CENTER FOR DRUG EVALUATION AND RESEARCH

APPLICATION NUMBER:

202515Orig1s000

CLINICAL PHARMACOLOGY AND BIOPHARMACEUTICS REVIEW(S)

CLINICAL PHARMACOLOGY REVIEW

Memorandum

NDA: 202515 Submission Date: 1/14/11

Submission Type; Code: Original; 505(b)(2);

Brand/Code Name: To be determined

Generic Name: Morphine Sulfate Injection, USP

Primary Reviewer: David Lee, Ph.D.
Secondary Reviewer Yun Xu, Ph.D.

OCP Division: DCP2

OND Division: Division of Division of Anesthesia, Analgesia, and

Addiction Products

Sponsor: Hospira, Inc.

Relevant IND(s):

Formulation; Strength(s): • 2 mg/ml, 4 mg/ml, 8 mg/ml, 10 mg/ml, 15 mg/ml of

morphine sulfate packaged in a Carpuject™ with Luer

Lock or iSecure[™] Prefilled syringe

Proposed Indication: Manage

Management of pain in patients where an opioid

analgesic is appropriate.

Recommendation

The Office of Clinical Pharmacology has reviewed the submission dated January 14th, 2011 and finds it acceptable provided that a satisfactory agreement can be reached with the Applicant regarding the Labeling.

Labeling recommendation

The following labeling recommendation is proposed:

12 CLINICAL PHARMACOLOGY

12.1 Mechanism of Action

(b) (4)



12 CLINICAL PHARMACOLOGY

12.1 Mechanism of Action

Morphine, a pure opioid agonist, is relatively selective for the mu receptor, although it can interact with other opioid receptors at higher doses. In addition to analgesia, the widely diverse effects of morphine sulfate include drowsiness, changes in mood,

respiratory depression, decreased gastrointestinal motility, nausea, vomiting, and alterations of the endocrine and autonomic nervous system.

Effects on the Central Nervous System (CNS)

The principal therapeutic action of morphine is analgesia. Other therapeutic effects of morphine include anxiolysis, euphoria and feelings of relaxation. Although the precise mechanism of the analgesic action is unknown, specific CNS opiate receptors and endogenous compounds with morphine-like activity have been identified throughout the brain and spinal cord and are likely to play a role in the expression and perception of analgesic effects. In common with other opioids, morphine causes respiratory depression, in part by a direct effect on the brainstem respiratory centers. Morphine and related opioids depress the cough reflex by direct effect on the cough center in the medulla. Morphine causes miosis, even in total darkness.

Effects on the Gastrointestinal Tract and on Other Smooth Muscle
Gastric, biliary and pancreatic secretions are decreased by morphine. Morphine
causes a reduction in motility and is associated with an increase in tone in the antrum
of the stomach and duodenum. Digestion of food in the small intestine is delayed and
propulsive contractions are decreased. Propulsive peristaltic waves in the colon are
decreased, while tone is increased to the point of spasm. The end result may be
constipation. Morphine can cause a marked increase in biliary tract pressure as a
result of spasm of the sphincter of Oddi. Morphine may also cause spasm of the
sphincter of the urinary bladder.

Effects on the Cardiovascular System

In therapeutic doses, morphine does not usually exert major effects on the cardiovascular system. Morphine produces peripheral vasodilation which may result in orthostatic hypotension and fainting. Release of histamine can occur, which may play a role in opioid-induced hypotension. Manifestations of histamine release and/or peripheral vasodilation may include pruritus, flushing, red eyes and sweating. *Endocrine System*

Opioid agonists have been shown to have a variety of effects on the secretion of hormones. Opioids inhibit the secretion of ACTH, cortisol, and luteinizing hormone (LH) in humans. They also stimulate prolactin, growth hormone (GH) secretion, and pancreatic secretion of insulin and glucagon in humans and other species, rats and dogs. Thyroid stimulating hormone (TSH) has been shown to be both inhibited and stimulated by opioids.

Immune System

Opioids have been shown to have a variety of effects on components of the immune system in *in vitro* and animal models. The clinical significance of these findings is unknown.

12.2 Pharmacodynamics

Morphine concentrations are not predictive of analgesic response, especially in patients previously treated with opioids. The minimum effective concentration varies

widely and is influenced by a variety of factors, including the extent of previous opioid use, age and general medical condition. Effective doses in tolerant patients may be significantly higher than in opioid-naïve patients.

12.3 Pharmacokinetics

Morphine has an apparent volume of distribution ranging from 1.0 to 4.7 L/kg after parenteral administration. Protein binding is low, about 36%, and muscle tissue binding is reported as 54%. A blood-brain barrier exists, and when morphine is introduced outside of the CNS, plasma concentrations of morphine remain higher than the corresponding CSF morphine levels.

Morphine has a total plasma clearance which ranges from 0.9 to 1.2 L/kg/h in postoperative patients, but shows considerable interindividual variation. The major pathway of clearance is hepatic glucuronidation to morphine-3-glucuronide, which is pharmacologically inactive. The major excretion path of the conjugate is through the kidneys, with about 10% in the feces. Morphine is also eliminated by the kidneys, 2 to 12% being excreted unchanged in the urine. Terminal half-life is commonly reported to vary from 1.5 to 4.5 hours, although the longer half-lives were obtained when morphine levels were monitored over protracted periods with very sensitive radioimmunoassay methods. The accepted elimination half-life in normal subjects is 1.5 to 2 hours.

Discussion

Hospira, Inc. submitted a New Drug Application (NDA) for Morphine Sulfate Injection USP in accordance with Section 505(b)(2) of the Federal Food, Drugs, and Cosmetic Act. The reference products for intravenous and intramuscular routes in this submission are Duramorph®, NDA 18565, and Morphine Sulfate Injection (in auto-injection system),

The indication and route of administration are the same as prescribed and recommended for the use of the listed drugs. The proposed drug product is a sterile aqueous solution. The Applicant has been marketing this product without an approved NDA.

The Applicant submitted published literature information to support the non-clinical requirements (Dr. Elizabeth Bolan's review, 6/17/11).

Additionally, no clinical studies

were conducted with the proposed product.

No clinical pharmacology studies were conducted with the proposed product. The Applicant requested a biowaiver of the in vivo study requirements for based on 21CFR320.22. The biowaiver request was reviewed by ONDQA Biopharmaceutics team and concluded that the sponsor's biowaiver request for intravenous route is acceptable (Dr. Minerva Hughes' review, 6/30/2011).

BIOPHARMACEUTICS REVIEW Office of New Drugs Quality Assessment								
Application No.:	NDA 202-515							
Submission Date:	14 January 2011	4 January 2011 Reviewer: Minerva Hughes, Ph.D.						
Division:	Division of Anesthesia and Analgesia Products	Team Lead: Angelica Dorantes, Ph.D.						
Sponsor:	Hospira	Supervisor: Patrick Marroum, Ph.D.						
Trade Name:	None proposed	Date Assigned:	2 February 2011					
Generic Name:	Morphine Sulfate Injection, USP	Date of Review:	30 June 2011					
Indication:	Pain not responsive to nonnarcotic analgesics	Type of Submission: Original NDA – 505 (b)(2)						
Formulation/strengths	2, 4, 8, 10, 15. (b) (4) mg/mL							
Route of Administration	IV (b) (4)							
Type of Review:	Biowaiver Request							

SUBMISSION: NDA 202-515 was submitted by Hospira in accordance with Section 505(b)(2) of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act for the use of Morphine Sulfate Injection USP in the treatment of pain not responsive to nonnarcotic analgesics. Morphine sulfate is an opiate agonist that has been used in clinical practice for the treatment of pain since the 1800's. This NDA was submitted in an effort to achieve compliance with FDA's position that all marketed drugs should have an approved marketing application, *FDA guidance on Marketing Unapproved Drugs – Compliance Policy Guide (2006)*. Hospira holds other approved marketing applications for morphine sulfate injection (NDA 19916: 0.5 – 5 mg/mL, IV-patient controlled, ANDA 071849, and ANDA 071850); however, the approved dosage strength and presentations are different in comparison with this new NDA.

BIOPHARMACEUTICS INFORMATION:

A waiver of the CFR's requirement to provide data from in vivo bioavailability or bioequivalence studies to support the approval of Morphine Sulfate Injection was requested on the basis that the product is an injectable solution and its bioavailability is self-evident, as per 21 CFR §320.22 (Criteria for waiver of evidence of in vivo bioavailability or bioequivalence).

In support of the requested biowaiver for Morphine Sulfate Injection, NDA 202-515 included the following information for review and evaluation:

- Formulation comparison table which included composition data for approved products
- Literature references for bioavailability and pharmacokinetic performance

The biopharmaceutics data are summarized and reviewed in the attached Reviewer's Notes section of this report.

CONCLUSION/RECOMMENDATION:

A waiver of the CFR's requirement to provide vivo bioavailability or bioequivalence data is granted for Morphine Sulfate Injection administered by the intravenous route (b)(4)

Minerva Hughes, Ph.D.

Biopharmaceutics Reviewer, ONDQA cc Archived in DARRTS.

Patrick Marroum, Ph.D.

Biopharmaceutics Supervisor, ONDQA

(b) (4)

REVIEWER'S NOTES

BIOPHARMACEUTICS REVIEW

Morphine Sulfate Injection USP is formulated as a sterile solution containing morphine sulfate and the inactive ingredients edetate disodium, citric acid, and sodium chloride. Hydrochloric acid or sodium hydroxide may be added for pH adjustment. The product is supplied in pre-filled syringes,

The applicant's request for a biowaiver was based on the following:

- (1) § 320.22(b)(1)(i) Parenteral solution intended for administration by injection
 - A. Proposed drug product labeling:

B. Reviewer's Comments: The proposed labeling indicates that the product is a parenteral solution intended for administration by injection (b)(4) intravenous (IV)

(b)(4) Based on

- intended for administration by injection, (b) (4) intravenous (IV) (b) (4) Based on this information, the criterion for a waiver based on §320.22(b)(1)(i) is met. Of note, the regulation does not distinguish between the different routes of injection and the mechanism of parenteral drug delivery can affect bioavailability. Data supporting equivalence to approved products are summarized and reviewed in following sections.
- (2) § 320.22(b)(1)(ii) Contains the same active and inactive ingredients in the same concentration as a drug product that is the subject of an approved NDA or ANDA

A. Formulation Comparison Table (Approved products vs. NDA 202-515) in NDA

	comparison racio (ripprovoa		/
	NDA 18565 Approval – 1984	NDA 19999 Approval - 1990	Pending Submission
Applicant	Baxter Healthcare	Meridian Medical	Hospira
Indication	Pain not responsive to nonnarcotic analgesics	Pain	Pain not responsive to non narcotic analgesics
Strength(s)	0.5, 1, 10, 25 mg/mL	15 mg/mL	2, 4, 8, 10, 15, (b) (4) mg/mL
Inactive Ingredients	Per 1 mL (Syringe) NaCl – 9 mg Per mL (Infusion)	Per 1 mL ($Vol = 0.7 mL$) Benzyl alcohol – 15 mg EDTA – 1 mg $H_2SO_4 - q.s.$ for pH	Per 1 mL (syringe) EDTA – 0.2 mg Citric acid – 0.4 mg NaCl – (b) (4)

	NDA 18565	NDA 19999	Pending Submission
A 11 /	Approval – 1984	Approval - 1990	**
Applicant	Baxter Healthcare	Meridian Medical	Hospira
	NaCl – 6.25 – 8 mg		HCl/NaOH – q.s. for pH
	$NaOH/H_2SO_4 - q.s.$ for pH	Final pH 2.5 – 6.0	
			Per 1 mL (vials)
	Final pH = $2.5-6.5$		EDTA – 0.2 mg
			Citric acid – (b) (4)
			NaCl – (b) (4)
			HCl/NaOH- q.s. for pH
			Final pH = $2.5^{(b)(4)}$
Route of	0.5 and 1 mg/mL: IV,	IM (vastas muscle)	2, 4, 8, 10, 15 mg/mL: IV
Administration	epidural, and intrathecal		(b) (4)
	injection		
	10 and 25 mg/mL: intrathecal		
	and epidural only using a		(Not for intrathecal or
	micro infusion device		epidural)
Dosage Form	DOSETTE ampoules	Auto-injector	(b) (4)
Dosage 1 orm	10 mL – 0.5 and 1 mg/mL	10.5 mg/0.7 mL (doses 10	
	20 mL – 10 and 25 mg/mL	mg, 5% overage)	
	20 HiL = 10 and 25 Hig/HiL	mg, 576 overage)	
DID (Canaria Dr.)	Yes	Yes	
RLD (Generic Rx)	1 68	1 08	-

RLD= reference listed drug.

B. Reviewer's Comments: The NDA provided a summary table comparing the proposed morphine sulfate injection product to approved reference listed drugs (RLD). The excipients citric acid and HCl were not used in the RLDs, but these excipients were approved for use at the same concentration in other approved Hospira morphine sulfate injection products. The excipient EDTA was also used at a lower concentration in the proposed drug product compared with approved morphine products, 0.2% compared with 1%. EDTA was used as an (b) (4) in the proposed formulation. It is an approved excipient in other injection products for (b) (4) IV. Concentration differences for inactive ingredients permitted by the regulations (§314.127(a)(8)(ii)(B)) for parental products referencing an RLD are changes in preservatives, buffers, and antioxidants that do not affect the safety and efficacy of the product. The inactive ingredients meet this criteria and the different EDTA concentration for the proposed product is not expected to affect its bioavailability, and thus, safety and efficacy, when used as intended. Therefore, bioavailability differences for this morphine sulfate injection product will depend on the route of delivery and concentration of active.

Assessment of Formulation for Intravenous Injection

Morphine sulfate is an old drug with numerous published reports on its pharmacokinetic and analgesic properties (>100 cited in NDA). Its use in pain management is accepted medical practice and dosing guidelines are outlined in standard medical reference books for oral, IV, intrathecal, epidural, subcutaneous and IM administration. No clinical or biopharmaceutic studies were submitted to NDA 202515. Reference was made to NDA 18565 (approved IV product) and published clinical studies as the basis for submission (i.e., 505(b)2).

Morphine sulfate is a highly water soluble compound, and, as stated previously, the proposed formulation does not contain any additives expected to affect the rate and extent of systemic exposure. The applicant has proposed IV products ranging from to 15 mg/mL. From

a bioavailability perspective, a bolus or infused IV injection provides the drug directly to the intravascular space, regardless of the volume of delivery. No absorption is involved and In clinical practice, morphine sulfate is bioavailability may be considered self-evident. administered on a mg/kg basis (refer to Prescribing Information) and not based on volume, with an initial IV dose of 2-10 mg/70 kg adult. The IV morphine RLD provides for a 0.5 mg/mL and 1 mg/mL morphine solution for direct IV injection; however, the total dose delivered using the approved product is expected to be within the range of concentrations proposed by this applicant (i.e., 2-15 mg). Additionally, the applicant's morphine injection products were within the range of the referenced RLD's morphine injection for intrathecal and epidural administration using a microinfusion device (i.e., Infumorph at 10 mg/mL and 25 mg/mL). This concentration morphine injection product is not diluted before infusion and intrathecal delivery is thought to have systemic exposures similar to IV delivery. Thus, a means to bridge safety and efficacy for all proposed concentrations could be discerned. The suitability of a biowaiver for the different morphine injection products was discussed further with the clinical team (Dr. Sharon Hertz, Dr. Ellen Fields, and Dr. Timothy Jiang). Additional in-use data were requested from the applicant and reviewed by the clinical reviewer (T. Jiang). From the clinical team's perspective, a bolus IV injection of morphine up to 15 mg/mL does not raise any new safety concerns and all products currently provide a benefit the public.

In consideration of the route of administration, dosing procedures, formulation, and clinical feedback, a waiver of bioavailability/bioequivalence studies is granted for the intravenous route of administration.



2 Page(s) has been Withheld in Full as b4 (CCI/TS) immediately following this page

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

/s/

MINERVA HUGHES
06/30/2011

PATRICK J MARROUM
06/30/2011

	0.1	CC'	1.01				1	
Office of Clinical Pharmacology								
	New Drug Application Filing and Review Form							
General Information About the Submission								
	Information			D 137			Information	
NDA/BLA Number	202515			Brand Name			orphine sulfate	
OCP Division (I, II, III, IV, V)	II		Generic	Name	ın	jection, USP		
Medical Division	DAAP			Drug Cl		Oı	pioid analgesic	
OCP Reviewer	Davie	David Lee, Ph.D.			on(s)	pa	anagement of pain in tients where an opioid	
OCP Team Leader	Yun	Xu, Ph.D.		Dosage Form			algesic is appropriate.	
Pharmacometrics Reviewer				Dosing I	Pagiman		mg/mL	
Date of Submission	Jan 1	4, 2011			Administration	IV	(b) (4) Injection	
Estimated Due Date of OCP Review		0, 2011		Sponsor			ospira	
Medical Division Due Date		17, 2011		Priority	Classification		andard	
PDUFA Due Date	Nov 1	14, 2011						
C	lin. F	Pharm. and Bio	opharn	n. Infor	mation			
		"X" if included at filing	Numbe studies submitt		Number of studies reviewed	Critica	al Comments If any	
STUDY TYPE			Susmitt		20120104			
Table of Contents present and sufficient to locate reports, tables, data, etc.								
Tabular Listing of All Human Studies								
HPK Summary								
Labeling		X						
Reference Bioanalytical and Analytical								
Methods I. Clinical Pharmacology								
Mass balance:								
Isozyme characterization:								
Blood/plasma ratio:								
Plasma protein binding:								
Pharmacokinetics (e.g., Phase I) -								
Healthy Volunteers-								
single								
multiple	dose:							
Patients-						<u> </u>		
single						1		
Dose proportionality -	uose:		<u> </u>			1		
fasting / non-fasting single	dose:							
fasting / non-fasting multiple								
Drug-drug interaction studies -						1		
In-vivo effects on primary	In-vivo effects on primary drug:							
In-vivo effects of primary	,							
	vitro:							
Subpopulation studies -	,							
	nicity:							
gender: pediatrics:						+		
	atrics:					+		
renal impair								
hepatic impair								
PD -								
	ase 2:			· · · · ·				
Ph	ase 3:							

Clinical Pharmacology and Biopharmaceutics Filing Form/Checklist for NDA_BLA or Referen@#16490

	<u> </u>	
PK/PD -		
Phase 1 and/or 2, proof of concept:		
Phase 3 clinical trial:		
Population Analyses -		
Data rich:		
Data sparse:		
II. Biopharmaceutics		
Absolute bioavailability		
Relative bioavailability -		
solution as reference:		
alternate formulation as reference:		
Bioequivalence studies -		
traditional design; single / multi dose:		Sponsor requests a biowaiver.
replicate design; single / multi dose:		
Food-drug interaction studies		
Bio-waiver request based on BCS		
BCS class		
Dissolution study to evaluate alcohol induced		
dose-dumping		
III. Other CPB Studies		
Genotype/phenotype studies		
Chronopharmacokinetics		
Pediatric development plan		This application is not for a new active ingredient, new indication, new dosage form, new dosing regimen, or new route of administration, so sponsor believes the requirement of 21CFR314.55 do not apply.
Literature References		
Total Number of Studies		

On **initial** review of the NDA/BLA application for filing:

	Content Parameter	Yes	No	N/A	Comment
Cri	teria for Refusal to File (RTF)				
1	Has the applicant submitted bioequivalence			X	No clinical study was conducted
	data comparing to-be-marketed product(s)				with the proposed product.
	and those used in the pivotal clinical trials?				
2	Has the applicant provided metabolism and			X	
	drug-drug interaction information?				
3	Has the sponsor submitted bioavailability		X		Sponsor requests a biowaiver.
	data satisfying the CFR requirements?				
4	Did the sponsor submit data to allow the			X	
	evaluation of the validity of the analytical				
	assay?				
5	Has a rationale for dose selection been			X	
	submitted?				
6	Is the clinical pharmacology and			X	
	biopharmaceutics section of the NDA				
	organized, indexed and paginated in a				
	manner to allow substantive review to				

	begin?				
7	Is the clinical pharmacology and			X	
	biopharmaceutics section of the NDA				
	legible so that a substantive review can				
	begin?				
8	Is the electronic submission searchable,			X	
	does it have appropriate hyperlinks and do			71	
	the hyperlinks work?				
	the hypermina work.	I			
Cri	teria for Assessing Quality of an NDA (Preli	minary	Asses	ssment	of Quality)
	Data	<u>J</u>	1255 61	,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,	or Quanty)
9	Are the data sets, as requested during pre-			X	
	submission discussions, submitted in the			71	
	appropriate format (e.g., CDISC)?				
10	If applicable, are the pharmacogenomic data			X	
10	sets submitted in the appropriate format?			Α	
	Studies and Analyses	I	<u> </u>		
11	Is the appropriate pharmacokinetic			v	
11	information submitted?			X	
12					
12	Has the applicant made an appropriate			X	
	attempt to determine reasonable dose				
	individualization strategies for this product				
	(i.e., appropriately designed and analyzed				
- 10	dose-ranging or pivotal studies)?				
13	Are the appropriate exposure-response (for			X	
	desired and undesired effects) analyses				
	conducted and submitted as described in the				
	Exposure-Response guidance?				
14	Is there an adequate attempt by the applicant			X	
	to use exposure-response relationships in				
	order to assess the need for dose				
	adjustments for intrinsic/extrinsic factors				
	that might affect the pharmacokinetic or				
	pharmacodynamics?				
15	Are the pediatric exclusivity studies			X	This application is not for a new
	adequately designed to demonstrate				active ingredient, new indication,
	effectiveness, if the drug is indeed				new dosage form, new dosing
	effective?				regimen, or new route of
					administration, so sponsor believes
					the requirement of 21CFR314.55 do
					not apply.
16	Did the applicant submit all the pediatric			X	***
	exclusivity data, as described in the WR?				
17	Is there adequate information on the			X	
	pharmacokinetics and exposure-response in				
	the clinical pharmacology section of the				
	label?				
	General	I.	ı	<u> </u>	
18	Are the clinical pharmacology and			X	

Clinical Pharmacology and Biopharmaceutics Filing Form/Checklist for NDA_BLA or Reference 16490

	biopharmaceutics studies of appropriate design and breadth of investigation to meet basic requirements for approvability of this product?				
19	Was the translation (of study reports or other study information) from another language needed and provided in this submission?			Х	
	IS THE CLINICAL PHARMACOLOGY SI yes	ECTIC	ON OF	THE.	APPLICATION FILEABLE?
	If the NDA/BLA is not fileable from the clinical provide comments to be sent to the Applicant.	-			
	Please identify and list any potential review iss	sues to	be for	warded	
	Reviewing Clinical Pharmacologist				Date
-	Team Leader/Supervisor				Date
	Hospira, Inc. submited a New Drug Applic accordance with Section 505(b)(2) of the F this submission is Duramorph®, NDA 018 injection system),	ederal 565, and eation a f the R udy red DQA. m, nev	Food and ro LD.	, Drug orphine oute of The pro- ments b this ap	Morphine Sulfate Injection USP in s, and Cosmetic Act. The basis for e Sulfate Injection (in auto- (b) (4) administration are the same as oposed drug product is a sterile coased on 21CFR320.22. This oplication is not for a new active iment, or new route of

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

/s/

DAVID J LEE
03/10/2011

YUN XU 03/10/2011

Reference ID: 2916490

BIOPHARMACEUTICS FILING REVIEW Office of New Drugs Quality Assessment							
Application No.:	NDA 202515						
Submission Date:	14 January 2011	Reviewer: Minerva Hughes, PhD					
Division:	Division of Anesthesia, Analgesia, and Rheumatology Products	Team Lead: Angelica Dorantes, PhD					
Sponsor:	Hospira	Supervisor: Patrick Marroum, PhD					
Trade Name:	None proposed	Date Assigned:	2 February 2011				
Generic Name:	Morphine Sulfate Injection, USP	Date of Review:	01 March 2011				
Indication:	Pain not responsive to nonnarcotic analgesics	Type of Submission: Original NDA – 505 (b)2 Biowaiver Request					
Formulation/strengths	Injection, Solution: 2 mg/mL; 4 mg/mL; 8 mg/mL; 10 mg/mL; 15 mg/mL;						
Route of Administration	Intravenous (b) (4)						

SUBMISSION: NDA 202-515 was submitted by Hospira in accordance with Section 505(b)(2) of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act for the use of morphine sulfate injection, USP in the treatment of pain not responsive to nonnarcotic analgesics. The NDA was submitted in an effort to achieve compliance with FDA's position that all marketed drugs should have an approved marketing application, *FDA guidance on Marketing Unapproved Drugs – Compliance Policy Guide.* Hospira currently holds approved marketing applications for morphine sulfate; however, the formulation strength and presentations are different in comparison with this new submission. In addition, this NDA is for intravenous injection routes. The applicant requests a waiver for bioavailability/bioequivalence studies on the basis that the requirements of 21 CFR 320.33 are met. That is, the drug product is:

- 1. a parenteral solution intended solely for administration by injection
- 2. contains the same active and inactive ingredients in the same concentration as an approved drug product

<u>BIOPHARMACEUTIC INFORMATION:</u> In support of the requested biowaiver, NDA 202-515 includes the following supportive biopharmaceutics data for review and evaluation:

- Proposed drug product composition and dosage form
- Formulation comparison table which includes composition data for approved products
- Literature references for bioavailability and pharmacokinetic performance

RECOMMENDATION:

From a biopharmaceutics perspective, the application is recommended for filling. The suitability of the waiver request will be a review issue.

Minerva Hughes

Patrick Marroum

Biopharmaceutics Reviewer Office of New Drugs Quality Assessment Biopharmaceutics Team Leader or Supervisor Office of New Drugs Quality Assessment

cc: Angelica Dorantes, Ying Wang, Kimberly Compton, Swati Patwardhan

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

/s/

MINERVA HUGHES
03/01/2011

PATRICK J MARROUM 03/02/2011

Reference ID: 2911914