Unknown

From: Schwartz, Jack A
Sent: Wednesday, August 06, 2003 5:15 PM
To: Shaw, Joan
Cc: Beamish, Don G; Lloyd (Washington), Lisa M
Subject: SEROQUEL: Trial 125

Hi Joan,

I have discussed with Don the impact of including PANSS as a secondary endpoint in trial 125. We agreed+ that this should not be a secondary endpoint for the following reasons: 1) it will place an additional burden on the investigators; 2) this trial needs to be simple and deliver quickly; 3) deleterious efficacy results compared to risperidone may place SEROQUEL at a disadvantage in the US market.

The SEROQUEL Brand Team, the 43 study team and US communications team are expending a significant amount of energy and time in ensuring the 'not so best' secondary PANSS results for trial 43 are interpreted correctly by our prescribers such that US sales are not adversely affected. Having a second study with PANSS 'not in favor of SEROQUEL' would further complicate an already delicate situation.

Thanks,

Jack