Trial record **1 of 1** for: hmgm

Previous Study | Return to List | Next Study

A Study of Patients With Major Depressive Disorder and Residual Apathy

ClinicalTrials.gov Identifier: NCT00985504

Recruitment Status: Completed
First Posted: September 28, 2009
Results First Posted: October 3, 2011
Last Update Posted: December 13, 2011

Sponsor:
Eli Lilly and Company

Collaborator:
Boehringer Ingelheim

Information provided by (Responsible Party):
Eli Lilly and Company

Study Details | Tabular View | Study Results | Disclaimer

How to Read a Study Record

Study Type:	Interventional

Study Design:	Allocation: Randomized; Intervention Model: Parallel Assignment; Masking: Triple (Participant, Care Provider, Investigator); Primary Purpose: Treatment
Condition:	Major Depressive Disorder
Interventions:	Drug: Duloxetine Drug: Escitalopram

Participant Flow

Hide Participant Flow

Recruitment Details

Key information relevant to the recruitment process for the overall study, such as dates of the recruitment period and locations
No text entered.

Pre-Assignment Details

Significant events and approaches for the overall study following participant enrollment, but prior to group assignment
Acute treatment period (1 week): Participants randomized to switch to 60 milligrams (mg) duloxetine once daily (QD) by mouth (po) or 10 mg escitalopram QD po. Optimization period (7 weeks): Participants given duloxetine or escitalopram in acute study period may optimize their QD po doses (60-120 mg duloxetine QD po; 10-20 mg escitalopram QD po).

Reporting Groups

	Description
Duloxetine	Participants received 60 milligrams (mg) of duloxetine once daily (QD) by mouth (po) for 1 week (Acute Treatment Period) followed by 60-120 mg QD po for the remaining 7 weeks (Optimization Period), with an option to continue treatment for an additional 2 weeks.
Escitalopram	

	Participants received 10 mg of escitalopram QD po for 1 week (Acute Treatment Period) followed by 10-20 mg QD po for the remaining 7 weeks (Optimization Period), with an option to continue treatment for an additional 2 weeks.

Participant Flow for 2 periods

Period 1: Acute Treatment Period

	Duloxetine	Escitalopram
STARTED	244	239
COMPLETED	229	227
NOT COMPLETED	15	12
Adverse Event	3	4
Entry Criteria Not Met	1	2
Protocol Violation	2	0
Sponsor Decision	0	1
Withdrawal by Subject	9	5

Period 2: Optimization Period

	Duloxetine	Escitalopram
STARTED	229	227
COMPLETED	203	204
NOT COMPLETED	26	23
Adverse Event	7	9
Death	0	1
Lack of Efficacy	5	3
Lost to Follow-up	0	1
Physician Decision	1	0
Protocol Violation	3	1
Withdrawal by Subject	10	8

Baseline Characteristics

Hide Baseline Characteristics

Population Description

Explanation of how the number of participants for analysis was determined. Includes whether analysis was per protocol, intention to treat, or another method. Also provides relevant details such as imputation technique, as appropriate.
No text entered.

Reporting Groups

	Description
Duloxetine	Participants received 60 milligrams (mg) of duloxetine once daily (QD) by mouth (po) for 1 week (Acute Treatment Period) followed by 60-120 mg QD po for the remaining 7 weeks (Optimization Period), with an option to continue treatment for an additional 2 weeks.
Escitalopram	Participants received 10 mg of escitalopram QD po for 1 week (Acute Treatment Period) followed by 10-20 mg QD po for the remaining 7 weeks (Optimization Period), with an option to continue treatment for an additional 2 weeks.
Total	Total of all reporting groups

Baseline Measures

	Duloxetine	**Escitalopram**	**Total**
Overall Participants Analyzed [Units: Participants]	**244**	**239**	**483**
Age [Units: Years] Mean (Standard Deviation)	**44.15 (13.81)**	**44.93 (12.89)**	**44.54 (13.35)**
Gender [Units: Participants]			
Female	**187**	**179**	**366**
Male	**57**	**60**	**117**

Ethnicity (NIH/OMB) [Units: Participants]			
Hispanic or Latino	**45**	**44**	**89**
Not Hispanic or Latino	**199**	**195**	**394**
Unknown or Not Reported	**0**	**0**	**0**
Race (NIH/OMB) [1] [Units: Participants]			
American Indian or Alaska Native	**34**	**37**	**71**
Asian	**90**	**82**	**172**
Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander	**1**	**0**	**1**
Black or African American	**0**	**1**	**1**
White	**120**	**119**	**239**
More than one race	**1**	**0**	**1**
Unknown or Not Reported	**0**	**0**	**0**
[1] One participant selected 2 races. Therefore, the total number of participants in the race category will be larger than the number of participants in the baseline table.			
Region of Enrollment [Units: Participants]			
Australia	**24**	**25**	**49**
Canada	**44**	**43**	**87**
China	**47**	**41**	**88**
Italy	**23**	**22**	**45**
Korea, Republic of	**18**	**15**	**33**
Mexico	**42**	**43**	**85**
Russian Federation	**23**	**25**	**48**
Taiwan	**23**	**25**	**48**
Taking Escitalopram 3 Months Prior to Study Entry [1] [Units: Participants]			
Yes	**67**	**59**	**126**

No	**177**	**180**	**357**
[1] Previous therapy status is defined as the number of participants who had taken escitalopram 3 months prior to study entry.			
Apathy Evaluation Scale - Clinician Rated Version (AES-C) Total Score [1] [Units: Units on a scale] Mean (Standard Deviation)	**46.28 (7.82)**	**46.34 (8.14)**	**46.31 (7.97)**
[1] The AES-C is a validated 18-item instrument used to assess cognitive, behavioral, emotional and other symptoms of apathy. Clinicians rate each item based on verbal and nonverbal information provided by the participant. Item scores range from 1 (not at all characteristic) to 4 (a lot characteristic). Total scores range from 18 to 72 where higher derived scores indicate more severe apathy.			
Montgomery-Asberg Depression Rating Scale (MADRS) Total Score [1] [Units: Units on a scale] Mean (Standard Deviation)	**10.57 (3.49)**	**10.29 (3.68)**	**10.43 (3.59)**
[1] The MADRS is a rating scale for severity of depressive mood symptoms. The MADRS has a 10-item checklist. Items are rated on a scale of 0-6, for a total score range of 0 (low severity of depressive symptoms) to 60 (high severity of depressive symptoms).			
Montgomery-Asberg Depression Rating Scale (MADRS) Item 8 Score [1] [Units: Units on a scale] Mean (Standard Deviation)	**1.82 (1.10)**	**1.82 (1.15)**	**1.82 (1.13)**
[1] The MADRS Item 8 assesses participants' inability to feel, through evaluation of their interest in their surroundings or activities that normally give pleasure, as well as their ability to react with adequate emotion to circumstances or people. The score ranges from 0 (normal interest in the surroundings and in other people) to 6 (the experience of being emotionally paralyzed, inability to feel anger, grief or pleasure and a complete or even painful failure to feel for close relatives and friends).			
Clinical Global Impressions of Severity Scale (CGI-S) [1]	**3.05 (0.91)**	**3.04 (0.91)**	**3.05 (0.91)**

[Units: Units on a scale] Mean (Standard Deviation)			

[1] The CGI-S measures severity of illness at the time of assessment compared with start of treatment. Scores range from 1 (normal, not at all ill) to 7 (among the most extremely ill participants).

Rothschild Scale for Antidepressant Tachyphylaxis (RSAT) Total Score [1] [Units: Units on a scale] Mean (Standard Deviation)	**10.72 (4.92)**	**10.51 (4.95)**	**10.62 (4.93)**

[1] RSAT assesses symptoms of apathy or decreased motivation among depressed participants who have achieved symptomatic remission with antidepressant treatment and consists of 6 self-report items assessing energy level, motivation and interest, cognitive functioning, weight gain, sleep and sexual functioning, as well as affect. Each item score ranges from 0 to 4 with total scores ranging from 0 to 28. Higher scores indicate greater disease severity.

The Massachusetts General Hospital Cognitive and Physical functioning Questionnaire (MGH-CPFQ) Total [1] [Units: Units on a scale] Mean (Standard Deviation)	**24.78 (5.73)**	**24.69 (5.83)**	**24.73 (5.78)**

[1] The MGH-CPFQ is a 7-item participant-rated questionnaire evaluating the participant's cognitive and physical well-being during the past month. It assesses motivation, wakefulness, energy, focus, recall, word-finding difficulty, and mental acuity. Each of the 7 items is scored on a 6-point scale ranging from "greater than normal" (score of 1) to "normal" (score of 2), to "totally absent" (score of 6). Total scores range from 7 to 42. Higher scores indicate greater disease severity.

Sheehan Disability Scale - Total Score (SDS Total) [1] [Units: Units on a scale] Mean (Standard Deviation)	**15.32 (6.76)**	**14.62 (6.39)**	**14.98 (6.58)**

[1] The SDS is completed by the participant and is used to assess the effect of the participant's symptoms on their work/social/family life. Total scores range from 0 to 30 with higher values indicating greater disruption in the participant's work/social/family life.

Outcome Measures

Hide All Outcome Measures

1. Primary: Change From Baseline in the Apathy Evaluation Scale - Clinician Rated Version (AES-C) Total Score at Week 8 [Time Frame: Baseline, 8 weeks]

Measure Type	Primary
Measure Title	Change From Baseline in the Apathy Evaluation Scale - Clinician Rated Version (AES-C) Total Score at Week 8
Measure Description	The AES-C is a validated 18-item instrument used to assess cognitive, behavioral, emotional and other symptoms of apathy. Clinicians rate each item based on verbal and nonverbal information provided by the participant. Item scores range from 1 (not at all characteristic) to 4 (a lot characteristic). Total scores range from 18 to 72 where higher derived scores indicate more severe apathy. The Least Squares (LS) Mean Value was calculated from a mixed model repeated measures (MMRM) model with terms of treatment, pooled investigator, visit, treatment*visit, baseline, and baseline*visit.
Time Frame	Baseline, 8 weeks

Population Description

Explanation of how the number of participants for analysis was determined. Includes whether analysis was per protocol, intention to treat, or another method. Also provides relevant details such as imputation technique, as appropriate.
All randomized participants with a baseline and at least 1 post-baseline result.

Reporting Groups

	Description
Duloxetine	Participants received 60 milligrams (mg) of duloxetine once daily (QD) by mouth (po) for 1 week (Acute Treatment Period) followed by 60-120 mg QD po for the remaining 7 weeks (Optimization Period), with an option to continue treatment for an additional 2 weeks.

Escitalopram	Participants received 10 mg of escitalopram QD po for 1 week (Acute Treatment Period) followed by 10-20 mg QD po for the remaining 7 weeks (Optimization Period), with an option to continue treatment for an additional 2 weeks.

Measured Values

	Duloxetine	Escitalopram
Participants Analyzed	**213**	**210**
Change From Baseline in the Apathy Evaluation Scale - Clinician Rated Version (AES-C) Total Score at Week 8 [Units: Units on a scale] Least Squares Mean (Standard Error)	**-13.88 (0.54)**	**-13.50 (0.54)**

Statistical Analysis 1 for Change From Baseline in the Apathy Evaluation Scale - Clinician Rated Version (AES-C) Total Score at Week 8

Groups [1]	All groups
Statistical Test Type [2]	Superiority or Other
Statistical Method [3]	Mixed Models Analysis
P Value [4]	0.612
Mean Difference (Final Values) [5]	-0.38
95% Confidence Interval	-1.87 to 1.10

[1] Additional details about the analysis, such as null hypothesis and power calculation:

No text entered.

[2] Details of power calculation, definition of non-inferiority margin, and other key parameters:

No text entered.

[3] Other relevant method information, such as adjustments or degrees of freedom:

The "Kenward-Roger approximation" was used in the MMRM model.

[4] Additional information, such as whether or not the p-value is adjusted for multiple comparisons and the a priori threshold for statistical significance:

No text entered.

[5] Other relevant estimation information:

No text entered.

2. **Secondary: Change From Baseline in the Apathy Evaluation Scale-Clinician Rated Version (AES-C) Subscale Scores at Week 8 [Time Frame: Baseline, 8 weeks]**

Measure Type	Secondary
Measure Title	Change From Baseline in the Apathy Evaluation Scale-Clinician Rated Version (AES-C) Subscale Scores at Week 8
Measure Description	AES-C subscales separately assess participants' intensity of cognitive, behavioral, emotional, and other apathy symptoms with individual item scores of 1 (not at all characteristic) to 4 (a lot characteristic). Subtotal score ranges for the subscales are: 8-32 (cognitive), 5-20 (behavioral), 2-8 (emotional), and 3-12 for other (display of personal insight, initiative and motivation). Higher subscale scores indicate greater illness severity. The LS Mean Value was calculated from an MMRM model with terms of treatment, pooled investigator, visit, treatment*visit, baseline, and baseline*visit.
Time Frame	Baseline, 8 weeks

Population Description

Explanation of how the number of participants for analysis was determined. Includes whether analysis was per protocol, intention to treat, or another method. Also provides relevant details such as imputation technique, as appropriate.
All randomized participants with a baseline and at least 1 post-baseline result.

Reporting Groups

	Description
Duloxetine	Participants received 60 milligrams (mg) of duloxetine once daily (QD) by mouth (po) for 1 week (Acute Treatment Period) followed by 60-120 mg QD po for the remaining 7 weeks (Optimization Period), with an option to continue treatment for an additional 2 weeks.
Escitalopram	

	Participants received 10 mg of escitalopram QD po for 1 week (Acute Treatment Period) followed by 10-20 mg QD po for the remaining 7 weeks (Optimization Period), with an option to continue treatment for an additional 2 weeks.

Measured Values

	Duloxetine	Escitalopram
Participants Analyzed	**213**	**210**
Change From Baseline in the Apathy Evaluation Scale-Clinician Rated Version (AES-C) Subscale Scores at Week 8 [Units: Units on a scale] Least Squares Mean (Standard Error)		
Cognition Items Total Score	**-6.49 (0.26)**	**-6.25 (0.26)**
Behavior Items Total Score	**-3.35 (0.15)**	**-3.25 (0.16)**
Emotional Items Total Score	**-1.66 (0.08)**	**-1.58 (0.08)**
Other Items Total Score	**-2.43 (0.10)**	**-2.44 (0.10)**

Statistical Analysis 1 for Change From Baseline in the Apathy Evaluation Scale-Clinician Rated Version (AES-C) Subscale Scores at Week 8

Groups [1]	All groups
Statistical Test Type [2]	Superiority or Other
Statistical Method [3]	Mixed Models Analysis
P Value [4]	0.504

[1] Additional details about the analysis, such as null hypothesis and power calculation:

No text entered.

[2] Details of power calculation, definition of non-inferiority margin, and other key parameters:

No text entered.

[3] Other relevant method information, such as adjustments or degrees of freedom:

The “Kenward-Roger approximation” was used in the MMRM model.

[4] Additional information, such as whether or not the p-value is adjusted for multiple comparisons and the a priori threshold for statistical significance:

This is the p-value for Cognition Items Total Score.

Statistical Analysis 2 for Change From Baseline in the Apathy Evaluation Scale-Clinician Rated Version (AES-C) Subscale Scores at Week 8

Groups [1]	All groups
Statistical Test Type [2]	Superiority or Other
Statistical Method [3]	Mixed Models Analysis
P Value [4]	0.665

[1] Additional details about the analysis, such as null hypothesis and power calculation:

No text entered.

[2] Details of power calculation, definition of non-inferiority margin, and other key parameters:

No text entered.

[3] Other relevant method information, such as adjustments or degrees of freedom:

The “Kenward-Roger approximation” was used in the MMRM model.

[4] Additional information, such as whether or not the p-value is adjusted for multiple comparisons and the a priori threshold for statistical significance:

This is the p-value for the Behavior Items Total Score.

Statistical Analysis 3 for Change From Baseline in the Apathy Evaluation Scale-Clinician Rated Version (AES-C) Subscale Scores at Week 8

Groups [1]	All groups
Statistical Test Type [2]	Superiority or Other
Statistical Method [3]	Mixed Models Analysis
P Value [4]	0.489

[1] Additional details about the analysis, such as null hypothesis and power calculation:

No text entered.

[2] Details of power calculation, definition of non-inferiority margin, and other key parameters:

No text entered.

[3] Other relevant method information, such as adjustments or degrees of freedom:

The “Kenward-Roger approximation” was used in the MMRM model.

[4] Additional information, such as whether or not the p-value is adjusted for multiple comparisons and the a priori threshold for statistical significance:

This is the p-value for Emotional Items Total Score.

Statistical Analysis 4 for Change From Baseline in the Apathy Evaluation Scale-Clinician Rated Version (AES-C) Subscale Scores at Week 8

Groups [1]	All groups
Statistical Test Type [2]	Superiority or Other
Statistical Method [3]	Mixed Models Analysis
P Value [4]	0.945

[1] Additional details about the analysis, such as null hypothesis and power calculation:

No text entered.

[2] Details of power calculation, definition of non-inferiority margin, and other key parameters:

No text entered.

[3] Other relevant method information, such as adjustments or degrees of freedom:

The “Kenward-Roger approximation” was used in the MMRM model.

[4] Additional information, such as whether or not the p-value is adjusted for multiple comparisons and the a priori threshold for statistical significance:

This is the p-value for Other Items Total Score.

3. Secondary: Change From Baseline in the Rothschild Scale for Antidepressant Tachyphylaxis (RSAT) Total and Individual Item Scores at Week 8 [Time Frame: Baseline, 8 weeks]

Measure Type	Secondary
Measure Title	Change From Baseline in the Rothschild Scale for Antidepressant Tachyphylaxis (RSAT) Total and Individual Item Scores at Week 8
Measure Description	RSAT assesses symptoms of apathy or decreased motivation among depressed participants who have achieved symptomatic remission with antidepressant treatment and consists of 6 self-report items assessing energy level, motivation and interest, cognitive functioning, weight gain, sleep and sexual functioning, as well as affect. Each item score ranges from 0 to 4 with total scores ranging from 0 to 28. Higher scores indicate

	greater disease severity. LS Mean Value was calculated from an MMRM model with terms of treatment, pooled investigator, visit, treatment*visit, baseline, and baseline*visit.
Time Frame	Baseline, 8 weeks

Population Description

Explanation of how the number of participants for analysis was determined. Includes whether analysis was per protocol, intention to treat, or another method. Also provides relevant details such as imputation technique, as appropriate.
All randomized participants with a baseline at and least 1 post-baseline result.

Reporting Groups

	Description
Duloxetine	Participants received 60 milligrams (mg) of duloxetine once daily (QD) by mouth (po) for 1 week (Acute Treatment Period) followed by 60-120 mg QD po for the remaining 7 weeks (Optimization Period), with an option to continue treatment for an additional 2 weeks.
Escitalopram	Participants received 10 mg of escitalopram QD po for 1 week (Acute Treatment Period) followed by 10-20 mg QD po for the remaining 7 weeks (Optimization Period), with an option to continue treatment for an additional 2 weeks.

Measured Values

	Duloxetine	**Escitalopram**
Participants Analyzed	**212**	**210**
Change From Baseline in the Rothschild Scale for Antidepressant Tachyphylaxis (RSAT) Total and Individual Item Scores at Week 8 [Units: Units on a scale] Least Squares Mean (Standard Error)		
RSAT Total Score	**-5.50 (0.26)**	**-4.98 (0.26)**
Energy Level	**-1.33 (0.07)**	**-1.19 (0.07)**
Motivation and Interest	**-1.41 (0.06)**	**-1.29 (0.06)**
Cognitive Functioning	**-0.90 (0.06)**	**-0.80 (0.06)**
Weight Gain	**-0.25 (0.05)**	**-0.11 (0.05)**

Sleep	**-0.48 (0.08)**	**-0.55 (0.08)**
Sexual Functioning	**-0.62 (0.07)**	**-0.60 (0.07)**
Affect	**-0.53 (0.04)**	**-0.50 (0.04)**

Statistical Analysis 1 for Change From Baseline in the Rothschild Scale for Antidepressant Tachyphylaxis (RSAT) Total and Individual Item Scores at Week 8

Groups [1]	All groups
Statistical Test Type [2]	Superiority or Other
Statistical Method [3]	Mixed Models Analysis
P Value [4]	0.157

[1] Additional details about the analysis, such as null hypothesis and power calculation:

No text entered.

[2] Details of power calculation, definition of non-inferiority margin, and other key parameters:

No text entered.

[3] Other relevant method information, such as adjustments or degrees of freedom:

The “Kenward-Roger approximation” was used in the MMRM model.

[4] Additional information, such as whether or not the p-value is adjusted for multiple comparisons and the a priori threshold for statistical significance:

This is the p-value for the Total Score.

Statistical Analysis 2 for Change From Baseline in the Rothschild Scale for Antidepressant Tachyphylaxis (RSAT) Total and Individual Item Scores at Week 8

Groups [1]	All groups
Statistical Test Type [2]	Superiority or Other
Statistical Method [3]	Mixed Models Analysis
P Value [4]	0.119

[1] Additional details about the analysis, such as null hypothesis and power calculation:

No text entered.

[2] Details of power calculation, definition of non-inferiority margin, and other key parameters:

No text entered.

[3] Other relevant method information, such as adjustments or degrees of freedom:

The “Kenward-Roger approximation” was used in the MMRM model.

[4] Additional information, such as whether or not the p-value is adjusted for multiple comparisons and the a priori threshold for statistical significance:

This is the p-value for the Energy Level score.

Statistical Analysis 3 for Change From Baseline in the Rothschild Scale for Antidepressant Tachyphylaxis (RSAT) Total and Individual Item Scores at Week 8

Groups [1]	All groups
Statistical Test Type [2]	Superiority or Other
Statistical Method [3]	Mixed Models Analysis
P Value [4]	0.184

[1] Additional details about the analysis, such as null hypothesis and power calculation:

No text entered.

[2] Details of power calculation, definition of non-inferiority margin, and other key parameters:

No text entered.

[3] Other relevant method information, such as adjustments or degrees of freedom:

The “Kenward-Roger approximation” was used in the MMRM model.

[4] Additional information, such as whether or not the p-value is adjusted for multiple comparisons and the a priori threshold for statistical significance:

This is the p-value for the Motivation and Interest score.

Statistical Analysis 4 for Change From Baseline in the Rothschild Scale for Antidepressant Tachyphylaxis (RSAT) Total and Individual Item Scores at Week 8

Groups [1]	All groups
Statistical Test Type [2]	Superiority or Other
Statistical Method [3]	Mixed Models Analysis
P Value [4]	0.226

[1] Additional details about the analysis, such as null hypothesis and power calculation:

No text entered.

[2] Details of power calculation, definition of non-inferiority margin, and other key parameters:

No text entered.

[3] Other relevant method information, such as adjustments or degrees of freedom:

The “Kenward-Roger approximation” was used in the MMRM model.

[4] Additional information, such as whether or not the p-value is adjusted for multiple comparisons and the a priori threshold for statistical significance:

This is the p-value for the Cognitive Functioning score.

Statistical Analysis 5 for Change From Baseline in the Rothschild Scale for Antidepressant Tachyphylaxis (RSAT) Total and Individual Item Scores at Week 8

Groups [1]	All groups
Statistical Test Type [2]	Superiority or Other
Statistical Method [3]	Mixed Models Analysis
P Value [4]	0.059

[1] Additional details about the analysis, such as null hypothesis and power calculation:

No text entered.

[2] Details of power calculation, definition of non-inferiority margin, and other key parameters:

No text entered.

[3] Other relevant method information, such as adjustments or degrees of freedom:

The “Kenward-Roger approximation” was used in the MMRM model.

[4] Additional information, such as whether or not the p-value is adjusted for multiple comparisons and the a priori threshold for statistical significance:

This is the p-value for the Weight Gain score.

Statistical Analysis 6 for Change From Baseline in the Rothschild Scale for Antidepressant Tachyphylaxis (RSAT) Total and Individual Item Scores at Week 8

Groups [1]	All groups
Statistical Test Type [2]	Superiority or Other
Statistical Method [3]	Mixed Models Analysis
P Value [4]	0.466

[1] Additional details about the analysis, such as null hypothesis and power calculation:

No text entered.

[2] Details of power calculation, definition of non-inferiority margin, and other key parameters:

No text entered.

[3] Other relevant method information, such as adjustments or degrees of freedom:

The “Kenward-Roger approximation” was used in the MMRM model.

[4] Additional information, such as whether or not the p-value is adjusted for multiple comparisons and the a priori threshold for statistical significance:

This is the p-value for the Sleep score.

Statistical Analysis 7 for Change From Baseline in the Rothschild Scale for Antidepressant Tachyphylaxis (RSAT) Total and Individual Item Scores at Week 8

Groups [1]	All groups
Statistical Test Type [2]	Superiority or Other
Statistical Method [3]	Mixed Models Analysis
P Value [4]	0.822

[1] Additional details about the analysis, such as null hypothesis and power calculation:

No text entered.

[2] Details of power calculation, definition of non-inferiority margin, and other key parameters:

No text entered.

[3] Other relevant method information, such as adjustments or degrees of freedom:

The “Kenward-Roger approximation” was used in the MMRM model.

[4] Additional information, such as whether or not the p-value is adjusted for multiple comparisons and the a priori threshold for statistical significance:

This is the p-value for the Sexual Functioning score.

Statistical Analysis 8 for Change From Baseline in the Rothschild Scale for Antidepressant Tachyphylaxis (RSAT) Total and Individual Item Scores at Week 8

Groups [1]	All groups
Statistical Test Type [2]	Superiority or Other
Statistical Method [3]	Mixed Models Analysis
P Value [4]	0.599

[1] Additional details about the analysis, such as null hypothesis and power calculation:

No text entered.

[2] Details of power calculation, definition of non-inferiority margin, and other key parameters:

No text entered.

[3] Other relevant method information, such as adjustments or degrees of freedom:

The “Kenward-Roger approximation” was used in the MMRM model.

[4] Additional information, such as whether or not the p-value is adjusted for multiple comparisons and the a priori threshold for statistical significance:

This is the p-value for the Affect score.

4. Secondary: Patient’s Global Impressions of Improvement Scale (PGI-I) Rating Scale Score at Week 8 [Time Frame: 8 weeks]

Measure Type	Secondary
Measure Title	Patient’s Global Impressions of Improvement Scale (PGI-I) Rating Scale Score at Week 8
Measure Description	The PGI-I is a scale that measures the participant's perception of improvement at the time of assessment compared with the start of treatment. The score ranges from 1 (very much better) to 7 (very much worse). The LS Mean Value was calculated from an MMRM model with terms of treatment, pooled investigator, visit, and treatment*visit.
Time Frame	8 weeks

Population Description

Explanation of how the number of participants for analysis was determined. Includes whether analysis was per protocol, intention to treat, or another method. Also provides relevant details such as imputation technique, as appropriate.
All randomized participants.

Reporting Groups

	Description
Duloxetine	Participants received 60 milligrams (mg) of duloxetine once daily (QD) by mouth (po) for 1 week (Acute Treatment Period) followed by 60-120 mg QD po for the

	remaining 7 weeks (Optimization Period), with an option to continue treatment for an additional 2 weeks.
Escitalopram	Participants received 10 mg of escitalopram QD po for 1 week (Acute Treatment Period) followed by 10-20 mg QD po for the remaining 7 weeks (Optimization Period), with an option to continue treatment for an additional 2 weeks.

Measured Values

	Duloxetine	**Escitalopram**
Participants Analyzed	**213**	**210**
Patient's Global Impressions of Improvement Scale (PGI-I) Rating Scale Score at Week 8 [Units: Units on a scale] Least Squares Mean (Standard Error)	**2.59 (0.08)**	**2.55 (0.08)**

Statistical Analysis 1 for Patient's Global Impressions of Improvement Scale (PGI-I) Rating Scale Score at Week 8

Groups [1]	All groups
Statistical Test Type [2]	Superiority or Other
Statistical Method [3]	Mixed Models Analysis
P Value [4]	0.723

[1] Additional details about the analysis, such as null hypothesis and power calculation:

No text entered.

[2] Details of power calculation, definition of non-inferiority margin, and other key parameters:

No text entered.

[3] Other relevant method information, such as adjustments or degrees of freedom:

The "Kenward-Roger approximation" was used in the MMRM model.

[4] Additional information, such as whether or not the p-value is adjusted for multiple comparisons and the a priori threshold for statistical significance:

This is the p-value for the PGI-I.

5. Secondary: Change From Baseline in the Clinical Global Impression of Severity (CGI-S) Rating Scale at Week 8 [Time Frame: Baseline, 8 weeks]

Measure Type	Secondary
Measure Title	Change From Baseline in the Clinical Global Impression of Severity (CGI-S) Rating Scale at Week 8
Measure Description	The CGI-S measures severity of illness at the time of assessment compared with start of treatment. Scores range from 1 (normal, not at all ill) to 7 (among the most extremely ill patients). The LS Mean Value was calculated from an MMRM model with terms of treatment, pooled investigator, visit, treatment*visit, baseline, and baseline*visit.
Time Frame	Baseline, 8 weeks

Population Description

Explanation of how the number of participants for analysis was determined. Includes whether analysis was per protocol, intention to treat, or another method. Also provides relevant details such as imputation technique, as appropriate.
All randomized participants with a baseline and at least 1 post-baseline result.

Reporting Groups

	Description
Duloxetine	Participants received 60 milligrams (mg) of duloxetine once daily (QD) by mouth (po) for 1 week (Acute Treatment Period) followed by 60-120 mg QD po for the remaining 7 weeks (Optimization Period), with an option to continue treatment for an additional 2 weeks.
Escitalopram	Participants received 10 mg of escitalopram QD po for 1 week (Acute Treatment Period) followed by 10-20 mg QD po for the remaining 7 weeks (Optimization Period), with an option to continue treatment for an additional 2 weeks.

Measured Values

	Duloxetine	**Escitalopram**
Participants Analyzed	**213**	**210**
	-0.86 (0.06)	**-0.93 (0.06)**

Change From Baseline in the Clinical Global Impression of Severity (CGI-S) Rating Scale at Week 8 [Units: Units on a scale] Least Squares Mean (Standard Error)		

Statistical Analysis 1 for Change From Baseline in the Clinical Global Impression of Severity (CGI-S) Rating Scale at Week 8

Groups [1]	All groups
Statistical Test Type [2]	Superiority or Other
Statistical Method [3]	Mixed Models Analysis
P Value [4]	0.410

[1] Additional details about the analysis, such as null hypothesis and power calculation:

No text entered.

[2] Details of power calculation, definition of non-inferiority margin, and other key parameters:

No text entered.

[3] Other relevant method information, such as adjustments or degrees of freedom:

The “Kenward-Roger approximation” was used in the MMRM model.

[4] Additional information, such as whether or not the p-value is adjusted for multiple comparisons and the a priori threshold for statistical significance:

No text entered.

6. Secondary: Change From Baseline in the Montgomery-Asberg Depression Rating Scale (MADRS) Total Score and Item 8 (Inability to Feel) at Week 8 [Time Frame: Baseline, 8 weeks]

Measure Type	Secondary
Measure Title	Change From Baseline in the Montgomery-Asberg Depression Rating Scale (MADRS) Total Score and Item 8 (Inability to Feel) at Week 8
Measure Description	MADRS is a rating scale for severity of depressive mood symptoms and has a 10-item checklist. Items are rated on a scale of 0-6, for a total

	score range of 0 (low severity of depressive symptoms) to 60 (high severity of depressive symptoms). Item 8 assesses the participant's inability to feel. Scores range from 0 (normal interest in surroundings and other people) to 6 (emotional paralysis, inability to feel anger/grief/pleasure). The LS Mean Value was calculated from an MMRM model with terms of treatment, pooled investigator, visit, treatment*visit, baseline, and baseline*visit.
Time Frame	Baseline, 8 weeks

Population Description

Explanation of how the number of participants for analysis was determined. Includes whether analysis was per protocol, intention to treat, or another method. Also provides relevant details such as imputation technique, as appropriate.
All randomized participants with a baseline and at least 1 post-baseline result.

Reporting Groups

	Description
Duloxetine	Participants received 60 milligrams (mg) of duloxetine once daily (QD) by mouth (po) for 1 week (Acute Treatment Period) followed by 60-120 mg QD po for the remaining 7 weeks (Optimization Period), with an option to continue treatment for an additional 2 weeks.
Escitalopram	Participants received 10 mg of escitalopram QD po for 1 week (Acute Treatment Period) followed by 10-20 mg QD po for the remaining 7 weeks (Optimization Period), with an option to continue treatment for an additional 2 weeks.

Measured Values

	Duloxetine	**Escitalopram**
Participants Analyzed	**213**	**210**
Change From Baseline in the Montgomery-Asberg Depression Rating Scale (MADRS) Total Score and Item 8 (Inability to Feel) at Week 8 [Units: Units on a scale] Least Squares Mean (Standard Error)		
Total Score	**-4.21 (0.32)**	**-4.14 (0.33)**

Item 8 (Inability to Feel)	**-1.01 (0.06)**	**-0.90 (0.06)**

Statistical Analysis 1 for Change From Baseline in the Montgomery-Asberg Depression Rating Scale (MADRS) Total Score and Item 8 (Inability to Feel) at Week 8

Groups [1]	All groups
Statistical Test Type [2]	Superiority or Other
Statistical Method [3]	Mixed Models Analysis
P Value [4]	0.880

[1] Additional details about the analysis, such as null hypothesis and power calculation:

No text entered.

[2] Details of power calculation, definition of non-inferiority margin, and other key parameters:

No text entered.

[3] Other relevant method information, such as adjustments or degrees of freedom:

The “Kenward-Roger approximation” was used in the MMRM model.

[4] Additional information, such as whether or not the p-value is adjusted for multiple comparisons and the a priori threshold for statistical significance:

This is the p-value for the Total Score.

Statistical Analysis 2 for Change From Baseline in the Montgomery-Asberg Depression Rating Scale (MADRS) Total Score and Item 8 (Inability to Feel) at Week 8

Groups [1]	All groups
Statistical Test Type [2]	Superiority or Other
Statistical Method [3]	Mixed Models Analysis
P Value [4]	0.224

[1] Additional details about the analysis, such as null hypothesis and power calculation:

No text entered.

[2] Details of power calculation, definition of non-inferiority margin, and other key parameters:

No text entered.

[3] Other relevant method information, such as adjustments or degrees of freedom:

The “Kenward-Roger approximation” was used in the MMRM model.

[4] Additional information, such as whether or not the p-value is adjusted for multiple comparisons and the a priori threshold for statistical significance:

This is the p-value for the Item 8 (Inability to Feel) score.

7. Secondary: Change From Baseline in the Massachusetts General Hospital Cognitive and Physical Functioning Questionnaire (MGH-CPFQ) Total and Item Scores at Week 8 [Time Frame: Baseline, 8 weeks]

Measure Type	Secondary
Measure Title	Change From Baseline in the Massachusetts General Hospital Cognitive and Physical Functioning Questionnaire (MGH-CPFQ) Total and Item Scores at Week 8
Measure Description	The MGH-CPFQ is a 7-item participant-rated questionnaire evaluating the participant's cognitive and physical well-being during the past month. The MGH-CPFQ assesses motivation, wakefulness, energy, focus, recall, word-finding difficulty, and mental acuity. Each item is scored on a 6-point scale ranging from 1 ("greater than normal") to 2 ("normal") to 6 ("totally absent"). Total scores range from 7 to 42. Higher scores indicate greater disease severity. The LS Mean Value was calculated from an analysis of covariance (ANCOVA) model with terms of treatment, pooled investigator, and baseline.
Time Frame	Baseline, 8 weeks

Population Description

Explanation of how the number of participants for analysis was determined. Includes whether analysis was per protocol, intention to treat, or another method. Also provides relevant details such as imputation technique, as appropriate.
All randomized participants with a baseline and at least 1 post-baseline result.

Reporting Groups

	Description
Duloxetine	Participants received 60 milligrams (mg) of duloxetine once daily (QD) by mouth (po) for 1 week (Acute Treatment Period) followed by 60-120 mg QD po for the

	remaining 7 weeks (Optimization Period), with an option to continue treatment for an additional 2 weeks.
Escitalopram	Participants received 10 mg of escitalopram QD po for 1 week (Acute Treatment Period) followed by 10-20 mg QD po for the remaining 7 weeks (Optimization Period), with an option to continue treatment for an additional 2 weeks.

Measured Values

	Duloxetine	Escitalopram
Participants Analyzed	**221**	**214**
Change From Baseline in the Massachusetts General Hospital Cognitive and Physical Functioning Questionnaire (MGH-CPFQ) Total and Item Scores at Week 8 [Units: Units on a scale] Least Squares Mean (Standard Error)		
Total Score	**-6.96 (0.34)**	**-6.91 (0.35)**
Motivation/Interest/Enthusiasm Score	**-1.34 (0.07)**	**-1.35 (0.07)**
Wakefulness/Alertness Score	**-0.96 (0.06)**	**-1.00 (0.06)**
Energy Score	**-1.28 (0.07)**	**-1.21 (0.07)**
Ability to Focus/Sustain Attention Score	**-0.99 (0.06)**	**-1.02 (0.06)**
Ability to Remember/Recall Information Score	**-0.91 (0.06)**	**-0.85 (0.06)**
Ability to Find Words Score	**-0.69 (0.05)**	**-0.71 (0.05)**
Sharpness/Mental Acuity Score	**-0.79 (0.05)**	**-0.85 (0.06)**

Statistical Analysis 1 for Change From Baseline in the Massachusetts General Hospital Cognitive and Physical Functioning Questionnaire (MGH-CPFQ) Total and Item Scores at Week 8

Groups [1]	All groups
Statistical Test Type [2]	Superiority or Other
Statistical Method [3]	ANCOVA
P Value [4]	0.910

[1] Additional details about the analysis, such as null hypothesis and power calculation:

No text entered.

[2] Details of power calculation, definition of non-inferiority margin, and other key parameters:

No text entered.

[3] Other relevant method information, such as adjustments or degrees of freedom:

ANCOVA main effect F test

[4] Additional information, such as whether or not the p-value is adjusted for multiple comparisons and the a priori threshold for statistical significance:

This is the p-value for the Total Score.

Statistical Analysis 2 for Change From Baseline in the Massachusetts General Hospital Cognitive and Physical Functioning Questionnaire (MGH-CPFQ) Total and Item Scores at Week 8

Groups [1]	All groups
Statistical Test Type [2]	Superiority or Other
Statistical Method [3]	ANCOVA
P Value [4]	0.882

[1] Additional details about the analysis, such as null hypothesis and power calculation:

No text entered.

[2] Details of power calculation, definition of non-inferiority margin, and other key parameters:

No text entered.

[3] Other relevant method information, such as adjustments or degrees of freedom:

ANCOVA main effect F test

[4] Additional information, such as whether or not the p-value is adjusted for multiple comparisons and the a priori threshold for statistical significance:

This is the p-value for the Motivation/Interest/Enthusiasm Score.

Statistical Analysis 3 for Change From Baseline in the Massachusetts General Hospital Cognitive and Physical Functioning Questionnaire (MGH-CPFQ) Total and Item Scores at Week 8

Groups [1]	All groups
Statistical Test Type [2]	Superiority or Other
Statistical Method [3]	ANCOVA
P Value [4]	0.657

[1] Additional details about the analysis, such as null hypothesis and power calculation:

No text entered.

[2] Details of power calculation, definition of non-inferiority margin, and other key parameters:

No text entered.

[3] Other relevant method information, such as adjustments or degrees of freedom:

ANCOVA main effect F test

[4] Additional information, such as whether or not the p-value is adjusted for multiple comparisons and the a priori threshold for statistical significance:

This is the p-value for the Wakefulness/Alertness Score.

Statistical Analysis 4 for Change From Baseline in the Massachusetts General Hospital Cognitive and Physical Functioning Questionnaire (MGH-CPFQ) Total and Item Scores at Week 8

Groups [1]	All groups
Statistical Test Type [2]	Superiority or Other
Statistical Method [3]	ANCOVA
P Value [4]	0.457

[1] Additional details about the analysis, such as null hypothesis and power calculation:

No text entered.

[2] Details of power calculation, definition of non-inferiority margin, and other key parameters:

No text entered.

[3] Other relevant method information, such as adjustments or degrees of freedom:

ANCOVA main effect F test

[4] Additional information, such as whether or not the p-value is adjusted for multiple comparisons and the a priori threshold for statistical significance:

This is the p-value for the Energy Score.

Statistical Analysis 5 for Change From Baseline in the Massachusetts General Hospital Cognitive and Physical Functioning Questionnaire (MGH-CPFQ) Total and Item Scores at Week 8

Groups [1]	All groups
Statistical Test Type [2]	Superiority or Other
Statistical Method [3]	ANCOVA
P Value [4]	0.737

[1] Additional details about the analysis, such as null hypothesis and power calculation:

No text entered.

[2] Details of power calculation, definition of non-inferiority margin, and other key parameters:

No text entered.

[3] Other relevant method information, such as adjustments or degrees of freedom:

ANCOVA main effect F test

[4] Additional information, such as whether or not the p-value is adjusted for multiple comparisons and the a priori threshold for statistical significance:

This is the p-value for the Ability to Focus/Sustain Attention Score.

Statistical Analysis 6 for Change From Baseline in the Massachusetts General Hospital Cognitive and Physical Functioning Questionnaire (MGH-CPFQ) Total and Item Scores at Week 8

Groups [1]	All groups
Statistical Test Type [2]	Superiority or Other
Statistical Method [3]	ANCOVA
P Value [4]	0.404

[1] Additional details about the analysis, such as null hypothesis and power calculation:

No text entered.

[2] Details of power calculation, definition of non-inferiority margin, and other key parameters:

No text entered.

[3] Other relevant method information, such as adjustments or degrees of freedom:

ANCOVA main effect F test

[4] Additional information, such as whether or not the p-value is adjusted for multiple comparisons and the a priori threshold for statistical significance:

This is the p-value for the Ability to Remember/Recall Information Score.

Statistical Analysis 7 for Change From Baseline in the Massachusetts General Hospital Cognitive and Physical Functioning Questionnaire (MGH-CPFQ) Total and Item Scores at Week 8

Groups [1]	All groups
Statistical Test Type [2]	Superiority or Other
Statistical Method [3]	ANCOVA

P Value [4]	0.808

[1] Additional details about the analysis, such as null hypothesis and power calculation:

No text entered.

[2] Details of power calculation, definition of non-inferiority margin, and other key parameters:

No text entered.

[3] Other relevant method information, such as adjustments or degrees of freedom:

ANCOVA main effect F test

[4] Additional information, such as whether or not the p-value is adjusted for multiple comparisons and the a priori threshold for statistical significance:

This is the p-value for the Ability to Find Words Score.

Statistical Analysis 8 for Change From Baseline in the Massachusetts General Hospital Cognitive and Physical Functioning Questionnaire (MGH-CPFQ) Total and Item Scores at Week 8

Groups [1]	All groups
Statistical Test Type [2]	Superiority or Other
Statistical Method [3]	ANCOVA
P Value [4]	0.431

[1] Additional details about the analysis, such as null hypothesis and power calculation:

No text entered.

[2] Details of power calculation, definition of non-inferiority margin, and other key parameters:

No text entered.

[3] Other relevant method information, such as adjustments or degrees of freedom:

ANCOVA main effect F test

[4] Additional information, such as whether or not the p-value is adjusted for multiple comparisons and the a priori threshold for statistical significance:

This is the p-value for the Sharpness/Mental Acuity Score.

8. Secondary: Change From Baseline in the Sheehan Disability Scale (SDS) Total and Individual Scores at Week 8 [Time Frame: Baseline, 8 weeks]

Measure Type	Secondary
Measure Title	Change From Baseline in the Sheehan Disability Scale (SDS) Total and Individual Scores at Week 8
Measure Description	The SDS is a participant-rated assessment. Total scores range from 0-30 with higher values indicating greater disruption in the participant's work/social/family life. Items 1-3 assess the effect of the participant's symptoms on work/school schedule, social life/leisure activities, and family life/home responsibilities, respectively. Item scores are 0-10; higher values indicate greater disruption. Number of unproductive days and days lost in past week (symptom related) were reported. LS Mean Value was calculated from an ANCOVA model with terms of treatment, pooled investigator, and baseline.
Time Frame	Baseline, 8 weeks

Population Description

Explanation of how the number of participants for analysis was determined. Includes whether analysis was per protocol, intention to treat, or another method. Also provides relevant details such as imputation technique, as appropriate.
All randomized participants with a baseline and at least 1 post-baseline result.

Reporting Groups

	Description
Duloxetine	Participants received 60 milligrams (mg) of duloxetine once daily (QD) by mouth (po) for 1 week (Acute Treatment Period) followed by 60-120 mg QD po for the remaining 7 weeks (Optimization Period), with an option to continue treatment for an additional 2 weeks.
Escitalopram	Participants received 10 mg of escitalopram QD po for 1 week (Acute Treatment Period) followed by 10-20 mg QD po for the remaining 7 weeks (Optimization Period), with an option to continue treatment for an additional 2 weeks.

Measured Values

	Duloxetine	**Escitalopram**
Participants Analyzed	**211**	**209**

Change From Baseline in the Sheehan Disability Scale (SDS) Total and Individual Scores at Week 8 [Units: Units on a scale] Least Squares Mean (Standard Error)		
SDS Total Score	**-7.55 (0.40)**	**-7.67 (0.41)**
SDS Work Score	**-2.42 (0.14)**	**-2.29 (0.14)**
SDS Family Score (N=212, 210)	**-2.51 (0.16)**	**-2.67 (0.16)**
SDS Social Score (N=212, 210)	**-2.56 (0.16)**	**-2.72 (0.16)**
SDS Days Lost Score (N=208, 204)	**-0.55 (0.11)**	**-0.60 (0.11)**
SDS Days Unproductive Score (N=209, 205)	**-1.78 (0.13)**	**-1.89 (0.13)**

Statistical Analysis 1 for Change From Baseline in the Sheehan Disability Scale (SDS) Total and Individual Scores at Week 8

Groups [1]	All groups
Statistical Test Type [2]	Superiority or Other
Statistical Method [3]	ANCOVA
P Value [4]	0.821

[1] Additional details about the analysis, such as null hypothesis and power calculation:

No text entered.

[2] Details of power calculation, definition of non-inferiority margin, and other key parameters:

No text entered.

[3] Other relevant method information, such as adjustments or degrees of freedom:

ANCOVA main effect F test

[4] Additional information, such as whether or not the p-value is adjusted for multiple comparisons and the a priori threshold for statistical significance:

This is the p-value for the SDS Total Score.

Statistical Analysis 2 for Change From Baseline in the Sheehan Disability Scale (SDS) Total and Individual Scores at Week 8

Groups [1]	All groups
Statistical Test Type [2]	Superiority or Other

Statistical Method [3]	ANCOVA
P Value [4]	0.491

[1] Additional details about the analysis, such as null hypothesis and power calculation:

No text entered.

[2] Details of power calculation, definition of non-inferiority margin, and other key parameters:

No text entered.

[3] Other relevant method information, such as adjustments or degrees of freedom:

ANCOVA main effect F test

[4] Additional information, such as whether or not the p-value is adjusted for multiple comparisons and the a priori threshold for statistical significance:

This is the p-value for the Item 1 (Work) Score.

Statistical Analysis 3 for Change From Baseline in the Sheehan Disability Scale (SDS) Total and Individual Scores at Week 8

Groups [1]	All groups
Statistical Test Type [2]	Superiority or Other
Statistical Method [3]	ANCOVA
P Value [4]	0.451

[1] Additional details about the analysis, such as null hypothesis and power calculation:

No text entered.

[2] Details of power calculation, definition of non-inferiority margin, and other key parameters:

No text entered.

[3] Other relevant method information, such as adjustments or degrees of freedom:

ANCOVA main effect F test

[4] Additional information, such as whether or not the p-value is adjusted for multiple comparisons and the a priori threshold for statistical significance:

This is the p-value for the Item 2 (Family) Score.

Statistical Analysis 4 for Change From Baseline in the Sheehan Disability Scale (SDS) Total and Individual Scores at Week 8

Groups [1]	All groups

Statistical Test Type [2]	Superiority or Other
Statistical Method [3]	ANCOVA
P Value [4]	0.443

[1] Additional details about the analysis, such as null hypothesis and power calculation:

No text entered.

[2] Details of power calculation, definition of non-inferiority margin, and other key parameters:

No text entered.

[3] Other relevant method information, such as adjustments or degrees of freedom:

ANCOVA main effect F test

[4] Additional information, such as whether or not the p-value is adjusted for multiple comparisons and the a priori threshold for statistical significance:

This is the p-value for the Item 3 (Social) Score.

Statistical Analysis 5 for Change From Baseline in the Sheehan Disability Scale (SDS) Total and Individual Scores at Week 8

Groups [1]	All groups
Statistical Test Type [2]	Superiority or Other
Statistical Method [3]	ANCOVA
P Value [4]	0.719

[1] Additional details about the analysis, such as null hypothesis and power calculation:

No text entered.

[2] Details of power calculation, definition of non-inferiority margin, and other key parameters:

No text entered.

[3] Other relevant method information, such as adjustments or degrees of freedom:

ANCOVA main effect F test

[4] Additional information, such as whether or not the p-value is adjusted for multiple comparisons and the a priori threshold for statistical significance:

This is the p-value for the Item 4 (Days Lost) Score.

Statistical Analysis 6 for Change From Baseline in the Sheehan Disability Scale (SDS) Total and Individual Scores at Week 8

Groups [1]	All groups
Statistical Test Type [2]	Superiority or Other
Statistical Method [3]	ANCOVA
P Value [4]	0.517

[1] Additional details about the analysis, such as null hypothesis and power calculation:

No text entered.

[2] Details of power calculation, definition of non-inferiority margin, and other key parameters:

No text entered.

[3] Other relevant method information, such as adjustments or degrees of freedom:

ANCOVA main effect F test

[4] Additional information, such as whether or not the p-value is adjusted for multiple comparisons and the a priori threshold for statistical significance:

This is the p-value for the Item 5 (Days Underproductive) Score.

9. Secondary: Percentage of Participants Who Relapsed During 8 Weeks [Time Frame: Baseline through 8 weeks]

Measure Type	Secondary
Measure Title	Percentage of Participants Who Relapsed During 8 Weeks
Measure Description	Relapse is defined as achieving a Montgomery-Asberg Depression Rating Scale (MADRS) total score≥16 at any time after baseline. The MADRS is a rating scale for severity of depressive mood symptoms. The MADRS has a 10-item checklist. Items are rated on a scale of 0-6, for a total score range of 0 (low severity of depressive symptoms) to 60 (high severity of depressive symptoms).
Time Frame	Baseline through 8 weeks

Population Description

Explanation of how the number of participants for analysis was determined. Includes whether analysis was per protocol, intention to treat, or another method. Also provides relevant details such as imputation technique, as appropriate.

All randomized participants with a baseline and at least 1 post-baseline result.

Reporting Groups

	Description
Duloxetine	Participants received 60 milligrams (mg) of duloxetine once daily (QD) by mouth (po) for 1 week (Acute Treatment Period) followed by 60-120 mg QD po for the remaining 7 weeks (Optimization Period), with an option to continue treatment for an additional 2 weeks.
Escitalopram	Participants received 10 mg of escitalopram QD po for 1 week (Acute Treatment Period) followed by 10-20 mg QD po for the remaining 7 weeks (Optimization Period), with an option to continue treatment for an additional 2 weeks.

Measured Values

	Duloxetine	Escitalopram
Participants Analyzed	**243**	**237**
Percentage of Participants Who Relapsed During 8 Weeks [Units: Percentage of participants]	**11.9**	**11.0**

Statistical Analysis 1 for Percentage of Participants Who Relapsed During 8 Weeks

Groups [1]	All groups
Statistical Test Type [2]	Superiority or Other
Statistical Method [3]	Fisher Exact
P Value [4]	0.776

[1] Additional details about the analysis, such as null hypothesis and power calculation:

No text entered.

[2] Details of power calculation, definition of non-inferiority margin, and other key parameters:

No text entered.

[3] Other relevant method information, such as adjustments or degrees of freedom:

No text entered.

[4]

Additional information, such as whether or not the p-value is adjusted for multiple comparisons and the a priori threshold for statistical significance:

No text entered.

10. Secondary: Number of Days From Baseline to Relapse as Defined by Montgomery-Asberg Depression Rating Scale (MADRS) Total Score ≥16 During 8 Weeks [Time Frame: Baseline through 8 weeks]

Measure Type	Secondary
Measure Title	Number of Days From Baseline to Relapse as Defined by Montgomery-Asberg Depression Rating Scale (MADRS) Total Score ≥16 During 8 Weeks
Measure Description	The number of days from baseline to the first relapse is defined as reaching a MADRS Total Score≥16. The MADRS has a 10-item checklist. Items are rated on a scale of 0-6, for a total score range of 0 (low severity of depressive symptoms) to 60 (high severity of depressive symptoms). Censored participants were included in the Kaplan-Meier analysis, the minimum and maximum time to relapse have been calculated and reported here. Median time to relapse and quartiles could not be computationally calculated using the Kaplan-Meier procedure due to low event rate and high completion rate (censored).
Time Frame	Baseline through 8 weeks

Population Description

Explanation of how the number of participants for analysis was determined. Includes whether analysis was per protocol, intention to treat, or another method. Also provides relevant details such as imputation technique, as appropriate.
Number of participants in each treatment group having time to relapse plus the participants censored. Duloxetine had 200 participants censored and escitalopram had 199 participants censored.

Reporting Groups

	Description

Duloxetine	Participants received 60 milligrams (mg) of duloxetine once daily (QD) by mouth (po) for 1 week (Acute Treatment Period) followed by 60-120 mg QD po for the remaining 7 weeks (Optimization Period), with an option to continue treatment for an additional 2 weeks.
Escitalopram	Participants received 10 mg of escitalopram QD po for 1 week (Acute Treatment Period) followed by 10-20 mg QD po for the remaining 7 weeks (Optimization Period), with an option to continue treatment for an additional 2 weeks.

Measured Values

	Duloxetine	**Escitalopram**
Participants Analyzed	**229**	**225**
Number of Days From Baseline to Relapse as Defined by Montgomery-Asberg Depression Rating Scale (MADRS) Total Score ≥16 During 8 Weeks [Units: Days]		
Minimum Number of Days from Baseline	**4.00**	**4.00**
Maximum Number of Days from Baseline	**81.00**	**68.00**

Statistical Analysis 1 for Number of Days From Baseline to Relapse as Defined by Montgomery-Asberg Depression Rating Scale (MADRS) Total Score ≥16 During 8 Weeks

Groups [1]	All groups
Statistical Test Type [2]	Superiority or Other
Statistical Method [3]	Log Rank
P Value [4]	0.691

[1] Additional details about the analysis, such as null hypothesis and power calculation:

The log-rank test was conducted using Kaplan-Meier Product-Limit method.

[2] Details of power calculation, definition of non-inferiority margin, and other key parameters:

No text entered.

[3] Other relevant method information, such as adjustments or degrees of freedom:

No text entered.

[4]

Additional information, such as whether or not the p-value is adjusted for multiple comparisons and the a priori threshold for statistical significance:

No text entered.

11. Secondary: Percentage of Participants Who Discontinue Due to Lack of Efficacy During 8 Weeks [Time Frame: Baseline through 8 weeks]

Measure Type	Secondary
Measure Title	Percentage of Participants Who Discontinue Due to Lack of Efficacy During 8 Weeks
Measure Description	Percentage of participants who discontinue after baseline due to lack of efficacy in the investigator's opinion.
Time Frame	Baseline through 8 weeks

Population Description

Explanation of how the number of participants for analysis was determined. Includes whether analysis was per protocol, intention to treat, or another method. Also provides relevant details such as imputation technique, as appropriate.
All randomized participants.

Reporting Groups

	Description
Duloxetine	Participants received 60 milligrams (mg) of duloxetine once daily (QD) by mouth (po) for 1 week (Acute Treatment Period) followed by 60-120 mg QD po for the remaining 7 weeks (Optimization Period), with an option to continue treatment for an additional 2 weeks.
Escitalopram	Participants received 10 mg of escitalopram QD po for 1 week (Acute Treatment Period) followed by 10-20 mg QD po for the remaining 7 weeks (Optimization Period), with an option to continue treatment for an additional 2 weeks.

Measured Values

	Duloxetine	**Escitalopram**

Participants Analyzed	**244**	**239**
Percentage of Participants Who Discontinue Due to Lack of Efficacy During 8 Weeks [Units: Percentage of participants]	**2.0**	**1.3**

Statistical Analysis 1 for Percentage of Participants Who Discontinue Due to Lack of Efficacy During 8 Weeks

Groups [1]	All groups
Statistical Test Type [2]	Superiority or Other
Statistical Method [3]	Fisher Exact
P Value [4]	0.724

[1] Additional details about the analysis, such as null hypothesis and power calculation:

No text entered.

[2] Details of power calculation, definition of non-inferiority margin, and other key parameters:

No text entered.

[3] Other relevant method information, such as adjustments or degrees of freedom:

No text entered.

[4] Additional information, such as whether or not the p-value is adjusted for multiple comparisons and the a priori threshold for statistical significance:

No text entered.

Serious Adverse Events

Show Serious Adverse Events

Other Adverse Events

Show Other Adverse Events

Limitations and Caveats

Hide Limitations and Caveats

Limitations of the study, such as early termination leading to small numbers of participants analyzed and technical problems with measurement leading to unreliable or uninterpretable data
No text entered.

More Information

Hide More Information

Certain Agreements:

Principal Investigators are **NOT** employed by the organization sponsoring the study.

There **IS** an agreement between Principal Investigators and the Sponsor (or its agents) that restricts the PI's rights to discuss or publish trial results after the trial is completed.

The agreement is:

☐ The only disclosure restriction on the PI is that the sponsor can review results communications prior to public release and can embargo communications regarding trial results for a period that is **less than or equal to 60 days**. The sponsor cannot require changes to the communication and cannot extend the embargo.

☑ The only disclosure restriction on the PI is that the sponsor can review results communications prior to public release and can embargo communications regarding trial results for a period that is **more than 60 days but less than or equal to 180 days**. The sponsor cannot require changes to the communication and cannot extend the embargo.

☐ Other disclosure agreement that restricts the right of the PI to discuss or publish trial results after the trial is completed.

Results Point of Contact:

Name/Title: Chief Medical Officer
Organization: Eli Lilly and Company
phone: 800-545-5979

Responsible Party:	Eli Lilly and Company
ClinicalTrials.gov Identifier:	NCT00985504 History of Changes
Other Study ID Numbers:	13018
	F1J-CR-**HMGM** (Other Identifier: Eli Lilly and Company)
First Submitted:	September 25, 2009
First Posted:	September 28, 2009
Results First Submitted:	August 29, 2011
Results First Posted:	October 3, 2011
Last Update Posted:	December 13, 2011