

NDA REGULATORY FILING REVIEW
(Including Memo of Filing Meeting)

NDA # 22-303 Supplement # Efficacy Supplement Type SE-

Proprietary Name: Treanda
Established Name: bendamustine hydrochloride
Strengths: for injection 100 mg

Applicant: Cephalon, Inc.
Agent for Applicant (if applicable):

Date of Application: 12-28-07
Date of Receipt: 12-31-07
Date clock started after UN:
Date of Filing Meeting: 1-29-08
Filing Date: 2-29-08
Action Goal Date (optional):

User Fee Goal Date: 10-31-08

Indication(s) requested: non-Hodgkins Lymphoma

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

NOTE:

(1) *If you have questions about whether the application is a 505(b)(1) or 505(b)(2) application, see Appendix A. A supplement can be either a (b)(1) or a (b)(2) regardless of whether the original NDA was a (b)(1) or a (b)(2). If the application or efficacy supplement is a (b)(2), complete Appendix B.*

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

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 by contacting the User Fee staff in the Office of Regulatory Policy. The applicant is required to pay a user fee if: (1) the product described in the 505(b)(2) application is a new molecular entity or (2) the applicant claims a new indication for a use that has not been approved under section 505(b). Examples of a new indication for a use include a new indication, a new dosing regime, a new patient population, and an Rx-to-OTC switch. The best way to determine if the applicant is claiming a new indication for a use is to compare the applicant's proposed labeling to labeling that has already been approved for the product described in the application. Highlight the differences between the proposed and approved labeling. If you need assistance in determining if the applicant is claiming a new indication for a use, please contact the User Fee staff.*

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

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

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

- 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
If no, explain:

- 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:

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

1. This application is a paper NDA YES

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

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

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

If combined paper + eNDA, which parts of the application were submitted in electronic format? All except cover letter, 356H, 3542a (patent information), patent certification, debarment certification, field copy certification, 3397 (User Fee), and 3454 (financial disclosure).

Additional comments:

3. This application is an eCTD NDA. YES

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

Additional comments:

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

NOTE: Debarment Certification should use wording in FD&C Act section 306(k)(1) i.e., "[Name of applicant] hereby certifies that it did not and will not use in any capacity the services of any person debarred under section 306 of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act in connection with this application." Applicant may not use wording such as "To the best of my knowledge . . ."

- Are the required pediatric assessment studies and/or deferral/partial waiver/full waiver of pediatric studies (or request for deferral/partial waiver/full waiver of pediatric studies) included? YES NO
- If the submission contains a request for deferral, partial waiver, or full waiver of studies, does the application contain the certification required under FD&C Act sections 505B(a)(3)(B) and (4)(A) and (B)? YES NO
- Is this submission a partial or complete response to a pediatric Written Request? YES NO

If yes, contact PMHT in the OND-IO

- Financial Disclosure forms included with authorized signature? YES NO
(Forms 3454 and/or 3455 must be included and must be signed by the APPLICANT, not an agent.)
NOTE: Financial disclosure is required for bioequivalence studies that are the basis for approval.
- Field Copy Certification (that it is a true copy of the CMC technical section) YES NO
- PDUFA and Action Goal dates correct in tracking system? YES NO
 If not, have the document room staff correct them immediately. These are the dates EES uses for calculating inspection dates.
- Drug name and applicant name correct in COMIS? If not, have the Document Room make the corrections. Ask the Doc Rm to add the established name to COMIS for the supporting IND if it is not already entered.
- List referenced IND numbers: 67,554
- Are the trade, established/proper, and applicant names correct in COMIS? YES NO
 If no, have the Document Room make the corrections.
- End-of-Phase 2 Meeting(s)? Date(s) 9-2-04 and 5-9-05 (CMC) NO
 If yes, distribute minutes before filing meeting.
- Pre-NDA Meeting(s)? Date(s) 10-29-07 NO
 If yes, distribute minutes before filing meeting.

- Any SPA agreements? Date(s) faxed comments only re: 1-20-05 SPA NO
If yes, distribute letter and/or relevant minutes before filing meeting.

Project Management

- If Rx, was electronic Content of Labeling submitted in SPL format? YES NO
If no, request in 74-day letter.
- If Rx, for all new NDAs/efficacy supplements submitted on or after 6/30/06:
Was the PI submitted in PLR format? YES NO

If no, explain. Was a waiver or deferral requested before the application was received or in the submission? If before, what is the status of the request:
- If Rx, all labeling (PI, PPI, MedGuide, carton and immediate container labels) has been consulted to DDMAC? YES NO
- If Rx, trade name (and all labeling) consulted to OSE/DMETS? YES NO
- If Rx, MedGuide and/or PPI (plus PI) consulted to ODE/DSRCS? N/A YES NO
- Risk Management Plan consulted to OSE/IO? N/A YES NO
- If a drug with abuse potential, was an Abuse Liability Assessment, including a proposal for scheduling submitted? NA YES NO

If Rx-to-OTC Switch or OTC application:

- Proprietary name, all OTC labeling/packaging, and current approved PI consulted to OSE/DMETS? YES NO
- If the application was received by a clinical review division, has DNPCE been notified of the OTC switch application? Or, if received by DNPCE, has the clinical review division been notified? YES NO

Clinical

- If a controlled substance, has a consult been sent to the Controlled Substance Staff? 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 EA officer, OPS? YES NO
- Establishment Evaluation Request (EER) submitted to DMPQ? YES NO

- If a parenteral product, consulted to Microbiology Team? YES NO

ATTACHMENT

MEMO OF FILING MEETING

DATE: January 29, 2008

NDA #: 22-303

DRUG NAMES: Treanda (bendamustine hydrochloride)

APPLICANT: Cephalon

BACKGROUND: This is a new molecular entity proposed as a lyophilized for injection formulation at 100 mg. in patients with chronic lymphocytic leukemia. The original NDA for CLL was submitted Sept. 20, 2007.

ATTENDEES: RJustice, RDagher, QRyan for Albrahim, CHolland, RSridhara, AGoheer, JBullock, AGoheer, VKwitkowski,, RKasliwal, JWLee, DPease

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

Discipline/Organization

Reviewer

Medical:	Gini Kwitkowski, Senior Clinical Analyst
Secondary Medical:	Amna Ibrahim, M.D.
Statistical:	Chris Holland, Ph.D./Raji Sridhara, Ph.D.
Pharmacology:	Anwar Goheer, Ph.D./John Leighton, Ph.D.
Statistical Pharmacology:	
Chemistry:	Ravindra Kasliwal, Ph.D./Sarah Pope, Ph.D., PAL, ONDQA/Ravi Harapanhalli, Ph.D.
Environmental Assessment (if needed):	
Biopharmaceutical:	Julie Bullock, Ph.D./Brian Booth, Ph.D.
Microbiology, sterility:	
Microbiology, clinical (for antimicrobial products only):	
DSI:	Lauren Iacono-Connor
OPS:	
Regulatory Project Management:	Dotti Pease/Sharon Thomas
Other Consults:	OSE – Janet Anderson

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

CLINICAL FILE REFUSE TO FILE

- Clinical site audit(s) needed? YES NO
If no, explain:

- 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

CLINICAL MICROBIOLOGY	N/A	<input type="checkbox"/>	FILE	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	REFUSE TO FILE	<input type="checkbox"/>
STATISTICS	N/A	<input type="checkbox"/>	FILE	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	REFUSE TO FILE	<input type="checkbox"/>
BIOPHARMACEUTICS			FILE	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	REFUSE TO FILE	<input type="checkbox"/>
• Biopharm. study site audits(s) needed? YES					<input type="checkbox"/>	NO <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
PHARMACOLOGY/TOX	N/A	<input type="checkbox"/>	FILE	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	REFUSE TO FILE	<input type="checkbox"/>
• GLP audit needed?				YES	<input type="checkbox"/>	NO <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
CHEMISTRY			FILE	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	REFUSE TO FILE	<input type="checkbox"/>
• Establishment(s) ready for inspection?				YES	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	NO <input type="checkbox"/>
• Sterile product?				YES	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	NO <input type="checkbox"/>
If yes, was microbiology consulted for validation of sterilization?				YES	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	NO <input type="checkbox"/>

ELECTRONIC SUBMISSION:
Any comments: not easily navigable

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

- 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.
- Issues to be communicated by Day 74 (3-14-08). List (optional):

ACTION ITEMS:

1. Ensure that the review and chemical classification codes, as well as any other pertinent classification codes (e.g., orphan, OTC) are correctly entered into COMIS.
2. If RTF, notify everybody who already received a consult request of RTF action. Cancel the EER.
3. If filed and the application is under the AIP, prepare a letter either granting (for signature by Center Director) or denying (for signature by ODE Director) an exception for review.
4. If filed, complete the Pediatric Page at this time. (If paper version, enter into DFS.)
5. Convey document filing issues/no filing issues to applicant by Day 74.

Dotti Pease
Regulatory Project Manager

**APPEARS THIS WAY
ON ORIGINAL**

Appendix A to NDA Regulatory Filing Review

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

- (1) Approval of the change proposed in the supplemental application would require data beyond that needed to support our previous finding of safety and efficacy in the approval of the

original application (or earlier supplement), and the applicant has not conducted all of its own studies for approval of the change, or obtained a right to reference studies it does not own. For example, if the change were for a new indication AND a higher dose, we would likely require clinical efficacy data and preclinical safety data to approve the higher dose. If the applicant provided the effectiveness data, but had to rely on a different listed drug, or a new aspect of a previously cited listed drug, to support the safety of the new dose, the supplement would be a 505(b)(2),

- (2) The applicant relies for approval of the supplement on published literature that is based on data that the applicant does not own or have a right to reference. If published literature is cited in the supplement but is not necessary for approval, the inclusion of such literature will not, in itself, make the supplement a 505(b)(2) supplement, or
- (3) The applicant is relying upon any data they do not own or to which they do not have right of reference.

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