NDA REGULATORY FILING REVIEW
(Including Memo of Filing Meeting)

NDA # 21-918 Supplement # NA Efficacy Supplement Type SE-

Proprietary Name: CETRAXAL
Established Name: Ciprofloxacin otic solution
Strengths: 0.2%

Applicant: SALVAT, S.A.
Agent for Applicant (if applicable): Anson Group

Date of Application: June 9, 2005
Date of Receipt: June 9, 2005
Date clock started after UN: NA
Date of Filing Meeting: August 1, 2005
Filing Date: August 8, 2005
Resubmission Date: October 31, 2008
Action Goal Date (optional): April 30, 2009 User Fee Goal Date: May 1, 2009
AE Action Date: April 6, 2006

Indication requested: Acute otitis externa

Type of Original NDA: (b)(1) ☐ (b)(2) X
AND (if applicable)
Type of Supplement: (b)(1) ☐ (b)(2) ☐

NOTE:
(1) If you have questions about whether the application is a 505(b)(1) or 505(b)(2) application, see Appendix A. A 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). If the application or efficacy supplement is a (b)(2), complete Appendix B.

Review Classification: S X P ☐
Resubmission after withdrawal? ☐ Resubmission after refuse to file? ☐
Chemical Classification: (1,2,3 etc.) 3
Other (orphan, OTC, etc.)

Form 3397 (User Fee Cover Sheet) submitted: YES X NO ☐

User Fee Status: Paid ☐ Exempt (orphan, government) ☐
Waived (e.g., small business, public health) X

NOTE: *If the NDA is a 505(b)(2) application, and the applicant did not pay a fee in reliance on the 505(b)(2) exemption (see box 7 on the User Fee Cover Sheet), confirm that a user fee is not required by contacting the User Fee staff in the Office of Regulatory Policy. The applicant is required to pay a user fee if: (1) the product described in the 505(b)(2) application is a new molecular entity or (2) the applicant claims a new indication for a use that that has not been approved under section 505(b). Examples of a new indication for a use include a new indication, a new dosing regime, a new patient population, and an Rx-to-OTC switch. The best way to determine if the applicant is claiming a new indication for a use is to compare the applicant's proposed labeling to labeling that has already been approved for the product described in the application.*

Highlight the differences between the proposed and approved labeling. If you need assistance in determining if the applicant is claiming a new indication for a use, please contact the User Fee staff.

- Is there any 5-year or 3-year exclusivity on this active moiety in any approved (b)(1) or (b)(2) application? YES ☐ NO X
  If yes, explain:

Note: If the drug under review is a 505(b)(2), this issue will be addressed in detail in appendix B.

- Does another drug have orphan drug exclusivity for the same indication? YES ☐ NO X

- If yes, is the drug considered to be the same drug according to the orphan drug definition of sameness [21 CFR 316.3(b)(13)]? YES ☐ NO ☐

  If yes, consult the Director, Division of Regulatory Policy II, Office of Regulatory Policy (HFD-007).

- Is the application affected by the Application Integrity Policy (AIP)? YES ☐ NO X
  If yes, explain:

- If yes, has OC/DMPQ been notified of the submission? YES ☐ NO ☐

- Does the submission contain an accurate comprehensive index? YES X NO ☐
  If no, explain:

- Was form 356h included with an authorized signature? YES X NO ☐
  If foreign applicant, both the applicant and the U.S. agent must sign.

- Submission complete as required under 21 CFR 314.50? YES X NO ☐
  If no, explain:

- Answer 1, 2, or 3 below (do not include electronic content of labeling as an partial electronic submission).

1. This application is a paper NDA YES X

2. This application is an eNDA or combined paper + eNDA YES ☐
   This application is: All electronic ☐ Combined paper + eNDA ☐
   This application is in: NDA format ☐ CTD format ☐
   Combined NDA and CTD formats ☐

   Does the eNDA, follow the guidance?
   (http://www.fda.gov/cder/guidance/2353fnl.pdf) YES ☐ NO ☐

   If an eNDA, all forms and certifications must be in paper and require a signature.

   If combined paper + eNDA, which parts of the application were submitted in electronic format?

   Additional comments:

3. This application is an eCTD NDA. YES ☐

If an eCTD NDA, all forms and certifications must either be in paper and signed or be electronically signed.

Additional comments:

- Patent information submitted on form FDA 3542a? YES X NO ☐
- Exclusivity requested? YES, 3 Years NO ☐
  NOTE: *An applicant can receive exclusivity without requesting it; therefore, requesting exclusivity is not required.*
- Correctly worded Debarment Certification included with authorized signature? YES X NO ☐
  If foreign applicant, both the applicant and the U.S. Agent must sign the certification.

  NOTE: *Debarment Certification should use wording in FD&C Act section 306(k)(1) i.e., "[Name of applicant] 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." Applicant may not use wording such as "To the best of my knowledge . . . ."*
- Are the required pediatric assessment studies and/or deferral/partial waiver/full waiver of pediatric studies (or request for deferral/partial waiver/full waiver of pediatric studies) included? YES X NO ☐
- If the submission contains a request for deferral, partial waiver, or full waiver of studies, does the application contain the certification required under FD&C Act sections 505B(a)(3)(B) and (4)(A) and (B)? YES X NO ☐
- Is this submission a partial or complete response to a pediatric Written Request? YES ☐ NO X

  If yes, contact PMHT in the OND-IO
- Financial Disclosure forms included with authorized signature? YES X NO ☐
  (Forms 3454 and/or 3455 must be included and must be signed by the APPLICANT, not an agent.)
  NOTE: *Financial disclosure is required for bioequivalence studies that are the basis for approval.*
- Field Copy Certification (that it is a true copy of the CMC technical section) YES X NO ☐
- PDUFA and Action Goal dates correct in tracking system? YES X NO ☐
  If not, have the document room staff correct them immediately. These are the dates EES uses for calculating inspection dates.
- Drug name and applicant name correct in COMIS? If not, have the Document Room make the corrections. Ask the Doc Rm to add the established name to COMIS for the supporting IND if it is not already entered.
- List referenced IND numbers: 67,173
- Are the trade, established/proper, and applicant names correct in COMIS? YES X NO ☐
  If no, have the Document Room make the corrections.
- End-of-Phase 2 Meeting(s)? Date(s) _____ NO X
  If yes, distribute minutes before filing meeting.

- Pre-NDA Meeting(s)? Date(s) 4/20/05 NO ☐
  If yes, distribute minutes before filing meeting.

- Any SPA agreements? Date(s) _____ NO X
  If yes, distribute letter and/or relevant minutes before filing meeting.

Project Management

- If Rx, was electronic Content of Labeling submitted in SPL format? YES X NO ☐
  If no, request in 74-day letter.

- If Rx, for all new NDAs/efficacy supplements submitted on or after 6/30/06:
  Was the PI submitted in PLR format? YES X NO ☐

  If no, explain. Was a waiver or deferral requested before the application was received or in the submission? If before, what is the status of the request:

- If Rx, all labeling (PI, PPI, MedGuide, carton and immediate container labels) has been consulted to DDMAC? YES X NO ☐

- If Rx, trade name (and all labeling) consulted to OSE/DMETS? YES X NO ☐

- If Rx, MedGuide and/or PPI (plus PI) consulted to ODE/DSRCS?
  N/A X YES ☐ NO ☐

- Risk Management Plan consulted to OSE/IO? N/A X YES ☐ NO ☐

- If a drug with abuse potential, was an Abuse Liability Assessment, including a proposal for scheduling submitted? NA X YES ☐ NO ☐

If Rx-to-OTC Switch or OTC application: NA

- Proprietary name, all OTC labeling/packaging, and current approved PI consulted to OSE/DMETS? YES ☐ NO ☐

- If the application was received by a clinical review division, has DNPCE been notified of the OTC switch application? Or, if received by DNPCE, has the clinical review division been notified? YES ☐ NO ☐

Clinical

- If a controlled substance, has a consult been sent to the Controlled Substance Staff? NA
  YES ☐ NO ☐

Chemistry

- Did applicant request categorical exclusion for environmental assessment? YES X NO ☐
  If no, did applicant submit a complete environmental assessment? YES ☐ NO ☐
  If EA submitted, consulted to EA officer, OPS? YES ☐ NO ☐

- Establishment Evaluation Request (EER) submitted to DMPQ? YES X NO ☐
- Consulted to Microbiology Team? YES X NO ☐

ATTACHMENT

MEMO OF FILING MEETING

DATE: August 23, 2005

NDA #: 21-918

DRUG NAMES: Cetraxal (ciprofloxacin otic solution), 0.2%

APPLICANT: SALVAT, S.A.

BACKGROUND: This NDA was submitted as a 505(b)(2) NDA on June 9, 2005. An approvable action was taken on April 6, 2006 because of concern regarding the vial design that it can be mistaken as an inhalation solution. The Sponsor resubmitted the application on October 31, 2008.

ATTENDEES: Janice Soreth, Susmita Samanta, Frederic marsik, Robert Osterberg, Daphne Lin, Chris Kadoorie, Venkateswar Jarugula, Jim Vidra, Charles, Bonapace, Peter Coderre, John Alexander, Amy Ellis, Milton Sloan, and Thamban Valappil.
Attendees at the complete resubmission confirmation meeting: Wiley Chambers, Katie Laessig, Frances LeSane, William Boyd, Milton Sloan, and Susmita Samanta

ASSIGNED REVIEWERS (including those not present at filing meeting) :

Discipline/Organization	Reviewer
Medical:	Nasim Moledina
Secondary Medical:	William Boyd, John Alexander
Statistical:	Chris Kadoorie
Pharmacology:	Amy Ellis
Statistical Pharmacology:	NA
Chemistry:	Milton Sloan
Environmental Assessment (if needed):	NA
Biopharmaceutical:	Charles Bonapace
Microbiology, sterility:	Denise Miller
Microbiology, clinical (for antimicrobial products only):	Peter Coderre
DSI: Mathew Thomas	
Regulatory Project Management:	Susmita Samanta
Other Consults:	
DDMAC:	Jeff Trunzo
DMEPA:	Denise Baugh
Micro-Sterility:	Denise Miller

Per reviewers, are all parts in English or English translation? YES X NO ☐
If no, explain:

CLINICAL FILE X REFUSE TO FILE ☐

- Clinical site audit(s) needed? YES X NO ☐
  If no, explain:
- Advisory Committee Meeting needed? YES, date if known _____ NO X

- If the application is affected by the AIP, has the division made a recommendation regarding whether or not an exception to the AIP should be granted to permit review based on medical necessity or public health significance?
  N/A X YES ☐ NO ☐

CLINICAL MICROBIOLOGY	N/A ☐	FILE X	REFUSE TO FILE ☐	
STATISTICS	N/A ☐	FILE X	REFUSE TO FILE ☐	
BIOPHARMACEUTICS		FILE X	REFUSE TO FILE ☐	

- Biopharm. study site audits(s) needed? YES ☐ NO X

PHARMACOLOGY/TOX	N/A ☐	FILE X	REFUSE TO FILE ☐	

- GLP audit needed? YES ☐ NO X

CHEMISTRY		FILE X	REFUSE TO FILE ☐	

- Establishment(s) ready for inspection? YES X NO ☐
- Sterile product? YES X NO ☐
  If yes, was microbiology consulted for validation of sterilization? YES X NO ☐

ELECTRONIC SUBMISSION:
Any comments:

REGULATORY CONCLUSIONS/DEFICIENCIES:
(Refer to 21 CFR 314.101(d) for filing requirements.)

☐ The application is unsuitable for filing. Explain why:

X The application, on its face, appears to be well-organized and indexed. The application appears to be suitable for filing.

X No filing issues have been identified.

☐ Filing issues to be communicated by Day 74. List (optional):

ACTION ITEMS: None

Susmita Samanta
Regulatory Project Manager

Appendix A to NDA Regulatory Filing Review

NOTE: The term "original application" or "original NDA" as used in this appendix denotes the NDA submitted. It does not refer to the reference drug product or "reference listed drug."

An original 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) 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, or
(3) 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) 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, and.

(3) 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) 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, or

(3) 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 Office of Regulatory Policy representative.

Appendix B to NDA Regulatory Filing Review
Questions for 505(b)(2) Applications

1. Does the application reference a listed drug (approved drug)? YES X NO ☐

If "No," skip to question 3.

2. Name of listed drug(s) referenced by the applicant (if any) and NDA/ANDA #(s): Cipro, NDA 19-537, Cipro HC, NDA 20-805, and Ciprodex, NDA 21-537

3. Is this application for a drug that is an "old" antibiotic (as described in the draft guidance implementing the 1997 FDAMA provisions? (Certain antibiotics are not entitled to Hatch-Waxman patent listing and exclusivity benefits.)

YES ☐ NO X

If "Yes," skip to question 7.

4. Is this application for a recombinant or biologically-derived product?

YES ☐ NO X

If "Yes "contact your ODE's Office of Regulatory Policy representative.

5. The purpose of the questions below (questions 5 to 6) is to determine if there is an approved drug product that is equivalent or very similar to the product proposed for approval that should be referenced as a listed drug in the pending application.

   (a) Is there a pharmaceutical equivalent(s) to the product proposed in the 505(b)(2) application that is already approved?

   YES ☐ NO X

   (*Pharmaceutical equivalents* are drug products in identical dosage forms that: (1) contain identical amounts of the identical active drug ingredient, i.e., the same salt or ester of the same therapeutic moiety, or, in the case of modified release dosage forms that require a reservoir or overage or such forms as prefilled syringes where residual volume may vary, that deliver identical amounts of the active drug ingredient over the identical dosing period; (2) do not necessarily contain the same inactive ingredients; and (3) meet the identical compendial or other applicable standard of identity, strength, quality, and purity, including potency and, where applicable, content uniformity, disintegration times, and/or dissolution rates. (21 CFR 320.1(c))

If "No," to (a) skip to question 6. Otherwise, answer part (b and (c)).

   (b) Is the pharmaceutical equivalent approved for the same indication for which the 505(b)(2) application is seeking approval? YES ☐ NO ☐

   (c) Is the approved pharmaceutical equivalent(s) cited as the listed drug(s)? YES ☐ NO ☐

If "Yes," (c), list the pharmaceutical equivalent(s) and proceed to question 6.

If "No," to (c) list the pharmaceutical equivalent and contact your ODE's Office of Regulatory Policy representative.

Pharmaceutical equivalent(s):

6. (a) Is there a pharmaceutical alternative(s) already approved? YES X NO ☐

(*Pharmaceutical alternatives* are drug products that contain the identical therapeutic moiety, or its precursor, but not necessarily in the same amount or dosage form or as the same salt or ester. Each such drug product individually meets either the identical or its own respective compendial or other applicable standard of identity, strength, quality, and purity, including potency and, where applicable, content uniformity, disintegration times and/or dissolution rates. (21 CFR 320.1(d)) Different dosage forms and strengths within a product line by a single manufacturer are thus pharmaceutical alternatives, as are extended-release products when compared with immediate- or standard-release formulations of the same active ingredient.)

If "No," to (a) skip to question 7. Otherwise, answer part (b and (c)).

(b) Is the pharmaceutical alternative approved for the same indication for which the 505(b)(2) application is seeking approval? YES X NO ☐

(c) Is the approved pharmaceutical alternative(s) cited as the listed drug(s)? YES X NO ☐

If "Yes," to (c), proceed to question 7.

***NOTE:** If there is more than one pharmaceutical alternative approved, consult your ODE's Office of Regulatory Policy representative to determine if the appropriate pharmaceutical alternatives are referenced.*

If "No," to (c), list the pharmaceutical alternative(s) and contact your ODE's Office of Regulatory Policy representative. Proceed to question 7.

Pharmaceutical alternative(s):

7. (a) Does the application rely on published literature necessary to support the proposed approval of the drug product (i.e. is the published literature necessary for the approval)?
YES X NO ☐

If "No," skip to question 8. Otherwise, answer part (b).

(b) Does any of the published literature cited reference a specific (e.g. brand name) product? Note that if yes, the applicant will be required to submit patent certification for the product, see question 12. Yes

8. Describe the change from the listed drug(s) provided for in this (b)(2) application (for example, "This application provides for a new indication, otitis media" or "This application provides for a change in dosage form, from capsules to solution"). The Proposed product contains a lower concentration of ciprofloxacin delivered in a higher volume of solution.

9. Is the application for a duplicate of a listed drug and eligible for approval under section 505(j) as an ANDA? (Normally, FDA may refuse-to-file such NDAs (see 21 CFR 314.101(d)(9)). YES ☐ NO X

10. Is the application for a duplicate of a listed drug whose only difference is that the extent to which the active ingredient(s) is absorbed or otherwise made available to the site of action less than that of the reference listed drug (RLD)? (See 314.54(b)(1)). If yes, the application may be refused for filing under 21 CFR 314.101(d)(9)). YES ☐ NO X