



GRx+Biosims

Old, New, and Future Challenges in Bioequivalence

September 7, 2018

Charles E. DiLiberti

Objectives and approaches

- Facilitate robust dialogue on the most pressing bioequivalence-related issues facing generic drug developers, sponsors, and CROs
- Based on informal feedback of “please fix it” wish-lists from stakeholders
- Identify issues as being old, new, or future *Olde New Future*
- Most serious/widespread issues summarized and presented first (~ 15 min) to stimulate audience participation and panel discussion (~ 45 min)
- Backup slides show details, suggested fixes, and less serious/widespread issues; for later review and reference

Panel

- Charlie DiLiberti, MS, President, Montclair Bioequivalence Services, LLC (Moderator)
- Keith Gallicano, PhD, Chief Scientific Officer, Novum Pharmaceutical Research Services
- Russ Rackley, PhD, Head, Global Pharmacokinetics/Drug Metabolism, Mylan Inc.
- Nageshwar Thudi, PhD, Senior Director, Clinical End Point Studies – Global, Teva Pharmaceuticals
- William Zarycranski, PharmD, Director Clinical Development – Early Phase, Sandoz Inc., A Novartis Company

Guidances – clarity, consistency, rationale, implementation issues

- Many guidances lack clarity:
 - Interpretation is uncertain
 - No quick way to resolve uncertainties
- Inconsistencies exist across guidances:
 - Between product-specific and general guidances
 - Among product-specific guidances for similar products
- FDA rationale behind its product-specific BE guidances is often a mystery

Olde *New*

Olde *New*

Olde
New

Guidances – clarity, consistency, rationale, implementation issues – cont'd

- Lack of guidances where they are needed Olde
- Implementation/enforcement issues: New
 - New product-specific BE guidances are issued without warning, and without implementation schedule
 - Adversely affects products under development and already-filed ANDAs under review
 - FDA improperly attempts to enforce draft guidances

Biowaivers and *in vitro* BE methods to reduce or eliminate clinical burden

- Suggestions/questions on extension of *in vitro* approaches for various types of locally acting drug products: *New*
 - Injectable, ophthalmic, nasal suspensions, topicals, implants
- Challenges meeting Q1/Q2 requirements to qualify for *in vitro* BE approaches for locally-acting drug products: *New Future*
 - New guidances + Q1/Q2 response opacity + Q1/Q2 policy opacity = stuck
- BCS biowaivers: overcoming obstacles *New*
 - Literature support for high permeability rather than CACO-2 studies
 - Q1/"Q2" similarity issues

Clinical endpoint BE studies: challenges

- High variability with untransformed change-from-baseline endpoints Olde
- High placebo response rates (especially if unexpected) Olde
- Too many primary endpoints Olde
- Need alternatives for many more products: *in vitro*, PK, etc. Olde

BE reserve (retention) samples

- Costly, difficult-to-obtain RLDs (note FDA waiver program) New
- Requirements for clinical endpoint BE studies are often onerous Olde
 - Each-site for multi-site studies New
 - Exacerbated when IVRS/IWRS are used
- Requirements for *in vitro* BE studies are unclear and potentially excessive Future
- Lack of clarity for dosage forms other than solid orals Olde

Patient PK studies

- FDA guidances sometimes specify patients when
 - NDA sponsor conducted multiple studies in healthy volunteers
 - EMA guidances recommend healthy volunteers
- Inferior BE comparisons in patients:
 - Steady state vs. single dose conditions
 - Confounding factors (disease state, con meds, different dose levels)
- Significant challenges with patient studies (recruitment, large amounts of RLD needed – high cost, duration, etc.)

New

Olde

Olde

ANDA review frustrations

- Frivolous citation of minor issues, seemingly to invoke a Refuse-to-Receive (RTR) or meet a GDUFA performance metric *New*
- Seemingly over-zealous/inexperienced reviewers: *New*
 - Demanding inappropriate application of guidances/regulations
 - Issuing unreasonable comments/deficiencies
 - Out-of-step with historical FDA policies/practices

CDISC data standards

- These are expensive and onerous to prepare *New*
- Poor guidance/clarity on details of how to apply CDISC to ANDAs *New*
- FDA demands perfection in structure/formatting *New*
- Is there any way to streamline these, e.g., for certain drug classes, formulations and/or types of study (patients vs NHVs)? *New*
- Are the new CDISC data files/formats even utilized by FDA? FDA sometimes asks for data in the old formats! *New*

Reference Listed Drug (RLD) issues

- Obtaining RLDs: REMS and restricted distribution programs
 - FDA protocol review for REMS compliance is of limited utility
- Considerable lot-to-lot variability in RLD
 - Inherent, and/or aging-related
 - Complicates generic development (moving target)
 - Justifies adjustment of BE criteria?
 - For products significantly affected by administration technique, are differences technique or formulation-related?

New

Older

Reference Scaled Average Bioequivalence (RSABE)

- When can/can't RSABE be used? PD, anticoagulants, etc. *New*
- Questions on details of implementing RSABE method: handling missing data, multiple dosing groups, passing unscaled average BE but not RSABE, etc. *New*
- Extension of RSABE principle to two-period designs (Balaam's: RR, RT, TR)? *Olde*
- Use of 2 different RLD lots to address high lot-to-lot RLD variability? *Olde New*

Outliers and anomalous data

- Need to re-think outlier/anomalous data policies
 - Humans are biological organisms subject to inherent and sometimes erratic variability
 - Many good studies are thrown out when the RLD is the bad actor
- Re-dosing study policy has morphed from routine to unclear/unacceptable
- Need better approaches for dealing with PK “flatliners” (all zero concentrations): expected for some types of products
- Recent FDA comments on alleged cross-study inconsistencies in absolute concentrations are concerning

Olde

New

Olde

New

Transdermal/topical patches

- PK studies: taping was OK but now is not – consequences
- Adhesion:
 - New guidance helps, but still residual issues
 - Scoring scale rationale, performance issues
 - Revised adhesion guidance under development
- Irritation:
 - New guidance under development
 - Scoring scale rationale, performance issues
 - SLS positive control patch issues
 - Policy on sites in different climatic regions?

New
Olde New

Olde New

Global harmonization of BE requirements

- Needed to minimize BE study redundancy for global registration
- Reference product issues across different regions
 - Ideally, would like to conduct one BE study against a reference product from one region, and file it in multiple regions, but not accepted by most regulatory authorities
 - Inequivalent reference product formulations in different regions
- BE approaches differ among different regions
- Global Bioequivalence Harmonization Initiative (GBHI) – limited success

Olde

Olde

Olde

New

Charles E. DiLiberti, President

Montclair Bioequivalence Services, LLC

charlie@montclairbe.com

Upcoming event of interest:

Streamlining Generic Drug Development by Matching Reference Product Composition and Performance, *In Vitro* and *In Vivo*

October 18 – 19, 2018

Baltimore, MD

Scientists Advancing Affordable Medicines, Inc.

<https://saamnow.com>

GRx+Biosims

Engineering the Future of Generic + Biosimilar Medicines

THANK YOU

With special thanks to my industry colleagues who contributed their current issues and valuable suggestions under conditions of anonymity, and to the outstanding panelists.

BACKUP SLIDES

(available post-conference)