# Clinical trial results:
# A psoriasis plaque test trial with LP0113 spray in patients with psoriasis vulgaris

## Summary

| | |
|---|---|
| EudraCT number | 2014-004759-30 |
| Trial protocol | FR |
| Global end of trial date | 30 June 2015 |

**Results information**

| | |
|---|---|
| Result version number | v1 (current) |
| This version publication date | 09 July 2016 |
| First version publication date | 09 July 2016 |

## Trial information

**Trial identification**

| | |
|---|---|
| Sponsor protocol code | LP0113-1123 |

**Additional study identifiers**

| | |
|---|---|
| ISRCTN number | - |
| ClinicalTrials.gov id (NCT number) | NCT02416258 |
| WHO universal trial number (UTN) | - |

Notes:

**Sponsors**

| | |
|---|---|
| Sponsor organisation name | LEO Pharma A/S |
| Sponsor organisation address | Industriparken 55, Ballerup, Denmark, 2750 |
| Public contact | Clinical Trial Disclosure Manager, LEO Pharma A/S, 45 44945888, ctr.disclosure@leo-pharma.com |
| Scientific contact | Clinical Trial Disclosure Manager, LEO Pharma A/S, 45 44945888, ctr.disclosure@leo-pharma.com |

Notes:

**Paediatric regulatory details**

| | |
|---|---|
| Is trial part of an agreed paediatric investigation plan (PIP) | No |
| Does article 45 of REGULATION (EC) No 1901/2006 apply to this trial? | No |
| Does article 46 of REGULATION (EC) No 1901/2006 apply to this trial? | No |

Notes:

## Results analysis stage

| | |
|---|---|
| Analysis stage | Final |
| Date of interim/final analysis | 30 May 2016 |
| Is this the analysis of the primary completion data? | Yes |
| Primary completion date | 30 June 2015 |
| Global end of trial reached? | Yes |
| Global end of trial date | 30 June 2015 |
| Was the trial ended prematurely? | No |

Notes:

## General information about the trial

Main objective of the trial:

To evaluate the anti-psoriatic effect of LP0113 aerosol spray compared to Daivobet® gel, LEO 90100 aerosol foam, betamethasone dipropionate (BDP) in the aerosol spray vehicle, calcipotriol in the aerosol spray vehicle and aerosol spray vehicle.

Protection of trial subjects:

N/A

Background therapy: -

Evidence for comparator: -

| | |
|---|---|
| Actual start date of recruitment | 02 April 2015 |
| Long term follow-up planned | No |
| Independent data monitoring committee (IDMC) involvement? | No |

Notes:

## Population of trial subjects

### Subjects enrolled per country

| | |
|---|---|
| Country: Number of subjects enrolled | France: 50 |
| Worldwide total number of subjects | 50 |
| EEA total number of subjects | 50 |

Notes:

### Subjects enrolled per age group

| | |
|---|---|
| In utero | 0 |
| Preterm newborn - gestational age < 37 wk | 0 |
| Newborns (0-27 days) | 0 |
| Infants and toddlers (28 days-23 months) | 0 |
| Children (2-11 years) | 0 |
| Adolescents (12-17 years) | 0 |
| Adults (18-64 years) | 38 |
| From 65 to 84 years | 12 |
| 85 years and over | 0 |

## Subject disposition

### Recruitment

Recruitment details:

50 subjects from 1 centre in France were enrolled into the trial. The first subject was enrolled on 02-Apr-2015 and the last subject completed the trial (last visit, including follow-up) on 30-Jun-2015.

### Pre-assignment

Screening details:

Screening assessments could occur up to 28 days prior to the Day 1 Visit (Visit 2; hereafter "Baseline"). At the Screening Visit, 1 to 6 lesions ("target plaques") were identified on the arms, legs and/or trunk of the subject and monitored until the Baseline Visit when the 6 test sites to be treated with IMP were identified. No screening failures.

### Period 1

| | |
|---|---|
| Period 1 title | Overall trial (overall period) |
| Is this the baseline period? | Yes |
| Allocation method | Randomised - controlled |
| Blinding used | Single blind |
| Roles blinded | Investigator[1] |

Blinding implementation details:

Due to the different formulations of some of the IMPs (foam, spray, gel), a fully double blinded design was not possible and the trial was performed as an investigator-blinded trial.

### Arms

| | |
|---|---|
| Are arms mutually exclusive? | No |
| **Arm title** | LP0113 aerosol spray |

Arm description:

Each subject was treated with the 6 products on 6 test sites (each 5 cm2) which were located within 1 to 6 stable psoriasis lesions (target plaques) on arms, legs and/or trunk. An application scheme showed which treatment should be applied to each test site. The test sites were marked with a numbered, disposable circular device, which was attached to the skin; the outline of each circular device was drawn on the skin using an indelible marker.

IMP was applied by site staff once daily 6 days a week for 4 weeks. A blinded investigator assessed test sites twice weekly for the severity of the clinical signs erythema, scaling, and infiltration.

LP0113 aerosol spray contains calcipotriol (as monohydrate) 50 mcg/g and betamethasone (as dipropionate) 0.5 mg/g.

| | |
|---|---|
| Arm type | Experimental |
| Investigational medicinal product name | LP0113 aerosol spray |
| Investigational medicinal product code | LP0113 |
| Other name | |
| Pharmaceutical forms | Cutaneous spray |
| Routes of administration | Topical use |

Dosage and administration details:

LP0113, LEO 90100, BDP in aerosol spray vehicle, calcipotriol in aerosol spray vehicle, and the aerosol spray vehicle were sprayed on the test sites and gently rubbed into the skin using a gloved finger (1 finger for each product). Each test site was treated with 50 mg degassed spray or foam. Finally, all test sites were covered with a non-occlusive gauze maintained with an hypoallergenic dressing.
At visits which only included application of IMPs, the non-occlusive gauze was removed from the test sites using a small pair of scissors. IMPs were then applied as described above and new non-occlusive gauze was applied to the test sites and attached using a hypoallergenic dressing.
At visits which included both application of IMPs and clinical assessments, the non-occlusive gauze and the circular devices were removed prior to the assessments by the blinded investigator; following the assessments, the circular devices were replaced with new ones and IMPs were applied as described above.

| | |
|---|---|
| **Arm title** | Daivobet® gel |

Arm description:

Each subject was treated with the 6 products on 6 test sites (each 5 cm2) which were located within 1 to 6 stable psoriasis lesions (target plaques) on arms, legs and/or trunk. An application scheme showed which treatment should be applied to each test site. The test sites were marked with a numbered, disposable circular device, which was attached to the skin; the outline of each circular device was drawn on the skin using an indelible marker.

IMP was applied by site staff once daily 6 days a week for 4 weeks. A blinded investigator assessed test sites twice weekly for the severity of the clinical signs erythema, scaling, and infiltration.

Daivobet® gel contains calcipotriol (as monohydrate) 50 mcg/g and betamethasone (as dipropionate) 0.5 mg/g.

| | |
|---|---|
| Arm type | Active comparator |
| Investigational medicinal product name | Daivobet® gel |
| Investigational medicinal product code | |
| Other name | |
| Pharmaceutical forms | Gel |
| Routes of administration | Topical use |

Dosage and administration details:

Daivobet® gel was applied using an Eppendorf combitip® (50 µl per application). Finally, all test sites were covered with a non-occlusive gauze maintained with an hypoallergenic dressing.
At visits which only included application of IMPs, the non-occlusive gauze was removed from the test sites using a small pair of scissors. IMPs were then applied as described above and new non-occlusive gauze was applied to the test sites and attached using a hypoallergenic dressing.
At visits which included both application of IMPs and clinical assessments, the non-occlusive gauze and the circular devices were removed prior to the assessments by the blinded investigator; following the assessments, the circular devices were replaced with new ones and IMPs were applied as described above.

| | |
|---|---|
| **Arm title** | LEO 90100 |

Arm description:

Each subject was treated with the 6 products on 6 test sites (each 5 cm2) which were located within 1 to 6 stable psoriasis lesions (target plaques) on arms, legs and/or trunk. An application scheme showed which treatment should be applied to each test site. The test sites were marked with a numbered, disposable circular device, which was attached to the skin; the outline of each circular device was drawn on the skin using an indelible marker.

IMP was applied by site staff once daily 6 days a week for 4 weeks. A blinded investigator assessed test sites twice weekly for the severity of the clinical signs erythema, scaling, and infiltration.

LEO 90100 contains calcipotriol (as monohydrate) 50 mcg/g and betamethasone (as dipropionate) 0.5 mg/g.

| | |
|---|---|
| Arm type | Active comparator |
| Investigational medicinal product name | LEO 90100 |
| Investigational medicinal product code | LEO 90100 |
| Other name | Enstilar® foam |
| Pharmaceutical forms | Cutaneous foam |
| Routes of administration | Topical use |

Dosage and administration details:

LP0113, LEO 90100, BDP in aerosol spray vehicle, calcipotriol in aerosol spray vehicle, and the aerosol spray vehicle were sprayed on the test sites and gently rubbed into the skin using a gloved finger (1 finger for each product). Each test site was treated with 50 mg degassed spray or foam. Finally, all test sites were covered with a non-occlusive gauze maintained with an hypoallergenic dressing.
At visits which only included application of IMPs, the non-occlusive gauze was removed from the test sites using a small pair of scissors. IMPs were then applied as described above and new non-occlusive gauze was applied to the test sites and attached using a hypoallergenic dressing.
At visits which included both application of IMPs and clinical assessments, the non-occlusive gauze and the circular devices were removed prior to the assessments by the blinded investigator; following the assessments, the circular devices were replaced with new ones and IMPs were applied as described above.

| | |
|---|---|
| **Arm title** | BDP aerosol spray |

Arm description:

Betamethasone dipropionate (BDP) in aerosol spray vehicle

Each subject was treated with the 6 products on 6 test sites (each 5 cm2) which were located within 1 to 6 stable psoriasis lesions (target plaques) on arms, legs and/or trunk. An application scheme showed which treatment should be applied to each test site. The test sites were marked with a numbered, disposable circular device, which was attached to the skin; the outline of each circular device was drawn on the skin using an indelible marker.

IMP was applied by site staff once daily 6 days a week for 4 weeks. A blinded investigator assessed test sites twice weekly for the severity of the clinical signs erythema, scaling, and infiltration.

BDP in aerosol spray contains betamethasone (as dipropionate) 0.5 mg/g.

| | |
|---|---|
| Arm type | Active comparator |
| Investigational medicinal product name | BDP aerosol spray |
| Investigational medicinal product code | |
| Other name | |
| Pharmaceutical forms | Cutaneous spray |
| Routes of administration | Topical use |

Dosage and administration details:

LP0113, LEO 90100, BDP in aerosol spray vehicle, calcipotriol in aerosol spray vehicle, and the aerosol spray vehicle were sprayed on the test sites and gently rubbed into the skin using a gloved finger (1 finger for each product). Each test site was treated with 50 mg degassed spray or foam. Finally, all test sites were covered with a non-occlusive gauze maintained with an hypoallergenic dressing.
At visits which only included application of IMPs, the non-occlusive gauze was removed from the test sites using a small pair of scissors. IMPs were then applied as described above and new non-occlusive gauze was applied to the test sites and attached using a hypoallergenic dressing.
At visits which included both application of IMPs and clinical assessments, the non-occlusive gauze and the circular devices were removed prior to the assessments by the blinded investigator; following the assessments, the circular devices were replaced with new ones and IMPs were applied as described above.

| | |
|---|---|
| **Arm title** | Calcipotriol aerosol spray |

Arm description:

Calcipotriol in aerosol spray vehicle

Each subject was treated with the 6 products on 6 test sites (each 5 cm2) which were located within 1 to 6 stable psoriasis lesions (target plaques) on arms, legs and/or trunk. An application scheme showed which treatment should be applied to each test site. The test sites were marked with a numbered, disposable circular device, which was attached to the skin; the outline of each circular device was drawn on the skin using an indelible marker.

IMP was applied by site staff once daily 6 days a week for 4 weeks. A blinded investigator assessed test sites twice weekly for the severity of the clinical signs erythema, scaling, and infiltration.

Calcipotriol in aerosol spray contains calcipotriol (as monohydrate) 50 mcg/g

| | |
|---|---|
| Arm type | Active comparator |
| Investigational medicinal product name | Calcipotriol aerosol spray |
| Investigational medicinal product code | |
| Other name | |
| Pharmaceutical forms | Cutaneous spray |
| Routes of administration | Topical use |

Dosage and administration details:

LP0113, LEO 90100, BDP in aerosol spray vehicle, calcipotriol in aerosol spray vehicle, and the aerosol spray vehicle were sprayed on the test sites and gently rubbed into the skin using a gloved finger (1 finger for each product). Each test site was treated with 50 mg degassed spray or foam. Finally, all test sites were covered with a non-occlusive gauze maintained with an hypoallergenic dressing.
At visits which only included application of IMPs, the non-occlusive gauze was removed from the test sites using a small pair of scissors. IMPs were then applied as described above and new non-occlusive gauze was applied to the test sites and attached using a hypoallergenic dressing.
At visits which included both application of IMPs and clinical assessments, the non-occlusive gauze and the circular devices were removed prior to the assessments by the blinded investigator; following the assessments, the circular devices were replaced with new ones and IMPs were applied as described above.

| **Arm title** | Aerosol spray vehicle |
|---|---|

Arm description:

Each subject was treated with the 6 products on 6 test sites (each 5 cm2) which were located within 1 to 6 stable psoriasis lesions (target plaques) on arms, legs and/or trunk. An application scheme showed which treatment should be applied to each test site. The test sites were marked with a numbered, disposable circular device, which was attached to the skin; the outline of each circular device was drawn on the skin using an indelible marker.

IMP was applied by site staff once daily 6 days a week for 4 weeks. A blinded investigator assessed test sites twice weekly for the severity of the clinical signs erythema, scaling, and infiltration.

| Arm type | Placebo |
|---|---|
| Investigational medicinal product name | Aerosol spray vehicle |
| Investigational medicinal product code | |
| Other name | |
| Pharmaceutical forms | Cutaneous spray |
| Routes of administration | Topical use |

Dosage and administration details:

LP0113, LEO 90100, BDP in aerosol spray vehicle, calcipotriol in aerosol spray vehicle, and the aerosol spray vehicle were sprayed on the test sites and gently rubbed into the skin using a gloved finger (1 finger for each product). Each test site was treated with 50 mg degassed spray or foam. Finally, all test sites were covered with a non-occlusive gauze maintained with an hypoallergenic dressing.
At visits which only included application of IMPs, the non-occlusive gauze was removed from the test sites using a small pair of scissors. IMPs were then applied as described above and new non-occlusive gauze was applied to the test sites and attached using a hypoallergenic dressing.
At visits which included both application of IMPs and clinical assessments, the non-occlusive gauze and the circular devices were removed prior to the assessments by the blinded investigator; following the assessments, the circular devices were replaced with new ones and IMPs were applied as described above.

Notes:

[1] - The roles blinded appear inconsistent with a simple blinded trial.

Justification: Due to the different formulations of some of the IMPs (foam, spray, gel), a fully double blinded design was not possible and the trial was performed as an investigator-blinded trial.

| **Number of subjects in period 1** | LP0113 aerosol spray | Daivobet® gel | LEO 90100 |
|---|---|---|---|
| Started | 50 | 50 | 50 |
| Completed | 50 | 50 | 50 |

| **Number of subjects in period 1** | BDP aerosol spray | Calcipotriol aerosol spray | Aerosol spray vehicle |
|---|---|---|---|
| Started | 50 | 50 | 50 |
| Completed | 50 | 50 | 50 |

## Baseline characteristics

| Reporting groups | |
|---|---|
| Reporting group title | Overall trial |

Reporting group description: -

| Reporting group values | Overall trial | Total | |
|---|---|---|---|
| Number of subjects | 50 | 50 | |
| Age categorical<br>Units: Subjects | | | |
| In utero | 0 | 0 | |
| Preterm newborn infants (gestational age < 37 wks) | 0 | 0 | |
| Newborns (0-27 days) | 0 | 0 | |
| Infants and toddlers (28 days-23 months) | 0 | 0 | |
| Children (2-11 years) | 0 | 0 | |
| Adolescents (12-17 years) | 0 | 0 | |
| Adults (18-64 years) | 38 | 38 | |
| From 65-84 years | 12 | 12 | |
| 85 years and over | 0 | 0 | |
| Age continuous<br>Units: years | | | |
| arithmetic mean | 52.3 | | |
| standard deviation | ± 13.6 | - | |
| Gender categorical<br>Units: Subjects | | | |
| Female | 21 | 21 | |
| Male | 29 | 29 | |

## End points

### End points reporting groups

| Reporting group title | LP0113 aerosol spray |
|---|---|

Reporting group description:

Each subject was treated with the 6 products on 6 test sites (each 5 cm2) which were located within 1 to 6 stable psoriasis lesions (target plaques) on arms, legs and/or trunk. An application scheme showed which treatment should be applied to each test site. The test sites were marked with a numbered, disposable circular device, which was attached to the skin; the outline of each circular device was drawn on the skin using an indelible marker.

IMP was applied by site staff once daily 6 days a week for 4 weeks. A blinded investigator assessed test sites twice weekly for the severity of the clinical signs erythema, scaling, and infiltration.

LP0113 aerosol spray contains calcipotriol (as monohydrate) 50 mcg/g and betamethasone (as dipropionate) 0.5 mg/g.

| Reporting group title | Daivobet® gel |
|---|---|

Reporting group description:

Each subject was treated with the 6 products on 6 test sites (each 5 cm2) which were located within 1 to 6 stable psoriasis lesions (target plaques) on arms, legs and/or trunk. An application scheme showed which treatment should be applied to each test site. The test sites were marked with a numbered, disposable circular device, which was attached to the skin; the outline of each circular device was drawn on the skin using an indelible marker.

IMP was applied by site staff once daily 6 days a week for 4 weeks. A blinded investigator assessed test sites twice weekly for the severity of the clinical signs erythema, scaling, and infiltration.

Daivobet® gel contains calcipotriol (as monohydrate) 50 mcg/g and betamethasone (as dipropionate) 0.5 mg/g.

| Reporting group title | LEO 90100 |
|---|---|

Reporting group description:

Each subject was treated with the 6 products on 6 test sites (each 5 cm2) which were located within 1 to 6 stable psoriasis lesions (target plaques) on arms, legs and/or trunk. An application scheme showed which treatment should be applied to each test site. The test sites were marked with a numbered, disposable circular device, which was attached to the skin; the outline of each circular device was drawn on the skin using an indelible marker.

IMP was applied by site staff once daily 6 days a week for 4 weeks. A blinded investigator assessed test sites twice weekly for the severity of the clinical signs erythema, scaling, and infiltration.

LEO 90100 contains calcipotriol (as monohydrate) 50 mcg/g and betamethasone (as dipropionate) 0.5 mg/g.

| Reporting group title | BDP aerosol spray |
|---|---|

Reporting group description:

Betamethasone dipropionate (BDP) in aerosol spray vehicle

Each subject was treated with the 6 products on 6 test sites (each 5 cm2) which were located within 1 to 6 stable psoriasis lesions (target plaques) on arms, legs and/or trunk. An application scheme showed which treatment should be applied to each test site. The test sites were marked with a numbered, disposable circular device, which was attached to the skin; the outline of each circular device was drawn on the skin using an indelible marker.

IMP was applied by site staff once daily 6 days a week for 4 weeks. A blinded investigator assessed test sites twice weekly for the severity of the clinical signs erythema, scaling, and infiltration.

BDP in aerosol spray contains betamethasone (as dipropionate) 0.5 mg/g.

| Reporting group title | Calcipotriol aerosol spray |
|---|---|

Reporting group description:

Calcipotriol in aerosol spray vehicle

Each subject was treated with the 6 products on 6 test sites (each 5 cm2) which were located within 1 to 6 stable psoriasis lesions (target plaques) on arms, legs and/or trunk. An application scheme showed which treatment should be applied to each test site. The test sites were marked with a numbered,

disposable circular device, which was attached to the skin; the outline of each circular device was drawn on the skin using an indelible marker.

IMP was applied by site staff once daily 6 days a week for 4 weeks. A blinded investigator assessed test sites twice weekly for the severity of the clinical signs erythema, scaling, and infiltration.

Calcipotriol in aerosol spray contains calcipotriol (as monohydrate) 50 mcg/g

| Reporting group title | Aerosol spray vehicle |
|---|---|

Reporting group description:

Each subject was treated with the 6 products on 6 test sites (each 5 cm2) which were located within 1 to 6 stable psoriasis lesions (target plaques) on arms, legs and/or trunk. An application scheme showed which treatment should be applied to each test site. The test sites were marked with a numbered, disposable circular device, which was attached to the skin; the outline of each circular device was drawn on the skin using an indelible marker.

IMP was applied by site staff once daily 6 days a week for 4 weeks. A blinded investigator assessed test sites twice weekly for the severity of the clinical signs erythema, scaling, and infiltration.

## Primary: Absolute Change in Total Clinical Score of Clinical Signs at End of Treatment Compared to Baseline

| End point title | Absolute Change in Total Clinical Score of Clinical Signs at End of Treatment Compared to Baseline |
|---|---|

End point description:

The severity of the clinical signs erythema, scaling, and infiltration was assessed on a 7-point scale ranging from 0 (no evidence) to 3 (severe) [0, 0.5, 1, 1.5, 2, 2.5, 3]. The Total Clinical Score (TCS) was obtained by summing the scores for erythema, scaling, and infiltration and could range from 0 to 9. Treatment differences were tested as contrasts using a two-way ANOVA with treatment and subject as fixed effects. As the purpose of this trial was to obtain preliminary clinical estimates of effect, no correction to multiplicity was made in the primary analysis. A secondary analysis using Tukey's honestly significant difference (HSD) method for correcting p-values was produced in the two-way ANOVA.

| End point type | Primary |
|---|---|

End point timeframe:

4 weeks

| **End point values** | LP0113 aerosol spray | Daivobet® gel | LEO 90100 | BDP aerosol spray |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Subject group type | Reporting group | Reporting group | Reporting group | Reporting group |
| Number of subjects analysed | 50 | 50 | 50 | 50 |
| Units: Total Clinical Score | | | | |
| arithmetic mean (standard deviation) | | | | |
| Baseline | 6.5 (± 0.8) | 6.5 (± 0.8) | 6.4 (± 0.8) | 6.4 (± 0.8) |
| Day 29 (Change from Baseline) | -5.4 (± 1.3) | -5 (± 1.6) | -5.9 (± 0.8) | -5.2 (± 1.3) |

| **End point values** | Calcipotriol aerosol spray | Aerosol spray vehicle | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Subject group type | Reporting group | Reporting group | | |
| Number of subjects analysed | 50 | 50 | | |
| Units: Total Clinical Score | | | | |
| arithmetic mean (standard deviation) | | | | |
| Baseline | 6.4 (± 0.8) | 6.4 (± 0.8) | | |
| Day 29 (Change from Baseline) | -3.1 (± 1.9) | -1.6 (± 1.5) | | |

## Statistical analyses

| **Statistical analysis title** | TCS comparison LP0113 vs Vehicle |
|---|---|

Statistical analysis description:

Between treatment difference in absolute change in TCS from baseline to end of treatment (LP0113 aerosol spray - Aerosol spray vehicle).
Treatment comparisons using ANOVA with treatment and subject as factors. Same subjects receiving both treatments applied to different test sites.

| | |
|---|---|
| Comparison groups | LP0113 aerosol spray v Aerosol spray vehicle |
| Number of subjects included in analysis | 100 |
| Analysis specification | Pre-specified |
| Analysis type | superiority |
| P-value | < 0.001 [1] |
| Method | ANOVA |
| Parameter estimate | Mean difference (net) |
| Point estimate | -3.81 |
| Confidence interval | |
| level | 95 % |
| sides | 2-sided |
| lower limit | -4.3 |
| upper limit | -3.32 |

Notes:

[1] - Statistically significant superiority of LP0113 aerosol spray over Aerosol spray vehicle

| **Statistical analysis title** | TCS comparison Daivobet vs Vehicle |
|---|---|

Statistical analysis description:

Between treatment difference in absolute change in TCS from baseline to end of treatment (Daivobet® gel - Aerosol spray vehicle).
Treatment comparisons using ANOVA with treatment and subject as factors. Same subjects receiving both treatments applied to different test sites.

| | |
|---|---|
| Comparison groups | Aerosol spray vehicle v Daivobet® gel |
| Number of subjects included in analysis | 100 |
| Analysis specification | Pre-specified |
| Analysis type | superiority |
| P-value | < 0.001 [2] |
| Method | ANOVA |
| Parameter estimate | Mean difference (net) |
| Point estimate | -3.42 |
| Confidence interval | |
| level | 95 % |
| sides | 2-sided |
| lower limit | -3.91 |
| upper limit | -2.93 |

Notes:

[2] - Statistically significant superiority of Daivobet® gel over Aerosol spray vehicle

| **Statistical analysis title** | TCS comparison LEO 90100 vs Vehicle |
|---|---|

Statistical analysis description:

Between treatment difference in absolute change in TCS from baseline to end of treatment (LEO 90100 - Aerosol spray vehicle).
Treatment comparisons using ANOVA with treatment and subject as factors. Same subjects receiving both treatments applied to different test sites.

| | |
|---|---|
| Comparison groups | Aerosol spray vehicle v LEO 90100 |
| Number of subjects included in analysis | 100 |
| Analysis specification | Pre-specified |
| Analysis type | superiority |
| P-value | < 0.001 [3] |
| Method | ANOVA |
| Parameter estimate | Mean difference (net) |
| Point estimate | -4.36 |
| Confidence interval | |
| level | 95 % |
| sides | 2-sided |
| lower limit | -4.85 |
| upper limit | -3.87 |

Notes:

[3] - Statistically significant superiority of LEO 90100 over Aerosol spray vehicle

| **Statistical analysis title** | TCS comparison BDP vs Vehicle |
|---|---|

Statistical analysis description:

Between treatment difference in absolute change in TCS from baseline to end of treatment (BDP aerosol spray - Aerosol spray vehicle).
Treatment comparisons using ANOVA with treatment and subject as factors. Same subjects receiving both treatments applied to different test sites.

| | |
|---|---|
| Comparison groups | Aerosol spray vehicle v BDP aerosol spray |
| Number of subjects included in analysis | 100 |
| Analysis specification | Pre-specified |
| Analysis type | superiority |
| P-value | < 0.001 [4] |
| Method | ANOVA |
| Parameter estimate | Mean difference (net) |
| Point estimate | -3.64 |
| Confidence interval | |
| level | 95 % |
| sides | 2-sided |
| lower limit | -4.13 |
| upper limit | -3.15 |

Notes:

[4] - Statistically significant superiority of BDP aerosol spray over Aerosol spray vehicle

| **Statistical analysis title** | TCS comparison Calcipotriol vs Vehicle |
|---|---|

Statistical analysis description:

Between treatment difference in absolute change in TCS from baseline to end of treatment (Calcipotriol aerosol spray - Aerosol spray vehicle).
Treatment comparisons using ANOVA with treatment and subject as factors. Same subjects receiving both treatments applied to different test sites.

| | |
|---|---|
| Comparison groups | Aerosol spray vehicle v Calcipotriol aerosol spray |

| | |
|---|---|
| Number of subjects included in analysis | 100 |
| Analysis specification | Pre-specified |
| Analysis type | superiority |
| P-value | < 0.001 [5] |
| Method | ANOVA |
| Parameter estimate | Mean difference (net) |
| Point estimate | -1.53 |
| Confidence interval | |
| level | 95 % |
| sides | 2-sided |
| lower limit | -2.02 |
| upper limit | -1.04 |

Notes:

[5] - Statistically significant superiority of Calcipotriol aerosol spray over Aerosol spray vehicle

| **Statistical analysis title** | TCS comparison LP0113 vs Calcipotriol |
|---|---|

Statistical analysis description:

Between treatment difference in absolute change in TCS from baseline to end of treatment (LP0113 aerosol spray - Calcipotriol aerosol spray).
Treatment comparisons using ANOVA with treatment and subject as factors. Same subjects receiving both treatments applied to different test sites.

| | |
|---|---|
| Comparison groups | Calcipotriol aerosol spray v LP0113 aerosol spray |
| Number of subjects included in analysis | 100 |
| Analysis specification | Pre-specified |
| Analysis type | superiority |
| P-value | < 0.001 [6] |
| Method | ANOVA |
| Parameter estimate | Mean difference (net) |
| Point estimate | -2.28 |
| Confidence interval | |
| level | 95 % |
| sides | 2-sided |
| lower limit | -2.77 |
| upper limit | -1.79 |

Notes:

[6] - Statistically significant superiority of LP0113 aerosol spray over Calcipotriol aerosol spray

| **Statistical analysis title** | TCS comparison Daivobet vs Calcipotriol |
|---|---|

Statistical analysis description:

Between treatment difference in absolute change in TCS from baseline to end of treatment (Daivobet® gel - Calcipotriol aerosol spray).
Treatment comparisons using ANOVA with treatment and subject as factors. Same subjects receiving both treatments applied to different test sites.

| | |
|---|---|
| Comparison groups | Calcipotriol aerosol spray v Daivobet® gel |
| Number of subjects included in analysis | 100 |
| Analysis specification | Pre-specified |
| Analysis type | superiority |
| P-value | < 0.001 [7] |
| Method | ANOVA |
| Parameter estimate | Mean difference (net) |
| Point estimate | -1.89 |

| | |
|---|---|
| Confidence interval | |
| level | 95 % |
| sides | 2-sided |
| lower limit | -2.38 |
| upper limit | -1.4 |

Notes:

[7] - Statistically significant superiority of Daivobet® gel over Calcipotriol aerosol spray

| **Statistical analysis title** | TCS comparison LEO 90100 vs Calcipotriol |
|---|---|

Statistical analysis description:

Between treatment difference in absolute change in TCS from baseline to end of treatment (LEO 90100 - Calcipotriol aerosol spray).
Treatment comparisons using ANOVA with treatment and subject as factors. Same subjects receiving both treatments applied to different test sites.

| | |
|---|---|
| Comparison groups | Calcipotriol aerosol spray v LEO 90100 |
| Number of subjects included in analysis | 100 |
| Analysis specification | Pre-specified |
| Analysis type | superiority |
| P-value | < 0.001 [8] |
| Method | ANOVA |
| Parameter estimate | Mean difference (net) |
| Point estimate | -2.83 |
| Confidence interval | |
| level | 95 % |
| sides | 2-sided |
| lower limit | -3.32 |
| upper limit | -2.34 |

Notes:

[8] - Statistically significant superiority of LEO 90100 over Calcipotriol aerosol spray

| **Statistical analysis title** | TCS comparison BDP vs Calcipotriol |
|---|---|

Statistical analysis description:

Between treatment difference in absolute change in TCS from baseline to end of treatment (BDP aerosol spray - Calcipotriol aerosol spray).
Treatment comparisons using ANOVA with treatment and subject as factors. Same subjects receiving both treatments applied to different test sites.

| | |
|---|---|
| Comparison groups | Calcipotriol aerosol spray v BDP aerosol spray |
| Number of subjects included in analysis | 100 |
| Analysis specification | Pre-specified |
| Analysis type | superiority |
| P-value | < 0.001 [9] |
| Method | ANOVA |
| Parameter estimate | Mean difference (net) |
| Point estimate | -2.11 |
| Confidence interval | |
| level | 95 % |
| sides | 2-sided |
| lower limit | -2.6 |
| upper limit | -1.62 |

Notes:

[9] - Statistically significant superiority of BDP aerosol spray over Calcipotriol aerosol spray

| **Statistical analysis title** | TCS comparison LP0113 vs BDP |
|---|---|

Statistical analysis description:

Between treatment difference in absolute change in TCS from baseline to end of treatment (LP0113 aerosol spray - BDP aerosol spray).
Treatment comparisons using ANOVA with treatment and subject as factors. Same subjects receiving both treatments applied to different test sites.

| | |
|---|---|
| Comparison groups | BDP aerosol spray v LP0113 aerosol spray |
| Number of subjects included in analysis | 100 |
| Analysis specification | Pre-specified |
| Analysis type | superiority |
| P-value | = 0.5 |
| Method | ANOVA |
| Parameter estimate | Mean difference (net) |
| Point estimate | -0.17 |
| Confidence interval | |
| level | 95 % |
| sides | 2-sided |
| lower limit | -0.66 |
| upper limit | 0.32 |

| **Statistical analysis title** | TCS comparison Daivobet vs BDP |
|---|---|

Statistical analysis description:

Between treatment difference in absolute change in TCS from baseline to end of treatment (Daivobet® gel - BDP aerosol spray).
Treatment comparisons using ANOVA with treatment and subject as factors. Same subjects receiving both treatments applied to different test sites.

| | |
|---|---|
| Comparison groups | BDP aerosol spray v Daivobet® gel |
| Number of subjects included in analysis | 100 |
| Analysis specification | Pre-specified |
| Analysis type | superiority |
| P-value | = 0.38 |
| Method | ANOVA |
| Parameter estimate | Mean difference (net) |
| Point estimate | 0.22 |
| Confidence interval | |
| level | 95 % |
| sides | 2-sided |
| lower limit | -0.27 |
| upper limit | 0.71 |

| **Statistical analysis title** | TCS comparison LEO 90100 vs BDP |
|---|---|

Statistical analysis description:

Between treatment difference in absolute change in TCS from baseline to end of treatment (LEO 90100 - BDP aerosol spray).
Treatment comparisons using ANOVA with treatment and subject as factors. Same subjects receiving both treatments applied to different test sites.

| | |
|---|---|
| Comparison groups | BDP aerosol spray v LEO 90100 |

| | |
|---|---|
| Number of subjects included in analysis | 100 |
| Analysis specification | Pre-specified |
| Analysis type | superiority |
| P-value | = 0.004 [10] |
| Method | ANOVA |
| Parameter estimate | Mean difference (net) |
| Point estimate | -0.72 |
| Confidence interval | |
| level | 95 % |
| sides | 2-sided |
| lower limit | -1.21 |
| upper limit | -0.23 |

Notes:

[10] - Statistically significant superiority of LEO 90100 over BDP aerosol spray

| **Statistical analysis title** | TCS comparison LP0113 vs LEO 90100 |
|---|---|

Statistical analysis description:

Between treatment difference in absolute change in TCS from baseline to end of treatment (LP0113 aerosol spray - LEO 90100).
Treatment comparisons using ANOVA with treatment and subject as factors. Same subjects receiving both treatments applied to different test sites.

| | |
|---|---|
| Comparison groups | LEO 90100 v LP0113 aerosol spray |
| Number of subjects included in analysis | 100 |
| Analysis specification | Pre-specified |
| Analysis type | superiority |
| P-value | = 0.028 [11] |
| Method | ANOVA |
| Parameter estimate | Mean difference (net) |
| Point estimate | 0.55 |
| Confidence interval | |
| level | 95 % |
| sides | 2-sided |
| lower limit | 0.06 |
| upper limit | 1.04 |

Notes:

[11] - Statistically significant superiority of LEO 90100 over LP0113 aerosol spray

| **Statistical analysis title** | TCS comparison Daivobet vs LEO 90100 |
|---|---|

Statistical analysis description:

Between treatment difference in absolute change in TCS from baseline to end of treatment (Daivobet® gel - LEO 90100).
Treatment comparisons using ANOVA with treatment and subject as factors. Same subjects receiving both treatments applied to different test sites.

| | |
|---|---|
| Comparison groups | LEO 90100 v Daivobet® gel |
| Number of subjects included in analysis | 100 |
| Analysis specification | Pre-specified |
| Analysis type | superiority |
| P-value | < 0.001 [12] |
| Method | ANOVA |
| Parameter estimate | Mean difference (net) |
| Point estimate | 0.94 |

| | |
|---|---|
| Confidence interval | |
| level | 95 % |
| sides | 2-sided |
| lower limit | 0.45 |
| upper limit | 1.43 |

Notes:

[12] - Statistically significant superiority of LEO 90100 over Daivobet® gel

| **Statistical analysis title** | TCS comparison LP0113 vs Daivobet |
|---|---|

Statistical analysis description:

Between treatment difference in absolute change in TCS from baseline to end of treatment (LP0113 aerosol spray - Daivobet® gel).
Treatment comparisons using ANOVA with treatment and subject as factors. Same subjects receiving both treatments applied to different test sites.

| | |
|---|---|
| Comparison groups | Daivobet® gel v LP0113 aerosol spray |
| Number of subjects included in analysis | 100 |
| Analysis specification | Pre-specified |
| Analysis type | superiority |
| P-value | = 0.12 |
| Method | ANOVA |
| Parameter estimate | Mean difference (net) |
| Point estimate | -0.39 |
| Confidence interval | |
| level | 95 % |
| sides | 2-sided |
| lower limit | -0.88 |
| upper limit | 0.1 |

| **Statistical analysis title** | TCS comparison LP0113 vs Vehicle - Tukey |
|---|---|

Statistical analysis description:

Between treatment difference in absolute change in TCS from baseline to end of treatment (LP0113 aerosol spray - Vehicle aerosol spray).
Treatment comparisons using ANOVA with treatment and subject as factors. Same subjects receiving both treatments applied to different test sites.

| | |
|---|---|
| Comparison groups | LP0113 aerosol spray v Aerosol spray vehicle |
| Number of subjects included in analysis | 100 |
| Analysis specification | Pre-specified |
| Analysis type | superiority |
| P-value | < 0.001 [13] |
| Method | ANOVA |
| Parameter estimate | Mean difference (net) |
| Confidence interval | |
| level | 95 % |
| sides | 2-sided |
| lower limit | -4.53 |
| upper limit | -3.09 |

Notes:

[13] - Corrected P-values and confidence intervals using Tukeys honestly significant difference method. Statistically significant superiority of LP0113 aerosol spray over Aerosol spray vehicle

| **Statistical analysis title** | TCS comparison Daivobet vs Vehicle - Tukey |
|---|---|

Statistical analysis description:

Between treatment difference in absolute change in TCS from baseline to end of treatment (Daivobet® gel - Vehicle aerosol spray).
Treatment comparisons using ANOVA with treatment and subject as factors. Same subjects receiving both treatments applied to different test sites.

| | |
|---|---|
| Comparison groups | Aerosol spray vehicle v Daivobet® gel |
| Number of subjects included in analysis | 100 |
| Analysis specification | Pre-specified |
| Analysis type | superiority |
| P-value | < 0.001 [14] |
| Method | ANOVA |
| Parameter estimate | Mean difference (net) |
| Confidence interval | |
| level | 95 % |
| sides | 2-sided |
| lower limit | -4.14 |
| upper limit | -2.7 |

Notes:

[14] - Corrected P-values and confidence intervals using Tukeys honestly significant difference method. Statistically significant superiority of Daivobet® gel over Aerosol spray vehicle

| **Statistical analysis title** | TCS comparison LEO 90100 vs Vehicle - Tukey |
|---|---|

Statistical analysis description:

Between treatment difference in absolute change in TCS from baseline to end of treatment (LEO 90100 - Vehicle aerosol spray).
Treatment comparisons using ANOVA with treatment and subject as factors. Same subjects receiving both treatments applied to different test sites.

| | |
|---|---|
| Comparison groups | Aerosol spray vehicle v LEO 90100 |
| Number of subjects included in analysis | 100 |
| Analysis specification | Pre-specified |
| Analysis type | superiority |
| P-value | < 0.001 [15] |
| Method | ANOVA |
| Parameter estimate | Mean difference (net) |
| Confidence interval | |
| level | 95 % |
| sides | 2-sided |
| lower limit | -5.08 |
| upper limit | -3.64 |

Notes:

[15] - Corrected P-values and confidence intervals using Tukeys honestly significant difference method. Statistically significant superiority of LEO 90100 over Aerosol spray vehicle

| **Statistical analysis title** | TCS comparison Calcipotriol vs Vehicle - Tukey |
|---|---|

Statistical analysis description:

Between treatment difference in absolute change in TCS from baseline to end of treatment (Calcipotriol aerosol spray - Vehicle aerosol spray).
Treatment comparisons using ANOVA with treatment and subject as factors. Same subjects receiving both treatments applied to different test sites.

| | |
|---|---|
| Comparison groups | Aerosol spray vehicle v Calcipotriol aerosol spray |

| | |
|---|---|
| Number of subjects included in analysis | 100 |
| Analysis specification | Pre-specified |
| Analysis type | superiority |
| P-value | < 0.001 [16] |
| Method | ANOVA |
| Parameter estimate | Mean difference (net) |
| Confidence interval | |
| level | 95 % |
| sides | 2-sided |
| lower limit | -2.25 |
| upper limit | -0.81 |

Notes:

[16] - Corrected P-values and confidence intervals using Tukeys honestly significant difference method. Statistically significant superiority of Calcipotriol aerosol spray over Aerosol spray vehicle

| **Statistical analysis title** | TCS comparison LP0113 vs Calcipotriol - Tukey |
|---|---|

Statistical analysis description:

Between treatment difference in absolute change in TCS from baseline to end of treatment (LP0113 aerosol spray - Calcipotriol aerosol spray).
Treatment comparisons using ANOVA with treatment and subject as factors. Same subjects receiving both treatments applied to different test sites.

| | |
|---|---|
| Comparison groups | Calcipotriol aerosol spray v LP0113 aerosol spray |
| Number of subjects included in analysis | 100 |
| Analysis specification | Pre-specified |
| Analysis type | superiority |
| P-value | < 0.001 [17] |
| Method | ANOVA |
| Parameter estimate | Mean difference (net) |
| Confidence interval | |
| level | 95 % |
| sides | 2-sided |
| lower limit | -3 |
| upper limit | -1.56 |

Notes:

[17] - Corrected P-values and confidence intervals using Tukeys honestly significant difference method. Statistically significant superiority of LP0113 aerosol spray over Calcipotriol aerosol spray

| **Statistical analysis title** | TCS comparison BDP vs Vehicle - Tukey |
|---|---|

Statistical analysis description:

Between treatment difference in absolute change in TCS from baseline to end of treatment (BDP aerosol spray - Aerosol spray vehicle).
Treatment comparisons using ANOVA with treatment and subject as factors. Same subjects receiving both treatments applied to different test sites.

| | |
|---|---|
| Comparison groups | Aerosol spray vehicle v BDP aerosol spray |
| Number of subjects included in analysis | 100 |
| Analysis specification | Pre-specified |
| Analysis type | superiority |
| P-value | < 0.001 [18] |
| Method | ANOVA |
| Parameter estimate | Mean difference (net) |

| | |
|---|---|
| Confidence interval | |
| level | 95 % |
| sides | 2-sided |
| lower limit | -4.36 |
| upper limit | -2.92 |

Notes:

[18] - Corrected P-values and confidence intervals using Tukeys honestly significant difference method. Statistically significant superiority of BDP aerosol spray over Aerosol spray vehicle

| **Statistical analysis title** | TCS comparison Daivobet vs Calcipotriol - Tukey |
|---|---|

Statistical analysis description:

Between treatment difference in absolute change in TCS from baseline to end of treatment (Daivobet® gel - Calcipotriol aerosol spray).
Treatment comparisons using ANOVA with treatment and subject as factors. Same subjects receiving both treatments applied to different test sites.

| | |
|---|---|
| Comparison groups | Calcipotriol aerosol spray v Daivobet® gel |
| Number of subjects included in analysis | 100 |
| Analysis specification | Pre-specified |
| Analysis type | superiority |
| P-value | < 0.001 [19] |
| Method | ANOVA |
| Parameter estimate | Mean difference (net) |
| Confidence interval | |
| level | 95 % |
| sides | 2-sided |
| lower limit | -2.61 |
| upper limit | -1.17 |

Notes:

[19] - Corrected P-values and confidence intervals using Tukeys honestly significant difference method. Statistically significant superiority of Daivobet® gel over Calcipotriol aerosol spray

| **Statistical analysis title** | TCS comparison LEO 90100 vs Calcipotriol - Tukey |
|---|---|

Statistical analysis description:

Between treatment difference in absolute change in TCS from baseline to end of treatment (LEO 90100 - Calcipotriol aerosol spray).
Treatment comparisons using ANOVA with treatment and subject as factors. Same subjects receiving both treatments applied to different test sites.

| | |
|---|---|
| Comparison groups | Calcipotriol aerosol spray v LEO 90100 |
| Number of subjects included in analysis | 100 |
| Analysis specification | Pre-specified |
| Analysis type | superiority |
| P-value | < 0.001 [20] |
| Method | ANOVA |
| Parameter estimate | Mean difference (net) |
| Confidence interval | |
| level | 95 % |
| sides | 2-sided |
| lower limit | -3.55 |
| upper limit | -2.11 |

Notes:

[20] - Corrected P-values and confidence intervals using Tukeys honestly significant difference method. Statistically significant superiority of LEO 90100 over Calcipotriol aerosol spray

| **Statistical analysis title** | TCS comparison BDP vs Calcipotriol - Tukey |
|---|---|

Statistical analysis description:

Between treatment difference in absolute change in TCS from baseline to end of treatment (BDP aerosol spray - Calcipotriol aerosol spray).
Treatment comparisons using ANOVA with treatment and subject as factors. Same subjects receiving both treatments applied to different test sites.

| | |
|---|---|
| Comparison groups | Calcipotriol aerosol spray v BDP aerosol spray |
| Number of subjects included in analysis | 100 |
| Analysis specification | Pre-specified |
| Analysis type | superiority |
| P-value | < 0.001 [21] |
| Method | ANOVA |
| Parameter estimate | Mean difference (net) |
| Confidence interval | |
| level | 95 % |
| sides | 2-sided |
| lower limit | -2.83 |
| upper limit | -1.39 |

Notes:

[21] - Corrected P-values and confidence intervals using Tukeys honestly significant difference method. Statistically significant superiority of BDP aerosol spray over Calcipotriol aerosol spray

| **Statistical analysis title** | TCS comparison LP0113 vs BDP - Tukey |
|---|---|

Statistical analysis description:

Between treatment difference in absolute change in TCS from baseline to end of treatment (LP0113 aerosol spray - BDP aerosol spray).
Treatment comparisons using ANOVA with treatment and subject as factors. Same subjects receiving both treatments applied to different test sites.

| | |
|---|---|
| Comparison groups | BDP aerosol spray v LP0113 aerosol spray |
| Number of subjects included in analysis | 100 |
| Analysis specification | Pre-specified |
| Analysis type | superiority |
| P-value | = 0.98 [22] |
| Method | ANOVA |
| Parameter estimate | Mean difference (net) |
| Confidence interval | |
| level | 95 % |
| sides | 2-sided |
| lower limit | -0.89 |
| upper limit | 0.55 |

Notes:

[22] - Corrected P-values and confidence intervals using Tukeys honestly significant difference method.

| **Statistical analysis title** | TCS comparison Daivobet vs BDP - Tukey |
|---|---|

Statistical analysis description:

Between treatment difference in absolute change in TCS from baseline to end of treatment (Daivobet® gel - BDP aerosol spray).
Treatment comparisons using ANOVA with treatment and subject as factors. Same subjects receiving both treatments applied to different test sites.

| | |
|---|---|
| Comparison groups | BDP aerosol spray v Daivobet® gel |

| | |
|---|---|
| Number of subjects included in analysis | 100 |
| Analysis specification | Pre-specified |
| Analysis type | superiority |
| P-value | = 0.95 [23] |
| Method | ANOVA |
| Parameter estimate | Mean difference (net) |
| Confidence interval | |
| level | 95 % |
| sides | 2-sided |
| lower limit | -0.5 |
| upper limit | 0.94 |

Notes:

[23] - Corrected P-values and confidence intervals using Tukeys honestly significant difference method.

| **Statistical analysis title** | TCS comparison LEO 90100 vs BDP - Tukey |
|---|---|

Statistical analysis description:

Between treatment difference in absolute change in TCS from baseline to end of treatment (LEO 90100 - BDP aerosol spray).
Treatment comparisons using ANOVA with treatment and subject as factors. Same subjects receiving both treatments applied to different test sites.

| | |
|---|---|
| Comparison groups | BDP aerosol spray v LEO 90100 |
| Number of subjects included in analysis | 100 |
| Analysis specification | Pre-specified |
| Analysis type | superiority |
| P-value | = 0.048 [24] |
| Method | ANOVA |
| Parameter estimate | Mean difference (net) |
| Confidence interval | |
| level | 95 % |
| sides | 2-sided |
| lower limit | -1.44 |
| upper limit | 0 |

Notes:

[24] - Corrected P-values and confidence intervals using Tukeys honestly significant difference method. Statistically significant superiority of LEO 90100 over BDP aerosol spray

| **Statistical analysis title** | TCS comparison LP0113 vs LEO 90100 - Tukey |
|---|---|

Statistical analysis description:

Between treatment difference in absolute change in TCS from baseline to end of treatment (LP0113 aerosol spray - LEO 90100).
Treatment comparisons using ANOVA with treatment and subject as factors. Same subjects receiving both treatments applied to different test sites.

| | |
|---|---|
| Comparison groups | LEO 90100 v LP0113 aerosol spray |
| Number of subjects included in analysis | 100 |
| Analysis specification | Pre-specified |
| Analysis type | superiority |
| P-value | = 0.24 [25] |
| Method | ANOVA |
| Parameter estimate | Mean difference (net) |

| | |
|---|---|
| Confidence interval | |
| level | 95 % |
| sides | 2-sided |
| lower limit | -0.17 |
| upper limit | 1.27 |

Notes:

[25] - Corrected P-values and confidence intervals using Tukeys honestly significant difference method.

| **Statistical analysis title** | TCS comparison Daivobet vs LEO 90100 - Tukey |
|---|---|

Statistical analysis description:

Between treatment difference in absolute change in TCS from baseline to end of treatment (Daivobet® gel - LEO 90100).
Treatment comparisons using ANOVA with treatment and subject as factors. Same subjects receiving both treatments applied to different test sites.

| | |
|---|---|
| Comparison groups | LEO 90100 v Daivobet® gel |
| Number of subjects included in analysis | 100 |
| Analysis specification | Pre-specified |
| Analysis type | superiority |
| P-value | = 0.003 [26] |
| Method | ANOVA |
| Parameter estimate | Mean difference (net) |
| Confidence interval | |
| level | 95 % |
| sides | 2-sided |
| lower limit | 0.22 |
| upper limit | 1.66 |

Notes:

[26] - Corrected P-values and confidence intervals using Tukeys honestly significant difference method.
Statistically significant superiority of LEO 90100 over Daivobet® gel

| **Statistical analysis title** | TCS comparison LP0113 vs Daivobet - Tukey |
|---|---|

Statistical analysis description:

Between treatment difference in absolute change in TCS from baseline to end of treatment (LP0113 aerosol spray - Daivobet® gel).
Treatment comparisons using ANOVA with treatment and subject as factors. Same subjects receiving both treatments applied to different test sites.

| | |
|---|---|
| Comparison groups | Daivobet® gel v LP0113 aerosol spray |
| Number of subjects included in analysis | 100 |
| Analysis specification | Pre-specified |
| Analysis type | superiority |
| P-value | = 0.62 [27] |
| Method | ANOVA |
| Parameter estimate | Mean difference (net) |
| Confidence interval | |
| level | 95 % |
| sides | 2-sided |
| lower limit | -1.11 |
| upper limit | 0.33 |

Notes:

[27] - Corrected P-values and confidence intervals using Tukeys honestly significant difference method.

## Secondary: Absolute Change in Total Clinical Score at Individual Visits Compared to Baseline

| End point title | Absolute Change in Total Clinical Score at Individual Visits Compared to Baseline |
|---|---|

End point description:

Total Clinical Score (TCS) of clinical signs (sum of erythema, scaling, and infiltration) could range from 0 to 9.

| End point type | Secondary |
|---|---|

End point timeframe:

4 weeks

| **End point values** | LP0113 aerosol spray | Daivobet® gel | LEO 90100 | BDP aerosol spray |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Subject group type | Reporting group | Reporting group | Reporting group | Reporting group |
| Number of subjects analysed | 50 | 50 | 50 | 50 |
| Units: Total Clinical Score | | | | |
| arithmetic mean (standard deviation) | | | | |
| Baseline | 6.5 (± 0.8) | 6.5 (± 0.8) | 6.4 (± 0.8) | 6.4 (± 0.7) |
| Day 4 (Change from Baseline) | -0.9 (± 1.2) | -1 (± 1.1) | -1.6 (± 1.5) | -0.8 (± 1.1) |
| Day 8 (Change from Baseline) | -2.5 (± 1.5) | -2.1 (± 1.3) | -3.1 (± 1.3) | -2 (± 1.5) |
| Day 11 (Change from Baseline) | -3.5 (± 1.8) | -3 (± 1.3) | -4.1 (± 1.3) | -3 (± 1.8) |
| Day 15 (Change from Baseline) | -4.2 (± 1.7) | -3.6 (± 1.5) | -4.8 (± 1.1) | -3.6 (± 1.9) |
| Day 18 (Change from Baseline) | -4.7 (± 1.4) | -4.3 (± 1.6) | -5.3 (± 1.1) | -4.3 (± 1.7) |
| Day 22 (Change from Baseline) | -4.9 (± 1.4) | -4.5 (± 1.7) | -5.5 (± 1) | -4.8 (± 1.4) |
| Day 25 (Change from Baseline) | -5.2 (± 1.3) | -4.9 (± 1.6) | -4.9 (± 1.6) | -5 (± 1.3) |
| Day 29 (Change from Baseline) | -5.4 (± 1.3) | -5 (± 1.6) | -5.9 (± 0.8) | -5.2 (± 1.3) |

| **End point values** | Calcipotriol aerosol spray | Aerosol spray vehicle | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Subject group type | Reporting group | Reporting group | | |
| Number of subjects analysed | 50 | 50 | | |
| Units: Total Clinical Score | | | | |
| arithmetic mean (standard deviation) | | | | |
| Baseline | 6.4 (± 0.7) | 6.4 (± 0.8) | | |
| Day 4 (Change from Baseline) | -0.3 (± 0.8) | -0.4 (± 0.7) | | |
| Day 8 (Change from Baseline) | -0.9 (± 1.1) | -0.5 (± 1) | | |
| Day 11 (Change from Baseline) | -1.4 (± 1.1) | -1 (± 1.1) | | |
| Day 15 (Change from Baseline) | -2 (± 1.4) | -1.1 (± 1.2) | | |
| Day 18 (Change from Baseline) | -2.4 (± 1.5) | -1.4 (± 1.3) | | |
| Day 22 (Change from Baseline) | -2.6 (± 1.4) | -1.2 (± 1.4) | | |
| Day 25 (Change from Baseline) | -2.8 (± 1.5) | -1.5 (± 1.4) | | |
| Day 29 (Change from Baseline) | -3.1 (± 1.9) | -1.6 (± 1.5) | | |

## Statistical analyses

No statistical analyses for this end point

## Secondary: Absolute Change in Score of The Clinical Sign Erythema at Individual Visits Compared to Baseline

| End point title | Absolute Change in Score of The Clinical Sign Erythema at Individual Visits Compared to Baseline |
|---|---|

End point description:

Erythema Score could range from 0 (no evidence) to 3 (severe) on a 7 point scale [0, 0.5, 1, 1.5, 2, 2.5, 3]. Erythema is one of three clinical scores (erythema, scaling, and infiltration) the sum of which equals the Total Clinical Score (range 0 to 9).

| End point type | Secondary |
|---|---|

End point timeframe:

4 weeks

| **End point values** | LP0113 aerosol spray | Daivobet® gel | LEO 90100 | BDP aerosol spray |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Subject group type | Reporting group | Reporting group | Reporting group | Reporting group |
| Number of subjects analysed | 50 | 50 | 50 | 50 |
| Units: Erythema Score | | | | |
| arithmetic mean (standard deviation) | | | | |
| Baseline | 2.3 (± 0.3) | 2.3 (± 0.3) | 2.3 (± 0.3) | 2.3 (± 0.3) |
| Day 4 (Change from Baseline) | -0.4 (± 0.4) | -0.4 (± 0.5) | -0.7 (± 0.5) | -0.4 (± 0.5) |
| Day 8 (Change from Baseline) | -0.8 (± 0.5) | -0.8 (± 0.5) | -1.1 (± 0.5) | -0.8 (± 0.6) |
| Day 11 (Change from Baseline) | -1.1 (± 0.7) | -1.1 (± 0.5) | -1.4 (± 0.6) | -1.1 (± 0.6) |
| Day 15 (Change from Baseline) | -1.3 (± 0.6) | -1.2 (± 0.5) | -1.5 (± 0.6) | -1.2 (± 0.7) |
| Day 18 (Change from Baseline) | -1.5 (± 0.6) | -1.5 (± 0.6) | -1.7 (± 0.7) | -1.5 (± 0.7) |
| Day 22 (Change from Baseline) | -1.5 (± 0.6) | -1.4 (± 0.7) | -1.7 (± 0.6) | -1.6 (± 0.5) |
| Day 25 (Change from Baseline) | -1.7 (± 0.6) | -1.6 (± 0.6) | -1.9 (± 0.6) | -1.8 (± 0.5) |
| Day 29 (Change from Baseline) | -1.8 (± 0.6) | -1.7 (± 0.6) | -2 (± 0.5) | -1.8 (± 0.5) |

| **End point values** | Calcipotriol aerosol spray | Aerosol spray vehicle | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Subject group type | Reporting group | Reporting group | | |
| Number of subjects analysed | 50 | 50 | | |
| Units: Erythema Score | | | | |
| arithmetic mean (standard deviation) | | | | |
| Baseline | 2.3 (± 0.3) | 2.3 (± 0.3) | | |
| Day 4 (Change from Baseline) | -0.1 (± 0.3) | -0.2 (± 0.3) | | |
| Day 8 (Change from Baseline) | -0.3 (± 0.4) | -0.3 (± 0.4) | | |
| Day 11 (Change from Baseline) | -0.5 (± 0.4) | -0.3 (± 0.5) | | |
| Day 15 (Change from Baseline) | -0.7 (± 0.5) | -0.4 (± 0.5) | | |
| Day 18 (Change from Baseline) | -0.8 (± 0.5) | -0.5 (± 0.6) | | |
| Day 22 (Change from Baseline) | -0.9 (± 0.5) | -0.4 (± 0.6) | | |
| Day 25 (Change from Baseline) | -1 (± 0.5) | -0.6 (± 0.6) | | |
| Day 29 (Change from Baseline) | -1.1 (± 0.7) | -0.6 (± 0.6) | | |

### Statistical analyses

No statistical analyses for this end point

## Secondary: Absolute Change in Score of The Clinical Sign Scaling at Individual Visits Compared to Baseline

| End point title | Absolute Change in Score of The Clinical Sign Scaling at Individual Visits Compared to Baseline |
|---|---|

End point description:

Scaling Score could range from 0 (no evidence) to 3 (severe) on a 7 point scale [0, 0.5, 1, 1.5, 2, 2.5, 3]. Scaling is one of three clinical scores (erythema, scaling, and infiltration) the sum of which equals the Total Clinical Score (range 0 to 9).

| End point type | Secondary |
|---|---|

End point timeframe:

4 weeks

| End point values | LP0113 aerosol spray | Daivobet® gel | LEO 90100 | BDP aerosol spray |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Subject group type | Reporting group | Reporting group | Reporting group | Reporting group |
| Number of subjects analysed | 50 | 50 | 50 | 50 |
| Units: Scaling Score | | | | |
| arithmetic mean (standard deviation) | | | | |
| Baseling | 2.1 (± 0.4) | 2 (± 0.4) | 2 (± 0.4) | 2 (± 0.4) |
| Day 4 (Change from Baseline) | -0.3 (± 0.5) | -0.4 (± 0.5) | -0.5 (± 0.6) | -0.2 (± 0.4) |
| Day 8 (Change from Baseline) | -0.9 (± 0.6) | -0.8 (± 0.6) | -1.1 (± 0.6) | -0.7 (± 0.7) |
| Day 11 (Change from Baseline) | -1.2 (± 0.7) | -1.1 (± 0.5) | -1.5 (± 0.6) | -1 (± 0.7) |
| Day 15 (Change from Baseline) | -1.5 (± 0.7) | -1.3 (± 0.6) | -1.7 (± 0.5) | -1.2 (± 0.7) |
| Day 18 (Change from Baseline) | -1.6 (± 0.6) | -1.5 (± 0.6) | -1.9 (± 0.5) | -1.4 (± 0.6) |
| Day 22 (Change from Baseline) | -1.7 (± 0.5) | -1.6 (± 0.7) | -1.9 (± 0.5) | -1.6 (± 0.6) |
| Day 25 (Change from Baseline) | -1.8 (± 0.5) | -1.7 (± 0.6) | -1.9 (± 0.5) | -1.7 (± 0.5) |
| Day 29 (Change from Baseline) | -1.8 (± 0.5) | -1.7 (± 0.6) | -2 (± 0.4) | -1.7 (± 0.5) |

| End point values | Calcipotriol aerosol spray | Aerosol spray vehicle | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Subject group type | Reporting group | Reporting group | | |
| Number of subjects analysed | 50 | 50 | | |
| Units: Scaling Score | | | | |
| arithmetic mean (standard deviation) | | | | |
| Baseling | 2 (± 0.4) | 2 (± 0.4) | | |
| Day 4 (Change from Baseline) | -0.1 (± 0.4) | -0.1 (± 0.4) | | |
| Day 8 (Change from Baseline) | -0.3 (± 0.5) | -0.1 (± 0.5) | | |
| Day 11 (Change from Baseline) | -0.5 (± 0.5) | -0.4 (± 0.6) | | |
| Day 15 (Change from Baseline) | -0.7 (± 0.6) | -0.3 (± 0.5) | | |
| Day 18 (Change from Baseline) | -0.8 (± 0.6) | -0.5 (± 0.5) | | |
| Day 22 (Change from Baseline) | -0.9 (± 0.5) | -0.4 (± 0.6) | | |
| Day 25 (Change from Baseline) | -1 (± 0.6) | -0.5 (± 0.6) | | |
| Day 29 (Change from Baseline) | -1.1 (± 0.7) | -0.6 (± 0.7) | | |

## Statistical analyses

No statistical analyses for this end point

## Secondary: Absolute Change in Score of The Clinical Sign Infiltration at Individual Visits Compared to Baseline

| End point title | Absolute Change in Score of The Clinical Sign Infiltration at Individual Visits Compared to Baseline |
|---|---|

End point description:

Infiltration Score could range from 0 (no evidence) to 3 (severe) on a 7 point scale [0, 0.5, 1, 1.5, 2, 2.5, 3]. Infiltration is one of three clinical scores (erythema, scaling, and infiltration) the sum of which equals the Total Clinical Score (range 0 to 9).

| End point type | Secondary |
|---|---|

End point timeframe:

4 weeks

| End point values | LP0113 aerosol spray | Daivobet® gel | LEO 90100 | BDP aerosol spray |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Subject group type | Reporting group | Reporting group | Reporting group | Reporting group |
| Number of subjects analysed | 50 | 50 | 50 | 50 |
| Units: Infiltration Score | | | | |
| arithmetic mean (standard deviation) | | | | |
| Baseline | 2.1 (± 0.3) | 2.1 (± 0.3) | 2.1 (± 0.3) | 2.1 (± 0.3) |
| Day 4 (Change from Baseline) | -0.3 (± 0.5) | -0.2 (± 0.4) | -0.4 (± 0.5) | -0.2 (± 0.5) |
| Day 8 (Change from Baseline) | -0.8 (± 0.6) | -0.6 (± 0.5) | -0.9 (± 0.5) | -0.5 (± 0.5) |
| Day 11 (Change from Baseline) | -1.2 (± 0.7) | -0.9 (± 0.5) | -1.3 (± 0.6) | -0.9 (± 0.6) |
| Day 15 (Change from Baseline) | -1.5 (± 0.6) | -1.2 (± 0.7) | -1.6 (± 0.5) | -1.2 (± 0.7) |
| Day 18 (Change from Baseline) | -1.6 (± 0.5) | -1.4 (± 0.7) | -1.8 (± 0.5) | -1.4 (± 0.7) |
| Day 22 (Change from Baseline) | -1.7 (± 0.5) | -1.5 (± 0.7) | -1.9 (± 0.4) | -1.5 (± 0.6) |
| Day 25 (Change from Baseline) | -1.7 (± 0.5) | -1.6 (± 0.6) | -2 (± 0.3) | -1.6 (± 0.5) |
| Day 29 (Change from Baseline) | -1.8 (± 0.5) | -1.6 (± 0.6) | -2 (± 0.3) | -1.7 (± 0.4) |

| End point values | Calcipotriol aerosol spray | Aerosol spray vehicle | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Subject group type | Reporting group | Reporting group | | |
| Number of subjects analysed | 50 | 50 | | |
| Units: Infiltration Score | | | | |
| arithmetic mean (standard deviation) | | | | |
| Baseline | 2.1 (± 0.3) | 2.1 (± 0.3) | | |
| Day 4 (Change from Baseline) | -0.1 (± 0.4) | -0.1 (± 0.3) | | |
| Day 8 (Change from Baseline) | -0.3 (± 0.4) | -0.1 (± 0.4) | | |

| | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Day 11 (Change from Baseline) | -0.4 (± 0.5) | -0.3 (± 0.4) | | |
| Day 15 (Change from Baseline) | -0.7 (± 0.6) | -0.3 (± 0.5) | | |
| Day 18 (Change from Baseline) | -0.8 (± 0.6) | -0.4 (± 0.5) | | |
| Day 22 (Change from Baseline) | -0.8 (± 0.6) | -0.3 (± 0.4) | | |
| Day 25 (Change from Baseline) | -0.9 (± 0.6) | -0.4 (± 0.5) | | |
| Day 29 (Change from Baseline) | -1 (± 0.7) | -0.4 (± 0.5) | | |

## Statistical analyses

No statistical analyses for this end point

## Secondary: Absolute Change in Total Skin Thickness at End of Treatment Compared to Baseline

| End point title | Absolute Change in Total Skin Thickness at End of Treatment Compared to Baseline |
|---|---|

End point description:

The skin thickness of each test site was measured at Baseline and Day 29 using an ultrasound scanner. Data were analysed with a special software (Dermavision 2D, Cortex Technology).

Compared to non-psoriatic skin, the ultrasound image of a psoriatic plaque is characterized by an increased skin thickness and by the presence of a so-called echo-poor band just below the skin surface. The thickness of this echo-poor band is an indication of the degree of acanthosis, papillomatosis and infiltration in the upper dermis.

Three scans were recorded per test site at each time point. At the end of the trial, these images were analysed by a blinded assessor at the trial site who recorded the following for each image:
- Total skin thickness (in millimetres)
- Echo-poor band thickness (in millimetres)

Treatment differences were tested as contrasts using a two-way ANOVA with treatment and subject as fixed effects.

| End point type | Secondary |
|---|---|

End point timeframe:

4 weeks

| End point values | LP0113 aerosol spray | Daivobet® gel | LEO 90100 | BDP aerosol spray |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Subject group type | Reporting group | Reporting group | Reporting group | Reporting group |
| Number of subjects analysed | 50 | 50 | 50 | 50 |
| Units: millimeters (mm) | | | | |
| arithmetic mean (standard deviation) | | | | |
| Baseline | 2.4 (± 0.4) | 2.4 (± 0.4) | 2.4 (± 0.5) | 2.4 (± 0.4) |
| Day 29 (Change from Baseline) | -1 (± 0.4) | -0.9 (± 0.4) | -1 (± 0.4) | -1 (± 0.3) |

| End point values | Calcipotriol aerosol spray | Aerosol spray vehicle | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Subject group type | Reporting group | Reporting group | | |
| Number of subjects analysed | 50 | 50 | | |
| Units: millimeters (mm) | | | | |

| arithmetic mean (standard deviation) | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Baseline | 2.4 (± 0.4) | 2.4 (± 0.4) | | |
| Day 29 (Change from Baseline) | -0.5 (± 0.5) | -0.2 (± 0.4) | | |

## Statistical analyses

| **Statistical analysis title** | Skin Thickness comparison LP0113 vs Vehicle |
|---|---|

Statistical analysis description:

Between treatment difference in absolute change in total skin thickness from baseline to end of treatment (LP0113 aerosol spray - Aerosol spray vehicle).
Treatment comparisons using ANOVA with treatment and subject as factors. Same subjects receiving both treatments applied to different test sites.

| Comparison groups | LP0113 aerosol spray v Aerosol spray vehicle |
|---|---|
| Number of subjects included in analysis | 100 |
| Analysis specification | Pre-specified |
| Analysis type | superiority |
| P-value | < 0.001 [28] |
| Method | ANOVA |
| Parameter estimate | Mean difference (net) |
| Point estimate | -0.82 |
| Confidence interval | |
| level | 95 % |
| sides | 2-sided |
| lower limit | -0.95 |
| upper limit | -0.68 |

Notes:

[28] - Statistically significant superiority of LP0113 aerosol spray over Aerosol spray vehicle

| **Statistical analysis title** | Skin Thickness comparison Daivobet vs Vehicle |
|---|---|

Statistical analysis description:

Between treatment difference in absolute change in total skin thickness from baseline to end of treatment (Daivobet® gel - Aerosol spray vehicle).
Treatment comparisons using ANOVA with treatment and subject as factors. Same subjects receiving both treatments applied to different test sites.

| Comparison groups | Aerosol spray vehicle v Daivobet® gel |
|---|---|
| Number of subjects included in analysis | 100 |
| Analysis specification | Pre-specified |
| Analysis type | superiority |
| P-value | < 0.001 [29] |
| Method | ANOVA |
| Parameter estimate | Mean difference (net) |
| Point estimate | -0.74 |
| Confidence interval | |
| level | 95 % |
| sides | 2-sided |
| lower limit | -0.88 |
| upper limit | -0.61 |

Notes:

[29] - Statistically significant superiority of Daivobet® gel over Aerosol spray vehicle

| **Statistical analysis title** | Skin Thickness comparison LEO 90100 vs Vehicle |
|---|---|

Statistical analysis description:

Between treatment difference in absolute change in total skin thickness from baseline to end of treatment (LEO 90100 - Aerosol spray vehicle).
Treatment comparisons using ANOVA with treatment and subject as factors. Same subjects receiving both treatments applied to different test sites.

| | |
|---|---|
| Comparison groups | Aerosol spray vehicle v LEO 90100 |
| Number of subjects included in analysis | 100 |
| Analysis specification | Pre-specified |
| Analysis type | superiority |
| P-value | < 0.001 [30] |
| Method | ANOVA |
| Parameter estimate | Mean difference (net) |
| Point estimate | -0.88 |
| Confidence interval | |
| level | 95 % |
| sides | 2-sided |
| lower limit | -1.02 |
| upper limit | -0.75 |

Notes:

[30] - Statistically significant superiority of LEO 90100 over Aerosol spray vehicle

| **Statistical analysis title** | Skin Thickness comparison BDP vs Vehicle |
|---|---|

Statistical analysis description:

Between treatment difference in absolute change in total skin thickness from baseline to end of treatment (BDP aerosol spray - Aerosol spray vehicle).
Treatment comparisons using ANOVA with treatment and subject as factors. Same subjects receiving both treatments applied to different test sites.

| | |
|---|---|
| Comparison groups | Aerosol spray vehicle v BDP aerosol spray |
| Number of subjects included in analysis | 100 |
| Analysis specification | Pre-specified |
| Analysis type | superiority |
| P-value | < 0.001 [31] |
| Method | ANOVA |
| Parameter estimate | Mean difference (net) |
| Point estimate | -0.81 |
| Confidence interval | |
| level | 95 % |
| sides | 2-sided |
| lower limit | -0.95 |
| upper limit | -0.68 |

Notes:

[31] - Statistically significant superiority of BDP aerosol spray over Aerosol spray vehicle

| **Statistical analysis title** | Skin Thickness comparison Calcipotriol vs Vehicle |
|---|---|

Statistical analysis description:

Between treatment difference in absolute change in total skin thickness from baseline to end of treatment (Calcipotriol aerosol spray - Aerosol spray vehicle).
Treatment comparisons using ANOVA with treatment and subject as factors. Same subjects receiving both treatments applied to different test sites.

| | |
|---|---|
| Comparison groups | Aerosol spray vehicle v Calcipotriol aerosol spray |

| | |
|---|---|
| Number of subjects included in analysis | 100 |
| Analysis specification | Pre-specified |
| Analysis type | superiority |
| P-value | < 0.001 [32] |
| Method | ANOVA |
| Parameter estimate | Mean difference (net) |
| Point estimate | -0.33 |
| Confidence interval | |
| level | 95 % |
| sides | 2-sided |
| lower limit | -0.46 |
| upper limit | -0.19 |

Notes:

[32] - Statistically significant superiority of Calcipotriol aerosol spray over Aerosol spray vehicle

| **Statistical analysis title** | Skin Thickness comparison LP0113 vs Calcipotriol |
|---|---|

Statistical analysis description:

Between treatment difference in absolute change in total skin thickness from baseline to end of treatment (LP0113 aerosol spray - Calcipotriol aerosol spray).
Treatment comparisons using ANOVA with treatment and subject as factors. Same subjects receiving both treatments applied to different test sites.

| | |
|---|---|
| Comparison groups | Calcipotriol aerosol spray v LP0113 aerosol spray |
| Number of subjects included in analysis | 100 |
| Analysis specification | Pre-specified |
| Analysis type | superiority |
| P-value | < 0.001 [33] |
| Method | ANOVA |
| Parameter estimate | Mean difference (net) |
| Point estimate | -0.49 |
| Confidence interval | |
| level | 95 % |
| sides | 2-sided |
| lower limit | -0.62 |
| upper limit | -0.35 |

Notes:

[33] - Statistically significant superiority of LP0113 aerosol spray over Calcipotriol aerosol spray

| **Statistical analysis title** | Skin Thickness comparison Daivobet vs Calcipotriol |
|---|---|

Statistical analysis description:

Between treatment difference in absolute change in total skin thickness from baseline to end of treatment (Daivobet® gel - Calcipotriol aerosol spray).
Treatment comparisons using ANOVA with treatment and subject as factors. Same subjects receiving both treatments applied to different test sites.

| | |
|---|---|
| Comparison groups | Calcipotriol aerosol spray v Daivobet® gel |
| Number of subjects included in analysis | 100 |
| Analysis specification | Pre-specified |
| Analysis type | superiority |
| P-value | < 0.001 [34] |
| Method | ANOVA |
| Parameter estimate | Mean difference (net) |
| Point estimate | -0.41 |

| | |
|---|---|
| Confidence interval | |
| level | 95 % |
| sides | 2-sided |
| lower limit | -0.55 |
| upper limit | -0.28 |

Notes:

[34] - Statistically significant superiority of Daivobet® gel over Calcipotriol aerosol spray

| **Statistical analysis title** | Skin Thickness comparison LEO90100 vs Calcipotriol |
|---|---|

Statistical analysis description:

Between treatment difference in absolute change in total skin thickness from baseline to end of treatment (LEO 90100 - Calcipotriol aerosol spray).
Treatment comparisons using ANOVA with treatment and subject as factors. Same subjects receiving both treatments applied to different test sites.

| | |
|---|---|
| Comparison groups | Calcipotriol aerosol spray v LEO 90100 |
| Number of subjects included in analysis | 100 |
| Analysis specification | Pre-specified |
| Analysis type | superiority |
| P-value | < 0.001 [35] |
| Method | ANOVA |
| Parameter estimate | Mean difference (net) |
| Point estimate | -0.55 |
| Confidence interval | |
| level | 95 % |
| sides | 2-sided |
| lower limit | -0.69 |
| upper limit | -0.42 |

Notes:

[35] - Statistically significant superiority of LEO 90100 over Calcipotriol aerosol spray

| **Statistical analysis title** | Skin Thickness comparison BDP vs Calcipotriol |
|---|---|

Statistical analysis description:

Between treatment difference in absolute change in total skin thickness from baseline to end of treatment (BDP aerosol spray - Calcipotriol aerosol spray).
Treatment comparisons using ANOVA with treatment and subject as factors. Same subjects receiving both treatments applied to different test sites.

| | |
|---|---|
| Comparison groups | Calcipotriol aerosol spray v BDP aerosol spray |
| Number of subjects included in analysis | 100 |
| Analysis specification | Pre-specified |
| Analysis type | superiority |
| P-value | < 0.001 [36] |
| Method | ANOVA |
| Parameter estimate | Mean difference (net) |
| Point estimate | -0.48 |
| Confidence interval | |
| level | 95 % |
| sides | 2-sided |
| lower limit | -0.62 |
| upper limit | -0.35 |

Notes:

[36] - Statistically significant superiority of BDP aerosol spray over Calcipotriol aerosol spray

| **Statistical analysis title** | Skin Thickness comparison LP0113 vs BDP |
|---|---|

Statistical analysis description:

Between treatment difference in absolute change in total skin thickness from baseline to end of treatment (LP0113 aerosol spray - BDP aerosol spray).
Treatment comparisons using ANOVA with treatment and subject as factors. Same subjects receiving both treatments applied to different test sites.

| | |
|---|---|
| Comparison groups | BDP aerosol spray v LP0113 aerosol spray |
| Number of subjects included in analysis | 100 |
| Analysis specification | Pre-specified |
| Analysis type | superiority |
| P-value | = 0.95 |
| Method | ANOVA |
| Parameter estimate | Mean difference (net) |
| Point estimate | 0 |
| Confidence interval | |
| level | 95 % |
| sides | 2-sided |
| lower limit | -0.14 |
| upper limit | 0.13 |

| **Statistical analysis title** | Skin Thickness comparison Daivobet vs BDP |
|---|---|

Statistical analysis description:

Between treatment difference in absolute change in total skin thickness from baseline to end of treatment (Daivobet® gel - BDP aerosol spray).
Treatment comparisons using ANOVA with treatment and subject as factors. Same subjects receiving both treatments applied to different test sites.

| | |
|---|---|
| Comparison groups | BDP aerosol spray v Daivobet® gel |
| Number of subjects included in analysis | 100 |
| Analysis specification | Pre-specified |
| Analysis type | superiority |
| P-value | = 0.32 |
| Method | ANOVA |
| Parameter estimate | Mean difference (net) |
| Point estimate | 0.07 |
| Confidence interval | |
| level | 95 % |
| sides | 2-sided |
| lower limit | -0.07 |
| upper limit | 0.2 |

| **Statistical analysis title** | Skin Thickness comparison LEO 90100 vs BDP |
|---|---|

Statistical analysis description:

Between treatment difference in absolute change in total skin thickness from baseline to end of treatment (LEO 90100 - BDP aerosol spray).
Treatment comparisons using ANOVA with treatment and subject as factors. Same subjects receiving both treatments applied to different test sites.

| | |
|---|---|
| Comparison groups | BDP aerosol spray v LEO 90100 |

| | |
|---|---|
| Number of subjects included in analysis | 100 |
| Analysis specification | Pre-specified |
| Analysis type | superiority |
| P-value | = 0.32 |
| Method | ANOVA |
| Parameter estimate | Mean difference (net) |
| Point estimate | -0.07 |
| Confidence interval | |
| level | 95 % |
| sides | 2-sided |
| lower limit | -0.2 |
| upper limit | 0.07 |

| **Statistical analysis title** | Skin Thickness comparison LP0113 vs LEO 90100 |
|---|---|

Statistical analysis description:

Between treatment difference in absolute change in total skin thickness from baseline to end of treatment (LP0113 aerosol spray - LEO 90100).
Treatment comparisons using ANOVA with treatment and subject as factors. Same subjects receiving both treatments applied to different test sites.

| | |
|---|---|
| Comparison groups | LEO 90100 v LP0113 aerosol spray |
| Number of subjects included in analysis | 100 |
| Analysis specification | Pre-specified |
| Analysis type | superiority |
| P-value | = 0.35 |
| Method | ANOVA |
| Parameter estimate | Mean difference (net) |
| Point estimate | 0.06 |
| Confidence interval | |
| level | 95 % |
| sides | 2-sided |
| lower limit | -0.07 |
| upper limit | 0.2 |

| **Statistical analysis title** | Skin Thickness comparison Daivobet vs LEO 90100 |
|---|---|

Statistical analysis description:

Between treatment difference in absolute change in total skin thickness from baseline to end of treatment (Daivobet® gel - LEO 90100).
Treatment comparisons using ANOVA with treatment and subject as factors. Same subjects receiving both treatments applied to different test sites.

| | |
|---|---|
| Comparison groups | LEO 90100 v Daivobet® gel |
| Number of subjects included in analysis | 100 |
| Analysis specification | Pre-specified |
| Analysis type | superiority |
| P-value | = 0.047 [37] |
| Method | ANOVA |
| Parameter estimate | Mean difference (net) |
| Point estimate | 0.14 |

| | |
|---|---|
| Confidence interval | |
| level | 95 % |
| sides | 2-sided |
| lower limit | 0 |
| upper limit | 0.27 |

Notes:

[37] - Statistically significant superiority of LEO 90100 over Daivobet® gel

| **Statistical analysis title** | Skin Thickness comparison LP0113 vs Daivobet |
|---|---|

Statistical analysis description:

Between treatment difference in absolute change in total skin thickness from baseline to end of treatment (LP0113 aerosol spray - Daivobet® gel).
Treatment comparisons using ANOVA with treatment and subject as factors. Same subjects receiving both treatments applied to different test sites.

| | |
|---|---|
| Comparison groups | Daivobet® gel v LP0113 aerosol spray |
| Number of subjects included in analysis | 100 |
| Analysis specification | Pre-specified |
| Analysis type | superiority |
| P-value | = 0.29 |
| Method | ANOVA |
| Parameter estimate | Mean difference (net) |
| Point estimate | -0.07 |
| Confidence interval | |
| level | 95 % |
| sides | 2-sided |
| lower limit | -0.21 |
| upper limit | 0.06 |

## Secondary: Absolute Change in Echo-poor Band Thickness at End of Treatment Compared to Baseline

| End point title | Absolute Change in Echo-poor Band Thickness at End of Treatment Compared to Baseline |
|---|---|

End point description:

The skin thickness of each test site was measured at Baseline and Day 29 using an ultrasound scanner. Data were analysed with a special software (Dermavision 2D, Cortex Technology).

Compared to non-psoriatic skin, the ultrasound image of a psoriatic plaque is characterized by an increased skin thickness and by the presence of a so-called echo-poor band just below the skin surface. The thickness of this echo-poor band is an indication of the degree of acanthosis, papillomatosis and infiltration in the upper dermis.

Three scans were recorded per test site at each time point. At the end of the trial, these images were analysed by a blinded assessor at the trial site who recorded the following for each image:
- Total skin thickness (in millimetres)
- Echo-poor band thickness (in millimetres)

Treatment differences were tested as contrasts using a two-way ANOVA with treatment and subject as fixed effects.

| End point type | Secondary |
|---|---|

End point timeframe:

4 weeks

| End point values | LP0113 aerosol spray | Daivobet® gel | LEO 90100 | BDP aerosol spray |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Subject group type | Reporting group | Reporting group | Reporting group | Reporting group |
| Number of subjects analysed | 50 | 50 | 50 | 50 |
| Units: millimeters (mm) | | | | |
| arithmetic mean (standard deviation) | | | | |
| Baseline | 1.2 (± 0.5) | 1.2 (± 0.5) | 1.2 (± 0.6) | 1.2 (± 0.4) |
| Day 29 (Change from Baseline) | -1.1 (± 0.4) | -1 (± 0.6) | -1.1 (± 0.5) | -1 (± 0.4) |

| End point values | Calcipotriol aerosol spray | Aerosol spray vehicle | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Subject group type | Reporting group | Reporting group | | |
| Number of subjects analysed | 50 | 50 | | |
| Units: millimeters (mm) | | | | |
| arithmetic mean (standard deviation) | | | | |
| Baseline | 1.1 (± 0.5) | 1.2 (± 0.5) | | |
| Day 29 (Change from Baseline) | -0.5 (± 0.6) | -0.2 (± 0.6) | | |

## Statistical analyses

| Statistical analysis title | Echo-poor Band comparison LP0113 vs. Vehicle |
|---|---|

Statistical analysis description:

Between treatment difference in absolute change in Echo-poor band thickness from baseline to end of treatment (LP0113 aerosol spray - Aerosol spray vehicle).
Treatment comparisons using ANOVA with treatment and subject as factors. Same subjects receiving both treatments applied to different test sites.

| | |
|---|---|
| Comparison groups | LP0113 aerosol spray v Aerosol spray vehicle |
| Number of subjects included in analysis | 100 |
| Analysis specification | Pre-specified |
| Analysis type | superiority |
| P-value | < 0.001 [38] |
| Method | ANOVA |
| Parameter estimate | Mean difference (net) |
| Point estimate | -0.86 |
| Confidence interval | |
| level | 95 % |
| sides | 2-sided |
| lower limit | -1.03 |
| upper limit | -0.68 |

Notes:

[38] - Statistically significant superiority of LP0113 aerosol spray over Aerosol spray vehicle

| Statistical analysis title | Echo-poor Band comparison Daivobet vs. Vehicle |
|---|---|

Statistical analysis description:

Between treatment difference in absolute change in Echo-poor band thickness from baseline to end of treatment (Daivobet® gel - Aerosol spray vehicle).
Treatment comparisons using ANOVA with treatment and subject as factors. Same subjects receiving both treatments applied to different test sites.

| | |
|---|---|
| Comparison groups | Aerosol spray vehicle v Daivobet® gel |
| Number of subjects included in analysis | 100 |
| Analysis specification | Pre-specified |
| Analysis type | superiority |
| P-value | < 0.001 [39] |
| Method | ANOVA |
| Parameter estimate | Mean difference (net) |
| Point estimate | -0.76 |
| Confidence interval | |
| level | 95 % |
| sides | 2-sided |
| lower limit | -0.94 |
| upper limit | -0.59 |

Notes:

[39] - Statistically significant superiority of Daivobet® gel over Aerosol spray vehicle

| **Statistical analysis title** | Echo-poor Band comparison LEO 90100 vs Vehicle |
|---|---|

Statistical analysis description:

Between treatment difference in absolute change in Echo-poor band thickness from baseline to end of treatment (LEO 90100 - Aerosol spray vehicle).
Treatment comparisons using ANOVA with treatment and subject as factors. Same subjects receiving both treatments applied to different test sites.

| | |
|---|---|
| Comparison groups | Aerosol spray vehicle v LEO 90100 |
| Number of subjects included in analysis | 100 |
| Analysis specification | Pre-specified |
| Analysis type | superiority |
| P-value | < 0.001 [40] |
| Method | ANOVA |
| Parameter estimate | Mean difference (net) |
| Point estimate | -0.91 |
| Confidence interval | |
| level | 95 % |
| sides | 2-sided |
| lower limit | -1.09 |
| upper limit | -0.74 |

Notes:

[40] - Statistically significant superiority of LEO 90100 over Aerosol spray vehicle

| **Statistical analysis title** | Echo-poor Band comparison BDP vs Vehicle |
|---|---|

Statistical analysis description:

Between treatment difference in absolute change in Echo-poor band thickness from baseline to end of treatment (BDP aerosol spray - Aerosol spray vehicle).
Treatment comparisons using ANOVA with treatment and subject as factors. Same subjects receiving both treatments applied to different test sites.

| | |
|---|---|
| Comparison groups | Aerosol spray vehicle v BDP aerosol spray |

| | |
|---|---|
| Number of subjects included in analysis | 100 |
| Analysis specification | Pre-specified |
| Analysis type | superiority |
| P-value | < 0.001 [41] |
| Method | ANOVA |
| Parameter estimate | Mean difference (net) |
| Point estimate | -0.81 |
| Confidence interval | |
| level | 95 % |
| sides | 2-sided |
| lower limit | -0.99 |
| upper limit | -0.64 |

Notes:

[41] - Statistically significant superiority of BDP aerosol spray over Aerosol spray vehicle

| **Statistical analysis title** | Echo-poor Band comparison Calcipotriol vs Vehicle |
|---|---|

Statistical analysis description:

Between treatment difference in absolute change in Echo-poor band thickness from baseline to end of treatment (Calcipotriol aerosol spray - Aerosol spray vehicle).
Treatment comparisons using ANOVA with treatment and subject as factors. Same subjects receiving both treatments applied to different test sites.

| | |
|---|---|
| Comparison groups | Aerosol spray vehicle v Calcipotriol aerosol spray |
| Number of subjects included in analysis | 100 |
| Analysis specification | Pre-specified |
| Analysis type | superiority |
| P-value | < 0.001 [42] |
| Method | ANOVA |
| Parameter estimate | Mean difference (net) |
| Point estimate | -0.31 |
| Confidence interval | |
| level | 95 % |
| sides | 2-sided |
| lower limit | -0.49 |
| upper limit | -0.14 |

Notes:

[42] - Statistically significant superiority of Calcipotriol aerosol spray over Aerosol spray vehicle

| **Statistical analysis title** | Echo-poor Band comparison LP0113 vs Calcipotriol |
|---|---|

Statistical analysis description:

Between treatment difference in absolute change in Echo-poor band thickness from baseline to end of treatment (LP0113 aerosol spray - Calcipotriol aerosol spray).
Treatment comparisons using ANOVA with treatment and subject as factors. Same subjects receiving both treatments applied to different test sites.

| | |
|---|---|
| Comparison groups | Calcipotriol aerosol spray v LP0113 aerosol spray |
| Number of subjects included in analysis | 100 |
| Analysis specification | Pre-specified |
| Analysis type | superiority |
| P-value | < 0.001 [43] |
| Method | ANOVA |
| Parameter estimate | Mean difference (net) |
| Point estimate | -0.54 |

| | |
|---|---|
| Confidence interval | |
| level | 95 % |
| sides | 2-sided |
| lower limit | -0.72 |
| upper limit | -0.37 |

Notes:

[43] - Statistically significant superiority of LP0113 aerosol spray over Calcipotriol aerosol spray

| **Statistical analysis title** | Echo-poor Band comparison Daivobet vs Calcipotriol |
|---|---|

Statistical analysis description:

Between treatment difference in absolute change in Echo-poor band thickness from baseline to end of treatment (Daivobet® gel - Calcipotriol aerosol spray).
Treatment comparisons using ANOVA with treatment and subject as factors. Same subjects receiving both treatments applied to different test sites.

| | |
|---|---|
| Comparison groups | Calcipotriol aerosol spray v Daivobet® gel |
| Number of subjects included in analysis | 100 |
| Analysis specification | Pre-specified |
| Analysis type | superiority |
| P-value | < 0.001 [44] |
| Method | ANOVA |
| Parameter estimate | Mean difference (net) |
| Point estimate | -0.45 |
| Confidence interval | |
| level | 95 % |
| sides | 2-sided |
| lower limit | -0.62 |
| upper limit | -0.27 |

Notes:

[44] - Statistically significant superiority of Daivobet® gel over Calcipotriol aerosol spray

| **Statistical analysis title** | Echo-poor Band comparison LEO90100 vs Calcipotriol |
|---|---|

Statistical analysis description:

Between treatment difference in absolute change in Echo-poor band thickness from baseline to end of treatment (LEO 90100 - Calcipotriol aerosol spray).
Treatment comparisons using ANOVA with treatment and subject as factors. Same subjects receiving both treatments applied to different test sites.

| | |
|---|---|
| Comparison groups | Calcipotriol aerosol spray v LEO 90100 |
| Number of subjects included in analysis | 100 |
| Analysis specification | Pre-specified |
| Analysis type | superiority |
| P-value | < 0.001 [45] |
| Method | ANOVA |
| Parameter estimate | Mean difference (net) |
| Point estimate | -0.6 |
| Confidence interval | |
| level | 95 % |
| sides | 2-sided |
| lower limit | -0.77 |
| upper limit | -0.43 |

Notes:

[45] - Statistically significant superiority of LEO 90100 over Calcipotriol aerosol spray

| **Statistical analysis title** | Echo-poor Band comparison BDP vs Calcipotriol |
|---|---|

Statistical analysis description:

Between treatment difference in absolute change in Echo-poor band thickness from baseline to end of treatment (BDP aerosol spray - Calcipotriol aerosol spray).
Treatment comparisons using ANOVA with treatment and subject as factors. Same subjects receiving both treatments applied to different test sites.

| | |
|---|---|
| Comparison groups | Calcipotriol aerosol spray v BDP aerosol spray |
| Number of subjects included in analysis | 100 |
| Analysis specification | Pre-specified |
| Analysis type | superiority |
| P-value | < 0.001 [46] |
| Method | ANOVA |
| Parameter estimate | Mean difference (net) |
| Point estimate | -0.5 |
| Confidence interval | |
| level | 95 % |
| sides | 2-sided |
| lower limit | -0.67 |
| upper limit | -0.33 |

Notes:

[46] - Statistically significant superiority of BDP aerosol spray over Calcipotriol aerosol spray

| **Statistical analysis title** | Echo-poor Band comparison LP0113 vs BDP |
|---|---|

Statistical analysis description:

Between treatment difference in absolute change in Echo-poor band thickness from baseline to end of treatment (LP0113 aerosol spray - BDP aerosol spray).
Treatment comparisons using ANOVA with treatment and subject as factors. Same subjects receiving both treatments applied to different test sites.

| | |
|---|---|
| Comparison groups | LP0113 aerosol spray v BDP aerosol spray |
| Number of subjects included in analysis | 100 |
| Analysis specification | Pre-specified |
| Analysis type | superiority |
| P-value | = 0.62 |
| Method | ANOVA |
| Parameter estimate | Mean difference (net) |
| Point estimate | -0.04 |
| Confidence interval | |
| level | 95 % |
| sides | 2-sided |
| lower limit | -0.22 |
| upper limit | 0.13 |

| **Statistical analysis title** | Echo-poor Band comparison Daivobet vs BDP |
|---|---|

Statistical analysis description:

Between treatment difference in absolute change in Echo-poor band thickness from baseline to end of treatment (Daivobet® gel - BDP aerosol spray).
Treatment comparisons using ANOVA with treatment and subject as factors. Same subjects receiving both treatments applied to different test sites.

| | |
|---|---|
| Comparison groups | BDP aerosol spray v Daivobet® gel |

| | |
|---|---|
| Number of subjects included in analysis | 100 |
| Analysis specification | Pre-specified |
| Analysis type | superiority |
| P-value | = 0.56 |
| Method | ANOVA |
| Parameter estimate | Mean difference (net) |
| Point estimate | 0.05 |
| Confidence interval | |
| level | 95 % |
| sides | 2-sided |
| lower limit | -0.12 |
| upper limit | 0.23 |

| **Statistical analysis title** | Echo-poor Band comparison LEO 90100 vs BDP |
|---|---|

Statistical analysis description:

Between treatment difference in absolute change in Echo-poor band thickness from baseline to end of treatment (LEO 90100 - BDP aerosol spray).
Treatment comparisons using ANOVA with treatment and subject as factors. Same subjects receiving both treatments applied to different test sites.

| | |
|---|---|
| Comparison groups | BDP aerosol spray v LEO 90100 |
| Number of subjects included in analysis | 100 |
| Analysis specification | Pre-specified |
| Analysis type | superiority |
| P-value | = 0.26 |
| Method | ANOVA |
| Parameter estimate | Mean difference (net) |
| Point estimate | -0.1 |
| Confidence interval | |
| level | 95 % |
| sides | 2-sided |
| lower limit | -0.27 |
| upper limit | 0.07 |

| **Statistical analysis title** | Echo-poor Band comparison LP0113 vs LEO 90100 |
|---|---|

Statistical analysis description:

Between treatment difference in absolute change in Echo-poor band thickness from baseline to end of treatment (LP0113 aerosol spray - LEO 90100).
Treatment comparisons using ANOVA with treatment and subject as factors. Same subjects receiving both treatments applied to different test sites.

| | |
|---|---|
| Comparison groups | LEO 90100 v LP0113 aerosol spray |
| Number of subjects included in analysis | 100 |
| Analysis specification | Pre-specified |
| Analysis type | superiority |
| P-value | = 0.52 |
| Method | ANOVA |
| Parameter estimate | Mean difference (net) |
| Point estimate | 0.06 |

| | |
|---|---|
| Confidence interval | |
| level | 95 % |
| sides | 2-sided |
| lower limit | -0.12 |
| upper limit | 0.23 |

| **Statistical analysis title** | Echo-poor Band comparison Daivobet vs LEO 90100 |
|---|---|

Statistical analysis description:

Between treatment difference in absolute change in Echo-poor band thickness from baseline to end of treatment (Daivobet® gel - LEO 90100).
Treatment comparisons using ANOVA with treatment and subject as factors. Same subjects receiving both treatments applied to different test sites.

| | |
|---|---|
| Comparison groups | LEO 90100 v Daivobet® gel |
| Number of subjects included in analysis | 100 |
| Analysis specification | Pre-specified |
| Analysis type | superiority |
| P-value | = 0.086 |
| Method | ANOVA |
| Parameter estimate | Mean difference (net) |
| Point estimate | 0.15 |
| Confidence interval | |
| level | 95 % |
| sides | 2-sided |
| lower limit | -0.02 |
| upper limit | 0.33 |

| **Statistical analysis title** | Echo-poor Band comparison LP0113 vs Daivobet |
|---|---|

Statistical analysis description:

Between treatment difference in absolute change in Echo-poor band thickness from baseline to end of treatment (LP0113 aerosol spray - Daivobet® gel).
Treatment comparisons using ANOVA with treatment and subject as factors. Same subjects receiving both treatments applied to different test sites.

| | |
|---|---|
| Comparison groups | Daivobet® gel v LP0113 aerosol spray |
| Number of subjects included in analysis | 100 |
| Analysis specification | Pre-specified |
| Analysis type | superiority |
| P-value | = 0.28 |
| Method | ANOVA |
| Parameter estimate | Mean difference (net) |
| Point estimate | -0.1 |
| Confidence interval | |
| level | 95 % |
| sides | 2-sided |
| lower limit | -0.27 |
| upper limit | 0.08 |

## Adverse events

### Adverse events information

Timeframe for reporting adverse events:

4 weeks

Adverse event reporting additional description:

No cutaneous AEs were observed and none of the AEs were assessed by the investigator to be related to the trial treatments. AEs are reported as one safety population for all IMP since all subjects were exposed to all IMPs at the same time. A total of 18 subjects (36.0%) experienced a total of 25 AEs after start of treatment with IMPs.

| | |
|---|---|
| Assessment type | Systematic |

### Dictionary used

| | |
|---|---|
| Dictionary name | MedDRA |
| Dictionary version | 15.1 |

### Reporting groups

| | |
|---|---|
| Reporting group title | Safety Population |

Reporting group description:

Each subject was treated with the 6 products on 6 test sites (each 5 cm2) which were located within 1 to 6 stable psoriasis lesions (target plaques) on arms, legs and/or trunk. An application scheme showed which treatment should be applied to each test site. The test sites were marked with a numbered, disposable circular device, which was attached to the skin; the outline of each circular device was drawn on the skin using an indelible marker.

IMP was applied by site staff once daily 6 days a week for 4 weeks. A blinded investigator assessed test sites twice weekly for the severity of the clinical signs erythema, scaling, and infiltration.

| **Serious adverse events** | Safety Population | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| Total subjects affected by serious adverse events | | | |
| subjects affected / exposed | 0 / 50 (0.00%) | | |
| number of deaths (all causes) | 0 | | |
| number of deaths resulting from adverse events | 0 | | |

Frequency threshold for reporting non-serious adverse events: 4 %

| **Non-serious adverse events** | Safety Population | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| Total subjects affected by non-serious adverse events | | | |
| subjects affected / exposed | 14 / 50 (28.00%) | | |
| Nervous system disorders | | | |
| Headache | | | |
| subjects affected / exposed | 4 / 50 (8.00%) | | |
| occurrences (all) | 4 | | |
| Migraine | | | |

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| subjects affected / exposed<br>occurrences (all) | 2 / 50 (4.00%)<br>4 | | |
| Gastrointestinal disorders<br>Diarrhoea<br>subjects affected / exposed<br>occurrences (all) | <br><br>2 / 50 (4.00%)<br>2 | | |
| Respiratory, thoracic and mediastinal disorders<br>Oropharyngeal pain<br>subjects affected / exposed<br>occurrences (all) | <br><br>2 / 50 (4.00%)<br>2 | | |
| Musculoskeletal and connective tissue disorders<br>Back pain<br>subjects affected / exposed<br>occurrences (all)<br>Neck pain<br>subjects affected / exposed<br>occurrences (all) | <br><br>2 / 50 (4.00%)<br>2<br><br>2 / 50 (4.00%)<br>2 | | |

## More information

## Substantial protocol amendments (globally)

Were there any global substantial amendments to the protocol? No

## Interruptions (globally)

Were there any global interruptions to the trial? No

## Limitations and caveats

Limitations of the trial such as small numbers of subjects analysed or technical problems leading to unreliable data.

| |
|---|
| None reported |

Notes: