APPLICATION NUMBER: 21-302
Memo

TO: Jonathan Wilkin, M.D.
   Director, Division of Dermatologic and Dental Drug Products
   HFD-540

FROM: David Diwa, Pharm.D.
      Safety Evaluator, Office of Post-Marketing Drug Risk Assessment
      HFD-400

THROUGH: Jerry Phillips, R.Ph.
          Associate Director, Office of Post-Marketing Drug Risk Assessment
          HFD-400

CC: Millie Wright,
    Project Manager
    HFD-540

DATE: October 11, 2001

RE: OPDRA Consult 00-0223, Elidel (Pimecrolimus Cream 1%) NDA 21-302

This memorandum is in response to a request from your Division on September 25, 2001, for a re-review of the proprietary name, Elidel. The expected action date on this application is on or before December 15, 2001.

OPDRA has identified an additional proprietary name Foradil, which has a potential for confusion with Elidel since our initial review. Foradil (formoterol fumarate) is a β2-agonist inhalation powder packaged with an inhaler device. The product is indicated for the maintenance treatment of asthma and prevention of exercise induced bronchospasm. Elidel and Foradil are formulated in different dosage forms. Moreover, the methods of administration and indication for the two products are different. Based on information currently available, we believe that Foradil does not pose significant
risk of confusion with Elidel. Therefore, we have no objections to the use of the proprietary name Elidel.

We consider this a final review. However, if the approval of the NDA is delayed beyond 90 days from the date of this review, the name must be re-evaluated. A re-review of the name before NDA approval will rule out any objections based upon approvals of other proprietary/established names from this date forward.

If you have any questions or need clarification, please contact the medication errors project manager, Sammie Beam at 301-827-3231.
This is a representation of an electronic record that was signed electronically and this page is the manifestation of the electronic signature.

/s/
David Diwa  
10/12/01 09:05:47 AM  
PHARMACIST

Jerry Phillips  
10/12/01 10:08:12 AM  
DIRECTOR
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DATE RECEIVED:</th>
<th>08/14/00</th>
<th>DUE DATE:</th>
<th>03/09/01</th>
<th>OPDRA CONSULT #:</th>
<th>00-0223</th>
</tr>
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</table>

**TO:**
Jonathan Wilkin, M.D.
Director, Division of Dermatologic & Dental Drug Products
HFD-540

**THROUGH:**
Millie Wright
Project Manager
HFD-540

**PRODUCT NAME:** Elidel (pimecrolimus cream) 1%
NDA: 21-302

**MANUFACTURER BY:** Novartis Pharma GmbH, Wehr/Baden, Germany

**DISTRIBUTED BY:** Novartis Pharmaceutical Corp., East Hanover, NJ

**SAFETY EVALUATOR:** David Diwa Pharm.D.

**SUMMARY:** In response to a consult from the Division of Dermatologic & Dental Drug Products (HFD-540), OPDRA has performed a review of the proposed proprietary name Elidel to determine the potential for confusion with marketed drug products and pending drug names.

**OPDRA RECOMMENDATION:**
OPDRA has no objection to use of the proprietary name, Elidel.

For **NDA/ANDA with action date beyond 90 days of this review**
This name must be re-evaluated approximately 90 days prior to the expected approval of the NDA. A re-review of the name prior to NDA approval will rule out any objections based upon approvals of other proprietary names/NDA's from the signature date of this document. A re-review request of the name should be submitted via e-mail to "OPDRAREQUEST" with the NDA number, the proprietary name, and the goal date. OPDRA will respond back via e-mail with the final recommendation.

For **NDA/ANDA with action date within 90 days of this review**
OPDRA considers this a final review. However, if the approval of the NDA is delayed beyond 90 days from the date of this review, the name must be re-evaluated. A re-review of the name prior to NDA approval will rule out any objections based upon approvals of other proprietary names/NDA's from this date forward.

**For Priority 6 Month Reviews**
OPDRA will monitor this name until approximately 30 days before the approval of the NDA. The reviewing division need not submit a second consult for name review. OPDRA will notify the reviewing division of any changes in our recommendation of the name based upon the approvals of other proprietary names/NDA's from this date forward.

---

Jerry Phillips, RPh
Associate Director for Medication Error Prevention
Office of Post-Marketing Drug Risk Assessment
Phone: (301) 827-3242
Fax: (301) 480-8173

Martin Himmel, MD
Deputy Director
Office of Post-Marketing Drug Risk Assessment
Center for Drug Evaluation and Research
Food and Drug Administration
DATE OF REVIEW: 01/17/01
NDA: 21-302
NAME OF DRUG: Elidel (pimecrolimus cream) 1%
NDA, HOLDER: Novartis Pharmaceutical Corporation

I. INTRODUCTION:

This consult is written in response to an August 14, 2000 request from the Division of Dermatologic and Dental Drug Products (HFD-540) for an assessment of the proposed proprietary name, Elidel. The sponsor submitted the name for review in phase III of IND and filed the NDA on December 15, 2000.

PRODUCT INFORMATION

Elidel (pimecrolimus cream) 1% is a macrolactam derivative and selective inhibitor of pro-inflammatory cytokines. It is also a mediator of T cell and mast cell activity. The product is proposed for use in the short-term and long-term management of atopic dermatitis (eczema) in pediatric and adult patients. Each gram of Elidel will contain 10 mg of the active ingredient pimecrolimus in a whitish cream base. The recommended dose is a twice-daily application to the affected areas. The sponsor has proposed packaging the product in tubes of 15 g, 30 g and 100 g.

II. RISK ASSESSMENT:

The medication error staff of OPDRA conducted a search of several standard published drug product reference texts1,2,3 as well as several FDA databases4 for existing drug names which sound alike or look alike to Elidel to a degree where potential confusion between drug names could occur under usual clinical practice settings. A search of the electronic online version of the U.S. Patent and Trademark Office’s Text and Image Database was also conducted5. An expert panel discussion was conducted to review all findings from the searches. In addition, OPDRA conducted three prescription analysis studies consisting of two written prescription studies (inpatient and outpatient)

2 American Drug Index, 42nd Edition, online version, Facts and Comparisons, St. Louis, MO.
3 Facts and Comparisons, online version, Facts and Comparisons, St. Louis, MO.
4 The Established Evaluation System [EES], the Labeling and Nomenclature Committee [LNC] database of Proprietary name consultation requests, New Drug Approvals 98-00, and the electronic online version of the FDA Orange Book.
and one verbal prescription study, involving health care practitioners within FDA. This exercise was conducted to simulate the prescription ordering process in order to evaluate potential errors in handwriting and verbal communication of the proposed name Elidel.

A. EXPERT PANEL DISCUSSION

The expert panel consists of members of OPDRA’s medication error Safety Evaluator Staff and a representative from the Division of Drug Marketing, Advertising and Communications (DDMAC).

Several names identified by Expert Panel were thought to have the potential for confusion with Elidel. These products are summarized in the table below.

DDMAC has no objection to the proposed drug name Elidel.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Product Name</th>
<th>Dosage form(s), Generic name</th>
<th>Usual Dose</th>
<th>Observation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Elidel</td>
<td>Pimecrolimus cream 1%</td>
<td>Apply to affected area BID for atopic dermatitis</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elocon</td>
<td>Mometosone furoate 0.1% cream/lotion</td>
<td>Apply to affected area 2-3 times daily</td>
<td>*LA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gliadel</td>
<td>Carmustine (BiCNU) 7.7 mg wafer</td>
<td>Single treatment dose with 8 wafers</td>
<td>*LA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elimite</td>
<td>Permethrin 5% cream</td>
<td>Apply as directed to affected area</td>
<td>*LA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elavil</td>
<td>Amitriptyline, 10, 25, 50, 75, 100 &amp; 150mg tablets; 10 mL injectable 10 mg/mL</td>
<td>30-100 mg/day single/divided doses</td>
<td>*SA/LA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parlodel</td>
<td>Bromocriptine ; 2.5 mg cap, 5 mg tab</td>
<td>1.25 mg BID</td>
<td>*LA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plendil</td>
<td>Felodipine, 2.5, 5, 10 mg extended release tabs</td>
<td>2.5-10 mg tabs</td>
<td>*LA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Isordil</td>
<td>Isosorbide dinitrate, sustained release · 40 mg cap; 5, 10, 20, 30 &amp; 40 mg tabs</td>
<td>5-40 mg tid or qid</td>
<td>*LA</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*SA = Sound-alike
*LA = Look-alike

B. PRESCRIPTION ANALYSIS STUDIES

1. Methodology:

Three studies were conducted by OPDRA involving 90 health professionals comprised of pharmacists, physicians, and nurses within the FDA. The objective was to test the degree of name confusion between Elidel and other drug names due to similarity in handwriting and verbal pronunciation of the name. Inpatient and outpatient prescriptions were written, each consisting of (known/unknown) drug products and a prescription for Elidel (see page 4). These prescriptions were scanned into a computer and subsequently delivered to a random sample of the participating health professionals via e-mail. In addition, the outpatient orders were recorded on voice mail. The voice mail messages were then sent to a random sample of the participating health professionals for their interpretations and review. After receiving either the written or verbal prescription orders, the participants sent their interpretations of the orders via e-mail to the medication error staff.
2. The results are summarized in Table 1.

### Table 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Study</th>
<th># of Participants</th>
<th># of Responses (%)</th>
<th>Correctly Interpreted</th>
<th>Incorrectly Interpreted</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Written Inpatient</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>16 (55%)</td>
<td>13 (81%)</td>
<td>3 (19%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Written Outpatient</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>22 (73%)</td>
<td>20 (91%)</td>
<td>2 (9%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Verbal</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>15 (48%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td>15 (100%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>53 (59%)</td>
<td>33 (62%)</td>
<td>20 (38%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Thirty eight percent of all study participants responded incorrectly to the name Elidel. Written and verbal scores of the incorrect responses are summarized in Table II on page 5.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Incorrectly Interpreted</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Written Outpatient</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eidel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eudel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Verbal Outpatient</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aladel (2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aldelal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amodal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alodel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alodol (2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allodar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allodel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alodel (2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allerdill</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allordil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eladel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iladel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Written Inpatient</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elidil (2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elidelare</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

All incorrect responses were misspelled or phonetic variations of the proposed drug name. Results of the verbal prescription study showed that in a majority of incorrect responses, the first letter of the proposed name Elidel was substituted with the letter A. The inaccurate interpretations of the proposed drug name did not overlap with an existing approved drug product. We recognize that high scores of incorrect interpretations would be common for all unapproved products because healthcare professionals are not familiar with the name.

C. SAFETY EVALUATOR RISK ASSESSMENT

The OPDRA expert panel identified Elocon, Gliadel, Elimite, Elavil, Parodel, Plendil and Isordil as marketed products with sound-alike/look-alike qualities to Elidel. While Elidel is applied topically, four of the identified products, Gliadel, Parodel, Plendil and Isordil are administered orally. Moreover, the four products have different strengths, dosing schedule and belong to a different pharmacological class when compared with Elidel. Gliadel (carmustine) is an antineoplastic agent administered in 7.7 mg single treatment dose wafers. Parodel (bromocriptine) is an antiparkinson’s agent available in tablet formulation. Plendil (felodipine) is an oral antihypertensive and Isordil (isorsobide dinitrate) is an oral vasodilator. The potential for name confusion between these four products and Elidel appears unlikely.

Elocon (mometosone furoate) is a corticosteroid topical cream/lotion. Both Elocon and Elidel are formulated as topical creams and can be used to treat atop dermatitis. Elocon is available as a 0.1% topical cream and Elidel will be marketed as a 1% topical cream. Despite these similarities, there are no strong sound-alike qualities between Elidel and Elocon. Moreover, the products can be differentiated when scripted (Eidel 0.1% vs Elocon 1%). Additionally, the potential for serious outcome if confusion occurs with these two products is low.
Elimite (permethrin) is a scabicide/pediculicide 5% topical cream formulation. It has look-alike qualities to Elidel. However, the two products have different indications for use, strengths, directions for use and pharmacologic activity. The potential for name confusion between Elimite and Elidel appears low.

Elavil (amitryptiline) has strong sound-alike/look-alike qualities to Elidel. Elavil is a tricylic antidepressant available in both tablet and injectable dosage forms. The two drug products are used in the long-term management of disease conditions. Elavil is available in 100 mg tablet formulation and Elidel is available in 100 g cream tubes. A family physician, nurse practitioner or a physician assistant can prescribe both Elavil and Elidel. In chronic disease states where patients may become familiar with directions for use, it is not uncommon for prescribers to write, “use as directed”. However, the potential for a mix-up between these two products appears to be low due to differences in use and route of administration.

D. LABELING, PACKAGING AND SAFETY RELATED ISSUES

In the review of the container labels, carton and insert labeling of Elidel, OPDRA has attempted to focus on safety issues relating to possible medication errors. OPDRA has reviewed the current container labels, carton and insert labeling and identified several areas of possible improvement, which might minimize potential user error.

1. CONTAINER/CARTON LABELING
   a. Revise to read: Usual Dosage: Apply twice daily to affected area. See package insert.
   b. Revise to read: Each gram contains 10 mg pimecrolimus. In addition, each gram contains benzyl alcohol.

2. PACKAGE INSERT (Dosage and Administration)

   A wide range of healthcare practitioners including dermatologists, family practitioners, pediatricians, nurse practitioners and physician assistants will likely prescribe Elidel. There is a potential risk for the statement “Elidel may be used on all skin surfaces” to draw varying interpretations. To remind the reader of general exceptions to the use of Elidel (e.g. cutaneous viral infections), Therefore we suggest the following:

   Elidel may be used on all [ ] skin surfaces [ ]
III. RECOMMENDATIONS:

1. OPDRA has no objection to the proposed proprietary drug name, Elidel.

2. OPDRA recommends implementation of labeling changes outlined in the review to improve the safe use of this product.

We would appreciate feedback of the final outcome of this consult. We would also be willing to meet with the Division for further discussion, if needed. If you have further questions or need clarifications, please contact David Diwa at 301-827-0892.

David Diwa, Pharm.D.
Safety Evaluator
Office of Post-Marketing Drug Risk Assessment

Concur:

Jerry Phillips, RPh
Associate Director for Medication Error Prevention
Office of Post-Marketing Drug Risk Assessment
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Drug Regulatory Affairs

SDZ ASM 981 (pimecrolimus) Cream 1%

NDA 21-302

Debarment Certification

NOVARTIS PHARMACEUTICALS CORPORATION 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.

James L. DeMartino, PhD
Associate Director
Drug Regulatory Affairs

Date December 6, 2000

Property of Novartis Pharmaceuticals Corporation
Confidential
May not be used, divulged, published or otherwise disclosed without the consent of Novartis Pharmaceuticals Corporation
EXCLUSIVITY SUMMARY for NDA # 21-302 SUPPL #

Trade Name Elidel Cream, 1%  Generic Name pimecrolimus

Applicant Name Novartis Pharmaceuticals Corporation  HFD-540

Approval Date December 13, 2001

PART I: IS AN EXCLUSIVITY DETERMINATION NEEDED?

1. An exclusivity determination will be made for all original applications, but only for certain supplements. Complete Parts II and III of this Exclusivity Summary only if you answer "YES" to one or more of the following questions about the submission.

   a) Is it an original NDA? YES/×/ NO /___/

   b) Is it an effectiveness supplement? YES /___/  NO /×/

      If yes, what type (SE1, SE2, etc.)?  N/A

   c) Did it require the review of clinical data other than to support a safety claim or change in labeling related to safety? (If it required review only of bioavailability or bioequivalence data, answer "NO.")

      YES /×/ NO /___/

      If your answer is "no" because you believe the study is a bioavailability study and, therefore, not eligible for exclusivity, EXPLAIN why it is a bioavailability study, including your reasons for disagreeing with any arguments made by the applicant that the study was not simply a bioavailability study. N/A

If it is a supplement requiring the review of clinical data but it is not an effectiveness supplement, describe the change or claim that is supported by the clinical data: N/A
d) Did the applicant request exclusivity?

YES /__/  NO /X/

If the answer to (d) is "yes," how many years of exclusivity did the applicant request?


e) Has pediatric exclusivity been granted for this Active Moiety?

YES /X/  NO //

IF YOU HAVE ANSWERED "NO" TO ALL OF THE ABOVE QUESTIONS, GO DIRECTLY TO THE SIGNATURE BLOCKS ON PAGE 9.

2. Has a product with the same active ingredient(s), dosage form, strength, route of administration, and dosing schedule previously been approved by FDA for the same use? (Rx to OTC Switches should be answered No - Please indicate as such).

YES /__/  NO /X/ 

If yes, NDA # ___________ Drug Name

IF THE ANSWER TO QUESTION 2 IS "YES," GO DIRECTLY TO THE SIGNATURE BLOCKS ON PAGE 9.

3. Is this drug product or indication a DESI upgrade?

YES /__/  NO /X/

IF THE ANSWER TO QUESTION 3 IS "YES," GO DIRECTLY TO THE SIGNATURE BLOCKS ON PAGE 9 (even if a study was required for the upgrade).

PART II: FIVE-YEAR EXCLUSIVITY FOR NEW CHEMICAL ENTITIES
(Answer either #1 or #2, as appropriate)
1. **Single active ingredient product.**

Has FDA previously approved under section 505 of the Act any drug product containing the same active moiety as the drug under consideration? Answer "yes" if the active moiety (including other esterified forms, salts, complexes, chelates or clathrates) has been previously approved, but this particular form of the active moiety, e.g., this particular ester or salt (including salts with hydrogen or coordination bonding) or other non-covalent derivative (such as a complex, chelate, or clathrate) has not been approved. Answer "no" if the compound requires metabolic conversion (other than deesterification of an esterified form of the drug) to produce an already approved active moiety.

**YES // NO /x/**

If "yes," identify the approved drug product(s) containing the active moiety, and, if known, the NDA #(s).

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 any one 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 OTC monograph, but that was never approved under an NDA, is considered not previously approved.)

**N/A**

**YES /__/ NO /__/**
If "yes," identify the approved drug product(s) containing the active moiety, and, if known, the NDA #(s) N/A

NDA #
NDA #
NDA #

IF THE ANSWER TO QUESTION 1 OR 2 UNDER PART II IS "NO," GO DIRECTLY TO THE SIGNATURE BLOCKS ON PAGE 9. IF "YES," GO TO PART III.

PART III: THREE-YEAR EXCLUSIVITY FOR NDA'S 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." N/A—this is a new chemical entity

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. N/A—new chemical entity

YES // NO /___/

IF "NO," GO DIRECTLY TO THE SIGNATURE BLOCKS ON PAGE 9.
2. A clinical investigation is "essential to the approval" if the Agency could not have approved the application or supplement without relying on that investigation. Thus, the investigation is not essential to the approval if 1) no clinical investigation is necessary to support the supplement or application in light of previously approved applications (i.e., information other than clinical trials, such as bioavailability data, would be sufficient to provide a basis for approval as an ANDA or 505(b)(2) application because of what is already known about a previously approved product), or 2) there are published reports of studies (other than those conducted or sponsored by the applicant) or other publicly available data that independently would have been sufficient to support approval of the application, without reference to the clinical investigation submitted in the application.

For the purposes of this section, studies comparing two products with the same ingredient(s) are considered to be bioavailability studies.

(a) In light of previously approved applications, is a clinical investigation (either conducted by the applicant or available from some other source, including the published literature) necessary to support approval of the application or supplement?

YES /x/  NO //

If "no," state the basis for your conclusion that a clinical trial is not necessary for approval AND GO DIRECTLY TO SIGNATURE BLOCK ON PAGE 9:

(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 /x/

(1) If the answer to 2(b) is "yes," do you personally know of any reason to disagree with the applicant's conclusion? If not applicable, answer NO.
N/A

YES / ___/ NO / ___/

If yes, explain:

(2) If the answer to 2(b) is "no," are you aware of published studies not conducted or sponsored by the applicant or other publicly available data that could independently demonstrate the safety and effectiveness of this drug product?

YES / ___/ NO / X/

If yes, explain:

(c) If the answers to (b)(1) and (b)(2) were both "no," identify the clinical investigations submitted in the application that are essential to the approval:

Investigation #1, Study #B305
Investigation #2, Study #B307
Investigation #3, Study #B316

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.

(a) For each investigation identified as "essential to the approval," has the investigation been relied on by the agency to demonstrate the effectiveness of a previously approved drug product? (If the investigation was relied on only to support the safety of a previously approved drug, answer "no.")
Investigation #1  B305  YES /__/  NO /X/
Investigation #2  B307  YES /__/  NO /X/
Investigation #3  B316  YES /__/  NO /X/

If you have answered "yes" for one or more investigations, identify each such investigation and the NDA in which each was relied upon: N/A

NDA # ________________ Study #
NDA # ________________ Study #
NDA # ________________ Study #

(b) For each investigation identified as "essential to the approval," does the investigation duplicate the results of another investigation that was relied on by the agency to support the effectiveness of a previously approved drug product?

Investigation #1  B305  YES /__/  NO /X/
Investigation #2  B307  YES /__/  NO /X/
Investigation #3  B316  YES /__/  NO /X/

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

NDA # ________________ Study #
NDA # ________________ Study #
NDA # ________________ Study #

(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"):  

Investigation #1, Study #B305
Investigation #2, Study #B307
Investigation #3, Study #B316
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?

Investigation #1
IND #_____ YES /x/ NO /__/ Explain:

Investigation #2
IND #_____ YES /x/ NO /__/ Explain:

Investigation #3
IND #_____ YES /x/ NO

(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? N/A

Investigation #1
YES /__/ Explain ______ NO /__/ Explain ______
Investigation #2
YES /__/ Explain ______ NO /__/ Explain ______

(c) Notwithstanding an answer of "yes" to (a) or (b), are there other reasons to believe that the applicant should not be credited with having "conducted or
sponsored" the study? (Purchased studies may not be used as the basis for exclusivity. However, if all rights to the drug are purchased (not just studies on the drug), the applicant may be considered to have sponsored or conducted the studies sponsored or conducted by its predecessor in interest.)

YES /___/       NO /X/

If yes, explain: ____________________________

______________________________

Signature of Preparer
Title: ____________________________

Date

Signature of Office or Division Director
Date
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NDA Number: 021302  Trade Name: ELIDEL (PIMECROLIMUS) CREAM 1%
Supplement Number: 000  Generic Name: PIMECROLIMUS
Stamp Date: 12/15/00  Action Date: 12/15/00
Supplement Type: N
COMIS Indication: ATOPIC DERMATITIS

Indication #1: For short-term and intermittent long-term therapy in the treatment of mild to moderate atopic dermatitis in non-immunocompromised patients 2 years of age and older in whom the use of alternative, - Date Entered: 11/25/01
Status: Pediatric Ranges were specified.
Range #1  Status: Completed
Range Values: Minimum: 2 yr  Maximum: Adult 

This page was printed on 11/27/01

/S/

Signature  

11/27/01

Date
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Document type: Registration
Document status: Final
Release date: October 30, 2000
Number of pages: 2
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Confidential
May not be used, divulged, published or otherwise disclosed
without the consent of Novartis Pharma AG

APPEARS THIS WAY
ON ORIGINAL
Time Sensitive Patent Information
pursuant to 21 C.F.R. 314.53
for
NDA # 21-302

The following is provided in accordance with the Drug Price Competition and Patent Term Restoration Act of 1984:

Trade Name: Elidel™
Active Ingredient(s): pimecrolimus
Strength: 1%
Dosage Form: Cream
Approval Date: Pending

A. U.S. Patent Number: 5,912,238
Expiration Date: June 15, 2016
Type of Patent: Compound per se; Pharmaceutical composition/formulation; and method of use in treating atopic dermatitis
Patent Owner: Novartis AG
Lichtstrasse 35 CH-4002
Basle, Switzerland

B. The undersigned declares that the above U.S. Patent Number 5,912,238 covers the pharmaceutical composition, formulation and/or method of use of Elidel™ (pimecrolimus) Cream 1%. This product is the subject of this application for which approval is being sought.

Signed: [Signature]
Date: 12/1/2000
Labeling Review
Addendum to NDA 21-302

NDA #21-302
Review start: 11/7/01
Review Completed: 11/26/01

Reviewer's Comment: The following is the final draft label submitted by the sponsor on June 19, 2001. It is followed by the label that is being recommended for approval by the division. It thus includes all the changes that were recommended by this reviewer and the clinical team and these changes were decided at the labeling meetings of 11/16/01 and 11/20/01. These labels are followed by the patient package insert (PPI) and the recommendations for changes by this reviewer. Deletions to the (PPI) are denoted by strikeout and additions by shadowing.
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Medical Officer, Dermatology
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    HFD-540/CSO/WrightM
    HFD-540/CHEM/Pappas
    HFD-520/MICRO/
    HFD-540/PHARM/HillB
    HFD-540/EP/CookD
    HFD-880/Biopharm/GhoshT
    HFD-725/Stats/FriedlinV
    In DFS 11/26/01

For Concurrence Only:
    HFD-540/Clinical TL/LukeM
    HFD-540/DivDir/WilkinJ
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Denise Cook
11/26/01 02:44:24 PM
MEDICAL OFFICER

This is the labeling addendum to the Elidel NDA

Markham Luke
11/26/01 04:30:39 PM
MEDICAL OFFICER
Labeling Review including PPI. Concur with changes to labeling.

Jonathan Wilkin
11/29/01 05:56:21 PM
MEDICAL OFFICER
Additional labeling changes are occurring as discussions with Sponsor proceed. This review captures the initial draft labeling sent to the Sponsor for comment.
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Elidel Cream 1%

14-SEP-2001

FDACDER EES
ESTABLISHMENT EVALUATION REQUEST
 DETAIL REPORT

Application: NDA 21302/000
Stamp: 15-DEC-2000
Regulatory Due: 15-OCT-2001
Applicant: NOVARTIS PHARMACEUTICALS CORP
NO CITY, , XX
1S
Priority: 540
Org Code: 
Action Goal: 
District Goal: 16-AUG-2001
Brand Name: ELIDEL (PIMECROLIMUS) CREAM 1%
Estab. Name: 
Generic Name: PIMECROLIMUS
Dosage Form: (CREAM)
Strength: 1%

Application Comment:
FDA Contacts: W. WRIGHT (HFD-540) 301-827-2020, Project Manager
E. PAPPAS (HFD-540) 301-827-2066, Review Chemist
W. DEAMP II (HFD-540) 301-827-2041, Team Leader

Overall Recommendation: ACCEPTABLE on 27-AUG-2001 by J. D AMBROGIO (HFD-324) 301-827-0062

Establishment:

DMF No: 
AADA:

Responsibilities:

Profile: CFN
Estab. Comment: THE NDA LISTED CFN — FOR A FACILITY WITH NO STREET ADDRESS
IN THIS DATA BASE. (on 05-JAN-2001 by E. PAPPAS (HFD-540) 301-827-2066)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Milestone Name</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Req. Type</th>
<th>Insp. Date</th>
<th>Decision &amp; Reason Creator</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SUBMITTED TO OC</td>
<td>09-JAN-2001</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>PAPPAS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUBMITTED TO DO</td>
<td>11-JAN-2001</td>
<td>GMP</td>
<td></td>
<td>EGASM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DO RECOMMENDATION</td>
<td>26-JAN-2001</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ACCEPTABLE EGASM BASED ON FILE REVIEW</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OC RECOMMENDATION</td>
<td>26-JAN-2001</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ACCEPTABLE EGASM DISTRICT RECOMMENDATION</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Establishment: 9617734
NOVARTIS PHARMA GMBH
OEFLINGER STRASSE 44
WERR. BADEN, GW D-79664

DMF No: 
AADA:

Responsibilities: FINISHED DOSAGE MANUFACTURER, FINISHED DOSAGE PACKAGER
Profile: OIN
Estab. Comment:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Milestone Name</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Req. Type</th>
<th>Insp. Date</th>
<th>Decision &amp; Reason Creator</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SUBMITTED TO OC</td>
<td>09-JAN-2001</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>PAPPAS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUBMITTED TO DO</td>
<td>11-JAN-2001</td>
<td>PS</td>
<td></td>
<td>EGASM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASSIGNED INSPECTION</td>
<td>16-JAN-2001</td>
<td>PS</td>
<td></td>
<td>EGASM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INSPECTION SCHEDULED</td>
<td>18-MAY-2001</td>
<td></td>
<td>05-JUL-2001</td>
<td>IRIVERA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INSPECTION PERFORMED</td>
<td>05-JUL-2001</td>
<td></td>
<td>05-JUL-2001</td>
<td>EGASM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DO RECOMMENDATION</td>
<td>23-AUG-2001</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ACCEPTABLE INSPECTION GARCIA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OC RECOMMENDATION</td>
<td>24-AUG-2001</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ACCEPTABLE GARCIA DISTRICT RECOMMENDATION</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Establishment: 9692043
**NOVARTIS PHARMA INC (CIBA)**  
SCHAFFHAUSERSTRASSE  
CH-4332 STEIN, , SZ

**DRUG SUBSTANCE**  
FINISHED DOSAGE RELEASE TESTER

**CRU**  
OAI Status: NONE

**FACILITY IS RESPONSIBLE FOR**  
OF THE DRUG SUBSTANCE AND  
THE TESTING OF THE EXCIPIENTS FOR THE FINISHED PRODUCT. (on 05-  
JAN-2001 by E. PAPPAS (HFD-540) 301-827-2066)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Milestone Name</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Req. Type</th>
<th>Insp. Date</th>
<th>Decision &amp; Reason Creator</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SUBMITTED TO OC</td>
<td>09-JAN-2001</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>PAPPAS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUBMITTED TO DO</td>
<td>11-JAN-2001</td>
<td>GMP</td>
<td></td>
<td>EGASH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASSIGNED INSPECTION '25-JAN-2001</td>
<td>GMP</td>
<td></td>
<td>EGASH</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INSPECTION SCHEDULED 29-MAY-2001</td>
<td>29-JUN-2001</td>
<td></td>
<td>IRIVERA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INSPECTION PERFORMED 29-JUN-2001</td>
<td>29-JUN-2001</td>
<td></td>
<td>IRIVERA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NO FD-483 WAS ISSUED, FIRM IS ACCEPTABLE.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DO RECOMMENDATION</td>
<td>02-AUG-2001</td>
<td></td>
<td>ACCEPTABLE</td>
<td>EGASH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OC RECOMMENDATION</td>
<td>02-AUG-2001</td>
<td></td>
<td>ACCEPTABLE</td>
<td>DAMBROGIOJ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>DISTRICT RECOMMENDATION</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**CTL**  
OAI Status: NONE

**FACILITY IS RESPONSIBLE FOR**  
OF THE DRUG SUBSTANCE AND  
THE TESTING OF THE EXCIPIENTS FOR THE FINISHED PRODUCT. (on 05-  
JAN-2001 by E. PAPPAS (HFD-540) 301-827-2066)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Milestone Name</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Req. Type</th>
<th>Insp. Date</th>
<th>Decision &amp; Reason Creator</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SUBMITTED TO OC</td>
<td>09-JAN-2001</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>PAPPAS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUBMITTED TO DO</td>
<td>11-JAN-2001</td>
<td>GMP</td>
<td></td>
<td>EGASH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASSIGNED INSPECTION '25-JAN-2001</td>
<td>GMP</td>
<td></td>
<td>EGASH</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INSPECTION SCHEDULED 29-MAY-2001</td>
<td>29-JUN-2001</td>
<td></td>
<td>IRIVERA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INSPECTION PERFORMED 28-JUN-2001</td>
<td>28-JUN-2001</td>
<td></td>
<td>IRIVERA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NO FD-483 WAS ISSUED, FIRM IS ACCEPTABLE.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DO RECOMMENDATION</td>
<td>02-AUG-2001</td>
<td></td>
<td>ACCEPTABLE</td>
<td>EGASH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OC RECOMMENDATION</td>
<td>02-AUG-2001</td>
<td></td>
<td>ACCEPTABLE</td>
<td>DAMBROGIOJ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>DISTRICT RECOMMENDATION</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Establishment: 9611204**  
NOVARTIS PHARMA INC (SANDOZ)  
LICHSTRASSE 35, ST. JOHANN SITE  
BASEL, , SZ 4002

**CRU**  
OAI Status: NONE

**FACILITY IS RESPONSIBLE FOR**  
OF THE DRUG SUBSTANCE AND  
THE TESTING OF THE EXCIPIENTS FOR THE FINISHED PRODUCT. (on 05-  
JAN-2001 by E. PAPPAS (HFD-540) 301-827-2066)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Milestone Name</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Req. Type</th>
<th>Insp. Date</th>
<th>Decision &amp; Reason Creator</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SUBMITTED TO OC</td>
<td>09-JAN-2001</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>PAPPAS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUBMITTED TO DO</td>
<td>11-JAN-2001</td>
<td>GMP</td>
<td></td>
<td>EGASH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASSIGNED INSPECTION '25-JAN-2001</td>
<td>GMP</td>
<td></td>
<td>EGASH</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INSPECTION SCHEDULED 29-MAY-2001</td>
<td>21-JUN-2001</td>
<td></td>
<td>IRIVERA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INSPECTION PERFORMED 28-JUN-2001</td>
<td>21-JUN-2001</td>
<td></td>
<td>IRIVERA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NO FD-483 WAS ISSUED, FIRM IS ACCEPTABLE.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DO RECOMMENDATION</td>
<td>02-AUG-2001</td>
<td></td>
<td>ACCEPTABLE</td>
<td>EGASH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OC RECOMMENDATION</td>
<td>02-AUG-2001</td>
<td></td>
<td>ACCEPTABLE</td>
<td>DAMBROGIOJ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>DISTRICT RECOMMENDATION</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Establishment: 9612715
**NOVARTIS PHARMA INC (SANDOZ)**
RINGASKIDDY/CORK, RINGASKIDDY, EI

**DMF No:** AADA:

**Responsibilities:** DRUG SUBSTANCE RELEASE TESTER

**Profile:** CTL  
**OAI Status:** NONE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Milestone Name</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Req. Type</th>
<th>Inspected Date</th>
<th>Decison &amp; Reason</th>
<th>Creator</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SUBMITTED TO OC</td>
<td>09-JAN-2001</td>
<td>GMP</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>PAPPAS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUBMITTED TO DO</td>
<td>11-JAN-2001</td>
<td>GMP</td>
<td></td>
<td>ACCEPTABLE</td>
<td>EGASM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DO RECOMMENDATION</td>
<td>25-JAN-2001</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>BASED ON FILE REVIEW</td>
<td>EGASM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OC RECOMMENDATION</td>
<td>02-AUG-2001</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ACCEPTABLE</td>
<td>DAMBROGIOJ</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Establishment: 9614433
**NOVARTIS PHARMAANALYTICA SA**
LOCARNO, , SZ

**DMF No:** AADA:

**Responsibilities:** DRUG SUBSTANCE STABILITY TESTER

**Profile:** CTL  
**OAI Status:** NONE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Milestone Name</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Req. Type</th>
<th>Inspected Date</th>
<th>Decison &amp; Reason</th>
<th>Creator</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SUBMITTED TO OC</td>
<td>09-JAN-2001</td>
<td>GMP</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>PAPPAS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OC RECOMMENDATION</td>
<td>11-JAN-2001</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ACCEPTABLE</td>
<td>EGASM</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Establishment:**

**DMF No:** AADA:

**Responsibilities:**

**Profile:** OIN  
**OAI Status:** NONE
### Estab. Comment:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Milestone Name</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Reg. Type</th>
<th>Insp. Date</th>
<th>Decision &amp; Reason</th>
<th>Creator</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SUBMITTED TO OC</td>
<td>09-JAN-2001</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>PAPPAS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUBMITTED TO DO</td>
<td>10-JAN-2001</td>
<td>GMP</td>
<td></td>
<td>ACCEPTABLE</td>
<td>FERGUSONS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DO RECOMMENDATION</td>
<td>07-FEB-2001</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ACCEPTABLE</td>
<td>DPAGANO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OC RECOMMENDATION</td>
<td>07-FEB-2001</td>
<td>ACCEPTABLE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>FERGUSONS</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Establishment:

![Establishment Icon]

### DMF No:

AADA:

### Responsibilities:

Profile: CTL

OAI Status: NONE

### Milestone Name

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Milestone Name</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Reg. Type</th>
<th>Insp. Date</th>
<th>Decision &amp; Reason</th>
<th>Creator</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SUBMITTED TO OC</td>
<td>09-JAN-2001</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>PAPPAS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUBMITTED TO DO</td>
<td>11-JAN-2001</td>
<td>GMP</td>
<td></td>
<td>EGASM</td>
<td>EGASM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASSIGNED INSPECTION</td>
<td>16-JAN-2001</td>
<td>GMP</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>EGASM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INSPECTION SCHEDULED</td>
<td>09-MAR-2001</td>
<td></td>
<td>16-MAR-2001</td>
<td>ACCEPTABLE</td>
<td>IRIVERA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INSPECTION PERFORMED</td>
<td>19-MAR-2001</td>
<td></td>
<td>16-MAR-2001</td>
<td></td>
<td>IRIVERA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RECOMMEND APPROVAL</td>
<td>17-APR-2001</td>
<td>ACCEPTABLE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>EGASM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OC RECOMMENDATION</td>
<td>18-APR-2001</td>
<td>ACCEPTABLE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>DISTRICT RECOMMENDATION</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Appears This Way On Original
Michael T. Jarratt, M.D.
DermResearch, Inc.
Building 3, Suite 120
8140 North Mopac
Austin, Texas 78759-8858

Dear Dr. Jarratt:

Between June 19 and 21, 2001, Mr. Joel Martinez, representing the Food and Drug Administration (FDA), met with you and your staff to review your conduct of a clinical study (protocol # CASM981.B307) of the investigational drug Elidel Cream 1%, performed for Novartis Pharmaceuticals Corporation. This inspection is a part of FDA’s Bioresearch Monitoring Program, which includes inspections designed to validate clinical studies on which drug approval may be based and to assure that the rights and welfare of the human subjects or those studies have been protected.

From our evaluation of the inspection report and the documents submitted with that report, we conclude that you did not adhere to pertinent federal regulations and/or good clinical investigational practices governing your conduct of clinical investigations and the protection of human subjects. We note that at the conclusion of the inspection, Mr. Martinez discussed with you his inspectional observation that two subjects were randomized prior to completion and evaluation of baseline laboratory tests. We acknowledge your promise to make corrections/changes in your procedures to ensure that the finding noted above is not repeated in any ongoing or future studies.

We appreciate the cooperation shown Investigator Martinez during the inspection. Should you have any questions or concerns about any aspect of the clinical testing of investigational drugs, please contact me by letter at the address given below.

Sincerely yours,

/Signature/

Antoine El-Hage, Ph.D.
Branch Chief
Good Clinical Practice II, HFD-47
Division of Scientific Investigations
Office of Medical Policy
Center for Drug Evaluation and Research
7520 Standish Place
Rockville, MD 20855
Dear Dr. Katz:

Between June 11 and 14, 2001, Ms. Sharon L. Matson, representing the Food and Drug Administration (FDA), met with Dr. Steven E. Kempers and his staff to review your conduct of a clinical study (protocol # CASM981.B307) of the investigational drug Elidel Cream 1%, performed for Novartis Pharmaceuticals Corporation. This inspection is a part of FDA's Bioresearch Monitoring Program, which includes inspections designed to validate clinical studies on which drug approval may be based and to assure that the rights and welfare of the human subjects of those studies have been protected.

From our evaluation of the inspection report and the documents submitted with that report, we conclude that you did not adhere to pertinent federal regulations and/or good clinical investigational practices governing your conduct of clinical investigations and the protection of human subjects. We note that at the conclusion of the inspection, Ms. Matson presented and discussed with Dr. Steven E. Kempers and his staff her inspectional observations. The discussion included the following:

a) Global Assessment ratings were incorrectly reported in the case report form (CRF) for subjects #7, #8, and #21.
b) Not all adverse events were reported in the CRFs for subjects #1, #2, #5, #9 and # 20.
c) Not all concomitant medications were reported for subjects #1#2, #5, #9 and # 20 and #24.

Please make corrections/changes in your procedures, to ensure that the findings noted above are not repeated in any ongoing or future studies.

We appreciate the cooperation shown Investigator Matson during the inspection. Should you have any questions or concerns about any aspect of the clinical testing of investigational drugs, please contact me by letter at the address given below.

Sincerely yours,

/\ Antoine El-Hage, Ph.D.
Branch Chief
Good Clinical Practice II, HFD-47
Division of Scientific Investigations
Office of Medical Policy
Center for Drug Evaluation and Research
7520 Standish Place
Rockville, MD 20855