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**1.3.5.1 Patent Information**

**Department of Health and Human Services**  
**Food and Drug Administration**

**PATENT INFORMATION SUBMITTED WITH THE**  
**FILING OF AN NDA, AMENDMENT, OR SUPPLEMENT**

**For Each Patent That Claims a Drug Substance**  
**(Active Ingredient), Drug Product (Formulation and Composition) and/or Method of Use**

The following is provided in accordance with Section 505(b) and (c) of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TRADE NAME (OR PROPOSED TRADE NAME)</th>
<th>INCRELEX™</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ACTIVE INGREDIENT(S)</th>
<th>STRENGTH(S)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Recombinant Human Insulin-like Growth Factor-1 (rhiGF-1)</td>
<td>10 mg/ml</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DOSAGE FORM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sterile, aqueous solution intended for subcutaneous injection.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This patent declaration form is required to be submitted to the Food and Drug Administration (FDA) with an NDA application, amendment, or supplement as required by 21 CFR 314.53 at the address provided in 21 CFR 314.53(d)(4).

Within thirty (30) days after approval of an NDA or supplement, or within thirty (30) days of issuance of a new patent, a new patent declaration must be submitted pursuant to 21 CFR 314.53(c)(2)(ii) with all of the required information based on the approved NDA or supplement. The information submitted in the declaration form submitted upon or after approval will be the only information relied upon by FDA for listing a patent in the Orange Book.

For hand-written or typewriter versions (only) of this report: If additional space is required for any narrative answer (i.e., one that does not require a "Yes" or "No" response), please attach an additional page referencing the question number.

**FDA will not list patent information if you submit an incomplete patent declaration or the patent declaration indicates the patent is not eligible for listing.**

For each patent submitted for the pending NDA, amendment, or supplement referenced above, you must submit all the information described below. If you are not submitting any patents for this pending NDA, amendment, or supplement, complete above section and sections 5 and 6.

### 1. GENERAL

a. United States Patent Number  
   5,681,814

b. Issue Date of Patent  
   10/28/1997

c. Expiration Date of Patent  
   10/28/2014

d. Name of Patent Owner  
   Genentech, Inc.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Address (of Patent Owner)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 DNA Way</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Address (of agent or representative named in 1.e.)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>South San Francisco</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ZIP Code</th>
<th>FAX Number (if available)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>94080</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Telephone Number</th>
<th>E-Mail Address (if available)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(650) 225-1000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

f. Is the patent referenced above a patent that has been submitted previously for the approved NDA or supplement referenced above?  
   Yes [ ] No [ ]

g. If the patent referenced above has been submitted previously for listing, is the expiration date a new expiration date?  
   Yes [ ] No [ ]

---

**NDA 21839**

FORM FDA 3542a (7/03)
1.3.5.1 Patent Information

For the patent referenced above, provide the following information on the drug substance, drug product and/or method of use that is the subject of the pending NDA, amendment, or supplement.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2. Drug Substance (Active Ingredient)</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2.1 Does the patent claim the drug substance that is the active ingredient in the drug product described in the pending NDA, amendment, or supplement?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.2 Does the patent claim a drug substance that is a different polymorph of the active ingredient described in the pending NDA, amendment, or supplement?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.3 If the answer to question 2.2 is &quot;Yes,&quot; do you certify that, as of the date of this declaration, you have test data demonstrating that a drug product containing the polymorph will perform the same as the drug product described in the NDA? The type of test data required is described at 21 CFR 314.53(b).</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.4 Specify the polymorphic form(s) claimed by the patent for which you have the test results described in 2.3.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| 2.5 Does the patent claim only a metabolite of the active ingredient pending in the NDA or supplement? (Complete the information in section 4 below if the patent claims a pending method of using the pending drug product to administer the metabolite.) | Yes | No |
| 2.6 Does the patent claim only an intermediate? | Yes | No |
| 2.7 If the patent referenced in 2.1 is a product-by-process patent, is the product claimed in the patent novel? (An answer is required only if the patent is a product-by-process patent.) | Yes | No |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>3. Drug Product (Composition/Formulation)</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3.1 Does the patent claim the drug product, as defined in 21 CFR 314.3, in the pending NDA, amendment, or supplement?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.2 Does the patent claim only an intermediate?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.3 If the patent referenced in 3.1 is a product-by-process patent, is the product claimed in the patent novel? (An answer is required only if the patent is a product-by-process patent.)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>4. Method of Use</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sponsors must submit the information in section 4 separately for each patent claim claiming a method of using the pending drug product for which approval is being sought. For each method of use claim referenced, provide the following information:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.1 Does the patent claim one or more methods of use for which approval is being sought in the pending NDA, amendment, or supplement?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.2 Claim Number (as listed in the patent) Does the patent claim referenced in 4.2 claim a pending method of use for which approval is being sought in the pending NDA, amendment, or supplement?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.2a If the answer to 4.2 is &quot;Yes,&quot; identify with specificity the use with reference to the proposed labeling for the drug product. Use: (Submit indication or method of use information as identified specifically in the proposed labeling.)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>5. No Relevant Patents</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>For this pending NDA, amendment, or supplement, there are no relevant patents that claim the drug substance (active ingredient), drug product (formulation or composition) or method(s) of use, for which the applicant is seeking approval and with respect to which a claim of patent infringement could reasonably be asserted if a person not licensed by the owner of the patent engaged in the manufacture, use, or sale of the drug product.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
6.3 PATENT INFORMATION

6.3.1 Declaration of Patent Information

6.3.1.1 The undersigned declares that this is an accurate and complete submission of patent information for the NDA, amendment, or supplement pending under section 505 of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act. This time-sensitive patent information is submitted pursuant to 21 CFR 314.53. I attest that I am familiar with 21 CFR 314.53 and this submission complies with the requirements of the regulation. I verify under penalty of perjury that the foregoing is true and correct.

Warning: A willfully and knowingly false statement is a criminal offense under 18 U.S.C. 1001.

6.3.2 Authorized Signature of NDA Applicant/Holder or Patent Owner (Attorney, Agent, Representative or other Authorized Official) (Provide Information below)

[Signature]

Date Signed: 11/4/24

NOTE: Only an NDA applicant/holder may submit this declaration directly to the FDA. A patent owner who is not the NDA applicant/holder is authorized to sign the declaration but may not submit it directly to FDA. 21 CFR 314.53(c)(4) and (d)(4).

Check applicable box and provide information below.

- [ ] NDA Applicant/Holder
- [ ] NDA Applicant's/Holder's Attorney, Agent (Representative) or other Authorized Official
- [ ] Patent Owner
- [ ] Patent Owner's Attorney, Agent (Representative) or Other Authorized Official

Name: Stephen N. Rosenfield

Address: Tercica, Inc.
651 Gateway Boulevard, Suite 950

City/State: South San Francisco, CA 94080

ZIP Code: 94080

Telephone Number: (650) 624-4994

Fax Number (if available): (650) 624-4940

E-Mail Address (if available): stephen.rosenfield@tercica.com

The public reporting burden for this collection of information has been estimated to average 9 hours per response, including the time for reviewing instructions, searching existing data sources, gathering and maintaining the data needed, and completing and reviewing the collection of information. Send comments regarding this burden estimate or any other aspect of this collection of information, including suggestions for reducing this burden to:

Food and Drug Administration
CDER (HFD-007)
5600 Fishers Lane
Rockville, MD 20857

An agency may not conduct or sponsor, and a person is not required to respond to, a collection of information unless it displays a currently valid OMB control number.
FORMULATED IGF-I COMPOSITION

Inventors: Ross G. Clark, Pacifica; Douglas A. Yeung, Fremont; James Q. Oeswein, Moss Beach, all of Calif.

Assignee: Genentech, Inc., South San Francisco, Calif.

Filed: Jun. 4, 1993

Related U.S. Application Data


References Cited

U.S. PATENT DOCUMENTS

4,857,505 8/1989 Arendt .......... 514/12
4,988,675 1/1991 Froesch .......... 514/4
5,126,524 6/1992 Clark et al .......... 514/12
5,187,151 2/1993 Clark et al .......... 514/12

FOREIGN PATENT DOCUMENTS

123228 10/1984 European Pat. Off.
123304 10/1984 European Pat. Off.
123873 12/1984 European Pat. Off.
35224687 12/1983 Japan
57026625 2/1992 Japan
2193891 2/1988 United Kingdom
2160258 3/1988 United Kingdom
WO 87/04038 2/1987 WIP0
WO 89/03822 6/1989 WIP0
WO 91/03295 3/1991 WIP0
WO 93/20371 11/1993 WIP0

OTHER PUBLICATIONS


Guler et al., "IGF II and II and recombinant human (rH) IGF I are hypoglycemic in the rat, minipig and man", The Endocrine Society, 68th Annual Mtg. 8394, (1986).


ABSTRACT

A formulation for IGF-I is disclosed that is useful in treating hyperglycemic disorders and, in combination with growth hormone, in enhancing growth of a mammal. Also disclosed is a process for preparing a formulation of growth hormone and IGF-I from the IGF-I formulation. The IGF-I formulation comprises about 2-20 mg/ml of IGF-I, about 2-50 mg/ml of an osmolyte, about 1-15 mg/ml of a stabilizer, and a buffered solution at about pH 5-5.5, optionally with a surfactant.
OTHER PUBLICATIONS


Young et al., “Growth hormone and testosterone can independently stimulate the growth of hypophysectomized prepuberal longs without any alteration in circulating concentrations of insulin-like growth factors”, *J. Endocrin.*, 121: 563–570 (1989).


1.3.5.1 Patent Information

Department of Health and Human Services
Food and Drug Administration

PATENT INFORMATION SUBMITTED WITH THE
FILING OF AN NDA, AMENDMENT, OR SUPPLEMENT
For Each Patent That Claims a Drug Substance
(Active Ingredient), Drug Product (Formulation and Composition) and/or Method of Use

The following is provided in accordance with Section 505(b) and (c) of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TRADE NAME (OR PROPOSED TRADE NAME)</th>
<th>INCRELEX™</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ACTIVE INGREDIENT(S)</th>
<th>STRENGTH(S)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Recombinant human Insulin-like Growth Factor-1 (rhIGF-1)</td>
<td>10 mg/ml</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| DOSAGE FORM |
|=============|
| Sterile, aqueous solution intended for subcutaneous injection. |

This patent declaration form is required to be submitted to the Food and Drug Administration (FDA) with an NDA application, amendment, or supplement as required by 21 CFR 314.53 at the address provided in 21 CFR 314.53(d)(4).

Within thirty (30) days after approval of an NDA or supplement, or within thirty (30) days of issuance of a new patent, a new patent declaration must be submitted pursuant to 21 CFR 314.53(c)(2)(i) with all of the required information based on the approved NDA or supplement. The information submitted in the declaration form submitted upon or after approval will be the only information relied upon by FDA for listing a patent in the Orange Book.

For handwritten or typewriter versions (only) of this report: If additional space is required for any narrative answer (i.e., one that does not require a "Yes" or "No" response), please attach an additional page referencing the question number.

FDA will not list patent information if you submit an incomplete patent declaration or the patent declaration indicates the patent is not eligible for listing.

For each patent submitted for the pending NDA, amendment, or supplement referenced above, you must submit all the information described below. If you are not submitting any patents for this pending NDA, amendment, or supplement, complete above section and sections 5 and 6.

1. GENERAL
   a. United States Patent Number
      5,824,642
   b. Issue Date of Patent
      10/20/1996
   c. Expiration Date of Patent
      10/20/2015
   d. Name of Patent Owner
      Genentech, Inc.
   e. Name of agent or representative who resides or maintains a place of business within the United States authorized to receive notice of patent certification under section 505(b)(3) and (j)(2)(B) of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act and 21 CFR 314.52 and 314.95 (If patent owner or NDA applicant/holder does not reside or have a place of business within the United States)
   f. Is the patent referenced above a patent that has been submitted previously for the approved NDA or supplement referenced above?
      ☑ Yes  ☐ No
   g. If the patent referenced above has been submitted previously for listing, is the expiration date a new expiration date?
      ☑ Yes  ☐ No

FORM FDA 3542a (7/03)
NDA 21839

Page 1
For the patent referenced above, provide the following information on the drug substance, drug product and/or method of use that is the subject of the pending NDA, amendment, or supplement.

2. Drug Substance (Active Ingredient)

2.1 Does the patent claim the drug substance that is the active ingredient in the drug product described in the pending NDA, amendment, or supplement?  
☐ Yes  ☐ No

2.2 Does the patent claim a drug substance that is a different polymorph of the active ingredient described in the pending NDA, amendment, or supplement?  
☐ Yes  ☐ No

2.3 If the answer to question 2.2 is "Yes," do you certify that, as of the date of this declaration, you have test data demonstrating that a drug product containing the polymorph will perform the same as the drug product described in the NDA? The type of test data required is described at 21 CFR 314.53(b).  
☐ Yes  ☐ No

2.4 Specify the polymorphic form(s) claimed by the patent for which you have the test results described in 2.3.

2.5 Does the patent claim only a metabolite of the active ingredient pending in the NDA or supplement?  
(Complete the information in section 4 below if the patent claims a pending method of using the pending drug product to administer the metabolite.)  
☐ Yes  ☐ No

2.6 Does the patent claim only an intermediate?  
☐ Yes  ☐ No

2.7 If the patent referenced in 2.1 is a product-by-process patent, is the product claimed in the patent novel? (An answer is required only if the patent is a product-by-process patent.)  
☐ Yes  ☐ No

3. Drug Product (Composition/Formulation)

3.1 Does the patent claim the drug product, as defined in 21 CFR 314.3, in the pending NDA, amendment, or supplement?  
☐ Yes  ☐ No

3.2 Does the patent claim only an intermediate?  
☐ Yes  ☐ No

3.3 If the patent referenced in 3.1 is a product-by-process patent, is the product claimed in the patent novel? (An answer is required only if the patent is a product-by-process patent.)  
☐ Yes  ☐ No

4. Method of Use

Sponsors must submit the information in section 4 separately for each patent claim claiming a method of using the pending drug product for which approval is being sought. For each method of use claim referenced, provide the following information:

4.1 Does the patent claim one or more methods of use for which approval is being sought in the pending NDA, amendment, or supplement?  
☐ Yes  ☐ No

4.2 Claim Number (as listed in the patent)

Use: (Submit indication or method of use information as identified specifically in the proposed labeling.)

INCRELEX<sup>TM</sup> replacement therapy is indicated for patients with primary IGF-1 deficiency.

☐ Yes  ☐ No

4.2a If the answer to 4.2 is "Yes," identify with specificity the use with reference to the proposed labeling for the drug product.

5. No Relevant Patents

For this pending NDA, amendment, or supplement, there are no relevant patents that claim the drug substance (active ingredient), drug product (formulation or composition) or method(s) of use, for which the applicant is seeking approval and with respect to which a claim of patent infringement could reasonably be asserted if a person not licensed by the owner of the patent engaged in the manufacture, use, or sale of the drug product.  
☐ Yes
6.1 The undersigned declares that this is an accurate and complete submission of patent information for the NDA, amendment, or supplement pending under section 505 of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act. This time-sensitive patent information is submitted pursuant to 21 CFR 314.53. I attest that I am familiar with 21 CFR 314.53 and this submission complies with the requirements of the regulation. I verify under penalty of perjury that the foregoing is true and correct.

Warning: A willfully and knowingly false statement is a criminal offense under 18 U.S.C. 1001.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Authorized Signature of NDA Applicant/Holder or Patent Owner (Attorney, Agent, Representative or other Authorized Official) (Provide Information below)</th>
<th>Date Signed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>[Signature]</td>
<td>11/4/04</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

NOTE: Only an NDA applicant/holder may submit this declaration directly to the FDA. A patent owner who is not the NDA applicant/holder is authorized to sign the declaration but may not submit it directly to FDA. 21 CFR 314.53(c)(4) and (d)(4).

Check applicable box and provide information below.

- [ ] NDA Applicant/Holder
- [ ] NDA Applicant's/Holder's Attorney, Agent (Representative) or other Authorized Official
- [ ] Patent Owner
- [ ] Patent Owner’s Attorney, Agent (Representative) or Other Authorized Official

Name
Stephen N. Rosenfield

Address
Tercica, Inc.
651 Gateway Boulevard, Suite 950

City/State
South San Francisco, CA 94080

ZIP Code
94080

Telephone Number
(650) 624-4994

FAX Number (if available)
(650) 624-4940

E-Mail Address (if available)
stephen.rosenfield@tercica.com

The public reporting burden for this collection of information has been estimated to average 9 hours per response, including the time for reviewing instructions, searching existing data sources, gathering and maintaining the data needed, and completing and reviewing the collection of information. Send comments regarding this burden estimate or any other aspect of this collection of information, including suggestions for reducing this burden to:

Food and Drug Administration
CDER (HFD-007)
5600 Fishers Lane
Rockville, MD 20857

An agency may not conduct or sponsor, and a person is not required to respond to, a collection of information unless it displays a currently valid OMB control number.
TREATMENT OF PARTIAL GROWTH HORMONE INSensitivity SYNDROME


Assignee: Genentech, Inc., South San Francisco, Calif.

Filed: Jun. 6, 1995

Patent Number: 5,824,462
Date of Patent: Oct. 20, 1998

Related U.S. Application Data


References Cited

U.S. PATENT DOCUMENTS
5,126,324 6/1992 Clark et al. 514/12
5,187,151 2/1993 Clark et al. 514/3

FOREIGN PATENT DOCUMENTS

OTHER PUBLICATIONS

Baumbach et al., “the Growth Hormone-Binding Protein in Rat Serum is an Alternatively Spliced Form of the Rat Growth Hormone Receptor” Gene & Development 3:1199-1205 (1989).

Methods for increasing the growth rate of a human patient having partial growth hormone insensitivity syndrome, but not Laron syndrome, are described. One such method comprises administering an effective dose of growth hormone, preferably growth hormone with a native human sequence, with or without an N-terminal methionine, to the patient. The patient is characterized as having a height of less than about 1.2 standard deviations below normal for age and sex, a serum level of high-affinity growth hormone binding protein that is at least 2 standard deviations below normal levels, a serum level of IGF-I that is below normal mean levels, and a serum level of growth hormone that is at least normal. In another such method, the same patient population is treated with an effective amount of IGF-I, given alone or in combination with an amount of growth hormone that is effective in combination with the IGF-I.

16 Claims, 12 Drawing Sheets
1.3.5.1 Patent Information

Department of Health and Human Services  
Food and Drug Administration

PATENT INFORMATION SUBMITTED WITH THE  
FILING OF AN NDA, AMENDMENT, OR SUPPLEMENT  
For Each Patent That Claims a Drug Substance  
(Active Ingredient), Drug Product (Formulation and Composition) and/or Method of Use

The following is provided in accordance with Section 505(b) and (c) of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TRADE NAME (OR PROPOSED TRADE NAME)</th>
<th>INCRELEX™</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ACTIVE INGREDIENT(S)</td>
<td>Recombinant human Insulin-like Growth Factor-1 (rhIGF-1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STRENGTH(S)</td>
<td>10 mg/ml</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

DOSAGE FORM  
Sterile, aqueous solution intended for subcutaneous injection.

This patent declaration form is required to be submitted to the Food and Drug Administration (FDA) with an NDA application, amendment, or supplement as required by 21 CFR 314.53 at the address provided in 21 CFR 314.53(d)(4).

Within thirty (30) days after approval of an NDA or supplement, or within thirty (30) days of issuance of a new patent, a new patent declaration must be submitted pursuant to 21 CFR 314.53(c)(2)(ii) with all of the required information based on the approved NDA or supplement. The information submitted in the declaration form submitted upon or after approval will be the only information relied upon by FDA for listing a patent in the Orange Book.

For hand-written or typewriter versions (only) of this report: If additional space is required for any narrative answer (i.e., one that does not require a "Yes" or "No" response), please attach an additional page referencing the question number.

FDA will not list patent information if you submit an incomplete patent declaration or the patent declaration indicates the patent is not eligible for listing.

For each patent submitted for the pending NDA, amendment, or supplement referenced above, you must submit all the information described below. If you are not submitting any patents for this pending NDA, amendment, or supplement, complete above section and sections 5 and 6.

1. GENERAL

a. United States Patent Number  
6,207,640

d. Name of Patent Owner  
Genentech, Inc.

b. Issue Date of Patent  
03/27/2001

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Address (of Patent Owner)</th>
<th>DNA Way</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>City/State</td>
<td>South San Francisco</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ZIP Code</td>
<td>94080</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

FAX Number (if available)

Telephone Number (650) 225-1000

E-Mail Address (if available)

f. Is the patent referenced above a patent that has been submitted previously for the approved NDA or supplement referenced above?  
☐ Yes  ☑ No

g. If the patent referenced above has been submitted previously for listing, is the expiration date a new expiration date?  
☐ Yes  ☑ No

FORM FDA 3542a (7/03)  
NDA 21839
1.3.5.1 Patent Information

For the patent referenced above, provide the following information on the drug substance, drug product and/or method of use that is the subject of the pending NDA, amendment, or supplement.

2. Drug Substance (Active Ingredient)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2.1 Does the patent claim the drug substance that is the active ingredient in the drug product described in the pending NDA, amendment, or supplement?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.2 Does the patent claim a drug substance that is a different polymorph of the active ingredient described in the pending NDA, amendment, or supplement?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.3 If the answer to question 2.2 is &quot;Yes,&quot; do you certify that, as of the date of this declaration, you have test data demonstrating that a drug product containing the polymorph will perform the same as the drug product described in the NDA? The type of test data required is described at 21 CFR 314.53(b).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.4 Specify the polymorphic form(s) claimed by the patent for which you have the test results described in 2.3.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.5 Does the patent claim only a metabolite of the active ingredient pending in the NDA or supplement? (Complete the information in section 4 below if the patent claims a pending method of using the pending drug product to administer the metabolite.)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.6 Does the patent claim only an intermediate?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.7 If the patent referenced in 2.1 is a product-by-process patent, is the product claimed in the patent novel? (An answer is required only if the patent is a product-by-process patent.)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3. Drug Product (Composition/Formulation)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3.1 Does the patent claim the drug product, as defined in 21 CFR 314.3, in the pending NDA, amendment, or supplement?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.2 Does the patent claim only an intermediate?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.3 If the patent referenced in 3.1 is a product-by-process patent, is the product claimed in the patent novel? (An answer is required only if the patent is a product-by-process patent.)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4. Method of Use

Sponsors must submit the information in section 4 separately for each patent claim claiming a method of using the pending drug product for which approval is being sought. For each method of use claim referenced, provide the following information:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4.1 Does the patent claim one or more methods of use for which approval is being sought in the pending NDA, amendment, or supplement?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.2 Claim Number (as listed in the patent)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15, 16, 17</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.2a If the answer to 4.2 is &quot;Yes,&quot; identify with specificity the use with reference to the proposed labeling for the drug product. Use: (Submit indication or method of use information as identified specifically in the proposed labeling.)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INCRED® replacement therapy is indicated for patients with primary IGF-1 deficiency</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5. No Relevant Patents

For this pending NDA, amendment, or supplement, there are no relevant patents that claim the drug substance (active ingredient), drug product (formulation or composition) or method(s) of use, for which the applicant is seeking approval and with respect to which a claim of patent infringement could reasonably be asserted if a person not licensed by the owner of the patent engaged in the manufacture, use, or sale of the drug product.

□ Yes
6.1 The undersigned declares that this is an accurate and complete submission of patent information for the NDA, amendment, or supplement pending under section 505 of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act. This time-sensitive patent information is submitted pursuant to 21 CFR 314.53. I attest that I am familiar with 21 CFR 314.53 and this submission complies with the requirements of the regulation. I verify under penalty of perjury that the foregoing is true and correct.

Warning: A willfully and knowingly false statement is a criminal offense under 18 U.S.C. 1001.

6.2 Authorized Signature of NDA Applicant/Holder or Patent Owner (Attorney, Agent, Representative or other Authorized Official) (Provide Information below)

Date Signed

11/4/04

NOTE: Only an NDA applicant/holder may submit this declaration directly to the FDA. A patent owner who is not the NDA applicant/holder is authorized to sign the declaration but may not submit it directly to FDA. 21 CFR 314.53(c)(4) and (d)(4).

Check applicable box and provide information below.

- [ ] NDA Applicant/Holder
- [ ] NDA Applicant's/Holder's Attorney, Agent (Representative) or other Authorized Official
- [ ] Patent Owner
- [ ] Patent Owner's Attorney, Agent (Representative) or Other Authorized Official

Name
Stephen N. Rosenfield

Address
Tercica, Inc.
681 Gateway Boulevard, Suite 950

City/State
South San Francisco, CA 94080

ZIP Code
94080

Telephone Number
(650) 624-4944

FAX Number (if available)
(650) 624-4940

E-Mail Address (if available)
stephen.rosenfield@tercica.com

The public reporting burden for this collection of information has been estimated to average 9 hours per response, including the time for reviewing instructions, searching existing data sources, gathering and maintaining the data needed, and completing and reviewing the collection of information. Send comments regarding this burden estimate or any other aspect of this collection of information, including suggestions for reducing this burden to:

Food and Drug Administration
CDER (HFD-007)
5600 Fishers Lane
Rockville, MD 20857

An agency may not conduct or sponsor, and a person is not required to respond to, a collection of information unless it displays a currently valid OMB control number.
TREATMENT OF PARTIAL GROWTH HORMONE INSENSITIVITY SYNDROME

Inventors: Kenneth M. Attie, San Francisco, CA (US); Lena M. S. Carlsson, Gothenburg (SE); Neil Gesundheit, Los Altos; Audrey Goddard, San Francisco, both of CA (US)

Assignee: Genentech, Inc., South San Francisco, CA (US)

Notice: Subject to any disclaimer, the term of this patent is extended or adjusted under 35 U.S.C. 154(b) by 0 days.

This patent is subject to a terminal disclaimer.

Appl. No.: 08/643,212
Filed: May 3, 1996

Relate U.S. Application Data
Continuation of application No. 08/410,452, filed on Mar. 24, 1995, now abandoned, and a continuation of application No. 08/224,982, filed on Apr. 7, 1994, now Pat. No. 5,646,113.

Int. Cl. A61K 38/00
U.S. Cl. 514/12; 514/21; 514/3; 530/303; 530/311; 530/399
Field of Search 514/12, 21, 3; 530/303, 311, 399
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ABSTRACT

Methods for increasing the growth rate of a human patient having partial growth hormone insensitivity syndrome, but not Laron syndrome, are described. One such method comprises administering an effective dose of growth hormone, preferably growth hormone with a native human sequence, with or without an N-terminal methionine, to the patient. The patient is characterized as having a height of less than about ~2 standard deviations below normal for age and sex, a serum level of high-affinity growth hormone binding protein that is at least 2 standard deviations below normal levels, a serum level of IGF-I that is below normal mean levels, and a serum level of growth hormone that is at least normal. In another such method, the same patient population is treated with an effective amount of IGF-I, given alone or in combination with an amount of growth hormone that is effective in combination with the IGF-I.
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EXCLUSIVITY SUMMARY

NDA # 21-839                  SUPPL #                        HFD # 510

Trade Name     INCRELEX

Generic Name   mecasermin (rDNA origin) injection, 10 mg/mL

Applicant Name  Tercica, Inc.

Approval Date, If Known

PART I  IS AN EXCLUSIVITY DETERMINATION NEEDED?

1. An exclusivity determination will be made for all original applications, and all efficacy 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 a 505(b)(1), 505(b)(2) or efficacy supplement?  YES ☒  NO ☐

If yes, what type? Specify 505(b)(1), 505(b)(2), SE1, SE2, SE3, SE4, SE5, SE6, SE7, SE8

505(b)(1) original NDA

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.

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:

d) Did the applicant request exclusivity?
YES ☒  NO ☐

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

7 - orphan exclusivity

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

YES ☐  NO ☒

If the answer to the above question in YES, is this approval a result of the studies submitted in response to the Pediatric Written Request?

IF YOU HAVE ANSWERED "NO" TO ALL OF THE ABOVE QUESTIONS, GO DIRECTLY TO THE SIGNATURE BLOCKS AT THE END OF THIS DOCUMENT.

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

YES ☐  NO ☒

IF THE ANSWER TO QUESTION 2 IS "YES," GO DIRECTLY TO THE SIGNATURE BLOCKS ON PAGE 8 (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 ☒

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.)

   YES ☐   NO ☐

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

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

**PART III THRE E-YEAR EXCLUSIVITY FOR NDAs AND SUPPLEMENTS**

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

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

   YES ☐   NO ☐
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.

(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 □  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 8:

(b) Did the applicant submit a list of published studies relevant to the safety and effectiveness of this drug product and a statement that the publicly available data would not independently support approval of the application?  
YES □  NO □

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

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:

Studies comparing two products with the same ingredient(s) are considered to be bioavailability studies for the purpose of this section.

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.")

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Investigation #1</th>
<th>YES □</th>
<th>NO □</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Investigation #2</td>
<td>YES □</td>
<td>NO □</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

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?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Investigation #1</th>
<th>YES □</th>
<th>NO □</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Investigation #2</td>
<td>YES □</td>
<td>NO □</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

If you have answered "yes" for one or more investigation, identify the NDA in which a similar investigation was relied on:
c) If the answers to 3(a) and 3(b) are no, identify each "new" investigation in the application or supplement that is essential to the approval (i.e., the investigations listed in #2(c), less any that are not "new"):  

4. To be eligible for exclusivity, a new investigation that is essential to approval must also have been conducted or sponsored by the applicant. An investigation was "conducted or sponsored by" the applicant if, before or during the conduct of the investigation, 1) the applicant was the sponsor of the IND named in the form FDA 1571 filed with the Agency, or 2) the applicant (or its predecessor in interest) provided substantial support for the study. Ordinarily, substantial support will mean providing 50 percent or more of the cost of the study.

a) For each investigation identified in response to question 3(c): if the investigation was carried out under an IND, was the applicant identified on the FDA 1571 as the sponsor?

Investigation #1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>IND #</th>
<th>YES □</th>
<th>NO □</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>!</td>
<td>!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>!</td>
<td>Explain:</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Investigation #2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>IND #</th>
<th>YES □</th>
<th>NO □</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>!</td>
<td>!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>!</td>
<td>Explain:</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(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?

Investigation #1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>YES □</th>
<th>NO □</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>!</td>
<td>!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Explain:</td>
<td>Explain:</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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 □

If yes, explain:

Name of person completing form: Enid Galliers
Title: CPMS, DMEDP
Date: 8/4/05

Name of Office/Division Director signing form: David G. Orloff, MD
Title: Director, DMEDP

Form OGD-011347; Revised 05/10/2004; formatted 2/15/05
This is a representation of an electronic record that was signed electronically and this page is the manifestation of the electronic signature.

/s/
--------------
Enid Galliers
8/5/05 11:52:17 AM

David Orloff
8/5/05 12:10:45 PM
PEDIATRIC PAGE

(Complete for all filed original applications and efficacy supplements)

NDA/BLA #: 21-839 
Supplement Type (e.g. SE5): 
Supplement Number: n/a

Stamp Date: 2/28/05 
Action Date: no later than 8/31/05

HFD-510 
Trade and generic names/dosage form: INCREDAX (mecasermin [rDNA origin] injection) 10 mg/mL

Applicant: TERCICA, INC. 
Therapeutic Class: 1 P, V DESIGNATED ORPHAN

Indication(s) previously approved: None.

Each approved indication must have pediatric studies: Completed, Deferred, and/or Waived.

Number of indications for this application: 1

Indication #1: Treat growth failure in pediatric patients with severe primary IGF-1 deficiency or with growth hormone gene deletion who have developed neutralizing antibodies to growth hormone.

Is there a full waiver for this indication (check one)?

☐ Yes: Please proceed to Section A.

☑ No: Please check all that apply: ☑ Partial Waiver ☑ Deferred ☑ Completed

NOTE: More than one may apply

Please proceed to Section B, Section C, and/or Section D and complete as necessary.

Section A: Fully Waived Studies

Reason(s) for full waiver:

☐ Products in this class for this indication have been studied/labeled for pediatric population
☐ Disease/condition does not exist in children
☐ Too few children with disease to study
☐ There are safety concerns
☐ Other:

If studies are fully waived, then pediatric information is complete for this indication. If there is another indication, please see Attachment A. Otherwise, this Pediatric Page is complete and should be entered into DFS.

Section B: Partially Waived Studies

Age/weight range being partially waived:

Min. x kg.  mo. 0 yr. 
Max. x kg. mo. yr. 2 

Tanner Stage 

Tanner Stage

Reason(s) for partial waiver:

☐ Products in this class for this indication have been studied/labeled for pediatric population
☐ Disease/condition does not exist in children
☐ Too few children with disease to study
☐ There are safety concerns
☐ Adult studies ready for approval
☐ Formulation needed
☑ Other: Condition is usually not diagnosed before this age.
Section C: Deferred Studies

Age/weight range being deferred:
Min ______ kg______ mo.______ yr.______ Tanner Stage______
Max_______ kg______ mo.______ yr.______ Tanner Stage______

Reason(s) for deferral:
☐ Products in this class for this indication have been studied/labeled for pediatric population
☐ Disease/condition does not exist in children
☐ Too few children with disease to study
☐ There are safety concerns
☐ Adult studies ready for approval
☐ Formulation needed
Other: __________________________

Date studies are due (mm/dd/yy): __________

If studies are completed, proceed to Section D. Otherwise, this Pediatric Page is complete and should be entered into DFS.

Section D: Completed Studies

Age/weight range of completed studies:
Min_______ kg______ mo.______ yr. ______ 2 Tanner Stage______
Max_______ kg______ mo.______ yr. ______ 18 Tanner Stage______

Comments: This drug should not be used in patients after their epiphyses have closed.

If there are additional indications, please proceed to Attachment A. Otherwise, this Pediatric Page is complete and should be entered into DFS.

This page was completed by: Enid Galliers

{See appended electronic signature page}

Regulatory Project Manager

cc: NDA 21-839
HFD-960/Grace Carmouze

FOR QUESTIONS ON COMPLETING THIS FORM CONTACT THE DIVISION OF PEDIATRIC DRUG DEVELOPMENT, HFD-960, 301-594-7337.
(revised 12-22-03)
This is a representation of an electronic record that was signed electronically and this page is the manifestation of the electronic signature.

/s/

Enid Galliers
8/8/05 06:16:36 PM
In accordance with the certification provision of the Generic Drug Enforcement Act of 1992, Tercica, Inc. hereby certifies that it did not and will not use in any capacity the services of any person debarred under section 306 of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act in connection with this application.

Ira Wallis, Ph.D
Vice President, Regulatory Affairs

Date
1.3.3 Debarment Certification

Tercica

eSign Approval Form

As per 21CFR, Part 11 regulations, your electronic signature is a legally binding equivalent of your handwritten signature, and it indicates you have read, understood, and approved the attached document.

UserName: Ira Wallis (iwallis)
Title:
Date: Wednesday, 22 September 2004, 02:34 PM  Pacific Standard Time
Meaning: Document Approval
Dear Enid,

Attached are the final Package Insert and Patient Package Insert, as agreed upon at today's conference call.

We will also be submitting these items to the eCTD, as requested.

Please confirm receipt of this e-mail.

Regards,
Shawn

Shawn D. McLaughlin, MBA  
Associate Director, Regulatory Affairs  
Tercica Inc.  
2000 Sierra Point Parkway, Suite 400  
Brisbane, CA 94005  
Direct: 650.624.4993  
FAX: 650.624.4989

This communication is intended solely for the use of the addressee and may contain information that is legally privileged, confidential or exempt from disclosure. If you are not the intended recipient, please note that any dissemination, distribution, or copying of this communication is strictly prohibited. Anyone who receives this message in error should notify the sender immediately and delete it from his or her computer.
Dear Enid,

We have incorporated the requested changes and I have attached the revised final PI.

We are also able to get the eCTD submission out today, so it should arrive in the EDR tomorrow.

Regards,
Shawn

Shawn D. McLaughlin, MBA
Associate Director, Regulatory Affairs
Tercica Inc.
2000 Sierra Point Parkway, Suite 400
Brisbane, CA 94005
Direct: 650.624.4993
FAX: 650.624.4989

This communication is intended solely for the use of the addressee and may contain information that is legally privileged, confidential or exempt from disclosure. If you are not the intended recipient, please note that any dissemination, distribution, or copying of this communication is strictly prohibited. Anyone who receives this message in error should notify the sender immediately and delete it from his or her computer.
ADRA Rev #1 of Action Package for NDA 21-839, Inrelex (mecasermin injection)

Reviewer: Lee Ripper, HFD-102  
Date received: 8/12/05  
Date of review: 8/15/05  
Date original NDA received: 2/28/05  
UF goal date: 8/31/05

Proposed Indication: Long-term Tx of growth failure in children with severe primary IGF-1 deficiency (primary IGDF) or with growth hormone (GH) gene deletion who have developed neutralizing antibodies to growth hormone.  
Action type: AP  
RPM: Enid Galliers, x7-6429  
Drug Classification: 1PV  
505(b)(1) application

Patent Info on form FDA 3542a: Yes  
Debarment Certification: AC  
Safety Update: MOR pp 123-27  
Clinical Inspection Summary: No DSI audits were performed.  
ODS/DMETS Review of Proprietary Name: AC 8/20/04, 6/24/05  
ODS/DMETS Review of Labels: 7/27/05  
DSRCS Review of PPI: 7/25/05  
DDMAC Review: 8/17/05  
Risk Management Plan: Per 7/26/05 PSC/WU mtg, an RMP is not needed. Dr. Orloff to check with OCC on issues of abuse with mecasermin.  
EA: Categorical exclusion granted.  
EER: AC 8/2/05  
Financial Disclosure: AC  
PSC/WU Mtg: Minutes of 7/26/05 mtg are in pkg

CMC section to Eric Duffy, 8/16/05; review completed 8/24/05  
P/T section to Ken Hastings, 8/16/05; review completed 8/24/05

1. Statistical review has not been finalized. Draft in package. CM 8/23/05  
2. No division director memo. Dr. Orloff will not write a review. Dr. Meyer's office director memo will suffice.  
3. DDMAC labeling review pending. CM 8/17/05.  
4. Comments on letter to Dr. Meyer and Enid Galliers.  
5. Comments on PI and PPI to Dr. Meyer 8/24/05.
This is a representation of an electronic record that was signed electronically and this page is the manifestation of the electronic signature.

/s/

-------------
Leah Ripper
8/30/2005 01:42:01 PM
CSO
# NDA REGULATORY FILING REVIEW

INCLUDING MEMO OF FILING MEETING

**NDA #** 21-839  **Supplement #** N/A  **SE1** SE2 SE3 SE4 SE5 SE6 SE7 SE8

**Trade Name:** INCRELEX  
**Generic Name:** (mecasermin rDNA origin) injection  
**Strengths:** 10 mg/mL

**Applicant:** TERCICA, INC.

**Date of Application:** 24-FEB-2005  
**Date of Receipt:** 28-FEB-2005  
**Date clock started after UN:** N/A  
**Date of Filing Meeting:** 20-APR-2005  
**Filing Date:** 29-APR-2005  
**Action Goal Date (optional):** N/A  
**User Fee Goal Date:** 31-AUG-2005

**Indication(s) requested:** “Long-term treatment of growth failure in children with primary IGF-1 deficiency (primary IGFD)”

**Type of Original NDA:**  
(b)(1) ☑  
(b)(2)  
**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 is a (b)(2), complete Appendix B.**

2. **If the application is a supplement to an NDA, please indicate whether the NDA is a (b)(1) or a (b)(2) application:**  
- [ ] NDA is a (b)(1) application  
- [x] NDA is a (b)(2) application

**Therapeutic Classification:**  
P: ☑  
S:  

**Resubmission after withdrawal?** N/A  
**Resubmission after refuse to file?** N/A  

**Chemical Classification:**  
(1,2,3 etc.: 1  

**Other (orphan, OTC, etc.):**  
☐  

**Form 3397 (User Fee Cover Sheet) submitted:**  
YES ☑  
NO  

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

**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. 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 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 an approved (b)(1) or (b)(2) application? 
  YES  NO  ✓
  If yes, explain:

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

- 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  ✓
  If yes, explain.

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

- Does the submission contain an accurate comprehensive index?  YES  ✓  NO

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

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

- If an electronic NDA, does it follow the Guidance?  N/A  ✓  YES  NO
  If an electronic NDA, all certifications must be in paper and require a signature.
  Which parts of the application were submitted in electronic format?

Additional comments:

- If in Common Technical Document format, does it follow the guidance?  N/A  ✓  YES  NO

- Is it an electronic CTD?  N/A  YES  ✓  NO

(If an electronic CTD, all certifications must be in paper and require a signature.) This eCTD properly contains electronic signatures.

Which parts of the application were submitted in electronic format?

Additional comments:

- Patent information submitted on form FDA 3542a? YES ☑ NO
- Exclusivity requested? YES, _____ years NO ☑
  
  **NOTE:** An applicant can receive exclusivity without requesting it; therefore, requesting exclusivity is not required.

  However, the applicant referred to its orphan designation and included copies of relevant orphan designation letters.

- Correctly worded Debarment Certification included with authorized signature? YES ☑ NO
  
  **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 . . . .”

- Financial Disclosure forms included with authorized signature? YES ☑ NO
  (Forms 3454 and 3455 must be used and must be signed by the APPLICANT.)

- Field Copy Certification (that it is a true copy of the CMC technical section)? YES ☑ NO

Refer to 21 CFR 314.101(d) for Filing Requirements

- PDUFA and Action Goal dates correct in COMIS? YES ☑ NO
  
  If not, have the document room staff correct them immediately. These are the dates EES uses for calculating inspection dates.

- Drug name/Applicant name correct in COMIS? If not, have the Document Room make the corrections.

- List referenced IND numbers: ☐ I 139,679; ☑ ☐

- End-of-Phase 2 Meeting(s)? Date(s) 3/5/03(Guidance) NO
  
  If yes, distribute minutes before filing meeting.

- Pre-NDA Meeting(s)? Date(s) 5/27/04 NO
  
  If yes, distribute minutes before filing meeting.

**Project Management**

- All labeling (PI, PPI, MedGuide, carton and immediate container labels) consulted to DDMAC? YES ☑ NO
• Trade name (plus PI and all labels and labeling) consulted to ODS/DMETS?  YES ✓ NO

• MedGuide and/or PPI (plus PI) consulted to ODS/DSRCS?  N/A YES ✓ NO

• If a drug with abuse potential, was an Abuse Liability Assessment, including a proposal for scheduling, submitted?  N/A ✓ YES NO

If Rx-to-OTC Switch application:

• OTC label comprehension studies, all OTC labeling, and current approved PI consulted to ODS/DSRCS?  N/A ✓ YES NO

• Has DOTCDP been notified of the OTC switch application?  YES NO

Clinical

• If a controlled substance, has a consult been sent to the Controlled Substance Staff?  N/A ✓ YES NO

Chemistry

• Did applicant request categorical exclusion for environmental assessment?  YES ✓ NO
  If no, did applicant submit a complete environmental assessment?  YES ✓ NO ✓
  If EA submitted, consulted to Florian Zielinski (HFD-357)?  N/A ✓ YES NO

• Establishment Evaluation Request (EER) submitted to DMPQ?  YES ✓ NO

• If a parenteral product, consulted to Microbiology Team (HFD-805)?  YES ✓ NO
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ATTACHMENT

MEMO OF FILING MEETING

DATE: April 20, 2005

BACKGROUND: This product is a new molecular entity, mecasermin (recombinant human IGF-1) and is being proposed for the orphan indication, long-term treatment of pediatric patients with growth hormone deficiency. The worldwide population with Laron Syndrome, a subset of the GHIS population may only number 250 – 350 individuals. The drug product is a solution for subcutaneous injection that will be packaged in multiple dose vials.

Mecasermin was approved in Japan as SOMAZON for a different sponsor.

ATTENDEES:
Drs. Ahn, El Hage, L. Green, Roman, Sahlroot, Shen, & Yim; Mr. Fritsch, Ms. Slavin, Ms. Galliers

ASSIGNED REVIEWERS:
Dragos Roman, Xavier Yserrn, Shen Xiao, Sang Chung, Todd Sahlroot, Vinayak Pawar

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Discipline</th>
<th>Reviewer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Medical:</td>
<td>D. Roman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secondary Medical:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Statistical:</td>
<td>T. Sahlroot</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pharmacology:</td>
<td>S. Xiao</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Statistical Pharmacology:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chemistry:</td>
<td>X. Yserrn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental Assessment (if needed)</td>
<td>n/a (categorical exclusion request)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Biopharmaceutical:</td>
<td>S. Chung</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Microbiology, sterility:</td>
<td>V. Pawar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Microbiology, clinical (for antimicrobial products only):</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DSI:</td>
<td>A. Slavin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regulatory Project Management:</td>
<td>E. Galliers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Consults:</td>
<td>Carol Pamer, ODS safety evaluator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sandy Birdsong, ODS PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Diane Smith, DMETS,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Debi Tran, DDMAC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Jeanine Best, DSRCS - PPI</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Per reviewers, are all parts in English or English translation? YES ✔ NO

If no, explain:

CLINICAL

FILE YES ✔ NO

• Clinical site inspection needed:

YES NO ✔

• Advisory Committee Meeting needed?

YES, date if known ___ NO ✔

• 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 ✔ YES NO

The sponsor did not submit a risk management plan (RMP), but clinical reviewers did not think it necessary. Dr. Orloff decided that this NDA should have Priority review status (with a six-month review clock).

**CLINICAL MICROBIOLOGY**

NA ✓ FILE   REFUSE TO FILE

**STATISTICS**

FILE ✓ ✓ REFUSE TO FILE

**BIOPHARMACEUTICS**

FILE ✓ ✓ REFUSE TO FILE

- Biopharm. inspection needed: YES ☑ NO

**PHARMACOLOGY**

NA FILE ✓ ✓ REFUSE TO FILE

- GLP inspection needed: YES ☑ NO

**CHEMISTRY**

FILE ✓ ✓ REFUSE TO FILE

- Establishment(s) ready for inspection? YES ✓ NO
  *(Contract mfr.’s do not make this drug continuously)*
- Microbiology YES ✓ NO

**ELECTRONIC SUBMISSION:** This is an eCTD, and all reviewers have been scheduled for training. The firm has established secure email w/ CDER.

Any comments:

**REGULATORY CONCLUSIONS/DEFICIENCIES:**

☐ The application is unsuitable for filing. Explain why:

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

✓ No filing issues have been identified.

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

- Although not a refuse to file issue, the biopharmaceutics reviewer could not locate raw data for the clinical pharmacology studies and an electronic submission of those data was requested and made.
- The reviewers needed clarification on how various formulations in different studies relate to the to-be-marketed formulation.
- The original orphan designation letter (for Genentech) was requested and received.

**ACTION ITEMS:**


[See appended electronic signature page.]

Enid Galliers, Supervisory Project Manager, HFD-510

Appendix A to NDA Regulatory Filing Review

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

(1) it relies on literature to meet any of the approval requirements (unless the applicant has a written right of reference to the underlying data)
(2) it relies on the Agency's previous approval of another sponsor's drug product (which may be evidenced by reference to publicly available FDA reviews, or labeling of another drug sponsor's drug product) to meet any of the approval requirements (unless the application includes a written right of reference to data in the other sponsor's NDA)
(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.)
(4) it seeks approval for a change from a product described in an OTC monograph and relies on the monograph to establish the safety or effectiveness of one or more aspects of the drug product for which approval is sought (see 21 CFR 330.11).

Products that may be likely to be described in a 505(b)(2) application include combination drug products (e.g., heart drug and diuretic (hydrochlorothiazide) combinations), OTC monograph deviations, new dosage forms, new indications, and new salts.

If you have questions about whether an application is a 505(b)(1) or 505(b)(2) application, please consult with the Director, Division of Regulatory Policy II, Office of Regulatory Policy (HFD-007).
Appendix B to NDA Regulatory Filing Review
Questions for 505(b)(2) Applications

1. Does the application reference a listed drug (approved drug)?
   YES NO
   
   *If "No," skip to question 3.*

2. Name of listed drug(s) referenced by the applicant (if any) and NDA/ANDA #s:

3. The purpose of this and the questions below (questions 3 to 5) is to determine if there is an approved drug product that is equivalent or very similar to the product proposed for approval and 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
      
      *(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," skip to question 4. Otherwise, answer part (b).*

   (b) Is the approved pharmaceutical equivalent(s) cited as the listed drug(s)?
      YES NO
      (The approved pharmaceutical equivalent(s) should be cited as the listed drug(s).)
      
      *If "Yes," skip to question 6. Otherwise, answer part (c).*

   (c) Have you conferred with the Director, Division of Regulatory Policy II, Office of Regulatory Policy (ORP) (HFD-007)?
      YES NO
      
      *If "No," please contact the Director, Division of Regulatory Policy II, ORP. Proceed to question 6.*

4. (a) Is there a pharmaceutical alternative(s) already approved?
   YES 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,” skip to question 5. Otherwise, answer part (b).

(b) Is the approved pharmaceutical alternative(s) cited as the listed drug(s)?

(YES NO)

(The approved pharmaceutical alternative(s) should be cited as the listed drug(s).)

NOTE: If there is more than one pharmaceutical alternative approved, consult the Director, Division of Regulatory Policy II, Office of Regulatory Policy (ORP) (HFD-007) to determine if the appropriate pharmaceutical alternatives are referenced.

If “Yes,” skip to question 6. Otherwise, answer part (c).

(c) Have you conferred with the Director, Division of Regulatory Policy II, ORP?

(YES NO)

If “No,” please contact the Director, Division of Regulatory Policy II, ORP. Proceed to question 6.

5. (a) Is there an approved drug product that does not meet the definition of “pharmaceutical equivalent” or “pharmaceutical alternative,” as provided in questions 3(a) and 4(a), above, but that is otherwise very similar to the proposed product?

(YES NO)

If “No,” skip to question 6.

If “Yes,” please describe how the approved drug product is similar to the proposed one and answer part (b) of this question. Please also contact the Director, Division of Regulatory Policy II, Office of Regulatory Policy (HFD-007), to further discuss.

(b) Is the approved drug product cited as the listed drug?

(YES NO)

6. 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”).

7. Is the application for a duplicate of a listed drug and eligible for approval under section 505(j) as an ANDA? (Normally, FDA will refuse-to-file such NDAs (see 21 CFR 314.101(d)(9)).

(YES NO)

8. Is 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 should be refused for filing under 21 CFR 314.101(d)(9)).

(YES NO)
9. Is the rate at which the product’s active ingredient(s) is absorbed or otherwise made available to the site of action unintentionally less than that of the RLD (see 21 CFR 314.54(b)(2))? If yes, the application should be refused for filing under 21 CFR 314.101(d)(9).

YES NO

10. Are there certifications for each of the patents listed for the listed drug(s)?

YES NO

11. Which of the following patent certifications does the application contain? (Check all that apply and identify the patents to which each type of certification was made, as appropriate.)

   - 21 CFR 314.50(i)(1)(i)(A)(1): The patent information has not been submitted to FDA. (Paragraph I certification)

   - 21 CFR 314.50(i)(1)(i)(A)(2): The patent has expired. (Paragraph II certification)

   - 21 CFR 314.50(i)(1)(i)(A)(3): The date on which the patent will expire. (Paragraph III certification)

   - 21 CFR 314.50(i)(1)(i)(A)(4): The patent is invalid, unenforceable, or will not be infringed by the manufacture, use, or sale of the drug product for which the application is submitted. (Paragraph IV certification)


   - 21 CFR 314.50(i)(1)(iii): The patent on the listed drug is a method of use patent and the labeling for the drug product for which the applicant is seeking approval does not include any indications that are covered by the use patent as described in the corresponding use code in the Orange Book. Applicant must provide a statement that the method of use patent does not claim any of the proposed indications. (Section viii statement)

   - 21 CFR 314.50(i)(3): Statement that applicant has a licensing agreement with the patent owner (must also submit certification under 21 CFR 314.50(i)(1)(i)(A)(4) above).
12. Did the applicant:

- Identify which parts of the application rely on information (e.g. literature, prior approval of another sponsor's application) that the applicant does not own or to which the applicant does not have a right of reference?  
  YES  NO

- Submit a statement as to whether the listed drug(s) identified has received a period of marketing exclusivity?  
  YES  NO

- Submit a bioavailability/bioequivalence (BA/BE) study comparing the proposed product to the listed drug?  
  N/A  YES  NO

- Certify that it is seeking approval only for a new indication and not for the indications approved for the listed drug if the listed drug has patent protection for the approved indications and the applicant is requesting only the new indication (21 CFR 314.54(a)(1)(iv).?  
  N/A  YES  NO

13. If the (b)(2) applicant is requesting 3-year exclusivity, did the applicant submit the following information required by 21 CFR 314.50(j)(4):

- Certification that at least one of the investigations included meets the definition of "new clinical investigation" as set forth at 314.108(a).  
  YES  NO

- A list of all published studies or publicly available reports that are relevant to the conditions for which the applicant is seeking approval.  
  YES  NO

- EITHER
  The number of the applicant's IND under which the studies essential to approval were conducted.  
  IND #  NO

  OR
  A certification that the NDA sponsor provided substantial support for the clinical investigation(s) essential to approval if it was not the sponsor of the IND under which those clinical studies were conducted?  
  YES  NO

14. Has the Associate Director for Regulatory Affairs, OND, been notified of the existence of the (b)(2) application?  
  YES  NO
This is a representation of an electronic record that was signed electronically and this page is the manifestation of the electronic signature.

/s/

Enid Galliers
8/4/05 12:51:37 AM
CSO
Dear Shawn:

We are requesting the following changes to the vial and carton labels based on consult reviews just completed by two divisions in the Office of Drug Safety as well as this division's review. Please contact me as soon as possible regarding your decision on these changes.

A. VIAL LABEL
1. Assure that the established name is at least as high as half the height of the proprietary name (see 21 CFR 201.10(g)(2).)
2. The “weight” of the established name is very light and it is quite difficult to read. This should be remedied.
3. The strength statements must be relocated directly below the established name and be stated as shown below:
   - 40 mg/4 mL
   - (10 mg/mL)
4. The net quantity statement (“40 mg”) should remain on the principal panel, but it should be less prominent in font weight. We also suggest adding a clarifying descriptor such as “Net wt. 40 mg” and relocating it to a less prominent position and font weight.
5. “For subcutaneous use only” should be moved to the principal display panel.
6. The large pinwheel logo obscures the text; it should be removed. The small pinwheel logo used to dot the “i” is acceptable.
7. Modify the storage condition statement to “Protect from freezing and direct light.”

CARTON LABEL:
2. Follow the instruction to “Protect from freezing and direct light” with another sentence, “Keep refrigerated and use within 30 days of vial entry” on the same display panel. (Moving the distributor information to another panel (not the principal one) should make this feasible.
3. The statement [J should be changed to “One multi-use vial,” and it might allow room for other required information if that statement appeared on only one or two panels.

Clean copies of the PI and PPI agreed to last Friday, July 29, are enclosed in MS Word. I've accepted the changes we agreed to but the items which require your input (e.g., the structure of the compound, information for Table 1, figure labeling in Instructions for Use, etc.) have been marked up (as changes) in red. Also, minor typing errors were corrected but are not marked in red. It would be helpful to use a labeling identifier number for the package insert, patient package insert, carton label, and vial label to be able to distinguish among versions of approved labeling in the future. Please consider adding ID numbers to labeling pieces. An issuance date (for the initial approved label) and a “Revised” date for subsequent approved labeling is required for the PI and PPI. Finally, we discovered that the name "INCRELEX" needed to be replaced with "IGF-1" in another part of the DESCRIPTION section, and it is marked in red. Please notify me if we have different understandings about anything in the PI or PPI.

Best regards,

PI.NDA  PPL.agreed07-2
9.080205.doc (marked up.0802
Enid
MEMORANDUM OF TELECON

DATE: 29 July 2005

APPLICATION NUMBER: NDA 21-839
INCRELEX (mecasermin [rDNA origin] injection)

BETWEEN:
Thorsten Von Stein, MD, PhD  Sr. Vice President-Clinical & Regulatory, Chief Medical Officer
George Bright, MD  Vice President and Medical Director, Endocrinology
Ira Wallis, PhD  Vice President – Regulatory Affairs
Ross Clark, PhD  Chief Technical Officer
James Frane, PhD  Acting Director – Biostatistics
Shawn McLaughlin, MBA  Associate Director – Regulatory Affairs
Christine Kubik, RAC  Manager – Regulatory Affairs

Phone: Conference Call-in Number
Representing: Tercica, Inc.

AND

FDA:
David Orloff, MD, Director, Division of Metabolic and Endocrine Drug Products (DMEDP)
Dragos Roman, MD, Medical Officer, DMEDP
Enid Galliers, CPMS, DMEDP

SUBJECT: Discussion of changes to Package Insert (PI) and Patient Package Insert (PPI)

BACKGROUND: On July 22, 2005, FDA sent (by secure email) labeling changes to Tercica that had been requested by the preclinical, clinical pharmacology and chemistry disciplines. Tercica responded with acceptance or suggestions that were subsequently accepted. Those changes were incorporated in the February 24, 2005, Tercica proposed labeling. That revised labeling was then modified with FDA-proposed clinical changes and sent to Tercica by secure email on July 25, 2005.

DISCUSSION:
On July 27, 2005, FDA and Tercica discussed the proposed changes. At the conclusion of the telecon, both groups appeared to be in agreement. FDA reminded the firm that review by the Office Director had not yet occurred, so additional labeling change requests might still be made.

Tercica agreed to incorporate the changes discussed in that telecon in the PI and PPI and to send them to FDA by secure email as soon as they were available. In the case of the PPI, Tercica needed to have a contractor produce some additional illustrations. Because of the possibility of additional changes, FDA requested the firm not to submit the revised labeling to the eCTD.

POSTMEETING NOTE:
Tercica emailed revised PI on August 2, 2005, with a few minor changes. The revised PPI was emailed to FDA on August 8, 2005. The FDA chemist accepted the chemical structure that had
been inserted at his request. The medical officer found the labeling generally acceptable but wants to propose a few minor changes.

On the date this memo is completed, the labeling needs to be reviewed by the FDA statistician (Table 1 in the PI only) and have a final check by the Division Director. Attached to this memo is a copy of the most recent labeling submitted by the firm with Tercica’s changes accepted and FDA’s latest comments added. Since not all FDA changes are clearly indicated, a summary of the comments and changes precedes the labeling.

{See appended signature page.}

Enid Galliers
CPMS, DMEDP

ATTACHMENTS:
August 10 FDA Comments, Change Requests
August 10, 2005, PI (w/ FDA mark-ups)
August 10, 2005, PPI (w/ FDA mark-ups)
August 10, 2005, FDA Division Comments on PI & PPI – INCRELEX, NDA 21-839

Package Insert (PI)-

1. 

2. 

3. 

4. 

5. 

Patient Package Insert (PPI) –

1. 

2. 

3. 

4. 

Appears This Way
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13 Page(s) Withheld

___ § 552(b)(4) Trade Secret / Confidential

___ § 552(b)(5) Deliberative Process

✓ § 552(b)(5) Draft Labeling
27 Page(s) Withheld

☐ § 552(b)(4) Trade Secret / Confidential
✓ § 552(b)(5) Deliberative Process
☐ § 552(b)(5) Draft Labeling
MEMO

To: David Orloff, MD
Director, Division of Metabolic and Endocrine Drug Products
HFD-510

From: Kristina C. Amwine, PharmD
Safety Evaluator, Division of Medication Errors and Technical Support, Office of Drug Safety
HFD-420

Through: Linda Kim-Jung, PharmD, Team Leader
Denise P. Toyer, PharmD, Deputy Director
Carol Holquist, RPh, Director
Division of Medication Errors and Technical Support, Office of Drug Safety
HFD-420

Date: July 25, 2005

Re: ODS Consult 04-0186-2, Increlex [Mecasermin (rDNA origin) Injection],
40 mg; NDA 21-839

This memorandum is in response to a June 29, 2005 request from your Division for a review of the container label and carton labeling of Increlex. The proposed proprietary name was found acceptable by DMETS initially on August 20, 2004 (see ODS Consult 04-0186) and then again on June 24, 2005 (see ODS Consult 04-0186-1). Although the package insert was available at the time of the previous reviews, only the text of the container label and carton labeling were available at that time. Thus, DMETS could not fully assess the container labels and carton labeling. This request contains full-color drafts of the container label and carton labeling. In review of the full-color drafts, DMETS has identified the following areas of improvement.

A. GENERAL COMMENTS

1. Per CFR 21 201.10(g)(2), increase the prominence of the established name so that it is at least ½ the size of the proprietary name. Additionally, the low “weight” of the font used for the established name causes the established name to be difficult to read. Revise accordingly.

2. Revise the total drug content statement to include the total volume as well as the number of total milligrams per vial followed by the concentration. For example.

   **40 mg/4 mL**
   (10 mg/mL)
3. Relocate the total drug content statement and concentration so that they are presented directly below the established name.

4. Include the route of administration on the principal display panel.

5. Remove the large “pinwheel” graphic, as it is distracting and detracts from the readability of the labels and labeling.

B. CARTON LABELING

Include the statement, “Keep refrigerated and use within 30 days of initial vial entry,” on the carton labeling as well as the container label.

We would be willing to meet with the Division for further discussion if needed. If you have any questions or need clarification, please contact Diane Smith, project manager, at 301-827-1998.
This is a representation of an electronic record that was signed electronically and this page is the manifestation of the electronic signature.

/s/
--------------------
Kristina Arnwine
7/27/05 04:06:26 PM
DRUG SAFETY OFFICE REVIEWER

Denise Toyer
7/27/05 04:08:12 PM
DRUG SAFETY OFFICE REVIEWER
Also signing for Linda Kim-Jung Team Leader

Carol Holquist
7/27/05 04:34:11 PM
DRUG SAFETY OFFICE REVIEWER
MEMORANDUM OF MEETING MINUTES

MEETING DATE: July 26, 2005
TIME: 9:00 – 10:00 AM
LOCATION: PKLN 14B-39
APPLICATION: NDA 21-839
DRUG NAME: INCRELEX (mecasermin [rDNA origin] injection), 40 mg/mL
TYPE OF MEETING: Pre-Approval Safety Conference (PASC) & Wrap-Up (WU)
MEETING CHAIR: David G. Orloff, MD
MEETING RECORDER: Enid Galliers

FDA ATTENDEES: (Title and Office/Division)
Rosemary Johann-Liang, MD, Deputy Director, Division of Drug Risk Evaluation, ODS
Lanh Green, PharmD, Team Leader, Safety Evaluators, DDRE, ODS
Carol Pamer, RPh, Safety Evaluator, DDRE, ODS
Sammie Beam, RPh, Regulatory Project Manager, DDRE, ODS
Robert J. Meyer, MD, Director, Office of Drug Evaluation II (ODE II), OND
Lee Ripper, ADRA, ODE II, OND
Jeff Fritsch, Office of Orphan Product Development, OC
David Orloff, MD, Director, Division of Metabolic and Endocrine Drug Products (DMEDP), ODE II
Dragos Roman, MD, Clinical Reviewer, DMEDP
Jeri El Hage, PhD, Supervisory Pharmacologist, DMEDP
Shen Xiao, PhD, Pharmacology Reviewer, DMEDP
Sang Chung, PhD, Biopharmaceutics Reviewer, DPE II, OCPB
Eric Duffy, PhD, Director, Division of New Drug Chemistry II, ONDC

EXTERNAL CONSTITUENT ATTENDEES: None.

BACKGROUND:

INCRELEX is an injectable human recombinant insulin-like growth factor-1 (IGF-1) product that is proposed for the treatment of extreme short stature in pediatric patients who have normal growth hormone secretion but are growth hormone insensitive. The applicant has received an orphan designation for the proposed indication/product. Most of the patients studied have been diagnosed with growth hormone insensitivity syndrome (GHIS) associated with Laron syndrome in which the patients have growth hormone receptor defects.

This drug product was studied – and the proposed labeling recommends – using twice daily dosing via subcutaneous injection. The product is packaged in multi-use vials containing a total of 40 mg mecasermin at a concentration of 10 mg/mL.
MEETING OBJECTIVES:

- **PASC** - To discuss potential serious adverse events (SAEs) that could appear in the postmarketing phase and ways to minimize or manage SAEs observed in the clinical trials.
- **WU** - To provide the signatory authority with an overview of the NDA.

DISCUSSION POINTS:

The progress of the following reviews was described:

- Pharmacology and biopharmaceutics reviews are complete and recommend approval.
- Chemistry review #2 is in final draft (recommending approval) but awaits submission of two postmarketing commitments and revised specifications by Tercica.
- The sterility assurance review is in final draft and awaits submission of data already provided by secure email. A recommendation to approve is anticipated.
- The drafted clinical review will recommend approval.
- The statistical review is ongoing.

Because of mecasermin’s insulin-like action, hypoglycemia is a likely adverse reaction. Hypoglycemia was observed in 42% of the patients studied in the open-label, historical-controlled trials. However, about 50% of GHIS patients were hypoglycemic before treatment. Most of the hypoglycemia reactions were mild to moderate, but four of the five severe hypoglycemia episodes involved hypoglycemic seizures. A temporal relationship between dosing and hypoglycemic events was observed. The activity of mecasermin (rhIGF-1) is analogous to treatment with short-acting insulins. Dr. Roman recommended strengthening labeling language to reinforce the need to consume a \( \frac{3}{4} \) meal within a short time frame of injecting IGF-1, and the participants concurred. Also, the labeling for patients strongly warns against taking an injection if the patient has not eaten or cannot eat and also includes instructions not to double the dose if one was missed.

Injection site reactions were cited frequently, but they were not deemed serious. The labeling instructs the patient to rotate sites among four areas of the body (eight sites) and illustrates those sites clearly. This was not identified as an area of concern by the participants at the meeting.

Tonsillar hypertrophy can be monitored easily since the symptoms include snoring, sleep apnea, and difficulty breathing or swallowing. These symptoms are described in the patient labeling with advice to notify the patient’s physician if the symptoms are bothersome.

Intracranial hypertension can be caused by IGF-1 as well as growth hormone. The patient labeling mentions that the occurrence of headache with vomiting should be reported to the physician.

As with growth hormone, IGF-1 is contraindicated in patients with active or suspected neoplasia.

Some metabolic abnormalities including hypercholesterolemia and liver enzyme elevations were observed in the GHIS patients but it is believed likely that they may be associated with the disease itself.
Although rare instances of valvular disease were observed in the studies, there is no plausible mechanism that would implicate IGF-1.

The possibility of diversion by body builders, etc. was discussed. It appears currently that the manufacturer is not ready to make enough of this drug product to supply such a market, and the Division has no special concern about the possibility of diversion. Nonetheless, it was recommended to contact OCC to explore the issue of regulatory prohibition of off-label prescribing similar to that for growth hormone. In addition, it was agreed that the labeling would state that IGF-1 should not be used as a substitute for growth hormone.

DECISIONS (AGREEMENTS) REACHED:
- Anticipated occurrence of hypoglycemia may be reduced by only injecting the drug product within a short (to-be-defined) time before or after the patient consumes a snack or meal. Also, DMEDP is considering adding a labeling recommendation to initiate treatment at a dose lower than the recommended therapeutic dose.
- The expected adverse events can be monitored and managed by the endocrinologist who treats the GHIS patient.
- This NDA does not require a Risk Management Plan.

UNRESOLVED ISSUES OR ISSUES REQUIRING FURTHER DISCUSSION: None.

ACTION ITEMS: Consult ORP and OCC regarding the potential for diversion of the drug product by the same population that uses growth hormone off-label.

Cleared by: 8.05.05
David Orloff, MD

Recorded by: 8.10.05
Enid Galliers

HANDOUTS:
Applicant’s Original (2/24/05) Proposed Package Insert & Patient Package Insert

Initialed by: R. Meyer/ 8.04.05/ D. Orloff/ 8.05.05/ D. Roman/ 8.08.05/ C. Pamer/ 8.09.05/ L. Green/ 8.09.05/ R. Johann-Liang/ 8.10.05/
This is a representation of an electronic record that was signed electronically and this page is the manifestation of the electronic signature.
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MEMORANDUM

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES
PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE
FOOD AND DRUG ADMINISTRATION
CENTER FOR DRUG EVALUATION AND RESEARCH

DATE: July 25, 2005

TO: David Orloff, M.D., Director
Division of Metabolic and Endocrine Drug Products
HFD-510

VIA: Enid Galliers, Chief, Project Management Staff,
Division of Metabolic and Endocrine Drug Products
HFD-510

FROM: Jeanine Best, M.S.N., R.N., P.N.P.
Patient Product Information Specialist
Division of Surveillance, Research, and Communication Support
HFD-410

THROUGH: Gerald Dal Pan, M.D., M.H.S., Director
Division of Surveillance, Research, and Communication Support
HFD-410

SUBJECT: DSRCS Review of the Patient Labeling for Increlex (mecasermin [rDNA origin] injection), NDA 21-839

The attached is the revised patient labeling for Increlex (mecasermin [rDNA origin] injection), NDA 21-839. We have simplified the wording, made it consistent with the PI, and removed unnecessary information (the purpose of patient information leaflets is to enhance appropriate use and provide important risk information about medications). Our proposed changes are known through research and experience to improve risk communication to a broad audience of varying educational backgrounds. We have also revised the leaflet to direct it to the parent or caregiver, as the product is indicated only in children.

These revisions are based on draft labeling submitted by the sponsor February 24, 2005. Patient information should always be consistent with the prescribing information. All future relevant changes to the PI should also be reflected in the PPI.

There are instructions for use at the end of the Patient Information leaflet and we have provided recommendations for minor language changes in the instructions section. Please also refer to the recommendations for improve clarity of instructions provided by the Division of Medication Errors and Technical Support (DMETS) (proprietary name review dated June 24, 2005).

Comments to the review division are bolded, underlined and italicized. We can provide a
3 Page(s) Withheld

___ § 552(b)(4) Trade Secret / Confidential

___ § 552(b)(5) Deliberative Process

✓ § 552(b)(5) Draft Labeling
This is a representation of an electronic record that was signed electronically and this page is the manifestation of the electronic signature.

/s/

Jeanine Best
7/25/05 10:05:53 AM
DRUG SAFETY OFFICE REVIEWER

Toni Piazza Hepp
7/25/05 10:10:30 AM
DRUG SAFETY OFFICE REVIEWER
for Gerald Dal Pan
MEMORANDUM OF TELECON

DATE: 21 July 2005

APPLICATION NUMBER: NDA 21-839
INCRELEX (mecasermin [rDNA origin] injection)

BETWEEN:
Name: Shawn McLaughlin
Phone:
Representing: Tercica, Inc.

AND
Name: Enid Galliers and Xavier Ysenn
DMEDP, HFD-510

SUBJECT: Request for agreement to and submission of Chemistry PMCs

BACKGROUND: The sponsor submitted (by email) on June 27, 2005, and to the eCTD on (July 13, 2005) responses to the CMC DR letter dated June 20, 2005, and CMC review #2 has been drafted. The Agency does not agree to certain responses made by the company; however, some of the required information may be submitted subsequent to approval. Also, some of the firm's proposed responses now need to be submitted formally. The firm will be asked to agree to the studies and to amend the pending NDA with the PMCs.

DISCUSSION:
The issues are identified by the item number in the June 20, 2005, DR letter.

Dr. Ysenn and I told Mr. McLaughlin that the firm's response to Item 2 in the DR letter was acceptable; the firm proposed to \( J \) and to include \( L \) additional \( J \) test. However, the firm must submit the revised drug substance specifications reflecting the inclusion of the additional test.

For Item 5, we told Mr. McLaughlin that determination of the expiration dating for the formulated drug substance \( L \) could be evaluated after approval but the firm would need to make a Post-Marketing commitment (PMC) to submit the data from three lots of ds with at least \( J \) (or more) stability data as soon after approval as available. (CMC Post-Marketing Commitment # I)

Mr. McLaughlin asked if the firm could use the ds that had been stored in \( L \) for \( J \) to produce finished drug product if they tested each lot to confirm that it met acceptance criteria. Dr. Ysenn told him that the Agency agreed to that proposal. We confirmed that the expiry dating for drug product is 12 months.

For Item 6, Dr. Ysenn noted that acceptance criteria are based on the provided stability data of
commercial size batches, and due to the limited stability data currently available, the Agency-
recommended modifications (from June 20, 2005) to those criteria; i.e., purity \( C \)
remain unchanged. Therefore, the firm needs to provide updated Drug Product Specifications that reflect these changes. Dr. Ysern commented that the recommended acceptance criteria could be re-evaluated in the future after submission of more extensive stability data.

For Item 7, Dr. Ysern verified that the Agency accepted the firm’s proposal to conduct the antimicrobial efficacy testing with benzyl alcohol and to submit those results by early August was acceptable.

For Item 8, we told the firm that it would need to characterize the \( L \) that are observed by \( J \) in the stability studies, but that could be done post-approval as a PMC. (CMC Post-Marketing Commitment # 2)

Mr. McLaughlin asked what the next steps were, and I told him that the firm should amend the NDA with the updated drug substance specifications for Item 2 and the revised acceptance criteria for Item 6. In addition, they should describe the studies for Items 5 and 8 with estimates for dates to submit the protocols, start the studies, and to submit the final results. I said that the firm did not need to respond immediately, but a submission by the end of next week would be good.

{See appended signature page.}

______________________________
Enid Galliers
CPMS, DMEDP
This is a representation of an electronic record that was signed electronically and this page is the manifestation of the electronic signature.

/s/

Enid Galliers
7/22/05 01:09:49 PM
CSO
13 July 2005

David Orloff, MD
Director, Division of Metabolic and Endocrine Drug Products
Center for Drug Evaluation and Research
Food and Drug Administration
ATTN: Document Control Room
5901-B Ammendale Road
Beltville, MD 20705-1266

RE: NDA 21-839; Amendment 0003
INCRELEX™ (mecasermin [rDNA origin] injection)
Recombinant Human Insulin-Like Growth Factor-1 (rhIGF-1)
Chemistry Information Amendment and Orphan Drug Correspondence

Dear Dr. Orloff,

Reference is made to our New Drug Application 21-839 for recombinant human Insulin-like Growth Factor-1 (rhIGF-1) for use as replacement therapy in the long-term treatment of growth failure in children with primary IGF-1 deficiency (Primary IGFD). This NDA was submitted in electronic Common Technical Document (eCTD) format on 24 February 2005, and filed on 28 April 2005.

The purpose of this amendment (0003) to the NDA is to provide responses to review questions from the Chemistry Discipline Review letter (Item 1.11.1), received on 20 June 2005 (unchanged from the responses submitted on 27 June 2005 via secure e-mail).

In addition, this amendment contains a revised Section 3.2.P.8.2 Post-Approval Stability Protocol. The only change made in the section is in Table 3.2.P.8.2-3, where  the  test had inadvertently been included. As discussed in NDA sections 3.2.P.8.3.1.1.6 and 3.2.P.5.6.3, the  has been discontinued as a  test, and is no longer run as part of stability protocols. These sections in the original NDA describe the rationale and justification for discontinuing the use  because of its qualitative nature, and that two other assays  performed as part of stability testing provide superior quantitative estimates of the degradation products expected to be seen by  Its inclusion as a test in the proposed Post-Approval Stability Protocol was an error in the original NDA, so the revised version removes this test in Table 3.2.P.8.2-3.

Finally, as requested by Enid Galliers on 11 July 2005, this amendment provides copies of correspondence related to our Orphan Drug designation (Item 1.11.3).
The enclosed CD-ROM contains the entire NDA amendment in eCTD format. Tercica has scanned the enclosed CD-ROM using Symantec Anti-virus, version 8.1.0.825 (virus definition file 7/6/2005 rev.8), and declares the media to be virus-free.

If you have any questions or comments on this submission, please contact me by phone at (650) 624-4993 or email: shawn.mclaughlin@tercica.com. For technical assistance, please contact Esther Herrick, Associate Director, Regulatory Documentation, at (650) 624-4926 or e-mail: esther.herrick@tercica.com.

Sincerely,

{See appended electronic signature page}

Shawn D. McLaughlin, M.B.A.
Associate Director
Regulatory Affairs
eSign Approval Form

As per 21CFR, Part 11 regulations, your electronic signature is a legally binding equivalent of your handwritten signature, and it indicates you have read, understood, and approved the attached document.

User Name: Shawn McLaughlin (smclaughlin)
Title:
Date: Wednesday, 13 July 2005, 10:35 AM  Pacific Standard Time
Meaning: Document Approval
DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES
FOOD AND DRUG ADMINISTRATION

APPLICATION TO MARKET A NEW DRUG, BIOLOGIC, OR AN ANTIBIOTIC DRUG FOR HUMAN USE
(Title 21, Code of Federal Regulations, Parts 314 & 601)

APPLICANT INFORMATION
NAME OF APPLICANT
Tercica, Inc.

DATE OF SUBMISSION
13 July 2005

TELEPHONE NO. (Include Area Code)
(650) 624-4900

FACSIMILE (FAX) Number (Include Area Code)
(650) 624-4989

APPLICANT ADDRESS (Number, Street, City, State, Country, ZIP Code or Mail Code, and U.S. License number if previously issued):
2000 Sierra Point Parkway, Suite 400
Brisbane, CA 94005

AUTHORIZED U.S. AGENT NAME & ADDRESS (Number, Street, City, State, ZIP Code, telephone & FAX number) IF APPLICABLE
NA

PRODUCT DESCRIPTION
NEW DRUG OR ANTIBIOTIC APPLICATION NUMBER, OR BIOLOGICS LICENSE APPLICATION NUMBER (If previously issued)

ESTABLISHED NAME (e.g., Proper name, USP/NF name)
mecasermin

PROPRIETARY NAME (trade name) IF ANY
INCRELEX™

CHEMICAL/BIOCHEMICAL/BLOOD PRODUCT NAME (If any)
Recombinant human insulin-like growth factor-1

CODE NAME (If any)
rhGf-1

DOSE FORM:
Liquid
STRENGTHS:
10 mg/mL

ROUTE OF ADMINISTRATION:
Subcutaneous injection

(PROPOSED) INDICATION(S) FOR USE:
Long-term treatment of growth failure in children with primary IGF-1 deficiency

APPLICATION DESCRIPTION
APPLICATION TYPE (check one)
☑ NEW DRUG APPLICATION (ANDA, 21 CFR 314.50)
☐ ABBREVIATED NEW DRUG APPLICATION (ANDA, 21 CFR 314.94)
☐ BIOLOGICS LICENSE APPLICATION (BLA, 21 CFR Part 601)

IF AN NDA, IDENTIFY THE APPROPRIATE TYPE
☐ 505 (b)(1)
☐ 505 (b)(2)

IF AN ANDA, OR 505(b)(2), IDENTIFY THE REFERENCE LISTED DRUG PRODUCT THAT IS THE BASIS FOR THE SUBMISSION
Name of Drug

HOLDER OF APPROVED APPLICATION

TYPE OF SUBMISSION (check one)
☐ ORIGINAL APPLICATION
☐ AMENDMENT TO PREVIOUS APPLICATION
☐ RESUBMISSION
☐ PRESUBMISSION
☐ ANNUAL REPORT
☐ ESTABLISHMENT DESCRIPTION SUPPLEMENT
☐ EFFICACY SUPPLEMENT
☐ LABELING SUPPLEMENT
☐ CHEMISTRY MANUFACTURING AND CONTROLS SUPPLEMENT
☐ OTHER

IF A SUBMISSION OF PARTIAL APPLICATION, PROVIDE LETTER DATE OF AGREEMENT TO PARTIAL SUBMISSION:

IF A SUPPLEMENT, IDENTIFY THE APPROPRIATE CATEGORY
☐ CBE
☐ CBE-30
☐ Prior Approval (PA)

REASON FOR SUBMISSION
Information amendment: Chemistry

PROPOSED MARKETING STATUS (check one)
☑ PRESCRIPTION PRODUCT (Rx)
☐ OVER THE COUNTER PRODUCT (OTC)

NUMBER OF VOLUMES SUBMITTED
NA

ESTABLISHMENT INFORMATION (Full establishment information should be provided in the body of the Application.)
Provide locations of all manufacturing, packaging and control sites for drug substance and drug product (continuation sheets may be used if necessary). Include name, address, contact, telephone number, registration number (CFR), DMF number, and manufacturing steps and/or type of testing (e.g. Final dosage form, stability testing) conducted at the site. Please indicate whether the site is ready for inspection or, if not, when it will be ready.

Cross References (list related License Applications, INDs, NDAs, PMAs, 510(k)s, IDEs, BMFs, and DMFs referenced in the current application)
IND — IND 39,679; IND — IND — IND — ; IND — IND —
DMF — DMF — DMF —
This application contains the following items: (Check all that apply)

☐ 1. Index  index.dot.xml
☐ 2. Labeling (check one) ☐ Draft Labeling ☐ Final Printed Labeling
☐ 3. Summary (21 CFR 314.50 (c))
☐ 4. Chemistry section
  ☒ A. Chemistry, manufacturing, and controls information (e.g., 21 CFR 314.50(d)(1); 21 CFR 601.2) Revised Section 3.2.P.8.2
  ☐ B. Samples (21 CFR 314.50 (e)(1); 21 CFR 601.2 (a)) (Submit only upon FDA's request)
  ☐ C. Methods validation package (e.g., 21 CFR 314.50(e)(2)(i); 21 CFR 601.2)
☐ 5. Nonclinical pharmacology and toxicology section (e.g., 21 CFR 314.50(d)(2); 21 CFR 601.2)
☐ 6. Human pharmacokinetics and bioavailability section (e.g., 21 CFR 314.50(d)(3); 21 CFR 601.2)
☐ 7. Clinical Microbiology (e.g., 21 CFR 314.50(d)(4))
☐ 8. Clinical data section (e.g., 21 CFR 314.50(d)(5); 21 CFR 601.2)
  ☒ 9. Safety update report (e.g., 21 CFR 314.51(d)(5)(vi)(b); 21 CFR 601.2)
  ☐ 10. Statistical section (e.g., 21 CFR 314.50(d)(6); 21 CFR 601.2)
  ☐ 11. Case report tabulations (e.g., 21 CFR 314.50(f)(1); 21 CFR 601.2)
  ☐ 12. Case report forms (e.g., 21 CFR 314.50 (f)(2); 21 CFR 601.2)
☐ 13. Patent information on any patent which claims the drug (21 U.S.C. 355(b) or (c))
☐ 14. A patent certification with respect to any patent which claims the drug (21 U.S.C. 355 (b)(2) or (j)(2)(A))
☐ 15. Establishment description (21 CFR Part 600, if applicable)
☐ 16. Debarment certification (FD&C Act 306 (k)(1))
☐ 17. Field copy certification (21 CFR 314.50 (i)(3))
☐ 18. User Fee Cover Sheet (Form FDA 3397)
☐ 19. Financial Information (21 CFR Part 54)
  ☒ 20. OTHER (Specify) Responses to Chemistry Discipline Review, Orphan Designation correspondence

CERTIFICATION

I agree to update this application with new safety information about the product that may reasonably affect the statement of contraindications, warnings, precautions, or adverse reactions in the draft labeling. I agree to submit safety update reports as provided for by regulation or as requested by FDA. If this application is approved, I agree to comply with all applicable laws and regulations that apply to approved applications, including, but not limited to the following:

1. Good manufacturing practice regulations in 21 CFR Parts 210, 211 or applicable regulations, Parts 606, and/or 820.
3. Labeling regulations in 21 CFR Parts 201, 606, 610, 660, and/or 800.
6. Regulations on Reports in 21 CFR 314.80, 314.81, 600.80, and 600.81.
7. Local, state, and Federal environmental impact laws.

If this application applies to a drug product that FDA has proposed for scheduling under the Controlled Substances Act, I agree not to market the product until the Drug Enforcement Administration makes a final scheduling decision.
The data and information in this submission have been reviewed and, to the best of my knowledge are certified to be true and accurate.

Warning: A willfully false statement is a criminal offense, U.S. Code, title 18, section 1001.

SIGNATURE OF RESPONSIBLE OFFICIAL OR AGENT
(See appended electronic signature)

TYPED NAME AND TITLE
Shawn D. McLaughlin, Associate Director, Regulatory Affairs

DATE:
13 July 2005

ADDRESS (Street, City, State, and ZIP Code)
2000 Sierra Point Parkway, Suite 400, Brisbane, CA 94005

Telephone Number
(650) 624-4993

Public reporting burden for this collection of information is estimated to average 24 hours per response, including the time for reviewing instructions, searching existing data sources, gathering and maintaining the data needed, and completing and reviewing the collection of information. Send comments regarding this burden estimate or any other aspect of this collection of information, including suggestions for reducing this burden to:

Department of Health and Human Services
Food and Drug Administration
CDER, HFD-99
1401 Rockville Pike
Rockville, MD 20852-1448

Food and Drug Administration
CDER (HFD-84)
12229 Wilkins Avenue
Rockville, MD 20852

An agency may not conduct or sponsor, and a person is not required to respond to, a collection of information unless it displays a currently valid OMB control number.
eSign Approval Form

As per 21CFR, Part 11 regulations, your electronic signature is a legally binding equivalent of your handwritten signature, and it indicates you have read, understood, and approved the attached document.

UserName: Shawn McLaughlin (smclaughlin)
Title: 
Date: Wednesday, 13 July 2005, 10:34 AM  Pacific Standard Time
Meaning: Document Approval
DISCIPLINE REVIEW LETTER

NDA 21-839

Tercica, Inc.
Attention: Ira Wallis, Ph.D.
Vice President, Regulatory Affairs
651 Gateway Blvd., Suite 950
South San Francisco, CA 94080

Dear Dr. Wallis:

Please refer to your Investigational New Drug Application (IND) submitted under section 505(i) of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act for INCRELEX (mecasermin [rDNA origin] injection), 10 mg/mL.

Our review of the chemistry, manufacturing, and controls section of your submission is complete, and we have identified the following deficiencies:

I. Drug Substance

A. Characterization

(1) Table 3.2.S.3.1-10 shows ⬜

尬 Please provide the rationale for these assignments.

B. Control of Drug Substance

(2) As the ⬜ test employing ⬜ under reduced conditions does not discriminate between rhIGF-1, ⬜

尬 The proposed ⬜

尬 under reduced conditions does not discriminate based on the expected primary structure for rhIGF-1 ⬜

尬 Either ⬜ un reduced ⬜ are potentially able to discriminate based on the expected primary structure for IGF-1. Provide ⬜ ⬜ test that discriminates ⬜ which do not conform to the expected IGF-1 primary structure.
C. Stability

(5) The information on the stability of the formulated bulk drug substance is very limited. Due to the problem encountered with the all formulated bulk drug substance lots packaged into have been discontinued. The only one lot packaged in the proposed was manufactured at the time of the submission of this NDA and no stability data were provided. Clearly, shelf-life estimates for the formulated bulk drug substance cannot be estimated. A shelf-life dating for the formulated bulk drug substance packaged into the proposed is not grantable, because of the limited data available. Therefore, drug substance batches should be immediately used for the manufacture of the drug product.

II. Drug Product

A. Control of Drug Product

(6) Based on the limited stability data you provided, the acceptance criteria of the purity testing should be modified. The area must be tightened to instead of the originally proposed should be instead of and should be changed from

(7) The antimicrobial effectiveness of the benzyl alcohol was demonstrated at the target concentration of Because the specified limit for benzyl alcohol in the final formulation is you should confirm the preservative effectiveness at the lowest acceptable concentration limit of

B. Stability

(8) Several not seen at 2-8°C, appeared after in samples stored at the 25°C/60% RH condition (lots 804336 and 804454). It would be of interest to identify these to clarify if these represent new degradation products not detected by method.

(9) Based on the available primary data (a total of with lot 804210, with lots 804336 and with 804454, at 2-8°C and at 25°C/60% RH storage
conditions) and the supportive stability data, the granted expiration dating is 12 months at the storage condition 2-8°C and protected from light. As satisfactory additional data become available, extension of the expiration period may be granted by the Agency.

We are providing these comments to you before we complete our review of the entire application to give you preliminary notice of issues that we have identified. In conformance with the prescription drug user fee reauthorization agreements, these comments do not reflect a final decision on the information reviewed and should not be construed to do so. These comments are preliminary and subject to change as we finalize our review of your application. In addition, we may identify other information that must be provided before we can approve this application. If you respond to these issues during this review cycle, depending on the timing of your response, and in conformance with the user fee reauthorization agreements, we may not be able to consider your response before we take an action on your application during this review cycle.

If you have any questions, call me at (301) 827-6429.

Sincerely,

(See appended electronic signature page)

Enid Galliers
Chief, Project Management Staff
Division of Metabolic and Endocrine Drug Products
Office of Drug Evaluation II
Center for Drug Evaluation and Research
This is a representation of an electronic record that was signed electronically and this page is the manifestation of the electronic signature.
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Enid Galliers
6/20/05 11:57:52 AM
The attached MEMORANDUM OF TELECON has the incorrect date below the heading of the first page and a different incorrect meeting date in the header of subsequent pages. The telecon took place on June 10, 2005.

Appears This Way On Original
MEMORANDUM OF TELECON

DATE: 10 July 2005

APPLICATION NUMBER: NDA 21-839
INCRELEX (mecasermin [rDNA origin] injection)

BETWEEN:
Thorsten Von Stein, MD, PhD Sr. Vice President-Clinical & Regulatory, Chief Medical Officer
George Bright, MD Vice President and Medical Director, Endocrinology
Ira Wallis, PhD Vice President – Regulatory Affairs
Joyce Kuntze, RN Director – Medical Science Liaisons
Jim Frane, PhD Acting Director – Biostatistics
Shawn McLaughlin, MBA Associate Director – Regulatory Affairs
Christine Kubik Manager – Regulatory Affairs
Russ Clark Chief Technical Officer
Jane Bailey Division of Technical Communications

Phone: Conference Call-in Number
Representing: Tercica, Inc.

AND
FDA: Dragos Roman, MD, Medical Officer, DMEGRP
Todd Sahrlroot, PhD, Statistical Team Leader, DB II, OPaSS
Enid Galliers, CPMS, DMEGRP

SUBJECT: Request for clarification of clinical and statistical information in NDA 21-839

BACKGROUND: On June 6, 2005, FDA sent (by secure email) a list of issues that the medical and statistical reviewers for this NDA wanted to discuss with Tercica (attached).

DISCUSSION:
The issues identified in the attachment were clarified, and the firm agreed to respond to them promptly. The firm offered to submit any responses that could be assembled quickly by secure email and they would target completing all responses and including them in the eCTD submission of the 120-day safety update, which was scheduled to be delivered on June 30, 2005. The FDA reviewers agreed to those time frames.

[See appended signature page.]

Enid Galliers
CPMS, DMEGRP

ATTACHMENT:
FDA Information request sent by secure email on June 6, 2005
July 21, 2005, Telecon – NDA 21-839
Page 3

CLINICAL ISSUES TO BE DISCUSSED

General questions

1. Was mecaserin dose-titration in patients enrolled late in Study 1419 done as outpatient or inpatient? If it was done as outpatient, was it as safe as the inpatient treatment initiation?

2. In SAS files “Study year” columns are described as “time from initiation of IGF-1 treatment.” The assumption is that any values ≤ 0 in this column represent baseline or pre-baseline values. Confirm this explanation or provide an alternative explanation if necessary. Why do some patients have multiple negative values in this column?

Efficacy questions

1. Height velocity < 50th percentile for age and sex was an inclusion criterion. Yet the range of height velocity (HV) at baseline was up to 7.6 cm and/or 1.8 SD score. Was this baseline height velocity a protocol violation of the HV entry criterion? If so, were other such violations (provide patient ID and GH values for such patients) and how did they affect the primary efficacy analysis, if any.

2. The baseline range of maximum GH concentration was 0.5 to 209.0 ng/mL. Since patients were all supposed to be GH sufficient, was the value of 0.5 ng/mL a protocol violation? If so, were other such violations (provide patient ID and HV values for such patients) and how did they affect the primary efficacy analysis, if any.

3. Explain how the “expected” height was calculated based on the published growth curves for Laron Syndrome patients for the 6 patients with near-adult heights.

Safety

1. It was stated in the NDA that patients underwent funduscopic examinations at baseline and periodically during treatment as part of the routine physical examination and that “there were no reports of retinopathy or loss of vision during the study for any subject.” Where is such an analysis detailed in the NDA? If not presented, provide it.

2. Provide (or indicate where in the NDA submission are located) the mean ± SD values at baseline, on treatment and at end of treatment for the following variables: hemoglobin, platelet counts, LDH, ALT, AST, calcium, phosphorus, T4, TSH, triglycerides. If not in the NDA, present this data in a table format indicating baseline, Year 1, Year 2, Year 3, etc. descriptive statistics (including the number of patients providing information for each yearly time point). For eosinophilia, present the number and percentage of patients with values above normal at each timepoint (baseline, Year 1, Year 2, Year 3, etc.) Indicate where in the NDA there is a summary of urinalysis results; if not, provide one.
July 21, 2005, Telecon – NDA 21-839
Page 4

3. Were the 23 patients who provide most of the safety laboratory data to study 1419, the Study F0671g patients which were “rolled” into 1419?

4. Explain and comment why such a large proportion of patients had abnormal baseline laboratory values (as an example, as many as 61% of AST values and 76 % of LDH values were abnormal prior to mecasermin treatment).

5. In the investigator study F0363s, which enrolled patients with non GH-deficient short stature and Laron Syndrome, two patients had liver enzyme elevations (one of them had LFT elevation on re-challenge). Provide the specific LFTs on these two patients and comment on this finding. Similarly, comment on the high cholesterol and triglyceride levels and the low phosphate serum concentrations (2-3.9 mg/dL) noted in a few patients in study 1419.

6. Identify in the submission the vital signs information for study 1419 (is it in essence the data of Study F0671g?) and the report of ECG results in any of the studies conducted (where any ECG analyses conducted, including QTc evaluations?).

7. Provide an explanation as why several patients had intermittent and end-of-trial echocardiographic abnormalities (described as “right and/or left ventricular hypertrophy/enlargement,” “pulmonary hypertension and tricuspid insufficiency,” “supranormal left ventricular performance.”) Also, comment on why adverse events of cardiomegaly Not Otherwise Specified (NOS) (2 patients), ventricular hypertrophy (3 patients), cardiac murmurs NOS (5 patients), tachycardia NOS (2 patients), dyspnea (1 patient) were considered by the investigators treatment-related. Provide an explanation as why all these findings should not alter unfavorably the risk/benefit balance of the product.

8. Provide graphic depictions of individual renal length values at baseline, on trial and at end of trial with mean and SD curves for all the patients evaluated. Similarly, provide graphic depiction of spleen length information at baseline, on trial and at end of trial (with 10th and 90th percentile references) as presented in a subgroup of patients (published data by Backeljaw et al in J Clin Endocrinol Metab 86: 1504–1510, 2001). Present the GFR information in a similar way.

9. What where the specific adverse events labeled as “mucosal membrane hyperplasia” (4 patients) and “hypertrophy NOS” (3 patients)?

STATISTICAL ISSUES TO BE DISCUSSED:

1. How was the pre-dose height velocity calculated? That is, if multiple measurements were available pre-dose, which measurements were selected for the calculation of height velocity? Was any pre-dose height data collected prospectively?

2. Is there a variable in the electronic database to indicate which height measurements used in the efficacy analyses were made at the 2 primary centers, and which were made by the local endocrinologists?
This is a representation of an electronic record that was signed electronically and this page is the manifestation of the electronic signature.

/s/

Enid Galliers
8/10/05 02:15:01 PM
CSO
Dear Shawn:

Thank you for the dial-in information and for the pediatric study plan exemption.

You are welcome to send the peds study plan exemption request by secure email; however, an official submission to the NDA is needed. That request may be included in the 120-day safety update submission — along with any labeling revisions you propose and the mock-ups of the container and carton labels.

Issues for the June 10 telecon:

Clinical issues to be discussed

General questions

1. Was mecasermin dose-titration in patients enrolled late in Study 1419 done as outpatient or inpatient? If it was done as outpatient, was it as safe as the inpatient treatment initiation?

2. In SAS files “Study year” columns are described as “time from initiation of IGF-1 treatment.” The assumption is that any values ≤ 0 in this column represent baseline or pre-baseline values. Confirm this explanation or provide an alternative explanation if necessary. Why do some patients have multiple negative values in this column?

Efficacy questions

1. Height velocity < 50th percentile for age and sex was an inclusion criterion. Yet the range of height velocity (HV) at baseline was up to 7.9 cm and/or 1.8 SD score. Was this baseline height velocity a protocol violation of the HV entry criterion? If so, were other such violations (provide patient ID and HV values for such patients) and how did they affect the primary efficacy analysis, if any.

2. The baseline range of maximum GH concentration was 0.5 to 209.0 ng/mL. Since patients were all supposed to be GH sufficient, was the value of 0.5 ng/mL a protocol violation? If so, were other such violations (provide patient ID and HV values for such patients) and how did they affect the primary efficacy analysis, if any.

3. Explain how was the “expected” height calculated based on the published growth curves for Laron Syndrome patients for the 6 patients with near-adult heights.

Safety

1. It was stated in the NDA that patients underwent funduscopic examinations at baseline and periodically during treatment as part of the routine physical examination and that “there were no reports of retinopathy or loss of vision during the study for any subject.” Where is such an analysis detailed in the NDA? If not resented provide it.

2. Provide (or indicate where in the NDA submission are located) the mean ± SD values at baseline, on treatment and at end of treatment for the following variables: hemoglobin, platelet counts, LDH, ALT, AST, calcium, phosphorus, T4, TSH, triglycerides. If not in the NDA, present this data in a table format indicating baseline, Year 1, Year 2, Year 3, etc. descriptive statistics (including the number of patients providing information for each yearly time point). For eosinophilia, present the number and percentage of patients with values above
Memo

To: David Orloff, MD
   Director, Division of Metabolic and Endocrine Drug Products; HFD-510

From: Felicia Duffy, RN
   Safety Evaluator, Division of Medication Errors and Technical Support
   Office of Drug Safety; HFD-420

Through: Alina Mahmud, RPh, MS, Team Leader
   Denise Toyer, PharmD, Deputy Director
   Carol Holquist, RPh, Director
   Division of Medication Errors and Technical Support
   Office of Drug Safety; HFD-420

Date: June 1, 2005

Re: ODS Consult 04-0186-1;Increlex (Mecasermin [rDNA origin] Injection) 40 mg/4 mL; NDA 21-839

This memorandum is in response to a May 5, 2005 request from your Division for a re-review of the proprietary name, Increlex. The proposed proprietary name, Increlex, was found acceptable by DMETS in a review dated August 20, 2004 (ODS Consult #04-0186). Container labels, carton, and insert labeling were submitted for review and comment with this consult.

Since the last review, DMETS has not identified any additional proprietary or established names that have the potential for confusion with Increlex. Therefore, we have no objections to the use of this proprietary name. However, DMETS has identified the following areas of improvement in the labels and labeling which may minimize potential user error. We also recommend consulting the Division of Surveillance, Research, and Communication Support (DSRCS) to review the patient package insert as this is a patient use injection product.

A. GENERAL COMMENT

Draft copies of the labels and labeling were provided in black and white, and do not represent the true color of the labels and labeling. It is not possible to fully assess the safety of the labels and labeling because the information provided does not reflect the presentation that will actually be used in the marketplace (i.e. color, placement of name, design, etc.). Please forward copies of the revised labels and labeling when available.
B. CONTAINER LABEL (40 mg/4 mL multi-use vial)

1. Please ensure that the established name is at least \( \frac{1}{2} \) the size of the proprietary name in accordance with CFR 201.10(g)(2).

2. In order to avoid confusion, we recommend expressing the strength in terms of total drug content as follows:

   \[
   40 \text{ mg/4 mL} \\
   (10 \text{ mg/mL})
   \]

3. If space permits, include the net quantity statement on the container label.

4. The statement, “For subcutaneous use only” should be prominently presented on the primary display panel to ensure the appropriate route of administration. Please revise.

5. The storage instructions direct the user to “\( \mathcal{L} \) \( \mathcal{J} \)” since “\( \mathcal{L} \)” is subjective, we recommend providing examples of what is considered “\( \mathcal{L} \)” or revising the statement to read “Protect from light” to ensure the appropriate storage of the product. In addition, in the package insert, and on the carton label, the storage statement also includes protecting the vial from “\( \mathcal{L} \)” however, this statement is not mentioned on the container label. In the event the vial becomes separated from the carton, if the package insert is misplaced, and to maintain consistency, please include the “\( \mathcal{L} \)” statement in the storage section.

C. CARTON LABELING (40 mg/4 mL multi-use vial)

1. See comments B1 through B5.

2. Please add the important statement “Use within 30 days of initial vial entry”, as it does not appear on the carton.

D. PACKAGE INSERT

1. Trailing zeros are present throughout the package insert. To avoid confusion, delete the trailing zeros throughout the package insert labeling since it may be misinterpreted, and potentially create a 10-fold error. In accordance with the 2004 USP General Notices chapter, “Use of Leading and Terminal Zeros” subsection (page 10), “In order to minimize the possibility of errors in the dispensing and administration of the drugs, the quantity of active ingredient when expressed in whole numbers shall be shown WITHOUT a decimal point that is followed by a terminal zero.” We also note that the Joint Commission for Accreditation of Hospitals (JCAHO), 2005 Hospitals National Patient Safety Goals includes the goal: Improve the effectiveness of communication among caregivers. A requirement to meet this goal is that each hospital must “Standardize a list of abbreviations, acronyms and symbols that are not to be used throughout the organization.” The use of trailing zeros is specifically listed as a dangerous abbreviation, acronym, or symbol. Other healthcare organizations, such as ISMP have also published similar lists containing symbols that can lead to medication errors.

2. The second paragraph in the “Dosage and Administration” section states that “Increlex should be administered shortly before or after a meal or snack.” We recommend including a specific time frame of when Increlex should be administered with regard to meals. The phrase “shortly before or after a meal or snack” is vague and may be interpreted anywhere from 5 minutes to 30 minutes. Please provide more specific information since this product may cause hypoglycemia if it is not taken in a timely manner with regard to meals. Additionally please elaborate “\( \mathcal{J} \)”.
3. See comment B5.

4. The “How Supplied” section describesIncrelex as a “10 mg/mL sterile solution in 5 mL multiple dose glass vials (40 mg/vial).” Delete the vial size (5 mL) as it is irrelevant.

E. PATIENT PACKAGE INSERT

1. How Should I use Increlex?

See comment D2.

2. What are the Possible Side Effects of Increlex?

Line 16 of this section states: “You should not take Increlex if you are sick or unable to eat.” Since this is important information related to taking Increlex, relocate this statement to “How Should I use Increlex?”

F. INSTRUCTIONS FOR USE

1. In order to make it easier for the user to follow the instructions on the proper use of Increlex, label the illustrations (e.g., Figure 1, Figure 2, etc.). The illustrations should follow along with the step-by-step instructions.

2. Preparing the Dose

   Step 6 states, \[ \text{Simplifying the instructions can increase the proper preparation of Increlex. For example, “Pull back on the plunger to draw air into the syringe equal to the Increlex dose”.} \]

3. Injecting the Dose

   Step 3 is very vague in the instructions on how to appropriately inject Increlex: \[ \text{We recommend more specificity in the injection instructions, as patients may not have had adequate education to inject Increlex. For example, there is no mention of aspirating prior to injection. This is important since intravenous administration of Increlex is contraindicated. Please revise.} \]

In summary, we have no objections to the use of the proprietary name,Increlex. Additionally, DDMAC finds the proprietary name Increlex acceptable from a promotional perspective. We consider this a final review. However, if the approval of the NDA is delayed beyond 90 days from the signature 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 Diane Smith at 301-827-1998.
This is a representation of an electronic record that was signed electronically and this page is the manifestation of the electronic signature.

/s/
Felicia Duffy
6/24/05 10:03:29 AM
DRUG SAFETY OFFICE REVIEWER

Alina Mahmud
6/24/05 10:49:11 AM
DRUG SAFETY OFFICE REVIEWER

Denise Toyer
6/24/05 10:58:54 AM
DRUG SAFETY OFFICE REVIEWER

Carol Holquist
6/24/05 12:11:49 PM
DRUG SAFETY OFFICE REVIEWER
IND 39,679

Tercica, Inc.
Attention: Ira Wallis, Ph.D.
Vice President, Regulatory Affairs
651 Gateway Boulevard, Suite 950
South San Francisco, CA  94080

Dear Dr. Wallis:

Please refer to your Investigational New Drug Application (IND) submitted under section 505(i) of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act for mecasermin (rDNA origin) injection [rhIGF-1].

We also refer to the January 24, 2005, meeting between representatives of your firm and FDA to discuss [J] We further refer to the minutes of that meeting issued on February 23, 2005.

At that time, we were unable to provide an answer to your question # 11 [C]

[J] Recently, the Office of Orphan Products Development provided its response to your question. Your question is restated below and the Agency response follows in bold type.

Question 11:
[C]

FDA response: [J]
The Office of Orphan Products Development has determined that rhIGF-1 is the active moiety of interest in this case. [C]

[J]

If you have any questions, contact Enid Galliers, Chief, Project Management Staff, at (301) 827-6429.

Sincerely,

{See appended electronic signature page}

David G. Orloff, M.D.
Director
Division of Metabolic and Endocrine Drug Products
Office of Drug Evaluation II
Center for Drug Evaluation and Research
This is a representation of an electronic record that was signed electronically and this page is the manifestation of the electronic signature.

/s/

David Orloff
5/9/05 05:16:29 PM
NDA 21-839

Tercica, Inc.
Attention: Ira Wallis, Ph.D.
Vice President, Regulatory Affairs
651 Gateway Blvd., Suite 950
South San Francisco, CA 94080

Dear Dr. Wallis:

Please refer to your Investigational New Drug Application (IND) submitted under section 505(i) of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act for INCRELEX (mecasermin rDNA origin) injection), 10 mg/mL.

We have completed our filing review and have determined that your application is sufficiently complete to permit a substantive review. Therefore, this application has been filed under section 505(b) of the Act on April 29, 2005, in accordance with 21 CFR 314.101(a).

At this time, we have not identified any potential filing review issues. Our filing review is only a preliminary evaluation of the application and is not indicative of deficiencies that may be identified during our review.

However, we request that you submit the following information or tell us where they are located in the application:

BIOPHARMACEUTICS

1. Please submit electronic files for the NONMEM analysis of the population pharmacokinetic study. The file format should be plain text format (i.e., .txt).

Please respond only to the above request for additional information.
If you have any questions, call Enid Galliers, Chief, Project Management Staff, at (301) 827-6429.

Sincerely,

(See appended electronic signature page)

David G. Orloff, M.D.
Director
Division of Metabolic and Endocrine Drug Products
Office of Drug Evaluation II
Center for Drug Evaluation and Research
IND 39,679

Tercica, Inc.
Attention: Ira Wallis, Ph.D.
Vice President, Regulatory Affairs
651 Gateway Blvd.
Suite 950
South San Francisco, CA 94080

Dear Dr. Wallis:

Please refer to your Investigational New Drug Application (IND) submitted under section 505(i) of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act for Mecasermin Injection, 10 mg/mL.

We also refer to your amendment dated June 8, 2005, containing a request for the Agency to comment on the acceptability of the name “INCRELEX” you proposed as the trademark for a mecasermin injection NDA. We further refer to your submissions dated July 7, 2004, and January 11, 2005, which contained additional information requested by the Agency for its evaluation.

We have completed our review of your submissions and have the following comments.

At this time we have no objection to the use of the proprietary name, INCRELEX. However, you should be aware that the name will be re-reviewed within 3 months of an approval action to rule out any objections based upon approvals of other proprietary or established names that take place in the meantime.

If you have any questions, call Enid Galliers, Chief, Project Management Staff, at 301-827-6429.

Sincerely,

(See appended electronic signature page)

David G. Orloff, M.D.
Director
Division of Metabolic and Endocrine Drug Products
Office of Drug Evaluation II
Center for Drug Evaluation and Research
This is a representation of an electronic record that was signed electronically and this page is the manifestation of the electronic signature.

/s/

David Orloff
4/13/05 05:39:43 PM
NDA 21-839

Tercica, Inc.
Attn: Ira Wallis, Ph.D.
Vice President, Regulatory Affairs
651 Gateway Boulevard, Suite 950
South San Francisco, CA 94080

Dear Dr. Wallis:

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

Name of Drug Product: Increlex™ [mecasermin (rDNA origin) injection]

Review Priority Classification: Priority (P)

Date of Application: February 24, 2005

Date of Receipt: February 28, 2005

Our Reference Number: NDA 21-839

Unless we notify you within 60 days of the receipt date that the application is not sufficiently complete to permit a substantive review, we will file the application on April 29, 2005, in accordance with 21 CFR 314.101(a). If we file the application, the user fee goal date will be August 31, 2005.

Under 21 CFR 314.102(c), you may request a meeting with this Division (to be held approximately 90 days from the above receipt date) for a brief report on the status of the review but not on the ultimate approvability of the application. Alternatively, you may choose to receive a report by telephone.

All applications for new active ingredients, new dosage forms, new indications, new routes of administration, and new dosing regimens are required to contain an assessment of the safety and effectiveness of the product in pediatric patients unless this requirement is waived or deferred. We note that you have not fulfilled the requirements. We acknowledge receipt of your request for a waiver of pediatric studies for this application. However, you have received an orphan designation for this drug and the indication proposed in the application, therefore, this application is exempt from the pediatric study requirements.
Please cite the NDA number listed above at the top of the first page of any communications concerning this application. Send all electronic or mixed electronic and paper submissions to the Central Document Room at the following address:

Food and Drug Administration  
Center for Drug Evaluation and Research  
Central Document Room (CDR)  
5901-B Ammendale Road  
Beltville, MD 20705-1266

If your submission only contains paper, send it to the following address:

U.S. Postal Service/Courier/Overnight Mail:  
Food and Drug Administration  
Center for Drug Evaluation and Research  
Division of Metabolic & Endocrine Drug Products, HFD-510  
Attention: Fishers Document Room, 8B45  
5600 Fishers Lane  
Rockville, Maryland 20857

If you have any questions, call me at (301) 827-6429.

Sincerely,

{See appended electronic signature page}

Enid Galliers  
Chief, Project Management Staff  
Division of Metabolic and Endocrine Drug Products  
Office of Drug Evaluation II  
Center for Drug Evaluation and Research
This is a representation of an electronic record that was signed electronically and this page is the manifestation of the electronic signature.

/s/

Enid Galliers
3/18/05 10:15:29 AM
See Instructions on Reverse Side Before Completing This Form

A completed form must be signed and accompany each new drug or biologic product application and each new supplement. See exceptions on the reverse side. If payment is sent by U.S. mail or courier, please include a copy of this completed form with payment. Payment instructions and fee rates can be found on CDER's website: http://www.fda.gov/cder/pdufa/default.htm

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1. APPLICANT'S NAME AND ADDRESS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tercica, Inc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>651 Gateway Boulevard, Suite 950</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South San Francisco, CA 94080</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2. TELEPHONE NUMBER (Include Area Code)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(650) 624-4920</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>3. PRODUCT NAME</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>INCRELEX (mecasermin [rDNA origin] injection), mecasermin (rhIGF-1)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>4. BLA SUBMISSION TRACKING NUMBER (STN) / NDA NUMBER</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N021839</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>5. DOES THIS APPLICATION REQUIRE CLINICAL DATA FOR APPROVAL?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>☑ YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐ NO</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

IF YOUR RESPONSE IS "NO" AND THIS IS FOR A SUPPLEMENT, STOP HERE AND SIGN THIS FORM.

IF RESPONSE IS 'YES', CHECK THE APPROPRIATE RESPONSE BELOW:

☑ THE REQUIRED CLINICAL DATA ARE CONTAINED IN THE APPLICATION.

☐ THE REQUIRED CLINICAL DATA ARE SUBMITTED BY REFERENCE TO:

(APPLICATION NO. CONTAINING THE DATA).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>6. USER FEE I.D. NUMBER</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Not Applicable</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>7. IS THIS APPLICATION COVERED BY ANY OF THE FOLLOWING USER FEE EXCLUSIONS? IF SO, CHECK THE APPLICABLE EXCLUSION.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>☐ A LARGE VOLUME PARENTERAL DRUG PRODUCT APPROVED UNDER SECTION 505 OF THE FEDERAL FOOD, DRUG, AND COSMETIC ACT BEFORE 9/1/92 (Self Explanatory)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☑ THE APPLICATION QUALIFIES FOR THE ORPHAN EXCEPTION UNDER SECTION 736(a)(1)(E) of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act (See item 7, reverse side before checking box.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐ A 505(b)(2) APPLICATION THAT DOES NOT REQUIRE A FEE (See item 7, reverse side before checking box.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐ THE APPLICATION IS SUBMITTED BY A STATE OR FEDERAL GOVERNMENT ENTITY FOR A DRUG THAT IS NOT DISTRIBUTED COMMERCIALY (Self Explanatory)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>8. HAS A WAIVER OF AN APPLICATION FEE BEEN GRANTED FOR THIS APPLICATION?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>☑ YES ☐ NO</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(See Item 8, reverse side if answered YES)

Public reporting burden for this collection of information is estimated to average 30 minutes per response, including the time for reviewing instructions, searching existing data sources, gathering and maintaining the data needed, and completing and reviewing the collection of information. Send comments regarding this burden estimate or any other aspect of this collection of information, including suggestions for reducing this burden to:

Department of Health and Human Services
Food and Drug Administration
CBER, HFM-99
1401 Rockville Pike
Rockville, MD 20852-1448

Food and Drug Administration
CDER, HFD-94
and
12420 Parklawn Drive, Room 3046
Rockville, MD 20852

An agency may not conduct or sponsor, and a person is not required to respond to, a collection of information unless it displays a currently valid OMB control number.
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TITLE

DATE

2/22/2005

NDA 21839

FORM FDA 3397 (12/03)
eSign Approval Form

As per 21CFR, Part 11 regulations, your electronic signature is a legally binding equivalent of your handwritten signature, and it indicates you have read, understood, and approved the attached document.

UserName: Ira Wallis (iwallis)
Title:
Date: Tuesday, 22 February 2005, 02:40 PM Pacific Standard Time
Meaning: Document Approval
CONSULTATION RESPONSE  
DIVISION OF MEDICATION ERRORS AND TECHNICAL SUPPORT 
OFFICE OF DRUG SAFETY  
(DMETS; HFD-420)  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DATE RECEIVED:</th>
<th>June 28, 2004</th>
<th>DESIRED COMPLETION</th>
<th>September 22, 2004</th>
<th>ODS CONSULT #:</th>
<th>04-0186</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DATE OF DOCUMENT:</td>
<td>June 8, 2004</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TO:  
David Orloff, MD  
Director, Division of Metabolic and Endocrine Drug Products (HFD-510)  
HFD-510  

THROUGH:  
Monika Johnson  
Project Manager  
HFD-510  

PRODUCT NAME:  
Increlex  
(Mecasermin Injection) (rDNA origin)  
40 mg/4 mL (10 mg/mL)  

IND#:  39,679  

IND SPONSOR: Tercica, Inc.  

SAFETY EVALUATOR: Kimberly Culley, RPh  

RECOMMENDATIONS:  

1. DMETS has no objections to the use of the proprietary name, Increlex from a safety perspective. This is considered a tentative decision and the firm should be notified that this name with its associated labels and labeling must be re-evaluated upon submission of the NDA and 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 or established names from the signature date of this document.

2. Please provide labels and labeling upon receipt to DMETS for review and comment.

3. DDMAC finds the proprietary name Increlex acceptable from a promotional perspective.

Carol Holquist, RPh  
Director, Division of Medication Errors and Technical Support  
Office of Drug Safety  
Phone: (301) 827-3242  
Fax: (301) 443-9664
DATE OF REVIEW:  August 20, 2004

IND#  39,679

NAME OF DRUG:  Increlex (Mecasermin Injection) (rDNA origin)
40 mg/4 mL (10 mg/mL)

IND HOLDER:  Tercica, Inc.

I. INTRODUCTION:

This consult was written in response to a request from the Division of Metabolic and Endocrine Drug Products (HFD-510) for an assessment of the proprietary name, Increlex, in regard to potential name confusion with other proprietary or established drug names. Container labels and insert labeling were not provided for review and comment at this time.

PRODUCT INFORMATION

Increlex contains mecasermin from rDNA origin, which is a human insulin-like growth factor-1 (hIGF-1). IGF-1 is a hormone that is structurally related to insulin and induces metabolic and tissue growth response (particularly that of cartilage and bone growth). This effect is in addition to autocrine and paracrine activities. Increlex is a sterile, aqueous, clear and colorless solution for subcutaneous injection. The indication for use is long-term treatment of growth failure in children with primary IGF-1 deficiency. Increlex will be supplied in a multi-dose vial containing 10 mg/mL with a total vial content of 40 mg of mecasermin. The recommended starting dose is 0.08 mg/kg, twice daily; administered subcutaneously with or shortly after a meal. The patient should be titrated to a maximum of 0.12 mg/kg based on tolerability.

Appears This Way
On Original
II. RISK ASSESSMENT:

The medication error staff of DMETS conducted a search of several standard published drug product reference texts\textsuperscript{1,2} as well as several FDA databases\textsuperscript{3} for existing drug names which sound-alike or look-alike to Increlex to a degree where potential confusion between drug names could occur under the 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 conducted\textsuperscript{4}. An expert panel discussion was conducted to review all findings from the searches. In addition, DMETS conducted three prescription analysis studies consisting of two written prescription studies (inpatient and outpatient) 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 name.

A. EXPERT PANEL DISCUSSION (EPD)

An Expert Panel discussion was held by DMETS to gather professional opinions on the safety of the proprietary name, Increlex. Potential concerns regarding drug marketing and promotion related to the proposed name were also discussed. This group is composed of DMETS Medication Error Prevention Staff with representation from the Division of Drug Marketing, Advertising, and Communications (DDMAC). The group relies on their clinical skill, professional experiences and a number of standard references when making a decision on the acceptability of a proprietary name.

1. DDMAC finds the proprietary name of Increlex acceptable from a promotional perspective.

2. The Expert Panel identified ten proprietary names that were thought to have the potential for confusion with Increlex. Additionally, two names were identified by independent review. These products, with their available dosage forms and usual dosage, are listed in table 1 (see page 4).

\textsuperscript{1} MICROMEDEX Integrated Index, 2004, MICROMEDEX, Inc., 6200 South Syracuse Way, Suite 300, Englewood, Colorado 80111-4740, which includes all products/databases within ChemKnowledge, DrugKnowledge, and RegsKnowledge Systems.
\textsuperscript{2} Facts and Comparisons, online version, Facts and Comparisons, St. Louis, MO.
\textsuperscript{3} AMF Decision Support System [DSS], the Division of Medication Errors and Technical Support [DMETS] database of Proprietary name consultation requests, New Drug Approvals 98-04, and the electronic online version of the FDA Orange Book.
\textsuperscript{4} WWW location http://tess2.uspto.gov/bin/gate.exe?f=searchstr&state=m2pu5u.1.1
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Product/Name</th>
<th>Established name, Dosage Form(s), Strength(s), Available dispensing size (if applicable)</th>
<th>Usual adult dose*</th>
<th>Other*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Intereflex™</td>
<td>Mecasermin Injection, 10 mg/mL (40 mg vial)</td>
<td>0.08 mg/kg (up to 0.12 mg/kg) twice daily by subcutaneous injection</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Antiflex</td>
<td>Orphenadrine Solution for Injection, 30 mg/mL (10 mL vial)</td>
<td>60 mg every 12 hours as needed</td>
<td>LA/SA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Azelex®</td>
<td>Azelaic Acid, 20% cream</td>
<td>Massage a thin film into the affected areas twice daily, in the morning and evening</td>
<td>SA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Celebrex®</td>
<td>Celecoxib Capsules, 100 mg, 200 mg and 400 mg</td>
<td>Osteoarthritis: 200 mg/day; as a single dose or as 100 mg twice/day. Rheumatoid arthritis: 100 to 200 mg twice/day. Acute pain and primary dysmenorrhea: 400 mg initially, followed by an additional 200 mg dose if needed on the first day with subsequent days at 200 mg twice daily as needed. Familial adenomatous polyposis: 400 mg twice daily.</td>
<td>SA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cerebyx®</td>
<td>Fosphenytoin Sodium Injection, 2 mL vial containing 150 mg Fosphenytoin Sodium equivalent to 100 mg of Phenytoin Sodium. 10 mL vial containing 750 mg Fosphenytoin Sodium equivalent to 500 mg of Phenytoin Sodium</td>
<td>Status Epilepticus: loading dose of 15 to 20 mg phenytoin sodium equivalent units (PE)/kg administered at 100 to 150 mg PE/min. Nonemergent Loading and Maintenance Dosing: loading dose of Cerebyx is 10-20 mg PE/kg given IV or IM. The initial daily maintenance dose of Cerebyx is 4-6 mg PE/kg/day. Pediatric: The safety of Cerebyx in pediatric patients has not been established. However dosing currently applied in clinical use in this population is 10-20 mg PE/kg for status epilepticus and seizure disorder loading dose with maintenance of 4-6 mg PE/kg.</td>
<td>SA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enablex</td>
<td>Darifenacin Hydrobromide Extended-release Tablets 7.5 mg and 15 mg</td>
<td>7.5 mg to 15 mg taken once daily.</td>
<td>SA/LA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Granulex®</td>
<td>0.12 mg Trypsin USP, 87 mg Balsam Peru, 788 mg Castor oil USP, an emulsifier and propellants (water dispersible) are contained in each gram.</td>
<td>Hold upright and approximately 12 inches from the area to be treated. Press valve and coat wound rapidly. Wound may be left unbandedaged or a wet dressing may be applied. Apply twice daily or as often as necessary. To remove, wash gently with water.</td>
<td>LA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Product Name</td>
<td>Established name, Dosage Form(s), Strength(s), Available dispensing size (if applicable)</td>
<td>Usual adult dose</td>
<td>Other</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Imitrex®</td>
<td>Sumatriptan Tablets: 25mg, 50mg, 100mg Injection: 6 mg/0.5 mL Nasal Spray: 5 mg and 20 mg</td>
<td>Oral: single doses of 25, 50, or 100 mg that may be repeated in 2 hours, not to exceed a total daily dose of 200 mg. Injection: maximum single adult dose is 6 mg injected SC. Intranasal: single doses of 5, 10, or 20 mg administered in 1 nostril are effective for the acute treatment of migraine in adults. A 10 mg dose may be achieved by administering a single 5 mg dose in each nostril. If headache returns, the dose may be repeated once after 2 hours, not to exceed a total daily dose of 40 mg.</td>
<td>LA/SA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Infanrix®</td>
<td>Diphtheria and Tetanus Toxoids and Acellular Pertussis Vaccine, Adsorbed (DTAP) Injection: 25 Lf units Diphtheria Toxoid, 10 Lf units Tetanus Toxoid, 25 mcg Inactivated Pertussis Toxin, 25 mcg FHA, 8 mcg Pertactin per 0.5 mL</td>
<td>The primary series consists of three-0.5 mL IM doses. The customary age for the first dose is 2 months of age, but it may be given as early as 6 weeks of age and up to the seventh birthday. Preterm infants should be vaccinated according to their chronological age from birth.</td>
<td>SA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Insulin</td>
<td>Various</td>
<td>Varied</td>
<td>LA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Invirase®</td>
<td>Saquinavir Capsules, 200 mg</td>
<td>Three 200 mg capsules 3 times daily taken within 2 hours after a full meal in combination with a nucleoside analog</td>
<td>SA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secremax™</td>
<td>Secretin Powder for Injection, 16 mcg</td>
<td>Pancreatic Secretion Stimulation: 0.2 mcg/kg IV over 1 minute Gastrin Secretion Stimulation: 0.4 mcg/kg IV over 1 minute Pancreatic Secretion to aid in ERCP (endoscopic retrograde cholangiopancreatography): 0.2 mcg/kg IV over 1 minute</td>
<td>LA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vincrex (discontinued)</td>
<td>Vincristine Injection, 5 mg vial</td>
<td>Adults: 1.4 mg/m² Children: 2 mg/m². For children weighing ≤10 kg or having a body surface area &lt; 1 m², give 0.05 mg/kg once a week.</td>
<td>LA/SA</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Frequently used, not all-inclusive.
**LA (look-alike), S/A (sound-alike)
B. PHONETIC and ORTHOGRAPHIC COMPUTER ANALYSIS (POCA)

As part of the name similarity assessment, proposed names are evaluated via a phonetic/orthographic algorithm. The proposed proprietary name is converted into its phonemic representation before it runs through the phonetic algorithm. The phonetic search module returns a numeric score to the search engine based on the phonetic similarity to the input text. Likewise, an orthographic algorithm exists which operates in a similar fashion. All names considered to have significant phonetic or orthographic similarities to Increlex were captured by the Expert Panel (EPD).

C. PRESCRIPTION ANALYSIS STUDIES

1. Methodology:

Three separate studies were conducted within the Centers of the FDA for the proposed proprietary name to determine the degree of confusion of Increlex with marketed U.S. drug names (proprietary and established) due to similarity in visual appearance with handwritten prescriptions or verbal pronunciation of the drug name. These studies employed a total of 123 health care professionals (pharmacists, physicians, and nurses). This exercise was conducted in an attempt to simulate the prescription ordering process. An inpatient order and outpatient prescriptions were written, each consisting of a combination of marketed and unapproved drug products and a prescription for Increlex (see below). These prescriptions were optically scanned and one prescription was delivered to a random sample of the participating health professionals via e-mail. In addition, the outpatient orders were recorded on voice mail and sent to a random sample of the participating health professionals for their interpretation 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.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>HANDWRITTEN PRESCRIPTION</th>
<th>VERBAL PRESCRIPTION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Outpatient RX:</td>
<td>Increlex</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.25 mL SubQ twice a day</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dispense one 5 milliliter vial</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inpatient RX:</td>
<td>Increlex</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.25 mL SubQ twice a day</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dispense one 5 milliliter vial</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2. Results:

None of the interpretations of the proposed name overlap, sound similar, or look similar to any currently marketed U.S. product. See appendix A for the complete listing of interpretations from the verbal and written studies.

D. SAFETY EVALUATOR RISK ASSESSMENT

In reviewing the proprietary nameIncrelex, the primary concerns related to look-alike and sound-alike confusion with Antiflex, Azelex, Celebrex, Cerebyx, Enablex**, Granulex, Imitrex, Infanrix, Insulin, Invirase, Secremax and Vincex. Upon further review of the names gathered from EPD and independent analysis, Invirase was not reviewed further due to a lack of convincing sound-alike similarity with Increlex. In addition, the products do not share significant overlapping characteristics such as strength, indication of use, frequency of administration and route of administration.

Additionally, DMETS conducted prescription studies to simulate the prescription ordering process. In this case, there was no confirmation that the proposed name could be confused with any of the aforementioned names. However, negative findings are not predicative as to what may occur once the drug is widely prescribed, as these studies have limitations primarily due to a small sample size. The majority of misinterpretations were misspelled/phonetic variations of the proposed name, Increlex.

1. Imitrex may look and sound similar to Increlex. Imitrex contains sumatriptan for the treatment of migraine and cluster headache. Imitrex is available in tablets (25 mg, 50 mg and 100 mg), injection (6 mg/0.5 mL) and nasal spray (5 mg and 20 mg). The auditory similarities are the result of the shared sounds in the leading syllables of “Im” and “Im”, central “e” (as in event with I or ε sound) and finalizing “ex.” These characteristics are also applicable to the visual similarities; the leading “n” and “m” may appear identical in script, which is also true of the central “i” and “e”. For visual similarities, the upstrokes “t” and “l” may also lead to a similar resemblance (see below).

The products differ in dosing frequency (once, with the potential to repeat compared with twice daily), indication of use (migraines compared with growth failure in children), storage (room temperature compared to refrigeration) and strength (6 mg/0.05 mL compared with 10 mg/mL). However, they overlap in route of administration and dosage form (subcutaneous injection). Moreover, there is the potential for a dose of Increlex to overlap with Imitrex in a child who weighs 50 kilograms receiving 6 mg. The dispensing amount could also overlap if a practitioner ordered “#1”, which could relate an auto-injector or a single vial. Although the frequency of dosing would not typically overlap, it would not be uncommon to see “Use as directed” and “dispense one” written on a prescription for either drug product. Due to the potential for overlapping characteristics, DMETS is concerned with the possibility for confusion. However, the sponsor has indicated that Increlex will have a limited distribution. This distribution will primarily involve ordering through one third-party logistics company for direct shipment to the patient via a provider (specialty and home health care pharmacies) who will complete the product order and insurance submission. Direct distribution helps to provide another method of distinction between the two drug products. The probability for a patient written a prescription for Increlex to be confused with Imitrex is
higher compared with the converse due to name recognition and higher dispensing numbers of Imitrex. As the distribution will be specific and the patient/provider will be expecting an injectable product requiring syringes/needles to be delivered to their home, the possibility for an error in administration lessens. In addition, since this Increlex will be used in a specific patient population, the patients/providers will likely be educated on the use of the product; henceforth aware of what to expect. This special ordering process, in adjunct with specificity of use, should help to minimize confusion between these two products.

2. Enablex may sound similar to Increlex when spoken and look similar when scripted. Enablex is the proposed proprietary name for darifenacin hydrobromide extended-release tablets indicated for the treatment of overactive bladder. The proprietary name of Enablex was reviewed by DMETS on 08 September 2004 (DMETS consult number 02-0006-2) and found acceptable. This drug product will be available as 7.5 mg and 15 mg extended-release tablets. The proposed dose is 7.5 mg daily, which may be increased to 15 mg daily. Enablex will be marketed in bottles of 30, 90, and 500 tablets. The phonetic similarities are due to the shared ending of “lex”, equivalent auditory interpretation of “En” and “In” and identical syllable count. The remaining central syllable of “ab” and “cre” should serve as a distinct characteristic, but this could depend on where the emphasis or stress is placed in the name when spoken. If the speaker focuses on the “blex” of Enablex; this could result in the central “a” to be pronounced as “ə” not “i”. This is akin to the emphasis placed on the “lex” or Increlex, which could result in the central “e” pronounced as “ə” not “ë”. The visual similarities stem from the shared ending of “lex”, which is compounded by the possibility for the leading “en” and “in” to appear alike when scripted (see below). In addition, the “a” and “cr” of Increlex may resemble each other when scripted. However, the presence of two upstrokes in Enablex may contribute to name distinction.

There is also a possibility for dosing in close proximity to the 7.5 mg strength of Enablex and Increlex. For example, a 63 kilogram patient receives 0.12 mg/kg of Increlex, the resultant dose would be 7.56 mg. This dose is within the dosing range of both products, and could result in confusion. However, this is not a direct overlap in dose, only dosing in close proximity and the drugs products differ in the following characteristics: route of administration (oral compared with injectable), dosage form (tablets compared with injectable solution in vials), frequency of dosing (daily compared with twice daily), and indication of use (overactive bladder compared with growth failure in children). Although the products differ in dosage form, each may have prescriptions written with the instructions “use as directed” and the dispensing amount as a days supply (e.g. one month supply, etc).
However, the sponsor has indicated thatIncrelex will have a limited distribution. This
distribution will primarily involve ordering through one third-party logistics company for
direct shipment to the patient via a provider (specialty and home health care pharmacies)
who will complete the product order and insurance submission. Direct distribution helps to
provide another method of distinction between the two drug products. As the distribution will
be specific and the patient/provider will be expecting an injectable product requiring
syringes/needles to be delivered to their home instead of tablets, the possibility for an error in
administration lessen. In addition, since this Increlex will be used in a specific patient
population, the patients/providers will likely be educated on the use of the product;
henceforth aware of what to expect. This special ordering process, in adjunct with specificity of
use, should help to minimize confusion between these two products.

3. Antiflex may sound similar to Increlex when spoken and look similar when scripted. Antiflex
contains orphenadrine for the treatment of muscle spasms or Parkinson’s disease. The drug
product is available in an injectable solution containing 30 mg/mL. Dosing is 60 mg
intramuscularly twice daily as needed. The verbal similarities route in the three syllable
composition, likeness of “an” and “in”, tendency to speak the middle syllable of both names
as “ã”, and shared “lex” ending. The “i” of Antiflex and the “cr” of Increlex should help to
distinguish the products verbally. The visual similarities result from a possibility for the
leading “A” and “I” to appear similar when scripted, shared “n” as the second letter in the
name and the shared concluding “lex” (see below). The “f” of Antiflex and the “cr” of
Increlex should help to distinguish the products visually.

The drug products share a dosing frequency (twice daily) and dosage form (injection), but
differ in method of administration (intramuscularly or intravenous Antiflex compared to
subcutaneous Increlex). The products can be differentiated by their strengths (30 mg/mL
compared with 10 mg/mL), dose (60 mg compared with 0.08 mg/kg up to 0.12 mg/kg),
duration of therapy (switch as soon as possible to oral tablets compared with maintenance
therapy), and indication (muscle spasm/Parkinson disease compared to long-term treatment
of growth failure in children with primary IGF-1 deficiency). As the products differ in both
dose and indication augmented by the lack of convincing look-alike and sound-alike
similarities, DMETS believes the possibility for confusion to be minimal.

4. Azelex may sound like Increlex when spoken. Azelex contains azelaic acid in a cream for the
treatment of acne vulgaris. The dosing regimen is twice daily to affected areas after washing
and patting dry. The primary auditory similarities in name involve the shared ending of “lex”
with the possibility of the central “ze” and “cre” sharing the same tone (ã, as in Zebeta® and
Lycra). However, the names should be distinguished by the leading “Az” and “In”, which are
distinct in speech. This is especially true of the “A” of Azelex, if verbalized as a hard “ã” as
in the words ache or atypical. Furthermore, the products do not share overlapping
characteristics, such as route of administration (topical compared with injectable), strength
(20% compared with 10 mg/mL), dosage form (cream compared with injectable), dose (thin
film compared with 0.08 mg/kg up to 0.12 mg/kg) and indication (acne compared to long-
term treatment of growth failure in children with primary IGF-1 deficiency). The products
share the dosing frequency of twice daily, but the overwhelming differences should outweigh
this similarity. Therefore, DMETS believes the chance of name confusion is minimal.
5. Celebrex may sound like Inrelex when spoken. Celebrex contains celecoxib that is indicated for the treatment of osteoarthritis, rheumatoid arthritis, acute pain, primary dysmenorrhea, and familial adenomatous polyposis. Celebrex is available as 100 mg, 200 mg and 400 mg capsules. Dosing ranges from 100-400 mg twice daily or can be administered as 200 mg in a single dose for the treatment of osteoarthritis. The verbal similarities route in the shared syllable count, second “e” in Celebrex sounding as “a” and the concluding “ex.” However, the leading “Cel” and “In” should help to differentiate the two drug names. In addition, the products only share the dosing frequency of twice daily. They differ in route of administration (oral compared with subcutaneous injection), dosage form (capsule compared with injectable), strength (100 mg, 200 mg and 400 mg compared with 40 mg/4 mL), patient population (children under 18 have not been investigated with Celebrex compared with pediatric use), and dispensing amount (number of capsules compared with number of vials). Due to the differing product characteristics, DMETS believes the chance of error to be minimal.

6. Cerebyx may sound similar to Inrelex when spoken and look similar when scripted. Cerebyx contains fosphenytoin sodium as an injection for short-term parenteral administration for status epilepticus indicated when other means of phenytoin administration are unavailable, inappropriate or deemed less advantageous. Indications include the prevention and treatment of seizures occurring during neurosurgery and control of generalized convulsive status epilepticus. Cerebyx can be substituted for oral phenytoin (less than 5 days). The verbal similarities stem from the shared three syllable composition and ending sound of “ex” (“yx” and “ex”). However, the leading “cere” as in the word “cerebral” and “incred” as in the word “incredible” should provide a differentiating characteristic in speech. The visual similarities route in the possibility for a leading “C” to resemble an “I”, shared central “re”, shared upstroke with similar placement of “b” and “l” and shared concluding “x” (see below).

Cerebyx

Visually they differ with the downstroke of the “y” in Cerebyx and the “nc” of Inrelex. The products share the same dosage form (injectable), but differ in route of administration as Cerebyx is administered intravenous or intramuscular compared to subcutaneous administration of Inrelex. Both products are also refrigerated. However, they differ in dose (4-20 mg PE/kg compared with 0.08 mg/kg up to 0.12 mg/kg), strength (150 mg and 750 mg compared with 40 mg/4 mL or 10 mg/mL), dosing frequency (constant infusion compared with twice daily administration), and indication (seizure activity compared with growth failure in children with primary IGF-1 deficiency). DMETS does not believe the probability of error to be great due to the differing indications, dosing regimens and lack of substantial verbal/visual similarities.

7. Infanrix may sound similar to Inrelex when spoken. Infanrix is an active simultaneous immunization for diphtheria, tetanus, and pertussis in infants to children (6 weeks to 7 years). The first dose is administered at 2 months of age, but it may be given as early as 6 weeks of age and up to the seventh birthday. The CDC recommends the three doses of 0.5 mL to be administered at 2 months, 4 months, and 6 months of age. The primary phonetic similarities
result from the shared beginning of “In” and ending of “x” compounded by the shared syllable count. The middle phonemes of “fan” and “cre” and letters of “r” and “i” (before the shared “ix”) ending should help differentiate the names. Both products are stored under refrigeration and share a similar patient population (pediatrics) and route of administration (subcutaneous). In addition, there could be an overlap in Infanrix and Increlex delivery amount (0.5 mL) that would be applicable for a child weighing 42 to 63 kilograms. However, this would conflict with the age appropriate use of Infanrix and would serve as a differentiating characteristic. Additionally, immunizations are usually written as only a one dose order (e.g. Infanrix 0.5 mL x 1 dose) and commonly this specific vaccination is written as “DPT” (e.g. DPT 0.5 mL x 1), both of which could help practitioners properly identify the correct drug product. Furthermore, the products do not share a similar dosing frequency (one dose compared with twice daily administration), route of administration (intramuscular compared with subcutaneous), dispensing vial size (single dose 0.5 mL vials compared with 4 mL multi-dose vial) and indication of use (immunization for diphtheria, tetanus, and pertussis compared with growth failure in children). Due to the distinct nature of immunizations and the lack of convincing auditory similarities, DMETS believes the potential for confusion to be low.

8. Insulin may look similar to Increlex when scripted. Insulin is indicated for Type 1 and Type 2 diabetes mellitus, hyperkalemia, and severe ketoacidosis/diabetic coma. The primary visual similarity results from the shared leading “In” and the congruently positioned “ii” and “ie” that gives the product names the same visual flow. In addition, a concluding “n” may resemble an “x”; therefore the centrally placed “cre” and “su” provide the only distinct visual cue for identification. Unfortunately, these do not hold power for busy practitioners who often obscure the central letters in lazy scripting (see below).

[Image]

Overlapping characteristics include dose, storage, dosing frequency and route of administration. However, insulin is often written with a modifier (70/30, N or NPH, R, etc), brand name (Humulin, Novolin, etc), dosing regimen (sliding scale) or dose in number of units. Due to the necessity of a modifier and/or brand name, DMETS believes the possibility for confusion to be minimal.

9. Granulex® may look similar to Increlex when scripted. Granulex contains trypsin, balsam peru, castor oil in an emulsion with propellants for the treatment of varicose ulcers, dehiscent wounds, decubital ulcers, sunburn and debridement of eschar. It may also used for general wound healing. Granulex is packaged as a 4 oz aerosol can. The visual similarities stem from the possibility for a capitalized, scripted “G” to look similar to an “I”, the “ne” of Granulex to look similar to “re” of Increlex and the shared “lex” ending (see below).

[Image]

The products overlap in frequency of dosing (twice daily). They differ in route of administration (topical compared with subcutaneous injection), strength (none to be specified compared with 10 mg/mL), dose (none to be specified compared with 0.08mg or
0.12 mg/kg), duration of therapy (until wound heals compared with maintenance), and indication (would healing compared with growth failure). Due to the numerous differences in product characteristics, DMETS believes the possibility of error to be minimal.

10. SecreMax may look similar to Increlex when scripted. SecreMax is a sterile powder acetate salt of secretin, a peptide hormone. SecreMax is indicated for use in secretin stimulation testing for stimulation of pancreatic secretions, including bicarbonate, to aid in the diagnosis of pancreatic exocrine dysfunction; stimulation of gastrin secretion to aid in the diagnosis of gastrinoma and; stimulation of pancreatic secretions to facilitate the identification of the ampulla of Vater and accessory papilla during endoscopic retrograde cholangiopancreatography (ERCP). The usual dose of SecreMax for each indication is 0.2 mcg/kg, 0.4 mcg/kg, and 0.2 mcg/kg respectively. SecreMax is supplied as a lyophilized sterile powder in vials containing 16 mcg secretin. The visual similarities result from the likeness of the starting capitalized and scripted “I” and “S”, the shared central “cre” and “x” ending (see below).

\[\text{SecreMax}\]
\[\text{Increlex}\]

However, the “m” and “l” should provide a differentiating characteristic for Secremax and should serve as a distinct scripting difference; thus providing a significant visual cue. In addition, the drug products differ in indication (stimulation of secretin, gastrin and pancreatic secretions for diagnostic use compared with growth failure in children), dosing regimen (ex. referencing 150 pound patient: 5-8 mg twice daily compared with 13 mg to 27 mg for one dose), route of administration (intravenous compared with subcutaneous), and context of use (diagnostic tool compared with treatment regimen). The products overlap in dosage form (injection), but DMETS does not believe there is a strong potential for confusion due to the differing characteristics and lack of strong visual similarity.

11. Vincrlex may look like and sound like Increlex. Vincrlex contains vincristine for the treatment of acute leukemia and in combination therapy for Hodgkin's disease, non-Hodgkin's malignant lymphomas (lymphocytic, mixed-cell, histiocytic, undifferentiated, nodular and diffuse types), rhabdomyosarcoma, neuroblastoma and Wilms' tumor. Vincrlex is no longer marketed in the US, but this proprietary name is well known. Therefore, practitioners may write for Vincrlex and a generic substitution would occur upon order completion. The auditory and visual similarities are due to the shared phonemes of “in”, “cr” and “ex.” In regard to auditory similarities, the shared “ex” holds weight in speech, but the difference in the leading letter should create a distinction; especially since “v” holds power in speech. They also differ in syllable count (two compared with three) and appearance in name length (due to the upstroke of the “l”, Increlex appears longer). In regard to visual similarities, the leading “V” may be mistaken for a capitalized, scripted “I”, which is compounded by the aforementioned, shared letter combinations (see below).

\[\text{Vincrlex}\]
\[\text{Increlex}\]
The products may also overlap in dose/dosing. Children under 10 kilogram with under 1 m² surface area are dosed at 0.05 mg/kg, which is similar to the 0.08 mg/kg dosing ofIncrelex. In addition, the dose may overlap with various ranges of weight and height; a patient weighing 150 pounds and having a height of 66 inches will receive 2.49 mg of vincristine. This potentially overlaps with the higher dosing of Increlex. However, Vincrrex is an oncology medication and most hospitals have protocols for order completion of chemotherapy to assure accuracy. This should help to decrease errors and confusion between Increlex and Vincrex. An important difference is the frequency of dosing, which is weekly for Vincrex and twice daily for Increlex. This difference should be significant in the detection of a misinterpreted order. Vincristine is also marketed as a 5 mg (5 mL) vial compared with the proposed 40 mg (4 mL) vial ofIncrelex. In addition, the drug products differ in indication (leukemia and lymphomas compared with growth deficiency in children), route of administration (intravenous compared with subcutaneous), and context of use (diagnostic tool compared with an oncology treatment regimen). DMETS believes the potential for error to be low due to the differences in product characteristics and lack of strong visual similarity.

E. INDEPENDENT NAME ANALYSIS

Upon review of the information submitted by the the following additional names were identified as potential sound or look-alike products.

Identified three names including Imitrex, Indocin, and Mycelex that were considered by DMETS to look and/or sound similar to Increlex. With respect to the promotional aspects of the name, the majority of respondents noted “no conflict” with respect to implied claims. However, one respondent indicated the name suggested increased height. DMETS does not have concerns with this interpretation of the name since increased height relates to the indication for the proposed drug product. The computer analysis found the following thirteen names that were considered for look-alike or sound-alike characteristics: Anaplex, Antiflex, Celebrex, Coreplex, Crantex, Etopflex, Granulex, Haniplex, Incremin, Inosiplex, Lincorex, Mediplex and Menoplex.

After evaluation of the aforementioned names, product characteristics, and knowledge of the distribution process, DMETS does concur that the names do not pose a significant problem with the proposed name, Increlex.
III. RECOMMENDATIONS:

A. DMETS has no objections to the use of the proprietary name, Increlex from a safety perspective. This is considered a tentative decision and the firm should be notified that this name with its associated labels and labeling must be re-evaluated upon submission of the NDA and 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 or established names from the signature date of this document.

B. Please provide labels and labeling upon receipt for review and comment.

C. DDMAC finds the proprietary name Increlex acceptable from a promotional perspective.

DMETS would appreciate feedback of the final outcome of this consult. We would be willing to meet with the Division for further discussion, if needed. If you have further questions or need clarifications, please contact Sammie Beam, project manager, at 301-827-2102.

__________________________________________________________________________
Kim Culley, RPh
Safety Evaluator
Division of Medication Errors and Technical Support
Office of Drug Safety

Concur:

__________________________________________________________________________
Alina Mahmud, RPh
Team Leader
Division of Medication Errors and Technical Support
Office of Drug Safety
Appendix A: DMETS Prescription Study Results (Increlex)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Inpatient</th>
<th>Outpatient</th>
<th>Voice</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Incrolet</td>
<td>Incrolet</td>
<td>Incrolet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inerlex</td>
<td>Incillex</td>
<td>Incrurex</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inerlex</td>
<td>Incrolex</td>
<td>Inthelect (inthelet)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inerlex</td>
<td>Incrolex</td>
<td>Incrolet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inerlex</td>
<td>Incrolex</td>
<td>Incrolex</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inerlex</td>
<td>Incrolex</td>
<td>Endolac</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inerlex</td>
<td>Inallex</td>
<td>Incrolex</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inerlex</td>
<td>Inbexix</td>
<td>Invalex</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inerlex</td>
<td>Incillex</td>
<td>Incrurex</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inerlex</td>
<td>Incroflex</td>
<td>Encrolex</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inerlex</td>
<td>Incrolex</td>
<td>Incrolex</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inerlex</td>
<td>Incrolex</td>
<td>Incrolex</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inerlex</td>
<td>Incrolex</td>
<td>Incrarex</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inerlex</td>
<td>Incrolex</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inerlex</td>
<td>Incrolex</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Kimberly Culley
2/16/05 12:40:51 PM
DRUG SAFETY OFFICE REVIEWER

Carol Holquist
2/16/05 03:15:05 PM
DRUG SAFETY OFFICE REVIEWER
IND 39,679

Tercica, Inc.
Attention: Ira Wallis, PhD
Vice President, Regulatory Affairs
651 Gateway Blvd. Suite 950
South San Francisco, CA 940800

Dear Dr. Wallis:

Please refer to your Investigational New Drug Application (IND) submitted under section 505(b)
of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act for Recombinant Human Insulin-Like Growth
Factor-I (rhIGF-I) 10 mg/ml for the treatment of short stature.

We also refer to the PreNDA meeting between representatives of your firm and the FDA on
May 27, 2004. The purpose of the meeting was to discuss the format, content and timing of a
New Drug Application.

The official minutes of that meeting are enclosed. You are responsible for notifying us of any
significant differences in understanding regarding the meeting outcomes.

If you have any questions, call me at (301) 827-9087.

Sincerely,

(See appended electronic signature page)

Monika Johnson, PharmD
Regulatory Project Manager
Division of Metabolic and Endocrine
Office of Drug Evaluation II
Center for Drug Evaluation and Research

Enclosure
May 27, 2004 Meeting Minutes
MEMORANDUM OF MEETING MINUTES

MEETING DATE: May 27, 2004

TIME: 1:30-2:30 PM

LOCATION: 14B39 Parklawn Building (teleconference)

APPLICATION: IND 39,679

DRUG NAME: Recombinant Human Insulin-Like Growth Factor-I (rhIGF-I)

TYPE OF MEETING: Pre-NDA

MEETING CHAIR: David G. Orloff, MD

MEETING RECORDER: Monika Johnson, PharmD

FDA ATTENDEES: (Title and Office/Division)

Division of Metabolic and Endocrine Drug Products
David G. Orloff, MD/Division Director
Dragos Roman, MD/Medical Reviewer
Xavier Ysenn, PhD/Chemistry Reviewer
Todd Sahlroot, PhD/Statistics Teamleader
Monika Johnson, PharmD/Regulatory Project Manager

Office of Orphan Drug Products
Jeff Fritsch, RPh/Office of Orphan Drug Products
Diana Deshields, RPh/Office of Orphan Drug Products

EXTERNAL CONSTITUENT ATTENDEES:

Tercica Medica Inc.
George Bright, MD/Vice President, Clinical Affairs
Rose G. Clark, PhD/Chief Technical Officer
Andy Grethlein, PhD/Vice President, Manufacturing
Ester Herrick/Associate Director/Regulatory Documentation
Mike Parker/Vice President, Quality
John Scarlett, MD/President, CEO
Ira Wallis, PhD/Vice President, Regulatory Affairs

BACKGROUND:

Tercica submitted a Pre-NDA meeting request on March 29, 2004. We received a background package on April 30, 2004.
DISCUSSION POINTS:

Following introductions, the Sponsor began by requesting Agency comments to their proposed questions. The italicized text represents discussion during the teleconference.

Clinical:

1) As stated in the FDA communication of 05 March 2003, the primary efficacy endpoint will be change in height velocity from baseline. An integrated database is being constructed which contains the individual efficacy data for all subjects enrolled in studies F0206s, F0375g, F0632g, F0671g and F0930s [1419]). Using this database the primary efficacy analysis will consist of paired t-tests of baseline annualized height velocity to annualized height velocity for all subjects completing a given year of treatment. The analysis is repeated for years one through eight. The secondary end point will be change in height standard deviation scores (HT-SDS) from baseline and will be similarly analyzed. Results from individual Genentech sponsored studies (F0375g, F0632g and F0671g) and Investigator Sponsored study (F0206s), will be summarized and offered as supporting evidence. Does the DMEDP agree with the proposed efficacy analysis?

FDA comment: The proposed efficacy analysis is acceptable.

The Division requested that the height velocity and IGF-I serum concentration data be presented in the NDA also as standard deviation scores in addition to cm/year and ng/ml, respectively.

2) A statistical analysis plan to support the claimed indication will be presented as Appendix A to the briefing document. The plan will specify the analyses, data tables and listings to be presented in the NDA to support the indication. Tercica considers that the list is both adequate and complete. Does the DMEDP agree?

FDA comment: You should provide a graph of mean height velocity and HT-SDS by dropout cohorts (cohorts of patients with similar times on study). The raw data in the electronic database should include all observations, not just those that were used to compute annualized height velocities.

The Division requested that the yearly efficacy data for height velocity and height SDS be presented in two ways: 1) for patients with complete efficacy data from baseline through Year 8 of treatment and 2) for all patients with data at each yearly time point irrespective of availability of data for prior or subsequent timepoints. The sponsor clarified that currently there are only 5 patients with measured final height data in the dataset (final height being defined as the height associated with a bone age ≥ 14 years for girls and ≥ 16 years for boys).
3) The subjects pertinent to the claimed indication are children with growth failure and primary IGFD. A safety profile will be constructed from exposure of 65 children exposed to doses of 80–240 µg/kg-day for a total of 231 patient treatment-years, and will form the basis of the integrated safety summary for the NDA. Genentech also sponsored other studies using rhIGF-1, including trials in HIV-AIDS wasting, type 1 diabetes and type 2 diabetes. Because we believe the adverse events experienced in studies of these disorders is substantially influenced by the coexisting morbidities of these diseases, the use of numerous concomitant medications by the populations studied, and in some cases by intravenous administration, and because these studies were conducted with late-adolescent, adult or elderly subjects, we do not propose to include the individual patient data from these studies in the integrated safety database for IGFD in the application. We do, however, propose to provide safety summaries from the individual non-statural studies sponsored by Genentech in the NDA. Also, because retinopathy was explicitly stated as a safety signal in the Type C meeting communication of March 2003 from the DMEDP to Tercica, Tercica plans to present and discuss the ophthalmologic findings related to the rhIGF-1 treatment of diabetic subjects in the NDA. Does the DMEDP agree with this strategy?

FDA comment: The proposed plan is acceptable.

The Division requested that, for non-statural studies, an additional safety summary be presented for the subgroup of patients <18 years of age. In addition, and importantly, the sponsor was requested to state clearly the extent and the depth of safety testing in each of the statural studies.

4) Tercica will file a request for rhIGF-1 use in Primary IGFD to be granted Fast Track Designation. Does the DMEDP agree that Tercica can submit the NDA as a rolling submission if this Designation is approved?

FDA comment: It is the judgment of the Division that rhIGF-I treatment for short stature in patients with primary IGFD does not qualify for fast track designation.

5) Independent of Fast Track status, Tercica's rhIGF-1 for primary IGFD meets the criterion for priority review, as set forth in CDER’s Manual of Policies and Procedures, “Priority Review Policy”, in that, “if approved, would be a significant improvement compared to marketed products in the treatment, diagnosis, or prevention of a disease”. rhIGF-1 will meet an unmet medical need and therefore should receive a priority review. Does DMEDP agree with this assessment?

FDA comment: The Division is in favor of granting priority review to the rhIGF-I NDA. The final decision will be made at the time of filing of the application.
6) Tercica plans to submit the NDA in an eCTD format, and will comply with the recommendations set forth in available guidelines and from the Office of Information Management. Tercica has already established contact with the Office of Information Management to submit a sample pilot eCTD. Does the DMEDP support filing the NDA in the eCTD format?

FDA comment: The Division supports the submission of the NDA in eCTD format.

7) rhIGF-1 was manufactured by Genentech using a very similar manufacturing process to that currently employed by Tercica. The dating for the Genentech-produced material was recently extended from 7 to 8 years after re-testing confirmed the material continued to demonstrate adequate stability (Serial No 0039, 23DEC03). For the purposes of the NDA submission, Tercica is proposing that at the time of filing, comparability will be established between the Tercica-produced and Genentech-produced material, and stability data will be provided on three Tercica-produced GMP lots having \( \mathcal{C} \) real-time data, respectively. Accelerated ageing data up to \( \mathcal{J} \) will also be submitted. Does DMEDP agree this proposed stability data will be sufficient for the Division to accept the NDA for filing?

FDA comment: The proposed stability data is acceptable for filing. Expiration dating will be based on the evaluation of the available data from material manufactured by Tercica.

8) As stated in the FDA Guidance Concerning Demonstration of Comparability of Human Biological Products, Including Therapeutic Biotechnology-derived Products (April 1996), “Determinations of product comparability may be based on chemical, physical and biological assays”. Based on this statement, Tercica submitted a CMC Information Amendment, (Serial No. 0036, submitted 07 November 2003), proposing to demonstrate comparability strictly via physical, biochemical and functional testing between drug substance produced using the Genentech \( \mathcal{C} \) made by Tercica following the transfer of that process to \( \mathcal{J} \).

\( \mathcal{Y} \): The Company received a verbal communication indicating that the DMEDP reviewer did not have any comments on the proposed comparability testing plan. Tercica assumes that the plan as submitted in Serial No.0036 is acceptable. Does the Division agree with this assumption?

FDA comment: Your proposal for demonstrating comparability between the drug substance manufactured by Genentech and Tercica, as described under ‘Analytical Comparability’ on pages 78 and 79 of your briefing document, is acceptable.
9) As summarized in the nonclinical data section, a large number of nonclinical studies on rhIGF-1 have been performed, including a two-year rat carcinogenicity study. Tercica believes that the nonclinical information to be provided in the NDA is sufficient for filing. Does the DMEDP agree?

FDA comment: Yes, the available nonclinical information is adequate to support NDA filing.

UNRESOLVED ISSUES OR ISSUES REQUIRING FURTHER DISCUSSION:

None

The sponsor was informed that a formal orphan designation transfer would need to be completed from the original sponsor, Genentech to the current sponsor, Tercica, Inc. Consult 21CFR316.27 for details.

Minutes prepared by

Monika Johnson, PharmD
Regulatory Project Manager

Concurrence: //s// June 24, 2004
David G. Orloff, MD
Director, DMEDP
This is a representation of an electronic record that was signed electronically and this page is the manifestation of the electronic signature.

/s/

Monika Johnson
6/24/04 05:00:00 PM
# NDA/EFFICACY SUPPLEMENT ACTION PACKAGE CHECKLIST

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NDA</th>
<th>Efficacy Supplement Type</th>
<th>Supplement Number</th>
<th>Applicant</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>21-839</td>
<td>SE-</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>Tercica, Inc.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Drug:** INCRELEX (mecasermin [rDNA origin] injection), 10 mg/mL

**RPM:** Enid Galliers 8/11/05 HFD-510 Phone # 827-6429

**Application Type:** (✓) 505(b)(1)  505(b)(2)

(This can be determined by consulting page 1 of the NDA Regulatory Filing Review for this application or Appendix A to this Action Package Checklist.)

**If this is a 505(b)(2) application, please review and confirm the information previously provided in Appendix B to the NDA Regulatory Filing Review. Please update any information (including patent certification information) that is no longer correct.**

(✓) Confirmed and/or corrected

**Listed drug(s) referred to in 505(b)(2) application (NDA #(s), Drug name(s)):**

### Application Classifications:

- Review priority
  - (✓) Standard
  - (✓) Priority
- Chem class (NDAs only)
  - 1
- Other (e.g., orphan, OTC)
  - V

### User Fee Goal Dates

8.31.2005

### Special programs (indicate all that apply)

- (✓) None
  - Subpart H
  - 21 CFR 314.510 (accelerated approval)
  - 21 CFR 314.520 (restricted distribution)
  - (✓) Fast Track
  - (✓) Rolling Review
  - (✓) CMA Pilot 1
  - (✓) CMA Pilot 2

### User Fee Information

- User Fee
  - (✓) Paid
  - UF ID number
  - None

- User Fee waiver
  - (✓) Small business
  - (✓) Public health
  - (✓) Barrier-to-Innovation
  - (✓) Other (specify)

- User Fee exception
  - (✓) Orphan designation
  - No-fee 505(b)(2) (see NDA Regulatory Filing Review for instructions)
  - Other (specify)

### Application Integrity Policy (AIP)

- Applicant is on the AIP
  - (✓) Yes
  - (✓) No

(Note: This can be determined by confirming whether the Division has received a written notice from the applicant (or the patent owner or its representative) stating that a legal action was filed within 45 days of receipt of its notice of certification. The applicant is required to notify the Division in writing whenever an action has been filed within this 45-day period (see 21 CFR 314.107(f)(2)).)

If “No,” the patent owner (or NDA holder, if it is an exclusive patent licensee) has until the expiration of the 45-day period described in question (1) to waive its right to bring a patent infringement action or to bring such an action. After the 45-day period expires, continue with question (4) below.

(4) Did the patent owner (or NDA holder, if it is an exclusive patent licensee) submit a written waiver of its right to file a legal action for patent infringement within the 45-day period described in question (1), as provided for by 21 CFR 314.107(f)(3)?

If “Yes,” there is no stay of approval based on this certification. Analyze the next paragraph IV certification in the application, if any. If there are no other paragraph IV certifications, skip to the next box below (Exclusivity).

If “No,” continue with question (5).

(5) Did the patent owner, its representative, or the exclusive patent licensee bring suit against the applicant for patent infringement within 45 days of the patent owner’s receipt of the applicant’s notice of certification?

(Note: This can be determined by confirming whether the Division has received a written notice from the applicant (or the patent owner or its representative) stating that a legal action was filed within 45 days of receipt of its notice of certification. The applicant is required to notify the Division in writing whenever an action has been filed within this 45-day period (see 21 CFR 314.107(f)(2)). If no written notice appears in the NDA file, confirm with the applicant whether a lawsuit was commenced within the 45-day period).

If “No,” there is no stay of approval based on this certification. Analyze the next paragraph IV certification in the application, if any. If there are no other paragraph IV certifications, skip to the next box below (Exclusivity).

If “Yes,” a stay of approval may be in effect. To determine if a 30-month stay is in effect, consult with the Director, Division of Regulatory Policy II, Office of Regulatory Policy (HFD-007) and attach a summary of the response.

---

**Exclusivity (approvals only)**

- Exclusivity summary
- Is there remaining 3-year exclusivity that would bar effective approval of a 505(b)(2) application? (Note that, even if exclusivity remains, the application may be tentatively approved if it is otherwise ready for approval.)

8.05.05

No.

- Is there existing orphan drug exclusivity protection for the “same drug” for the proposed indication(s)? Refer to 21 CFR 316.3(b)(13) for the definition of “same drug” for an orphan drug (i.e., active moiety). This definition is NOT the same as that used for NDA chemical classification.

( ) Yes, Application #

(✓) No

---

**Administrative Reviews (Project Manager, ADRA) (indicate date of each review)**

8.04.05;
## Summary Reviews (e.g., Office Director, Division Director, Medical Team Leader)
*(indicate date for each review)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Clinical review(s)</td>
<td>8.05.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Microbiology (efficacy) review(s)</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Safety Update review(s)</td>
<td>Included in 8.05.05 MOR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Risk Management Plan review(s)</td>
<td>Included in 8.05.05 MOR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pediatric Page</td>
<td>8.08.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demographic Worksheet</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Statistical review(s)</td>
<td>In draft</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Biopharmaceutical review(s)</td>
<td>5.03.05; 7.22.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Controlled Substance Staff review(s) and recommendation for scheduling</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clinical Inspection Review Summary (DSI)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Clinical studies</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Bioequivalence studies</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CMC review(s)</td>
<td>6.17.05; 8.05.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental Assessment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Categorical Exclusion</td>
<td>6.17.05 CMC # 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Review &amp; FONS</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Review &amp; Environmental Impact Statement</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Microbiology (validation of sterilization &amp; product sterility) review(s)</td>
<td>8.05.05</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Facilities inspection (provide EER report)                          | Date completed: 8.02.05
|  - Acceptable                                                      | ✓
|  - Withhold recommendation                                          | ()
| Methods validation                                                  | ✓ Completed
|  - Requested                                                       | ()
|  - Not yet requested                                                | ()
| Pharm/tox review(s), including referenced IND reviews               | 4.21.05; 7.21.05    |
| Nonclinical inspection review summary                               | n/a                |
| Statistical review(s) of carcinogenicity studies                    | 7.26.05            |
| CAC/ECAC report                                                     | 7.12.05            |
IND 39,679

Tercica Medica, Inc.
Attention: Kevin Dwyer
Acting Head, Regulatory Affairs
651 Gateway Blvd., Suite 950
South San Francisco, CA  94080

Dear Mr. Dwyer:

Please refer to the meeting between representatives of your firm and FDA on March 5, 2003. The purpose of the meeting was to discuss the development of recombinant human insulin-like growth factor-I (rIGF-I) for treatment of growth hormone }

The official minutes of that meeting are enclosed. You are responsible for notifying us of any significant differences in understanding regarding the meeting outcomes.

If you have any questions, call me at 301-827-9087.

Sincerely,

{See appended electronic signature page}

Monika Johnson, PharmD
Regulatory Project Manager
Division of Metabolic and Endocrine Drug Products
Office of Drug Evaluation II
Center for Drug Evaluation and Research

Enclosure

March 5, 2003 meeting minutes
MEMORANDUM OF MEETING MINUTES

MEETING DATE: March 5, 2003

TIME: 11:00 am- 12:00 noon EST

LOCATION: Teleconference (Parklawn Building, 15B45)

APPLICATION: IND 39,679 Recombinant human insulin-like growth factor-I

TYPE OF MEETING: Guidance

MEETING CHAIR: David G. Orloff, MD

MEETING RECORDER: Monika Johnson, PharmD

FDA ATTENDEES, TITLES, AND OFFICE/DIVISION

David G. Orloff, MD/Director/Division of Metabolic and Endocrine Drug Products (DMEDP), HFD-510
Robert Perlstein, MD/Medical Reviewer/DMEDP, HFD-510
Dragos Roman, MD/Medical Reviewer/DMEDP, HFD-510
Enid Galliers/Chief, Project Management Staff/DMEDP, HFD-510
Monika Johnson, PharmD/Regulatory Project Manager/DMEDP, HFD-510
Xavier Ysern, PhD/Chemistry Reviewer/Office of New Drug Chemistry II, HFD-820
Jon Sahlroot, PhD/Statistics Team Leader/Division of Biometrics II, HFD-715
Hae Young Ahn, PhD/Biopharmaceutics Team Leader/Office of Clinical Pharmacology & Biopharmaceutics, HFD-870
Herman Rhee, PhD/Pharmacology Reviewer/DMEDP, HFD-510

EXTERNAL CONSTITUENT ATTENDEES AND TITLES:

Ira Wallace/Vice President Regulatory Affairs/Tercica Medica, Inc. (TM)
Kevin Dwyer/Acting Head, Regulatory Affairs/TM
Ross G. Clark, PhD/Chief Technical Officer/TM
C 3 Consultant
J Consultant
John A. Scarlett, MD/ President and Chief Medical Officer/TM
BACKGROUND:

Tercica Medica, Inc. proposed the use of recombinant human insulin-like growth factor-I (rhIGF-I) to treat patients with growth hormone \( \text{L} \) including patients with Laron syndrome.

On April 19, 2002, Genentech, Inc. transferred this IND to Tercica who also acquired the intellectual property rights, data, and manufacturing process for rhIGF-1.

Since there has been minimal activity in this IND for a long period of time, Tercica requested a meeting with the Agency to provide an update on current clinical data and confirm any previous agreements made with Genentech, Inc., i.e., adequacy of data to support a marketing application, and to begin a collaborative relationship with the division.

MEETING OBJECTIVE:

To reach an agreement with the division as to the definition of primary insulin-like growth factor-I deficiency and that the use of rhIGF-1 in this population is replacement therapy.

DISCUSSION POINTS:

Following introductions, questions posed by the sponsor were addressed.

*Italicized comments provided to Tercica Medica represent discussion that took place during the meeting.*

**Question 1:**

 Does the Division tentatively accept that the wording of the treatment indication for IGF-I replacement therapy could be analogous to that for growth hormone replacement therapy for growth hormone deficiency in children and thereby might take the following form?

\[
\text{L}
\]

**FDA response:**

If the data submitted in the NDA demonstrate that IGF-I administration to patients with primary IGF-I deficiency is effective in promoting linear growth and is associated with a favorable safety profile, IGF-I therapy can be approved for the treatment of primary IGF-I deficiency. An approval for the "long-term treatment" of growth failure in children with primary IGF-I deficiency will require proof that short-term efficacy gains are sustained. To this end, present all available evidence from the database and published literature that measures the effects of IGF-I treatment on long-term efficacy (i.e., greater than 1-2 years), final or near-final height, rate of bone age maturation, and timing of onset of puberty and puberty progression. If IGF-I therapy is
approved for the treatment of IGF-I deficiency, we will request subsequent collection of final height data on all patients studied.

There was general agreement on the importance of long-term efficacy data in order to obtain a claim of "long-term treatment". The sponsor stated that there is considerable patient exposure accumulated in the clinical trials (e.g., approximately 230 patient-years, 2 patients treated for >10 years, mean duration of exposure of 3.5 years, etc.). At the time of the NDA submission, the sponsor will present detailed data on bone age maturation, timing and progression of puberty, and final height in patients who can be analyzed for these variables.

Question 2:

Does the Division agree that the indicated population for IGF-I replacement therapy would be defined as having stature equal to or less than –3.0 SDS and IGF-I levels equal to or below –3.0 SDS in the presence of intact growth hormone secretion?"

FDA response:

The proposed definition of primary IGF-I deficiency based on (1) intact growth hormone (GH) secretion, (2) height equal to or less than –3.0 SDS, and (3) basal IGF-I levels equal to or below –3.0 SDS may include some patients with "idiopathic short stature" (ISS). In order to exclude this heterogeneous group of patients, we suggest using the IGF-I generation test in response to exogenous GH as an additional diagnostic criterion. Alternatively (and more desirably), one can use genetic testing (e.g. mutation analysis) to verify the diagnosis of a GH receptor (GHR) defect (i.e., Laron type short stature), biochemical evidence of a post GHR defect in signal transduction, and the presence of a substantial amount of neutralizing anti-GH antibodies in patients with GH gene deletion as additional diagnostic criteria.

The agency asked for stricter criteria for the diagnosis of primary IGFD in order to differentiate the primary IGFD patients from the relatively few patients with ISS who may meet the proposed auxological and biochemical criteria defined in the question. The sponsor stated that there was no intention to treat patients with idiopathic short stature and will reassess the feasibility of the IGF-I generation test or genetic testing as possible additional diagnostic criteria.

Question 3:

Does the Division agree that the data from the clinical trials performed by Genentech along with supporting data from other important clinical studies, as outlined in the briefing document, are adequate in terms of total patient exposure, duration of therapy, dose regimens explored, and study designs utilized to support the filing of an NDA for the use of IGF-I in children with primary IGF-I deficiency?

FDA response:

The Division acknowledges the difficulty of conducting randomized, controlled trials in patients with primary IGF-I deficiency because of both ethical considerations and the limited number of
patients with the severe form of the condition. At the time of NDA submission, the Division will review the available data, which should include the results of study 1419 (the largest study to be included in the NDA), and will make a determination regarding approval based on a risk benefit analysis of all submitted data.

Comments for specific components of the question:

**Dose regimen:** The data presented seem to establish a dose regimen for IGF-I therapy in patients with primary IGF-I deficiency.

**Duration of therapy and total patient exposure:** Both are difficult to assess in the absence of the data from study 1419. If study 1419 is informative, it will augment significantly both the efficacy (duration of therapy and sustainability of effect) and safety databases.

**Trial design:** We note that no statistics are presented in any of the open label studies that compare height velocity (HV) on treatment with HV at baseline. Therefore, a statistical analysis of annualized HV changes on IGF-I treatment for the treatment-naïve patients enrolled in study 1419 must be provided. HV data from the other open-label studies should be analyzed statistically as well (i.e., on-treatment HV compared with pre-treatment HV). Height SDS changes and HV information from published studies will complement and support the five original studies listed in the package.

*The agency stressed the importance of study 1419 in substantially expanding the amount and quality of efficacy and safety data to be presented in the final NDA. Such data, in addition to the data already obtained in the Genentech studies and studies published in the medical literature, can be the basis of a reviewable New Drug Application.*

*With respect to trial design issues, the agency asked for inferential statistics for annual height velocity changes in study 1419 (which contains 42 IGF-I naïve patients) and in the already completed Genentech studies. For study 1419, such statistics will include at least construction of 95% confidence intervals for changes from baseline in height velocity. For the Genentech studies, a similar approach, or a t-test, or an alternative analysis at the discretion of the sponsor was recommended. The sponsor agreed with these requests and may submit a statistical analysis plan for review prior to the NDA submission.*

*With respect to safety issues, the sponsor is already evaluating the list of safety signals presented in the “Additional issues” section, below.*

**Additional issues:**

1) **Safety:**

Provide extensive safety information for the following safety signals:
- hypoglycemia
- hearing loss (conductive vs. sensorineural vs. mixed)
• organomegaly (i.e., spleen, heart, kidney [with emphasis on renal function at the end of
therapy])
• benign intracranial hypertension
• acromegalic facial changes
• lipohypertrophy
• obstructive sleep apnea, incidence of T&As, evidence of nasopharyngeal/oropharyngeal
lymphoid tissue hypertrophy
• edema/arthralgia/myalgia/carpal-tunnel syndrome
• change in body composition (i.e., increase in total body fat)
• tumorigenesis
• retinopathy

2) Pharmacokinetics

In your ongoing clinical trial, draw 3 blood samples at steady state using a sparse sampling
technique: one at predose and 2 samples after Tmax, and conduct a population PK analysis for
IGF-I. Fixed time sampling should be avoided. Alternatively, PK information from previously
studied diabetic patients (comparable age group such as 2 to 15 years of age) who were treated
with IGF-I may be presented for the whole range of the therapeutic regimens tested (60, 80, 120
µg/kg BID).

The sponsor will analyze the already available PK data in adolescents with diabetes and young
children with Laron Syndrome and will submit it for discussion/further guidance to the agency.

UNRESOLVED ISSUES OR ISSUES REQUIRING FURTHER DISCUSSION:

None

ATTACHMENTS/HANDOUTS:

None

Minutes Preparer: Monika Johnson, PharmD
Regulatory Review Officer

Chair Concurrence: /s/ March 6, 2003
David G. Orloff, MD
Division Director
This is a representation of an electronic record that was signed electronically and this page is the manifestation of the electronic signature.

/s/

Monika Johnson
3/6/03 02:58:42 PM