EXCLUSIVITY SUMMARY

NDA # 200-732     SUPPL # 000     HFD # 530

Trade Name

Generic Name   Zidovudine Tablets, 100 mg

Applicant Name   Matrix Laboratories Limited

Approval Date, If Known   February 23, 2011

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." Intent)

      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.

      Applicant requested a biowaiver for this 100 mg strength tablet, supported by formulation proportionality and similar dissolution data of their approved ANDA 78-922 for zidovudine 300 mg tablets.

      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?

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

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

3. In addition to being essential, investigations must be "new" to support exclusivity. The agency interprets "new clinical investigation" to mean an investigation that 1) has not been relied on by the agency to demonstrate the effectiveness of a previously approved drug for any indication and 2) does not duplicate the results of another investigation that was relied on by the agency to demonstrate the effectiveness of a previously approved drug product, i.e., does not redemonstrate something the agency considers to have been demonstrated in an already approved application.

a) For each investigation identified as "essential to the approval," has the investigation been relied on by the agency to demonstrate the effectiveness of a previously approved drug product? (If the investigation was relied on only to support the safety of a previously approved drug, answer "no.")

Investigation #1

Investigation #2

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

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

Investigation #1

Investigation #2

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

c) If the answers to 3(a) and 3(b) are no, identify each "new" investigation in the application or supplement that is essential to the approval (i.e., the investigations listed in #2(c), less any that are not "new"):

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

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

      Investigation #1
      
      IND #
      
      YES \[\square\]  !  NO \[\square\]
      !  Explain:

      Investigation #2
      
      IND #
      
      YES \[\square\]  !  NO \[\square\]
      !  Explain:

   (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 \[\square\]  !  NO \[\square\]
Investigation #2

YES  NO

(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:  David Araojo
Title:  Project Manager
Date:  2/22/2011

Name of Office/Division Director signing form:  Jeffrey Murray
Title:  Deputy Director, DAVP

Reference ID: 2909089
This is a representation of an electronic record that was signed electronically and this page is the manifestation of the electronic signature.

/s/

DAVID E ARAOJO
02/23/2011

JEFFREY S MURRAY
02/23/2011
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**ACTION PACKAGE CHECKLIST**

### APPLICATION INFORMATION¹

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NDA #</th>
<th>200-732</th>
<th>NDA Supplement #</th>
<th>000</th>
<th>BLA #</th>
<th>BLA STN #</th>
<th>If NDA, Efficacy Supplement Type:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BLA #</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>BLA STN #</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Proprietary Name:**
- Zidovudine

**Established/Proper Name:**
- Zidovudine

**Dosage Form:**
- 100 mg Tablets

**Applicant:**
- Matrix Laboratories Limited

**Agent for Applicant (if applicable):**
- Keith Giunta, Mylan Pharmaceuticals

**RPM:**
- David Araojo

**Division:**
- DAVP

**NDAs:**
- NDA Application Type: [ ] 505(b)(1) [x] 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 505(b)(2) Assessment or the Appendix to this Action Package Checklist.)

**505(b)(2) Original NDAs and 505(b)(2) NDA supplements:**
- Listed drug(s) relied upon for approval (include NDA #(s) and drug name(s)):
  - NDA 20-518, 19-655, and 19-910 Retrovir 300 mg Tablets, 100mg Capsules and 50mg/ml Syrup

Provide a brief explanation of how this product is different from the listed drug.

This product is different from the Retrovir 100 mg Capsules in that this is a 100 mg Tablet.

If no listed drug, explain.
- [ ] This application relies on literature.
- [ ] This application relies on a final OTC monograph.
- [ ] Other (explain)

**Two months prior to each action,** review the information in the 505(b)(2) Assessment and submit the draft to CDER OND IO for clearance. Finalize the 505(b)(2) Assessment at the time of the approval action.

**On the day of approval,** check the Orange Book again for any new patents or pediatric exclusivity.
- [x] 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.

### Actions

- [ ] Proposed action
- User Fee Goal Date is **23Feb2011**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AP</th>
<th>TA</th>
<th>CR</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>[x]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>None</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

---

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.
If accelerated approval or approval based on efficacy studies in animals, were promotional materials received?
Note: Promotional materials to be used within 120 days after approval must have been submitted (for exceptions, see [http://www.fda.gov/downloads/Drugs/GuidanceComplianceRegulatoryInformation/Guidances/ucm069965.pdf](http://www.fda.gov/downloads/Drugs/GuidanceComplianceRegulatoryInformation/Guidances/ucm069965.pdf)). If not submitted, explain

- **Review priority:**
  - [x] Standard
  - [ ] Priority

- **Chemical classification (new NDAs only):**
  - [x] 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)
  - Approval based on animal studies

- **BLAs: Subpart E**
  - Accelerated approval (21 CFR 601.41)
  - Restricted distribution (21 CFR 601.42)

- **Subpart I**
  - Approval based on animal studies

- **Submitted in response to a PMR**
- **Submitted in response to a PMC**
- **Submitted in response to a Pediatric Written Request**

- **REMS:**
  - [ ] MedGuide
  - Communication Plan
  - ETASU
  - REMS not required

**Comments:**

- **BLAs only:** Ensure RMS-BLA Product Information Sheet for TBP and RMS-BLA Facility Information Sheet for TBP have been completed and forwarded to OPI/OBI/DRM (Vicky Carter)

- **BLAs only:** Is the product subject to official FDA lot release per 21 CFR 610.2

- **Public communications (approvals only)**
  - Office of Executive Programs (OEP) liaison has been notified of action
  - Press Office notified of action (by OEP)
  - Indicate what types (if any) of information dissemination are anticipated

---

2 Answer all questions in all sections in relation 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)).

   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)?

   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)).

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

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

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CONTENTS OF ACTION PACKAGE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Copy of this Action Package Checklist³</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**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/non-consent by officers/employees
  - Included

**Action Letters**

- Copies of all action letters *(including approval letter with final labeling)*
  - Action(s) and date(s) Y

**Labeling**

- Package Insert *(write submission/communication date at upper right of first page of PI)*
  - Most recent draft labeling. If it is division-proposed labeling, it should be in track-changes format.
    - Y
  - Original applicant-proposed labeling
  - Example of class labeling, if applicable

³ Fill in blanks with dates of reviews, letters, etc.
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| Medication Guide/Patient Package Insert/Instructions for Use/Device Labeling (write submission/communication date at upper right of first page of each piece) | □ Medication Guide
□ Patient Package Insert
□ Instructions for Use
□ Device Labeling
□ None |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Most-recent draft labeling. If it is division-proposed labeling, it should be in track-changes format.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Original applicant-proposed labeling</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Example of class labeling, if applicable</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Labels (full color carton and immediate-container labels) (write submission/communication date on upper right of first page of each submission)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Most-recent draft labeling</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proprietary Name</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Acceptability/non-acceptability letter(s) (indicate date(s))</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Review(s) (indicate date(s))</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Labeling reviews (indicate dates of reviews and meetings) | RPM
DMEPA
DRISK
DDMAC
CSS
Other reviews |

### Administrative / Regulatory Documents

| Administrative Reviews (e.g., RPM Filing Review/Memo of Filing Meeting) (indicate date of each review) | Y |
| All NDA (b)(2) Actions: Date each action cleared by (b)(2) Clearance Cmte |
| NDA (b)(2) Approvals Only: 505(b)(2) Assessment (indicate date) | |
| NDAs only: Exclusivity Summary (signed by Division Director) | Included |
| Application Integrity Policy (AIP) Status and Related Documents [http://www.fda.gov/ICECI/EnforcementActions/ApplicationIntegrityPolicy/default.htm](http://www.fda.gov/ICECI/EnforcementActions/ApplicationIntegrityPolicy/default.htm) | |
| • Applicant is on the AIP | □ Yes □ No |
| • This application is on the AIP |
| o If yes, Center Director’s Exception for Review memo (indicate date) | |
| o If yes, OC clearance for approval (indicate date of clearance communication) | |
| Pediatrics (approvals only) |
| • Date reviewed by PeRC |
| o If PeRC review not necessary, explain: PREA NOT triggered. |
| • Pediatric Page/Record (approvals only, must be reviewed by PERC before finalized) | |
| 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) | □ Included |
| Outgoing communications (letters (except action letters), emails, faxes, telecons) | Y |

---

4 Filing reviews for scientific disciplines should be filed behind the respective discipline tab.
## Internal Memoranda, Telecons, etc.

### Minutes of Meetings

- Regulatory Briefing *(indicate date of mtg)*
  - No mtg
- If not the first review cycle, any end-of-review meeting *(indicate date of mtg)*
  - N/A or no mtg
- Pre-NDA/BLA meeting *(indicate date of mtg)*
  - No mtg
- EOP2 meeting *(indicate date of mtg)*
  - No mtg
- Other milestone meetings (e.g., EOP2a, CMC pilots) *(indicate dates of mtgs)*

### Advisory Committee Meeting(s)

- Date(s) of Meeting(s)
  - No AC meeting
- 48-hour alert or minutes, if available *(do not include transcript)*

### Decisional and Summary Memos

- Office Director Decisional Memo *(indicate date for each review)*
  - None
- Division Director Summary Review *(indicate date for each review)*
  - None
- Cross-Discipline Team Leader Review *(indicate date for each review)*
  - None
- PMR/PMC Development Templates *(indicate total number)*
  - None

### Clinical Information

- Clinical Reviews
  - Clinical Team Leader Review(s) *(indicate date for each review)*
  - None
  - Clinical review(s) *(indicate date for each review)*
  - None
  - Social scientist review(s) (if OTC drug) *(indicate date for each review)*
  - None
- Financial Disclosure reviews(s) or location/date if addressed in another review OR
  - If no financial disclosure information was required, check here and include a review/memo explaining why not *(indicate date of review/memo)*
  - None
- Clinical reviews from immunology and 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 applicable
- Risk Management
  - REMS Documents and Supporting Statement *(indicate date(s) of submission(s))*
    - None
  - REMS Memo(s) and letter(s) *(indicate date(s))*
    - None
  - Risk management review(s) and recommendations (including those by OSE and CSS) *(indicate date of each review and indicate location/date if incorporated into another review)*
    - None
- DSI Clinical Inspection Review Summary(ies) *(include copies of DSI letters to investigators)*
  - None requested

---

5 Filing reviews should be filed with the discipline reviews.

Version: 8/25/10
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Clinical Microbiology</strong></th>
<th>None</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Clinical Microbiology Team Leader Review(s) <em>(indicate date for each review)</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Clinical Microbiology Review(s) <em>(indicate date for each review)</em></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Biostatistics</strong></th>
<th>None</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Statistical Division Director Review(s) <em>(indicate date for each review)</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Statistical Team Leader Review(s) <em>(indicate date for each review)</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Statistical Review(s) <em>(indicate date for each review)</em></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Clinical Pharmacology</strong></th>
<th>None</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Clinical Pharmacology Division Director Review(s) <em>(indicate date for each review)</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Clinical Pharmacology Team Leader Review(s) <em>(indicate date for each review)</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Clinical Pharmacology review(s) <em>(indicate date for each review)</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>DSI Clinical Pharmacology Inspection Review Summary <em>(include copies of DSI letters)</em></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Nonclinical</strong></th>
<th>None</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pharmacology/Toxicology Discipline Reviews</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Product Quality</strong></th>
<th>None</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Product Quality Discipline Reviews</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Reference ID: 2909176
| Environmental Assessment (check one) (original and supplemental applications) | Y |
| Categorical Exclusion (indicate review date) (all original applications and all efficacy supplements that could increase the patient population) |  |
| 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) (only original NDAs and supplements that include a new facility or a change that affects the manufacturing sites\(^6\)) | Date completed: 08Dec2010
- Acceptable
- Withhold recommendation
- Not applicable |
| BLAs: TB-EER (date of most recent TB-EER must be within 30 days of action date) (original and supplemental BLAs) | Date completed:
- Acceptable
- Withhold recommendation |
| NDAs: Methods Validation (check box only, do not include documents) |  |

---

\(^6\) I.e., a new facility or a change in the facility, or a change in the manufacturing process in a way that impacts the Quality Management Systems of the facility.
Appendix 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/

DAVID E ARAOJO
02/23/2011

Reference ID: 2909176
Mylan Pharmaceuticals, Inc.
Attention: Keith Giunta, Associate Director Regulatory Affairs
U.S. Agent for Matrix Laboratories Limited
781 Chestnut Ridge Road
P.O. Box 4310
Morgantown, WV 26504-4310

Dear Mr. Giunta:

Please refer to your New Drug Application (NDA) submitted under section 505(b) of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act for Zidovudine Tablets, 100 mg.

We are reviewing Matrix’s submission and have the following comments and information requests. We request the following information in order to continue our evaluation of Matrix’s NDA.

In your response letters dated January 11, 2011, and January 21, 2011, respectively, you have submitted data on the splitting accuracy and dissolution profile comparisons of the scored tablets. We note that the data were generated on a developmental batch and that you committed to submitting the data on the first commercial batch.

When you submit these data, please indicate in the cover letter that this information is being submitted as a General Correspondence to the NDA to fulfill a commitment submitted during review of the original NDA 200-732. We recommend that you also include appropriate batch information including batch analysis data in the submission.

To facilitate prompt review of your response, please also provide an electronic courtesy copy of your response to both Jeannie David, Regulatory Project Manager in the Office of New Drug Quality Assessment (Jeannie.David@fda.hhs.gov), and David Araojo, Regulatory Project Manager the Office of New Drugs (David.Araojo@fda.hhs.gov).

If you have any questions regarding this letter, call Jeannie David, Regulatory Project Manager, at (301) 796-4247.

Reference ID: 2904103
Sincerely,

{See appended electronic signature page}

Stephen P. Miller, Ph.D.
Acting Chief, Branch V
Division of New Drug Quality Assessment II
Office of New Drug Quality Assessment
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/

STEPHEN P MILLER
02/11/2011
INFORMATION REQUEST

Mylan Pharmaceuticals, Inc.
Attention: Keith Giunta, Associate Director Regulatory Affairs
U.S. Agent for Matrix Laboratories Limited
781 Chestnut Ridge Road
P.O. Box 4310
Morgantown, WV 26504-4310

Dear Mr. Giunta:

Please refer to your New Drug Application (NDA) submitted under section 505(b) of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act for Zidovudine Tablets, 100 mg.

We are reviewing the Chemistry, Manufacturing and Controls sections of your application and have the following comments and information requests. We kindly request your immediate written response.

1. Please provide data on dosing accuracy of tablet split in half including content uniformity per USP <905> and any potential assay loss due to breakage. A statistical analysis of this data is also desirable.

2. Please provide more detailed description on the tablet dispersibility study including information on the tablet disintegration time and how the fineness of dispersion is determined.

To facilitate prompt review of your response, please also provide an electronic courtesy copy of your response to both Jeannie David, Regulatory Project Manager in the Office of New Drug Quality Assessment (Jeannie.David@fda.hhs.gov), and David Araojo, Regulatory Project Manager the Office of New Drugs (David.Araojo@fda.hhs.gov).

If you have any questions regarding this letter, call Jeannie David, Regulatory Project Manager, at (301) 796-4247.

Sincerely,

Stephen P. Miller, Ph.D.
Acting Chief, Branch V
Division of New Drug Quality Assessment II
Office of New Drug Quality Assessment
Center for Drug Evaluation and Research

Reference ID: 2870611
This is a representation of an electronic record that was signed electronically and this page is the manifestation of the electronic signature.

/s/

STEPHEN P MILLER
12/01/2010
INFORMATION REQUEST

Mylan Pharmaceuticals, Inc.
Attention: Keith Giunta, Associate Director Regulatory Affairs
U.S. Agent for Matrix Laboratories Limited
781 Chestnut Ridge Road
P.O. Box 4310
Morgantown, WV 26504-4310

Dear Mr. Giunta:

Please refer to your New Drug Application (NDA) submitted under section 505(b) of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act for Zidovudine Tablets, 100 mg.

We are reviewing the Chemistry, Manufacturing and Controls sections of your application and have the following comments and information requests. We request a prompt written response in order to continue our evaluation of your NDA.

1. Please clarify if the closures for the drug products are Child-Resistance (CR) caps. Since you are seeking a full approval instead of a tentative approval for the NDA, we recommend that CR closures be used for the drug product in compliance with The Poison Prevention Packaging Act of 1970 (16 CFR1700.14). Special packaging is defined under 15 U.S.C. 1471(2)(4), 16 CFR 1700.1(b)(4), and 21 CFR 310.3(l). Regulations issued under the PPPA (Poison Prevention Packaging Act) establish performance standards and test methods that determine if a packaging system is child-resistant and adult-use-effective (16 CFR 1700.15 and 16 CFR 1700.20, respectively).

2. Please amend this NDA by providing a commitment to use a CR closure for product marketed in the US, and identify a suitable CR closure for commercial use. If the CR closure will be used with the same induction-sealed bottle that you have studied, we believe that the stability data you have collected on the non-CR packages is suitable for both systems. If a different bottle will be used, or if an induction seal will not be part of the CR package, you will need to provide a suitable scientific justification linking the CR container/closure system to the non-CR container/closure system which you have studied (e.g., comparision of moisture permeation, etc).

3. Please also commit to include the CR package(s) in your commercial stability commitment.
4. Please note that it is our understanding that CR closures are preferable from the perspective of the groups involved in procuring PEPFAR drugs, so you may wish to discuss with some purchasers, for example, Supply Chain Management System, to see if CR closures are preferred for product that will be distributed outside the US as well.

To facilitate prompt review of your response, please also provide an electronic courtesy copy of your response to both Jeannie David, Regulatory Project Manager in the Office of New Drug Quality Assessment (Jeannie.David@fda.hhs.gov), and David Araojo, Regulatory Project Manager the Office of New Drugs (David.Araojo@fda.hhs.gov).

If you have any questions regarding this letter, call Jeannie David, Regulatory Project Manager, at (301) 796-4247.

Sincerely,

{See appended electronic signature page}

Stephen P. Miller, Ph.D.
Acting Chief, Branch V
Division of New Drug Quality Assessment II
Office of New Drug Quality Assessment
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/

STEPHEN P MILLER
08/24/2010
DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES

Food and Drug Administration
Silver Spring  MD  20993

FILING COMMUNICATION

Mylan Pharmaceuticals, Inc.
Attention:  Keith Giunta, Associate Director Regulatory Affairs
U.S. Agent for Matrix Laboratories Limited
781 Chestnut Ridge Rd.
Morgantown, WV 26504-4310

Dear Mr. Giunta:

Please refer to your new drug application (NDA) 200-732 dated April 22, 2010, received April 23, 2010, submitted pursuant to section 505(b)(2) of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act, for Zidovudine Tablets, 100 mg.

We completed our filing review and determined that your application is sufficiently complete to permit a substantive review. This application is considered filed on June 22, 2010, in accordance with 21 CFR 314.101(a). The review classification for this application is Standard. Therefore, the user fee goal date is February 23, 2011.

We are reviewing your application according to the processes described in the Guidance for Review Staff and Industry: Good Review Management Principles and Practices for PDUFA Products. Therefore, we established internal review timelines as described in the guidance, which includes the timeframes for FDA internal milestone meetings (e.g., filing, planning, mid-cycle, team and wrap-up meetings). Please be aware that the timelines described in the guidance are flexible and subject to change based on workload and other potential review issues (e.g., submission of amendments). We will inform you of any necessary information requests or status updates following the milestone meetings or at other times, as needed, during the process. If major deficiencies are not identified during the review, we plan to communicate proposed labeling comments by February 9, 2011.

We have the following comment:

Chemistry

It is our understanding that a few PEPFAR recipient nations have expressed a preference for antiretroviral drugs to be supplied in an individual carton containing a bottle and the package insert. If you wish, you may submit color images of carton label(s) for review. If they are found to be acceptable you would have an option to provide bottles alone and bottles within cartons. No additional stability data would be required because the addition of a cardboard carton is not expected to have a measurable effect on the protection provided by the bottle.
If you have any questions, please call David Araojo, Pharm.D., Sr. Program Consultant, at (301) 796-0669.

Sincerely yours,

{See appended electronic signature page}

Jeffrey Murray, M.D., M.P.H.
Deputy Director
Division of Antiviral Products
Office of Antimicrobial Products
Center for Drug Evaluation and Research
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Application Type/Number</th>
<th>Submission Type/Number</th>
<th>Submitter Name</th>
<th>Product Name</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NDA-200732</td>
<td>ORIG-1</td>
<td>MATRIX LABORATORIES LTD</td>
<td>Zidovudine 100mg tablets</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

/s/

JEFFREY S MURRAY
06/28/2010
NDA 200-732

Mylan Pharmaceuticals, Inc.
Attention: Keith Giunta, Associate Director Regulatory Affairs
U.S. Agent for Matrix Laboratories Limited
781 Chestnut Ridge Road
P.O. Box 4310
Morgantown, WV 26504-4310

Dear Mr. Giunta:

We have received your New Drug Application (NDA) submitted pursuant to section 505(b)(2) of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act (FDCA) for the following:

Name of Drug Product: Zidovudine Tablets, 100 mg

Date of Application: April 22, 2010

Date of Receipt: April 23, 2010

Our Reference Number: NDA 200-732

Unless we notify you within 60 days of the receipt date that the application is not sufficiently complete to permit a substantive review, we will file the application on June 22, 2010 in accordance with 21 CFR 314.101(a).

If you have not already done so, promptly 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/ForIndustry/DataStandards/StructuredProductLabeling/default.htm. Failure to submit the content of labeling in SPL format may result in a refusal-to-file action under 21 CFR 314.101(d)(3). The content of labeling must conform to the content and format requirements of revised 21 CFR 201.56-57.

The NDA number provided above should be cited at the top of the first page of all submissions to this application. Send all submissions, electronic or paper, including those sent by overnight mail or courier, to the following address:

Food and Drug Administration
Center for Drug Evaluation and Research
Division of Antiviral Products
5901-B Ammendale Road
Beltsville, MD 20705-1266

All regulatory documents submitted in paper should be three-hole punched on the left side of the page and bound. The left margin should be at least three-fourths of an inch to assure text is not obscured in the fastened area. Standard paper size (8-1/2 by 11 inches) should be used; however, it may occasionally be necessary to use individual pages larger than standard paper size. Non-standard, large pages should be folded and mounted to allow the page to be opened for review without disassembling the jacket and refolded without damage when the volume is shelved. Shipping unbound documents may result in the loss of portions of the submission or an unnecessary delay in processing which could have an adverse impact on the review of the submission. For additional information, please see http://www.fda.gov/Drugs/DevelopmentApprovalProcess/FormsSubmissionRequirements/DrugMasterFilesDMFs/ucm073080.htm

If you have any questions, call me at (301) 796-0669.

Sincerely,

{See appended electronic signature page}

David Araojo, Pharm.D.
Senior Program Consultant
Division of Antiviral Products
Office of Antimicrobial Products
Center for Drug Evaluation and Research
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Application Type/Number</th>
<th>Submission Type/Number</th>
<th>Submitter Name</th>
<th>Product Name</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NDA-200732</td>
<td>ORIG-1</td>
<td>MATRIX LABORATORIES LTD</td>
<td>Zidovudine 100mg tablets</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

/s/

DAVID E ARAOJO
05/11/2010
Dear Mr. Giunta:

Please refer to Matrix’s preassigned New Drug Application (NDA) number 200-732, to be submitted under section 505(b) of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act for Zidovudine Tablets, 100 mg.

We also refer to your April 5, 2010 request for Fast Track designation. We have reviewed your request and conclude that it meets the criteria for the Fast Track designation. Therefore, we are designating Zidovudine Tablets, 100 mg for treatment of HIV-1 infection as a fast track product.

We are granting fast track designation for the following reason:

This application is being submitted in response to the October 2006 final Guidance for Industry, “Fixed Dose Combination, Co-Packaged Drug Products and Single-Entity Versions of Previously Approved Antiretrovirals for the Treatment of HIV.” This guidance was developed to encourage the development and approval of fixed dose combination and co-packaged versions of previously approved antiretroviral therapies, so that these products are available for the treatment and prevention of the global spread of HIV/AIDS. Swift evaluation of the safety, efficacy, and quality of these products is vital if the President’s Emergency Plan for AIDS Relief is to effectively address this urgent public health need.

If you have any questions, please contact David Araojo, Pharm.D., Senior Program Consultant, at (301) 796-0669 or via email at david.araojo@fda.hhs.gov.
Sincerely yours,

{See appended electronic signature page}

Jeffrey Murray, M.D., M.P.H.
Deputy Director
Division of Antiviral Products
Office of Antimicrobial Products
Center for Drug Evaluation and Research

Email CC: Nitin Bhattad, Regulatory POC of Matrix Labs. Limited in India
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Application Type/Number</th>
<th>Submission Type/Number</th>
<th>Submitter Name</th>
<th>Product Name</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NDA-200732</td>
<td>ORIG-1</td>
<td>MATRIX LABORATORIES LIMITED</td>
<td>Zidovudine 100mg tablets</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NDA-200732</td>
<td>GI-1</td>
<td>MATRIX LABORATORIES LIMITED</td>
<td>Zidovudine 100mg tablets</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

/s/

JEFFREY S MURRAY
04/12/2010