



Clinical trial results:

A Phase 3, Double-Blind, Randomized, 8-Week, Vehicle-Controlled Efficacy and Safety Study of Ruxolitinib Cream Followed by a Long-Term Safety Extension Period in Adolescents and Adults With Atopic Dermatitis

Summary

| | |
|--------------------------|------------------|
| EudraCT number | 2018-003713-18 |
| Trial protocol | CZ DE BG PL ES |
| Global end of trial date | 09 November 2020 |

Results information

| | |
|--------------------------------|------------------|
| Result version number | v1 (current) |
| This version publication date | 04 December 2021 |
| First version publication date | 04 December 2021 |

Trial information

Trial identification

| | |
|-----------------------|----------------|
| Sponsor protocol code | INCB 18424-304 |
|-----------------------|----------------|

Additional study identifiers

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

Notes:

Sponsors

| | |
|------------------------------|---|
| Sponsor organisation name | Incyte Corporation |
| Sponsor organisation address | 1801 Augustine Cutoff drive, Wilmington, United States, 19803 |
| Public contact | Study Director, Incyte Corporation, +1 8554633463, medinfo@incyte.com |
| Scientific contact | Study Director, Incyte Corporation, +1 8554633463, medinfo@incyte.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 | 09 November 2020 |
| Is this the analysis of the primary completion data? | No |
| Global end of trial reached? | Yes |
| Global end of trial date | 09 November 2020 |
| Was the trial ended prematurely? | No |

Notes:

General information about the trial

Main objective of the trial:

The purpose of this study is to assess the efficacy of ruxolitinib cream in adolescents and adults with atopic dermatitis (AD).

Protection of trial subjects:

This study will be performed in accordance with ethical principles that have their origin in the Declaration of Helsinki and conducted in adherence to the study Protocol, applicable Good Clinical Practices, and applicable laws and country-specific regulations in which the study is being conducted.

Background therapy: -

Evidence for comparator: -

| | |
|---|------------------|
| Actual start date of recruitment | 20 December 2018 |
| Long term follow-up planned | Yes |
| Long term follow-up rationale | Safety |
| Long term follow-up duration | 11 Months |
| Independent data monitoring committee (IDMC) involvement? | No |

Notes:

Population of trial subjects

Subjects enrolled per country

| | |
|--------------------------------------|--------------------|
| Country: Number of subjects enrolled | Bulgaria: 35 |
| Country: Number of subjects enrolled | Canada: 6 |
| Country: Number of subjects enrolled | Czechia: 88 |
| Country: Number of subjects enrolled | Germany: 9 |
| Country: Number of subjects enrolled | Poland: 63 |
| Country: Number of subjects enrolled | Spain: 8 |
| Country: Number of subjects enrolled | United States: 409 |
| Worldwide total number of subjects | 618 |
| EEA total number of subjects | 203 |

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) | 122 |
| Adults (18-64 years) | 439 |
| From 65 to 84 years | 56 |
| 85 years and over | 1 |

Subject disposition

Recruitment

Recruitment details:

A total of 618 participants were enrolled at 65 investigative sites in North America and Europe from December 20, 2018 to November 09, 2020.

Pre-assignment

Screening details:

Participants in Vehicle Control (VC) Period with no safety concerns at week 8 continued in the 44-week Long Term Safety (LTS) Period and equally randomized into 1 of the 2 active treatment groups. Participants who were on active treatment during the VC Period continued with the same treatment regimen in the LTS Period

Period 1

| | |
|------------------------------|--|
| Period 1 title | Vehicle Control Period (Day 1 to Week 8) |
| Is this the baseline period? | Yes |
| Allocation method | Randomised - controlled |
| Blinding used | Double blind |
| Roles blinded | Investigator, Carer, Subject, Assessor |

Arms

| | |
|------------------------------|------------------------------|
| Are arms mutually exclusive? | Yes |
| Arm title | VC Period: Vehicle Cream BID |

Arm description:

Ruxolitinib matching vehicle cream applied topically to the affected areas as a thin film twice daily (BID) 8 hours apart from Day 1 up to Week 8.

| | |
|--|---------------|
| Arm type | Placebo |
| Investigational medicinal product name | Vehicle Cream |
| Investigational medicinal product code | |
| Other name | |
| Pharmaceutical forms | Cream |
| Routes of administration | Topical use |

Dosage and administration details:

Twice Daily

| | |
|------------------|--|
| Arm title | VC Period: Ruxolitinib 0.75% Cream BID |
|------------------|--|

Arm description:

Ruxolitinib 0.75% cream, applied topically to the affected areas as a thin film BID 8 hours apart from Day 1 up to Week 8.

| | |
|--|--------------|
| Arm type | Experimental |
| Investigational medicinal product name | ruxolitinib |
| Investigational medicinal product code | |
| Other name | |
| Pharmaceutical forms | Cream |
| Routes of administration | Topical use |

Dosage and administration details:

0.75% cream Twice Daily

| | |
|------------------|---------------------------------------|
| Arm title | VC Period: Ruxolitinib 1.5% Cream BID |
|------------------|---------------------------------------|

Arm description:

Ruxolitinib 1.5% cream, applied topically to the affected areas as a thin film BID 8 hours apart from Day 1 up to Week 8.

| | |
|----------|--------------|
| Arm type | Experimental |
|----------|--------------|

| | |
|--|-------------|
| Investigational medicinal product name | ruxolitinib |
| Investigational medicinal product code | |
| Other name | |
| Pharmaceutical forms | Cream |
| Routes of administration | Topical use |

Dosage and administration details:

1.5% cream Twice Daily

| Number of subjects in period 1 | VC Period: Vehicle Cream BID | VC Period: Ruxolitinib 0.75% Cream BID | VC Period: Ruxolitinib 1.5% Cream BID |
|--------------------------------|------------------------------|--|---------------------------------------|
| | | | |
| Started | 124 | 248 | 246 |
| Completed | 105 | 209 | 224 |
| Not completed | 19 | 39 | 22 |
| Consent withdrawn by subject | 11 | 21 | 15 |
| Physician decision | 3 | - | 1 |
| Adverse event, non-fatal | 1 | 1 | - |
| Lost to follow-up | 3 | 13 | 4 |
| Reason not Specified | 1 | 2 | 2 |
| Protocol deviation | - | 2 | - |

Period 2

| | |
|------------------------------|--|
| Period 2 title | Long-Term Safety Period (Weeks 8 to 52) |
| Is this the baseline period? | No |
| Allocation method | Randomised - controlled |
| Blinding used | Double blind |
| Roles blinded | Subject, Investigator, Carer, Data analyst |

Arms

| | |
|------------------------------|--|
| Are arms mutually exclusive? | Yes |
| Arm title | LTS Period: Vehicle Cream to Ruxolitinib 0.75% Cream BID |

Arm description:

Participants who applied vehicle cream during the VC Period were randomized at Week 8 to apply ruxolitinib 0.75% cream, topically to the affected areas as a thin film BID as needed from Week 9 up to Week 52.

| | |
|--|--------------|
| Arm type | Experimental |
| Investigational medicinal product name | ruxolitinib |
| Investigational medicinal product code | |
| Other name | |
| Pharmaceutical forms | Cream |
| Routes of administration | Topical use |

Dosage and administration details:

0.75% cream twice daily

| | |
|------------------|---|
| Arm title | LTS Period: Vehicle Cream to Ruxolitinib 1.5% Cream BID |
|------------------|---|

Arm description:

Participants who applied vehicle cream during the VC Period were randomized at Week 8 to apply ruxolitinib 1.5% cream, topically to the affected areas as a thin film BID as needed from Week 9 up to Week 52.

| | |
|--|--------------|
| Arm type | Experimental |
| Investigational medicinal product name | ruxolitinib |
| Investigational medicinal product code | |
| Other name | |
| Pharmaceutical forms | Cream |
| Routes of administration | Topical use |

Dosage and administration details:

1.5% cream twice daily

| | |
|------------------|---|
| Arm title | LTS Period: Ruxolitinib 0.75% Cream BID |
|------------------|---|

Arm description:

Participants who applied ruxolitinib 0.75% cream during the VC Period, continued applying ruxolitinib 0.75% cream, topically to the affected areas as a thin film BID as needed from Week 9 up to Week 52.

| | |
|--|--------------|
| Arm type | Experimental |
| Investigational medicinal product name | ruxolitinib |
| Investigational medicinal product code | |
| Other name | |
| Pharmaceutical forms | Cream |
| Routes of administration | Topical use |

Dosage and administration details:

0.75% cream twice daily

| | |
|------------------|--|
| Arm title | LTS Period: Ruxolitinib 1.5% Cream BID |
|------------------|--|

Arm description:

Participants who applied ruxolitinib 1.5% cream during the VC Period, continued applying ruxolitinib 1.5% cream, topically to the affected areas as a thin film BID as needed from Week 9 up to Week 52.

| | |
|--|--------------|
| Arm type | Experimental |
| Investigational medicinal product name | ruxolitinib |
| Investigational medicinal product code | |
| Other name | |
| Pharmaceutical forms | Cream |
| Routes of administration | Topical use |

Dosage and administration details:

1.5% cream twice daily

| Number of subjects in period 2^[1] | LTS Period: Vehicle Cream to Ruxolitinib 0.75% Cream BID | LTS Period: Vehicle Cream to Ruxolitinib 1.5% Cream BID | LTS Period: Ruxolitinib 0.75% Cream BID |
|---|--|---|---|
| Started | 53 | 52 | 204 |
| Completed | 33 | 41 | 151 |
| Not completed | 20 | 11 | 53 |
| Consent withdrawn by subject | 12 | 8 | 26 |
| Physician decision | 1 | - | 4 |
| Adverse event, non-fatal | - | - | 4 |
| Pregnancy | 1 | - | - |
| Lost to follow-up | 4 | 2 | 13 |

| | | | |
|----------------------|---|---|---|
| Reason not Specified | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| Lack of efficacy | 1 | - | 4 |
| Protocol deviation | - | - | 1 |

| Number of subjects in period 2^[1] | LTS Period: Ruxolitinib 1.5% Cream BID |
|---|--|
| Started | 221 |
| Completed | 170 |
| Not completed | 51 |
| Consent withdrawn by subject | 34 |
| Physician decision | 2 |
| Adverse event, non-fatal | - |
| Pregnancy | 1 |
| Lost to follow-up | 10 |
| Reason not Specified | - |
| Lack of efficacy | 4 |
| Protocol deviation | - |

Notes:

[1] - The number of subjects starting the period is not consistent with the number completing the preceding period. It is expected the number of subjects starting the subsequent period will be the same as the number completing the preceding period.

Justification: As per disposition table some subjects discontinued the study after vehicle period, and the participants from vehicle period are randomly assigned to one of the treatment groups in LTS period.

Baseline characteristics

Reporting groups

| | |
|--|--|
| Reporting group title | VC Period: Vehicle Cream BID |
| Reporting group description: Ruxolitinib matching vehicle cream applied topically to the affected areas as a thin film twice daily (BID) 8 hours apart from Day 1 up to Week 8. | |
| Reporting group title | VC Period: Ruxolitinib 0.75% Cream BID |
| Reporting group description: Ruxolitinib 0.75% cream, applied topically to the affected areas as a thin film BID 8 hours apart from Day 1 up to Week 8. | |
| Reporting group title | VC Period: Ruxolitinib 1.5% Cream BID |
| Reporting group description: Ruxolitinib 1.5% cream, applied topically to the affected areas as a thin film BID 8 hours apart from Day 1 up to Week 8. | |

| Reporting group values | VC Period: Vehicle Cream BID | VC Period: Ruxolitinib 0.75% Cream BID | VC Period: Ruxolitinib 1.5% Cream BID |
|--|------------------------------|--|---------------------------------------|
| Number of subjects | 124 | 248 | 246 |
| Age categorical Units: Subjects | | | |
| In utero | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Preterm newborn infants (gestational age < 37 wks) | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Newborns (0-27 days) | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Infants and toddlers (28 days-23 months) | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Children (2-11 years) | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Adolescents (12-17 years) | 22 | 55 | 45 |
| Adults (18-64 years) | 87 | 171 | 181 |
| From 65-84 years | 15 | 22 | 19 |
| 85 years and over | 0 | 0 | 1 |
| Age Continuous Units: years | | | |
| arithmetic mean | 38.9 | 35.8 | 35.9 |
| standard deviation | ± 18.90 | ± 18.45 | ± 18.01 |
| Sex: Female, Male Units: participants | | | |
| Female | 80 | 150 | 150 |
| Male | 44 | 98 | 96 |
| Race/Ethnicity, Customized Units: Subjects | | | |
| Hispanic or Latino | 17 | 31 | 30 |
| Not Hispanic or Latino | 107 | 217 | 216 |
| Race/Ethnicity, Customized Units: Subjects | | | |
| White/Caucasian | 85 | 174 | 178 |
| Black/African-American | 32 | 63 | 57 |
| Asian | 2 | 6 | 6 |
| American-Indian/Alaska Native | 0 | 0 | 1 |

| | | | |
|----------------------------------|---|---|---|
| Native Hawaiian/Pacific Islander | 2 | 0 | 0 |
| Other | 3 | 5 | 4 |

| | | | |
|--|------------------|------------------|------------------|
| Body Mass Index Units: Kilograms per square metre (kg/m ²) arithmetic mean standard deviation | 27.75 ± 6.737 | 27.60 ± 7.091 | 28.01 ± 7.495 |
|--|------------------|------------------|------------------|

| | | | |
|--|-------|--|--|
| Reporting group values | Total | | |
| Number of subjects | 618 | | |
| Age categorical Units: Subjects | | | |
| In utero | 0 | | |
| Preterm newborn infants (gestational age < 37 wks) | 0 | | |
| Newborns (0-27 days) | 0 | | |
| Infants and toddlers (28 days-23 months) | 0 | | |
| Children (2-11 years) | 0 | | |
| Adolescents (12-17 years) | 122 | | |
| Adults (18-64 years) | 439 | | |
| From 65-84 years | 56 | | |
| 85 years and over | 1 | | |
| Age Continuous Units: years arithmetic mean standard deviation | - | | |
| Sex: Female, Male Units: participants | | | |
| Female | 380 | | |
| Male | 238 | | |
| Race/Ethnicity, Customized Units: Subjects | | | |
| Hispanic or Latino | 78 | | |
| Not Hispanic or Latino | 540 | | |
| Race/Ethnicity, Customized Units: Subjects | | | |
| White/Caucasian | 437 | | |
| Black/African-American | 152 | | |
| Asian | 14 | | |
| American-Indian/Alaska Native | 1 | | |
| Native Hawaiian/Pacific Islander | 2 | | |
| Other | 12 | | |
| Body Mass Index Units: Kilograms per square metre (kg/m ²) arithmetic mean standard deviation | - | | |

End points

End points reporting groups

| | |
|---|--|
| Reporting group title | VC Period: Vehicle Cream BID |
| Reporting group description: Ruxolitinib matching vehicle cream applied topically to the affected areas as a thin film twice daily (BID) 8 hours apart from Day 1 up to Week 8. | |
| Reporting group title | VC Period: Ruxolitinib 0.75% Cream BID |
| Reporting group description: Ruxolitinib 0.75% cream, applied topically to the affected areas as a thin film BID 8 hours apart from Day 1 up to Week 8. | |
| Reporting group title | VC Period: Ruxolitinib 1.5% Cream BID |
| Reporting group description: Ruxolitinib 1.5% cream, applied topically to the affected areas as a thin film BID 8 hours apart from Day 1 up to Week 8. | |
| Reporting group title | LTS Period: Vehicle Cream to Ruxolitinib 0.75% Cream BID |
| Reporting group description: Participants who applied vehicle cream during the VC Period were randomized at Week 8 to apply ruxolitinib 0.75% cream, topically to the affected areas as a thin film BID as needed from Week 9 up to Week 52. | |
| Reporting group title | LTS Period: Vehicle Cream to Ruxolitinib 1.5% Cream BID |
| Reporting group description: Participants who applied vehicle cream during the VC Period were randomized at Week 8 to apply ruxolitinib 1.5% cream, topically to the affected areas as a thin film BID as needed from Week 9 up to Week 52. | |
| Reporting group title | LTS Period: Ruxolitinib 0.75% Cream BID |
| Reporting group description: Participants who applied ruxolitinib 0.75% cream during the VC Period, continued applying ruxolitinib 0.75% cream, topically to the affected areas as a thin film BID as needed from Week 9 up to Week 52. | |
| Reporting group title | LTS Period: Ruxolitinib 1.5% Cream BID |
| Reporting group description: Participants who applied ruxolitinib 1.5% cream during the VC Period, continued applying ruxolitinib 1.5% cream, topically to the affected areas as a thin film BID as needed from Week 9 up to Week 52. | |

Primary: Percentage of Participants Who Achieved Investigator's Global Assessment – Treatment Success (IGA-TS) at Week 8

| | |
|---|---|
| End point title | Percentage of Participants Who Achieved Investigator's Global Assessment – Treatment Success (IGA-TS) at Week 8 |
| End point description: The IGA is an overall eczema severity rating on a 5-point scale ranging from 0 (clear skin) to 4 (severe disease). The score is based on an overall assessment of the degree of erythema, induration/papulation, and oozing/crusting. The IGA-TS is defined as an IGA score of 0 (clear skin) or 1 (almost clear skin) with ≥ 2 grade improvement from Baseline. | |
| End point type | Primary |
| End point timeframe: Baseline to Week 8 | |

| End point values | VC Period: Vehicle Cream BID | VC Period: Ruxolitinib 0.75% Cream BID | VC Period: Ruxolitinib 1.5% Cream BID | |
|-----------------------------------|------------------------------------|---|--|--|
| Subject group type | Reporting group | Reporting group | Reporting group | |
| Number of subjects analysed | 118 | 231 | 228 | |
| Units: percentage of participants | | | | |
| number (confidence interval 95%) | 7.6 (3.5 to 14.0) | 39.0 (32.6 to 45.6) | 51.3 (44.6 to 58.0) | |

Statistical analyses

| Statistical analysis title | Exact Logistic regression |
|---|---|
| Comparison groups | VC Period: Vehicle Cream BID v VC Period: Ruxolitinib 0.75% Cream BID |
| Number of subjects included in analysis | 349 |
| Analysis specification | Pre-specified |
| Analysis type | |
| P-value | < 0.0001 ^[1] |
| Method | Conditional Exact Test |
| Parameter estimate | Odds ratio (OR) |
| Point estimate | 8.84 |
| Confidence interval | |
| level | 95 % |
| sides | 2-sided |
| lower limit | 4.125 |
| upper limit | 21.202 |

Notes:

[1] - The unadjusted p-values between each treatment group and vehicle were calculated based on Conditional Exact test.

| Statistical analysis title | Exact Logistic regression |
|---|--|
| Comparison groups | VC Period: Vehicle Cream BID v VC Period: Ruxolitinib 1.5% Cream BID |
| Number of subjects included in analysis | 346 |
| Analysis specification | Pre-specified |
| Analysis type | |
| P-value | < 0.0001 ^[2] |
| Method | Conditional Exact Test |
| Parameter estimate | Odds ratio (OR) |
| Point estimate | 15.8 |
| Confidence interval | |
| level | 95 % |
| sides | 2-sided |
| lower limit | 7.354 |
| upper limit | 38.061 |

Notes:

[2] - The unadjusted p-values between each treatment group and vehicle were calculated based on Conditional Exact test.

Secondary: Proportion of Participants Who Achieved Eczema Area and Severity Index 75 (EASI75) at Week 8

| | |
|--|--|
| End point title | Proportion of Participants Who Achieved Eczema Area and Severity Index 75 (EASI75) at Week 8 |
| End point description: | |
| EASI scoring system examines 4 areas of the body (head/neck, trunk, upper limbs, and lower limbs) and weights them for participants of at least 8 years of age. Each of the 4 body regions is assessed separately for erythema (E), induration/papulation/edema (I), excoriations (Ex), and lichenification (I) each on a scale of 0 to 3 (0 = none, absent; 1 = mild; 2 = moderate; 3 = severe). Half scores are allowed between severities 1, 2 and 3. The final EASI score was obtained by weight-averaging these 4 scores and will range from 0 to 72 and the severity strata are as follows: 0 = clear; 0.1 to 1.0 = almost clear; 1.1 to 7.0 = mild; 7.1 to 21.0 = moderate; 21.1 to 50.0 = severe; 50.1 to 72.0 = very severe. An EASI75 responder was defined as a participant achieving 75% or greater improvement from Baseline in EASI score. | |
| End point type | Secondary |
| End point timeframe: | |
| Baseline to Week 8 | |

| End point values | VC Period: Vehicle Cream BID | VC Period: Ruxolitinib 0.75% Cream BID | VC Period: Ruxolitinib 1.5% Cream BID | |
|-----------------------------------|------------------------------------|---|--|--|
| Subject group type | Reporting group | Reporting group | Reporting group | |
| Number of subjects analysed | 118 | 231 | 228 | |
| Units: percentage of participants | | | | |
| number (confidence interval 95%) | 14.4 (8.6 to 22.1) | 51.5 (44.9 to 58.1) | 61.8 (55.2 to 68.2) | |

Statistical analyses

| | |
|---|--|
| Statistical analysis title | Exact Logistic regression |
| Comparison groups | VC Period: Vehicle Cream BID v VC Period: Ruxolitinib 1.5% Cream BID |
| Number of subjects included in analysis | 346 |
| Analysis specification | Pre-specified |
| Analysis type | |
| P-value | < 0.0001 ^[3] |
| Method | Conditional Exact Test |
| Parameter estimate | Odds ratio (OR) |
| Point estimate | 10.67 |
| Confidence interval | |
| level | 95 % |
| sides | 2-sided |
| lower limit | 5.775 |
| upper limit | 20.732 |

Notes:

[3] - The unadjusted p-values between each treatment group and vehicle were calculated based on Conditional Exact test.

| | |
|-----------------------------------|---|
| Statistical analysis title | Exact Logistic regression |
| Comparison groups | VC Period: Vehicle Cream BID v VC Period: Ruxolitinib 0.75% Cream BID |

| | |
|---|-------------------------|
| Number of subjects included in analysis | 349 |
| Analysis specification | Pre-specified |
| Analysis type | |
| P-value | < 0.0001 ^[4] |
| Method | Conditional Exact Test |
| Parameter estimate | Odds ratio (OR) |
| Point estimate | 6.84 |
| Confidence interval | |
| level | 95 % |
| sides | 2-sided |
| lower limit | 3.723 |
| upper limit | 13.184 |

Notes:

[4] - The unadjusted p-values between each treatment group and vehicle were calculated based on Conditional Exact test.

Secondary: Percentage of Participants With a \geq 4-Point Improvement in Itch Numerical Rating Scale (NRS) Score From Baseline to Week 8

| | |
|-----------------|---|
| End point title | Percentage of Participants With a \geq 4-Point Improvement in Itch Numerical Rating Scale (NRS) Score From Baseline to Week 8 |
|-----------------|---|

End point description:

The Itch NRS is a daily participant-reported measure (24-hour recall), of the worst level of itch using a diary. Participants are asked to rate the itching severity because of their AD by selecting a number from 0 (no itch) to 10 (worst imaginable itch) that best describes their worst level of itching in the past 24 hours.

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

End point timeframe:

Baseline to Week 8

| End point values | VC Period: Vehicle Cream BID | VC Period: Ruxolitinib 0.75% Cream BID | VC Period: Ruxolitinib 1.5% Cream BID | |
|-----------------------------------|------------------------------------|---|--|--|
| Subject group type | Reporting group | Reporting group | Reporting group | |
| Number of subjects analysed | 80 | 157 | 146 | |
| Units: percentage of participants | | | | |
| number (not applicable) | 16.3 | 42.7 | 50.7 | |

Statistical analyses

| | |
|----------------------------|--|
| Statistical analysis title | Exact Logistic regression |
| Comparison groups | VC Period: Vehicle Cream BID v VC Period: Ruxolitinib 1.5% Cream BID |

| | |
|---|-------------------------|
| Number of subjects included in analysis | 226 |
| Analysis specification | Pre-specified |
| Analysis type | |
| P-value | < 0.0001 ^[5] |
| Method | Conditional Exact Test |
| Parameter estimate | Odds ratio (OR) |
| Point estimate | 5.8 |
| Confidence interval | |
| level | 95 % |
| sides | 2-sided |
| lower limit | 2.833 |
| upper limit | 12.657 |

Notes:

[5] - The unadjusted p-values between each treatment group and vehicle were calculated based on Conditional Exact test.

| | |
|---|---|
| Statistical analysis title | Exact Logistic regression |
| Comparison groups | VC Period: Vehicle Cream BID v VC Period: Ruxolitinib 0.75% Cream BID |
| Number of subjects included in analysis | 237 |
| Analysis specification | Pre-specified |
| Analysis type | |
| P-value | < 0.0001 ^[6] |
| Method | Conditional Exact Test |
| Parameter estimate | Odds ratio (OR) |
| Point estimate | 4.17 |
| Confidence interval | |
| level | 95 % |
| sides | 2-sided |
| lower limit | 2.045 |
| upper limit | 9.036 |

Notes:

[6] - The unadjusted p-values between each treatment group and vehicle were calculated based on Conditional Exact test.

Secondary: Proportion of Participants With a Clinically Meaningful (\geq 6-Point) Improvement in the Patient-Reported Outcomes Measurement Information System (PROMIS) Short Form – Sleep Disturbance (8b – 24-Hour Recall) Score at Week 8

| | |
|-----------------|---|
| End point title | Proportion of Participants With a Clinically Meaningful (\geq 6-Point) Improvement in the Patient-Reported Outcomes Measurement Information System (PROMIS) Short Form – Sleep Disturbance (8b – 24-Hour Recall) Score at Week 8 |
|-----------------|---|

End point description:

The PROMIS Short Form – Sleep Disturbance (8b) questionnaire assesses participant's self-reported perceptions of sleep quality, sleep depth, and restoration associated with sleep. This questionnaire is completed in the morning by the participant where each item asks the participant to rate the severity of the participant's sleep disturbance. It is a 5-point scale with a range in score from 8 to 40, with higher scores indicating greater severity of sleep disturbance.

| | |
|----------------------|-----------|
| End point type | Secondary |
| End point timeframe: | |
| Baseline to Week 8 | |

| End point values | VC Period: Vehicle Cream BID | VC Period: Ruxolitinib 0.75% Cream BID | VC Period: Ruxolitinib 1.5% Cream BID | |
|-----------------------------------|------------------------------------|---|--|--|
| Subject group type | Reporting group | Reporting group | Reporting group | |
| Number of subjects analysed | 110 | 213 | 211 | |
| Units: percentage of participants | | | | |
| number (not applicable) | 19.1 | 20.7 | 25.6 | |

Statistical analyses

| Statistical analysis title | Exact Logistic regression |
|---|---|
| Comparison groups | VC Period: Vehicle Cream BID v VC Period: Ruxolitinib 0.75% Cream BID |
| Number of subjects included in analysis | 323 |
| Analysis specification | Pre-specified |
| Analysis type | |
| P-value | = 0.8553 ^[7] |
| Method | Conditional Exact Test |
| Parameter estimate | Odds ratio (OR) |
| Point estimate | 1.11 |
| Confidence interval | |
| level | 95 % |
| sides | 2-sided |
| lower limit | 0.598 |
| upper limit | 2.094 |

Notes:

[7] - The unadjusted p-values between each treatment group and vehicle were calculated based on Conditional Exact test.

| Statistical analysis title | Exact Logistic regression |
|---|--|
| Comparison groups | VC Period: Vehicle Cream BID v VC Period: Ruxolitinib 1.5% Cream BID |
| Number of subjects included in analysis | 321 |
| Analysis specification | Pre-specified |
| Analysis type | |
| P-value | = 0.2359 ^[8] |
| Method | Conditional Exact Test |
| Parameter estimate | Odds ratio (OR) |
| Point estimate | 1.47 |
| Confidence interval | |
| level | 95 % |
| sides | 2-sided |
| lower limit | 0.805 |
| upper limit | 2.741 |

Notes:

[8] - The unadjusted p-values between each treatment group and vehicle were calculated based on Conditional Exact test.

Secondary: Percentage of Participants With a Clinically Meaningful (≥ 6 -Point) Improvement in the PROMIS Short Form – Sleep-Related Impairment (8a – 24-Hour Recall) Score at Week 8

| | |
|---|--|
| End point title | Percentage of Participants With a Clinically Meaningful (≥ 6 -Point) Improvement in the PROMIS Short Form – Sleep-Related Impairment (8a – 24-Hour Recall) Score at Week 8 |
| End point description: | |
| The PROMIS Short Form – Sleep-Related Impairment (8a) questionnaire assesses participant's self-reported perceptions of alertness, sleepiness, and tiredness during usual waking hours and the perceived functional impairments during wakefulness associated with sleep problems or impaired alertness. The questionnaire is filled in the evening where each item asks the participant to rate the severity of the participant's sleep impairment. It has 8 simple questions with a 5-point scale with a range in score from 8 to 40, with higher scores indicating greater severity of sleep-related impairment. | |
| End point type | Secondary |
| End point timeframe: | |
| Baseline to Week 8 | |

| End point values | VC Period: Vehicle Cream BID | VC Period: Ruxolitinib 0.75% Cream BID | VC Period: Ruxolitinib 1.5% Cream BID | |
|-----------------------------------|------------------------------------|---|--|--|
| Subject group type | Reporting group | Reporting group | Reporting group | |
| Number of subjects analysed | 111 | 215 | 212 | |
| Units: percentage of participants | | | | |
| number (not applicable) | 13.5 | 20.0 | 23.1 | |

Statistical analyses

| | |
|---|---|
| Statistical analysis title | Exact Logistic regression |
| Comparison groups | VC Period: Vehicle Cream BID v VC Period: Ruxolitinib 0.75% Cream BID |
| Number of subjects included in analysis | 326 |
| Analysis specification | Pre-specified |
| Analysis type | |
| P-value | = 0.1784 ^[9] |
| Method | Conditional Exact Test |
| Parameter estimate | Odds ratio (OR) |
| Point estimate | 1.62 |
| Confidence interval | |
| level | 95 % |
| sides | 2-sided |
| lower limit | 0.827 |
| upper limit | 3.342 |

Notes:

[9] - The unadjusted p-values between each treatment group and vehicle were calculated based on Conditional Exact test.

| | |
|-----------------------------------|--|
| Statistical analysis title | Exact Logistic regression |
| Comparison groups | VC Period: Vehicle Cream BID v VC Period: Ruxolitinib 1.5% Cream BID |

| | |
|---|--------------------------|
| Number of subjects included in analysis | 323 |
| Analysis specification | Pre-specified |
| Analysis type | |
| P-value | = 0.0472 ^[10] |
| Method | Conditional Exact Test |
| Parameter estimate | Odds ratio (OR) |
| Point estimate | 1.96 |
| Confidence interval | |
| level | 95 % |
| sides | 2-sided |
| lower limit | 1.007 |
| upper limit | 4 |

Notes:

[10] - The unadjusted p-values between each treatment group and vehicle were calculated based on Conditional Exact test.

Secondary: Percentage of Participants With at Least One Treatment-Emergent Adverse Event (TEAE) and Treatment-Emergent Serious Adverse Event (SAE) During the VC Period

| | |
|-----------------|--|
| End point title | Percentage of Participants With at Least One Treatment-Emergent Adverse Event (TEAE) and Treatment-Emergent Serious Adverse Event (SAE) During the VC Period |
|-----------------|--|

End point description:

An AE is any untoward medical occurrence associated with the use of a drug in humans, whether or not considered drug-related. An AE can therefore be any unfavorable and unintended sign (including an abnormal laboratory finding), symptom, or disease (new or exacerbated) temporally associated with the use of study treatment. A SAE is defined as any untoward medical occurrence that, at any dose results in death, is life-threatening, requires inpatient hospitalization or prolongation of existing hospitalization, results in persistent or significant disability/incapacity, is a congenital anomaly/birth defect or an important medical event may be considered serious when, based on appropriate medical judgment, the event may jeopardize the participant and may require medical or surgical intervention to prevent one of the outcomes listed above. A TEAE or treatment emergent SAE is any AE or SAE either reported for first time or worsening of a pre-existing event after first dose of study drug.

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

End point timeframe:

From date of first application up to Week 8

| End point values | VC Period: Vehicle Cream BID | VC Period: Ruxolitinib 0.75% Cream BID | VC Period: Ruxolitinib 1.5% Cream BID | |
|-----------------------------------|------------------------------------|---|--|--|
| Subject group type | Reporting group | Reporting group | Reporting group | |
| Number of subjects analysed | 124 | 248 | 246 | |
| Units: percentage of participants | | | | |
| number (not applicable) | | | | |
| TEAE | 31.5 | 29.0 | 23.6 | |
| Treatment Emergent SAE | 0.0 | 1.2 | 0.4 | |

Statistical analyses

Secondary: Percentage of Participants With at Least One TEAE and Treatment Emergent SAE During the LTS Period

| | |
|-----------------|--|
| End point title | Percentage of Participants With at Least One TEAE and Treatment Emergent SAE During the LTS Period |
|-----------------|--|

End point description:

An AE is any untoward medical occurrence associated with the use of a drug in humans, whether or not considered drug-related. An AE can therefore be any unfavorable and unintended sign (including an abnormal laboratory finding), symptom, or disease (new or exacerbated) temporally associated with the use of study treatment. A SAE is defined as any untoward medical occurrence that, at any dose results in death, is life-threatening, requires inpatient hospitalization or prolongation of existing hospitalization, results in persistent or significant disability/incapacity, is a congenital anomaly/birth defect or an important medical event may be considered serious when, based on appropriate medical judgment, the event may jeopardize the participant and may require medical or surgical intervention to prevent one of the outcomes listed above. A TEAE or treatment emergent SAE is any AE or SAE either reported for first time or worsening of a pre-existing event after first dose of study drug.

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

End point timeframe:

Week 8 until last follow-up visit (up to 52 weeks)

| End point values | LTS Period: Vehicle Cream to Ruxolitinib 0.75% Cream BID | LTS Period: Vehicle Cream to Ruxolitinib 1.5% Cream BID | LTS Period: Ruxolitinib 0.75% Cream BID | LTS Period: Ruxolitinib 1.5% Cream BID |
|-----------------------------------|--|---|--|---|
| Subject group type | Reporting group | Reporting group | Reporting group | Reporting group |
| Number of subjects analysed | 53 | 52 | 204 | 221 |
| Units: percentage of participants | | | | |
| number (not applicable) | | | | |
| TEAE | 58.5 | 65.4 | 66.2 | 54.3 |
| Treatment Emergent SAE | 3.8 | 0.0 | 2.5 | 1.4 |

Statistical analyses

No statistical analyses for this end point

Secondary: Percentage of Participants Who Achieved an IGA-TS at Weeks 2 and 4

| | |
|-----------------|--|
| End point title | Percentage of Participants Who Achieved an IGA-TS at Weeks 2 and 4 |
|-----------------|--|

End point description:

The IGA is an overall eczema severity rating on a 5-point scale ranging from 0 (clear skin) to 4 (severe disease). The score is based on an overall assessment of the degree of erythema, induration/papulation, and oozing/crusting. The IGA-TS is defined as an IGA score of 0 (clear skin) or 1 (almost clear skin) with ≥ 2 grade improvement from Baseline.

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

End point timeframe:

Baseline to Weeks 2 and 4

| End point values | VC Period: Vehicle Cream BID | VC Period: Ruxolitinib 0.75% Cream BID | VC Period: Ruxolitinib 1.5% Cream BID | |
|-----------------------------------|------------------------------------|---|--|--|
| Subject group type | Reporting group | Reporting group | Reporting group | |
| Number of subjects analysed | 118 | 231 | 228 | |
| Units: percentage of participants | | | | |
| number (not applicable) | | | | |
| Week 2 | 4.2 | 17.3 | 25.0 | |
| Week 4 | 5.9 | 35.5 | 43.4 | |

Statistical analyses

No statistical analyses for this end point

Secondary: Percentage of Participants Achieving an IGA of 0 or 1 During the VC Period

| | |
|-----------------|--|
| End point title | Percentage of Participants Achieving an IGA of 0 or 1 During the VC Period |
|-----------------|--|

End point description:

The IGA is an overall eczema severity rating on a 5-point scale ranging from 0 (clear skin) to 4 (severe disease). The score is based on an overall assessment of the degree of erythema, induration/papulation, and oozing/crusting.

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

End point timeframe:

Weeks 2, 4 and 8

| End point values | VC Period: Vehicle Cream BID | VC Period: Ruxolitinib 0.75% Cream BID | VC Period: Ruxolitinib 1.5% Cream BID | |
|-----------------------------------|------------------------------------|---|--|--|
| Subject group type | Reporting group | Reporting group | Reporting group | |
| Number of subjects analysed | 118 | 231 | 228 | |
| Units: percentage of participants | | | | |
| number (not applicable) | | | | |
| Week 2 | 9.3 | 24.2 | 34.6 | |
| Week 4 | 16.9 | 45.9 | 52.6 | |
| Week 8 | 16.1 | 51.1 | 62.3 | |

Statistical analyses

No statistical analyses for this end point

Secondary: Percentage of Participants Achieving an IGA of 0 or 1 During the LTS Period

| | |
|---|---|
| End point title | Percentage of Participants Achieving an IGA of 0 or 1 During the LTS Period |
| End point description: The IGA is an overall eczema severity rating on a 5-point scale ranging from 0 (clear skin) to 4 (severe disease). The score is based on an overall assessment of the degree of erythema, induration/papulation, and oozing/crusting. | |
| End point type | Secondary |
| End point timeframe: Weeks 8, 12, 16, 20, 24, 28, 32, 36, 40, 44, 48, and 52 | |

| End point values | LTS Period: Vehicle Cream to Ruxolitinib 0.75% Cream BID | LTS Period: Vehicle Cream to Ruxolitinib 1.5% Cream BID | LTS Period: Ruxolitinib 0.75% Cream BID | LTS Period: Ruxolitinib 1.5% Cream BID |
|-----------------------------------|--|---|--|---|
| Subject group type | Reporting group | Reporting group | Reporting group | Reporting group |
| Number of subjects analysed | 50 | 49 | 187 | 203 |
| Units: percentage of participants | | | | |
| number (not applicable) | | | | |
| Week 8 | 26.0 | 10.2 | 57.5 | 65.5 |
| Week 12 | 59.6 | 45.8 | 59.6 | 73.0 |
| Week 16 | 59.6 | 59.6 | 68.9 | 74.1 |
| Week 20 | 69.0 | 58.7 | 71.1 | 74.5 |
| Week 24 | 61.0 | 67.4 | 70.4 | 72.4 |
| Week 28 | 67.6 | 67.4 | 74.1 | 72.0 |
| Week 32 | 77.1 | 72.7 | 74.2 | 73.8 |
| Week 36 | 81.3 | 69.8 | 73.3 | 79.3 |
| Week 40 | 77.1 | 66.7 | 76.0 | 79.3 |
| Week 44 | 74.3 | 70.5 | 75.2 | 80.1 |
| Week 48 | 79.4 | 69.8 | 75.2 | 75.9 |
| Week 52 | 79.4 | 74.4 | 76.7 | 80.1 |

Statistical analyses

No statistical analyses for this end point

Secondary: Percentage of Participants With a \geq 4-Point Improvement in Itch NRS Score From Baseline to Weeks 2 and 4

| | |
|--|---|
| End point title | Percentage of Participants With a \geq 4-Point Improvement in Itch NRS Score From Baseline to Weeks 2 and 4 |
| End point description: The Itch NRS is a daily participant-reported measure (24-hour recall), of the worst level of itch intensity using a diary. Participants are asked to rate the itching severity because of their AD by selecting a number from 0 (no itch) to 10 (worst imaginable itch) that best describes their worst level of itching in the past 24 hours. | |
| End point type | Secondary |
| End point timeframe: Baseline to Weeks 2 and 4 | |

| End point values | VC Period: Vehicle Cream BID | VC Period: Ruxolitinib 0.75% Cream BID | VC Period: Ruxolitinib 1.5% Cream BID | |
|-----------------------------------|------------------------------------|---|--|--|
| Subject group type | Reporting group | Reporting group | Reporting group | |
| Number of subjects analysed | 80 | 157 | 146 | |
| Units: percentage of participants | | | | |
| number (not applicable) | | | | |
| Week 2 | 5.0 | 27.4 | 32.2 | |
| Week 4 | 12.5 | 38.2 | 45.2 | |

Statistical analyses

No statistical analyses for this end point

Secondary: Percentage of Participants Who Achieved EASI50 During the VC Period

| | |
|-----------------|---|
| End point title | Percentage of Participants Who Achieved EASI50 During the VC Period |
|-----------------|---|

End point description:

EASI scoring system examines 4 areas of the body (head/neck, trunk, upper limbs, and lower limbs) and weights them for participants of at least 8 years of age. Each of the 4 body regions is assessed separately for erythema (E), induration/papulation/edema (I), excoriations (Ex), and lichenification (I) each on a scale of 0 to 3 (0 = none, absent; 1 = mild; 2 = moderate; 3 = severe). Half scores are allowed between severities 1, 2 and 3. The final EASI score was obtained by weight-averaging these 4 scores and will range from 0 to 72 and the severity strata are as follows: 0 = clear; 0.1 to 1.0 = almost clear; 1.1 to 7.0 = mild; 7.1 to 21.0 = moderate; 21.1 to 50.0 = severe; 50.1 to 72.0 = very severe. An EASI50 responder was defined as a participant achieving 50% or greater improvement from Baseline in EASI score.

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

End point timeframe:

Baseline to Weeks 2, 4 and 8

| End point values | VC Period: Vehicle Cream BID | VC Period: Ruxolitinib 0.75% Cream BID | VC Period: Ruxolitinib 1.5% Cream BID | |
|-----------------------------------|------------------------------------|---|--|--|
| Subject group type | Reporting group | Reporting group | Reporting group | |
| Number of subjects analysed | 118 | 231 | 228 | |
| Units: percentage of participants | | | | |
| number (not applicable) | | | | |
| Week 2 | 16.1 | 45.5 | 53.5 | |
| Week 4 | 28.8 | 69.7 | 71.9 | |
| Week 8 | 33.9 | 75.8 | 79.8 | |

Statistical analyses

No statistical analyses for this end point

Secondary: Percentage of Participants Who Achieved EASI75 at Weeks 2 and 4

| | |
|-----------------|---|
| End point title | Percentage of Participants Who Achieved EASI75 at Weeks 2 and 4 |
|-----------------|---|

End point description:

EASI scoring system examines 4 areas of the body (head/neck, trunk, upper limbs, and lower limbs) and weights them for participants of at least 8 years of age. Each of the 4 body regions is assessed separately for erythema (E), induration/papulation/edema (I), excoriations (Ex), and lichenification (I) each on a scale of 0 to 3 (0 = none, absent; 1 = mild; 2 = moderate; 3 = severe). Half scores are allowed between severities 1, 2 and 3. The final EASI score was obtained by weight-averaging these 4 scores and will range from 0 to 72 and the severity strata are as follows: 0 = clear; 0.1 to 1.0 = almost clear; 1.1 to 7.0 = mild; 7.1 to 21.0 = moderate; 21.1 to 50.0 = severe; 50.1 to 72.0 = very severe. An EASI75 responder was defined as a participant achieving 75% or greater improvement from Baseline in EASI score.

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

End point timeframe:

Baseline to Weeks 2 and 4

| End point values | VC Period: Vehicle Cream BID | VC Period: Ruxolitinib 0.75% Cream BID | VC Period: Ruxolitinib 1.5% Cream BID | |
|-----------------------------------|------------------------------------|---|--|--|
| Subject group type | Reporting group | Reporting group | Reporting group | |
| Number of subjects analysed | 118 | 231 | 228 | |
| Units: percentage of participants | | | | |
| number (not applicable) | | | | |
| Week 2 | 4.2 | 25.5 | 31.6 | |
| Week 4 | 10.2 | 42.0 | 50.4 | |

Statistical analyses

No statistical analyses for this end point

Secondary: Percentage of Participants Who Achieved EASI90 During the VC Period

| | |
|-----------------|---|
| End point title | Percentage of Participants Who Achieved EASI90 During the VC Period |
|-----------------|---|

End point description:

EASI scoring system examines 4 areas of the body (head/neck, trunk, upper limbs, and lower limbs) and weights them for participants of at least 8 years of age. Each of the 4 body regions is assessed separately for erythema (E), induration/papulation/edema (I), excoriations (Ex), and lichenification (I) each on a scale of 0 to 3 (0 = none, absent; 1 = mild; 2 = moderate; 3 = severe). Half scores are allowed between severities 1, 2 and 3. The final EASI score was obtained by weight-averaging these 4 scores and will range from 0 to 72 and the severity strata are as follows: 0 = clear; 0.1 to 1.0 = almost clear; 1.1 to 7.0 = mild; 7.1 to 21.0 = moderate; 21.1 to 50.0 = severe; 50.1 to 72.0 = very severe. An EASI90 responder was defined as a participant achieving 90% or greater improvement from Baseline in EASI score.

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

End point timeframe:

Baseline to Weeks 2, 4 and 8

| End point values | VC Period: Vehicle Cream BID | VC Period: Ruxolitinib 0.75% Cream BID | VC Period: Ruxolitinib 1.5% Cream BID | |
|-----------------------------------|------------------------------------|---|--|--|
| Subject group type | Reporting group | Reporting group | Reporting group | |
| Number of subjects analysed | 118 | 231 | 228 | |
| Units: percentage of participants | | | | |
| number (not applicable) | | | | |
| Week 2 | 0.8 | 10.8 | 15.8 | |
| Week 4 | 2.5 | 25.5 | 32.5 | |
| Week 8 | 4.2 | 35.1 | 43.4 | |

Statistical analyses

No statistical analyses for this end point

Secondary: Percent Change From Baseline in EASI Score During the VC Period

| | |
|-----------------|---|
| End point title | Percent Change From Baseline in EASI Score During the VC Period |
|-----------------|---|

End point description:

EASI scoring system examines 4 areas of the body (head/neck, trunk, upper limbs, and lower limbs) and weights them for participants of at least 8 years of age. Each of the 4 body regions is assessed separately for erythema (E), induration/papulation/edema (I), excoriations (Ex), and lichenification (I) each on a scale of 0 to 3 (0 = none, absent; 1 = mild; 2 = moderate; 3 = severe). Half scores are allowed between severities 1, 2 and 3. The final EASI score was obtained by weight-averaging these 4 scores and will range from 0 to 72 and the severity strata are as follows: 0 = clear; 0.1 to 1.0 = almost clear; 1.1 to 7.0 = mild; 7.1 to 21.0 = moderate; 21.1 to 50.0 = severe; 50.1 to 72.0 = very severe. A negative change from Baseline indicates improvement.

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

End point timeframe:

Baseline, Weeks 2, 4 and 8

| End point values | VC Period: Vehicle Cream BID | VC Period: Ruxolitinib 0.75% Cream BID | VC Period: Ruxolitinib 1.5% Cream BID | |
|--|------------------------------------|---|--|--|
| Subject group type | Reporting group | Reporting group | Reporting group | |
| Number of subjects analysed | 118 | 231 | 228 | |
| Units: percent change | | | | |
| least squares mean (standard error) | | | | |
| Percent Change From Baseline at Week 2 | -13.95 (± 4.02) | -45.86 (± 2.84) | -49.08 (± 2.86) | |
| Percent Change From Baseline at Week 4 | -20.45 (± 3.62) | -65.00 (± 2.50) | -66.35 (± 2.51) | |
| Percent Change From Baseline at Week 8 | -28.84 (± 3.57) | -73.37 (± 2.50) | -74.84 (± 2.46) | |

Statistical analyses

| | |
|---|---|
| Statistical analysis title | Mixed Model |
| Statistical analysis description: Percent change from Baseline in EASI score at Week 2 | |
| Comparison groups | VC Period: Vehicle Cream BID v VC Period: Ruxolitinib 0.75% Cream BID |
| Number of subjects included in analysis | 349 |
| Analysis specification | Pre-specified |
| Analysis type | |
| P-value | < 0.0001 |
| Method | Mixed-Model with Repeated Measures |
| Parameter estimate | Least Squares Mean Difference |
| Point estimate | -31.91 |
| Confidence interval | |
| level | 95 % |
| sides | 2-sided |
| lower limit | -41.57 |
| upper limit | -22.25 |
| Variability estimate | Standard error of the mean |
| Dispersion value | 4.92 |

| | |
|---|--|
| Statistical analysis title | Mixed Model |
| Statistical analysis description: Percent change from Baseline in EASI score at Week 2 | |
| Comparison groups | VC Period: Vehicle Cream BID v VC Period: Ruxolitinib 1.5% Cream BID |
| Number of subjects included in analysis | 346 |
| Analysis specification | Pre-specified |
| Analysis type | |
| P-value | < 0.0001 |
| Method | Mixed-Model with Repeated Measures |
| Parameter estimate | Least Squares Mean Difference |
| Point estimate | -35.13 |
| Confidence interval | |
| level | 95 % |
| sides | 2-sided |
| lower limit | -44.81 |
| upper limit | -25.44 |
| Variability estimate | Standard error of the mean |
| Dispersion value | 4.93 |

| | |
|---|---|
| Statistical analysis title | Mixed Model |
| Statistical analysis description: Percent change from Baseline in EASI score at Week 4 | |
| Comparison groups | VC Period: Vehicle Cream BID v VC Period: Ruxolitinib 0.75% Cream BID |
| Number of subjects included in analysis | 349 |
| Analysis specification | Pre-specified |
| Analysis type | |
| P-value | < 0.0001 |
| Method | Mixed-Model with Repeated Measures |
| Parameter estimate | Least Squares Mean Difference |
| Point estimate | -44.56 |
| Confidence interval | |
| level | 95 % |
| sides | 2-sided |
| lower limit | -53.19 |
| upper limit | -35.92 |
| Variability estimate | Standard error of the mean |
| Dispersion value | 4.4 |

| | |
|---|--|
| Statistical analysis title | Mixed Model |
| Statistical analysis description: Percent change from Baseline in EASI score at Week 4 | |
| Comparison groups | VC Period: Vehicle Cream BID v VC Period: Ruxolitinib 1.5% Cream BID |
| Number of subjects included in analysis | 346 |
| Analysis specification | Pre-specified |
| Analysis type | |
| P-value | < 0.0001 |
| Method | Mixed-Model with Repeated Measures |
| Parameter estimate | Least Squares Mean Difference |
| Point estimate | -45.91 |
| Confidence interval | |
| level | 95 % |
| sides | 2-sided |
| lower limit | -54.55 |
| upper limit | -37.26 |
| Variability estimate | Standard error of the mean |
| Dispersion value | 4.4 |

| | |
|---|-------------|
| Statistical analysis title | Mixed Model |
| Statistical analysis description: Percent change from Baseline in EASI score at Week 8 | |

| | |
|---|---|
| Comparison groups | VC Period: Vehicle Cream BID v VC Period: Ruxolitinib 0.75% Cream BID |
| Number of subjects included in analysis | 349 |
| Analysis specification | Pre-specified |
| Analysis type | |
| P-value | < 0.0001 |
| Method | Mixed-Model with Repeated Measures |
| Parameter estimate | Least Squares Mean Difference |
| Point estimate | -44.53 |
| Confidence interval | |
| level | 95 % |
| sides | 2-sided |
| lower limit | -53.08 |
| upper limit | -35.98 |
| Variability estimate | Standard error of the mean |
| Dispersion value | 4.35 |

| | |
|--|--|
| Statistical analysis title | Mixed Model |
| Statistical analysis description: | |
| Percent change from Baseline in EASI score at Week 8 | |
| Comparison groups | VC Period: Vehicle Cream BID v VC Period: Ruxolitinib 1.5% Cream BID |
| Number of subjects included in analysis | 346 |
| Analysis specification | Pre-specified |
| Analysis type | |
| P-value | < 0.0001 |
| Method | Mixed-Model with Repeated Measures |
| Parameter estimate | Least Squares Mean Difference |
| Point estimate | -46 |
| Confidence interval | |
| level | 95 % |
| sides | 2-sided |
| lower limit | -54.51 |
| upper limit | -37.48 |
| Variability estimate | Standard error of the mean |
| Dispersion value | 4.33 |

Secondary: Percent Change From Baseline in Scoring Atopic Dermatitis (SCORAD) Score During the VC Period

| | |
|-----------------|---|
| End point title | Percent Change From Baseline in Scoring Atopic Dermatitis (SCORAD) Score During the VC Period |
|-----------------|---|

End point description:

The SCORAD is a tool to assess extent and severity of eczema. To determine the extent, the rule of nines or handprint method is used to assess eczema affected area (A). To determine disease severity (B) it evaluates 6 clinical characteristics: 1. redness, 2. swelling, 3. oozing/crusting, 4. scratch marks, 5. lichenification, and 6. dryness on a 4-point scale of 0 to 3 (0=none, 1=mild, 2=moderate, 3=severe), added to give B with maximum score of 18. Subjective symptoms (C) of itch and sleeplessness are assessed using a visual analogue scale where 0 is no itch (or no sleeplessness) and 10 is the worst imaginable itch (or sleeplessness), added to give C with maximum score of 20. These 3 aspects: extent

of disease (A: 0-1-2), disease severity (B: 0-18), & subjective symptoms (C: 0-20) combined using $A/5 + 7*B/2 + C$ to give a maximum possible score of 103, where 0 = no disease and 103 = severe disease. A negative change from Baseline indicates improvement.

| | |
|----------------------------|-----------|
| End point type | Secondary |
| End point timeframe: | |
| Baseline, Weeks 2, 4 and 8 | |

| End point values | VC Period: Vehicle Cream BID | VC Period: Ruxolitinib 0.75% Cream BID | VC Period: Ruxolitinib 1.5% Cream BID | |
|--|------------------------------------|---|--|--|
| Subject group type | Reporting group | Reporting group | Reporting group | |
| Number of subjects analysed | 118 | 231 | 228 | |
| Units: percent change | | | | |
| arithmetic mean (standard deviation) | | | | |
| Percent Change From Baseline at Week 2 | -13.87 (± 24.816) | -39.62 (± 28.061) | -45.22 (± 28.461) | |
| Percent Change From Baseline at Week 4 | -21.79 (± 30.083) | -54.85 (± 29.803) | -58.76 (± 29.580) | |
| Percent Change From Baseline at Week 8 | -23.63 (± 33.918) | -63.71 (± 28.494) | -67.39 (± 29.098) | |

Statistical analyses

| | |
|--|---|
| Statistical analysis title | ANCOVA |
| Statistical analysis description: | |
| Percent change from Baseline in SCORAD score at Week 8 | |
| Comparison groups | VC Period: Vehicle Cream BID v VC Period: Ruxolitinib 0.75% Cream BID |
| Number of subjects included in analysis | 349 |
| Analysis specification | Pre-specified |
| Analysis type | |
| P-value | < 0.0001 |
| Method | ANCOVA |
| Parameter estimate | Least Squares Mean Difference |
| Point estimate | -39.4 |
| Confidence interval | |
| level | 95 % |
| sides | 2-sided |
| lower limit | -46.48 |
| upper limit | -32.38 |
| Variability estimate | Standard error of the mean |
| Dispersion value | 3.59 |

| | |
|----------------------------|--------|
| Statistical analysis title | ANCOVA |
|----------------------------|--------|

Statistical analysis description:

Percent change from Baseline in SCORAD score at Week 8

| | |
|---|--|
| Comparison groups | VC Period: Vehicle Cream BID v VC Period: Ruxolitinib 1.5% Cream BID |
| Number of subjects included in analysis | 346 |
| Analysis specification | Pre-specified |
| Analysis type | |
| P-value | < 0.0001 |
| Method | ANCOVA |
| Parameter estimate | Least Squares Mean Difference |
| Point estimate | -43.5 |
| Confidence interval | |
| level | 95 % |
| sides | 2-sided |
| lower limit | -50.51 |
| upper limit | -36.53 |
| Variability estimate | Standard error of the mean |
| Dispersion value | 3.56 |

Secondary: Change From Baseline in Itch NRS Score During the VC Period

| | |
|------------------------|---|
| End point title | Change From Baseline in Itch NRS Score During the VC Period |
| End point description: | The Itch NRS is a daily participant-reported measure (24-hour recall), of the worst level of itch intensity using a diary. Participants are asked to rate the itching severity because of their AD by selecting a number from 0 (no itch) to 10 (worst imaginable itch) that best describes their worst level of itching in the past 24 hours. A negative change from Baseline indicates improvement. |
| End point type | Secondary |
| End point timeframe: | Baseline, Weeks 2, 4 and 8 |

| End point values | VC Period: Vehicle Cream BID | VC Period: Ruxolitinib 0.75% Cream BID | VC Period: Ruxolitinib 1.5% Cream BID | |
|-------------------------------------|------------------------------------|---|--|--|
| Subject group type | Reporting group | Reporting group | Reporting group | |
| Number of subjects analysed | 118 | 231 | 228 | |
| Units: units on a scale | | | | |
| least squares mean (standard error) | | | | |
| Change From Baseline at Week 2 | -0.69 (± 0.21) | -2.21 (± 0.15) | -2.43 (± 0.15) | |
| Change From Baseline at Week 4 | -1.03 (± 0.23) | -2.82 (± 0.17) | -3.00 (± 0.17) | |
| Change From Baseline at Week 8 | -1.39 (± 0.25) | -3.28 (± 0.18) | -3.09 (± 0.17) | |

Statistical analyses

| | |
|-----------------------------------|---|
| Statistical analysis title | Mixed Model |
| Statistical analysis description: | Change from Baseline in Itch NRS score at Week 2 |
| Comparison groups | VC Period: Vehicle Cream BID v VC Period: Ruxolitinib 0.75% |

| | |
|---|------------------------------------|
| | Cream BID |
| Number of subjects included in analysis | 349 |
| Analysis specification | Pre-specified |
| Analysis type | |
| P-value | < 0.0001 |
| Method | Mixed-Model with Repeated Measures |
| Parameter estimate | Least Squares Mean Difference |
| Point estimate | -1.52 |
| Confidence interval | |
| level | 95 % |
| sides | 2-sided |
| lower limit | -2.02 |
| upper limit | -1.01 |
| Variability estimate | Standard error of the mean |
| Dispersion value | 0.26 |

| | |
|--|--|
| Statistical analysis title | Mixed Model |
| Statistical analysis description: | |
| Change from Baseline in Itch NRS score at Week 2 | |
| Comparison groups | VC Period: Vehicle Cream BID v VC Period: Ruxolitinib 1.5% Cream BID |
| Number of subjects included in analysis | 346 |
| Analysis specification | Pre-specified |
| Analysis type | |
| P-value | < 0.0001 |
| Method | Mixed-Model with Repeated Measures |
| Parameter estimate | Least Squares Mean Difference |
| Point estimate | -1.74 |
| Confidence interval | |
| level | 95 % |
| sides | 2-sided |
| lower limit | -2.24 |
| upper limit | -1.24 |
| Variability estimate | Standard error of the mean |
| Dispersion value | 0.26 |

| | |
|--|---|
| Statistical analysis title | Mixed Model |
| Statistical analysis description: | |
| Change from Baseline in Itch NRS score at Week 4 | |
| Comparison groups | VC Period: Vehicle Cream BID v VC Period: Ruxolitinib 0.75% Cream BID |

| | |
|---|------------------------------------|
| Number of subjects included in analysis | 349 |
| Analysis specification | Pre-specified |
| Analysis type | |
| P-value | < 0.0001 |
| Method | Mixed-Model with Repeated Measures |
| Parameter estimate | Least Squares Mean Difference |
| Point estimate | -1.79 |
| Confidence interval | |
| level | 95 % |
| sides | 2-sided |
| lower limit | -2.36 |
| upper limit | -1.23 |
| Variability estimate | Standard error of the mean |
| Dispersion value | 0.29 |

| | |
|--|--|
| Statistical analysis title | Mixed Model |
| Statistical analysis description: | |
| Change from Baseline in Itch NRS score at Week 4 | |
| Comparison groups | VC Period: Vehicle Cream BID v VC Period: Ruxolitinib 1.5% Cream BID |
| Number of subjects included in analysis | 346 |
| Analysis specification | Pre-specified |
| Analysis type | |
| P-value | < 0.0001 |
| Method | Mixed-Model with Repeated Measures |
| Parameter estimate | Least Squares Mean Difference |
| Point estimate | -1.97 |
| Confidence interval | |
| level | 95 % |
| sides | 2-sided |
| lower limit | -2.53 |
| upper limit | -1.4 |
| Variability estimate | Standard error of the mean |
| Dispersion value | 0.29 |

| | |
|--|---|
| Statistical analysis title | Mixed Model |
| Statistical analysis description: | |
| Change from Baseline in Itch NRS score at Week 8 | |
| Comparison groups | VC Period: Vehicle Cream BID v VC Period: Ruxolitinib 0.75% Cream BID |
| Number of subjects included in analysis | 349 |
| Analysis specification | Pre-specified |
| Analysis type | |
| P-value | < 0.0001 |
| Method | Mixed-Model with Repeated Measures |
| Parameter estimate | Least Squares Mean Difference |
| Point estimate | -1.89 |

| | |
|----------------------|----------------------------|
| Confidence interval | |
| level | 95 % |
| sides | 2-sided |
| lower limit | -2.49 |
| upper limit | -1.29 |
| Variability estimate | Standard error of the mean |
| Dispersion value | 0.31 |

| | |
|---|--|
| Statistical analysis title | Mixed Model |
| Statistical analysis description: Change from Baseline in Itch NRS score at Week 8 | |
| Comparison groups | VC Period: Vehicle Cream BID v VC Period: Ruxolitinib 1.5% Cream BID |
| Number of subjects included in analysis | 346 |
| Analysis specification | Pre-specified |
| Analysis type | |
| P-value | < 0.0001 |
| Method | Mixed-Model with Repeated Measures |
| Parameter estimate | Least Squares Mean Difference |
| Point estimate | -1.7 |
| Confidence interval | |
| level | 95 % |
| sides | 2-sided |
| lower limit | -2.3 |
| upper limit | -1.1 |
| Variability estimate | Standard error of the mean |
| Dispersion value | 0.3 |

Secondary: Time to Achieve Itch NRS Score Improvement of at Least 2, 3 or 4 Points During the VC Period

| | |
|--|--|
| End point title | Time to Achieve Itch NRS Score Improvement of at Least 2, 3 or 4 Points During the VC Period |
| End point description: The Itch NRS is a daily participant-reported measure (24-hour recall), of the worst level of itch intensity using a diary. Participants are asked to rate the itching severity because of their AD by selecting a number from 0 (no itch) to 10 (worst imaginable itch) that best describes their worst level of itching in the past 24 hours. | |
| End point type | Secondary |
| End point timeframe: Up to Week 8 | |

| End point values | VC Period: Vehicle Cream BID | VC Period: Ruxolitinib 0.75% Cream BID | VC Period: Ruxolitinib 1.5% Cream BID | |
|---|------------------------------------|---|--|--|
| Subject group type | Reporting group | Reporting group | Reporting group | |
| Number of subjects analysed | 118 | 231 | 228 | |
| Units: days | | | | |
| median (confidence interval 95%) | | | | |
| ≥ 2-Point Improvement in Itch NRS Score | 20.0 (13.0 to 24.0) | 5.0 (4.0 to 6.0) | 4.0 (4.0 to 5.0) | |
| ≥ 3-Point Improvement in Itch NRS Score | 44.0 (25.0 to 99999) | 8.0 (6.0 to 13.0) | 8.0 (6.0 to 11.0) | |

Statistical analyses

No statistical analyses for this end point

Secondary: Change From Baseline in Skin Pain NRS Score During the VC Period

| | |
|-----------------|--|
| End point title | Change From Baseline in Skin Pain NRS Score During the VC Period |
|-----------------|--|

End point description:

The Skin Pain NRS is a daily patient-reported measure (24-hour recall), of the worst level of pain intensity from 0 (no pain) to 10 (worst imaginable pain) using a diary. Participants were asked, "Rate the pain severity from your atopic dermatitis skin changes by selecting a number that best describes your worst level of pain in the past 24 hours." A negative change from Baseline indicates improvement.

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

End point timeframe:

Baseline, Weeks 2, 4 and 8

| End point values | VC Period: Vehicle Cream BID | VC Period: Ruxolitinib 0.75% Cream BID | VC Period: Ruxolitinib 1.5% Cream BID | |
|--------------------------------------|------------------------------------|---|--|--|
| Subject group type | Reporting group | Reporting group | Reporting group | |
| Number of subjects analysed | 118 | 231 | 228 | |
| Units: units on a scale | | | | |
| arithmetic mean (standard deviation) | | | | |
| Change From Baseline at Week 2 | -0.53 (± 1.677) | -1.78 (± 2.145) | -1.73 (± 2.125) | |
| Change From Baseline at Week 4 | -0.93 (± 1.964) | -2.28 (± 2.449) | -2.27 (± 2.262) | |
| Change From Baseline at Week 8 | -1.35 (± 2.540) | -2.45 (± 2.575) | -2.37 (± 2.428) | |

Statistical analyses

| | |
|----------------------------|--------|
| Statistical analysis title | ANCOVA |
|----------------------------|--------|

Statistical analysis description:

Change from Baseline in Skin Pain NRS score at Week 8

| | |
|---|---|
| Comparison groups | VC Period: Vehicle Cream BID v VC Period: Ruxolitinib 0.75% Cream BID |
| Number of subjects included in analysis | 349 |
| Analysis specification | Pre-specified |
| Analysis type | |
| P-value | < 0.0001 |
| Method | ANCOVA |
| Parameter estimate | Least Squares Mean Difference |
| Point estimate | -1.5 |
| Confidence interval | |
| level | 95 % |
| sides | 2-sided |
| lower limit | -1.94 |
| upper limit | -0.97 |
| Variability estimate | Standard error of the mean |
| Dispersion value | 0.25 |

| | |
|---|--|
| Statistical analysis title | ANCOVA |
| Statistical analysis description: | |
| Change from Baseline in Skin Pain NRS score at Week 8 | |
| Comparison groups | VC Period: Vehicle Cream BID v VC Period: Ruxolitinib 1.5% Cream BID |
| Number of subjects included in analysis | 346 |
| Analysis specification | Pre-specified |
| Analysis type | |
| P-value | < 0.0001 |
| Method | ANCOVA |
| Parameter estimate | Least Squares Mean Difference |
| Point estimate | -1.2 |
| Confidence interval | |
| level | 95 % |
| sides | 2-sided |
| lower limit | -1.72 |
| upper limit | -0.76 |
| Variability estimate | Standard error of the mean |
| Dispersion value | 0.25 |

Secondary: Percentage of Participants With a Clinically Meaningful (≥ 6 -Point) Improvement in the PROMIS Short Form – Sleep Disturbance (8b) 24-Hour Recall Score at Weeks 2, 4 and 8

| | |
|-----------------|---|
| End point title | Percentage of Participants With a Clinically Meaningful (≥ 6 -Point) Improvement in the PROMIS Short Form – Sleep Disturbance (8b) 24-Hour Recall Score at Weeks 2, 4 and 8 |
|-----------------|---|

End point description:

The PROMIS Short Form – Sleep Disturbance (8b) questionnaire assesses participant's self-reported perceptions of sleep quality, sleep depth, and restoration associated with sleep. This questionnaire is completed in the morning by the participant where each item asks the participant to rate the severity of the participant's sleep disturbance. It is a 5-point scale with a range in score from 8 to 40, with higher scores indicating greater severity of sleep disturbance.

| | |
|----------------------|-----------|
| End point type | Secondary |
| End point timeframe: | |
| Weeks 2 ,4 and 8 | |

| End point values | VC Period: Vehicle Cream BID | VC Period: Ruxolitinib 0.75% Cream BID | VC Period: Ruxolitinib 1.5% Cream BID | |
|-----------------------------------|------------------------------------|---|--|--|
| Subject group type | Reporting group | Reporting group | Reporting group | |
| Number of subjects analysed | 110 | 213 | 211 | |
| Units: percentage of participants | | | | |
| number (not applicable) | | | | |
| Week 2 | 10.0 | 14.6 | 18.0 | |
| Week 4 | 12.7 | 16.9 | 18.0 | |
| Week 8 | 19.1 | 20.7 | 25.6 | |

Statistical analyses

No statistical analyses for this end point

Secondary: Proportion of Participants With a Clinically Meaningful (≥ 6 -Point) Improvement in the PROMIS Short Form – Sleep-Related Impairment (8a) 24-Hour Recall Score at Weeks 2, 4 and 8

| | |
|-----------------|--|
| End point title | Proportion of Participants With a Clinically Meaningful (≥ 6 -Point) Improvement in the PROMIS Short Form – Sleep-Related Impairment (8a) 24-Hour Recall Score at Weeks 2, 4 and 8 |
|-----------------|--|

End point description:

The PROMIS Short Form – Sleep-Related Impairment (8a) questionnaire assesses participant's self-reported perceptions of alertness, sleepiness, and tiredness during usual waking hours and the perceived functional impairments during wakefulness associated with sleep problems or impaired alertness. The questionnaire is filled in the evening where each item asks the participant to rate the severity of the participant's sleep impairment. It has 8 simple questions with a 5-point scale with a range in score from 8 to 40, with higher scores indicating greater severity of sleep-related impairment.

| | |
|----------------------|-----------|
| End point type | Secondary |
| End point timeframe: | |
| Weeks 2, 4 and 8 | |

| End point values | VC Period: Vehicle Cream BID | VC Period: Ruxolitinib 0.75% Cream BID | VC Period: Ruxolitinib 1.5% Cream BID | |
|-----------------------------------|------------------------------------|---|--|--|
| Subject group type | Reporting group | Reporting group | Reporting group | |
| Number of subjects analysed | 111 | 215 | 212 | |
| Units: percentage of participants | | | | |
| number (not applicable) | | | | |
| Week 2 | 7.2 | 10.7 | 13.2 | |
| Week 4 | 9.0 | 13.0 | 19.8 | |
| Week 8 | 13.5 | 20.0 | 23.1 | |

Statistical analyses

No statistical analyses for this end point

Secondary: Change From Baseline in PROMIS Short Form – Sleep Disturbance (8b) 24-Hour Recall Score During the VC Period

| | |
|-----------------|--|
| End point title | Change From Baseline in PROMIS Short Form – Sleep Disturbance (8b) 24-Hour Recall Score During the VC Period |
|-----------------|--|

End point description:

The PROMIS Short Form – Sleep Disturbance (8b) questionnaire assesses participant's self-reported perceptions of sleep quality, sleep depth, and restoration associated with sleep. This questionnaire is completed in the morning by the participant where each item asks the participant to rate the severity of the participant's sleep disturbance. It is a 5-point scale with a range in score from 8 to 40, with higher scores indicating greater severity of sleep disturbance. A negative change from Baseline indicates improvement.

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

End point timeframe:

Baseline, Weeks 2, 4 and 8

| End point values | VC Period: Vehicle Cream BID | VC Period: Ruxolitinib 0.75% Cream BID | VC Period: Ruxolitinib 1.5% Cream BID | |
|-------------------------------------|------------------------------------|---|--|--|
| Subject group type | Reporting group | Reporting group | Reporting group | |
| Number of subjects analysed | 118 | 231 | 228 | |
| Units: units on a scale | | | | |
| least squares mean (standard error) | | | | |
| Change From Baseline at Week 2 | -1.32 (± 0.46) | -1.92 (± 0.33) | -2.30 (± 0.33) | |
| Change From Baseline at Week 4 | -2.02 (± 0.50) | -2.32 (± 0.35) | -2.88 (± 0.35) | |
| Change From Baseline at Week 8 | -2.60 (± 0.60) | -3.30 (± 0.42) | -3.40 (± 0.41) | |

Statistical analyses

| | |
|----------------------------|-------------|
| Statistical analysis title | Mixed Model |
|----------------------------|-------------|

Statistical analysis description:

Change from Baseline in PROMIS Short Form–Sleep Disturbance (8b) 24-hour recall score at Week 2

| | |
|-------------------|---|
| Comparison groups | VC Period: Vehicle Cream BID v VC Period: Ruxolitinib 0.75% Cream BID |
|-------------------|---|

| | |
|---|------------------------------------|
| Number of subjects included in analysis | 349 |
| Analysis specification | Pre-specified |
| Analysis type | |
| P-value | = 0.2903 |
| Method | Mixed-Model with Repeated Measures |
| Parameter estimate | Least Squares Mean Difference |
| Point estimate | -0.6 |
| Confidence interval | |
| level | 95 % |
| sides | 2-sided |
| lower limit | -1.71 |
| upper limit | 0.51 |
| Variability estimate | Standard error of the mean |
| Dispersion value | 0.57 |

| | |
|---|--|
| Statistical analysis title | Mixed Model |
| Statistical analysis description: | |
| Change from Baseline in PROMIS Short Form–Sleep Disturbance (8b) 24-hour recall score at Week 2 | |
| Comparison groups | VC Period: Vehicle Cream BID v VC Period: Ruxolitinib 1.5% Cream BID |
| Number of subjects included in analysis | 346 |
| Analysis specification | Pre-specified |
| Analysis type | |
| P-value | = 0.0837 |
| Method | Mixed-Model with Repeated Measures |
| Parameter estimate | Least Squares Mean Difference |
| Point estimate | -0.98 |
| Confidence interval | |
| level | 95 % |
| sides | 2-sided |
| lower limit | -2.09 |
| upper limit | 0.13 |
| Variability estimate | Standard error of the mean |
| Dispersion value | 0.57 |

| | |
|---|---|
| Statistical analysis title | Mixed Model |
| Statistical analysis description: | |
| Change from Baseline in PROMIS Short Form–Sleep Disturbance (8b) 24-hour recall score at Week 4 | |
| Comparison groups | VC Period: Vehicle Cream BID v VC Period: Ruxolitinib 0.75% Cream BID |
| Number of subjects included in analysis | 349 |
| Analysis specification | Pre-specified |
| Analysis type | |
| P-value | = 0.6272 |
| Method | Mixed-Model with Repeated Measures |
| Parameter estimate | Least Squares Mean Difference |
| Point estimate | -0.3 |

| | |
|----------------------|----------------------------|
| Confidence interval | |
| level | 95 % |
| sides | 2-sided |
| lower limit | -1.5 |
| upper limit | 0.91 |
| Variability estimate | Standard error of the mean |
| Dispersion value | 0.61 |

| | |
|---|--|
| Statistical analysis title | Mixed Model |
| Statistical analysis description: | |
| Change from Baseline in PROMIS Short Form–Sleep Disturbance (8b) 24-hour recall score at Week 4 | |
| Comparison groups | VC Period: Vehicle Cream BID v VC Period: Ruxolitinib 1.5% Cream BID |
| Number of subjects included in analysis | 346 |
| Analysis specification | Pre-specified |
| Analysis type | |
| P-value | = 0.1609 |
| Method | Mixed-Model with Repeated Measures |
| Parameter estimate | Least Squares Mean Difference |
| Point estimate | -0.86 |
| Confidence interval | |
| level | 95 % |
| sides | 2-sided |
| lower limit | -2.07 |
| upper limit | 0.34 |
| Variability estimate | Standard error of the mean |
| Dispersion value | 0.61 |

| | |
|---|---|
| Statistical analysis title | Mixed Model |
| Statistical analysis description: | |
| Change from Baseline in PROMIS Short Form–Sleep Disturbance (8b) 24-hour recall score at Week 8 | |
| Comparison groups | VC Period: Vehicle Cream BID v VC Period: Ruxolitinib 0.75% Cream BID |
| Number of subjects included in analysis | 349 |
| Analysis specification | Pre-specified |
| Analysis type | |
| P-value | = 0.3362 |
| Method | Mixed-Model with Repeated Measures |
| Parameter estimate | Least Squares Mean Difference |
| Point estimate | -0.7 |
| Confidence interval | |
| level | 95 % |
| sides | 2-sided |
| lower limit | -2.13 |
| upper limit | 0.73 |
| Variability estimate | Standard error of the mean |
| Dispersion value | 0.73 |

| | |
|---|--|
| Statistical analysis title | Mixed Model |
| Statistical analysis description: | |
| Change from Baseline in PROMIS Short Form–Sleep Disturbance (8b) 24-hour recall score at Week 8 | |
| Comparison groups | VC Period: Vehicle Cream BID v VC Period: Ruxolitinib 1.5% Cream BID |
| Number of subjects included in analysis | 346 |
| Analysis specification | Pre-specified |
| Analysis type | |
| P-value | = 0.269 |
| Method | Mixed-Model with Repeated Measures |
| Parameter estimate | Least Squares Mean Difference |
| Point estimate | -0.8 |
| Confidence interval | |
| level | 95 % |
| sides | 2-sided |
| lower limit | -2.23 |
| upper limit | 0.62 |
| Variability estimate | Standard error of the mean |
| Dispersion value | 0.73 |

Secondary: Change From Baseline in PROMIS Short Form – Sleep-Related Impairment (8a) 24-Hour Recall Score During the VC Period

| | |
|-----------------|---|
| End point title | Change From Baseline in PROMIS Short Form – Sleep-Related Impairment (8a) 24-Hour Recall Score During the VC Period |
|-----------------|---|

End point description:

The PROMIS Short Form – Sleep-Related Impairment (8a) questionnaire assesses participant’s self-reported perceptions of alertness, sleepiness, and tiredness during usual waking hours and the perceived functional impairments during wakefulness associated with sleep problems or impaired alertness. The questionnaire is filled in the evening where each item asks the participant to rate the severity of the participant’s sleep impairment. It has 8 simple questions with a 5-point scale with a range in score from 8 to 40, with higher scores indicating greater severity of sleep-related impairment. A negative change from Baseline indicates improvement.

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

End point timeframe:

Baseline, Weeks 2, 4 and 8

| End point values | VC Period: Vehicle Cream BID | VC Period: Ruxolitinib 0.75% Cream BID | VC Period: Ruxolitinib 1.5% Cream BID | |
|-------------------------------------|------------------------------------|---|--|--|
| Subject group type | Reporting group | Reporting group | Reporting group | |
| Number of subjects analysed | 118 | 231 | 228 | |
| Units: units on a scale | | | | |
| least squares mean (standard error) | | | | |
| Change From Baseline at Week 2 | -0.80 (± 0.44) | -1.87 (± 0.31) | -2.00 (± 0.31) | |
| Change From Baseline at Week 4 | -1.37 (± 0.49) | -2.13 (± 0.35) | -2.91 (± 0.35) | |

| | | | | |
|--------------------------------|---------------------|---------------------|---------------------|--|
| Change From Baseline at Week 8 | -2.08 (\pm 0.55) | -3.26 (\pm 0.39) | -3.31 (\pm 0.38) | |
|--------------------------------|---------------------|---------------------|---------------------|--|

Statistical analyses

| | |
|---|---|
| Statistical analysis title | Mixed Model |
| Statistical analysis description: Change from Baseline in PROMIS Short Form – Sleep-Related Impairment (8a) 24-hour recall score at Week 2 | |
| Comparison groups | VC Period: Vehicle Cream BID v VC Period: Ruxolitinib 0.75% Cream BID |
| Number of subjects included in analysis | 349 |
| Analysis specification | Pre-specified |
| Analysis type | |
| P-value | = 0.0482 |
| Method | Mixed-Model with Repeated Measures |
| Parameter estimate | Least Squares Mean Difference |
| Point estimate | -1.07 |
| Confidence interval | |
| level | 95 % |
| sides | 2-sided |
| lower limit | -2.13 |
| upper limit | -0.01 |
| Variability estimate | Standard error of the mean |
| Dispersion value | 0.54 |

| | |
|---|--|
| Statistical analysis title | Mixed Model |
| Statistical analysis description: Change from Baseline in PROMIS Short Form – Sleep-Related Impairment (8a) 24-hour recall score at Week 2 | |
| Comparison groups | VC Period: Vehicle Cream BID v VC Period: Ruxolitinib 1.5% Cream BID |
| Number of subjects included in analysis | 346 |
| Analysis specification | Pre-specified |
| Analysis type | |
| P-value | = 0.0271 |
| Method | Mixed-Model with Repeated Measures |
| Parameter estimate | Least Squares Mean Difference |
| Point estimate | -1.2 |
| Confidence interval | |
| level | 95 % |
| sides | 2-sided |
| lower limit | -2.26 |
| upper limit | -0.14 |
| Variability estimate | Standard error of the mean |
| Dispersion value | 0.54 |

| | |
|---|---|
| Statistical analysis title | Mixed Model |
| Statistical analysis description: Change from Baseline in PROMIS Short Form – Sleep-Related Impairment (8a) 24-hour recall score at Week 4 | |
| Comparison groups | VC Period: Vehicle Cream BID v VC Period: Ruxolitinib 0.75% Cream BID |
| Number of subjects included in analysis | 349 |
| Analysis specification | Pre-specified |
| Analysis type | |
| P-value | = 0.2091 |
| Method | Mixed-Model with Repeated Measures |
| Parameter estimate | Least Squares Mean Difference |
| Point estimate | -0.76 |
| Confidence interval | |
| level | 95 % |
| sides | 2-sided |
| lower limit | -1.94 |
| upper limit | 0.42 |
| Variability estimate | Standard error of the mean |
| Dispersion value | 0.6 |

| | |
|---|--|
| Statistical analysis title | Mixed Model |
| Statistical analysis description: Change from Baseline in PROMIS Short Form – Sleep-Related Impairment (8a) 24-hour recall score at Week 4 | |
| Comparison groups | VC Period: Vehicle Cream BID v VC Period: Ruxolitinib 1.5% Cream BID |
| Number of subjects included in analysis | 346 |
| Analysis specification | Pre-specified |
| Analysis type | |
| P-value | = 0.0111 |
| Method | Mixed-Model with Repeated Measures |
| Parameter estimate | Least Squares Mean Difference |
| Point estimate | -1.53 |
| Confidence interval | |
| level | 95 % |
| sides | 2-sided |
| lower limit | -2.71 |
| upper limit | -0.35 |
| Variability estimate | Standard error of the mean |
| Dispersion value | 0.6 |

| | |
|-----------------------------------|-------------|
| Statistical analysis title | Mixed Model |
|-----------------------------------|-------------|

Statistical analysis description:

Change from Baseline in PROMIS Short Form – Sleep-Related Impairment (8a) 24-hour recall score at Week 8

| | |
|---|---|
| Comparison groups | VC Period: Vehicle Cream BID v VC Period: Ruxolitinib 0.75% Cream BID |
| Number of subjects included in analysis | 349 |
| Analysis specification | Pre-specified |
| Analysis type | |
| P-value | = 0.0802 |
| Method | Mixed-Model with Repeated Measures |
| Parameter estimate | Least Squares Mean Difference |
| Point estimate | -1.18 |
| Confidence interval | |
| level | 95 % |
| sides | 2-sided |
| lower limit | -2.51 |
| upper limit | 0.14 |
| Variability estimate | Standard error of the mean |
| Dispersion value | 0.68 |

Statistical analysis title

Mixed Model

Statistical analysis description:

Change from Baseline in PROMIS Short Form – Sleep-Related Impairment (8a) 24-hour recall score at Week 8

| | |
|---|--|
| Comparison groups | VC Period: Vehicle Cream BID v VC Period: Ruxolitinib 1.5% Cream BID |
| Number of subjects included in analysis | 346 |
| Analysis specification | Pre-specified |
| Analysis type | |
| P-value | = 0.0666 |
| Method | Mixed-Model with Repeated Measures |
| Parameter estimate | Least Squares Mean Difference |
| Point estimate | -1.24 |
| Confidence interval | |
| level | 95 % |
| sides | 2-sided |
| lower limit | -2.56 |
| upper limit | 0.09 |
| Variability estimate | Standard error of the mean |
| Dispersion value | 0.67 |

Secondary: Change From Baseline in PROMIS Short Form – Sleep-Related Impairment (8a) 7-Day Recall Score During the LTS Period

| | |
|-----------------|--|
| End point title | Change From Baseline in PROMIS Short Form – Sleep-Related Impairment (8a) 7-Day Recall Score During the LTS Period |
|-----------------|--|

End point description:

The PROMIS Short Form – Sleep-Related Impairment (8a) questionnaire assesses participant's self-reported perceptions of alertness, sleepiness, and tiredness during usual waking hours and the perceived functional impairments during wakefulness associated with sleep problems or impaired

alertness. The questionnaire is filled in the evening where each item asks the participant to rate the severity of the participant's sleep impairment. It has 8 simple questions with a 5-point scale with a range in score from 8 to 40, with higher scores indicating greater severity of sleep-related impairment. A negative change from Baseline indicates improvement.

| | |
|--------------------------------|-----------|
| End point type | Secondary |
| End point timeframe: | |
| Baseline, Weeks 12, 24, and 52 | |

| End point values | LTS Period: Vehicle Cream to Ruxolitinib 0.75% Cream BID | LTS Period: Vehicle Cream to Ruxolitinib 1.5% Cream BID | LTS Period: Ruxolitinib 0.75% Cream BID | LTS Period: Ruxolitinib 1.5% Cream BID |
|--------------------------------------|--|---|--|---|
| Subject group type | Reporting group | Reporting group | Reporting group | Reporting group |
| Number of subjects analysed | 45 | 46 | 171 | 180 |
| Units: units on a scale | | | | |
| arithmetic mean (standard deviation) | | | | |
| Change From Baseline at Week 12 | -1.73 (± 4.019) | -2.04 (± 6.282) | -0.32 (± 4.724) | -0.04 (± 3.914) |
| Change From Baseline at Week 24 | -0.47 (± 4.695) | -1.04 (± 5.969) | -0.11 (± 5.136) | 0.22 (± 4.868) |
| Change From Baseline at Week 52 | -1.48 (± 5.304) | -2.33 (± 6.582) | -0.24 (± 5.660) | -0.69 (± 5.483) |

Statistical analyses

No statistical analyses for this end point

Secondary: Change From Baseline in PROMIS Short Form – Sleep Disturbance (8b) 7-Day Recall Score During the LTS Period

| | |
|-----------------|---|
| End point title | Change From Baseline in PROMIS Short Form – Sleep Disturbance (8b) 7-Day Recall Score During the LTS Period |
|-----------------|---|

End point description:

The PROMIS Short Form – Sleep Disturbance (8b) questionnaire assesses participant's self-reported perceptions of sleep quality, sleep depth, and restoration associated with sleep. This questionnaire is completed in the morning by the participant where each item asks the participant to rate the severity of the participant's sleep disturbance. It is a 5-point scale with a range in score from 8 to 40, with higher scores indicating greater severity of sleep disturbance. A negative change from Baseline indicates improvement.

| | |
|--------------------------------|-----------|
| End point type | Secondary |
| End point timeframe: | |
| Baseline, Weeks 12, 24, and 52 | |

| End point values | LTS Period: Vehicle Cream to Ruxolitinib 0.75% Cream BID | LTS Period: Vehicle Cream to Ruxolitinib 1.5% Cream BID | LTS Period: Ruxolitinib 0.75% Cream BID | LTS Period: Ruxolitinib 1.5% Cream BID |
|--------------------------------------|--|---|--|---|
| Subject group type | Reporting group | Reporting group | Reporting group | Reporting group |
| Number of subjects analysed | 45 | 46 | 171 | 180 |
| Units: units on a scale | | | | |
| arithmetic mean (standard deviation) | | | | |
| Change From Baseline at Week 12 | -2.00 (± 4.973) | -1.80 (± 5.588) | -0.37 (± 4.621) | -0.32 (± 4.466) |
| Change From Baseline at Week 24 | -0.97 (± 6.188) | -1.87 (± 5.691) | -0.03 (± 4.688) | 0.06 (± 5.376) |
| Change From Baseline at Week 52 | -1.39 (± 7.198) | -2.88 (± 7.235) | -0.36 (± 6.049) | |

Statistical analyses

No statistical analyses for this end point

Secondary: Change From Baseline in Atopic Dermatitis Afflicted Percentage of Body Surface Area (%BSA) During the VC Period

| | |
|-----------------|---|
| End point title | Change From Baseline in Atopic Dermatitis Afflicted Percentage of Body Surface Area (%BSA) During the VC Period |
|-----------------|---|

End point description:

Body surface area affected by AD was assessed for 4 separate body regions and is collected as part of the EASI assessment: head and neck, trunk (including genital region), upper extremities, and lower extremities (including the buttocks). Each body region was assessed for disease extent ranging from 0% to 100% involvement. The overall total percentage was reported based off of all 4 body regions combined, after applying specific multipliers to the different body regions to account for the percent of the total BSA represented by each of the 4 regions. Use the percentage of skin affected for each region (0 to 100%) in EASI as follows: BSA Total = 0.1*BSA head and neck + 0.3*BSA trunk + 0.2* BSA upper limbs + 0.4*BSA lower limbs. A negative change from Baseline indicates improvement.

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

End point timeframe:

Baseline, Weeks 2, 4 and 8

| End point values | VC Period: Vehicle Cream BID | VC Period: Ruxolitinib 0.75% Cream BID | VC Period: Ruxolitinib 1.5% Cream BID | |
|--------------------------------------|------------------------------------|---|--|--|
| Subject group type | Reporting group | Reporting group | Reporting group | |
| Number of subjects analysed | 118 | 231 | 228 | |
| Units: units on a scale | | | | |
| arithmetic mean (standard deviation) | | | | |
| Change From Baseline at Week 2 | -0.48 (± 3.008) | -2.92 (± 3.944) | -3.99 (± 4.636) | |
| Change From Baseline at Week 4 | -1.62 (± 3.338) | -4.77 (± 4.711) | -5.45 (± 5.223) | |
| Change From Baseline at Week 8 | -2.13 (± 4.671) | -6.00 (± 4.845) | -6.61 (± 5.479) | |

Statistical analyses

| | |
|---|---|
| Statistical analysis title | ANCOVA |
| Statistical analysis description: Change from Baseline in %BSA at Week 8 | |
| Comparison groups | VC Period: Vehicle Cream BID v VC Period: Ruxolitinib 0.75% Cream BID |
| Number of subjects included in analysis | 349 |
| Analysis specification | Pre-specified |
| Analysis type | |
| P-value | < 0.0001 |
| Method | ANCOVA |
| Parameter estimate | Least Squares Mean Difference |
| Point estimate | -3.9 |
| Confidence interval | |
| level | 95 % |
| sides | 2-sided |
| lower limit | -4.84 |
| upper limit | -2.97 |
| Variability estimate | Standard error of the mean |
| Dispersion value | 0.48 |

| | |
|---|--|
| Statistical analysis title | ANCOVA |
| Statistical analysis description: Change from Baseline in %BSA at Week 8 | |
| Comparison groups | VC Period: Vehicle Cream BID v VC Period: Ruxolitinib 1.5% Cream BID |
| Number of subjects included in analysis | 346 |
| Analysis specification | Pre-specified |
| Analysis type | |
| P-value | < 0.0001 |
| Method | ANCOVA |
| Parameter estimate | Least Squares Mean Difference |
| Point estimate | -4.5 |
| Confidence interval | |
| level | 95 % |
| sides | 2-sided |
| lower limit | -5.47 |
| upper limit | -3.63 |
| Variability estimate | Standard error of the mean |
| Dispersion value | 0.47 |

Secondary: Change From Baseline in Atopic Dermatitis Afflicted %BSA During the LTS Period

| | |
|-----------------|--|
| End point title | Change From Baseline in Atopic Dermatitis Afflicted %BSA During the LTS Period |
|-----------------|--|

End point description:

Body surface area affected by AD was assessed for 4 separate body regions and is collected as part of the EASI assessment: head and neck, trunk (including genital region), upper extremities, and lower extremities (including the buttocks). Each body region was assessed for disease extent ranging from 0% to 100% involvement. The overall total percentage was reported based off of all 4 body regions combined, after applying specific multipliers to the different body regions to account for the percent of the total BSA represented by each of the 4 regions. Use the percentage of skin affected for each region (0 to 100%) in EASI as follows: BSA Total = 0.1*BSA head and neck + 0.3*BSA trunk + 0.2* BSA upper limbs + 0.4*BSA lower limbs. A negative change from Baseline indicates improvement.

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

End point timeframe:

Baseline, Weeks 12, 16, 20, 24, 28, 32, 36, 40, 44, 48 and 52

| End point values | LTS Period: Vehicle Cream to Ruxolitinib 0.75% Cream BID | LTS Period: Vehicle Cream to Ruxolitinib 1.5% Cream BID | LTS Period: Ruxolitinib 0.75% Cream BID | LTS Period: Ruxolitinib 1.5% Cream BID |
|--------------------------------------|--|---|--|---|
| Subject group type | Reporting group | Reporting group | Reporting group | Reporting group |
| Number of subjects analysed | 50 | 49 | 187 | 203 |
| Units: units on a scale | | | | |
| arithmetic mean (standard deviation) | | | | |
| Change From Baseline at Week 12 | -3.89 (± 5.530) | -4.71 (± 4.980) | -6.61 (± 4.395) | -7.69 (± 5.106) |
| Change From Baseline at Week 16 | -4.41 (± 5.553) | -5.47 (± 5.289) | -6.77 (± 5.270) | -7.80 (± 5.096) |
| Change From Baseline at Week 20 | -4.88 (± 5.210) | -6.27 (± 6.193) | -7.48 (± 4.900) | -8.05 (± 4.920) |
| Change From Baseline at Week 24 | -4.70 (± 4.775) | -6.37 (± 5.817) | -7.49 (± 4.988) | -8.00 (± 5.071) |
| Change From Baseline at Week 28 | -4.59 (± 4.677) | -6.21 (± 6.597) | -7.48 (± 4.827) | -8.07 (± 5.099) |
| Change From Baseline at Week 32 | -5.10 (± 5.203) | -6.79 (± 5.960) | -7.69 (± 4.891) | -7.89 (± 5.004) |
| Change From Baseline at Week 36 | -4.65 (± 5.266) | -6.16 (± 6.045) | -7.79 (± 4.856) | -8.38 (± 5.119) |
| Change From Baseline at Week 40 | -4.59 (± 5.196) | -6.42 (± 5.887) | -7.83 (± 4.976) | -8.44 (± 5.090) |
| Change From Baseline at Week 44 | -5.18 (± 4.901) | -6.56 (± 6.200) | -7.92 (± 5.082) | -8.43 (± 5.122) |
| Change From Baseline at Week 48 | -5.30 (± 5.130) | -6.61 (± 5.897) | -7.64 (± 5.380) | -8.33 (± 5.204) |
| Change From Baseline at Week 52 | -5.12 (± 5.114) | -6.83 (± 5.837) | -7.92 (± 4.823) | -8.42 (± 4.973) |

Statistical analyses

No statistical analyses for this end point

Secondary: Change From Baseline in Patient-Oriented Eczema Measure (POEM) Score During the VC Period

| | |
|---|---|
| End point title | Change From Baseline in Patient-Oriented Eczema Measure (POEM) Score During the VC Period |
| End point description: The POEM is a 7-question quality-of-life assessment that asks how many days the participant has been bothered by various aspects of their skin condition during the past 7 days. It assesses disease symptoms (dryness, itching, flaking, cracking, sleep loss, bleeding and weeping) on a scale ranging from 0-4 (0 = no days, 1 = 1-2 days, 2 = 3-4 days, 3 = 5-6 days, 4 = everyday). The sum of the 7 items gives the total POEM score of 0 (absent disease) to 28 (severe disease). High scores are indicative of more severe disease and poor quality of life. A negative change from Baseline indicates improvement. | |
| End point type | Secondary |
| End point timeframe: Baseline, Weeks 2, 4 and 8 | |

| End point values | VC Period: Vehicle Cream BID | VC Period: Ruxolitinib 0.75% Cream BID | VC Period: Ruxolitinib 1.5% Cream BID | |
|--------------------------------------|------------------------------------|---|--|--|
| Subject group type | Reporting group | Reporting group | Reporting group | |
| Number of subjects analysed | 118 | 231 | 228 | |
| Units: units on a scale | | | | |
| arithmetic mean (standard deviation) | | | | |
| Change From Baseline at Week 2 | -2.06 (± 5.371) | -8.21 (± 6.694) | -8.86 (± 6.807) | |
| Change From Baseline at Week 4 | -4.01 (± 6.125) | -9.59 (± 6.883) | -9.97 (± 6.839) | |
| Change From Baseline at Week 8 | -4.18 (± 6.574) | -10.34 (± 6.835) | -10.08 (± 7.167) | |

Statistical analyses

| | |
|---|---|
| Statistical analysis title | ANCOVA |
| Statistical analysis description: Change from Baseline in POEM score at Week 8 | |
| Comparison groups | VC Period: Vehicle Cream BID v VC Period: Ruxolitinib 0.75% Cream BID |
| Number of subjects included in analysis | 349 |
| Analysis specification | Pre-specified |
| Analysis type | |
| P-value | < 0.0001 |
| Method | ANCOVA |
| Parameter estimate | Least Squares Mean Difference |
| Point estimate | -6.1 |

| | |
|----------------------|----------------------------|
| Confidence interval | |
| level | 95 % |
| sides | 2-sided |
| lower limit | -7.38 |
| upper limit | -4.86 |
| Variability estimate | Standard error of the mean |
| Dispersion value | 0.64 |

| | |
|--|--|
| Statistical analysis title | ANCOVA |
| Statistical analysis description: | |
| Change from Baseline in POEM score at Week 8 | |
| Comparison groups | VC Period: Vehicle Cream BID v VC Period: Ruxolitinib 1.5% Cream BID |
| Number of subjects included in analysis | 346 |
| Analysis specification | Pre-specified |
| Analysis type | |
| P-value | < 0.0001 |
| Method | ANCOVA |
| Parameter estimate | Least Squares Mean Difference |
| Point estimate | -5.9 |
| Confidence interval | |
| level | 95 % |
| sides | 2-sided |
| lower limit | -7.17 |
| upper limit | -4.67 |
| Variability estimate | Standard error of the mean |
| Dispersion value | 0.64 |

| | |
|--|--|
| Secondary: Change From Baseline in POEM Score During the LTS Period | |
| End point title | Change From Baseline in POEM Score During the LTS Period |
| End point description: | |
| <p>The POEM is a 7-question quality-of-life assessment that asks how many days the participant has been bothered by various aspects of their skin condition during the past 7 days. It assesses disease symptoms (dryness, itching, flaking, cracking, sleep loss, bleeding and weeping) on a scale ranging from 0-4 (0 = no days, 1 = 1-2 days, 2 = 3-4 days, 3 = 5-6 days, 4 = everyday). The sum of the 7 items gives the total POEM score of 0 (absent disease) to 28 (severe disease). High scores are indicative of more severe disease and poor quality of life. A negative change from Baseline indicates improvement.</p> | |
| End point type | Secondary |
| End point timeframe: | |
| Baseline, Weeks 12, 24 and 52 | |

| End point values | LTS Period: Vehicle Cream to Ruxolitinib 0.75% Cream BID | LTS Period: Vehicle Cream to Ruxolitinib 1.5% Cream BID | LTS Period: Ruxolitinib 0.75% Cream BID | LTS Period: Ruxolitinib 1.5% Cream BID |
|--------------------------------------|--|---|--|---|
| Subject group type | Reporting group | Reporting group | Reporting group | Reporting group |
| Number of subjects analysed | 50 | 49 | 187 | 203 |
| Units: units on a scale | | | | |
| arithmetic mean (standard deviation) | | | | |
| Change From Baseline at Week 12 | -5.65 (± 7.460) | -6.04 (± 7.269) | -9.72 (± 6.571) | -10.58 (± 6.883) |
| Change From Baseline at Week 24 | -4.03 (± 7.006) | -5.71 (± 6.567) | -10.30 (± 6.675) | -10.58 (± 6.848) |
| Change From Baseline at Week 52 | -6.15 (± 7.304) | -6.28 (± 7.340) | -10.29 (± 6.187) | -10.65 (± 6.699) |

Statistical analyses

No statistical analyses for this end point

Secondary: Change From Baseline in Dermatology Life Quality Index (DLQI) Score During the VC Period

| | |
|-----------------|--|
| End point title | Change From Baseline in Dermatology Life Quality Index (DLQI) Score During the VC Period |
|-----------------|--|

End point description:

The DLQI is a simple, 10 question (Q) validated quality-of-life questionnaire to measure how much the skin problem has affected the participant. It covers 6 domains including symptoms and feelings (Q1 and Q2), daily activities (Q3 and Q4), leisure (Q5 and Q6), work and school (Q7), personal relationships (Q8 and Q9), and treatment(Q10). The recall Period of this scale is over the last week. Response categories include 0-not at all, 1-a little, 2-a lot, and 3-very much, and unanswered or not relevant responses scored as 0. Scores range from 0 ("no impact on participant's life") to 30 ("extremely large effect on participant's life"), and a 4-point change from Baseline is considered as the minimal clinically important difference threshold. A negative change from Baseline indicates less impact of the skin problem on participant's life.

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

End point timeframe:

Baseline, Weeks 2, 4, and 8

| End point values | VC Period: Vehicle Cream BID | VC Period: Ruxolitinib 0.75% Cream BID | VC Period: Ruxolitinib 1.5% Cream BID | |
|--------------------------------------|------------------------------------|---|--|--|
| Subject group type | Reporting group | Reporting group | Reporting group | |
| Number of subjects analysed | 105 | 194 | 202 | |
| Units: units on a scale | | | | |
| arithmetic mean (standard deviation) | | | | |
| Change From Baseline at Week 2 | -0.91 (± 4.679) | -5.40 (± 5.874) | -5.14 (± 5.394) | |
| Change From Baseline at Week 4 | -3.00 (± 4.962) | -6.62 (± 5.966) | -6.16 (± 5.771) | |
| Change From Baseline at Week 8 | -3.30 (± 5.353) | -7.18 (± 6.004) | -6.41 (± 5.731) | |

Statistical analyses

| | |
|---|---|
| Statistical analysis title | ANCOVA |
| Statistical analysis description: Change from Baseline in total DLQI score at Week 8 | |
| Comparison groups | VC Period: Vehicle Cream BID v VC Period: Ruxolitinib 0.75% Cream BID |
| Number of subjects included in analysis | 299 |
| Analysis specification | Pre-specified |
| Analysis type | |
| P-value | < 0.0001 |
| Method | ANCOVA |
| Parameter estimate | Least Squares Mean Difference |
| Point estimate | -3.3 |
| Confidence interval | |
| level | 95 % |
| sides | 2-sided |
| lower limit | -4.19 |
| upper limit | -2.32 |
| Variability estimate | Standard error of the mean |
| Dispersion value | 0.48 |

| | |
|---|--|
| Statistical analysis title | ANCOVA |
| Statistical analysis description: Change from Baseline in total DLQI score at Week 8 | |
| Comparison groups | VC Period: Vehicle Cream BID v VC Period: Ruxolitinib 1.5% Cream BID |
| Number of subjects included in analysis | 307 |
| Analysis specification | Pre-specified |
| Analysis type | |
| P-value | < 0.0001 |
| Method | ANCOVA |
| Parameter estimate | Least Squares Mean Difference |
| Point estimate | -2.8 |
| Confidence interval | |
| level | 95 % |
| sides | 2-sided |
| lower limit | -3.67 |
| upper limit | -1.83 |
| Variability estimate | Standard error of the mean |
| Dispersion value | 0.47 |

Secondary: Change From Baseline in DLQI Score During the LTS Period

| | |
|-----------------|--|
| End point title | Change From Baseline in DLQI Score During the LTS Period |
|-----------------|--|

End point description:

The DLQI is a simple, 10 question (Q) validated quality-of-life questionnaire to measure how much the skin problem has affected the participant. It covers 6 domains including symptoms and feelings (Q1 and Q2), daily activities (Q3 and Q4), leisure (Q5 and Q6), work and school (Q7), personal relationships (Q8 and Q9), and treatment (Q10). The recall Period of this scale is over the last week. Response categories include 0-not at all, 1-a little, 2-a lot, and 3-very much, and unanswered or not relevant responses scored as 0. Scores range from 0 ("no impact on participant's life") to 30 ("extremely large effect on participant's life"), and a 4-point change from Baseline is considered as the minimal clinically important difference threshold. A negative change from Baseline indicates less impact of the skin problem on participant's life.

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

End point timeframe:

Baseline, Weeks 12, 24, and 52

| End point values | LTS Period: Vehicle Cream to Ruxolitinib 0.75% Cream BID | LTS Period: Vehicle Cream to Ruxolitinib 1.5% Cream BID | LTS Period: Ruxolitinib 0.75% Cream BID | LTS Period: Ruxolitinib 1.5% Cream BID |
|--------------------------------------|--|---|--|---|
| Subject group type | Reporting group | Reporting group | Reporting group | Reporting group |
| Number of subjects analysed | 47 | 41 | 157 | 180 |
| Units: units on a scale | | | | |
| arithmetic mean (standard deviation) | | | | |
| Change From Baseline at Week 12 | -2.09 (± 3.611) | -2.79 (± 5.542) | -7.07 (± 5.931) | -7.06 (± 6.044) |
| Change From Baseline at Week 24 | -1.22 (± 3.293) | -3.08 (± 3.759) | -7.17 (± 6.152) | -7.01 (± 5.754) |
| Change From Baseline at Week 52 | -3.09 (± 3.753) | -3.20 (± 4.234) | -7.49 (± 5.776) | -7.28 (± 6.196) |

Statistical analyses

No statistical analyses for this end point

Secondary: Change from Baseline in Children Dermatology Life Quality Index (CDLQI) Score During the VC Period

| | |
|-----------------|--|
| End point title | Change from Baseline in Children Dermatology Life Quality Index (CDLQI) Score During the VC Period |
|-----------------|--|

End point description:

CDLQI is the youth/children's version of the DLQI. The CDLQI is a simple 10 question (Q) validated quality-of-life questionnaire. It covers 6 domains including symptoms and feelings (Q1 and Q2), leisure (Q4, Q5, and Q6), school or holidays (Q7), personal relationships (Q3 and Q8), sleep (Q9) and treatment (Q10). Response categories include 0-not at all, 1-a little, 2-a lot, and 3-very much, and unanswered or not relevant responses scored as 0. The total DLQI score is calculated by adding the score of each question resulting in a maximum score of 30 (extremely large effect on participant's life) and a minimum score of 0 (no impact on participant's life) and a 4-point change from Baseline is considered as the minimal clinically important difference threshold. A negative change from Baseline indicates less impact of the skin problem on participant's life.

| | |
|-----------------------------|-----------|
| End point type | Secondary |
| End point timeframe: | |
| Baseline, Weeks 2, 4, and 8 | |

| End point values | VC Period: Vehicle Cream BID | VC Period: Ruxolitinib 0.75% Cream BID | VC Period: Ruxolitinib 1.5% Cream BID | |
|--------------------------------------|------------------------------------|---|--|--|
| Subject group type | Reporting group | Reporting group | Reporting group | |
| Number of subjects analysed | 13 | 37 | 26 | |
| Units: units on a scale | | | | |
| arithmetic mean (standard deviation) | | | | |
| Change From Baseline at Week 2 | -1.67 (± 5.416) | -3.45 (± 4.570) | -3.58 (± 4.032) | |
| Change From Baseline at Week 4 | -3.10 (± 6.488) | -4.82 (± 4.934) | -4.52 (± 5.221) | |
| Change From Baseline at Week 8 | -2.36 (± 7.500) | -4.56 (± 5.061) | -4.12 (± 6.418) | |

Statistical analyses

| | |
|---|---|
| Statistical analysis title | ANCOVA |
| Statistical analysis description: | |
| Change from Baseline in total CDLQI score at Week 8 | |
| Comparison groups | VC Period: Vehicle Cream BID v VC Period: Ruxolitinib 0.75% Cream BID |
| Number of subjects included in analysis | 50 |
| Analysis specification | Pre-specified |
| Analysis type | |
| P-value | = 0.0099 |
| Method | ANCOVA |
| Parameter estimate | Least Squares Mean Difference |
| Point estimate | -4.1 |
| Confidence interval | |
| level | 95 % |
| sides | 2-sided |
| lower limit | -7.24 |
| upper limit | -1.03 |
| Variability estimate | Standard error of the mean |
| Dispersion value | 1.55 |

| | |
|---|--|
| Statistical analysis title | ANCOVA |
| Statistical analysis description: | |
| Change from Baseline in total CDLQI score at Week 8 | |
| Comparison groups | VC Period: Vehicle Cream BID v VC Period: Ruxolitinib 1.5% Cream BID |

| | |
|---|-------------------------------|
| Number of subjects included in analysis | 39 |
| Analysis specification | Pre-specified |
| Analysis type | |
| P-value | = 0.0542 |
| Method | ANCOVA |
| Parameter estimate | Least Squares Mean Difference |
| Point estimate | -3.1 |
| Confidence interval | |
| level | 95 % |
| sides | 2-sided |
| lower limit | -6.3 |
| upper limit | 0.06 |
| Variability estimate | Standard error of the mean |
| Dispersion value | 1.59 |

Secondary: Change from Baseline in CDLQI Score During the LTS Period

| | |
|--|---|
| End point title | Change from Baseline in CDLQI Score During the LTS Period |
| End point description: | |
| CDLQI is the youth/children's version of the DLQI. The CDLQI is a simple 10 question (Q) validated quality-of-life questionnaire. It covers 6 domains including symptoms and feelings (Q1 and Q2), leisure (Q4, Q5, and Q6), school or holidays (Q7), personal relationships (Q3 and Q8), sleep (Q9) and treatment (Q10). Response categories include 0-not at all, 1-a little, 2-a lot, and 3-very much, and unanswered or not relevant responses scored as 0. The total DLQI score is calculated by adding the score of each question resulting in a maximum score of 30 (extremely large effect on participant's life) and a minimum score of 0 (no impact on participant's life) and a 4-point change from Baseline is considered as the minimal clinically important difference threshold. A negative change from Baseline indicates less impact of the skin problem on participant's life. | |
| End point type | Secondary |
| End point timeframe: | |
| Baseline, Weeks 12, 24, and 52 | |

| End point values | LTS Period: Vehicle Cream to Ruxolitinib 0.75% Cream BID | LTS Period: Vehicle Cream to Ruxolitinib 1.5% Cream BID | LTS Period: Ruxolitinib 0.75% Cream BID | LTS Period: Ruxolitinib 1.5% Cream BID |
|--------------------------------------|--|---|--|---|
| Subject group type | Reporting group | Reporting group | Reporting group | Reporting group |
| Number of subjects analysed | 3 | 8 | 30 | 23 |
| Units: units on a scale | | | | |
| arithmetic mean (standard deviation) | | | | |
| Change From Baseline at Week 12 | -7.50 (± 2.121) | -4.88 (± 5.436) | -5.54 (± 5.153) | -5.57 (± 5.482) |
| Change From Baseline at Week 24 | -8.50 (± 2.121) | -4.88 (± 4.549) | -5.72 (± 6.066) | -5.68 (± 7.326) |
| Change From Baseline at Week 52 | -8.00 (± 1.414) | -6.38 (± 9.023) | -5.35 (± 4.902) | -6.57 (± 5.983) |

Statistical analyses

No statistical analyses for this end point

Secondary: Mean Patient Global Impression of Change (PGIC) Score at Weeks 2, 4, and 8

| | |
|-----------------|--|
| End point title | Mean Patient Global Impression of Change (PGIC) Score at Weeks 2, 4, and 8 |
|-----------------|--|

End point description:

The PGIC is a participants' self-reporting measure that reflects their belief about the efficacy of treatment. It is a 7-point scale where participants rate the questions as: 1=very much improved, 2=much improved, 3=minimally improved, 4=no change, 5=minimally worse, 6=much worse, and 7=very much worse. The lower score indicates improvement.

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

End point timeframe:

Weeks 2, 4 and 8

| End point values | VC Period: Vehicle Cream BID | VC Period: Ruxolitinib 0.75% Cream BID | VC Period: Ruxolitinib 1.5% Cream BID | |
|--------------------------------------|------------------------------------|---|--|--|
| Subject group type | Reporting group | Reporting group | Reporting group | |
| Number of subjects analysed | 118 | 231 | 228 | |
| Units: score on a scale | | | | |
| arithmetic mean (standard deviation) | | | | |
| Week 2 | 3.32 (± 1.268) | 2.19 (± 1.019) | 1.95 (± 0.980) | |
| Week 4 | 2.99 (± 1.259) | 1.95 (± 0.980) | 1.71 (± 0.852) | |
| Week 8 | 2.93 (± 1.380) | 1.73 (± 0.906) | 1.70 (± 0.909) | |

Statistical analyses

No statistical analyses for this end point

Secondary: Proportion of Participants With Each Score on the PGIC at Weeks 2, 4, and 8

| | |
|-----------------|---|
| End point title | Proportion of Participants With Each Score on the PGIC at Weeks 2, 4, and 8 |
|-----------------|---|

End point description:

The PGIC is a participants' self-reporting measure that reflects their belief about the efficacy of treatment. It is a 7-point scale where participants rate the questions as: 1=very much improved, 2=much improved, 3=minimally improved, 4=no change, 5=minimally worse, 6=much worse, and 7=very much worse. The lower score indicates improvement.

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

End point timeframe:

Weeks 2, 4 and 8

| End point values | VC Period: Vehicle Cream BID | VC Period: Ruxolitinib 0.75% Cream BID | VC Period: Ruxolitinib 1.5% Cream BID | |
|-----------------------------------|------------------------------------|---|--|--|
| Subject group type | Reporting group | Reporting group | Reporting group | |
| Number of subjects analysed | 118 | 231 | 228 | |
| Units: percentage of participants | | | | |
| number (not applicable) | | | | |
| Week 2 - Very Much Improved: 1 | 4.6 | 32.1 | 41.0 | |
| Week 2 - Much Improved: 2 | 20.2 | 27.1 | 30.9 | |
| Week 2 - Minimally Improved: 3 | 38.5 | 32.1 | 20.7 | |
| Week 2 - No Change: 4 | 21.1 | 7.8 | 6.5 | |
| Week 2 - Minimally Worse: 5 | 7.3 | 0.5 | 0.9 | |
| Week 2 - Much Worse: 6 | 7.3 | 0.5 | 0.0 | |
| Week 2 - Very Much Worse: 7 | 0.9 | 0.0 | 0.0 | |
| Week 4 - Very Much Improved: 1 | 10.0 | 41.9 | 49.1 | |
| Week 4 - Much Improved: 2 | 29.0 | 28.6 | 35.2 | |
| Week 4 - Minimally Improved: 3 | 29.0 | 22.1 | 12.0 | |
| Week 4 - No Change: 4 | 20.0 | 6.9 | 2.8 | |
| Week 4 - Minimally Worse: 5 | 8.0 | 0.5 | 0.9 | |
| Week 4 - Much Worse: 6 | 4.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | |
| Week 4 - Very Much Worse: 7 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | |
| Week 8 - Very Much Improved: 1 | 16.8 | 52.7 | 51.6 | |
| Week 8 - Much Improved: 2 | 24.8 | 26.1 | 32.6 | |
| Week 8 - Minimally Improved: 3 | 23.8 | 16.3 | 12.1 | |
| Week 8 - No Change: 4 | 22.8 | 4.9 | 1.9 | |
| Week 8 - Minimally Worse: 5 | 7.9 | 0.0 | 1.4 | |
| Week 8 - Much Worse: 6 | 3.0 | 0.0 | 0.5 | |
| Week 8 - Very Much Worse: 7 | 1.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | |

Statistical analyses

No statistical analyses for this end point

Secondary: Proportion of Participants With a Score of Either 1 or 2 on the PGIC at Weeks 2, 4, and 8

| | |
|-----------------|---|
| End point title | Proportion of Participants With a Score of Either 1 or 2 on the PGIC at Weeks 2, 4, and 8 |
|-----------------|---|

End point description:

The PGIC is a participants' self-reporting measure that reflects their belief about the efficacy of treatment. It is a 7-point scale where participants rate the questions as: 1=very much improved, 2=much improved, 3=minimally improved, 4=no change, 5=minimally worse, 6=much worse, and 7=very much worse. The lower score indicates improvement.

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

End point timeframe:

Weeks 2, 4 and 8

| End point values | VC Period: Vehicle Cream BID | VC Period: Ruxolitinib 0.75% Cream BID | VC Period: Ruxolitinib 1.5% Cream BID | |
|-----------------------------------|------------------------------------|---|--|--|
| Subject group type | Reporting group | Reporting group | Reporting group | |
| Number of subjects analysed | 118 | 231 | 228 | |
| Units: percentage of participants | | | | |
| number (confidence interval 95%) | | | | |
| Week 2 | 24.8 (17.0 to 34.0) | 59.2 (52.3 to 65.8) | 71.9 (65.4 to 77.8) | |
| Week 4 | 39.0 (29.4 to 49.3) | 70.5 (64.0 to 76.5) | 84.3 (78.7 to 88.8) | |
| Week 8 | 41.6 (31.9 to 51.8) | 78.8 (72.5 to 84.2) | 84.2 (78.6 to 88.8) | |

Statistical analyses

| Statistical analysis title | Exact Logistic regression |
|--|---|
| Statistical analysis description: | |
| Percentage of participants with a score of either 1 or 2 on the PGIC at Week 8 | |
| Comparison groups | VC Period: Vehicle Cream BID v VC Period: Ruxolitinib 0.75% Cream BID |
| Number of subjects included in analysis | 349 |
| Analysis specification | Pre-specified |
| Analysis type | |
| P-value | < 0.0001 |
| Method | Conditional Exact Test |
| Parameter estimate | Odds ratio (OR) |
| Point estimate | 5.16 |
| Confidence interval | |
| level | 95 % |
| sides | 2-sided |
| lower limit | 2.987 |
| upper limit | 9.049 |

| Statistical analysis title | Exact Logistic regression |
|--|--|
| Statistical analysis description: | |
| Percentage of participants with a score of either 1 or 2 on the PGIC at Week 8 | |
| Comparison groups | VC Period: Vehicle Cream BID v VC Period: Ruxolitinib 1.5% Cream BID |
| Number of subjects included in analysis | 346 |
| Analysis specification | Pre-specified |
| Analysis type | |
| P-value | < 0.0001 |
| Method | Conditional Exact Test |
| Parameter estimate | Odds ratio (OR) |
| Point estimate | 7.47 |

| | |
|---------------------|---------|
| Confidence interval | |
| level | 95 % |
| sides | 2-sided |
| lower limit | 4.23 |
| upper limit | 13.415 |

Secondary: Change From Baseline in EuroQuality of Life Five Dimensions (EQ-5D-5L) Visual Analogue Scale (VAS) Score During the VC Period

| | |
|-----------------|---|
| End point title | Change From Baseline in EuroQuality of Life Five Dimensions (EQ-5D-5L) Visual Analogue Scale (VAS) Score During the VC Period |
|-----------------|---|

End point description:

EQ-5D-5L questionnaire has: EQ-5D-5L descriptive system & EQ-VAS. EQ-5D is a validated, self-administered, generic utility questionnaire wherein participants rate their current health state based on 5 dimensions: mobility, self-care, usual activities, pain/discomfort, and anxiety/depression. 5L indicates that for each dimension, there are 5 levels: 1=no problems, 2=slight problems, 3=moderate problems, 4=severe problems, and 5=extreme problems. EQ-5D-5L score is assessed using VAS that ranges from 0 to 100 millimetres (mm), where 0 indicates "worst health you can imagine" and 100 indicates "best health you can imagine". The participant was asked to indicate his/her health state over past 7 days in each of the 5 dimensions. Digits for the 5 dimensions can be combined into a 5-digit number that describes the participant's health state. In the EQ-VAS, participants had to record their health state on a scale ranging from 0 to 100. A positive change from Baseline indicates improvement.

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

End point timeframe:

Baseline, Weeks 2, 4 and 8

| End point values | VC Period: Vehicle Cream BID | VC Period: Ruxolitinib 0.75% Cream BID | VC Period: Ruxolitinib 1.5% Cream BID | |
|--------------------------------------|------------------------------------|---|--|--|
| Subject group type | Reporting group | Reporting group | Reporting group | |
| Number of subjects analysed | 118 | 231 | 228 | |
| Units: units on a scale | | | | |
| arithmetic mean (standard deviation) | | | | |
| Change From Baseline at Week 2 | 1.43 (± 13.975) | 6.16 (± 14.409) | 6.98 (± 15.956) | |
| Change From Baseline at Week 4 | 3.31 (± 15.061) | 6.38 (± 17.512) | 8.55 (± 17.244) | |
| Change From Baseline at Week 8 | 2.97 (± 15.946) | 7.16 (± 18.245) | 8.36 (± 16.767) | |

Statistical analyses

| | |
|----------------------------|--------|
| Statistical analysis title | ANCOVA |
|----------------------------|--------|

Statistical analysis description:

Change from Baseline in EQ VAS score at Week 8

| | |
|-------------------|--|
| Comparison groups | VC Period: Vehicle Cream BID v VC Period: Ruxolitinib 1.5% Cream BID |
|-------------------|--|

| | |
|---|-------------------------------|
| Number of subjects included in analysis | 346 |
| Analysis specification | Pre-specified |
| Analysis type | |
| P-value | = 0.0044 |
| Method | ANCOVA |
| Parameter estimate | Least Squares Mean Difference |
| Point estimate | 5.1 |
| Confidence interval | |
| level | 95 % |
| sides | 2-sided |
| lower limit | 1.59 |
| upper limit | 8.54 |
| Variability estimate | Standard error of the mean |
| Dispersion value | 1.77 |

| | |
|--|---|
| Statistical analysis title | ANCOVA |
| Statistical analysis description: | |
| Change from Baseline in EQ VAS score at Week 8 | |
| Comparison groups | VC Period: Vehicle Cream BID v VC Period: Ruxolitinib 0.75% Cream BID |
| Number of subjects included in analysis | 349 |
| Analysis specification | Pre-specified |
| Analysis type | |
| P-value | = 0.015 |
| Method | ANCOVA |
| Parameter estimate | Least Squares Mean Difference |
| Point estimate | 4.4 |
| Confidence interval | |
| level | 95 % |
| sides | 2-sided |
| lower limit | 0.85 |
| upper limit | 7.86 |
| Variability estimate | Standard error of the mean |
| Dispersion value | 1.78 |

Secondary: Change From Baseline in Work Productivity and Activity Impairment Questionnaire: Specific Health Problem (WPAI-SHP) Version 2.0 (v2.0) During the VC Period

| | |
|-----------------|---|
| End point title | Change From Baseline in Work Productivity and Activity Impairment Questionnaire: Specific Health Problem (WPAI-SHP) Version 2.0 (v2.0) During the VC Period |
|-----------------|---|

End point description:

The WPAI-SHP is a 6-item participant questionnaire developed to measure the effect of overall health and specific symptoms on productivity at work and regular activities outside of it in the past 7 days. The WPAI-SHP consists of 6 questions as follows: 1=currentlly employed; 2=hours missed due to AD; 3=hours missed other reasons; 4=hours actually worked; 5=degree AD affected productivity while working; 6=degree AD affected regular activities and the computed percentage, range for each sub scale is from 0 to 100, with higher values indicating greater impairment and less productivity. A negative change from Baseline indicates improvement.

| | |
|-----------------------------|-----------|
| End point type | Secondary |
| End point timeframe: | |
| Baseline, Weeks 2, 4, and 8 | |

| End point values | VC Period: Vehicle Cream BID | VC Period: Ruxolitinib 0.75% Cream BID | VC Period: Ruxolitinib 1.5% Cream BID | |
|---|------------------------------------|---|--|--|
| Subject group type | Reporting group | Reporting group | Reporting group | |
| Number of subjects analysed | 118 | 231 | 228 | |
| Units: units on a scale | | | | |
| arithmetic mean (standard deviation) | | | | |
| % Work Missed : Change From Baseline at Week 2 | 4.77 (± 23.348) | 0.64 (± 19.190) | 2.53 (± 17.803) | |
| % Work Missed :Change From Baseline at Week 4 | 3.22 (± 22.497) | -0.15 (± 22.299) | 4.31 (± 19.679) | |
| % Work Missed :: Change From Baseline at Week 8 | 10.03 (± 24.477) | 3.50 (± 24.760) | 3.51 (± 18.479) | |
| % Impairment While Working : Baseline at Week 2 | -4.49 (± 25.500) | -12.76 (± 21.371) | -13.24 (± 19.958) | |
| % Impairment While Working: Baseline at Week 4 | -12.05 (± 24.514) | -15.25 (± 22.648) | -18.10 (± 19.832) | |
| % Impairment While Working: Baseline at Week 8 | -10.93 (± 25.618) | -18.83 (± 23.365) | -17.32 (± 19.013) | |
| % Overall Work Impairment: Baseline at Week 2 | -2.78 (± 31.057) | -12.58 (± 24.670) | -11.10 (± 23.717) | |
| % Overall Work Impairment: Baseline at Week 4 | -10.41 (± 26.627) | -15.14 (± 25.543) | -16.19 (± 22.037) | |
| % Overall Work Impairment:: Baseline at Week 8 | -2.06 (± 29.625) | -17.00 (± 25.916) | -13.65 (± 22.476) | |
| % Activity Impairment : Baseline at Week 2 | -4.63 (± 21.243) | -12.79 (± 23.462) | -16.68 (± 23.295) | |
| % Activity Impairment : Baseline at Week 4 | -8.38 (± 20.981) | -17.24 (± 24.715) | -18.70 (± 23.550) | |
| % Activity Impairment : Baseline at Week 8 | -9.50 (± 25.361) | -19.66 (± 25.157) | -18.60 (± 25.557) | |

Statistical analyses

| | |
|---|---|
| Statistical analysis title | ANCOVA |
| Statistical analysis description: | |
| Percent work time missed due to AD: Change from Baseline in WPAI-SHP v2.0 at Week 8 | |
| Comparison groups | VC Period: Vehicle Cream BID v VC Period: Ruxolitinib 0.75% Cream BID |
| Number of subjects included in analysis | 349 |
| Analysis specification | Pre-specified |
| Analysis type | |
| P-value | = 0.142 |
| Method | ANCOVA |
| Parameter estimate | Least Squares Mean Difference |
| Point estimate | -5.6 |

| | |
|----------------------|----------------------------|
| Confidence interval | |
| level | 95 % |
| sides | 2-sided |
| lower limit | -13.12 |
| upper limit | 1.89 |
| Variability estimate | Standard error of the mean |
| Dispersion value | 3.81 |

| | |
|---|--|
| Statistical analysis title | ANCOVA |
| Statistical analysis description: | |
| Percent work time missed due to AD: Change from Baseline in WPAI-SHP v2.0 at Week 8 | |
| Comparison groups | VC Period: Vehicle Cream BID v VC Period: Ruxolitinib 1.5% Cream BID |
| Number of subjects included in analysis | 346 |
| Analysis specification | Pre-specified |
| Analysis type | |
| P-value | = 0.0375 |
| Method | ANCOVA |
| Parameter estimate | Least Squares Mean Difference |
| Point estimate | -8 |
| Confidence interval | |
| level | 95 % |
| sides | 2-sided |
| lower limit | -15.51 |
| upper limit | -0.47 |
| Variability estimate | Standard error of the mean |
| Dispersion value | 3.82 |

| | |
|---|---|
| Statistical analysis title | ANCOVA |
| Statistical analysis description: | |
| Percent impairment while working due to AD: Change from Baseline in WPAI-SHP v2.0 at Week 8 | |
| Comparison groups | VC Period: Vehicle Cream BID v VC Period: Ruxolitinib 0.75% Cream BID |
| Number of subjects included in analysis | 349 |
| Analysis specification | Pre-specified |
| Analysis type | |
| P-value | = 0.0012 |
| Method | ANCOVA |
| Parameter estimate | Least Squares Mean Difference |
| Point estimate | -9.1 |
| Confidence interval | |
| level | 95 % |
| sides | 2-sided |
| lower limit | -14.48 |
| upper limit | -3.63 |
| Variability estimate | Standard error of the mean |
| Dispersion value | 2.75 |

| | |
|---|--|
| Statistical analysis title | ANCOVA |
| Statistical analysis description: | |
| Percent impairment while working due to AD: Change from Baseline in WPAI-SHP v2.0 at Week 8 | |
| Comparison groups | VC Period: Vehicle Cream BID v VC Period: Ruxolitinib 1.5% Cream BID |
| Number of subjects included in analysis | 346 |
| Analysis specification | Pre-specified |
| Analysis type | |
| P-value | = 0.0095 |
| Method | ANCOVA |
| Parameter estimate | Least Squares Mean Difference |
| Point estimate | -7.2 |
| Confidence interval | |
| level | 95 % |
| sides | 2-sided |
| lower limit | -12.58 |
| upper limit | -1.77 |
| Variability estimate | Standard error of the mean |
| Dispersion value | 2.74 |

| | |
|--|---|
| Statistical analysis title | ANCOVA |
| Statistical analysis description: | |
| Percent overall work impairment due to AD: Change from Baseline in WPAI-SHP v2.0 at Week 8 | |
| Comparison groups | VC Period: Vehicle Cream BID v VC Period: Ruxolitinib 0.75% Cream BID |
| Number of subjects included in analysis | 349 |
| Analysis specification | Pre-specified |
| Analysis type | |
| P-value | < 0.0001 |
| Method | ANCOVA |
| Parameter estimate | Least Squares Mean Difference |
| Point estimate | -15.2 |
| Confidence interval | |
| level | 95 % |
| sides | 2-sided |
| lower limit | -22.69 |
| upper limit | -7.73 |
| Variability estimate | Standard error of the mean |
| Dispersion value | 3.8 |

| | |
|--|--------|
| Statistical analysis title | ANCOVA |
| Statistical analysis description: | |
| Percent overall work impairment due to AD: Change from Baseline in WPAI-SHP v2.0 at Week 8 | |

| | |
|---|--|
| Comparison groups | VC Period: Vehicle Cream BID v VC Period: Ruxolitinib 1.5% Cream BID |
| Number of subjects included in analysis | 346 |
| Analysis specification | Pre-specified |
| Analysis type | |
| P-value | = 0.001 |
| Method | ANCOVA |
| Parameter estimate | Least Squares Mean Difference |
| Point estimate | -12.6 |
| Confidence interval | |
| level | 95 % |
| sides | 2-sided |
| lower limit | -20.1 |
| upper limit | -5.18 |
| Variability estimate | Standard error of the mean |
| Dispersion value | 3.79 |

| | |
|--|---|
| Statistical analysis title | ANCOVA |
| Statistical analysis description: | |
| Percent activity impairment due to AD: Change from Baseline in WPAI-SHP v2.0 at Week 8 | |
| Comparison groups | VC Period: Vehicle Cream BID v VC Period: Ruxolitinib 0.75% Cream BID |
| Number of subjects included in analysis | 349 |
| Analysis specification | Pre-specified |
| Analysis type | |
| P-value | < 0.0001 |
| Method | ANCOVA |
| Parameter estimate | Least Squares Mean Difference |
| Point estimate | -12.1 |
| Confidence interval | |
| level | 95 % |
| sides | 2-sided |
| lower limit | -16.18 |
| upper limit | -7.95 |
| Variability estimate | Standard error of the mean |
| Dispersion value | 2.09 |

| | |
|--|--|
| Statistical analysis title | ANCOVA |
| Statistical analysis description: | |
| Percent activity impairment due to AD: Change from Baseline in WPAI-SHP v2.0 at Week 8 | |
| Comparison groups | VC Period: Vehicle Cream BID v VC Period: Ruxolitinib 1.5% Cream BID |

| | |
|---|-------------------------------|
| Number of subjects included in analysis | 346 |
| Analysis specification | Pre-specified |
| Analysis type | |
| P-value | < 0.0001 |
| Method | ANCOVA |
| Parameter estimate | Least Squares Mean Difference |
| Point estimate | -10.4 |
| Confidence interval | |
| level | 95 % |
| sides | 2-sided |
| lower limit | -14.53 |
| upper limit | -6.37 |
| Variability estimate | Standard error of the mean |
| Dispersion value | 2.08 |

Secondary: Change From Baseline in WPAI-SHP v2.0 During the LTS Period

| | |
|--|---|
| End point title | Change From Baseline in WPAI-SHP v2.0 During the LTS Period |
| End point description: | |
| <p>The WPAI-SHP is a 6-item participant questionnaire developed to measure the effect of overall health and specific symptoms on productivity at work and regular activities outside of it in the past 7 days. The WPAI-SHP consists of 6 questions as follows: 1=currently employed; 2=hours missed due to AD; 3=hours missed other reasons; 4=hours actually worked; 5=degree AD affected productivity while working; 6=degree AD affected regular activities and the computed percentage, range for each sub scale is from 0 to 100, with higher values indicating greater impairment and less productivity. A negative change from Baseline indicates improvement.</p> | |
| End point type | Secondary |
| End point timeframe: | |
| Baseline, Weeks 12, 24, 36, and 52 | |

| End point values | LTS Period: Vehicle Cream to Ruxolitinib 0.75% Cream BID | LTS Period: Vehicle Cream to Ruxolitinib 1.5% Cream BID | LTS Period: Ruxolitinib 0.75% Cream BID | LTS Period: Ruxolitinib 1.5% Cream BID |
|--|--|---|--|---|
| Subject group type | Reporting group | Reporting group | Reporting group | Reporting group |
| Number of subjects analysed | 50 | 49 | 187 | 203 |
| Units: units on a scale | | | | |
| arithmetic mean (standard deviation) | | | | |
| %Work Time Missed Baseline to Week 12 | -4.26 (± 24.958) | -0.81 (± 17.257) | -0.17 (± 24.581) | 3.48 (± 16.470) |
| %Work Time Missed Baseline to Week 24 | -2.06 (± 28.778) | -11.35 (± 22.947) | -0.38 (± 23.511) | 5.13 (± 24.419) |
| %Work Time Missed Baseline to Week 36 | -1.04 (± 23.312) | -5.44 (± 27.625) | -0.02 (± 20.410) | 3.37 (± 20.967) |
| %Work Time Missed Baseline to Week 52 | -2.29 (± 25.148) | 3.60 (± 24.186) | 0.50 (± 28.348) | 6.36 (± 21.806) |
| % Impairment While Working Baseline to Week 12 | -5.91 (± 10.075) | -13.50 (± 29.784) | -19.87 (± 21.572) | -22.02 (± 19.652) |
| % Impairment While Working Baseline to Week 24 | -7.14 (± 22.835) | -16.47 (± 18.007) | -19.74 (± 23.719) | -22.56 (± 22.433) |

| | | | | |
|---|-------------------|-------------------|-------------------|-------------------|
| % Impairment While Working Baseline to Week 36 | -7.33 (± 15.337) | -11.43 (± 21.432) | -18.79 (± 21.232) | -24.61 (± 20.359) |
| % Impairment While Working Baseline to Week 52 | -16.00 (± 24.129) | -13.85 (± 17.578) | -20.00 (± 25.312) | -21.86 (± 25.836) |
| % Overall Work Impairment : Baseline tp Week 12 | -11.64 (± 20.194) | -10.72 (± 23.285) | -17.40 (± 23.123) | -17.91 (± 24.692) |
| % Overall Work Impairment : Baseline tp Week 24 | -10.99 (± 33.070) | -25.22 (± 25.009) | -17.83 (± 27.226) | -19.31 (± 26.893) |
| % Overall Work Impairment : Baseline tp Week 36 | -7.77 (± 25.443) | -15.27 (± 30.360) | -17.70 (± 23.161) | -21.84 (± 27.812) |
| % Overall Work Impairment : Baseline tp Week 52 | -17.29 (± 33.754) | -10.17 (± 27.793) | -18.62 (± 28.397) | -16.20 (± 32.59) |
| % Overall Work Impairment : Baseline to Week 12 | -7.78 (± 24.016) | -11.74 (± 22.736) | -21.17 (± 25.287) | -21.92 (± 26.378) |
| % Overall Work Impairment : Baseline to Week 24 | -7.18 (± 26.552) | -13.78 (± 19.690) | -22.42 (± 25.547) | -22.32 (± 26.481) |
| % Overall Work Impairment : Baseline to Week 36 | -10.65 (± 23.655) | -15.24 (± 20.150) | -23.43 (± 25.748) | -25.34 (± 26.927) |
| % Overall Work Impairment : Baseline to Week 52 | -10.88 (± 28.001) | -14.88 (± 20.044) | -22.95 (± 24.656) | -23.93 (± 27.743) |

Statistical analyses

No statistical analyses for this end point

Secondary: Trough Plasma Concentrations of Ruxolitinib During the VC Period

| | |
|-----------------|--|
| End point title | Trough Plasma Concentrations of Ruxolitinib During the VC Period ^[11] |
|-----------------|--|

End point description:

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

End point timeframe:

Weeks 2, 4 and 8

Notes:

[11] - The end point is not reporting statistics for all the arms in the baseline period. It is expected all the baseline period arms will be reported on when providing values for an end point on the baseline period.

Justification: No C trough values calculated for the Vehicle group

| End point values | VC Period: Ruxolitinib 0.75% Cream BID | VC Period: Ruxolitinib 1.5% Cream BID | | |
|--------------------------------------|---|--|--|--|
| Subject group type | Reporting group | Reporting group | | |
| Number of subjects analysed | 236 | 238 | | |
| Units: nanomole per litre (nM) | | | | |
| arithmetic mean (standard deviation) | | | | |
| Week 2 | 25.2 (± 37.4) | 38.5 (± 64.5) | | |
| Week 4 | 22.6 (± 35.2) | 41.8 (± 83.6) | | |
| Week 8 | 22.4 (± 36.1) | 36.1 (± 66.6) | | |

Statistical analyses

No statistical analyses for this end point

Secondary: Trough Plasma Concentrations of Ruxolitinib During the LTS Period

| | |
|-----------------|---|
| End point title | Trough Plasma Concentrations of Ruxolitinib During the LTS Period |
|-----------------|---|

End point description:

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

End point timeframe:

Weeks 12, 16, 20, 24, 28, 32, 36, 40, 44, 48 and 52

| End point values | LTS Period: Vehicle Cream to Ruxolitinib 0.75% Cream BID | LTS Period: Vehicle Cream to Ruxolitinib 1.5% Cream BID | LTS Period: Ruxolitinib 0.75% Cream BID | LTS Period: Ruxolitinib 1.5% Cream BID |
|--------------------------------------|--|---|--|---|
| Subject group type | Reporting group | Reporting group | Reporting group | Reporting group |
| Number of subjects analysed | 50 | 51 | 198 | 215 |
| Units: nM | | | | |
| arithmetic mean (standard deviation) | | | | |
| Week 12 | 13.8 (± 22.7) | 23.9 (± 55.2) | 14.3 (± 26.9) | 22.6 (± 46.6) |
| Week 16 | 12.3 (± 22.8) | 16.1 (± 27.7) | 15.1 (± 28.3) | 23.9 (± 45.9) |
| Week 20 | 18.8 (± 41.0) | 25.3 (± 43.9) | 13.6 (± 20.5) | 26.8 (± 55.9) |
| Week 24 | 11.7 (± 26.0) | 27.6 (± 62.4) | 18.5 (± 49.8) | 25.7 (± 56.9) |
| Week 28 | 20.4 (± 39.9) | 17.6 (± 32.2) | 16.1 (± 36.1) | 20.8 (± 39.8) |
| Week 32 | 14.6 (± 30.6) | 26.4 (± 51.3) | 14.0 (± 23.2) | 25.9 (± 67.8) |
| Week 36 | 11.4 (± 23.7) | 29.9 (± 52.8) | 15.0 (± 28.4) | 22.0 (± 40.1) |
| Week 40 | 12.6 (± 36.7) | 32.8 (± 59.4) | 20.0 (± 51.1) | 26.3 (± 59.4) |
| Week 44 | 15.9 (± 31.9) | 23.0 (± 33.7) | 14.8 (± 28.8) | 24.1 (± 40.9) |
| Week 48 | 16.8 (± 38.6) | 35.7 (± 64.5) | 23.4 (± 58.1) | 26.3 (± 54.3) |
| Week 52 | 12.9 (± 21.8) | 35.7 (± 65.2) | 17.7 (± 33.9) | 23.3 (± 48.1) |

Statistical analyses

No statistical analyses for this end point

Adverse events

Adverse events information

Timeframe for reporting adverse events:

60 weeks

Adverse event reporting additional description:

AE additional description

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

Dictionary used

| | |
|-----------------|--------|
| Dictionary name | MedDRA |
|-----------------|--------|

| | |
|--------------------|----|
| Dictionary version | 21 |
|--------------------|----|

Reporting groups

| | |
|-----------------------|--------------------------------------|
| Reporting group title | VC and LTS Period: Vehicle Cream BID |
|-----------------------|--------------------------------------|

Reporting group description:

VC and LTS Period: Vehicle Cream BID

Participants received vehicle cream, applied topically to the affected areas as a thin film BID from Day 1 to Week 8 during the VC Period. Participants from Vehicle cream arm were crossed over to 0.75 or 1.5mg rux BID

| | |
|-----------------------|---|
| Reporting group title | VC and LTS Period: Ruxolitinib 1.5% Cream BID |
|-----------------------|---|

Reporting group description:

Participants received ruxolitinib 1.5% cream, applied topically to the affected areas as a thin film BID from Day 1 to Week 8 during the VC Period. Participants from Vehicle cream arm were crossed over to 1.5 rux BID.

| | |
|-----------------------|--|
| Reporting group title | VC and LTS Period: Ruxolitinib 0.75% Cream BID |
|-----------------------|--|

Reporting group description:

Participants received ruxolitinib 0.75% cream, applied topically to the affected areas as a thin film BID from Day 1 to Week 8 during the VC Period. Participants from Vehicle cream arm were crossed over to 0.75 rux BID.

| Serious adverse events | VC and LTS Period: Vehicle Cream BID | VC and LTS Period: Ruxolitinib 1.5% Cream BID | VC and LTS Period: Ruxolitinib 0.75% Cream BID |
|---|---|---|--|
| Total subjects affected by serious adverse events | | | |
| subjects affected / exposed | 0 / 124 (0.00%) | 4 / 298 (1.34%) | 8 / 301 (2.66%) |
| number of deaths (all causes) | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| number of deaths resulting from adverse events | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Injury, poisoning and procedural complications | | | |
| Ankle fracture | | | |
| subjects affected / exposed | 0 / 124 (0.00%) | 0 / 298 (0.00%) | 1 / 301 (0.33%) |
| occurrences causally related to treatment / all | 0 / 0 | 0 / 0 | 0 / 1 |
| deaths causally related to treatment / all | 0 / 0 | 0 / 0 | 0 / 0 |
| Meniscus injury | | | |

| | | | |
|---|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|
| subjects affected / exposed | 0 / 124 (0.00%) | 0 / 298 (0.00%) | 1 / 301 (0.33%) |
| occurrences causally related to treatment / all | 0 / 0 | 0 / 0 | 0 / 1 |
| deaths causally related to treatment / all | 0 / 0 | 0 / 0 | 0 / 0 |
| Vascular disorders | | | |
| Deep vein thrombosis | | | |
| subjects affected / exposed | 0 / 124 (0.00%) | 1 / 298 (0.34%) | 0 / 301 (0.00%) |
| occurrences causally related to treatment / all | 0 / 0 | 0 / 1 | 0 / 0 |
| deaths causally related to treatment / all | 0 / 0 | 0 / 0 | 0 / 0 |
| Cardiac disorders | | | |
| Arrhythmia | | | |
| subjects affected / exposed | 0 / 124 (0.00%) | 1 / 298 (0.34%) | 0 / 301 (0.00%) |
| occurrences causally related to treatment / all | 0 / 0 | 0 / 1 | 0 / 0 |
| deaths causally related to treatment / all | 0 / 0 | 0 / 0 | 0 / 0 |
| Myocardial infarction | | | |
| subjects affected / exposed | 0 / 124 (0.00%) | 0 / 298 (0.00%) | 1 / 301 (0.33%) |
| occurrences causally related to treatment / all | 0 / 0 | 0 / 0 | 0 / 1 |
| deaths causally related to treatment / all | 0 / 0 | 0 / 0 | 0 / 0 |
| Nervous system disorders | | | |
| Cerebrovascular accident | | | |
| subjects affected / exposed | 0 / 124 (0.00%) | 1 / 298 (0.34%) | 1 / 301 (0.33%) |
| occurrences causally related to treatment / all | 0 / 0 | 0 / 1 | 0 / 1 |
| deaths causally related to treatment / all | 0 / 0 | 0 / 0 | 0 / 0 |
| Reproductive system and breast disorders | | | |
| Ovarian cyst ruptured | | | |
| subjects affected / exposed | 0 / 124 (0.00%) | 0 / 298 (0.00%) | 1 / 301 (0.33%) |
| occurrences causally related to treatment / all | 0 / 0 | 0 / 0 | 0 / 1 |
| deaths causally related to treatment / all | 0 / 0 | 0 / 0 | 0 / 0 |
| Gastrointestinal disorders | | | |
| Small intestinal obstruction | | | |
| subjects affected / exposed | 0 / 124 (0.00%) | 0 / 298 (0.00%) | 1 / 301 (0.33%) |
| occurrences causally related to treatment / all | 0 / 0 | 0 / 0 | 0 / 1 |
| deaths causally related to treatment / all | 0 / 0 | 0 / 0 | 0 / 0 |
| Respiratory, thoracic and mediastinal disorders | | | |
| Dyspnoea | | | |

| | | | |
|---|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|
| subjects affected / exposed | 0 / 124 (0.00%) | 1 / 298 (0.34%) | 0 / 301 (0.00%) |
| occurrences causally related to treatment / all | 0 / 0 | 0 / 1 | 0 / 0 |
| deaths causally related to treatment / all | 0 / 0 | 0 / 0 | 0 / 0 |
| Pulmonary embolism | | | |
| subjects affected / exposed | 0 / 124 (0.00%) | 1 / 298 (0.34%) | 0 / 301 (0.00%) |
| occurrences causally related to treatment / all | 0 / 0 | 0 / 1 | 0 / 0 |
| deaths causally related to treatment / all | 0 / 0 | 0 / 0 | 0 / 0 |
| Infections and infestations | | | |
| Chronic tonsillitis | | | |
| subjects affected / exposed | 0 / 124 (0.00%) | 1 / 298 (0.34%) | 0 / 301 (0.00%) |
| occurrences causally related to treatment / all | 0 / 0 | 0 / 1 | 0 / 0 |
| deaths causally related to treatment / all | 0 / 0 | 0 / 0 | 0 / 0 |
| Pneumonia | | | |
| subjects affected / exposed | 0 / 124 (0.00%) | 0 / 298 (0.00%) | 1 / 301 (0.33%) |
| occurrences causally related to treatment / all | 0 / 0 | 0 / 0 | 0 / 1 |
| deaths causally related to treatment / all | 0 / 0 | 0 / 0 | 0 / 0 |
| Pyelonephritis | | | |
| subjects affected / exposed | 0 / 124 (0.00%) | 0 / 298 (0.00%) | 1 / 301 (0.33%) |
| occurrences causally related to treatment / all | 0 / 0 | 0 / 0 | 0 / 1 |
| deaths causally related to treatment / all | 0 / 0 | 0 / 0 | 0 / 0 |
| Sepsis | | | |
| subjects affected / exposed | 0 / 124 (0.00%) | 0 / 298 (0.00%) | 1 / 301 (0.33%) |
| occurrences causally related to treatment / all | 0 / 0 | 0 / 0 | 0 / 1 |
| deaths causally related to treatment / all | 0 / 0 | 0 / 0 | 0 / 0 |
| Tooth infection | | | |
| subjects affected / exposed | 0 / 124 (0.00%) | 0 / 298 (0.00%) | 1 / 301 (0.33%) |
| occurrences causally related to treatment / all | 0 / 0 | 0 / 0 | 0 / 1 |
| deaths causally related to treatment / all | 0 / 0 | 0 / 0 | 0 / 0 |

Frequency threshold for reporting non-serious adverse events: 5 %

| Non-serious adverse events | VC and LTS Period: Vehicle Cream BID | VC and LTS Period: Ruxolitinib 1.5% Cream BID | VC and LTS Period: Ruxolitinib 0.75% Cream BID |
|---|--|--|--|
| Total subjects affected by non-serious adverse events subjects affected / exposed | 9 / 124 (7.26%) | 51 / 298 (17.11%) | 49 / 301 (16.28%) |
| General disorders and administration site conditions Application site pain subjects affected / exposed occurrences (all) | 8 / 124 (6.45%) 8 | 2 / 298 (0.67%) 3 | 2 / 301 (0.66%) 2 |
| Infections and infestations Upper respiratory tract infection subjects affected / exposed occurrences (all) Nasopharyngitis subjects affected / exposed occurrences (all) | 1 / 124 (0.81%) 1 0 / 124 (0.00%) 0 | 23 / 298 (7.72%) 28 27 / 298 (9.06%) 39 | 23 / 301 (7.64%) 26 28 / 301 (9.30%) 43 |

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

None reported