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## Oral Mucositis (OM)

| Grade 0 | Grade 1 | Grade 2 | Grade 3 | Grade 4 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| No change |  |  |  |  |
|  | Soreness/ erythema | Erythema, ulcers; can eat solid food | Ulcers; requires liquid diet only | Alimentation (nourishment) not possible |

- Common and impactful toxicity of concomitant chemoradiation regimens used for the treatment of head and neck cancers - severe OM (SOM) in about 70\% of patients
- Unmet clinical need contributes to adverse patient outcomes, treatment intolerance, and increased resource use
- Key pathobiological targets for mechanistically-based interventions include oxidative stress, the innate immune response, and pro-inflammatory initiators


## Introduction

EC-18: Orally available, lipid-based small molecule


- Also known as 1-Palmitoyl-2-Linoleoyl-3-Acetyl-racGlycerol (PLAG)/Mosedipimod
- Each capsule contains 500 mg of active pharmaceutical ingredient (PLAG) and 1 mg of antioxidant ( $\boldsymbol{\alpha}$-tocopherol)
- Excellent drug safety profile based on non-clinical and Phase 1 clinical studies
- EC-18 acts as an immune modulator contributing to rapid resolution of inflammation and fast return to immune homeostasis

| JSO | How was EC-18 discovered? <br> Ji Sun, 2022-05-26T21:29:23.238 |
| :---: | :---: |
| SOO 0 | in 1989. the original researcher, Dr. Sanghee Kim, an oncologist, began investigating the effects of deer antler and discovered the fact that it stimulates the proliferation of hematopoietic stem cells from bone marrow. <br> Sookyung Oh, 2022-05-31T18:47:42.370 |
| SOO 1 | The research finally identified several elements of the monoacetyldiglycerides (MADG) family and proved that each of the elements stimulates hematopoietic stem cells. Upon the identification of the MADG and its chemical equation, Dr. Tae-Seok Lee of Enzychem came up with a method for its synthesis. Research has since been focused on the illumination of the biological functions of the MADG, especially MADG3, synthesized by Dr. Lee MADG3 came to be christened EC-18 later on. <br> Sookyung Oh, 2022-05-31T18:48:42.413 |
| SO1 | Is EC-18 a biological product? <br> Sookyung Oh, 2022-05-31T18:55:37.292 |
| S01 0 | No, EC-18 is a fully synthesized lipid based small molecule. Sookyung Oh, 2022-05-31T18:56:09.081 |
| SO2 | Where does EC-18 bind to? <br> Sookyung Oh, 2022-05-31T19:47:09.694 |
| SO2 0 | EC-18 binds to one of the GPCRs (G Protein coupled receptors). <br> Sookyung Oh, 2022-05-31T19:50:30.659 |
| SO3 | Is this an anti-inflammatory drug? <br> Sookyung Oh, 2022-05-31T19:47:22.957 |
| SO3 0 | Yes, our drug class belongs to anti-inflammatory agent. Sookyung Oh, 2022-05-31T20:18:07.744 |

## Study Design



| KKO | Q: Did any of the patients have difficulty swallowing the capsules? How big is the capsule? Koeun Kim, 2022-05-26T15:16:27.367 |
| :---: | :---: |
| KKO 0 | A: The capsules are about a size of a small pea. The patients with Grade 3 or higher had difficulties swallowing not only study drug but also any solid food. But we still encouraged our patients to take the study drug to reduce the potential incidence of severe oral mucositis. <br> Koeun Kim, 2022-05-26T15:20:20.749 |
| KK1 | Q: Did patients take EC-18 on days they didn't receive radiation? Koeun Kim, 2022-05-26T15:17:46.799 |
| KK1 0 | A: Yes, the patients were told to take EC-18 every day for 49 days including the days they didn't receive radiation treatment (weekends and/or holiday(s)). <br> Koeun Kim, 2022-05-26T15:18:02.611 |
| KK2 | Q: Isn't 2000 mg per day too high of a dose? Koeun Kim, 2022-05-26T15:19:12.793 |
| SO2 0 | A: Based on Phase 1 healthy volunteer study, EC-18 was well tolerated up to $4000 \mathrm{mg} /$ day. In stage 1 of Phase 2 study, EC-18 $2000 \mathrm{mg} /$ day was shou to be safe and well-tolerated. <br> Sookyung Oh, 2022-05-31T19:03:30.338 |
| KK3 | Q: Is it a prophylactic, prevention, or treatment? Koeun Kim, 2022-05-26T15:32:50.140 |
| SO3 0 | A: None of the above. It is a supportive care study drug, which helps reduce the severity of Oral Mucositis. Sookyung Oh, 2022-05-31T19:04:26.151 |
| JS4 | What is the half-life of EC-18? Can it be taken as QD instead of BID? Ji Sun, 2022-05-26T21:30:32.036 |
| SO4 0 | A: Yes, in our other indications we allowed patients to take EC-18 once a day. However, we suggest patients to take twice a day since OM patients have difficulty swallowing. <br> Sookyung Oh, 2022-05-31T19:07:35.606 |
| SO4 1 | A: We'll get back to you on the half-life. Sookyung Oh, 2022-05-31T19:08:02.200 |

## Study Design (Cont'd)

## Endpoints

- Primary efficacy:
- Duration of SOM during active and short-term follow-up (STFU)
- Secondary:
- Incidence of SOM up to STFU
- Time to SOM onset
- Time to opioid use
- Safety:
- Incidence of AEs and SAEs


## Covariates

- Cisplatin regimen (Weekly vs. Tri-weekly)
- Human papillomavirus (HPV) status (positive vs. negative)

SAF: Safety analysis set ITT: Intent-to-treat

## Enrollment and Assignment

PD: Protocol Deviation
IP: Investigational Product


## Patient Baseline Characteristics

- Well balanced across two arms

| Characteristics | No. (\%) of Patients |  |  |  |  |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Total } \\ & (\mathrm{N}=97) \end{aligned}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Stage 1 |  |  |  | Stage 2 |  |  |
|  | Placebo $(n=6)$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { EC-18 } 500 \mathrm{mg} \\ & \quad(\mathrm{n}=6) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { EC-18 } 1000 \mathrm{mg} \\ (\mathrm{n}=5) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { EC-18 } 2000 \mathrm{mg} \\ (\mathrm{n}=6) \end{gathered}$ | Placebo $(n=34)$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { EC-18 } 2000 \mathrm{mg} \\ & \quad(\mathrm{n}=40) \end{aligned}$ |  |
| Tumor Site |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Nasopharynx | 0 | 1 (17) | 0 | 0 | 1 (3) | 0 | 2 (2) |
| Hypopharynx | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 (2) | 1 (1) |
| Oropharynx | 2 (33) | 3 (50) | 2 (40) | 4 (67) | 27 (79) | 33 (83) | 71 (73) |
| Oral Cavity | 4 (67) | 2 (33) | 2 (40) | 2 (33) | 5 (15) | 6 (15) | 21 (22) |
| Multiple | 0 | 0 | 1 (20) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 (1) |
| Unknown | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 (3) | 0 | 1 (1) |
| TNM Stage |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 0-II | 3 (6) | 2 (4) | 2 (4) | 2 (4) | 18 (53) | 25 (53) | 52 (54) |
| III | 1 (5) | 3 (15) | 2 (10) | 3 (15) | 7 (21) | 4 (10) | 20 (20) |
| IV | 2 (8) | 1 (4) | 1 (4) | 1 (4) | 9 (26) | 11 (27) | 25 (26) |
| Tumor HPV status |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Positive | 4 (67) | 5 (83) | 3 (60) | 6 (100) | 22 (65) | 28 (70) | 68 (70) |
| Negative | 2 (33) | 1 (17) | 0 | 0 | 9 (26) | 9 (23) | 21 (22) |
| Unknown | 0 | 0 | 2 (40) | 0 | 3 (9) | 3 (7) | 8 (8) |
| Cisplatin Schedule |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Every 3 weeks (High-dose) | 5 (83) | 0 | 2 (40) | 1 (17) | 14 (41) | 12 (30) | 34 (35) |
| Weekly (Low-dose) | 1 (17) | 6 (100) | 3 (60) | 5 (83) | 20 (59) | 28 (70) | 63 (65) |

## Efficacy Results

## Duration and Incidence of SOM ккз

| Duration of SOM Up to STFU Period (PP) |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Duration (days) | Placebo | EC-18 2000 mg |
| n | 20 | 22 |
| Median | 13.5 | 0.0 |
| Min, Max | 0,77 | 0,48 |



| Incidence of SOM Up to STFU Period (PP) |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Incidence [n(\%)] | Placebo | EC-18 2000 $\mathbf{~ m g}$ |
| n | 20 | 22 |
| Incidence of SOM | $14(70.0)$ | $10(45.5)$ |



| KKO | Q: Did you get a statistical significance or $p$ value with analysis of such a small number of patients? Koeun Kim, 2022-05-26T15:00:11.886 |
| :---: | :---: |
| SOO 0 | A: Since this is a Phase 2 proof of concept study, we did not expect a strong statistical significance (our $\mathrm{p}=0.5575$ for SOM duration; 0.1894 for SOM incidence). The signal we saw for the compliant patient group sufficient to the purpose of this study. <br> Sookyung Oh, 2022-05-27T15:51:27.103 |
| KK1 | Q: How are the results among patients who developed SOM? (Excluding ones who didn't develop SOM) Koeun Kim, 2022-05-26T15:21:21.919 |
| S01 0 | A: It is a little misleading to be looking at median duration for people who never developed SOM, but we do know that the time to onset of SOM for the EC-18 group was 8 days later than the placebo group. |
|  | FYI: Median duration of SOM only for patients who developed SOM was 23.0 vs 34.3 days (Placebo vs. EC-18) for up to STFU and 14.0 vs 13.0 days fo up to Active treatment period. <br> Sookyung Oh, 2022-05-27T15:55:48.729 |
| KK2 | Q: How do you score the days of SOM duration when you had an incidence of SOM? How is duration 0 days but still have and incidence rate of 45.5\%? <br> Koeun Kim, 2022-05-26T15:22:16.887 |
| SO2 0 | A: This is because the duration is based on the imputed median value from all patients while incidence rate is based on the SOM occurrence. Sookyung Oh, 2022-05-31T19:22:15.086 |
| KK3 | Q: What is your actual comparison to the standard of care (SOC)? Do you think that your placebo data is very close to SOC? Koeun Kim, 2022-05-26T15:23:20.780 |
| SO3 0 | A: Our PP placebo duration was 13.5 , which was smaller but comparable to the industry reported placebo duration. Sookyung Oh, 2022-05-31T19:25:36.241 |
| JS4 | What was your mean of SOM duration? <br> Ji Sun, 2022-05-26T21:27:34.721 |
| SO4 0 | A: 19.3 vs. 15.3 days (Placebo vs. EC-18) for up to STFU and 9.3 vs 6.2 days for up to Active treatment period in PP population. Sookyung Oh, 2022-05-27T16:01:11.741 |
| SO5 | What do your mITT/ITT results show? <br> Sookyung Oh, 2022-05-31T19:28:06.804 |
| SO5 0 | It is unfortunate that the half of mITT population were not compliant. We believe the results for the PP population (compliant group) truly represent the EC-18 efficacy. <br> Sookyung Oh, 2022-05-31T19:32:20.503 |

Cumulative SOM Incidence Over Time (PP) кко

KKO $\quad$ Q: Do you have data after Week 7? How are the results? Koeun Kim, 2022-05-26T15:03:05.397
SOO 0 A: The cumulative SOM incidence at the end of Active treatment period is $65 \%$ for Placebo and $40.9 \%$ for EC-18, and the cumulative SOM incidence a the end of STFU period is $70 \%$ for Placebo and $45.5 \%$ for EC-18 Sookyung Oh, 2022-05-27T17:25:56.217
KK1 Q: In the previous slide, the incidence reduction was $35 \%$. How did the incidence drop 44\% in Week 7? Koeun Kim, 2022-05-26T15:06:43.202
SO1 0 A: This graph shows the cumulative incidence up to 7th week, but our incidence results include Active treatment period, which can go beyond 7 weeks (up to 9 weeks).
Sookyung Oh, 2022-05-27T17:33:11.673

## Secondary Endpoints

Time to SOM Onset (PP)

| Time to onset of SOM <br> (days; 95\% CI)* | EC-18 2000 mg | Placebo |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| n | 22 | 20 |
| Median | $51(33.0)$, | $43(28.0)$, |

*Kaplan-Meier Estimation

| Time to Opioid Use (PP) | KKO |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Time to Opioid Use <br> (days) | Placebo | EC-18 $\mathbf{2 0 0 0} \mathbf{~ m g}$ |
| n | 6 | 8 |
| Mean | 26 | 32.3 |
| Median | 25.5 | 37 |

KKO Q: How was the duration of opioid use? Were patients on a shorter period of opioids? Koeun Kim, 2022-05-26T15:07:23.119

SOO 0 A: Per secondary endpoint, we measured time of opioid use. Our data doesn't capture the end date of opioid use per each patient and therefore, we can't measure the opioid use duration
Sookyung Oh, 2022-05-27T19:04:21.690

## Covariate Analysis - Cisplatin Regimen and HPV Status

- EC-18 favorably impacted SOM incidence in patients:
- With Weekly low-dose cisplatin
- With HPV+ tumors

| PP Subgroups | $\begin{gathered} E C-182000 m g \\ (N=22) \end{gathered}$ | Placebo (N=20) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| All PP | 45.5\% (10/22) | 70.0\% (14/20) |
| Cisplatin (Weekly) | 37.5\% (6/16) | 70.0\% (7/10) |
| Tri-Weekly Cisplatin | 66.7\% (4/6) | 70.0\% (7/10) |
| HPV+ | 35.3 (6/17)* | 66.7\% (8/12) |
| HPV- | 75.0\% (3/4) | 71.4\% (5/7)* |

* One unknown HPV Status


## Safety Results

## Safety Summary

- Comparable safety across all arms
- Attributable to expected chemoradiation-related toxicity

Treatment-Related AE


Stage 1
Stage 2

Treatment-Related SAE


Stage 1
Stage 2

* Determined to be not related to EC-18


## Treatment-Related AE $\geq 15 \%$

## - Comparable across all arms

|  | Placebo ( $\mathrm{N}=40$ ) |  | EC-18 |  |  |  |  |  | $\begin{gathered} \text { Total ( } \mathrm{N}=97 \text { ) } \\ \hline \% \end{gathered}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | 500 mg ( $\mathrm{N}=6$ ) |  | 1000 mg ( $\mathrm{N}=5$ ) |  | 2000 mg ( $\mathrm{N}=46$ ) |  |  |
|  | No. | \% | No. | \% | No. | \% | No. | \% |  |
| Any Adverse Events | 261.0 | 92.5 | 40.0 | 100.0 | 37.0 | 100.0 | 281.0 | 95.7 | 94.8 |
| Nausea | 40.0 | 70.0 | 5.0 | 66.7 | 3.0 | 40.0 | 41.0 | 69.6 | 68.0 |
| Fatigue | 21.0 | 42.5 | 4.0 | 50.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 22.0 | 43.5 | 41.2 |
| Dry mouth | 13.0 | 32.5 | 3.0 | 50.0 | 3.0 | 20.0 | 23.0 | 43.5 | 38.1 |
| Dysgeusia | 14.0 | 35.0 | 3.0 | 33.3 | 4.0 | 40.0 | 22.0 | 39.1 | 37.1 |
| Dysphagia | 17.0 | 40.0 | 2.0 | 33.3 | 1.0 | 20.0 | 18.0 | 34.8 | 36.1 |
| Stomatitis | 15.0 | 19.6 | 4.0 | 50.0 | 4.0 | 40.0 | 18.0 | 30.4 | 28.9 |
| Vomiting | 17.0 | 28.3 | 2.0 | 33.3 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 19.0 | 26.1 | 27.8 |
| Constipation | 14.0 | 30.0 | 3.0 | 50.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 10.0 | 21.7 | 25.8 |
| Weight decreased | 15.0 | 23.9 | 2.0 | 33.3 | 5.0 | 60.0 | 14.0 | 19.6 | 25.8 |
| Oral pain | 9.0 | 20.0 | 3.0 | 50.0 | 3.0 | 60.0 | 9.0 | 19.6 | 23.7 |
| Oropharyngeal pain | 11.0 | 22.5 | 4.0 | 66.7 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 9.0 | 17.4 | 21.6 |
| Radiation skin injury | 11.0 | 21.7 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 1.0 | 20.0 | 14.0 | 21.7 | 21.6 |
| Diarrhoea | 10.0 | 22.5 | 2.0 | 33.3 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 6.0 | 13.0 | 17.5 |
| Dehydration | 11.0 | 22.5 | 1.0 | 16.7 | 5.0 | 40.0 | 5.0 | 6.5 | 15.5 |

## Conclusions kко

- Mitigation of the development and the time course of SOM
- Duration of SOM
- Incidence of SOM
- Time to Onset of SOM
- Time to Opioid Use
- Excellent safety profile comparable to placebo
- Substantial benefits to HPV+ HNC patients treated with low dose cisplatin
- Future analyses include
- 1-year long-term tumor assessment
- Biomarker and genomics analyses

[^0]
## Acknowledgment

Deep appreciation goes to all our patients and their families, investigators, and site staff



[^0]:    KKO
    Q: Is there a potential that EC-18 may work in radiation or chemotherapy alone?
    Koeun Kim, 2022-05-26T15:15:11.190
    SOO 0 Yes, we have seen similar results from our non-clinical CIOM (Chemotherapy-induced Oral Mucositis) and ARS (Acute Radiation Syndrome) indications.
    Sookyung Oh, 2022-05-31T19:44:04.514
    JS1 What is your plan for Phase 3?
    Ji Sun, 2022-05-26T21:28:39.128
    SO1 0 We are currently strategizing what our best p3 design options are.
    Sookyung Oh, 2022-05-31T19:46:41.243

