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What are mental illnesses?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>“RDoC framework conceptualizes mental illnesses as brain disorders”¹</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>“RDoC is [...] agnostic about the mechanistic and causal relationships between psychology and biology and [...] advocates rigorous integration of the two domains”²</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“Mental disorders are best characterized in terms of the interaction between different components in a psychopathology network [...] connected through a myriad of biological, psychological and societal mechanisms”³</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

¹ Insel, T. et al, 2010 Am J Psychiatry 167:7, July 2010
³ Borsboom, D., 2017 World Psychiatry, 16(1)
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In a sample of 1566 patients, DSM-IV MDD criteria were met in 170 different ways.

---

Where do we go from here?

While the limitations of the available systems (especially for some of the diagnoses) are acknowledged, there is no current alternative gold standard.

Extensive interactions between academics, developers and regulators are encouraged.

The European Medicines Agency has a scheme for the Qualification of Novel Methodologies, giving advice early on in the development and publishing the outcome of final qualifications. Earlier – preliminary interactions are encouraged with the Innovation Task Force.
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Guideline on clinical investigation of medicinal products in the treatment of epileptic disorders

Draft
Guideline on clinical investigation of medicinal products for the treatment of Multiple Sclerosis

26 March 2015
EMA/CHMP/771815/2011, Rev. 2
Committee for Medicinal Products for Human Use (CHMP)
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FIH and PK studies</th>
<th>Proof of Concept</th>
<th>Pivotal Evidence</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
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<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
An hypothesis-driven drug development

Medicine safely administered and absorbed → Change in a measurable brain parameter → Improvement in the way a patient feels and functions

FIH and PK studies | Proof of Concept | Pivotal Evidence

If the medicine does not produce the intended change in the target brain parameter, the hypothesis is not supported.

If it does, the next step is to demonstrate changes relevant to the patient.
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<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A clinically relevant benefit – to weight against the risks - needs to be established and quantified. Biomarkers are unlikely to be sufficient. The currently available outcome measurement tools are far from ideal-engagement with regulators on other ways to measure such outcomes are encouraged.</td>
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What matters to you?¹

Any questions?
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