 (12)	0	1 (12)		
	Week 24	0	2 (33)	0	0	0	1 (12)		
					•				

SAFETY RESULTS

Table 3: Most Common Adverse Events*						
%	T/PR (N=38)	PR (N=22)				
Fatigue	42	41				
Pruritus	40	9				
Headache	37	27				
Nausea	34	23				
Diarrhea	24	18				
Dizziness	21	9				
Pyrexia	21	9				
Depression	21	9				
Neutropenia	21	23				
Anorexia	10	4				
Vomiting	18	9				
Myalgia	16	23				
Chills	16	18				
Weight Decreased	10	23				
Insomnia	13	23				

*Reported in >15% of patients regardless of severity in any treatment arm, in bold event occurring at >10% points in any T/PR group vs PR. Abdominal pain occurred more frequently in the T/PR groups ($\geq 10\%$ difference) compared to PR as well.

PHARMACOKINETIC RESULTS

Table 5: Comparison of	[:] Telaprevir	Steady-state	Conce
ART Regimens	·		

Parameter	ART Drug Regimens	In HIV/HCV Co-infected Patients			In Healthy Volunteers			ers	
		Ref conc (no ART)	Conc Ratio to Ref (%)		Ref conc (no ART)	Conc Ratio to Re (%)		o Ref	
		Mean (ng/mL)	Mean	90% CILB	90% CIUB	Mean (ng/mL)	Mean	90% CILB	90% CIUB
C _{min}	EFV	1984	93	56	156	1640	75	66	87
C _{min}	ATV/r	1984	131	77	222	1840	85	75	98
C _{avg}	EFV	2830	97	64	146	2299	82	73	92
Cavg	ATV/r	2830	107	70	165	2553	80	76	85
C _{max}	EFV	3718	101	72	143	2985	86	76	97
C _{max}	ATV/r	3718	98	69	140	3316	79	74	84
EFV= efavirenz-ba	ased ART reaime	en		ATV/	r= atazana	avir/ritonavir-ba	ased ART r	eaimen	

Table 6: Pharmacokinetics of ART After and Before HCV Treatment in HIV/HCV Co-infected Patients and in Healthy Volunteers											
	In HIV/HCV Co-infected Patients				In Healthy Volunteers						
ART Medication	Median C	Cmin before	Median (10 th - 90 th percentiles) ratio of			Reference C _{min} , Mean (90%Cl) conc ratio of ART C _{min} , AUC, C _{max}				min , AUC, C max	
	HCV treat	ment (ng/mL)	C _{min} before and afte	C _{min} before and after HCV treatment*			f ART	relative to reference			
	+TVR/PR	+PBO/PR	+TVR/PR	+PBO/PR	C _{min}	Cavg	C _{max}	C _{min}	C _{avg}	C _{max}	
Atazanavir (ATV)	1230	1890	122% (54% - Undef)	81% (16% - 220%)	805	1981	5169	185% (140% - 244%)	117% (97%-142%)	85% (73% - 98%)	
Efavirenz (EFV)	1441	1925	86% (53% - 165%)	66% (52% - 148%)	1955	2897	5287	90% (81%-101%)	82% (74% - 90%)	76% (68% - 85%)	
Tenofovir (+EFV)	61.2	67.6	90% (60% - 422%)	59% (42% - 201%)	51.3	113.8	343.5	117% (106%-128%)	110% (103% - 118%)	122% (112%-133%)	
Tenofovir (-EFV)	128.1	139	83% (35% - 353%)	74% (53% - 170%)	52.8	123.0	312.1	141% (129% - 154%)	130% (122%- 139%)	130% (116%-145%)	

ATV= atazanavir/ritonavir-based ART regimen EFV= efavirenz-based ART regimen

- volunteers as shown in Table 5.

CONCLUSIONS

- to PR alone (54%).
- medication was deemed necessary.
- treatment was comparable to that previously observed in chronic genotype 1 HCV-monoinfected patients.

REFERENCES

- INCIVEK [package insert]. Cambridge, MA: Vertex Pharmaceuticals Incorporated; 201 Incivo (EU summary of product characteristics) (Tibotec, Beerse, Belgium, 2011). Incivek (Canada product monograph) (Vertex Pharmaceuticals, 2011
- Jacobson IM, McHutchison JG, Dusheiko G, et al. N Engl J Med. 2011; 364(25):2405-16.

AUTHOR DISCLOSURES

KE Sherman has received Grant/Research Support from interest; Bristol-Myers Squibb: Advisory Committees or Review Panels; SciClone : Grant/Research Support; SciClone: Consulting; Boehringer-Ingelheim: Advisory Committees or Review Panels; Tibotec: Advisory Committees or Review Panels; SciClone : Grant/Research Support; SciClone : anels; Merck: Advisory Committees or Review Panels; Merck/Schering Plough: Grant/Research Support; Genentech/Roche: Grant/Research Support; Genentech/Roche: Grant/Research Support; Johnson & Johnson:Advisory Comr tees or Review Panels; Baxter: Advisory Committees or Review Panels; Regulus: Advisory Committees or Review Panels; Boehringer-Ingelheim: Grant/Research Support. JK Rockstroh has received Grant/Research Support from: Abbott: Advisory Committees or Review Panels; Bl:Advisory Committees or Review Panels; BMS:Advisory Committees or Review Panels; Roche: Advisory Committees or Review Panels; BMS:Advisory Committees or Review Panels; Commit or Review Panels; ViiV: Advisory Committees or Review Panels; Abbott: Speaking and Teaching; BI: Speaking and Teaching; Roche: Speaking and Teaching; Gilead: Speaking and Teaching; Gilead: Advisory Committees or Review Panels; Merck: Speaking and Teaching; Tibotec: Speaking and Teaching; Gilead: Speaking and Teaching; Gilead: Advisory Committees or Review Panels; Merck: Speaking and Teaching; Tibotec: Speaking and Teaching; Gilead: Speaking and Teaching; Gilead: Speaking and Teaching; Gilead: Advisory Committees or Review Panels; Merck: Speaking and Teaching; Tibotec: Speaking and Teaching; Gilead: Speaking and Teaching; Gilead: Advisory Committees or Review Panels; Merck: Speaking and Teaching; Gilead: Speaking and Teaching; Gilead Grant/Research Support; Janssen: Advisory Committees or Review Panels; Janssen: Speaking and Teaching; Novartis: Consulting. DT Dieterich: has received Grant/Research Support from: Advisory Committees or Review Panels; Gilead: Advisory Committees or Review Panels; Boehringer Ingelheim: Advisory Committees or Review Panels; Gilead: Advis Panels; Novartis: Advisory Committees or Review Panels; Pfizer:Advisory Committees or Review Panels; Schering-Plough: Speaking and Teaching; Vertex: Advisory Committees or Review Panels; Idenix: Advisory Committees or Review Panels; Schering-Plough: Speaking and Teaching; Vertex: Advisory Committees or Review Panels; Idenix: Advisory Committe Soriano has received Grant/Research Support; Boehringer: Speaking and Teaching. PM Girard: No conflict of interest. MS Sulkowski has received Grant/Research Support; Form: Roche: Consulting; Roche:Grant/Research Support; Merck: Consulting; Merck: Grant/Research Support; Abbott: Consulting; BIPI: Grant/Research Support; Vertex: Consulting; Vertex: Grant/Research Support; Tibotec: Grant/Research Support; Gilead: Grant/Research Support; BIPI: Grant/Research Support; BIPI Support; BMS: Grant/Research Support; BMS: Consulting; Pfizer: Advisory Committees or Review Panels; Pharmaset: Consulting; Pharmaset: Grant/Research Support. S McCallister, N Adda, B Adiwijaya, M Bsharat, and L Mahnke are employees and stockholders of Vertex Pharmaceuticals Incorporated.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS The authors wish to thank all patients, study coordinators, and CROs who participated in Study 110. Medical writing, editorial, and coordination support was provided by Jonathan Kirk. MD and JK are employees and stockholders of Vertex Pharmaceuticals Incorporatec

Presented at the 62nd Annual Meeting of the American Association for the Study of Liver Diseases (AASLD), "The Liver Meeting"[®], San Francisco, CA, USA, November 4-8, 2011



*Address correspondence to: Kenneth E. Sherman, MD, PhD. Division of Digestive Diseases, University of Cincinnati College of Medicine, Cincinnati, OH Email: shermake@ucmail.uc.edu

- No severe rashes were reported.
- Four patients (1 Part A and 2 Part B) received an erythropoietin stimulating
- 12 T/PR and 5 PR patients had Grade 3 hemoglobin levels
- CD4 counts declined in both T/PR and PR groups; CD4% remain unchanged.
 - Bilirubin adverse events occurred more frequently in 27% (4/15) of ATV/r patients receiving T/PR compared to 0% (0/8) in ATV/r patients receiving PR alone as did indirect bilirubinemia.
 - Patients in the T/PR group had lower baseline indirect bilirubin levels (13 µmol/L [95% CI 2, 55]) and experienced a higher change from baseline at Week 1 (mean 29 µmol/L [95% CI 2, 175]) compared to the control arm (baseline mean: 18 µmol/L [95% CI 1, 75]; Week 1 mean 22 µmol/L [95% CI 2, 169]). At Week 12 mean indirect bilirubin levels were 18 µmol/L [95% CI 2, 87]) and 18 µmol/L [95% CI 2, 169]) in T/PR and PR, respectively.
- One patient in the T/PR ATV/r-based group discontinued telaprevir at Week 3 due to a severe AE of jaundice (Table 5).

Table 4: Adverse Events and Treatment Discontinuation							
	Par	τA	Part B				
	No	ART	EFV/TD	F/FTC	ATV/r + TDF	+ FTC/3TC	
	T/PR	PR	T/PR	PR	T/PR	PR	
	N=7	N=6	N=16	N=8	N=15	N=8	
Any AE, n (%)	7 (100)	6 (100)	16 (100)	8 (100)	15 (100)	8 (100)	
Serious AE* [†] , n (%)	1 (14)	0	1 (6)	0	5 (33)	1 (12)	
Discontinuation of all study							
drugs due to AE, n (%)	0	0	0	0	2 (13)	0	
Due to jaundice	0	0	0	0	1 (6.7)	0	
Due to cholelithiasis	0	0	0	0	1 (6.7)	0	
Due to hemolytic anemia*	0	0	0	0	1 (6.7)	0	

*Hemolytic anemia was reported as a serious adverse event. ⁺ One additional patient had a serious AE of pneumococcal pneumonia reported after the Week 4 safety follow-up visit.

• Patients receiving the ATV/r-based regimens in both the T/PR and control arms experienced elevated indirect bilirubin upon HCV treatment. The elevated bilirubin was related to atazanavir exposure, consistent with previously reported literature.⁸

• Week 4 intensive telaprevir pharmacokinetic data were comparable across ART regimens, and also comparable to the values in healthy volunteers (Table 4). • Pharmacokinetics of ART medications when co-administered with T/PR resulted in modest changes that are consistent with the values obtained in DDI studies in healthy

• In this interim analysis, higher Week 24 on-treatment responses were seen in chronic genotype 1 HCV/HIV co-infected patients treated with T/PR (74%) compared

• TVR exposures were comparable across ART regimens. Higher TVR dose (1125 mg q8h) with EFV resulted in TVR exposures that were comparable to other ART groups thus, no other TVR dose adjustment was deemed necessary. Modest interactions were observed between TVR and ART; no dose adjustment in ART

Bilirubinemia was notable in patients receiving T/PR with an ATV/r-based regimen. Overall safety and tolerability of patients treated with TVR combination

- Sherman KE, Flamm SL, Afdhal NH, et al. N Engl J Med. 2011; 365(11):1014-24 Zeuzem S, Andreone P, Pol S, et al. N Engl J Med. 2011; 364(25):2417-28 Van Heeswijk et al. CROI 2011; Abstract 146LB
- Molina J-M. et al. (2008) The Lancet 372: 646-655

ntration by





Use of Antiretroviral Therapy

	PR	B/PR
Any*	34 (100)	64 (100)
HIV Protease Inhibitors [†]	31 (91)	54 (84)
ATV/r Lopinavir/r Darunavir/r	13 (38) 10 (29) 7 (21)	20 (31) 16 (25) 12 (19)
NRTIs ^{††}	33 (97)	60 (94)
Integrase Inhibitors	4 (12)	11 (17)
CCR5 antagonists	1 (3)	1 (2)

* To maintain blinding in this continuing study, data is only shown where at least 1 patient in each treatment group is represented. † HIV PIs included ATVr, DRV/r, LPV/r, fAMP/r, SAQ/r † NRTIs included TDF, ABC, 3TC, FTC

Sulkowski M et al. 49TH IDSA; Boston, MA; October 20-23, 2011; Abst. LB-37.

Patient Disposition

	PEG2b/RBV	PEG2b/RBV + BOC
Treated, n (Percentage)	34 (100%)	64 (100%)
Discontinued during treatment phase, n (Percentage)	14 (41%)	16 (25%)
Due to AE, n (Percentage)	3 (9%)	9 (14%)
Due to treatment failure, n (Percentage)	11 (32%)	3 (5%)
Other reasons	0	4 (6%)
Completed treatment phase, n (Percentage)	1 (3%)	2 (3%)
Ongoing, n (Percentage)	19 (56%)	46 (72%)
Most commons AE > 10% Neutropen vomiting, pyrexia, loss of appetite	ia, dysgeusia	١,
Sulkowski M et al. 49TH IDSA: Boston, MA: October 20-23, 2011:	Abst I B-37	



Most Common Adverse Events With a Difference of ≥10% Between Groups*

	PEG2b/RBV (N=34)	PEG2b/RBV + BOC (N=64)
Days on study, median	166	211
Neutropenia, (%)	3%	13%
Dysgeusia, (%)	15%	25%
Vomiting, (%)	15%	25%
Pyrexia, (%)	21%	34%
Headache, (%)	12%	28%
Decreased Appetite, (%)	18%	30%

*A difference of ≥10% for patients receiving PEG2b/RBV+BOC when compared with PEG2b/RBV. Sulkowski M et al. 49TH IDSA; Boston, MA; October 20-23, 2011; Abst. LB-37.

Hematologic Adverse Events

	PEG2b/RBV (N=34)	PEG2b/RBV + BOC (n=64)
Anemia		
AEs, n (%)	9 (26)	19 (30)
SAEs, n (%)	2 (6)	1 (2)
AEs leading to discontinuation, n (%)	1 (3)	1 (2)
Grade 2 (8.0 to <9.5 g/dL), n (%)	7 (21)	10 (16)
Grade 3 (6.5 to <8.0 g/dL), n (%)	1 (3)	3 (5)
Erythropoietin use, n (%)	7 (21)	17 (27)
Transfusions, n (%)	2 (6)	4 (6)
Neutropenia		
AEs, n (%)	1 (3)	8 (13)
Grade 3 (<0.75x10 ⁹ /L), n (%)	3 (9)	10 (16)
Grade 4 (<0.5x10 ⁹ /L), n (%)	*	*

*To maintain blinding in this continuing study the table only shows data where events occurred in at least 1 patient in each treatment group. Sulkowski M et al. 49TH IDSA; Boston, MA; October 20-23, 2011; Abst. LB-37.