CENTER FOR DRUG EVALUATION AND RESEARCH

APPLICATION NUMBER: 21-526/S004

ADMINISTRATIVE and CORRESPONDENCE DOCUMENTS

EXCLUSIVITY SUMMARY

NDA # 21-526	SUPPL # 004	HFD # 110	
Trade Name Ranexa			
Generic Name ranolazine			
Applicant Name CV Therape	eutics		
Approval Date, If Known			
PART I IS AN EXCLU	USIVITY DETERMINATIO	ON NEEDED?	
1. An exclusivity determina supplements. Complete PAR' one or more of the following of	ΓS II and III of this Exclusivity	y Summary only if you	•
a) Is it a 505(b)(1), 50	95(b)(2) or efficacy supplement	nt? YES ⊠	NO 🗌
If yes, what type? Specify 505	5(b)(1), 505(b)(2), SE1, SE2, S	SE3,SE4, SE5, SE6, S	SE7, SE8
SE 1			
	view of clinical data other than ety? (If it required review on		_
uata, answer no.)		YES 🔀	NO 🗌
not eligible for exclus	because you believe the study is sivity, EXPLAIN why it is a g with any arguments made by study.	bioavailability study	y, including you
	requiring the review of clinic he change or claim that is sup		

N Dill I de la		
d) Did the applicant request exclusivity?	YES 🗌	NO 🖂
If the answer to (d) is "yes," how many years of exclusivity	did the applica	ant request?
e) Has pediatric exclusivity been granted for this Active M	oiety? YES 🗌	NO 🖂
If the answer to the above question in YES, is this approval a response to the Pediatric Written Request?	esult of the stud	lies submitted in
IF YOU HAVE ANSWERED "NO" TO <u>ALL</u> OF THE ABOVE QU THE SIGNATURE BLOCKS AT THE END OF THIS DOCUME	•	DIRECTLY TO
2. Is this drug product or indication a DESI upgrade?	YES 🗌	NO 🖂
IF THE ANSWER TO QUESTION 2 IS "YES," GO DIRECTLY TO ON PAGE 8 (even if a study was required for the upgrade).	O THE SIGNA	ΓURE BLOCKS
PART II FIVE-YEAR EXCLUSIVITY FOR NEW CHES (Answer either #1 or #2 as appropriate)	MICAL ENTI	ΓIES
1. Single active ingredient product.		
Has FDA previously approved under section 505 of the Act any dractive moiety as the drug under consideration? Answer "yes" if the esterified forms, salts, complexes, chelates or clathrates) has been particular form of the active moiety, e.g., this particular ester or salt coordination bonding) or other non-covalent derivative (such as a contract approved. Answer "no" if the compound requires medeesterification of an esterified form of the drug) to produce an almost active moiety.	e active moiety n previously ap (including salts) complex, chelate etabolic converse	(including other proved, but this with hydrogen or , or clathrate) has sion (other than
	YES 🖂	NO 🗌
If "yes," identify the approved drug product(s) containing the active #(s).	moiety, and, if l	known, the NDA

NDA#
NDA#
NDA#
2. Combination product.
If the product contains more than one active moiety(as defined in Part II, #1), has FDA previously approved an application under section 505 containing <u>any one</u> of the active moieties in the drug product? If, for example, the combination contains one never-before-approved active moiety and one previously approved active moiety, answer "yes." (An active moiety that is marketed under an DTC monograph, but that was never approved under an NDA, is considered not previously approved.)
YES NO NO
If "yes," identify the approved drug product(s) containing the active moiety, and, if known, the NDA #(s).
NDA#
NDA#
NDA#

IF THE ANSWER TO QUESTION 1 OR 2 UNDER PART II IS "NO," GO DIRECTLY TO THE SIGNATURE BLOCKS ON PAGE 8. (Caution: The questions in part II of the summary should only be answered "NO" for original approvals of new molecular entities.)
IF "YES," GO TO PART III.

PART III THREE-YEAR EXCLUSIVITY FOR NDAs AND SUPPLEMENTS

To qualify for three years of exclusivity, an application or supplement must contain "reports of new clinical investigations (other than bioavailability studies) essential to the approval of the application and conducted or sponsored by the applicant." This section should be completed only if the answer to PART II, Question 1 or 2 was "yes."

1. Does the application contain reports of clinical investigations? (The Agency interprets "clinical investigations" to mean investigations conducted on humans other than bioavailability studies.) If the application contains clinical investigations only by virtue of a right of reference to clinical investigations in another application, answer "yes," then skip to question 3(a). If the answer to 3(a) is "yes" for any investigation referred to in another application, do not complete remainder of

summary for that investigation.	YES	\boxtimes	NO 🗌		
IF "NO," GO DIRECTLY TO THE SIGNATURE BLOCKS ON	PAGE 8				
2. A clinical investigation is "essential to the approval" if the Age application or supplement without relying on that investigation essential to the approval if 1) no clinical investigation is necessal application in light of previously approved applications (i.e., information as bioavailability data, would be sufficient to provide a base 505(b)(2) application because of what is already known about a prethere are published reports of studies (other than those conducted other publicly available data that independently would have been at the application, without reference to the clinical investigation substitute.	Thus, ry to supmation of is for apviously sponsor sponsor sufficient	the involute the other the opproval approve ored by	estigation is not e supplement or an clinical trials, as an ANDA or ed product), or 2) the applicant) or oport approval of		
(a) In light of previously approved applications, is a clinical by the applicant or available from some other source, increases ary to support approval of the application or suppler	cluding the nent?	•	lished literature)		
If "no," state the basis for your conclusion that a clinical tr AND GO DIRECTLY TO SIGNATURE BLOCK ON PA		t necess	sary for approval		
(b) Did the applicant submit a list of published studies relevant to the safety and effectiveness of this drug product and a statement that the publicly available data would not independently support approval of the application?					
	YES		NO 🔀		
(1) If the answer to 2(b) is "yes," do you personally with the applicant's conclusion? If not applicable,	know o	f any re NO.	eason to disagree		
	YES		NO 🗌		
If yes, explain:					
(2) If the answer to 2(b) is "no," are you aware of pu sponsored by the applicant or other publicly availab demonstrate the safety and effectiveness of this dru	le data tl	nat cou			

YES 🗌 NO 🖂

If ye	es, expla	in:						
	(c)	If the answers to (b)(1) and (b)(2) were both "no," id submitted in the application that are essential to the	•	al investigations				
CVT 3036 or MERLIN-TIMI 36, a double-blind, placebo-controlled, international study conducted in patients within 48 hours of onset of acute coronary syndrome.								
	-	ring two products with the same ingredient(s) are courpose of this section.	onsidered to be	e bioavailability				
3. In addition to being essential, investigations must be "new" to support exclusivity. The agency interprets "new clinical investigation" to mean an investigation that 1) has not been relied on by the agency to demonstrate the effectiveness of a previously approved drug for any indication and 2) does not duplicate the results of another investigation that was relied on by the agency to demonstrate the effectiveness of a previously approved drug product, i.e., does not redemonstrate something the agency considers to have been demonstrated in an already approved application.								
	relied o	ach investigation identified as "essential to the appro- n by the agency to demonstrate the effectiveness? (If the investigation was relied on only to support drug, answer "no.")	of a previously	approved drug				
	Investig	ation #1	YES 🗌	NO 🖂				
	Investig	ation #2	YES 🗌	NO 🗌				
		ave answered "yes" for one or more investigations, i NDA in which each was relied upon:	dentify each su	ch investigation				
	duplicat	each investigation identified as "essential to the ap te the results of another investigation that was relied eness of a previously approved drug product?	•	_				
	Investig	ation #1	YES	NO 🖂				
	Investig	ration #2	YES 🗌	NO 🗌				

If you have answered "yes" for one or more investigation, identify the NDA in which a similar investigation was relied on:

- c) If the answers to 3(a) and 3(b) are no, identify each "new" investigation in the application or supplement that is essential to the approval (i.e., the investigations listed in #2(c), less any that are not "new"):
- 4. To be eligible for exclusivity, a new investigation that is essential to approval must also have been conducted or sponsored by the applicant. An investigation was "conducted or sponsored by" the applicant if, before or during the conduct of the investigation, 1) the applicant was the sponsor of the IND named in the form FDA 1571 filed with the Agency, or 2) the applicant (or its predecessor in interest) provided substantial support for the study. Ordinarily, substantial support will mean providing 50 percent or more of the cost of the study.
 - a) For each investigation identified in response to question 3(c): if the investigation was carried out under an IND, was the applicant identified on the FDA 1571 as the sponsor?

(b) For each investigation not carried out under an IND or for which the applicant was not identified as the sponsor, did the applicant certify that it or the applicant's predecessor in interest provided substantial support for the study?

Inves	stigation #1	!		
YES Expl	<u>—</u>	! NO ! Explain:		
Inves YES Expl	<u> </u>	! ! ! NO		
(c) N the a (Puro drug spon	Notwithstanding an answer of "yeapplicant should not be credited chased studies may not be used as are purchased (not just studies of sored or conducted the studies specifically and some studies of the	es" to (a) or (b), are the d with having "conducts the basis for exclusivi on the drug), the applic	cted or sponse ty. However, ant may be co	ored" the study? if all rights to the onsidered to have
If yes	s, explain: 			======
Name of per Title: RPM Date: 11/6/0	rson completing form: John Dav	rid		
Name of Off Title: Direct	fice/Division Director signing fo	rm: Norman Stockbrid	lge, M.D., Ph	.D.
Form OGD-	011347; Revised 05/10/2004; fo	ormatted 2/15/05		

This is a representation of an electronic record that was signed electronical	ly and
this page is the manifestation of the electronic signature.	

/s/

Norman Stockbridge

11/6/2008 11:53:56 AM

PEDIATRIC PAGE

(Complete for all filed original applications and efficacy supplements)

NDA/BLA#: <u>21-526</u>	Supplement Number: 004	NDA Supplement Type (e.g. SE5): <u>SE1</u>			
Division Name: DCaRP	PDUFA Goal Date: <u>7/27/08</u> Stamp Date: <u>9/27/2007</u>				
Proprietary Name: Ranexa					
Established/Generic Name: ranolazi	<u>ne</u>				
Dosage Form: 500 and 1000 mg E	xtended-Release (ER) Tablets				
Applicant/Sponsor: CV Therapeutic	<u>s</u>				
Indication(s) <u>previously approved</u> (pleating (1) treatment of chronic angina. Because who have not achieved an adequate recombination with amlodipine, beta bloappeared to be smaller in women than (2) (3) (4)	use Ranexa prolongs the QT int esponse with other antianginal o ckers or nitrates. The effect on a	rerval, it should be reserved for patients drugs. Ranexa should be used in			
Q1: Is this application in response to a	a PREA PMC? Yes 🗌 Co	ontinue			
	<u></u>	ease proceed to Question 2.			
If Yes, NDA/BLA#:	Supplement #:	PMC #:			
Does the division agree that th	is is a complete response to the	PMC?			
Yes. Skip to signat	ure block.				
☐ No. Please proceed	d to Question 2 and complete th	e Pediatric Page, as applicable.			
Q2: Does this application provide for (question):	If yes, please check all categori	es that apply and proceed to the next			
(a) NEW \square active ingredient(s); \boxtimes in administration?*	dication(s); dosage form;	dosing regimen; or \square route of			
(b) \square No. PREA does not apply. Skip	to signature block.				
* Note for CDER: SE5, SE6, and SE	7 submissions may also trigge	er PREA.			
Pediatric use for each pediatric subpoapplication under review. A Pediatric	•				
Number of indications for this pending (Attach a completed Pediatric Page for		ication.)			
Indication: -S-004 The treatment of c treat patients with chronic stable angir		restriction on the use of ranolazine to			
		(b) (4)			
Q3: Does this indication have orphan	· ·				
Yes. PREA does not apply	. •				
No. Please proceed to the	next question.				

Q4: Is there a full waiver for all pediatric age groups for this indication (check one)?
☐ No: Please check all that apply:
☐ Partial Waiver for selected pediatric subpopulations (Complete Sections B)
☐ Deferred for the remaining pediatric subpopulations (Complete Sections C)
☐ Completed for some or all pediatric subpopulations (Complete Sections D)
☐ Appropriately Labeled for some or all pediatric subpopulations (Complete Sections E)
☐ Extrapolation in One or More Pediatric Age Groups (Complete Section F)
(Please note that Section F may be used alone or in addition to Sections C, D, and/or E.)
Section A: Fully Waived Studies (for all pediatric age groups)
Reason(s) for full waiver: (check, and attach a brief justification)
Necessary studies would be impossible or highly impracticable because:
□ Disease/condition does not exist in children
☐ Too few children with disease/condition to study
Other (e.g., patients geographically dispersed):
 Product does not represent a meaningful therapeutic benefit over existing therapies for pediatric patients AND is not likely to be used in a substantial number of pediatric patients.
 Evidence strongly suggests that product would be ineffective or unsafe in all pediatric subpopulations (Note: if studies are fully waived on this ground, this information must be included in the labeling.)
☐ Justification attached.
If studies are fully waived, then pediatric information is complete for this indication. If there is another indication, please complete another Pediatric Page for each indication. Otherwise, this Pediatric Page is complete and should be signed and entered into DFS.

Section B: Partially Waived Studies (for selected pediatric subpopulations)

Check subpopulation(s) and reason for which studies are being partially waived (fill in applicable criteria below): Note: If Neonate includes premature infants, list minimum and maximum age in "gestational age" (in weeks).

Neonate wk. mo. wk.								
minimum maximum feasible* therapeutic benefit* musafe* failed^\(\) Neonate					Reason (see below for further detail):):
Other			minimum	maximum		therapeutic		Formulation failed ^Δ
Other		Neonate	wk mo.	wk mo.				
Otheryrmoyrmoyrmoyrmo		Other	yr mo.	yr mo.				
□ Other _yrmo. _yrmo. □ <td></td> <td>Other</td> <td> yr mo.</td> <td> yr mo.</td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td>		Other	yr mo.	yr mo.				
Are the indicated age ranges (above) based on weight (kg)?		Other	yr mo.	yr mo.				
Are the indicated age ranges (above) based on Tanner Stage? □ No; □ Yes. Reason(s) for partial waiver (check reason corresponding to the category checked above, and attach a brie justification): # Not feasible: □ Necessary studies would be impossible or highly impracticable because: □ Disease/condition does not exist in children □ Too few children with disease/condition to study □ Other (e.g., patients geographically dispersed): □ Product does not represent a meaningful therapeutic benefit over existing therapies for pediatric patients in this/these pediatric subpopulation(s) AND is not likely to be used in a substantial number of pediatric patients in this/these pediatric subpopulation(s). † Ineffective or unsafe: □ Evidence strongly suggests that product would be ineffective or unsafe in this/these pediatric population(s) (Note: if studies are partially waived on this ground, this information must be included in the labeling.) Δ Formulation failed: □ Applicant can demonstrate that reasonable attempts to produce a pediatric formulation necessary for this/these pediatric subpopulation(s) have failed. (Note: A partial waiver on this ground may only cove the pediatric subpopulation(s) requiring that formulation. An applicant seeking a partial waiver on this		Other	yr mo.	yr mo.				
 pediatric patients in this/these pediatric subpopulation(s). † Ineffective or unsafe: □ Evidence strongly suggests that product would be ineffective or unsafe in this/these pediatric population(s) (<i>Note: if studies are partially waived on this ground, this information must be included in the labeling.</i>) △ Formulation failed: □ Applicant can demonstrate that reasonable attempts to produce a pediatric formulation necessary for this/these pediatric subpopulation(s) have failed. (<i>Note: A partial waiver on this ground may only covethe pediatric subpopulation(s) requiring that formulation. An applicant seeking a partial waiver on this</i> 	Are the indicated age ranges (above) based on Tanner Stage? No; Yes. Reason(s) for partial waiver (check reason corresponding to the category checked above, and attach a brief justification): # Not feasible: Necessary studies would be impossible or highly impracticable because: Disease/condition does not exist in children Too few children with disease/condition to study Other (e.g., patients geographically dispersed): * Not meaningful therapeutic benefit:							
the pediatric subpopulation(s) requiring that formulation. An applicant seeking a partial waiver on this	 pediatric patients in this/these pediatric subpopulation(s). † Ineffective or unsafe: □ Evidence strongly suggests that product would be ineffective or unsafe in this/these pediatric population(s) (<i>Note: if studies are partially waived on this ground, this information must be included in the labeling.</i>) △ Formulation failed: □ Applicant can demonstrate that reasonable attempts to produce a pediatric formulation necessary for 							
ground must submit documentation detailing why a pediatric formulation cannot be developed. This submission will be posted on FDA's website if waiver is granted.) ☐ Justification attached. For those pediatric subpopulations for which studies have not been waived, there must be (1) corresponding.		the pedi ground i submiss ustification	atric subpopulat must submit doc ion will be poste attached.	tion(s) requiring cumentation deta ed on FDA's web	that formula ailing why a p osite if waive	tion. An applicant sec pediatric formulation r is granted.)	eking a partial wa cannot be develo	iver on this ped. This

For those pediatric subpopulations for which studies have not been waived, there must be (1) corresponding study plans that have been deferred (if so, proceed to Sections C and F and complete the PeRC Pediatric Plan Template); (2) submitted studies that have been completed (if so, proceed to Sections D and F and complete the PeRC Pediatric Assessment form); and/or (3) additional studies in other age groups that are not needed because the drug is appropriately labeled in one or more pediatric subpopulations (if so, proceed to Sections E and F). Note that more than one of these options may apply for this indication to cover <u>all</u> of the pediatric subpopulations.

Section C: Deferred Studies (for remaining pediatric subpopulations). Complete Section F on Extrapolation.

Check pediatric subpopulation for which pediatric studies are being deferred (and fill in applicable reason below):

Deferrals (for each or all age groups):			Reason for Deferral			Applicant Certification				
Population		minimum	maximum	Ready for Approval in Adults	Need Additional Adult Safety or Efficacy Data	Other Appropriate Reason (specify below)*	Yes	No		
	Neonate	wk mo.	wk mo.							
	Other	yr mo.	yr mo.							
	Other	yr mo.	yr mo.							
	Other	yr mo.	yr mo.							
	Other	yr mo.	yr mo.							
	All Pediatric Populations	0 yr. 0 mo.	16 yr. 11 mo.							
Date studies are due (mm/dd/yy):										
Are the indicated age ranges (above) based on weight (kg)?										
Are the indicated age ranges (above) based on Tanner Stage? No; Yes.										
* Oth	ner Reason:	* Other Reason:								

† Note: Studies may only be deferred if an <u>applicant submits a certification of grounds</u> for deferring the studies, a description of the planned or ongoing studies, evidence that the studies are being conducted or will be conducted with due diligence and at the earliest possible time, and a timeline for the completion of the studies. If studies are deferred, on an annual basis applicant must submit information detailing the progress made in conducting the studies or, if no progress has been made, evidence and documentation that such studies will be conducted with due diligence and at the earliest possible time. This requirement should be communicated to the applicant in an appropriate manner (e.g., in an approval letter that specifies a required study as a post-marketing commitment.)

If all of the pediatric subpopulations have been covered through the partial waivers and deferrals, proceed to Section F. For those pediatric subpopulations for which studies have been completed, proceed to Sections D and F and complete the PeRC Pediatric Assessment form. For those pediatric subpopulations for which additional studies are not needed because the drug is appropriately labeled in one or more pediatric subpopulations, proceed to Sections E and F.

Section D: Completed Studies (for some or all pediatric subpopulations). Complete Section F on Extrapolation.

Pediatric subpopulation(s) in which studies have been completed (check below):						
Population minin			maximum	PaRC Padiatric Assess		
	Neonate	wk mo	wk mo.	Yes 🗌	No 🗌	
	Other	yr mo.	yr mo.	Yes 🗌	No 🗌	
	Other	yr mo.	yr mo.	Yes 🗌	No 🗌	
	Other	yr mo.	yr mo.	Yes 🗌	No 🗌	
	Other	yr mo.	yr mo.	Yes 🗌	No 🗌	
	All Pediatric Subpopulations	0 yr. 0 mo.	16 yr. 11 mo.	Yes 🗌	No 🗌	
Are t	the indicated age ranges (abov	e) based on w	eight (kg)?	No; Yes		
Are t	the indicated age ranges (abov	e) based on T	anner Stage?] No; ☐ Yes.		
Note: For those pediatric subpopulations for which additional studies are not needed because the drug is appropriately labeled in one or more pediatric subpopulations, proceed to Sections E and F. If there are no further pediatric subpopulations to cover based on the partial waivers, deferrals and completed studies, go to Section F.						
Section E: Drug Appropriately Labeled (for some or all pediatric subpopulations): (Complete section F)						
	tional pediatric studies are not opriately labeled for the indicat			c subpopula	tion(s) because product is	
Popu	ulation		minimum		maximum	
] Neonate	w	k mo.	_	wk mo.	
	Other	yı	yr mo.		yr mo.	
	Other		yr mo.		yr mo.	
] Other	yı	yr mo.		yr mo.	
] Other	yı	yr mo.		yr mo.	
	All Pediatric Subpopulations 0 yr. 0 mo. 16 yr. 11 mo.					
Are the indicated age ranges (above) based on weight (kg)? No; Yes. Are the indicated age ranges (above) based on Tanner Stage? No; Yes. If studies are not needed because efficacy is being extrapolated from other adult and/or pediatric studies,						
proceed to Section F. Otherwise, this Pediatric Page is complete and should be signed and entered into DFS.						

Section F: Extrapolation from Other Adult and/or Pediatric Studies (for deferred and completed studies)

Note: Pediatric efficacy can be extrapolated from adequate and well-controlled studies in adults and/or other pediatric subpopulations if (and only if) (1) the course of the disease/condition <u>AND</u> (2) the effects of the product are sufficiently similar between the reference population and the target pediatric subpopulation needing studies. Extrapolation of efficacy from studies in adults and/or other children usually requires supplementation with other information obtained from the target pediatric subpopulation, such as pharmacokinetic and safety studies.

	atric studies are not necessa apolated from adequate and v				
				Extrapol	ated from:
	Population	minimum	maximum	Adult Studies?	Other Pediatric Studies?
	Neonate	wk mo.	wk mo.		
	Other	yr mo.	yr mo.		
	Other	yr mo.	yr mo.		
	Other	yr mo.	yr mo.		
	Other	yr mo.	yr mo.		
	All Pediatric Subpopulations	0 yr. 0 mo.	16 yr. 11 mo.		
Are t	he indicated age ranges (abo	ove) based on wei	ight (kg)?	☐ No; ☐ Yes.	
Are t	he indicated age ranges (abo	ove) based on Tar	nner Stage?	☐ No; ☐ Yes.	
	e: If extrapolating data from elextrapolation must be include				ific data supporting
	If there are additional indications, please complete the attachment for each one of those indications. Otherwise, this Pediatric Page is complete and should be signed and entered into DFS.				
This	page was completed by:				
{See	appended electronic signatu	ıre page}			
Reg	ulatory Project Manager				
(Rev	rised: 4/2008)				

NOTE: If you have no other indications for this application, you may delete the attachments from this document.

Attachment A

(This attachment is to be completed for those applications with multiple indications only.)

Indication #2:
Q1: Does this indication have orphan designation?
☐ Yes. PREA does not apply. Skip to signature block.
□ No. Please proceed to the next question.
Q2: Is there a full waiver for all pediatric age groups for this indication (check one)?
☐ Yes: (Complete Section A.)
☐ No: Please check all that apply:
☐ Partial Waiver for selected pediatric subpopulations (Complete Sections B)
□ Deferred for the remaining pediatric subpopulations (Complete Sections C)
☐ Completed for some or all pediatric subpopulations (Complete Sections D)
☐ Appropriately Labeled for some or all pediatric subpopulations (Complete Sections E)
☐ Extrapolation in One or More Pediatric Age Groups (Complete Section F)
(Please note that Section F may be used alone or in addition to Sections C, D, and/or E.)
Section A: Fully Waived Studies (for all pediatric age groups)
Section A: Fully Waived Studies (for all pediatric age groups) Reason(s) for full waiver: (check, and attach a brief justification)
Reason(s) for full waiver: (check, and attach a brief justification)
Reason(s) for full waiver: (check, and attach a brief justification) Necessary studies would be impossible or highly impracticable because:
Reason(s) for full waiver: (check, and attach a brief justification) Necessary studies would be impossible or highly impracticable because: Disease/condition does not exist in children
Reason(s) for full waiver: (check, and attach a brief justification) Necessary studies would be impossible or highly impracticable because: Disease/condition does not exist in children Too few children with disease/condition to study
Reason(s) for full waiver: (check, and attach a brief justification) Necessary studies would be impossible or highly impracticable because: Disease/condition does not exist in children Too few children with disease/condition to study Other (e.g., patients geographically dispersed): Product does not represent a meaningful therapeutic benefit over existing therapies for pediatric
Reason(s) for full waiver: (check, and attach a brief justification) Necessary studies would be impossible or highly impracticable because: Disease/condition does not exist in children Too few children with disease/condition to study Other (e.g., patients geographically dispersed): Product does not represent a meaningful therapeutic benefit over existing therapies for pediatric patients AND is not likely to be used in a substantial number of pediatric patients. Evidence strongly suggests that product would be ineffective or unsafe in all pediatric subpopulations (Note: if studies are fully waived on this ground, this information must be included in

Section B: Partially Waived Studies (for selected pediatric subpopulations)

Check subpopulation(s) and reason for which studies are being partially waived (fill in applicable criteria below): Note: If Neonate includes premature infants, list minimum and maximum age in "gestational age" (in weeks).

Neonate wk. mo. wk.									
minimum maximum feasible* therapeutic benefit* musafe* failed^\(\) Neonate						Reason (see below	v for further detail):	
Other			minimum	maximum		therapeutic		Formulation failed ^Δ	
Other		Neonate	wk mo.	wk mo.					
Otheryrmoyrmoyrmoyrmo		Other	yr mo.	yr mo.					
□ Other _yrmo. _yrmo. □ <td></td> <td>Other</td> <td> yr mo.</td> <td> yr mo.</td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td>		Other	yr mo.	yr mo.					
Are the indicated age ranges (above) based on weight (kg)?		Other	yr mo.	yr mo.					
Are the indicated age ranges (above) based on Tanner Stage? □ No; □ Yes. Reason(s) for partial waiver (check reason corresponding to the category checked above, and attach a brie justification): # Not feasible: □ Necessary studies would be impossible or highly impracticable because: □ Disease/condition does not exist in children □ Too few children with disease/condition to study □ Other (e.g., patients geographically dispersed): □ Product does not represent a meaningful therapeutic benefit over existing therapies for pediatric patients in this/these pediatric subpopulation(s) AND is not likely to be used in a substantial number of pediatric patients in this/these pediatric subpopulation(s). † Ineffective or unsafe: □ Evidence strongly suggests that product would be ineffective or unsafe in this/these pediatric population(s) (Note: if studies are partially waived on this ground, this information must be included in the labeling.) Δ Formulation failed: □ Applicant can demonstrate that reasonable attempts to produce a pediatric formulation necessary for this/these pediatric subpopulation(s) have failed. (Note: A partial waiver on this ground may only cove the pediatric subpopulation(s) requiring that formulation. An applicant seeking a partial waiver on this		Other	yr mo.	yr mo.					
 pediatric patients in this/these pediatric subpopulation(s). † Ineffective or unsafe: □ Evidence strongly suggests that product would be ineffective or unsafe in this/these pediatric population(s) (<i>Note: if studies are partially waived on this ground, this information must be included in the labeling.</i>) △ Formulation failed: □ Applicant can demonstrate that reasonable attempts to produce a pediatric formulation necessary for this/these pediatric subpopulation(s) have failed. (<i>Note: A partial waiver on this ground may only covethe pediatric subpopulation(s) requiring that formulation. An applicant seeking a partial waiver on this</i> 	Are Rea just # [the indicate son(s) for p ification): Not feasible Necessa Disease Too few Other (e	d age ranges (a artial waiver (ch : ary studies would /condition does children with dis .g., patients geogful therapeutic does not repres	bove) based on eck reason cord be impossible not exist in child sease/condition ographically disp benefit:	Tanner Stagresponding to highly implement to study ersed):	ge? No; Ye to the category check practicable because: c benefit over existing	es. ked above, and at g therapies for pe	diatric	
the pediatric subpopulation(s) requiring that formulation. An applicant seeking a partial waiver on this	Δ [pediatrice frective or Evidence population the labe are cormulation Applicar	e patients in this/ unsafe: e strongly sugge on(s) (<i>Note: if st</i> <i>ling.</i>) failed: at can demonstra	these pediatric sets that product dudies are partial	subpopulation t would be in tly waived or tble attempts	effective or unsafe in this ground, this info	n this/these pediatormation must be rice formulation ne	tric included in cessary for	
ground must submit documentation detailing why a pediatric formulation cannot be developed. This submission will be posted on FDA's website if waiver is granted.) ☐ Justification attached. For those pediatric subpopulations for which studies have not been waived, there must be (1) corresponding.		the pedi ground i submiss ustification	atric subpopulat must submit doc ion will be poste attached.	tion(s) requiring cumentation deta ed on FDA's web	that formula ailing why a p osite if waive	tion. An applicant sec pediatric formulation r is granted.)	eking a partial wa cannot be develo	iver on this ped. This	

For those pediatric subpopulations for which studies have not been waived, there must be (1) corresponding study plans that have been deferred (if so, proceed to Sections C and F and complete the PeRC Pediatric Plan Template); (2) submitted studies that have been completed (if so, proceed to Sections D and F and complete the PeRC Pediatric Assessment form); and/or (3) additional studies in other age groups that are not needed because the drug is appropriately labeled in one or more pediatric subpopulations (if so, proceed to Sections E and F). Note that more than one of these options may apply for this indication to cover <u>all</u> of the pediatric subpopulations.

Section C: Deferred Studies (for remaining pediatric subpopulations). Complete Section F on Extrapolation.

Check pediatric subpopulation for which pediatric studies are being deferred (and fill in applicable reason below):

Defe	errals (for each	ı or all age grou	ıps):		Reason for Deferral			Applicant Certification	
Pop	ulation	minimum	maximum	Ready for Approval in Adults	Need Additional Adult Safety or Efficacy Data	Other Appropriate Reason (specify below)*	Yes	No	
	Neonate	wk mo.	wk mo.						
	Other	yr mo.	yr mo.						
	Other	yr mo.	yr mo.						
	Other	yr mo.	yr mo.						
	Other	yr mo.	yr mo.						
	All Pediatric Populations	0 yr. 0 mo.	16 yr. 11 mo.						
	Date studies a	are due (mm/dd/	/yy):						
Are t	he indicated aç	ge ranges (abov	e) based on wei	ght (kg)?	☐ No; ☐ Ye	es.			
Are t	the indicated ag	ge ranges (abov	e) based on Tar	nner Stage?	P □ No; □ Ye	s.			
* Oth	ner Reason:								

† Note: Studies may only be deferred if an <u>applicant submits a certification of grounds</u> for deferring the studies, a description of the planned or ongoing studies, evidence that the studies are being conducted or will be conducted with due diligence and at the earliest possible time, and a timeline for the completion of the studies. If studies are deferred, on an annual basis applicant must submit information detailing the progress made in conducting the studies or, if no progress has been made, evidence and documentation that such studies will be conducted with due diligence and at the earliest possible time. This requirement should be communicated to the applicant in an appropriate manner (e.g., in an approval letter that specifies a required study as a post-marketing commitment.)

If all of the pediatric subpopulations have been covered through the partial waivers and deferrals, proceed to Section F. For those pediatric subpopulations for which studies have been completed, proceed to Sections D and F and complete the PeRC Pediatric Assessment form. For those pediatric subpopulations for which additional studies are not needed because the drug is appropriately labeled in one or more pediatric subpopulations, proceed to Sections E and F.

Section D: Completed Studies (for some or all pediatric subpopulations). Complete Section F on Extrapolation.

Pedi	atric subpopulation(s) in which	studies have b	een completed (che	eck below):	
	Population	minimum	maximum	<u>, </u>	iatric Assessment form attached?.
	Neonate	wk mo	wk mo.	Yes 🗌	No 🗌
	Other	yr mo.	yr mo.	Yes 🗌	No 🗌
	Other	yr mo.	yr mo.	Yes 🗌	No 🗌
	Other	yr mo.	yr mo.	Yes 🗌	No 🗌
	Other	yr mo.	yr mo.	Yes 🗌	No 🗌
	All Pediatric Subpopulations	0 yr. 0 mo.	16 yr. 11 mo.	Yes 🗌	No 🗌
Are t	he indicated age ranges (abov	e) based on w	eight (kg)?	No; 🗌 Yes.	
Are t	he indicated age ranges (abov	e) based on Ta	anner Stage?	No; 🗌 Yes.	
appr furth	e: For those pediatric subpopula copriately labeled in one or more er pediatric subpopulations to d ion F.	e pediatric sub	populations, procee	d to Sections E	and F. If there are no
Sect	ion E: Drug Appropriately Lab	eled (for some	or all pediatric subp	opulations): (Co	mplete section F)
	tional pediatric studies are not opriately labeled for the indicat			c subpopulation	(s) because product is
Рорі	ulation		minimum		maximum
] Neonate	w	к. <u> </u>	wk.	mo.
] Other	yr	mo.		mo.
] Other	yr	mo.		mo.
] Other	yr	mo.	yr.	mo.
] Other	yr	mo.	yr.	mo.
	All Pediatric Subpopulation	ons	0 yr. 0 mo.		16 yr. 11 mo.
Are t	he indicated age ranges (abov	e) based on w	eight (kg)?	No; Yes.	
Are t	he indicated age ranges (abov	e) based on Ta	anner Stage?	No; 🗌 Yes.	
	idies are not needed because o	-	-		=

Section F: Extrapolation from Other Adult and/or Pediatric Studies (for deferred and completed studies)

Note: Pediatric efficacy can be extrapolated from adequate and well-controlled studies in adults and/or other pediatric subpopulations if (and only if) (1) the course of the disease/condition <u>AND</u> (2) the effects of the product are sufficiently similar between the reference population and the target pediatric subpopulation needing studies. Extrapolation of efficacy from studies in adults and/or other children usually requires supplementation with other information obtained from the target pediatric subpopulation, such as pharmacokinetic and safety studies.

	atric studies are not necessa polated from adequate and v				
				Extrapol	ated from:
	Population	minimum	maximum	Adult Studies?	Other Pediatric Studies?
	Neonate	wk mo.	wk mo.		
	Other	yr mo.	yr mo.		
	Other	yr mo.	yr mo.		
	Other	yr mo.	yr mo.		
	Other	yr mo.	yr mo.		
	All Pediatric Subpopulations	0 yr. 0 mo.	16 yr. 11 mo.		
Are t	he indicated age ranges (abo	ove) based on wei	ight (kg)?	☐ No; ☐ Yes.	
Are t	he indicated age ranges (abo	ove) based on Tar	nner Stage?	☐ No; ☐ Yes.	
	e: If extrapolating data from elextrapolation must be include				ific data supporting
	ere are additional indication cted. If there are no other i				
This	page was completed by:				
{See	appended electronic signatu	ıre page}			
Reg	ulatory Project Manager				
	QUESTIONS ON COMPLETER At 301-796-0700	TING THIS FORM	I CONTACT THE	PEDIATRIC AND MA	ATERNAL HEALTH
(Rev	rised: 4/2008)				

This is a representation of an electronic record that was signed electronically a	ınd
this page is the manifestation of the electronic signature.	

/s/

John David

11/6/2008 02:44:24 PM

1.3.3 Debarment Certification

CV Therapeutics, Inc., hereby certifies that it did not and will not use in any capacity the services of any person debarred under Section 306 of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act in connection with this application.

Carol D. Karp Senior Vice President Regulatory Affairs

Quality and Drug Safety

Date

ACTION PACKAGE CHECKLIST

	APPLICATI	ON I	NFORMATION ¹	
NDA# 21-526 BLA#	NDA Supplement # S-004 BLA STN #		If NDA, Efficacy Suppleme	ent Type: SE 1
Tablets		₹)	Applicant: CV Therapeutic Agent for Applicant (if appl	
RPM: John David	·····		Division: DCaRP	
NDAs: NDA Application Type Efficacy Supplement:	:	Liste	b)(2) Original NDAs and 505(d) drug(s) referred to in 505(b) /ANDA #(s) and drug name(s)	(2) application (include
of whether the original Consult page 1 of the N	ither a (b)(1) or a (b)(2) regardless NDA was a (b)(1) or a (b)(2). IDA Regulatory Filing Review for endix A to this Action Package		ide a brief explanation of how I drug.	this product is different from the
		☐ I	f no listed drug, check here ar	nd explain:
		prov check exclu notif	ided in Appendix B to the R king the Orange Book for an usivity. If there are any chan by the OND ADRA immedia the Regulatory Filing Revie	
			☐ No changes ☐ Date of check:	Updated
		infor whet from	ther pediatric information nation to the labeling of this drug.	e listed drug changed, determine eeds to be added to or deleted
			he day of approval, check the nts or pediatric exclusivity.	ne Orange Book again for any new
 User Fee Goal Dat Action Goal Date (7/27/08
❖ Actions				
Proposed	action			
Previous :	actions (specify type and date for each	h actio	n taken)	⊠ None
	ovals only) ed approval (21 CFR 314.510/601.41) ewed (indicate dates of reviews)), adver	rtising MUST have been	Requested in AP letter Received and reviewed

Version: 5/29/08

¹ The **Application Information** section is (only) a checklist. The **Contents of Action Package** section (beginning on page 5) lists the documents to be included in the Action Package.

*	Application ² Characteristics	
	Review priority: Standard Priority Chemical classification (new NDAs only):	
	☐ Fast Track ☐ Rx-to-OTC full switch ☐ Rolling Review ☐ Rx-to-OTC partial switch ☐ Orphan drug designation ☐ Direct-to-OTC	
	Restricted distribution (21 CFR 314.520) Subpart I Subpart H	rated approval (21 CFR 601.41) sted distribution (21 CFR 601.42) val based on animal studies
	☐ Submitted in response to a PMR ☐ Submitted in response to a PMC	
	Comments:	
*	Application Integrity Policy (AIP) http://www.fda.gov/ora/compliance_ref/aip_page.html	
	Applicant is on the AIP	☐ Yes ⊠ No
	This application is on the AIP	☐ Yes ⊠ No
	 If yes, exception for review granted (file Center Director's memo in Administrative/Regulatory Documents section, with Administrative Reviews) 	☐ Yes
	 If yes, OC clearance for approval (file communication in Administrative/Regulatory Documents section with Administrative Reviews) 	Yes Not an AP action
*	Date reviewed by PeRC (required for approvals only) If PeRC review not necessary, explain:	7/9/08
*	BLAs only: RMS-BLA Product Information Sheet for TBP has been completed and forwarded to OBPS/DRM (approvals only)	Yes, date
*	BLAs only: is the product subject to official FDA lot release per 21 CFR 610.2 (approvals only)	☐ Yes ☐ No
*	Public communications (approvals only)	
	Office of Executive Programs (OEP) liaison has been notified of action	☐ Yes ⊠ No
	Press Office notified of action	☐ Yes ☒ No
	Indicate what types (if any) of information dissemination are anticipated	None HHS Press Release FDA Talk Paper CDER Q&As Other

Version: 5/29/08

² All questions in all sections pertain to the pending application, i.e., if the pending application is an NDA or BLA supplement, then the questions should be answered in relation to that supplement, not in relation to the original NDA or BLA. For example, if the application is a pending BLA supplement, then a new RMS-BLA Product Information Sheet for TBP must be completed.

*	Exclusiv	ity	
	•	Is approval of this application blocked by any type of exclusivity?	⊠ No ☐ Yes
		• NDAs and BLAs: Is there existing orphan drug exclusivity for the "same" drug or biologic for the proposed indication(s)? Refer to 21 CFR 316.3(b)(13) for the definition of "same drug" for an orphan drug (i.e., active moiety). This definition is NOT the same as that used for NDA chemical classification.	☐ No ☐ Yes If, yes, NDA/BLA # and date exclusivity expires:
		• (b)(2) NDAs only: Is there remaining 5-year exclusivity that would bar effective approval of a 505(b)(2) application)? (Note that, even if exclusivity remains, the application may be tentatively approved if it is otherwise ready for approval.)	☐ No ☐ Yes If yes, NDA # and date exclusivity expires:
		• (b)(2) NDAs only: Is there remaining 3-year exclusivity that would bar effective approval of a 505(b)(2) application? (Note that, even if exclusivity remains, the application may be tentatively approved if it is otherwise ready for approval.)	☐ No ☐ Yes If yes, NDA # and date exclusivity expires:
		• (b)(2) NDAs only: Is there remaining 6-month pediatric exclusivity that would bar effective approval of a 505(b)(2) application? (Note that, even if exclusivity remains, the application may be tentatively approved if it is otherwise ready for approval.)	☐ No ☐ Yes If yes, NDA # and date exclusivity expires:
	,	• NDAs only: Is this a single enantiomer that falls under the 10-year approval limitation of 505(u)? (Note that, even if the 10-year approval limitation period has not expired, the application may be tentatively approved if it is otherwise ready for approval.)	☐ No ☐ Yes If yes, NDA # and date 10- year limitation expires:
*	Patent In	formation (NDAs only)	
		Patent Information: Verify that form FDA-3542a was submitted for patents that claim the drug for which approval is sought. If the drug is an old antibiotic, skip the Patent Certification questions.	✓ Verified✓ Not applicable because drug is an old antibiotic.
		Patent Certification [505(b)(2) applications]: Verify that a certification was submitted for each patent for the listed drug(s) in the Orange Book and identify the type of certification submitted for each patent.	21 CFR 314.50(i)(1)(<i>i</i>)(A) Verified 21 CFR 314.50(i)(1) (ii) (iii)
		[505(b)(2) applications] If the application includes a paragraph III certification, it cannot be approved until the date that the patent to which the certification pertains expires (but may be tentatively approved if it is otherwise ready for approval).	No paragraph III certification Date patent will expire
		[505(b)(2) applications] For each paragraph IV certification, verify that the applicant notified the NDA holder and patent owner(s) of its certification that the patent(s) is invalid, unenforceable, or will not be infringed (review documentation of notification by applicant and documentation of receipt of notice by patent owner and NDA holder). (If the application does not include any paragraph IV certifications, mark "N/A" and skip to the next section below (Summary Reviews)).	☐ N/A (no paragraph IV certification)☐ Verified
11			

[505(b)(2) applications] For each paragraph IV certification, based on the questions below, determine whether a 30-month stay of approval is in effect due to patent infringement litigation.		
Answer the following questions for each paragraph IV certification:		
(1) Have 45 days passed since the patent owner's receipt of the applicant's notice of certification?	Yes	□ No
(Note: The date that the patent owner received the applicant's notice of certification can be determined by checking the application. The applicant is required to amend its 505(b)(2) application to include documentation of this date (e.g., copy of return receipt or letter from recipient acknowledging its receipt of the notice) (see 21 CFR 314.52(e))).		·
If "Yes," skip to question (4) below. If "No," continue with question (2).		
(2) Has the patent owner (or NDA holder, if it is an exclusive patent licensee) submitted a written waiver of its right to file a legal action for patent infringement after receiving the applicant's notice of certification, as provided for by 21 CFR 314.107(f)(3)?	Yes	□ No
If "Yes," there is no stay of approval based on this certification. Analyze the next paragraph IV certification in the application, if any. If there are no other paragraph IV certifications, skip the rest of the patent questions.		
If "No," continue with question (3).		
(3) Has the patent owner, its representative, or the exclusive patent licensee filed a lawsuit for patent infringement against the applicant?	Yes	☐ No
(Note: This can be determined by confirming whether the Division has received a written notice from the (b)(2) applicant (or the patent owner or its representative) stating that a legal action was filed within 45 days of receipt of its notice of certification. The applicant is required to notify the Division in writing whenever an action has been filed within this 45-day period (see 21 CFR 314.107(f)(2))).		
If "No," the patent owner (or NDA holder, if it is an exclusive patent licensee) has until the expiration of the 45-day period described in question (1) to waive its right to bring a patent infringement action or to bring such an action. After the 45-day period expires, continue with question (4) below.		
(4) Did the patent owner (or NDA holder, if it is an exclusive patent licensee) submit a written waiver of its right to file a legal action for patent infringement within the 45-day period described in question (1), as provided for by 21 CFR 314.107(f)(3)?	Yes	□ No
If "Yes," there is no stay of approval based on this certification. Analyze the next paragraph IV certification in the application, if any. If there are no other paragraph IV certifications, skip to the next section below (Summary Reviews).		
If "No," continue with question (5).		

	(5) Did the patent owner, its representative, or the exclusive patent licensee bring suit against the (b)(2) applicant for patent infringement within 45 days of the patent owner's receipt of the applicant's notice of certification?(Note: This can be determined by confirming whether the Division has	Yes No
	received a written notice from the (b)(2) applicant (or the patent owner or its representative) stating that a legal action was filed within 45 days of receipt of its notice of certification. The applicant is required to notify the Division in writing whenever an action has been filed within this 45-day period (see 21 CFR 314.107(f)(2)). If no written notice appears in the NDA file, confirm with the applicant whether a lawsuit was commenced within the 45-day period).	
	If "No," there is no stay of approval based on this certification. Analyze the next paragraph IV certification in the application, if any. If there are no other paragraph IV certifications, skip to the next section below (Summary Reviews).	
ŧ	If "Yes," a stay of approval may be in effect. To determine if a 30-month stay is in effect, consult with the OND ADRA and attach a summary of the response.	
	CONTENTS OF ACTION PACKAGE	
*	Copy of this Action Package Checklist ³	11/6/08
	Officer/Employee List	
	UTILCET/Employee List	
*	List of officers/employees who participated in the decision to approve this application and consented to be identified on this list (approvals only)	
*	List of officers/employees who participated in the decision to approve this application and	☑ Included☑ Included
♦	List of officers/employees who participated in the decision to approve this application and consented to be identified on this list (approvals only)	
*	List of officers/employees who participated in the decision to approve this application and consented to be identified on this list (approvals only) Documentation of consent/nonconsent by officers/employees	
	List of officers/employees who participated in the decision to approve this application and consented to be identified on this list (approvals only) Documentation of consent/nonconsent by officers/employees Action Letters	Action(s) and date(s) Approved
	List of officers/employees who participated in the decision to approve this application and consented to be identified on this list (approvals only) Documentation of consent/nonconsent by officers/employees Action Letters Copies of all action letters (including approval letter with final labeling)	Action(s) and date(s) Approved
	List of officers/employees who participated in the decision to approve this application and consented to be identified on this list (approvals only) Documentation of consent/nonconsent by officers/employees Action Letters Copies of all action letters (including approval letter with final labeling) Labeling Package Insert (write submission/communication date at upper right of first page of PI) Most recent division-proposed labeling (only if generated after latest applicant	Action(s) and date(s) Approved
	List of officers/employees who participated in the decision to approve this application and consented to be identified on this list (approvals only) Documentation of consent/nonconsent by officers/employees Action Letters Copies of all action letters (including approval letter with final labeling) Labeling Package Insert (write submission/communication date at upper right of first page of PI)	Action(s) and date(s) Approved 11/5/08
	List of officers/employees who participated in the decision to approve this application and consented to be identified on this list (approvals only) Documentation of consent/nonconsent by officers/employees Action Letters Copies of all action letters (including approval letter with final labeling) Labeling Package Insert (write submission/communication date at upper right of first page of PI) Most recent division-proposed labeling (only if generated after latest applicant submission of labeling) Most recent submitted by applicant labeling (only if subsequent division labeling	Action(s) and date(s) Approved 11/5/08
	List of officers/employees who participated in the decision to approve this application and consented to be identified on this list (approvals only) Documentation of consent/nonconsent by officers/employees Action Letters Copies of all action letters (including approval letter with final labeling) Labeling Package Insert (write submission/communication date at upper right of first page of PI) Most recent division-proposed labeling (only if generated after latest applicant submission of labeling) Most recent submitted by applicant labeling (only if subsequent division labeling does not show applicant version)	Action(s) and date(s) Approved 11/5/08 11/4/08 11/3/04
	List of officers/employees who participated in the decision to approve this application and consented to be identified on this list (approvals only) Documentation of consent/nonconsent by officers/employees Action Letters Copies of all action letters (including approval letter with final labeling) Labeling Package Insert (write submission/communication date at upper right of first page of PI) Most recent division-proposed labeling (only if generated after latest applicant submission of labeling) Most recent submitted by applicant labeling (only if subsequent division labeling does not show applicant version) Original applicant-proposed labeling	Action(s) and date(s) Approved 11/5/08 11/4/08 11/3/04 9/27/07

³ Fill in blanks with dates of reviews, letters, etc. Version: 5/29/08

	Most recent submitted by applicant labeling (only if subsequent division labeling does not show applicant version)	11/3/08
	❖ Original applicant-proposed labeling	9/27/08
	 Other relevant labeling (e.g., most recent 3 in class, class labeling), if applicable 	previously approved label
*	Labels (full color carton and immediate-container labels) (write submission/communication date at upper right of first page of each submission)	
	Most-recent division proposal for (only if generated after latest applicant submission)	N/A
	 Most recent applicant-proposed labeling 	N/A
*	Labeling reviews (indicate dates of reviews and meetings)	 ☑ RPM ☐ DMEDP ☐ DRISK ☑ DDMAC 3/10/08 ☐ CSS ☑ Other reviews SEALD 6/12/08, 11/3/08
	Administrative / Regulatory Documents	
*	Administrative Reviews (e.g., RPM Filing Review ⁴ /Memo of Filing Meeting) (indicate date of each review)	11/6/08
*	NDAs only: Exclusivity Summary (signed by Division Director)	⊠ Included
*	AIP-related documents	☑ Not on AIP
*	Pediatric Page (approvals only, must be reviewed by PERC before finalized)	
*	Debarment certification (original applications only): verified that qualifying language was not used in certification and that certifications from foreign applicants are cosigned by U.S. agent (include certification)	○ Verified, statement is acceptable
*	Postmarketing Requirement (PMR) Studies	⊠ None
	Outgoing communications (if located elsewhere in package, state where located)	
	Incoming submissions/communications	
*	Postmarketing Commitment (PMC) Studies	⊠ None
	 Outgoing Agency request for postmarketing commitments (if located elsewhere in package, state where located) 	
	Incoming submission documenting commitment	
*	Outgoing communications (letters (except previous action letters), emails, faxes, telecons)	6/23/08, 12/3/07, 11/29/07, 10/25/07
*	Internal memoranda, telecons, etc.	
*	Minutes of Meetings	
	Pre-Approval Safety Conference (indicate date; approvals only)	Not applicable
	Regulatory Briefing (indicate date)	No mtg
<u></u>	Pre-NDA/BLA meeting (indicate date)	☐ No mtg 6/27/07
	EOP2 meeting (indicate date)	No mtg ■ No mtg

⁴ Filing reviews for other disciplines should be filed behind the discipline tab. Version: 5/29/08

	• Other (e.g., EOP2a, CMC pilot programs)	SPA 7/24/04
❖ A	dvisory Committee Meeting(s)	☑ No AC meeting
	Date(s) of Meeting(s)	
	48-hour alert or minutes, if available	
	Decisional and Summary Memos	
* O	office Director Decisional Memo (indicate date for each review)	⊠ None
D	vivision Director Summary Review (indicate date for each review)	☐ None 11/3/08, 7/21/08
C	ross-Discipline Team Leader Review (indicate date for each review)	☐ None 7/21/08
	Clinical Information ⁵	
* C	linical Reviews	
	Clinical Team Leader Review(s) (indicate date for each review)	10/23/08, 7/21/08
	Clinical review(s) (indicate date for each review)	10/20/08 (2), 9/26/08 (2), 9/24/08 (2), 9/22/08, 4/21/08
	• Social scientist review(s) (if OTC drug) (indicate date for each review)	⊠ None
❖ S	afety update review(s) (indicate location/date if incorporated into another review)	N/A
	inancial Disclosure reviews(s) or location/date if addressed in another review OR	6/6/08
I	f no financial disclosure information was required, review/memo explaining why not	
	linical reviews from other clinical areas/divisions/Centers (indicate date of each review)	None
	ontrolled Substance Staff review(s) and Scheduling Recommendation (indicate date of ach review)	Not needed Not needed
❖ R	 EMS REMS Document and Supporting Statement (indicate date(s) of submission(s)) Review(s) and recommendations (including those by OSE and CSS) (indicate location/date if incorporated into another review) 	⊠ None
♦ D	SI Inspection Review Summary(ies) (include copies of DSI letters to investigators)	None requested None
	Clinical Studies	
	Bioequivalence Studies	a deliteratura kun ang period di interiod an ang period di interiod and ang period di interiod and ang period di interiod and and ang period and an ang period and ang period and an ang period and an ang period and an ang period
	Clinical Pharmacology Studies	
	Clinical Microbiology None	
* C	linical Microbiology Team Leader Review(s) (indicate date for each review)	None Non
C	linical Microbiology Review(s) (indicate date for each review)	None Non
.	Biostatistics None	
❖ S	tatistical Division Director Review(s) (indicate date for each review)	None None None None None
S	tatistical Team Leader Review(s) (indicate date for each review)	None None
S	tatistical Review(s) (indicate date for each review)	☐ None 4/21/08
	Clinical Pharmacology None	

 $^{^{5}}$ Filing reviews should be filed with the discipline reviews. Version: 5/29/08

		None None
	Clinical Pharmacology Team Leader Review(s) (indicate date for each review)	None Non
	Clinical Pharmacology review(s) (indicate date for each review)	☐ None 5/28/08
*	DSI Clinical Pharmacology Inspection Review Summary	☐ None N/A
	Nonclinical None	
*	Pharmacology/Toxicology Discipline Reviews	
	ADP/T Review(s) (indicate date for each review)	⊠ None
i	Supervisory Review(s) (indicate date for each review)	None Non
	 Pharm/tox review(s), including referenced IND reviews (indicate date for each review) 	⊠ None
*	Review(s) by other disciplines/divisions/Centers requested by P/T reviewer (indicate date for each review)	⊠ None
*	Statistical review(s) of carcinogenicity studies (indicate date for each review)	No carc
*	ECAC/CAC report/memo of meeting	None Included in P/T review, page
*	DSI Nonclinical Inspection Review Summary	None requested None requested
	CMC/Quality None	
*	CMC/Quality Discipline Reviews	
	ONDQA/OBP Division Director Review(s) (indicate date for each review)	⊠ None
1	Branch Chief/TeamLeader Review(s) (indicate date for each review)	⊠ None
	CMC/product quality review(s) (indicate date for each review)	☐ None 6/25/08
	BLAs only: Facility information review(s) (indicate dates)	⊠ None
*	 Microbiology Reviews NDAs: Microbiology reviews (sterility & pyrogenicity) (indicate date of each review) BLAs: Sterility assurance, product quality microbiology 	Not needed Not needed
*	Reviews by other disciplines/divisions/Centers requested by CMC/quality reviewer (indicate date for each review)	⊠ None
*	Environmental Assessment (check one) (original and supplemental applications)	
	Categorical Exclusion (indicate review date)(all original applications and all efficacy supplements that could increase the patient population)	
	Review & FONSI (indicate date of review)	
	Review & Environmental Impact Statement (indicate date of each review)	6/25/08
*	Facilities Review/Inspection	
	• NDAs: Facilities inspections (include EER printout) (date completed must be within 2 years of action date)	Date completed: Acceptable Withhold recommendation
	 BLAs: TBP-EER Compliance Status Check (approvals only, both original and all 	Date completed: Acceptable Withhold recommendation Date completed:

NDA/BLA	#
Page 0	

	supplemental applications except CBEs) (date completed must be within 60 days prior to AP)	Requested Accepted Hold
*	NDAs: Methods Validation	☐ Completed ☐ Requested ☐ Not yet requested ☐ Not needed

Version: 5/29/08

Appendix A to Action Package Checklist

An NDA or NDA supplemental application is likely to be a 505(b)(2) application if:

- (1) It relies on published literature to meet any of the approval requirements, and the applicant does not have a written right of reference to the underlying data. If published literature is cited in the NDA but is not necessary for approval, the inclusion of such literature will not, in itself, make the application a 505(b)(2) application.
- (2) **Or** it relies for approval on the Agency's previous findings of safety and efficacy for a listed drug product and the applicant does not own or have right to reference the data supporting that approval.
- (3) **Or** it relies on what is "generally known" or "scientifically accepted" about a class of products to support the safety or effectiveness of the particular drug for which the applicant is seeking approval. (Note, however, that this does not mean *any* reference to general information or knowledge (e.g., about disease etiology, support for particular endpoints, methods of analysis) causes the application to be a 505(b)(2) application.)

Types of products for which 505(b)(2) applications are likely to be submitted include: fixed-dose combination drug products (e.g., heart drug and diuretic (hydrochlorothiazide) combinations); OTC monograph deviations(see 21 CFR 330.11); new dosage forms; new indications; and, new salts.

An efficacy supplement can be either a (b)(1) or a (b)(2) regardless of whether the original NDA was a (b)(1) or a (b)(2).

An efficacy supplement is a 505(b)(1) supplement if the supplement contains all of the information needed to support the approval of the change proposed in the supplement. For example, if the supplemental application is for a new indication, the supplement is a 505(b)(1) if:

- (1) The applicant has conducted its own studies to support the new indication (or otherwise owns or has right of reference to the data/studies).
- (2) And no additional information beyond what is included in the supplement or was embodied in the finding of safety and effectiveness for the original application or previously approved supplements is needed to support the change. For example, this would likely be the case with respect to safety considerations if the dose(s) was/were the same as (or lower than) the original application.
- (3) **And** all other "criteria" are met (e.g., the applicant owns or has right of reference to the data relied upon for approval of the supplement, the application does not rely for approval on published literature based on data to which the applicant does not have a right of reference).

An efficacy supplement is a 505(b)(2) supplement if:

- (1) Approval of the change proposed in the supplemental application would require data beyond that needed to support our previous finding of safety and efficacy in the approval of the original application (or earlier supplement), and the applicant has not conducted all of its own studies for approval of the change, or obtained a right to reference studies it does not own. For example, if the change were for a new indication AND a higher dose, we would likely require clinical efficacy data and preclinical safety data to approve the higher dose. If the applicant provided the effectiveness data, but had to rely on a different listed drug, or a new aspect of a previously cited listed drug, to support the safety of the new dose, the supplement would be a 505(b)(2).
- (2) Or the applicant relies for approval of the supplement on published literature that is based on data that the applicant does not own or have a right to reference. If published literature is cited in the supplement but is not necessary for approval, the inclusion of such literature will not, in itself, make the supplement a 505(b)(2) supplement.
- (3) Or the applicant is relying upon any data they do not own or to which they do not have right of reference.

If you have questions about whether an application is a 505(b)(1) or 505(b)(2) application, consult with your ODE's ADRA.

This is a representation of an electronic record that was signed electronically and this page is the manifestation of the electronic signature.

/s/

John David 11/10/2008 10:47:39 AM



DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH & HUMAN SERVICES

Food and Drug Administration Rockville, MD 20857

NDA 21-526/S-004/(b) (4)

INFORMATION REQUEST LETTER

CV Therapeutics, Inc. Attention: Carol D. Karp Vice President, Regulatory Affairs 3172 Porter Drive Palo Alto, CA 94304

Dear Ms. Karp:

Please refer to your supplemental new drug application (NDA) dated September 27, 2007, received September 27, 2007, submitted under section 505(b)(1) of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act, for Ranexa (ranolazine) 500 and 1000 mg Extended-Release (ER) Tablets.

We are reviewing the Clinical section of your submission and have the following comments and information requests. We request a prompt written response in order to continue our evaluation of your NDA.

Please explain the Holter stop times and durations you submitted in the MERLIN04.XPT dataset in Serial 023.

We note that virtually all durations are an integer number of hours. You describe getting the start times from the CRFs but deriving the durations from the Holter recordings themselves and calculating the end time as the start time plus the duration. The Holters with which we are familiar record much more precisely, e.g., minute or second. Furthermore, we note that 1,825 (28%) of the recordings are exactly 168 hours (i.e., 7 days).

We examined Holter durations for patients who died in-hospital. Among them, the following two patients died the day of admission. We verified the Holter start time (hstart) and death time (dthtime) against the CRFs.

Note that your Holter durations exceed the times between Holter start and death by 6 days and 5 hours respectively.

NDA 21-526/S-004/ (b) Page 2 of 3

If you have any questions, please call Mr. John David, Regulatory Project Manager at (301) 796-1059.

Sincerely,

{See appended electronic signature page}

Norman Stockbridge, M.D., Ph.D. Director Division of Cardiovascular and Renal Products Office of Drug Evaluation I Center for Drug Evaluation and Research

This is a representation of an electronic record that was	signed electronically and
this page is the manifestation of the electronic signature).

/s/

Norman Stockbridge

6/23/2008 01:29:10 PM

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE FOOD AND DRUG ADMINISTRATION		R	REQUEST FOR	CONSU	LTATION	
TO (Office/Division): OPS Staff Attn: Raanan Bloom (301-796-2185) WO21 RM 3515			FROM (Name, Office/Division, and Phone Number of Requestor): Teshara G. Bouie, ONDQA, Division of Post-Marketing Assessment, 301-796-1649			
DATE MArch 13, 2008	IND NO.		NDA NO. NDA 21-526	TYPE OF DOCUMENT SE1-004		DATE OF DOCUMENT September 27, 2007
NAME OF DRUG Ranexa		PRIORITY	CONSIDERATION	CLASSIFICATION OF DR	RUG	DESIRED COMPLETION DATE June 1, 2008
NAME OF FIRM: CV Ther	ap					
			REASON FO	OR REQUEST		
			I. GEN	NERAL		
□ NEW PROTOCOL □ PRE-NDA MEETING □ PROGRESS REPORT □ END-OF-PHASE 2a MEE □ NEW CORRESPONDENCE □ END-OF-PHASE 2 MEE □ DRUG ADVERTISING □ RESUBMISSION □ ADVERSE REACTION REPORT □ SAFETY / EFFICACY □ MANUFACTURING CHANGE / ADDITION □ PAPER NDA □ MEETING PLANNED BY □ CONTROL SUPPLEMEN			TING			
			II. BION	METRICS		
☐ PRIORITY P NDA REVIEW ☐ END-OF-PHASE 2 MEETING ☐ CONTROLLED STUDIES ☐ PROTOCOL REVIEW ☐ OTHER (SPECIFY BELOW):			☐ CHEMISTRY REVIEW ☐ PHARMACOLOGY ☐ BIOPHARMACEUTICS ☐ OTHER (SPECIFY BELOW):			
			III. BIOPHAI	RMACEUTICS		
☐ DISSOLUTION ☐ BIOAVAILABILTY STUDIES ☐ PHASE 4 STUDIES			☐ DEFICIENCY LETTER RESPONSE ☐ PROTOCOL - BIOPHARMACEUTICS ☐ IN-VIVO WAIVER REQUEST			
			IV. DRUG	G SAFETY		
☐ PHASE 4 SURVEILLANCE/EPIDEMIOLOGY PROTOCOL ☐ DRUG USE, e.g., POPULATION EXPOSURE, ASSOCIATED DIAGNOSES ☐ CASE REPORTS OF SPECIFIC REACTIONS (List below) ☐ COMPARATIVE RISK ASSESSMENT ON GENERIC DRUG GROUP			☐ REVIEW OF MARKETING EXPERIENCE, DRUG USE AND SAFETY ☐ SUMMARY OF ADVERSE EXPERIENCE ☐ POISON RISK ANALYSIS			
V. SCIENTIFIC INVESTIGATIONS						
☐ CLINICAL				☐ NONCLINICAL		
COMMENTS / SPECIAL INS term treatment of chro						-line therapy for the long-R.
signature of requestor Teshara G. Bouie			METHOD OF DELIVERY (Check one) ☑ DFS ☐ EMAIL ☐ MAIL ☐ HAND			
PRINTED NAME AND SIGNATURE OF RECEIVER			PRINTED NAME AND SIGNATURE OF DELIVERER			

This is a representation of an electronic record that was signed electronical	ly and
this page is the manifestation of the electronic signature.	

Teshara Bouie 3/13/2008 09:46:15 AM

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH & HUMAN SERVICES

Food and Drug Administration Rockville, MD 20857

NDA 21-526 S-004/(b) (4)

CV Therapeutics, Inc. Attention: Carol D. Karp 3172 Porter Drive Palo Alto, CA 94304

Dear Ms. Karp:

Please refer to your supplemental new drug application(s) submitted under section 505(b) of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act for Ranexa (ranolazine) 500 and 1000 mg Extended-Release (ER) Tablets.

We also refer to your submission dated December 19, 2007, received December 20, 2007, containing a request for a waiver of the 4-month safety update.

We have considered your request and have granted a waiver for S-004/(b) (4)

If you have any questions, please call Mr. John David, Regulatory Health Project Manager, at (301) 796-1059.

Sincerely,

{See appended electronic signature page}

Norman Stockbridge, M.D., Ph.D. Director Division of Cardiovascular and Renal Products Office of Drug Evaluation I Center for Drug Evaluation and Research

This is a representation of an electronic record that was signed electronical	ly and
this page is the manifestation of the electronic signature.	

Norman Stockbridge 1/24/2008 04:17:21 PM



DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH & HUMAN SERVICES

Public Health Service

Food and Drug Administration Rockville, MD 20857

FILING COMMUNICATION

NDA 21-526/S-004

CV Therapeutics Attention: Carol D. Karp 3172 Porter Drive Palo Alto, CA 94304

Dear Ms. Karp:

Please refer to your supplemental new drug application (NDA) dated September 27, 2007, received September 27, 2007, submitted under section 505(b) of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act, for Ranexa (ranolazine) 500 and 1000 mg Extended-Release (ER) Tablets.

We also refer to your submissions dated October 18, 23 and November 26, 2007.

We have completed our filing review and have determined that your application is sufficiently complete to permit a substantive review. Therefore, this application is considered filed 60 days after the date we received your application in accordance with 21 CFR 314.101(a). The review classification for this application is **Standard**. Therefore, the user fee goal date is July 27, 2008.

In your cover letter for this submission, you cite 4 reasons for considering this application for Priority review. The first was that the results presented reduce a treatment-limiting safety concern. This echoes and references MaPP 6020.3, but wholly out of context. The reference in 6020.3 appears as an illustration of how a new therapy might represent a significant advance over existing therapeutic alternatives, not that this specific product might be less unsafe than previously feared.

We also request that you submit the following information:

CVT 3119

Please provide a full study report.

CVT 3032

Please summarize the plasma concentration data ordered for dose and time of measurement and provide appropriate plots and descriptive statistics.

CVT 3114

- 1. The report does not indicate whether the reader of the echo-cardiograms was blinded.
- 2. A plot of the Fridericia corrected QTc on RR (in the absence of drug) could not be found.

NDA 21-526/S-004 Page 2 of 3

3. The description about the hierarchy of the leads used to determine QT and RR intervals is not clear. Was Lead II used as default to determine QT and Leads V5 or V3 only when the QT interval could not be determined from Lead II or was QT determined as the average from Leads II, V5 and V3?

We are providing the above comments to give you preliminary notice of <u>potential</u> review issues. Our filing review is only a preliminary evaluation of the application and is not indicative of deficiencies that may be identified during our review. Issues may be added, deleted, expanded upon, or modified as we review the application.

Please respond only to the above requests for additional information. While we anticipate that any response submitted in a timely manner will be reviewed during this review cycle, such review decisions will be made on a case-by-case basis at the time of receipt of the submission.

If you have any questions, please call Mr. John David, Regulatory Project Manager at (301) 796-1059.

Sincerely,

{See appended electronic signature page}

Norman Stockbridge, M.D., Ph.D. Director Division of Cardiovascular and Renal Products Office of Drug Evaluation I Center for Drug Evaluation and Research

This is a representation of an el	ectronic record that was	signed electronically and
this page is the manifestation o	f the electronic signature	e. •

Norman Stockbridge

Norman Stockbridge 12/3/2007 04:56:15 PM

REQUEST FOR CONSULTATION

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES
PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE
FOOD AND DRUG ADM NISTRATION

TO (Division/Office): Office of Surveillance and Epidemiology (OSE) Attention: Darrell Jenkins, RPM		FROM: CDR John David			
DATE 12/3/07	IND NO.	NDA NO. 21-526. S-004 (b) (4)	TYPE OF DOCUMENT NDA Supplement (b) (4)	DATE OF DOCUMENT 9/27/07	
NAME OF DRUG Ranexa (ranolazine)		PRIORITY CONSIDERATION Standard	CLASSIFICATION OF DRUG	DESIRED COMPLETION DATE 3/3/08	
NAME OF FIRM: CV Therape	utics				
		REASON FOR R	REQUEST		
		I. GENER	AL		
 □ NEW PROTOCOL □ PROGRESS REPORT □ NEW CORRESPONDENCE □ DRUG ADVERTISING □ ADVERSE REACTION REPORT □ MANUFACTURING CHANGE/AI □ MEETING PLANNED BY 		☐ PRENDA MEETING ☐ END OF PHASE II MEETING ☐ RESUBMISSION ☐ SAFETY/EFFICACY ☐ PAPER NDA ☐ CONTROL SUPPLEMENT	☐ FINAL PRINTE☐ LABELING RE	:Vision W Correspondence 'E review	
		II. BIOMETI	RICS		
STATISTICAL EVALUATION BRAN	СН		STATISTICAL APPLICATION BRANCH		
☐ TYPE A OR B NDA REVIEW ☐ END OF PHASE II MEETING ☐ CONTROLLED STUDIES ☐ PROTOCOL REVIEW ☐ OTHER (SPECIFY BELOW):			☐ CHEMISTRY REVIEW ☐ PHARMACOLOGY ☐ BIOPHARMACEUTICS ☐ OTHER (SPECIFY BELOW):		
		III. BIOPHARMA	CEUTICS		
☐ DISSOLUTION ☐ BIOAVAILABILTY STUDIES ☐ PHASE IV STUDIES			☐ DEFICIENCY LETTER RESPONSE☐ PROTOCOL-BIOPHARMACEUTICS☐ IN-VIVO WAIVER REQUEST		
		IV. DRUG EXPE	ERIENCE		
 □ PHASE IV SURVEILLANCE/EPIDEMIOLOGY PROTOCOL □ DRUG USE e.g. POPULATION EXPOSURE, ASSOCIATED DIAGNOSES □ CASE REPORTS OF SPECIFIC REACTIONS (List below) □ COMPARATIVE RISK ASSESSMENT ON GENERIC DRUG GROUP 			☐ REVIEW OF MARKETING EXPERIENCE, DRUG USE AND SAFETY ☐ SUMMARY OF ADVERSE EXPERIENCE ☐ POISON RISK ANALYSIS		
V. SCIENTIFIC INVESTIGATIONS					
☐ CLINICAL			□ PRECLINICAL		
COMMENTS/SPECIAL INSTRUCTIONS: Please review the tradename & labeling for NDA 21-526 Ranexa (ranolazine) 500 and 1000 mg Extended-Release (ER) Tablets and provide comments. This first-line therapy for the long-term treatment of chronic angina. This submission is located in the EDR. Thank you!					
SIGNATURE OF REQUESTER CDR John David			METHOD OF DELIVERY (Check one) X EMAIL	□ HAND	
SIGNATURE OF RECEIVER			SIGNATURE OF DELIVERER		

This is a representation of an electronic record that was signed electronically a	ınd
this page is the manifestation of the electronic signature.	

John David

12/3/2007 08:21:29 AM

REQUEST FOR CONSULTATION

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES
PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE
FOOD AND DRUG ADM NISTRATION

FOOD AND DRUG ADM	NISTRATION				
TO (Division/Office): Lisa Hubbard, RPh, Regulatory Review Officer, Division of DrugMarketing, Advertising, and Communication (DDMAC)			FROM: CDR John David		
DATE 12/3/07	IND NO.	NDA NO. 21-526. S-004 (b) (4)	TYPE OF DOCUMENT DDMAC Consult	DATE OF DOCUMENT 9/27/07	
NAME OF DRUG Ranexa (ranolazine)		PRIORITY CONSIDERATION Standard	CLASSIFICATION OF DRUG	DESIRED COMPLETION DATE 3/3/08	
NAME OF FIRM: United Therapeutic	S				
		REASON FOR F	REQUEST		
		I. GENER	AL		
□ NEW PROTOCOL □ PRENDA MEETING □ PROGRESS REPORT □ END OF PHASE II MEETING □ NEW CORRESPONDENCE □ RESUBMISSION □ DRUG ADVERTISING □ SAFETY/EFFICACY □ ADVERSE REACTION REPORT □ PAPER NDA □ MANUFACTURING CHANGE/ADDITION □ CONTROL SUPPLEMENT □ MEETING PLANNED BY			☐ RESPONSE TO DEFICIENCY LETTER ☐ FINAL PRINTED LABELING ☐ LABELING REVISION ☐ ORIGINAL NEW CORRESPONDENCE ☐ FORMULATIVE REVIEW X OTHER (SPECIFY BELOW):		
		II. BIOMET	RICS		
STATISTICAL EVALUATION BRANCH			STATISTICAL APPLICATION BRANCH		
☐ TYPE A OR B NDA REVIEW ☐ END OF PHASE II MEETING ☐ CONTROLLED STUDIES ☐ PROTOCOL REVIEW ☐ OTHER (SPECIFY BELOW):			☐ CHEMISTRY REVIEW ☐ PHARMACOLOGY ☐ BIOPHARMACEUTICS ☐ OTHER (SPECIFY BELOW):		
•		III. BIOPHARMA	CEUTICS		
☐ DISSOLUTION ☐ BIOAVAILABILTY STUDIES ☐ PHASE IV STUDIES			□ DEFICIENCY LETTER RESPONSE□ PROTOCOL-BIOPHARMACEUTICS□ IN-VIVO WAIVER REQUEST		
		IV. DRUG EXPI	ERIENCE		
☐ PHASE IV SURVEILLANCE/EPIDEMIOLOGY PROTOCOL ☐ DRUG USE e.g. POPULATION EXPOSURE, ASSOCIATED DIAGNOSES ☐ CASE REPORTS OF SPECIFIC REACTIONS (List below) ☐ COMPARATIVE RISK ASSESSMENT ON GENERIC DRUG GROUP			☐ REVIEW OF MARKETING EXPERIENCE, DRUG USE AND SAFETY ☐ SUMMARY OF ADVERSE EXPERIENCE ☐ POISON RISK ANALYSIS		
V. SCIENTIFIC INVESTIGATIONS					
X CLINICAL			□ PRECLINICAL		
COMMENTS/SPECIAL INSTRUCTIONS: Please review the labeling for NDA 21-526 Ranexa (ranolazine) 500 and 1000 mg Extended-Release (ER) Tablets and provide comments. This was submitted on 9/27/07. 1) S-004: first-line therapy for the long-term treatment of chronic angina.				7. 1) S-004 : first-line	
SIGNATURE OF REQUESTER CDR John David			METHOD OF DELIVERY (Check one) X EMAIL	□ HAND	
SIGNATURE OF RECEIVER			SIGNATURE OF DELIVERER		

This is a representation of an electronic record that was signed electronically a	ınd
this page is the manifestation of the electronic signature.	

/s/ _____

John David 12/3/2007 08:10:49 AM



Public Health Service

Food and Drug Administration Rockville, MD 20857

NDA 21-526/S-004

PRIOR APPROVAL SUPPLEMENT

CV Therapeutics, Inc. Attention: Carol D. Karp Senior Vice President Regulatory Affairs Quality and Drug Safety 3172 Porter Drive Palo Alto, CA 94304

Dear Ms. Karp:

We have received your supplemental new drug application submitted under section 505(b) of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act for the following:

Name of Drug Product: Ranexa® (ranolazine) Extended-release Tablets

NDA Number: 21-526

Supplement number: S-004

Date of supplement: September 27, 2007

Date of receipt: September 27, 2007

This supplemental application proposes to expand the indication of Ranexa to first-line therapy for the long-term treatment of chronic angina.

Unless we notify you within 60 days of the receipt date that the application is not sufficiently complete to permit a substantive review, we will file the application on November 26, 2007 in accordance with 21 CFR 314.101(a).

Please cite the application number listed above at the top of the first page of all submissions to this application. Send all submissions, electronic or paper, including those sent by overnight mail or courier, to the following address:

NDA 21-526/S-004 Page 2

> Food and Drug Administration Center for Drug Evaluation and Research Division of Cardiovascular and Renal Products 5901-B Ammendale Road Beltsville, MD 20705-1266

If you have any questions, please contact:

Mr. John David Regulatory Project Manager (301)796-1059

Sincerely,

{See appended electronic signature page}

Edward Fromm
Chief, Project Management Staff
Division of Cardiovascular and Renal Products
Office of Drug Evaluation I
Center for Drug Evaluation and Research

This is a representation of an electronic record that was signed electronically ar	nd
this page is the manifestation of the electronic signature.	

Edward Fromm

10/25/2007 02:13:22 PM