CENTER FOR DRUG EVALUATION AND RESEARCH

APPLICATION NUMBER:

22-202

ADMINISTRATIVE and CORRESPONDENCE DOCUMENTS

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

Form Approved: OMB No. 0910-0513
Expiration Date: 07/31/06
See OMB Statement on Page 3.

NDA NUMBER
22-202

NAME OF APPLICANT / NDA HOLDER
Xanodyne Pharmaceuticals, Inc.

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

TRADE NAME (OR PROPOSED TRADE NAME)
Zipsor

ACTIVE INGREDIENT(S)	STRENGTH(S)
diclofenac, potassium	25 mg

DOSAGE FORM
soft gelatin capsule

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 file 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	b. Issue Date of Patent	c. Expiration Date of Patent
US 6,365,180 B1	4/2/2002	7/16/2019

d. Name of Patent Owner		
aai Pharma Inc.	Address *(of Patent Owner)* 2330 Scientific Park Drive	
	City/State Wilmington, NC	
	ZIP Code 28405	FAX Number *(if available)*
	Telephone Number	E-Mail Address *(if available)*

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)		
☞ Xanodyne Pharmaceuticals, Inc.	Address *(of agent or representative named in 1.e.)* One Riverfront Place	
	City/State Newport, Kentucky	
	ZIP Code 4563	FAX Number *(if available)* (859 371-6391
	Telephone Number (859)371-6388	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

PSC Media Arts (301) 443-1090 EF

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	Patent 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?	☐ 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.	Use: *(Submit indication or method of use information as identified specifically in the approved labeling.)*	

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. Declaration Certification

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
Thomas P Jenny	8-23-07

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	
Address	City/State
ZIP Code	Telephone Number
FAX Number *(if available)*	E-Mail Address *(if available)*

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.

PSC Media Arts (301) 443-1090 EF

1.3.5.2 Patent Certification

Paragraph II Certification

The reference drug for this 505(b)(2) application is Cataflam (diclofenac potassium immediate release tablets), NDA# 20-142 (Novartis Pharmaceuticals). Patent and exclusivity information provided in the "Approved Drug Products with Therapeutic Equivalence Evaluations" (Orange Book, updated August 24, 2007) indicate that there are no unexpired patents or unexpired exclusivity for this product.

Arthur C Ilse 8/30/2007

Arthur C. Ilse
Director,
Regulatory Affairs
Xanodyne Pharmaceuticals, Inc.

EXCLUSIVITY SUMMARY

NDA # 22-202 SUPPL # HFD # 170

Trade Name Zipsor Liquid Filled Capsules

Generic Name diclofenac potassium

Applicant Name Xanodyne Pharmaceuticals

Approval Date, If Known June 16, 2009

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)(2)

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?

3 years

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#	20142	Cataflam
NDA#	22122	Voltaren
NDA#	21005	Solaraze

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).

NDA#

NDA#

NDA#

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 THREE-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 ☐

IF "NO," GO DIRECTLY TO THE SIGNATURE BLOCKS ON PAGE 8.

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:

Study XP21L-301 Multiple-dose efficacy study of Diclofenac Potassium Soft Gelatin Capsules 25mg in patients with postoperative pain following bunionectomy surgery

Study XP21L-302Multiple-dose efficacy study of Diclofenac Potassium Soft Gelatin Capsules 25mg in patients with postoperative pain following bunionectomy surgery

Study CL-00395 single-dose, dose ranging studies of DiclofenacPotassium Soft Gelatin Capsules (DPSGC) 25mg, 50 mg, and 100 mg in patients with postoperative pain following dental surgery.

Study CL-0004000 single-dose, dose ranging studies of DiclofenacPotassium Soft Gelatin Capsules (DPSGC) 25mg, 50 mg, and 100 mg in patients with postoperative pain following dental surgery.

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.")

Investigation #1	YES ☐	NO ☒
Investigation #2	YES ☐	NO ☒

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

Also "No" for Investigations 3 and 4

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

Investigation #1	YES ☐	NO ☒
Investigation #2	YES ☐	NO ☒

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

Also "No" for Investigations #3 and #4

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"):

All listed in 2C

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

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

Investigation #1		!
IND # 63,308	YES ☒	! NO ☐ ! Explain:
Investigation #2		!
IND # 63,308	YES ☒	! NO ☐ ! Explain:

same IND for Investigations #3 and #4

(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	!
	!
YES ☐	! NO ☐
Explain:	! Explain:

Investigation #2	!
	!
YES ☐	! NO ☐
Explain:	! 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: Ellen Fields, MD
Title: Clinical Team Leader, DAARP
Date: June 16, 2009

Name of Office/Division Director signing form: Sharon Hertz, MD
Title: Deputy Division Director, DAARP

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/

Sharon Hertz
6/16/2009 02:02:05 PM

1.3.5.3 Statements of Claimed Exclusivity

Requesting Three Years of Exclusivity

As part of this new drug application, Xanodyne Pharmaceuticals, Inc. (XPI) is requesting three (3) years exclusivity for the use of Zipsor™ (diclofenac potassium) Soft Gelatin Capsules for the relief of mild to moderate pain.

Pursuant to 314.50(j) and 314.108(b)(2), support for this exclusivity request is based on the following:

1. The active moiety in this product, diclofenac potassium, has been previously approved in another application under 505(b) of the act.

2. This application contains new clinical investigations, other than bioavailability studies, sponsored by XPI that are essential to the approval of the application.

Arthur C Ilse 8/30/2007

Arthur C. Ilse
Director,
Regulatory Affairs
Xanodyne Pharmaceuticals, Inc.

PEDIATRIC PAGE
(Complete for all filed original applications and efficacy supplements)

NDA/BLA#: 22-202 Supplement Number: _____ NDA Supplement Type (e.g. SE5): _____

Division Name: DAARP PDUFA Goal Date: June 16, 2009 Stamp Date: 12/16/2008

Proprietary Name: Zipsor

Established/Generic Name: diclofenac potassium soft gelatin capsules

Dosage Form: 25 mg

Applicant/Sponsor: Xanodyne

Indication(s) *previously approved* (please complete this question for supplements and Type 6 NDAs only):
(1) relief of mild to moderate acute pain
(2) _____
(3) _____
(4) _____

Pediatric use for each pediatric subpopulation must be addressed for each indication covered by current application under review. A Pediatric Page must be completed for each indication.

Number of indications for this pending application(s): 1
(Attach a completed Pediatric Page for each indication in current application.)

Indication: relief of mild to moderate acute pain

Q1: Is this application in response to a PREA PMR? Yes ☐ Continue
No ☒ Please proceed to Question 2.

If Yes, NDA/BLA#: _____ Supplement #: _____ PMR #: _____

Does the division agree that this is a complete response to the PMR?

☐ Yes. Please proceed to Section D.

☐ No. Please proceed to Question 2 and complete the Pediatric Page, as applicable.

Q2: Does this application provide for (If yes, please check all categories that apply and proceed to the next question):

(a) NEW ☐ active ingredient(s) (includes new combination); ☐ indication(s); ☒ dosage form; ☐ dosing regimen; or ☐ route of administration?*

(b) ☐ No. PREA does not apply. **Skip to signature block.**

**** Note for CDER: SE5, SE6, and SE7 submissions may also trigger PREA.***

Q3: Does this indication have orphan designation?

☐ Yes. PREA does not apply. **Skip to signature block.**

☒ No. Please proceed to the next question.

Q4: Is there a full waiver for all pediatric age groups for this indication (check one)?

☐ Yes: (Complete Section A.)

☒ No: Please check all that apply:

☒ Partial Waiver for selected pediatric subpopulations (Complete Sections B)

☒ Deferred for some or all pediatric subpopulations (Complete Sections C)

☐ Completed for some or all pediatric subpopulations (Complete Sections D)

☐ Appropriately Labeled for some or all pediatric subpopulations (Complete Sections E)

☐ Extrapolation in One or More Pediatric Age Groups (Complete Section F)

(Please note that Section F may be used alone or in addition to Sections C, D, and/or E.)

Section A: Fully Waived Studies (for all pediatric age groups)

Reason(s) for full waiver: (**check, and attach a brief justification for the reason(s) selected**)

- ☐ Necessary studies would be impossible or highly impracticable because:
  - ☐ Disease/condition does not exist in children
  - ☐ Too few children with disease/condition to study
  - ☐ Other (e.g., patients geographically dispersed): _____
- ☐ Product does not represent a meaningful therapeutic benefit over existing therapies for pediatric patients AND is not likely to be used in a substantial number of pediatric patients.
- ☐ Evidence strongly suggests that product would be unsafe in all pediatric subpopulations (*Note: if studies are fully waived on this ground, this information must be included in the labeling.*)
- ☐ Evidence strongly suggests that product would be ineffective in all pediatric subpopulations (*Note: if studies are fully waived on this ground, this information must be included in the labeling.*)
- ☐ Evidence strongly suggests that product would be ineffective and unsafe in all pediatric subpopulations (*Note: if studies are fully waived on this ground, this information must be included in the labeling.*)

☐ Justification attached.

If studies are fully waived, then pediatric information is complete for this indication. If there is another indication, please complete another Pediatric Page for each indication. Otherwise, this Pediatric Page is complete and should be signed.

Section B: Partially Waived Studies (for selected pediatric subpopulations)

Check subpopulation(s) and reason for which studies are being partially waived (fill in applicable criteria below):

Note: If Neonate includes premature infants, list minimum and maximum age in "gestational age" (in weeks).

				Reason (see below for further detail):			
		minimum	maximum	Not feasible#	Not meaningful therapeutic benefit*	Ineffective or unsafe†	Formulation failed∆
☐	Neonate	0 wk. 0 mo.	__ wk. __ mo.	☐	☐	☐	☐
☒	Other	0 yr. 0 mo.	1 yr. 0 mo.	☐	☐	☒	☐
☐	Other	__ yr. __ mo.	__ yr. __ mo.	☐	☐	☐	☐
☐	Other	__ yr. __ mo.	__ yr. __ mo.	☐	☐	☐	☐
☐	Other	__ yr. __ mo.	__ yr. __ mo.	☐	☐	☐	☐

Are the indicated age ranges (above) based on weight (kg)? ☒ No; ☐ Yes.

Are the indicated age ranges (above) based on Tanner Stage? ☐ No; ☒ Yes.

Reason(s) for partial waiver (**check reason** corresponding to the category checked above, and **attach a brief justification**):

Not feasible:

- ☐ Necessary studies would be impossible or highly impracticable because:
  - ☐ Disease/condition does not exist in children
  - ☐ Too few children with disease/condition to study
  - ☐ Other (e.g., patients geographically dispersed): _____

* Not meaningful therapeutic benefit:

- ☐ Product does not represent a meaningful therapeutic benefit over existing therapies for pediatric patients in this/these pediatric subpopulation(s) AND is not likely to be used in a substantial number of

pediatric patients in this/these pediatric subpopulation(s).

† Ineffective or unsafe:

- ☐ Evidence strongly suggests that product would be unsafe in all pediatric subpopulations (*Note: if studies are partially waived on this ground, this information must be included in the labeling.*)
- ☐ Evidence strongly suggests that product would be ineffective in all pediatric subpopulations (*Note: if studies are partially waived on this ground, this information must be included in the labeling.*)
- ☒ Evidence strongly suggests that product would be ineffective and unsafe in all pediatric subpopulations (*Note: if studies are partially waived on this ground, this information must be included in the labeling.*)

Δ Formulation failed:

- ☐ Applicant can demonstrate that reasonable attempts to produce a pediatric formulation necessary for this/these pediatric subpopulation(s) have failed. (*Note: A partial waiver on this ground may only cover the pediatric subpopulation(s) requiring that formulation. An applicant seeking a partial waiver on this ground must submit documentation detailing why a pediatric formulation cannot be developed. This submission will be posted on FDA's website if waiver is granted.)*

☐ Justification attached.

For those pediatric subpopulations for which studies have not been waived, there must be (1) corresponding study plans that have been deferred (if so, proceed to Sections C and complete the PeRC Pediatric Plan Template); (2) submitted studies that have been completed (if so, proceed to Section D and complete the PeRC Pediatric Assessment form); (3) additional studies in other age groups that are not needed because the drug is appropriately labeled in one or more pediatric subpopulations (if so, proceed to Section E); and/or (4) additional studies in other age groups that are not needed because efficacy is being extrapolated (if so, proceed to Section F). Note that more than one of these options may apply for this indication to cover all of the pediatric subpopulations.

Section C: Deferred Studies (for selected pediatric subpopulations).

Check pediatric subpopulation(s) for which pediatric studies are being deferred (and fill in applicable reason below):

Deferrals (for each or all age groups):				**Reason for Deferral**			**Applicant Certification †**
Population		minimum	maximum	Ready for Approval in Adults	Need Additional Adult Safety or Efficacy Data	Other Appropriate Reason (specify below)*	Received
☐	Neonate	__ wk. __ mo.	__ wk. __ mo.	☐	☐	☐	☐
☒	Other	1 yr. 11 mo.	2 yr. 11 mo.	☐	☒	☐	☐
☒	Other	2 yr. 11 mo.	12 yr. 11 mo.	☐	☒	☐	☐
☒	Other	12 yr. 11 mo.	17 yr. 11 mo.	☐	☒	☐	☐
☐	Other	__ yr. __ mo.	__ yr. __ mo.	☐	☐	☐	☐
☐	All Pediatric Populations	0 yr. 0 mo.	16 yr. 11 mo.	☐	☐	☐	☐
	Date studies are due (mm/dd/yy): _____						

Are the indicated age ranges (above) based on weight (kg)? ☒ No; ☐ Yes.

Are the indicated age ranges (above) based on Tanner Stage? ☐ No; ☒ Yes.

* Other Reason: _____

† Note: Studies may only be deferred if an applicant submits a certification of grounds for deferring the studies, a description of the planned or ongoing studies, evidence that the studies are being conducted or will be conducted with due diligence and at the earliest possible time, and a timeline for the completion of the studies. If studies are deferred, on an annual basis applicant must submit information detailing the progress made in conducting the studies or, if no progress has been made, evidence and documentation that such studies will be conducted with due diligence and at the earliest possible time. This requirement should be communicated to the applicant in an appropriate manner (e.g., in an approval letter that specifies a required study as a post-marketing commitment.)

If all of the pediatric subpopulations have been covered through partial waivers and deferrals, Pediatric Page is complete and should be signed. If not, complete the rest of the Pediatric Page as applicable.

Section D: Completed Studies (for some or all pediatric subpopulations).

Pediatric subpopulation(s) in which studies have been completed (check below):

	Population	minimum	maximum	PeRC Pediatric Assessment form attached?.	
☐	Neonate	__ wk. __ mo.	__ wk. __ mo.	Yes ☐	No ☐
☐	Other	__ yr. __ mo.	__ yr. __ mo.	Yes ☐	No ☐
☐	Other	__ yr. __ mo.	__ yr. __ mo.	Yes ☐	No ☐
☐	Other	__ yr. __ mo.	__ yr. __ mo.	Yes ☐	No ☐
☐	Other	__ yr. __ mo.	__ yr. __ mo.	Yes ☐	No ☐
☐	All Pediatric Subpopulations	0 yr. 0 mo.	16 yr. 11 mo.	Yes ☐	No ☐

Are the indicated age ranges (above) based on weight (kg)? ☐ No; ☐ Yes.

Are the indicated age ranges (above) based on Tanner Stage? ☐ No; ☐ Yes.

Note: If there are no further pediatric subpopulations to cover based on partial waivers, deferrals and/or completed studies, Pediatric Page is complete and should be signed. If not, complete the rest of the Pediatric Page as applicable.

Section E: Drug Appropriately Labeled (for some or all pediatric subpopulations):

Additional pediatric studies are not necessary in the following pediatric subpopulation(s) because product is appropriately labeled for the indication being reviewed:

Population		minimum	maximum
☐	Neonate	__ wk. __ mo.	__ wk. __ mo.
☐	Other	__ yr. __ mo.	__ yr. __ mo.
☐	Other	__ yr. __ mo.	__ yr. __ mo.
☐	Other	__ yr. __ mo.	__ yr. __ mo.
☐	Other	__ yr. __ mo.	__ yr. __ mo.
☐	All Pediatric Subpopulations	0 yr. 0 mo.	16 yr. 11 mo.

Are the indicated age ranges (above) based on weight (kg)? ☐ No; ☐ Yes.

Are the indicated age ranges (above) based on Tanner Stage? ☐ No; ☐ Yes.

If all pediatric subpopulations have been covered based on partial waivers, deferrals, completed studies, and/or existing appropriate labeling, this Pediatric Page is complete and should be signed. If not, complete the rest of the Pediatric Page as applicable.

Section F: Extrapolation from Other Adult and/or Pediatric Studies (for deferred and/or completed studies)

Note: Pediatric efficacy can be extrapolated from adequate and well-controlled studies in adults and/or other pediatric subpopulations if (and only if) (1) the course of the disease/condition AND (2) the effects of the product are sufficiently similar between the reference population and the pediatric subpopulation for which information will be extrapolated. Extrapolation of efficacy from studies in adults and/or other children usually requires supplementation with other information obtained from the target pediatric subpopulation, such as pharmacokinetic and safety studies. Under the statute, safety cannot be extrapolated.

Pediatric studies are not necessary in the following pediatric subpopulation(s) because efficacy can be extrapolated from adequate and well-controlled studies in adults and/or other pediatric subpopulations:

Population		minimum	maximum	Extrapolated from:	
				Adult Studies?	Other Pediatric Studies?
☐	Neonate	__ wk. __ mo.	__ wk. __ mo.	☐	☐
☐	Other	__ yr. __ mo.	__ yr. __ mo.	☐	☐
☐	Other	__ yr. __ mo.	__ yr. __ mo.	☐	☐
☐	Other	__ yr. __ mo.	__ yr. __ mo.	☐	☐
☐	Other	__ yr. __ mo.	__ yr. __ mo.	☐	☐
☐	All Pediatric Subpopulations	0 yr. 0 mo.	16 yr. 11 mo.	☐	☐

Are the indicated age ranges (above) based on weight (kg)? ☐ No; ☐ Yes.

Are the indicated age ranges (above) based on Tanner Stage? ☐ No; ☐ Yes.

Note: If extrapolating data from either adult or pediatric studies, a description of the scientific data supporting the extrapolation must be included in any pertinent reviews for the application.

If there are additional indications, please complete the attachment for each one of those indications. Otherwise, this Pediatric Page is complete and should be signed and entered into DFS or DARRTS as appropriate after clearance by PeRC.

This page was completed by:

{See appended electronic signature page}

Regulatory Project Manager

(Revised: 6/2008)

NOTE: If you have no other indications for this application, you may delete the attachments from this document.

Attachment A

(This attachment is to be completed for those applications with multiple indications only.)

Indication #2: _____

Q1: Does this indication have orphan designation?

- ☐ Yes. PREA does not apply. **Skip to signature block.**
- ☐ No. Please proceed to the next question.

Q2: Is there a full waiver for all pediatric age groups for this indication (check one)?

- ☐ Yes: (Complete Section A.)
- ☐ No: Please check all that apply:
  - ☐ Partial Waiver for selected pediatric subpopulations (Complete Sections B)
  - ☐ Deferred for some or all pediatric subpopulations (Complete Sections C)
  - ☐ Completed for some or all pediatric subpopulations (Complete Sections D)
  - ☐ Appropriately Labeled for some or all pediatric subpopulations (Complete Sections E)
  - ☐ Extrapolation in One or More Pediatric Age Groups (Complete Section F)

  (Please note that Section F may be used alone or in addition to Sections C, D, and/or E.)

Section A: Fully Waived Studies (for all pediatric age groups)

Reason(s) for full waiver: (**check, and attach a brief justification for the reason(s) selected**)

- ☐ Necessary studies would be impossible or highly impracticable because:
  - ☐ Disease/condition does not exist in children
  - ☐ Too few children with disease/condition to study
  - ☐ Other (e.g., patients geographically dispersed): _____
- ☐ Product does not represent a meaningful therapeutic benefit over existing therapies for pediatric patients AND is not likely to be used in a substantial number of pediatric patients.
- ☐ Evidence strongly suggests that product would be unsafe in all pediatric subpopulations (*Note: if studies are fully waived on this ground, this information must be included in the labeling.*)
- ☐ Evidence strongly suggests that product would be ineffective in all pediatric subpopulations (*Note: if studies are fully waived on this ground, this information must be included in the labeling.*)
- ☐ Evidence strongly suggests that product would be ineffective and unsafe in all pediatric subpopulations (*Note: if studies are fully waived on this ground, this information must be included in the labeling.*)

☐ Justification attached.

If studies are fully waived, then pediatric information is complete for this indication. If there is another indication, please complete another Pediatric Page for each indication. Otherwise, this Pediatric Page is complete and should be signed.

Section B: Partially Waived Studies (for selected pediatric subpopulations)

Check subpopulation(s) and reason for which studies are being partially waived (fill in applicable criteria below):

Note: If Neonate includes premature infants, list minimum and maximum age in "gestational age" (in weeks).

				Reason (see below for further detail):			
		minimum	maximum	Not feasible#	Not meaningful therapeutic benefit*	Ineffective or unsafe†	Formulation failed∆
☐	Neonate	__ wk. __ mo.	__ wk. __ mo.	☐	☐	☐	☐
☐	Other	__ yr. __ mo.	__ yr. __ mo.	☐	☐	☐	☐
☐	Other	__ yr. __ mo.	__ yr. __ mo.	☐	☐	☐	☐
☐	Other	__ yr. __ mo.	__ yr. __ mo.	☐	☐	☐	☐
☐	Other	__ yr. __ mo.	__ yr. __ mo.	☐	☐	☐	☐

Are the indicated age ranges (above) based on weight (kg)? ☐ No; ☐ Yes.

Are the indicated age ranges (above) based on Tanner Stage? ☐ No; ☐ Yes.

Reason(s) for partial waiver (**check reason** corresponding to the category checked above, and **attach a brief justification**):

Not feasible:

☐ Necessary studies would be impossible or highly impracticable because:

- ☐ Disease/condition does not exist in children
- ☐ Too few children with disease/condition to study
- ☐ Other (e.g., patients geographically dispersed): _____

* Not meaningful therapeutic benefit:

☐ Product does not represent a meaningful therapeutic benefit over existing therapies for pediatric patients in this/these pediatric subpopulation(s) AND is not likely to be used in a substantial number of pediatric patients in this/these pediatric subpopulation(s).

† Ineffective or unsafe:

- ☐ Evidence strongly suggests that product would be unsafe in all pediatric subpopulations (*Note: if studies are partially waived on this ground, this information must be included in the labeling.*)
- ☐ Evidence strongly suggests that product would be ineffective in all pediatric subpopulations (*Note: if studies are partially waived on this ground, this information must be included in the labeling.*)
- ☐ Evidence strongly suggests that product would be ineffective and unsafe in all pediatric subpopulations (*Note: if studies are partially waived on this ground, this information must be included in the labeling.*)

∆ Formulation failed:

☐ Applicant can demonstrate that reasonable attempts to produce a pediatric formulation necessary for this/these pediatric subpopulation(s) have failed. (*Note: A partial waiver on this ground may only cover the pediatric subpopulation(s) requiring that formulation. An applicant seeking a partial waiver on this ground must submit documentation detailing why a pediatric formulation cannot be developed. This submission will be posted on FDA's website if waiver is granted.)*

☐ Justification attached.

For those pediatric subpopulations for which studies have not been waived, there must be (1) corresponding study plans that have been deferred (if so, proceed to Section C and complete the PeRC Pediatric Plan Template); (2) submitted studies that have been completed (if so, proceed to Section D and complete the PeRC Pediatric Assessment form); (3) additional studies in other age groups that are not needed because the drug is appropriately labeled in one or more pediatric subpopulations (if so, proceed to Section E); and/or (4) additional studies in other age groups that are not needed because efficacy is being extrapolated (if so,

proceed to Section F).. Note that more than one of these options may apply for this indication to cover all of the pediatric subpopulations.

Section C: Deferred Studies (for some or all pediatric subpopulations).

Check pediatric subpopulation(s) for which pediatric studies are being deferred (and fill in applicable reason below):

Deferrals (for each or all age groups):				**Reason for Deferral**			**Applicant Certification †**
Population		minimum	maximum	Ready for Approval in Adults	Need Additional Adult Safety or Efficacy Data	Other Appropriate Reason (specify below)*	Received
☐	Neonate	__ wk. __ mo.	__ wk. __ mo.	☐	☐	☐	☐
☐	Other	__ yr. __ mo.	__ yr. __ mo.	☐	☐	☐	☐
☐	Other	__ yr. __ mo.	__ yr. __ mo.	☐	☐	☐	☐
☐	Other	__ yr. __ mo.	__ yr. __ mo.	☐	☐	☐	☐
☐	Other	__ yr. __ mo.	__ yr. __ mo.	☐	☐	☐	☐
☐	All Pediatric Populations	0 yr. 0 mo.	16 yr. 11 mo.	☐	☐	☐	☐
	Date studies are due (mm/dd/yy): _____						

Are the indicated age ranges (above) based on weight (kg)? ☐ No; ☐ Yes.

Are the indicated age ranges (above) based on Tanner Stage? ☐ No; ☐ Yes.

* Other Reason: _____

† Note: Studies may only be deferred if an applicant submits a certification of grounds for deferring the studies, a description of the planned or ongoing studies, evidence that the studies are being conducted or will be conducted with due diligence and at the earliest possible time, and a timeline for the completion of the studies. If studies are deferred, on an annual basis applicant must submit information detailing the progress made in conducting the studies or, if no progress has been made, evidence and documentation that such studies will be conducted with due diligence and at the earliest possible time. This requirement should be communicated to the applicant in an appropriate manner (e.g., in an approval letter that specifies a required study as a post-marketing commitment.)

If all of the pediatric subpopulations have been covered through partial waivers and deferrals, Pediatric Page is complete and should be signed. If not, complete the rest of the Pediatric Page as applicable.

Section D: Completed Studies (for some or all pediatric subpopulations).

Pediatric subpopulation(s) in which studies have been completed (check below):					
Population		minimum	maximum	PeRC Pediatric Assessment form attached?	
☐	Neonate	__ wk. __ mo.	__ wk. __ mo.	Yes ☐	No ☐
☐	Other	__ yr. __ mo.	__ yr. __ mo.	Yes ☐	No ☐
☐	Other	__ yr. __ mo.	__ yr. __ mo.	Yes ☐	No ☐
☐	Other	__ yr. __ mo.	__ yr. __ mo.	Yes ☐	No ☐
☐	Other	__ yr. __ mo.	__ yr. __ mo.	Yes ☐	No ☐
☐	All Pediatric Subpopulations	0 yr. 0 mo.	16 yr. 11 mo.	Yes ☐	No ☐

Are the indicated age ranges (above) based on weight (kg)? ☐ No; ☐ Yes.

Are the indicated age ranges (above) based on Tanner Stage? ☐ No; ☐ Yes.

Note: If there are no further pediatric subpopulations to cover based on partial waivers, deferrals and/or completed studies, Pediatric Page is complete and should be signed. If not, complete the rest of the Pediatric Page as applicable.

Section E: Drug Appropriately Labeled (for some or all pediatric subpopulations):

Additional pediatric studies are not necessary in the following pediatric subpopulation(s) because product is appropriately labeled for the indication being reviewed:			
Population		minimum	maximum
☐	Neonate	__ wk. __ mo.	__ wk. __ mo.
☐	Other	__ yr. __ mo.	__ yr. __ mo.
☐	Other	__ yr. __ mo.	__ yr. __ mo.
☐	Other	__ yr. __ mo.	__ yr. __ mo.
☐	Other	__ yr. __ mo.	__ yr. __ mo.
☐	All Pediatric Subpopulations	0 yr. 0 mo.	16 yr. 11 mo.

Are the indicated age ranges (above) based on weight (kg)? ☐ No; ☐ Yes.

Are the indicated age ranges (above) based on Tanner Stage? ☐ No; ☐ Yes.

If all pediatric subpopulations have been covered based on partial waivers, deferrals, completed studies, and/or existing appropriate labeling, this Pediatric Page is complete and should be signed. If not, complete the rest of the Pediatric Page as applicable.

Section F: Extrapolation from Other Adult and/or Pediatric Studies (for deferred and/or completed studies)

Note: Pediatric efficacy can be extrapolated from adequate and well-controlled studies in adults and/or other pediatric subpopulations if (and only if) (1) the course of the disease/condition AND (2) the effects of the product are sufficiently similar between the reference population and the pediatric subpopulation for which information will be extrapolated. Extrapolation of efficacy from studies in adults and/or other children usually requires supplementation with other information obtained from the target pediatric subpopulation, such as pharmacokinetic and safety studies. Under the statute, safety cannot be extrapolated.

Pediatric studies are not necessary in the following pediatric subpopulation(s) because efficacy can be extrapolated from adequate and well-controlled studies in adults and/or other pediatric subpopulations:

Population		minimum	maximum	Extrapolated from:	
				Adult Studies?	Other Pediatric Studies?
☐	Neonate	__ wk. __ mo.	__ wk. __ mo.	☐	☐
☐	Other	__ yr. __ mo.	__ yr. __ mo.	☐	☐
☐	Other	__ yr. __ mo.	__ yr. __ mo.	☐	☐
☐	Other	__ yr. __ mo.	__ yr. __ mo.	☐	☐
☐	Other	__ yr. __ mo.	__ yr. __ mo.	☐	☐
☐	All Pediatric Subpopulations	0 yr. 0 mo.	16 yr. 11 mo.	☐	☐

Are the indicated age ranges (above) based on weight (kg)? ☐ No; ☐ Yes.

Are the indicated age ranges (above) based on Tanner Stage? ☐ No; ☐ Yes.

Note: If extrapolating data from either adult or pediatric studies, a description of the scientific data supporting the extrapolation must be included in any pertinent reviews for the application.

If there are additional indications, please copy the fields above and complete pediatric information as directed. If there are no other indications, this Pediatric Page is complete and should be entered into DFS or DARRTS as appropriate after clearance by PeRC.

This page was completed by:

{See appended electronic signature page}

Regulatory Project Manager

FOR QUESTIONS ON COMPLETING THIS FORM CONTACT THE PEDIATRIC AND MATERNAL HEALTH STAFF at 301-796-0700

(Revised: 6/2008)

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

/s/

Tanya Clayton
6/15/2009 07:12:36 PM

1.3.3 Debarment Certification

In accordance with the requirement Section 306(k) of the Federal Food Drug and Cosmetic Act, as amended by the Generic Drug Enforcement Act of 1992, Xanodyne Pharmaceuticals, 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 Act in connection with the development of this application.

Arthur C Ilse 8/30/2007

Arthur C. Ilse
Director,
Regulatory Affairs
Xanodyne Pharmaceuticals, Inc.

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES
Food and Drug Administration

CERTIFICATION: FINANCIAL INTERESTS AND ARRANGEMENTS OF CLINICAL INVESTIGATORS

Form Approved: OMB No. 0910-0396
Expiration Date: April 30, 2009.

TO BE COMPLETED BY APPLICANT

With respect to all covered clinical studies (or specific clinical studies listed below (if appropriate)) submitted in support of this application, I certify to one of the statements below as appropriate. I understand that this certification is made in compliance with 21 CFR part 54 and that for the purposes of this statement, a clinical investigator includes the spouse and each dependent child of the investigator as defined in 21 CFR 54.2(d).

Please mark the applicable checkbox.

☒ (1) As the sponsor of the submitted studies, I certify that I have not entered into any financial arrangement with the listed clinical investigators (enter names of clinical investigators below or attach list of names to this form) whereby the value of compensation to the investigator could be affected by the outcome of the study as defined in 21 CFR 54.2(a). I also certify that each listed clinical investigator required to disclose to the sponsor whether the investigator had a proprietary interest in this product or a significant equity in the sponsor as defined in 21 CFR 54.2(b) did not disclose any such interests. I further certify that no listed investigator was the recipient of significant payments of other sorts as defined in 21 CFR 54.2(f).

Clinical Investigators		
	See attached list of clinical investigators	

☐ (2) As the applicant who is submitting a study or studies sponsored by a firm or party other than the applicant, I certify that based on information obtained from the sponsor or from participating clinical investigators, the listed clinical investigators (attach list of names to this form) did not participate in any financial arrangement with the sponsor of a covered study whereby the value of compensation to the investigator for conducting the study could be affected by the outcome of the study (as defined in 21 CFR 54.2(a)); had no proprietary interest in this product or significant equity interest in the sponsor of the covered study (as defined in 21 CFR 54.2(b)); and was not the recipient of significant payments of other sorts (as defined in 21 CFR 54.2(f)).

☐ (3) As the applicant who is submitting a study or studies sponsored by a firm or party other than the applicant, I certify that I have acted with due diligence to obtain from the listed clinical investigators (attach list of names) or from the sponsor the information required under 54.4 and it was not possible to do so. The reason why this information could not be obtained is attached.

NAME	TITLE
Steve Boesing, MS	Senior Clinical Operations Manager
FIRM / ORGANIZATION Xanodyne Pharmaceuticals, Inc.	
SIGNATURE	DATE 8/20/2007

Paperwork Reduction Act Statement

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. Public reporting burden for this collection of information is estimated to average 1 hour per response, including time for reviewing instructions, searching existing data sources, gathering and maintaining the necessary data, and completing and reviewing the collection of information. Send comments regarding this burden estimate or any other aspect of this collection of information to the address to the right:

Department of Health and Human Services
Food and Drug Administration
5600 Fishers Lane, Room 14C-03
Rockville, MD 20857

PSC Graphics: (301) 443-1090 EF

ACTION PACKAGE CHECKLIST

APPLICATION INFORMATION[1]		
NDA # 22-202 BLA #	NDA Supplement # BLA STN #	If NDA, Efficacy Supplement Type:
Proprietary Name: Zipsor Established/Proper Name: diclofenac potassium soft gelatin capsules Dosage Form: 25 milligrams		Applicant: Xanodyne Pharmaceuticals Agent for Applicant (if applicable):
RPM: Tanya Clayton		Division: Anesthesia, Analgesia and Rheumatology Products

NDAs: NDA Application Type: ☐ 505(b)(1) ☒ 505(b)(2) Efficacy Supplement: ☐ 505(b)(1) ☐ 505(b)(2) (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). Consult page 1 of the NDA Regulatory Filing Review for this application or Appendix A to this Action Package Checklist.)	505(b)(2) Original NDAs and 505(b)(2) NDA supplements: Listed drug(s) referred to in 505(b)(2) application (include NDA/ANDA #(s) and drug name(s)): Cataflam, 22-142 Provide a brief explanation of how this product is different from the listed drug. The sponsor is relying on the referenced NDA for non-clinical studies and human safety information. This will be the first diclofenac product containing the capsule formulation. ☐ If no listed drug, check here and explain: **Prior to approval, review and confirm the information previously provided in Appendix B to the Regulatory Filing Review by re-checking the Orange Book for any new patents and pediatric exclusivity. If there are any changes in patents or exclusivity, notify the OND ADRA immediately and complete a new Appendix B of the Regulatory Filing Review.** ☐ No changes ☐ Updated Date of check: **If pediatric exclusivity has been granted or the pediatric information in the labeling of the listed drug changed, determine whether pediatric information needs to be added to or deleted from the labeling of this drug.** **On the day of approval, check the Orange Book again for any new patents or pediatric exclusivity.**

❖ User Fee Goal Date Action Goal Date (if different)	June 16, 2009 May 15, 2009
❖ Actions	
• Proposed action	☒ AP ☐ TA ☐ AE ☐ NA ☐ CR
• Previous actions *(specify type and date for each action taken)*	☐ None AE July 21,2008

[1] The **Application Information** section is (only) a checklist. The **Contents of Action Package** section (beginning on page 5) lists the documents to be included in the Action Package.

❖ Advertising *(approvals only)* Note: If accelerated approval (21 CFR 314.510/601.41), advertising MUST have been submitted and reviewed *(indicate dates of reviews)*	☒ Requested in AP letter ☐ Received and reviewed

❖ Application[2] Characteristics	
Review priority: ☒ Standard ☐ Priority Chemical classification (new NDAs only): ☐ Fast Track ☐ Rolling Review ☐ Orphan drug designation ☐ Rx-to-OTC full switch ☐ Rx-to-OTC partial switch ☐ Direct-to-OTC NDAs: Subpart H ☐ Accelerated approval (21 CFR 314.510) ☐ Restricted distribution (21 CFR 314.520) Subpart I ☐ Approval based on animal studies BLAs: Subpart E ☐ Accelerated approval (21 CFR 601.41) ☐ Restricted distribution (21 CFR 601.42) Subpart H ☐ Approval based on animal studies ☐ Submitted in response to a PMR ☐ Submitted in response to a PMC Comments:	
❖ Application Integrity Policy (AIP) http://www.fda.gov/ora/compliance_ref/aip_page.html	
• Applicant is on the AIP	☐ Yes ☒ No
• This application is on the AIP	☐ Yes ☐ No
• If yes, exception for review granted *(file Center Director's memo in* Administrative/Regulatory Documents *section, with* Administrative Reviews*)*	☐ Yes
• If yes, OC clearance for approval *(file communication in* Administrative/Regulatory Documents *section with* Administrative Reviews*)*	☐ Yes ☐ Not an AP action
❖ Date reviewed by PeRC *(required for approvals only)* If PeRC review not necessary, explain: ☐	April 1, 2009
❖ BLAs only: *RMS-BLA Product Information Sheet for TBP* has been completed and forwarded to OBPS/DRM *(approvals only)*	☐ Yes, date
❖ BLAs only: is the product subject to official FDA lot release per 21 CFR 610.2 *(approvals only)*	☐ Yes ☐ No
❖ Public communications *(approvals only)*	
• Office of Executive Programs (OEP) liaison has been notified of action	☒ Yes ☐ No
• Press Office notified of action	☒ Yes ☐ No
• Indicate what types (if any) of information dissemination are anticipated	☒ None ☐ HHS Press Release ☐ FDA Talk Paper ☐ CDER Q&As ☐ Other

[2] All questions in all sections pertain to the pending application, i.e., if the pending application is an NDA or BLA supplement, then the questions should be answered in relation to that supplement, not in relation to the original NDA or BLA. For example, if the application is a pending BLA supplement, then a new *RMS-BLA Product Information Sheet for TBP* must be completed.

❖ Exclusivity	
• Is approval of this application blocked by any type of exclusivity?	☐ No ☒ Yes
• NDAs and BLAs: Is there existing orphan drug exclusivity for the "same" drug or biologic 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.*	☒ No ☐ Yes If, yes, NDA/BLA # and date exclusivity expires:
• (b)(2) NDAs only: Is there remaining 5-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.)*	☒ No ☐ Yes If yes, NDA # and date exclusivity expires:
• (b)(2) NDAs only: 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.)*	☒ No ☐ Yes If yes, NDA # and date exclusivity expires:
• (b)(2) NDAs only: Is there remaining 6-month pediatric 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.)*	☒ No ☐ Yes If yes, NDA # and date exclusivity expires:
• NDAs only: Is this a single enantiomer that falls under the 10-year approval limitation of 505(u)? *(Note that, even if the 10-year approval limitation period has not expired, the application may be tentatively approved if it is otherwise ready for approval.)*	☒ No ☐ Yes If yes, NDA # and date 10-year limitation expires:
❖ Patent Information (NDAs only)	
• Patent Information: Verify that form FDA-3542a was submitted for patents that claim the drug for which approval is sought. If the drug is an old antibiotic, skip the Patent Certification questions.	☒ Verified ☐ Not applicable because drug is an old antibiotic.
• Patent Certification [505(b)(2) applications]: Verify that a certification was submitted for each patent for the listed drug(s) in the Orange Book and identify the type of certification submitted for each patent.	21 CFR 314.50(i)(1)(*i*)(A) ☒ Verified 21 CFR 314.50(i)(1) ☐ (ii) ☐ (iii)
• [505(b)(2) applications] If the application includes a **paragraph III** certification, it cannot be approved until the date that the patent to which the certification pertains expires (but may be tentatively approved if it is otherwise ready for approval).	☐ No paragraph III certification Date patent will expire
• [505(b)(2) applications] For **each paragraph IV** certification, verify that the applicant notified the NDA holder and patent owner(s) of its certification that the patent(s) is invalid, unenforceable, or will not be infringed (review documentation of notification by applicant and documentation of receipt of notice by patent owner and NDA holder). *(If the application does not include any paragraph IV certifications, mark "N/A" and skip to the next section below (*Summary Reviews*)).*	☒ N/A (no paragraph IV certification) ☐ Verified

• [505(b)(2) applications] For **each paragraph IV** certification, based on the questions below, determine whether a 30-month stay of approval is in effect due to patent infringement litigation. Answer the following questions for **each** paragraph IV certification:	
(1) Have 45 days passed since the patent owner's receipt of the applicant's notice of certification? (Note: The date that the patent owner received the applicant's notice of certification can be determined by checking the application. The applicant is required to amend its 505(b)(2) application to include documentation of this date (e.g., copy of return receipt or letter from recipient acknowledging its receipt of the notice) (see 21 CFR 314.52(e))).	☐ Yes ☐ No
*If "**Yes**," skip to question (4) below. If "**No**," continue with question (2).*	
(2) Has the patent owner (or NDA holder, if it is an exclusive patent licensee) submitted a written waiver of its right to file a legal action for patent infringement after receiving the applicant's notice of certification, as provided for by 21 CFR 314.107(f)(3)?	☐ Yes ☐ No
*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 the rest of the patent questions.* *If "**No**," continue with question (3).*	
(3) Has the patent owner, its representative, or the exclusive patent licensee filed a lawsuit for patent infringement against the applicant? (Note: This can be determined by confirming whether the Division has received a written notice from the (b)(2) 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))).	☐ Yes ☐ No
*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)?	☐ Yes ☐ No
*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 section below (*Summary Reviews*).* *If "**No**," continue with question (5).*	
/	

(5) Did the patent owner, its representative, or the exclusive patent licensee bring suit against the (b)(2) 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 (b)(2) 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 section below (*Summary Reviews*).* *If "**Yes**," a stay of approval may be in effect. To determine if a 30-month stay is in effect, consult with the OND ADRA and attach a summary of the response.*	☐ Yes ☐ No
CONTENTS OF ACTION PACKAGE	
❖ Copy of this Action Package Checklist[3]	
Officer/Employee List	
❖ List of officers/employees who participated in the decision to approve this application and consented to be identified on this list *(approvals only)*	☒ Included
Documentation of consent/nonconsent by officers/employees	☒ Included
Action Letters	
❖ Copies of all action letters *(including approval letter with final labeling)*	Action(s) and date(s) AP June 16, 2009; AE July 21 ,2008
Labeling	
❖ Package Insert *(write submission/communication date at upper right of first page of PI)*	
❖ Most recent division-proposed labeling (only if generated after latest applicant submission of labeling)	June 16, 2009
❖ Most recent submitted by applicant labeling (only if subsequent division labeling does not show applicant version)	
❖ Original applicant-proposed labeling	September 21, 2007
❖ Other relevant labeling (e.g., most recent 3 in class, class labeling), if applicable	
❖ Medication Guide/Patient Package Insert/Instructions for Use *(write submission/communication date at upper right of first page of each piece)*	☒ Medication Guide ☐ Patient Package Insert ☐ Instructions for Use ☐ None
❖ Most-recent division-proposed labeling (only if generated after latest applicant submission of labeling)	

[3] Fill in blanks with dates of reviews, letters, etc.

❖ Most recent submitted by applicant labeling (only if subsequent division labeling does not show applicant version)	December 16, 2008
❖ Original applicant-proposed labeling	September 21, 2007
❖ Other relevant labeling (e.g., most recent 3 in class, class labeling), if applicable	
❖ Labels (**full color** carton and immediate-container labels) *(write submission/communication date at upper right of first page of each submission)*	
❖ Most-recent division proposal for (only if generated after latest applicant submission)	
❖ Most recent applicant-proposed labeling	December 16, 2008
❖ Labeling reviews *(indicate dates of reviews and meetings)*	☒ RPM ☒ DMEDP June 12, 2008 ☐ DRISK ☒ DDMAC December 4,2007 ☐ CSS ☐ Other reviews
Administrative / Regulatory Documents	
❖ Administrative Reviews *(e.g., RPM Filing Review[4]/Memo of Filing Meeting) (indicate date of each review)*	July 21, 2008
❖ NDAs only: Exclusivity Summary *(signed by Division Director)*	☒ Included
❖ AIP-related documents • Center Director's Exception for Review memo • If approval action, OC clearance for approval	☒ Not on AIP
❖ Pediatric Page *(approvals only, must be reviewed by PERC before finalized)*	☒ Included
❖ Debarment certification (original applications only): verified that qualifying language was not used in certification and that certifications from foreign applicants are cosigned by U.S. agent *(include certification)*	☒ Verified, statement is acceptable
❖ Postmarketing Requirement (PMR) Studies	☒ None
• Outgoing communications *(if located elsewhere in package, state where located)*	
• Incoming submissions/communications	
❖ Postmarketing Commitment (PMC) Studies	☐ None
• Outgoing Agency request for postmarketing commitments *(if located elsewhere in package, state where located)*	March 25, 2009
• Incoming submission documenting commitment	March 26, 2009
❖ Outgoing communications *(letters (except previous action letters), emails, faxes, telecons)*	CR Ack Letter (January 16, 2009); Filing Letter (December 4, 2007); Discipline Review letter (February 14, 2008)
❖ Internal memoranda, telecons, etc.	
❖ Minutes of Meetings	
• Pre-Approval Safety Conference *(indicate date; approvals only)*	☒ Not applicable
• Regulatory Briefing *(indicate date)*	☒ No mtg
• Pre-NDA/BLA meeting *(indicate date)*	☐ No mtg May 12, 2003; May 15, 2003 (CMC)

[4] Filing reviews for other disciplines should be filed behind the discipline tab.

• EOP2 meeting *(indicate date)*	☐ No mtg July 28, 2006
• Other (e.g., EOP2a, CMC pilot programs)	SPA November 8, 2004
❖ Advisory Committee Meeting(s)	☒ No AC meeting
• Date(s) of Meeting(s)	
• 48-hour alert or minutes, if available	
Decisional and Summary Memos	
❖ Office Director Decisional Memo *(indicate date for each review)*	☐ None
Division Director Summary Review *(indicate date for each review)*	☐ None June 16, 2009
Cross-Discipline Team Leader Review *(indicate date for each review)*	☐ None July 21, 2008
Clinical Information[5]	
❖ Clinical Reviews	
• Clinical Team Leader Review(s) *(indicate date for each review)*	May 19, 2009
• Clinical review(s) *(indicate date for each review)*	June 23, 2008
• Social scientist review(s) (if OTC drug) *(indicate date for each review)*	☒ None
❖ Safety update review(s) *(indicate location/date if incorporated into another review)*	
❖ Financial Disclosure reviews(s) or location/date if addressed in another review OR If no financial disclosure information was required, review/memo explaining why not	Clinical Review June 23, 2008
❖ Clinical reviews from other clinical areas/divisions/Centers *(indicate date of each review)*	☒ None
❖ Controlled Substance Staff review(s) and Scheduling Recommendation *(indicate date of each review)*	☒ Not needed
❖ REMS • REMS Document and Supporting Statement *(indicate date(s) of submission(s))* • Review(s) and recommendations (including those by OSE and CSS) *(indicate location/date if incorporated into another review)*	☒ None
❖ DSI Inspection Review Summary(ies) *(include copies of DSI letters to investigators)*	☐ None requested
• Clinical Studies	March 26, 2008; March 15, 2008; March 12, 2008; February 20, 2008
• Bioequivalence Studies	N/A
• Clinical Pharmacology Studies	
Clinical Microbiology ☒ None	
❖ Clinical Microbiology Team Leader Review(s) *(indicate date for each review)*	☐ None
Clinical Microbiology Review(s) *(indicate date for each review)*	☐ None
Biostatistics ☐ None	
❖ Statistical Division Director Review(s) *(indicate date for each review)*	☒ None
Statistical Team Leader Review(s) *(indicate date for each review)*	☒ None
Statistical Review(s) *(indicate date for each review)*	☐ None June 12, 2008

[5] Filing reviews should be filed with the discipline reviews.

Clinical Pharmacology ☐ None	
❖ Clinical Pharmacology Division Director Review(s) *(indicate date for each review)*	☒ None
Clinical Pharmacology Team Leader Review(s) *(indicate date for each review)*	☒ None
Clinical Pharmacology review(s) *(indicate date for each review)*	☐ None June 20, 2008
❖ DSI Clinical Pharmacology Inspection Review Summary	☒ None
Nonclinical ☐ None	
❖ Pharmacology/Toxicology Discipline Reviews	
• ADP/T Review(s) *(indicate date for each review)*	☒ None
• Supervisory Review(s) *(indicate date for each review)*	☐ None June 23, 2008
• Pharm/tox review(s), including referenced IND reviews *(indicate date for each review)*	☐ None May 1, 2009
❖ Review(s) by other disciplines/divisions/Centers requested by P/T reviewer *(indicate date for each review)*	☒ None
❖ Statistical review(s) of carcinogenicity studies *(indicate date for each review)*	☒ No carc
❖ ECAC/CAC report/memo of meeting	☒ None Included in P/T review, page
❖ DSI Nonclinical Inspection Review Summary	☒ None requested
CMC/Quality ☐ None	
❖ CMC/Quality Discipline Reviews	
• ONDQA/OBP Division Director Review(s) *(indicate date for each review)*	☒ None
• Branch Chief/TeamLeader Review(s) *(indicate date for each review)*	☒ None
• CMC/product quality review(s) *(indicate date for each review)*	☐ None June 3, 2008; January 28, 2008; October 30, 2007
• BLAs only: Facility information review(s) *(indicate dates)*	☐ None
❖ Microbiology Reviews • NDAs: Microbiology reviews (sterility & pyrogenicity) *(indicate date of each review)* • BLAs: Sterility assurance, product quality microbiology	☒ Not needed
❖ Reviews by other disciplines/divisions/Centers requested by CMC/quality reviewer *(indicate date for each review)*	☒ None
❖ Environmental Assessment (check one) (original and supplemental applications)	
☒ Categorical Exclusion *(indicate review date)(all original applications and all efficacy supplements that could increase the patient population)*	CMC Draft Review #1, page 84, January 28, 2008
☐ Review & FONSI *(indicate date of review)*	
☐ Review & Environmental Impact Statement *(indicate date of each review)*	
❖ Facilities Review/Inspection	
• NDAs: Facilities inspections (include EER printout) *(date completed must be within 2 years of action date)*	Date completed: March 6, 2008 ☒ Acceptable ☐ Withhold recommendation

• BLAs: ➢ TBP-EER ➢ Compliance Status Check (approvals only, both original and all supplemental applications except CBEs) *(date completed must be within 60 days prior to AP)*	Date completed: ☐ Acceptable ☐ Withhold recommendation Date completed: ☐ Requested ☐ Accepted ☐ Hold
❖ NDAs: Methods Validation	☒ Completed ☐ Requested ☐ Not yet requested ☐ Not needed

Appendix A to Action Package Checklist

An NDA or NDA supplemental 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) **Or** 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.
(3) **Or** 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) **And** 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.
(3) **And** 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) **Or** 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.
(3) **Or** 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 ADRA.

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

/s/

Tanya Clayton
6/18/2009 04:34:16 PM

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH & HUMAN SERVICES

Public Health Service

Food and Drug Administration
Rockville, MD 20857

NDA 22-202

Xanodyne Pharmaceuticals, Inc.
One Riverfront Place
Newport, KY 41071-4563

Attention: Arthur C. Ilse
Director, Regulatory Affairs

Dear Mr. Ilse:

We acknowledge receipt on December 16, 2008 of your resubmission to your new drug application for Zipsor (diclofenac potassium) Soft Gelatin Capsules.

We consider this a complete, class 2 response to our July 21, 2008 action letter. Therefore, the user fee goal date is June 16, 2009.

If you have any questions, call Tanya Clayton, Regulatory Project Manager, at (301) 796-0871.

Sincerely,

{See appended electronic signature page}

Sara E. Stradley, M.S.
Chief, Project Management Staff
Division of Anesthesia, Analgesia and
Rheumatology 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/

Sara Stradley
1/16/2009 08:20:57 AM

NDA REGULATORY FILING REVIEW
(Including Memo of Filing Meeting)

NDA # 22-202 Supplement # Efficacy Supplement Type SE-

Proprietary Name: Zipsor
Established Name: diclofenac potassium soft gelatin capsules
Strengths: 25 mg

Applicant: Xanodyne Pharmaceuticals, Inc.
Agent for Applicant (if applicable):

Date of Application: September 21, 2007
Date of Receipt: September 21, 2007
Date clock started after UN:
Date of Filing Meeting: October 29, 2007
Filing Date: November 20, 2007
Action Goal Date (optional): User Fee Goal Date: July 21, 2008

Indication(s) requested: relief of mild to moderate pain

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.) 3
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 by contacting the User Fee staff in the Office of Regulatory Policy. The applicant is required to pay a user fee if: (1) the product described in the 505(b)(2) application is a new molecular entity or (2) the applicant claims a new indication for a use that that has not been approved under section 505(b). Examples of a new indication for a use include a new indication, a new dosing regime, a new patient population, and an Rx-to-OTC switch. The best way to determine if the applicant is claiming a new indication for a use is to compare the applicant's proposed labeling to labeling that has already been approved for the product described in the application. Highlight the differences between the proposed and approved labeling. If you need assistance in determining if the applicant is claiming a new indication for a use, please contact the User Fee staff.*

- Is there any 5-year or 3-year exclusivity on this active moiety in any approved (b)(1) or (b)(2) application? YES ☒ NO ☐
  If yes, explain: NDA 22-122 Voltaren diclofenac sodium topical gel, 3 years

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?
   (http://www.fda.gov/cder/guidance/2353fnl.pdf) YES ☐ NO ☐

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

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

   Additional comments:

3. This application is an eCTD NDA. YES ☒
   If an eCTD NDA, all forms and certifications must either be in paper and signed or be electronically signed.

   Additional comments:

- Patent information submitted on form FDA 3542a? YES ☒ NO ☐

- Exclusivity requested? Yes ☒ Years 3 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: 63,308

- 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) _____ NO ☒
  If yes, distribute minutes before filing meeting.

- Pre-NDA Meeting(s)? Date(s) Feb 11, 2003-Clinical, Feb 26, 2003-CMC NO ☐

If yes, distribute minutes before filing meeting.

- Any SPA agreements? Date(s) August 30, 2004 NO ☐
  If yes, distribute letter and/or relevant minutes before filing meeting. **Follow-up Meeting held October 12, 2004**

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?
  ☒ N/A ☐ NO ☐

YES

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: October 29, 2007

NDA #: 22-202

DRUG NAMES: Zipsor (diclofenac potassium soft gelatin capsules)

APPLICANT: Xanodyne Pharmaceuticals

BACKGROUND: This NDA was submitted as a 505(b)(2) application. The referenced drug is Cataflam (NDA 20-142). The sponsor is relying on the referenced NDA for non-clinical studies and human safety information. This will be the first diclofenac product containing the capsule formulation.

ATTENDEES: Bob Rappaport, Sharon Hertz, Christina Fang, John Hill, Asoke Mukherjee, Yongman Kim, Emmanuel Fadiran, Dionne Price, Mary Purucker, Suresh Doddapaneni, Dana Christodoulou, Dan Mellon, Mary Dempsey, Janice Weiner, Rosemary Addy

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

Discipline/Organization	Reviewer
Medical:	Christina Fang
Secondary Medical:	
Statistical:	Yongman Kim
Pharmacology:	Asoke Mukherjee
Statistical Pharmacology:	
Chemistry:	John Hill
Environmental Assessment (if needed):	
Biopharmaceutical:	Emmanuel Fadiran
Microbiology, sterility:	
Microbiology, clinical (for antimicrobial products only):	
DSI:	Sherbet Samuels
OPS:	
Regulatory Project Management:	Tanya Clayton
Other Consults:	DDMAC- Michelle Safarik OSE- Cheryl Wisemen Clinical Pharmacology

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 ☒	FILE ☐	REFUSE TO FILE ☐
STATISTICS	N/A ☐	FILE ☒	REFUSE TO FILE ☐
BIOPHARMACEUTICS		FILE ☒	REFUSE TO FILE ☐

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

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

- GLP audit needed? YES ☐ NO ☒

CHEMISTRY	FILE ☒	REFUSE TO FILE ☐

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

ELECTRONIC SUBMISSION:
Any comments: To be conveyed in 74 Day Letter:

Clinical: Request a dose response analysis for 2 submitted studies.

Statistics: Request SAS files.

Chemistry: Impurities should be tightened because they are below ICH guidelines. There may also be degradation issues and a structural alert.

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.
- ☒ Filing issues to be communicated by Day 74. 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.

Tanya D. Clayton
Regulatory Project Manager

Appendix A to NDA Regulatory Filing Review

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

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

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

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

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

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

(1) The applicant has conducted its own studies to support the new indication (or otherwise owns or has right of reference to the data/studies),

(2) No additional information beyond what is included in the supplement or was embodied in the finding of safety and effectiveness for the original application or previously approved supplements is needed to support the change. For example, this would likely be the case with respect to safety considerations if the dose(s) was/were the same as (or lower than) the original application, and.

(3) All other "criteria" are met (e.g., the applicant owns or has right of reference to the data relied upon for approval of the supplement, the application does not rely for approval on published literature based on data to which the applicant does not have a right of reference).

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

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

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

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

(3) The applicant is relying upon any data they do not own or to which they do not have right of reference.

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

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

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

*If "**No**," skip to question 3.*

2. Name of listed drug(s) referenced by the applicant (if any) and NDA/ANDA #(s): Cataflam, NDA 20-142 (indicated for treatment of primary dysmenorrhea, relief of mild to moderate pain, relief of signs/symptoms of osteoarthritis and rheumatoid arthritis

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

YES ☐ NO ☒

*If "**Yes**," skip to question 7.*

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

YES ☐ NO ☒

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

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

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

   YES ☐ NO ☒

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Pharmaceutical alternative(s):

7. (a) Does the application rely on published literature necessary to support the proposed approval of the drug product (i.e. is the published literature necessary for the approval)?

YES ☐ NO ☒

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

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

8. Describe the change from the listed drug(s) provided for in this (b)(2) application (for example, "This application provides for a new indication, otitis media" or "This application provides for a change in dosage form, from capsules to solution").

This application provides for a change in dosage form, from tablet to capsule.

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

10. Is the application for a duplicate of a listed drug whose only difference is that the extent to which the active ingredient(s) is absorbed or otherwise made available to the site of action less than that of the reference listed drug (RLD)? YES ☐ NO ☒

(See 314.54(b)(1)). If yes, the application may be refused for filing under 21 CFR 314.101(d)(9)).

11. Is the application for a duplicate of a listed drug whose only difference is that the rate at which the product's active ingredient(s) is absorbed or made available to the site of action is unintentionally less than that of the RLD (see 21 CFR 314.54(b)(2))? If yes, the application may be refused for filing under 21 CFR 314.101(d)(9). YES ☐ NO ☒

12. Are there certifications for each of the patents listed in the Orange Book for the listed drug(s) referenced by the applicant (see question #2)? Cataflam, NDA 20-142 (This is different from the patent declaration submitted on form FDA 3542 and 3542a.) YES ☒ NO ☐

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

☐ Not applicable (e.g., solely based on published literature. See question # 7

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

☒ 21 CFR 314.50(i)(1)(i)(A)(2): The patent has expired. (Paragraph II certification)
Patent number(s):

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

☐ 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)
Patent number(s):

NOTE: *IF FILED, and if the applicant made a "Paragraph IV" certification [21 CFR 314.50(i)(1)(i)(A)(4)], the applicant must* ***subsequently*** *submit a signed certification stating that the NDA holder and patent owner(s) were notified the NDA was filed [21 CFR 314.52(b)]. The applicant must also submit documentation showing that the NDA holder and patent owner(s) received the notification [21 CFR 314.52(e)]. OND will contact you to verify that this documentation was received.*

☐ 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).
Patent number(s):

☐ Written statement from patent owner that it consents to an immediate effective date upon approval of the application.
Patent number(s):

☐ 21 CFR 314.50(i)(1)(ii): No relevant patents.

☐ 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)
Patent number(s):

14. Did the applicant:

- Identify which parts of the application rely on the finding of safety and effectiveness for a listed drug or published literature describing a listed drug or both? For example, pharm/tox section of application relies on finding of preclinical safety for a listed drug.

  YES ☒ NO ☐

  *If "**Yes**," what is the listed drug product(s) and which sections of the 505(b)(2) application rely on the finding of safety and effectiveness or on published literature about that listed drug*

  Cataflam, NDA 20-142; Sponsor is relying on the non-clinical studies and human safety information.
  Was this listed drug product(s) referenced by the applicant? (see question # 2)

  YES ☒ NO ☐

- Submit a bioavailability/bioequivalence (BA/BE) study comparing the proposed product to the listed drug(s)?

  N/A ☐ YES ☒ NO ☐

15. (a) Is there unexpired exclusivity on this listed drug (for example, 5 year, 3 year, orphan or pediatric exclusivity)? Note: this information is available in the Orange Book.

YES ☐ NO ☒

If "**Yes**," please list:

Application No.	Product No.	Exclusivity Code	Exclusivity Expiration

---

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

/s/

Tanya Clayton
7/21/2008 02:14:50 PM
CSO

Sara Stradley
7/21/2008 02:25:44 PM
CSO

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH & HUMAN SERVICES

Public Health Service

Food and Drug Administration
Rockville, MD 20857

NDA 22-202

DISCIPLINE REVIEW LETTER

Xanodyne Pharmaceutical, Inc.
Attention: Arthur C. Isle
Director, Regulatory Affairs
One Riverfront Place
Newport, KY 41071-4563

Dear Mr. Isle:

Please refer to your September 21, 2007 new drug application (NDA) submitted under section 505(b) of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act for Zipsor (diclofenac potassium soft gelatin capsules) 25 mg.

Our review of the Chemistry, Manufacturing and Controls section of your submission is complete, and we have identified the following deficiencies:

1. In section 3.2.P.2.4, page 5, you discuss testing of the (b) (4) and the (b) (4) Identify the company you mention in the sentence that states, "An MVTR transmission tests … were performed on flat sheet material by Company on the …"

2. Confirm that the MVTR testing was conducted on the (b) (4).

3. Provide photostability data for Zipsor™ in the (b) (4) blister card, or a rationale as to why they are not required.

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 Tanya Clayton, Regulatory Health Project Manager, at (301) 796-0871.

Sincerely,

Ali Al-Hakim, Ph.D.
Pharmaceutical Assessment Lead for the
Division of Anesthesia, Analgesia and
Rheumatology Products, HFD-170
DNDC III, Office of New Drug Chemistry
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/

Ali Al-Hakim
2/14/2008 01:05:45 PM

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH & HUMAN SERVICES

Public Health Service

Food and Drug Administration
Rockville, MD 20857

FILING COMMUNICATION

NDA 22-202

Xanodyne Pharmaceuticals, Inc.
One Riverfront Place
Newport, KY 41071-4563

Attention: Arthur C. Ilse
Director, Regulatory Affairs

Dear Mr. Ilse:

Please refer to your new drug application (NDA) dated September 21, 2007, received September 21, 2007, submitted pursuant to section 505(b)(2) of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act, for Zipsor (diclofenac potassium) Soft Gelatin Capsules.

We have completed our filing review and have determined that your application is sufficiently complete to permit a substantive review. Therefore, in accordance with 21 CFR 314.101(a), this application is considered filed 60 days after the date we received your application. The review classification for this application is **Standard**. Therefore, the user fee goal date is July 21, 2008.

During our filing review of your application, we identified the following potential review issues:

1. Provide detailed exposure information for the multiple-dose studies (Study CL-396, Study CL-401, and Study CL-2000) in a format similar to Table 22 in the study report for Study XP21L-301 and Study XP21L-302.

2. Provide the results of a dose-response analysis (statistical comparison between the treatment groups of different doses) for all randomized, double-blind, efficacy studies containing two or more dose levels, especially the time-specific pain intensity difference and pain relief scores in the single-dose dental studies.

3. Provide information on the number and percentage of patients per treatment arm missing stopwatch data in each efficacy study, where the stopwatch was used to evaluate onset of pain relief after the initial (or single) dose. Also provide an explanation for the high number of reports of "stopwatch elapsed time not covered" since it was listed as a protocol violation in more than 50% of patients in the two bunionectomy studies (Study XP21L-301 and 302).

4. Submit the data files (as SAS transport files) and the modeling files for the PK-PD analysis for Study AAI-002000. Specify the program that was used for the PK-PD analysis.

5. Submit the full dissolution profile (and the corresponding f2 data) comparison between the clinical formulation (series 1200) and to-be-marketed formulation (series 1300/1400).

6. Provide the statistical analysis of the stability test data (SAS format).

7. Provide dissolution profiles and stability data for the registration and supporting batches or indicate the NDA module in which they have been included.

8. Your limit of impurity (b) (4) should be either reduced to not more than (NMT) (b) (4) % or (b) (4) whichever is lower, as per the ICH Q3B guidelines for impurities in new drugs or provide data to support adequate qualification for safety. Adequate qualification should include:

    a. Minimal genetic toxicology screen (two in vitro genetic toxicology studies, e.g., one point mutation assay and one chromosome aberration assay) with the isolated impurity, tested up to the limit dose for the assay.

    b. Repeat dose toxicology of appropriate duration to support the proposed indication.

9. The specification for the impurity (b) (4) should be set at NMT (b) (4) mcg/day as it is a known rodent carcinogen.

We are providing the above comments to give you preliminary notice of potential 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. Issues may be added, deleted, expanded upon, or modified as we review the application.

If you have not already done so, you must submit the content of labeling [21 CFR 314.50(l)(1)(i)] in structured product labeling (SPL) format as described at http://www.fda.gov/oc/datacouncil/spl.html. The content of labeling must be in the Prescribing Information (physician labeling rule) format.

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 requirement. We acknowledge receipt of your request for a deferral of pediatric studies for this application for pediatric patients.

If you have any questions, call Tanya Clayton, Regulatory Project Manager, at (301) 796-0871.

Sincerely,

{See appended electronic signature page}

Bob Rappaport, M.D.
Director
Division of Anesthesia, Analgesia and
Rheumatology 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/

Bob Rappaport
12/4/2007 01:58:52 PM

MEMORANDUM OF MEETING MINUTES

MEETING DATE: June 12, 2006

TIME: 12:00-1:00pm (teleconference)

APPLICATION: IND 63, 308

DRUG NAME: Diclofenac Potassium Soft Gelatin Capsules

INDICATION: Relief of mild to moderate pain

TYPE OF MEETING: Type C

MEETING CHAIR: Sharon Hertz, MD, Deputy Director
Division of Anesthesia, Analgesia and Rheumatology Products (DAARP)

MEETING RECORDER: Pratibha Rana, MS, Regulatory Project Manager, DAARP

ATTENDEES:

	Title
Michael Giuliani, MD	Chief Medical Officer
James L. Young, PhD	Vice President, Product Development
Dorothy A. Frank, M.S., RAC	Vice President, Regulatory Affairs
Jeffrey S. Greiwe, PhD	Senior Program Manager
Jeffrey D. Lazar, MD, PhD	Clinical and Regulatory Consultant
FDA	**Title**
Bob A. Rappaport, MD	Division Director, (DAARP)
Sharon Hertz, MD	Deputy Director, (DAARP)
Thomas J. Permutt, PhD	Team Leader, Statistics
Suresh Doddapaneni, PhD	Clinical Pharmacology Team Leader
Lei K. Zhang, PhD	Clinical Pharmacology Reviewer
Pratibha Rana, MS	Regulatory Project Manager, DAARP

Xanodyne Pharmaceuticals, Inc. submitted a Type-B meeting request dated February 26, 2006, to discuss the proposed indication, proposed Phase 3 plan and the eventual NDA. The Sponsor also submitted a briefing package dated May 16, 2006, which contained a list of questions to be discussed at this meeting. Upon review of the briefing package, the Division responded to the Sponsor's questions via email on June 6, 2006. Any discussion that took place at the meeting is captured directly under the relevant original response including any changes in our original position. The Sponsor's questions are in ***bold italics***; FDA's response is in *italics*; meeting discussion is in normal font.

CMC Question

Question 11: Does the Division agree that the proposed CMC data package is sufficient to support filing the NDA?

FDA Response:
The proposed CMC data package is acceptable; however, the NDA should also include the following additional information:

a. *A well documented Pharmaceutical Development Report as per ICH-Q8.*

b. *Justification for the final formulation of the drug product and comprehensive report describing the differences between the old and the final formulation and if there is any impact on the final drug product with respect to dissolution, stability, impurities and any other testing parameters.*

c. *A table containing addresses and CFN numbers of all sites involved in manufacturing, testing, stability, packaging, etc. of the drug substance and the drug product*

d. *We recommend that you revise (tighten) the stability specifications for the drug product impurities based on the actual stability test data obtained from the NDA validation batches.*

e. *An appropriate amount of satisfactory and real-time stability test data which covers the proposed expiry dating.*

Discussion:
There was no further discussion after the responses were sent to the Sponsor.

Preclinical Question

Question 1: Does the Division agree that no additional pharmacology/toxicology studies are needed to support an eventual NDA submission?

FDA Response:
Yes, if the formulation of the diclofenac potassium capsules is the same as that provided in the briefing package.

Discussion:
There was no further discussion after the responses were sent to the Sponsor.

Clinical Questions

Question 2: Does the Division agree that the proposed 25 mg dose has been adequately characterized?

FDA Response:
It appears that there are changes in the composition as well as manufacturing process for the to-be-marketed formulation compared to formulations used in the previous PK studies (bioequivalence to Cataflam, food effect) and clinical studies. Compare the formulation composition used for these earlier studies and the final formulation and assess the impact of these changes on the existing data. Based on the extent of these changes, provide in vitro dissolution data or in vivo BE data to link the formulations with justification for the method chosen.

Discussion:
There was no further discussion after the responses were sent to the Sponsor.

Question 3: Does the Division agree that the dosing regimen of 25 mg DPSGC every 6 hours is appropriate?

FDA Response:
In light of the fact that your product (25 mg) has an earlier Tmax and lower a AUC compared to the Cataflam 50-mg drug product, it will be necessary to support your proposed dosing regimen with clinical data. Adequate support includes determining the median time to remedication as well as evidence of efficacy in an adequate and well-controlled multiple-dose study.

Sponsor's follow up Question:

Xanodyne is committed to providing this information. It would help us meet your objectives if we understand the underlying goals. Are there any concerns the Division has or is this a routine requirement of all programs?

Discussion:
The Division noted that the standard information to support dosing interval is median time to remedication. The Sponsor asked whether the amount of rescue medication used through 6 hours could be used for the efficacy endpoint. The Division responded that adequate evidence of efficacy in this setting is an assessment of pain over a multiple-dose period, such as SPID over 0 to 48 hours. It is possible to get time to remedication and efficacy in one study by measuring time to remedication following the first dose of study drug during a multiple-dose study.

Question 4: Does the Division agree that the proposed phase 3 program – two bunionectomy studies, together with the above referenced dental pain studies – is adequate to support the proposed indication of relief of mild to moderate acute pain?

FDA Response:
Two adequate and well-controlled clinical studies are acceptable to provide evidence of efficacy. The primary efficacy endpoint of SPID during the first 6 hours after the first dose is inadequate to define efficacy. The primary efficacy endpoint must reflect efficacy over the course of a multiple-dose period of appropriate duration, at a minimum, over 48 hours. Describe how missing data will be managed.

Sponsor's follow up Question:

To meet the intent of your request, Xanodyne proposes to measure SPID during the first 6 hours after the first dose and also for a 6 hour evaluation after the 42 hour dose. Both SPID measurements will be analyzed for efficacy. We fully expect to demonstrate efficacy at both time points.

Missing data will be interpreted as the worst observation carried forward prior to the missing data point.

Discussion:

The Division noted that it is preferable to evaluate efficacy over at least 48 hours rather than over two separate single-dose periods. The Sponsor noted that they are interested in demonstrating an earlier onset of effect. The Division pointed out that a comparative claim would require replicated comparative data from adequate and well-controlled trials. The Division stated that use of worst observation carried forward is acceptable, including the baseline value or some other value, as long as it represents the worst value.

(b) (4)

[redacted]

Question 7: Does the Division agree that the total overall proposed number of exposures in the development program is adequate to support the proposed NDA?

Question 8: Does the Division agree that the proposed multiple dose exposures are adequate to support the proposed NDA?

FDA Response to Questions 7 and 8:
Table 6.2.4-1 in your meeting package describes a total of 628 patients who are anticipated to receive single doses of 25 mg, 50 mg, or 100 mg. There are 172 patients who are anticipated to receive 16 doses of 25 mg over 4 days, 131 patients will receive 24 doses of 25 mg over 5 days, 124 patients will receive 24 doses of 50 mg over 5 days, and 13 patients who are anticipated to receive 22 doses of 25 mg over 8 days and 14 patients who are anticipated to receive 22 doses of 50 mg over 8 days. The 421 patients who will receive 4 doses per day over 4 and 5 days are appropriate multiple-dose patients to support safety for this product if the dosing interval is every 6 hours. If the dosing interval is less than 6 hours, additional patients will be needed.

Provide a rationale for why it is acceptable that approximately 90% of the safety database will be female.

Discussion:
There was no further discussion after the responses were sent to the Sponsor.

Question 9: Is the Division likely to agree to a waiver of the requirement for pediatric studies with the DPSGC product?

FDA Response:
It is unlikely that a waiver will be granted. The indications sought include pediatric patients. It would be acceptable to defer pediatric studies at this time.

Discussion:
There was no further discussion after the responses were sent to the Sponsor.

Question 10: Does the Division agree that referencing other approved diclofenac product labeling is sufficient to provide information on dosing in special populations?

FDA Response:
Yes. We also advise you to conduct a literature search to update information on dosing in special populations.

Discussion:
There was no further discussion after the responses were sent to the Sponsor.

Administrative Question

Question 12: Does the Division agree with the proposal for a paper NDA filing in CTD format?

FDA Response: That will be an acceptable format for submission. The appropriate format for datasets to support the application is the SAS transport file.

Discussion:
There was no further discussion after the responses were sent to the Sponsor.

General Comments regarding 505 (b)2 applications

The following comments are from the October 1999 DRAFT Guidance for Industry: Applications Covered by Section 505(b)(2), available at http://www.fda.gov/cder/guidance/guidance.htm:

1. *505(b)(2) applications must clearly identify those portions of the application that rely on information you do not own or to which you do not have a right of reference.*

2. *A 505(b)(2) application that relies upon the Agency's previous finding of safety or efficacy for a listed drug must specifically identify any and all listed drugs by established name, proprietary name, dosage form, strength, route of administration, name of the listed drug's Sponsor and the application number.*

3. *A 505(b)(2) application relying upon literature must clearly identify the listed drug(s) on which the studies were conducted (if any).*

4. *For a 505(b)(2) application you must provide a patent certification or statement as required under section 505(b)(2) of the Act with respect to any relevant patents that claim the listed drug and that claim any other drugs on which the investigations relied on by the applicant for approval of the application were conducted, or that claim a use for the listed or other drug (21 CFR 314.54(a)(1)(vi)). -- (Listed in the Orange Book)*

5. *Patent certification should specify the exact patent number(s), and the exact name of the listed drug or other drug even if all relevant patents have expired.*

6. *Note the following key issue regarding the requirement for appropriate patent certification: Due to legislation contained in the Medicare Prescription Drug, Improvement, and Modernization Act of 2003 (MMA), if during the review of an NDA filed under 505(b)(2), either the applicant decides to refer to a different product than that/those identified in the original application, or the Agency discovers that the applicant did not appropriately certify to the patent(s) of the products referenced in the original application, then the applicant would be required to withdraw and resubmit the application as a new original NDA, with the appropriate Patent Certifications included, potentially requiring a new User Fee.*

7. *Before submitting your NDA, the guidance recommends that you submit a plan to the reviewing Division that specifically identifies the types of bridging studies that will be conducted. You should also identify those components of its application for which you expect*

to rely on FDA's finding of safety and effectiveness of a previously approved drug product. The Division will critique the plan and provide guidance.

8. *The review of this plan will be completed around Division deadlines that may take higher priority; therefore, the Division encourages that you submit such a plan well in advance of the NDA submission, to provide adequate time for the reviewer to evaluate the proposal and resolve any potential concerns that may result in a filing issue or delay in the review process.*

9. *You must also submit a relative bioavailability study comparing the proposed product to the listed drug(s) (if any).*

10. *If the only literature that you submit is within the public domain and/or you have right of reference to the studies and the data required to support them, you may be able to submit a 505(b)(1) application.*

11. *If portions of your application rely upon studies that you do not have right of reference to or are not within the public domain, you must submit a 505(b)(2) application. Please note that not all studies reported in the literature are supported by data that exists within the public domain. Many studies in the literature are supported by proprietary data.*

12. *For the NDA, you may need to complete nonclinical pharmacokinetic bridging studies in order to compare exposures obtained in the referenced drug product with those obtained with your drug product for the product labeling.*

Discussion:
There was no further discussion after the responses were sent to the Sponsor.

Action Items: The Division will confirm the response to Question 5.

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

/s/

Pratibha Rana
7/28/2006 04:53:25 PM