

**CENTER FOR DRUG EVALUATION AND
RESEARCH**

APPLICATION NUMBER:

205637Orig1s000

PROPRIETARY NAME REVIEW(S)

**Department of Health and Human Services
Public Health Service
Food and Drug Administration
Center for Drug Evaluation and Research
Office of Surveillance and Epidemiology
Office of Medication Error Prevention and Risk Management**

Proprietary Name Review

Date: January 14, 2014

Reviewer: James Schlick, RPh, MBA
Division of Medication Error Prevention and Analysis

Team Leader: Irene Z. Chan, PharmD, BCPS
Division of Medication Error Prevention and Analysis

Drug Name and Strengths: Bunavail
(Buprenorphine and Naloxone buccal film)
 ^{(b) (4)} 2.1 mg/0.348 mg, 4.2 mg/0.696 mg,
6.3 mg/1.044 mg

Application Type/Number: NDA 205637

Applicant/Sponsor: Biodelivery Sciences International, Inc.

OSE RCM #: 2013-2442

*** This document contains proprietary and confidential information that should not be released to the public.***

CONTENTS

1	INTRODUCTION.....	1
1.1	Product Information.....	1
2	RESULTS.....	1
2.1	Promotional Assessment	1
2.2	Safety Assessment.....	1
3	CONCLUSIONS.....	3
3.1	Comments to the Applicant.....	4
4	REFERENCES	5
	APPENDICES.....	7

1 INTRODUCTION

This review evaluates the proposed proprietary name, Bunavail, from a safety and promotional perspective. The sources and methods used to evaluate the proposed name are outlined in the reference section and Appendix A respectively. We previously reviewed the proposed name, Bunavail, in OSE Review# 2012-1938, dated January 30, 2013, and the name was found conditionally acceptable. The strengths in the current proprietary name submission differ from the previous proprietary name review. A comparison of the strength changes can be found in Section 1.1.

1.1 PRODUCT INFORMATION

The following product information is provided in the October 25, 2013 proprietary name submission.

- Active Ingredient: Buprenorphine and Naloxone
- Indication of Use: Treatment of opioid dependence
- Route of Administration: Buccal
- Dosage Form: Buccal Film

Strengths Presented in OSE Review# 2012-1938 Dated January 30, 2013	Strengths Presented in October 25, 2013 Submission
(b) (4)	(b) (4)
	2.1 mg/0.348 mg
	4.2 mg/0.696 mg
	6.3 mg/1.044 mg

- Dose and Frequency: One to two films buccally once daily
- How Supplied/Container Closure System: Each Bunavail film is provided in an individual, (b) (4) sealed, foil package. The different strengths will be distinguished by color coding on the individual foil packages. The foil packages containing individual films, all of the same dosage strength, will be packaged into multi-film cartons (30 films per carton). (b) (4) The cartons will use the same identifying color coding as will be used for the various dosage strengths on the individual foil packages.
- Storage: Store at 15-30°C (59-86°F), protected from freezing and moisture, until ready to use.

2 RESULTS

The following sections provide information obtained and considered in the overall evaluation of the proposed proprietary name.

2.1 PROMOTIONAL ASSESSMENT

The Office of Prescription Drug Promotion (OPDP) determined the proposed name is acceptable from a promotional perspective. DMEPA and the Division of Anesthesia, Analgesia, and Addiction Products (DAAAP) concurred with the findings of OPDP's promotional assessment of the proposed name.

2.2 SAFETY ASSESSMENT

The following aspects were considered in the safety evaluation of the name.

2.2.1 United States Adopted Names (USAN) SEARCH

There is no USAN stem present in the proposed proprietary name.¹

2.2.2 Components of the Proposed Proprietary Name

The Applicant indicated in their submission that the proposed name, Bunavail, has no intended meaning. This proprietary name is comprised of a single word that does not contain a modifier, route of administration, or dosage form that is misleading or can contribute to medication error.

2.2.3 FDA Name Simulation Studies

Sixty-one practitioners participated in DMEPA's prescription studies. The response, 'Bonival', in the voice prescription study is similar to the currently marketed product, Boniva, and is evaluated in Appendix E. Also in the voice prescription study, the most common misinterpretations included 'Bona' 'Boni', and 'Bono' instead of the letter string 'Buna'.

In the written prescription study, the letter string 'un' was misinterpreted as the letter string 'ier', the letter string 'Bun' was misinterpreted as 'Bren' and 'Brin', and the letters 'v' and 'a' for 'r' and 'o' respectively. We have considered these variations in our look-alike and sound-alike searches and analysis (see Appendix B). Appendix C contains the results from the verbal and written prescription studies.

2.2.4 Comments from Other Review Disciplines at Initial Review

In response to the OSE, October 31, 2013 e-mail, the Division of Anesthesia, Analgesia, and Addiction Products (DAAAP) did not forward any comments or concerns relating to the proposed proprietary name at the initial phase of the review.

2.2.5 Failure Mode and Effects Analysis of Similar Names

The potential letter and letter string variations listed in Appendix B were used to search for names with possible orthographic and phonetic similarity to the proposed proprietary name, Bunavail. Table 1 lists the names with orthographic or spelling similarity to the proposed proprietary name, Bunavail, identified by the primary reviewer (PR) and the Expert Panel Discussion (EPD), which were not previously identified and evaluated in OSE Review # 2012-1938.

Because the strengths have changed, we evaluated the previously identified names of potential concern (see OSE Review # 2012-1938) and considered any lessons learned from recent post-marketing experience, which may have altered our previous conclusion regarding the acceptability of the proposed proprietary name. Our review determined the change in strengths does not alter our previous conclusion.

Our analysis of the 26 names contained in Table 1 determined none pose a risk for confusion with Bunavail as described in Appendices D through E.

¹ USAN stem list searched December 11, 2013.

Table 1: Collective List of Potentially Similar Names (DMEPA, EPD, Other Disciplines)					
Look Similar					
Name	Source	Name	Source	Name	Source
Bannal	FDA	Bonamil	FDA	Promacet	FDA
Binosto	FDA	Renvela	FDA	Banacid	FDA
Buminate	FDA	Acuvail	FDA	Bonacal Plus	FDA
Prinivil	FDA	Betimol	FDA	Runatal	FDA
Danazol	FDA	Bunazosin	FDA	Dura-vent	FDA
Oruvail	FDA	Promiseb	FDA		
Sound Similar					
Name	Source	Name	Source	Name	Source
Benadryl	FDA	Minivelle	FDA		
Look and Sound Similar					
Name	Source	Name	Source	Name	Source
Bunavail***	FDA	Burn-o-jel	FDA	Banaril	FDA
Banzel	FDA	Beta-val	FDA	Boniva	FDA
Menaval	FDA				

2.2.6 Communication of DMEPA’s Analysis at Midpoint of Review

DMEPA communicated our findings to the Division of Anesthesia, Analgesia, and Addiction Products (DAAAP) via e-mail on January 16, 2014. At that time we also requested additional information or concerns that could inform our review. Per e-mail correspondence from the Division of Anesthesia, Analgesia, and Addiction Products (DAAAP) on January 13, 2014, they stated no additional concerns with the proposed proprietary name, Bunavail.

3 CONCLUSIONS

The proposed proprietary name is acceptable from both a promotional and safety perspective.

If you have further questions or need clarifications, please contact Lisa Skarupa, OSE project manager, at 301-796-2219.

*** This document contains proprietary and confidential information that should not be released to the public.***

3.1 COMMENTS TO THE APPLICANT

We have completed our review of the proposed proprietary name, Bunavail, and have concluded that this name is acceptable.

If any of the proposed product characteristics as stated in your October 25, 2013 submission are altered, the name must be resubmitted for review.

4 REFERENCES

1. Micromedex Integrated Index (<http://csi.micromedex.com>)

Micromedex contains a variety of databases covering pharmacology, therapeutics, toxicology and diagnostics.

2. *Phonetic and Orthographic Computer Analysis (POCA)*

POCA is a database which was created for the Division of Medication Error Prevention and Analysis, FDA. As part of the name similarity assessment, proposed names are evaluated via a phonetic/orthographic algorithm. The proposed proprietary name is converted into its phonemic representation before it runs through the phonetic algorithm. Likewise, an orthographic algorithm exists which operates in a similar fashion.

3. Drug Facts and Comparisons, online version, St. Louis, MO (<http://factsandcomparisons.com>)

Drug Facts and Comparisons is a compendium organized by therapeutic course; it contains monographs on prescription and OTC drugs, with charts comparing similar products. This database also lists the orphan drugs.

4. *FDA Document Archiving, Reporting & Regulatory Tracking System [DARRTS]*

DARRTS is a government database used to organize Applicant and Sponsor submissions as well as to store and organize assignments, reviews, and communications from the review divisions.

5. *Division of Medication Errors Prevention and Analysis proprietary name consultation requests*

This is a list of proposed and pending names that is generated by the Division of Medication Error Prevention and Analysis from the Access database/tracking system.

6. Drugs@FDA (<http://www.accessdata.fda.gov/scripts/cder/drugsatfda/index.cfm>)

Drugs@FDA contains most of the drug products approved since 1939. The majority of labels, approval letters, reviews, and other information are available for drug products approved from 1998 to the present. Drugs@FDA contains official information about FDA approved brand name, generic drugs, therapeutic biological products, prescription and over-the-counter human drugs and discontinued drugs and "Chemical Type 6" approvals.

7. *U.S. Patent and Trademark Office* (<http://www.uspto.gov>)

USPTO provides information regarding patent and trademarks.

8. *Clinical Pharmacology Online* (www.clinicalpharmacology-ip.com)

Clinical Pharmacology contains full monographs for the most common drugs in clinical use, plus mini monographs covering investigational, less common, combination, nutraceutical and nutritional products. It also provides a keyword search engine.

9. *Natural Medicines Comprehensive Databases* (www.naturaldatabase.com)

Natural Medicines contains up-to-date clinical data on the natural medicines, herbal medicines, and dietary supplements used in the western world.

10. *Access Medicine* (www.accessmedicine.com)

Access Medicine® from McGraw-Hill contains full-text information from approximately 60 titles; it

includes tables and references. Among the titles are: Harrison's Principles of Internal Medicine, Basic & Clinical Pharmacology, and Goodman and Gilman's The Pharmacologic Basis of Therapeutics.

11. USAN Stems (<http://www.ama-assn.org/ama/pub/about-ama/our-people/coalitions-consortiums/united-states-adopted-names-council/naming-guidelines/approved-stems.shtml>)

USAN Stems List contains all the recognized USAN stems.

12. Red Book (www.thomsonhc.com/home/dispatch)

Red Book contains prices and product information for prescription, over-the-counter drugs, medical devices, and accessories.

13. Lexi-Comp (www.lexi.com)

Lexi-Comp is a web-based searchable version of the Drug Information Handbook.

14. Medical Abbreviations (www.medilexicon.com)

Medical Abbreviations dictionary contains commonly used medical abbreviations and their definitions.

15. CVS/Pharmacy (www.CVS.com)

This database contains commonly used over the counter products not usually identified in other databases.

16. Walgreens (www.walgreens.com)

This database contains commonly used over the counter products not usually identified in other databases.

17. Rx List (www.rxlist.com)

RxList is an online medical resource dedicated to offering detailed and current pharmaceutical information on brand and generic drugs.

18. Dogpile (www.dogpile.com)

Dogpile is a [Metasearch](#) engine that searches multiple search engines including Google, Yahoo! and Bing, and returns the most relevant results to the search.

19. Natural Standard (<http://www.naturalstandard.com>)

Natural Standard is a resource that aggregates and synthesizes data on complementary and alternative medicine.

APPENDICES

Appendix A

FDA's Proprietary Name Risk Assessment considers the promotional and safety aspects of a proposed proprietary name. The promotional review of the proposed name is conducted by OPDP. OPDP evaluates proposed proprietary names to determine if they are overly fanciful, so as to misleadingly imply unique effectiveness or composition, as well as to assess whether they contribute to overstatement of product efficacy, minimization of risk, broadening of product indications, or making of unsubstantiated superiority claims. OPDP provides their opinion to DMEPA for consideration in the overall acceptability of the proposed proprietary name.

The safety assessment is conducted by DMEPA. DMEPA staff search a standard set of databases and information sources to identify names that are similar in pronunciation, spelling, and orthographically similar when scripted to the proposed proprietary name. Additionally, we consider inclusion of USAN stems or other characteristics that when incorporated into a proprietary name may cause or contribute to medication errors (i.e., dosing interval, dosage form/route of administration, medical or product name abbreviations, names that include or suggest the composition of the drug product, etc.). DMEPA defines a medication error as any preventable event that may cause or lead to inappropriate medication use or patient harm while the medication is in the control of the health care professional, patient, or consumer.²

Following the preliminary screening of the proposed proprietary name, DMEPA gathers to discuss their professional opinions on the safety of the proposed proprietary name. This meeting is commonly referred to the Center for Drug Evaluation and Research (CDER) Expert Panel discussion. DMEPA also considers other aspects of the name that may be misleading from a safety perspective. DMEPA staff conducts a prescription simulation studies using FDA health care professionals. When provided, DMEPA considers external proprietary name studies conducted by or for the Applicant/Sponsor and incorporates the findings of these studies into the overall risk assessment.

The DMEPA primary reviewer assigned to evaluate the proposed proprietary name is responsible for considering the collective findings, and provides an overall risk assessment of the proposed proprietary name. DMEPA bases the overall risk assessment on the findings of a Failure Mode and Effects Analysis (FMEA) of the proprietary name and misleading nature of the proposed proprietary name with a focus on the avoidance of medication errors.

DMEPA uses the clinical expertise of its staff to anticipate the conditions of the clinical setting where the product is likely to be used based on the characteristics of the proposed product. DMEPA considers the product characteristics associated with the proposed product throughout the risk assessment because the product characteristics of the proposed may provide a context for communication of the drug name and ultimately determine the use of the product in the *usual* clinical practice setting.

Typical product characteristics considered when identifying drug names that could potentially be confused with the proposed proprietary name include, but are not limited to; established name of the proposed product, proposed indication of use, dosage form, route of administration, strength, unit of measure, dosage units, recommended dose, typical quantity or volume, frequency of administration, product packaging, storage conditions, patient population, and prescriber population. DMEPA considers how these product characteristics may or may not be present in communicating a product name throughout the medication use system. Because drug name confusion can occur at any point in the medication use process, DMEPA considers the potential for

² National Coordinating Council for Medication Error Reporting and Prevention. <http://www.nccmerp.org/aboutMedErrors.html>. Last accessed 10/11/2007.

confusion throughout the entire U.S. medication use process, including drug procurement, prescribing and ordering, dispensing, administration, and monitoring the impact of the medication.³

The DMEPA considers the spelling of the name, pronunciation of the name when spoken, and appearance of the name when scripted. DMEPA compares the proposed proprietary name with the proprietary and established name of existing and proposed drug products and names currently under review at the FDA. DMEPA compares the pronunciation of the proposed proprietary name with the pronunciation of other drug names because verbal communication of medication names is common in clinical settings. DMEPA examines the phonetic similarity using patterns of speech. If provided, DMEPA will consider the Sponsor’s intended pronunciation of the proprietary name. However, DMEPA also considers a variety of pronunciations that could occur in the English language because the Sponsor has little control over how the name will be spoken in clinical practice. The orthographic appearance of the proposed name is evaluated using a number of different handwriting samples. DMEPA applies expertise gained from root-cause analysis of postmarketing medication errors to identify sources of ambiguity within the name that could be introduced when scripting (e.g., “T” may look like “F,” lower case ‘a’ looks like a lower case ‘u,’ etc). Additionally, other orthographic attributes that determine the overall appearance of the drug name when scripted (see Table 1 below for details).

Table 1. Criteria Used to Identify Drug Names that Look- or Sound-Similar to a Proposed Proprietary Name.

Type of Similarity	Considerations when Searching the Databases		
	<i>Potential Causes of Drug Name Similarity</i>	<i>Attributes Examined to Identify Similar Drug Names</i>	<i>Potential Effects</i>
Look-alike	Similar spelling	Identical prefix Identical infix Identical suffix Length of the name Overlapping product characteristics	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Names may appear similar in print or electronic media and lead to drug name confusion in printed or electronic communication Names may look similar when scripted and lead to drug name confusion in written communication
	Orthographic similarity	Similar spelling Length of the name/Similar shape Upstrokes Down strokes Cross-strokes Dotted letters Ambiguity introduced by scripting letters Overlapping product characteristics	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Names may look similar when scripted, and lead to drug name confusion in written communication
Sound-	Phonetic	Identical prefix	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Names may sound similar

³ Institute of Medicine. Preventing Medication Errors. The National Academies Press: Washington DC. 2006.

alike	similarity	Identical infix Identical suffix Number of syllables Stresses Placement of vowel sounds Placement of consonant sounds Overlapping product characteristics	when pronounced and lead to drug name confusion in verbal communication
-------	------------	---	---

Lastly, DMEPA considers the potential for the proposed proprietary name to inadvertently function as a source of error for reasons other than name confusion. Post-marketing experience has demonstrated that proprietary names (or components of the proprietary name) can be a source of error in a variety of ways. Consequently, DMEPA considers and evaluates these broader safety implications of the name throughout this assessment and the medication error staff provides additional comments related to the safety of the proposed proprietary name or product based on professional experience with medication errors.

1. Database and Information Sources

DMEPA searches the internet, several standard published drug product reference texts, and FDA databases to identify existing and proposed drug names that may sound-alike or look-alike to the proposed proprietary name. A standard description of the databases used in the searches is provided in the reference section of this review. To complement the process, the DMEPA uses a computerized method of identifying phonetic and orthographic similarity between medication names. The program, Phonetic and Orthographic Computer Analysis (POCA), uses complex algorithms to select a list of names from a database that have some similarity (phonetic, orthographic, or both) to the trademark being evaluated. Lastly, DMEPA reviews the USAN stem list to determine if any USAN stems are present within the proprietary name. The individual findings of multiple safety evaluators are pooled and presented to the CDER Expert Panel. DMEPA also evaluates if there are characteristics included in the composition that may render the name unacceptable from a safety perspective (abbreviation, dosing interval, etc.).

2. Expert Panel Discussion

DMEPA gathers CDER professional opinions on the safety of the proposed product and discussed the proposed proprietary name (Expert Panel Discussion). The Expert Panel is composed of Division of Medication Errors Prevention (DMEPA) staff and representatives from the Office of Prescription Drug Promotion (OPDP). We also consider input from other review disciplines (OND, ONDQA/OBP). The Expert Panel also discusses potential concerns regarding drug marketing and promotion related to the proposed names.

The primary Safety Evaluator presents the pooled results of the database and information searches to the Expert Panel for consideration. Based on the clinical and professional experiences of the Expert Panel members, the Panel may recommend additional names, additional searches by the primary Safety Evaluator to supplement the pooled results, or general advice to consider when reviewing the proposed proprietary name.

3. FDA Prescription Simulation Studies

Three separate studies are conducted within the Centers of the FDA for the proposed proprietary name to determine the degree of confusion of the proposed proprietary name with marketed U.S. drug names (proprietary and established) due to similarity in visual appearance with handwritten prescriptions or verbal pronunciation of the drug name. The studies employ healthcare professionals (pharmacists, physicians, and nurses), and attempts to simulate the prescription ordering process. The primary Safety Evaluator uses the results to identify orthographic or phonetic vulnerability of the proposed name to be misinterpreted by healthcare practitioners.

In order to evaluate the potential for misinterpretation of the proposed proprietary name in handwriting and verbal communication of the name, inpatient medication orders and/or outpatient prescriptions are written, each consisting of a combination of marketed and unapproved drug products, including the proposed name. These orders are optically scanned and one prescription is delivered to a random sample of participating health professionals via e-mail. In addition, a verbal prescription is recorded on voice mail. The voice mail messages are then sent to a random sample of the participating health professionals for their interpretations and review. After receiving either the written or verbal prescription orders, the participants record their interpretations of the orders which are recorded electronically.

4. Comments from Other Review Disciplines

DMEPA requests the Office of New Drugs (OND) and/or Office of Generic Drugs (OGD), ONDQA or OBP for their comments or concerns with the proposed proprietary name, ask for any clinical issues that may impact the DMEPA review during the initial phase of the name review. Additionally, when applicable, at the same time DMEPA requests concurrence/non-concurrence with OPDP's decision on the name. The primary Safety Evaluator addresses any comments or concerns in the safety evaluator's assessment.

The OND/OGD Regulatory Division is contacted a second time following our analysis of the proposed proprietary name. At this point, DMEPA conveys their decision to accept or reject the name. The OND or OGD Regulatory Division is requested to provide any further information that might inform DMEPA's final decision on the proposed name.

Additionally, other review disciplines opinions such as ONDQA or OBP may be considered depending on the proposed proprietary name.

5. Safety Evaluator Risk Assessment of the Proposed Proprietary Name

The primary Safety Evaluator applies his/her individual expertise gained from evaluating medication errors reported to FDA, considers all aspects of the name that may be misleading or confusing, conducts a Failure Mode and Effects Analysis, and provides an overall decision on acceptability dependent on their risk assessment of name confusion. Failure Mode and Effects Analysis (FMEA) is a systematic tool for evaluating a process and identifying where and how it might fail.⁴ When applying FMEA to assess the risk of a proposed proprietary name, DMEPA seeks to evaluate the potential for a proposed proprietary name to be confused with another drug name because of name confusion and, thereby, cause errors to occur in the medication use system. FMEA capitalizes on the predictable and preventable nature of medication errors associated with drug name confusion. FMEA allows the Agency to identify the potential for medication errors due to orthographically or phonetically similar drug names prior to approval, where actions to overcome these issues are easier and more effective than remedies available in the post-approval phase.

In order to perform an FMEA of the proposed name, the primary Safety Evaluator must analyze the use of the product at all points in the medication use system. Because the proposed product is has not been marketed, the primary Safety Evaluator anticipates the use of the product in the usual practice settings by considering the clinical and product characteristics listed in Section 1.2 of this review. The Safety Evaluator then analyzes the proposed proprietary name in the context of the usual practice setting and works to identify potential failure modes and the effects associated with the failure modes.

In the initial stage of the Risk Assessment, the Safety Evaluator compares the proposed proprietary name to all of the names gathered from the above searches, Expert Panel Discussion, and prescription studies, external studies, and identifies potential failure modes by asking:

⁴ Institute for Healthcare Improvement (IHI). Failure Mode and Effects Analysis. Boston. IHI:2004.

“Is the proposed proprietary name convincingly similar to another drug name, which may cause practitioners to become confused at any point in the usual practice setting? And are there any components of the name that may function as a source of error beyond sound/look-alike?”

An affirmative answer indicates a failure mode and represents a potential for the proposed proprietary name to be confused with another proprietary or established drug name because of look- or sound-alike similarity or because of some other component of the name. If the answer to the question is no, the Safety Evaluator is not convinced that the names possess similarity that would cause confusion at any point in the medication use system, thus the name is eliminated from further review.

In the second stage of the Risk Assessment, the primary Safety Evaluator evaluates all potential failure modes to determine the likely *effect* of the drug name confusion, by asking:

“Could the confusion of the drug names conceivably result in medication errors in the usual practice setting?”

The answer to this question is a central component of the Safety Evaluator’s overall risk assessment of the proprietary name. If the Safety Evaluator determines through FMEA that the name similarity would not ultimately be a source of medication errors in the usual practice setting, the primary Safety Evaluator eliminates the name from further analysis. However, if the Safety Evaluator determines through FMEA that the name similarity could ultimately cause medication errors in the usual practice setting, the Safety Evaluator will then recommend the use of an alternate proprietary name.

Moreover, DMEPA will object to the use of proposed proprietary name when the primary Safety Evaluator identifies one or more of the following conditions in the Overall Risk Assessment:

- a. OPDP finds the proposed proprietary name misleading from a promotional perspective, and the Review Division concurs with OPDP’s findings. The Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act provides that labeling or advertising can misbrand a product if misleading representations are made or suggested by statement, word, design, device, or any combination thereof, whether through a PROPRIETARY name or otherwise [21 U.S.C 321(n); See also 21 U.S.C. 352(a) & (n)].
- b. DMEPA identifies that the proposed proprietary name is misleading because of similarity in spelling or pronunciation to another proprietary or established name of a different drug or ingredient [CFR 201.10.(C)(5)].
- c. FMEA identifies the potential for confusion between the proposed proprietary name and other proprietary or established drug name(s), and demonstrates that medication errors are likely to result from the drug name confusion under the conditions of usual clinical practice.
- d. The proposed proprietary name contains an USAN (United States Adopted Names) stem.
- e. DMEPA identifies a potential source of medication error within the proposed proprietary name. For example, the proprietary name may be misleading or, inadvertently, introduce ambiguity and confusion that leads to errors. Such errors may not necessarily involve confusion between the proposed drug and another drug product but involve a naming characteristic that when incorporated into a proprietary name, may be confusing, misleading, cause or contribute to medication errors.

If DMEPA objects to a proposed proprietary name on the basis that drug name confusion could lead to medication errors, the primary Safety Evaluator uses the FMEA process to identify strategies to reduce the risk of medication errors. DMEPA generally recommends that the Sponsor select an alternative proprietary name and submit the alternate name to the Agency for review. However, in rare instances FMEA may identify plausible strategies that could reduce the risk of medication error of the currently proposed name. In that instance, DMEPA may be able to provide the Sponsor with recommendations that reduce or eliminate the potential for error and, thereby, would render the proposed name acceptable.

In the event that DMEPA objects to the use of the proposed proprietary name, based upon the potential for confusion with another proposed (but not yet approved) proprietary name, DMEPA will provide a contingency objection based on the date of approval. Whichever product, the Agency approves first has the right to use the proprietary name, while DMEPA will recommend that the second product to reach approval seek an alternative name.

The threshold set for objection to the proposed proprietary name may seem low to the Applicant/Sponsor. However, the safety concerns set forth in criteria a through e above are supported either by FDA regulation or by external healthcare authorities, including the Institute of Medicine (IOM), World Health Organization (WHO), the Joint Commission, and the Institute for Safe Medication Practices (ISMP). These organizations have examined medication errors resulting from look- or sound-alike drug names, confusing, or misleading names and called for regulatory authorities to address the issue prior to approval. Additionally, DMEPA contends that the threshold set for the Proprietary Name Risk Assessment is reasonable because proprietary drug name confusion is a predictable and preventable source of medication error that, in many instances, the Agency and/or Sponsor can identify and rectify prior to approval to avoid patient harm.

Furthermore, post-marketing experience has demonstrated that medication errors resulting from drug name confusion are notoriously difficult to rectify post-approval. Educational and other post-approval efforts are low-leverage strategies that have had limited effectiveness at alleviating medication errors involving drug name confusion. Sponsors have undertaken higher-leverage strategies, such as drug name changes, in the past but at great financial cost to the Sponsor and at the expense of the public welfare, not to mention the Agency's credibility as the authority responsible for approving the error-prone proprietary name. Moreover, even after Sponsors' have changed a product's proprietary name in the post-approval phase, it is difficult to eradicate the original proprietary name from practitioners' vocabulary, and as a result, the Agency has continued to receive reports of drug name confusion long after a name change in some instances. Therefore, DMEPA believes that post-approval efforts at reducing name confusion errors should be reserved for those cases in which the potential for name confusion could not be predicted prior to approval.

Appendix B: Letters and Letter Strings with Possible Orthographic or Phonetic Misinterpretation

Letters in Name Bunavail	Scripted May Appear as	Spoken May Be Interpreted as
Capital 'B'	R, Z, P, D,F	P, D, V
Lower case 'b'	l, h, k, t, lo,f	p, v, d
Lower case 'u''	n, y, v, w, Any Vowel	o
Lower case 'n'	m, u, x, r, h, s	dn, gn, kn, mn, pn
Lower case 'a'	el, ci, cl, d, o, u	any vowel
Lower Case 'v'	r, u, w	f
Lower case 'a'	el, ci, cl, d, o, u	any vowel
Lower case 'i'	e, l	y
Lower case 'l'	b,e, s, A, P, i	p, v, d
Letter strings in Name Bunavail	Scripted May Appear as	Spoken May Be Interpreted as
u	ri, re	
un	ier	

Appendix C: Prescription Simulation Samples and Results

Figure 1. Bunavail Study (Conducted on November 22, 2013)

Handwritten Requisition Medication Order	Verbal Prescription
<p data-bbox="191 470 407 499"><u>Medication Order:</u></p> <p data-bbox="201 520 922 590"><i>Bunavail 6.3/1.04 mg Give 1 film once daily</i></p>	<p data-bbox="956 470 1224 499">Bunavail 4.2/0.696 mg</p> <p data-bbox="956 520 1328 550">Place 2 films inside cheek daily</p> <p data-bbox="956 571 1062 600">Disp #30</p>
<p data-bbox="191 625 472 655"><u>Outpatient Prescription:</u></p> <p data-bbox="240 701 824 779"><i>Bunavail 4.2/0.696 mg</i></p> <p data-bbox="250 800 915 926"><i>Place 2 films inside cheek QD</i> <i>#30</i></p>	

FDA Prescription Simulation Responses (Aggregate 1 Rx Studies Report)

192 People Received Study
61 People Responded

Study Name: Bunavail

<u>Total</u>	<u>22</u>	<u>22</u>	<u>17</u>	<u>.</u>
<u>INTERPRETATION</u>	<u>OUTPATIENT</u>	<u>VOICE</u>	<u>INPATIENT</u>	<u>TOTAL</u>
BCENOVAAIL	0	0	1	1
BERAVAIL	0	0	1	1
BIERAVAIL	0	0	1	1
BIEROVAAIL	0	0	2	2
BONAVAIL	0	9	0	9
BONAVALE	0	4	0	4
BONAVALE 4.2/0.696MG	0	1	0	1
BONAVEO	0	1	0	1
BONEVAYO	0	1	0	1
BONIVAIL	0	2	0	2
BONIVAL	0	1	0	1
BONIVALE	0	2	0	2
BONOVALE	0	1	0	1
BRENARAIE	1	0	0	1
BRENARAIL	2	0	0	2
BRENAVAIE	1	0	0	1
BRENAVAIL	4	0	2	6
BRENORAIL	1	0	0	1
BRENOVAAIL	0	0	3	3
BRENOVAAIL 4.2/0.696 MG	1	0	0	1
BRENURAIL	1	0	0	1
BRENVAIL	0	0	1	1
BRENVRAIE	1	0	0	1
BREVOVAAIL	0	0	1	1
BRINARAIE	1	0	0	1
BRINARAIL	2	0	0	2
BRINAVAIE	1	0	0	1
BRINURAIL	1	0	0	1
BRINVAIE	1	0	0	1
BUNARAIE	1	0	0	1
BUNARAIE 4.2/0.696 MG	1	0	0	1
BUNAVAIE	1	0	0	1
BUNAVAIL	1	0	2	3
BUNOVAAIL	0	0	2	2
BUROVAAIL	0	0	1	1

Appendix D: Proprietary names not likely to be confused or not used in usual practice settings for the reasons described.

No.	Proprietary Name	Active Ingredient	Similarity to Bunavail	Failure preventions
1.	Binosto	Alendronate	Look alike	The name pair has sufficient orthographic differences
2.	Betimol	Timolol	Look alike	The name pair has sufficient orthographic differences
3.		Bunazosin	Look alike	Name found in Micromedex database. Unable to find product characteristics in any other database
4.	Runatal	Multivitamin with iron	Look alike	The name pair has sufficient orthographic differences
5.	Bunavail ^{***}	Buprenorphine/Naloxone	Look and sound alike	The name that is the subject of this review
6.		Bannal	Look alike	Name found in Facts and Comparisons database. Unable to find product characteristics in any other database
7.	Banacid	Aluminum Hydroxide Magnesium Hydroxide Magnesium Trisilicate	Look alike	Name found in Micromedex database. Unable to find product characteristics in any other database
8.	Bonamil	Infant formula	Look alike	Name found in Red Book database. Unable to find product characteristics in any other database. This product was discontinued from the market in 2000.
9.	Dura-vent	Guaifenesin/ Phenylpropanolamine	Look alike	Name found in Red Book database. Unable to find product characteristics in any other database. This product was discontinued from the market in 2001.

^{***} This document contains proprietary and confidential information that should not be released to the public.^{***}

Appendix E: Risk of medication errors due to product confusion minimized by dissimilarity of the names and/ or use in clinical practice for the reasons described.

No.	<p>Proposed name: Bunavail</p> <p>Dosage Form: Buccal Film</p> <p>Strengths: (b) (4) 2.1/0.348 mg, 4.2/0.696 mg, 6.3/1.044 mg</p> <p>Usual Dose: 1 to 2 film(s) buccally once daily</p>	<p>Failure Mode: Incorrect Product Ordered/ Selected/Dispensed or Administered because of Name confusion Causes (could be multiple)</p>	<p>Prevention of Failure Mode</p> <p>In the conditions outlined below, the following combination of factors, are expected to minimize the risk of confusion between these two names</p>
1.	<p>Buminate (albumin Human, USP)</p> <p>Strength: 5% and 25%</p> <p>Dosage form: solution</p> <p>Dose: adults (hypovolemia): infuse 5% solution at rate < 2 to 4 mL/minute or 25% solution at < 1 mL/minute; children (hypovolemia): 0.5 to 1 g/kg/dose intravenously as needed maximum 6 g/kg/day; adults (nephrosis): 100 to 200 mL of 25% solution with a loop diuretic for 7 to 10 days; adults (hypoproteinemia) 25 grams intravenously or 200 mL to 300 ml (50 to 75 grams) of 25% solution at < 2 mL/minute; neonates, infants and children (hypoproteinemia): 0.5 to 1 gram/kg/dose intravenously over 2 to 4 hours or 100 mL (25 gram) of 25% solution at < 2 mL per minute</p> <p>Route of Administration: Intravenous</p>	<p>Orthographic similarity: Both names begin with 'B', and the letter string 'Buna' is similar in shape to the letter string 'Bumi'</p>	<p>Orthographic differences: The letter string 'il' is not similar to the suffix 'te' when scripted as they are shaped differently due to upstroke letters in different positions.</p> <p>Product characteristic differences:</p> <p>Strength: Both products are available in multiple strengths. There is no overlap or numerical similarity in strength between the two products</p>

No.	<p>Proposed name: Bunavail</p> <p>Dosage Form: Buccal Film</p> <p>Strengths: (b) (4) 2.1/0.348 mg, 4.2/0.696 mg, 6.3/1.044 mg</p> <p>Usual Dose: 1 to 2 film(s) buccally once daily</p>	<p>Failure Mode: Incorrect Product Ordered/ Selected/Dispensed or Administered because of Name confusion Causes (could be multiple)</p>	<p>Prevention of Failure Mode</p> <p>In the conditions outlined below, the following combination of factors, are expected to minimize the risk of confusion between these two names</p>
2.	<p>Danazol</p> <p>Strength: 50 mg, 100 mg, and 200 mg</p> <p>Dosage form: capsule</p> <p>Dose: 50-400 mg orally bid</p> <p>Route of Administration: oral</p>	<p>Orthographic similarity: Both names begin with letters that may be similarly scripted (B vs. D), and the letter string “Buna” may be similar to the letter string “Dana” when scripted using a block style lettering.</p> <p><u>Overlapping product characteristics:</u></p> <p>Route: Oral</p>	<p>Strength: Both products are available in multiple strengths. There is no overlap or numerical similarity in strength between the two products.</p>
3.	<p>Renvela (Sevelamer)</p> <p>Tablets – 800 mg Oral Powder – 0.8 gm and 2.4 gm packet</p> <p>Usual Dose: 800 mg to 2.4 gm orally three times daily</p>	<p>Orthographic: The letter string ‘Ren’ can look similar to the letter string ‘Bun’ when scripted especially if the ‘B’ in Bunavail does not have a closed looped at the bottom of the letter. The letter string ‘ve’ can look similar to the letter string ‘va’. Both names have the letter ‘l’ in similar positions at the end of the name.</p> <p>Route of Administration: Both are via the oral route</p> <p>Dose: Both products can be prescribed as ‘take 1’</p>	<p>Orthographic: Bunavail has the letter ‘a’ between the letter ‘n and ‘v’ where Renvela does not. Renvela has the letter ‘a’ after the letter ‘l’ where Bunavail does not. This gives the names a different shape in the middle and end of the names.</p> <p>Strength: Both products have multiple strengths that would need to be indicated on the prescription. There is no overlap or numerical similarity in strength between the two products.</p> <p>Frequency of Administration: Three times daily for Renvela vs. once daily for Bunavail.</p>

No.	<p>Proposed name: Bunavail</p> <p>Dosage Form: Buccal Film</p> <p>Strengths: (b) (4) 2.1/0.348 mg, 4.2/0.696 mg, 6.3/1.044 mg</p> <p>Usual Dose: 1 to 2 film(s) buccally once daily</p>	<p>Failure Mode: Incorrect Product Ordered/ Selected/Dispensed or Administered because of Name confusion Causes (could be multiple)</p>	<p>Prevention of Failure Mode</p> <p>In the conditions outlined below, the following combination of factors, are expected to minimize the risk of confusion between these two names</p>
4.	<p>Bonacal Plus</p> <p>Multivitamin with iron</p> <p>Tablets</p> <p>Usual Dose: 1 tablet orally once daily</p>	<p>Orthographic: The letter string 'Bona' can look similar to the letter string 'Buna'. Both names have the letters 'a' and 'l' in similar positions at the end of the names.</p> <p>Route of Administration: Both are via the oral route</p> <p>Dose: Both products can be prescribed as 'take 1'</p> <p>Frequency of Administration: Both products can be prescribed once daily</p>	<p>Orthographic: The modifier 'Plus' provides differentiation when written on a prescription.</p> <p>Strength: Bunavail contains multiple strengths that would need to be indicated on the prescription. Bonacal is a single strength product so the strength may be omitted. There are no overlaps in strength between the two products.</p>
5.	<p>Acuvail (Ketorolac)</p> <p>Ophthalmic Solution</p> <p>0.45%</p> <p>Usual Dose: Instill 1 drop to affected eye(s) 2 times daily 24 hours before surgery and on the day of surgery; continue for 2 weeks</p>	<p>Orthographic: The letter strings 'uvail' and 'avail' at the ends of both names look similar when scripted.</p>	<p>Orthographic: The letter string 'Bun' does not look similar to the letter string 'Ac' when scripted.</p> <p>Strength: Bunavail contains multiple strengths that would need to be indicated on the prescription. There is no overlap or numerical similarity in strength between the two products.</p>

No.	Proposed name: Bunavail Dosage Form: Buccal Film Strengths: <small>(b) (4)</small> 2.1/0.348 mg, 4.2/0.696 mg, 6.3/1.044 mg Usual Dose: 1 to 2 film(s) buccally once daily	Failure Mode: Incorrect Product Ordered/ Selected/Dispensed/ Administered because of Name confusion Causes (could be multiple)	Prevention of Failure Mode In the conditions outlined below, the following combination of factors, are expected to minimize the risk of confusion between these two names
6.	Oruvail (Ketoprofen) Extended-release Capsule 100mg, 150 mg, 200 mg Usual Dose: 100 mg to 200 mg orally once daily	Orthographic: The letter strings ‘uvail’ and ‘avail’ at the ends of both names look similar when scripted. Route of Administration: Both are via the oral route Frequency of Administration: Both products can be prescribed once daily Dose: Both products can be prescribed as ‘take 1’	Orthographic: The letter string ‘Bun’ does not look similar to the letter string ‘Or’ when scripted. Strength: Both products have multiple strengths that would need to be indicated on the prescription. There is no overlap or numerical similarity in strength between the two products.
7.	Promacet (Aspirin/ Butalbital) Tablets 650 mg/50 mg Usual Dose: 1 tablet orally every 4 hours as needed	Orthographic: The letter ‘B’ and the letter ‘P’ can look similar when scripted especially if the lower loop is not closed or prominently scripted. Both names contain the letter ‘a’ in similar positions. Both names have an upstroke letter at the end of the name. Route of Administration: Both are via the oral route Dose: Both products can be prescribed as ‘take 1’	Orthographic: The letter string ‘vai’ does not look similar to the letter string ‘ce’ when scripted. The cross stroke in the letter ‘t’ provides differentiation when scripted. Strength: Bunavail contains multiple strengths that would need to be indicated on the prescription. Promacet is a single strength product so the strength may be omitted. There is no overlap or numerical similarity in strength between the two products.

No.	<p>Proposed name: Bunavail</p> <p>Dosage Form: Buccal Film</p> <p>Strengths: (b) (4) 2.1/0.348 mg, 4.2/0.696 mg, 6.3/1.044 mg</p> <p>Usual Dose: 1 to 2 film(s) buccally once daily</p>	<p>Failure Mode: Incorrect Product Ordered/ Selected/Dispensed/ Administered because of Name confusion Causes (could be multiple)</p>	<p>Prevention of Failure Mode</p> <p>In the conditions outlined below, the following combination of factors, are expected to minimize the risk of confusion between these two names</p>
8.	<p>Promiseb</p> <p>Multi-ingredient topical cream</p> <p>Usual Dose: Apply to affected area 2 to 3 times per day</p>	<p>Orthographic: The letter 'B' and the letter 'P' can look similar when scripted especially if the lower loop is not closed or prominently scripted. Both names have an upstroke letter at the end of the name.</p>	<p>Orthographic: The letter string 'ise' in Promiseb does not look similar to the letter string 'vai' when scripted.</p> <p>Strength: Bunavail contains multiple strengths that would need to be indicated on the prescription. Promiseb is a single strength product so the strength may be omitted. There is no overlap or numerical similarity in strength between the two products.</p>
9.	<p>Prinivil (Lisinopril)</p> <p>Tablets</p> <p>2.5 mg, 5 mg, 10 mg, 20 mg, 40 mg</p> <p>Usual Dose: 2.5 mg to 40 mg orally once daily</p>	<p>Orthographic: The letter 'B' and the letter 'P' can look similar when scripted especially if the lower loop is not closed or prominently scripted. Both names contain the letter 'n' and 'v' in similar positions. Both names end in the letter string 'il'.</p> <p>Route of Administration: Both are via the oral route</p> <p>Dose: Both products can be prescribed as 'take 1'</p> <p>Frequency of Administration: Both products can be prescribed once daily</p>	<p>Orthographic: There is an extra letter 'a' after the 'v' in Bunavail that is not in Prinivil which provides differentiation at the end of the names.</p> <p>Strength: Both products have multiple strengths that would need to be indicated on the prescription. There is no overlap or numerical similarity in strength between the two products.</p>

No.	<p>Proposed name: Bunavail</p> <p>Dosage Form: Buccal Film</p> <p>Strengths: (b) (4) 2.1/0.348 mg, 4.2/0.696 mg, 6.3/1.044 mg</p> <p>Usual Dose: 1 to 2 film(s) buccally once daily</p>	<p>Failure Mode: Incorrect Product Ordered/ Selected/Dispensed or Administered because of Name confusion Causes (could be multiple)</p>	<p>Prevention of Failure Mode</p> <p>In the conditions outlined below, the following combination of factors, are expected to minimize the risk of confusion between these two names</p>
10.	<p>Benadryl (Diphenhydramine)</p> <p>Capsule, Tablet, Oral Solution, Injection Solution, Orally Disintegrating Film (ODF)</p> <p>Capsule: 25 mg and 50 mg Tablet: 25 mg Oral Solution: 12.5 mg/5 mL and 6.25 mg/5 mL Injection Solution: 50 mg/mL ODF: 12.5 mg and 25 mg</p> <p>Usual Dose: Oral Administration: 3.125 mg to 50 mg every 4 to 6 hours as needed</p> <p>Intravenous Administration: 10 to 50 mg infused intravenously over 10-15 minutes.</p>	<p>Phonetic: The letter string 'Buna' and 'Bena' can sound similar when spoken. The letter string 'il' can sound similar to the letter string 'yl' when spoken.</p> <p>Route of Administration: Both can be given via the oral route</p> <p>Dosage Form: Both products are available in an oral film.</p> <p>Dose: Both products can be prescribed as 'take 1'</p>	<p>Phonetic: The letter string 'dr' in Benadryl does not sound similar to the letter 'v' in Bunavail.</p> <p>Strength: Both products are available in multiple strengths that would need to be indicated on the prescription. There is no overlap or numerical similarity in strength between the two products.</p>
11.	<p>Minivelle (Estradiol)</p> <p>Transdermal Film</p> <p>0.375 mg/24 hours 0.0075 mg/24 hours 0.05 mg/24 hours 0.1 mg/24 hours</p> <p>Usual Dose: Apply to the abdomen or buttocks twice weekly</p>	<p>Phonetic: The letter string 'nivelle' can sound similar to the letter string 'navail' when spoken.</p> <p>Dose: Both products can be prescribed as 'apply one'</p>	<p>Phonetic: The letter string 'Mi' does not sound similar to the letter string 'Bu' when spoken.</p> <p>Strength: Both products have multiple strengths that would need to be indicated on the prescription. There is no overlap or numerical similarity in strength between the two products.</p> <p>Frequency of Administration: Twice weekly for Minivelle vs. once daily for Bunavail.</p>

No.	<p>Proposed name: Bunavail</p> <p>Dosage Form: Buccal Film</p> <p>Strengths: (b) (4) 2.1/0.348 mg, 4.2/0.696 mg, 6.3/1.044 mg</p> <p>Usual Dose: 1 to 2 film(s) buccally once daily</p>	<p>Failure Mode: Incorrect Product Ordered/ Selected/Dispensed or Administered because of Name confusion Causes (could be multiple)</p>	<p>Prevention of Failure Mode</p> <p>In the conditions outlined below, the following combination of factors, are expected to minimize the risk of confusion between these two names</p>
12.	<p>Burn-O-Jel (Lidocaine)</p> <p>Topical Gel</p> <p>0.5%</p> <p>Usual Dose: Apply to affected area no more than 3 to 4 times per day</p>	<p>Orthographic: If the prescriber does not script the dashes in the name, then the letter string 'Burn' can look similar to the letter string 'il' and the letter string 'el' can look similar to the letter string 'el'.</p> <p>Phonetic: Both names begin with the letter string 'Bu'. The letter string 'il' can sound similar to the letter string 'el'.</p>	<p>Orthographic: The letter string 'oj' does not look similar to the letter string 'ava' when scripted. The dashes provide additional differentiation if scripted.</p> <p>Phonetic: The letter string 'noj' in Burn-O-Gel does not sound similar to the letter string 'nava' when spoken.</p> <p>Strength: Bunavail contains multiple strengths that would need to be indicated on the prescription. Burn-O-Jel is a single strength product so the strength may be omitted. There is no overlap or numerical similarity in strength between the two products.</p>
13.	<p>Banaril (Diphenhydramine)</p> <p>Strength: 50 mg/mL</p> <p>Dosage form: injection 10 mL vial</p> <p>Dose: 10 to 50 mg infused intravenously over 10 to 15 minutes.</p> <p>Maximum infusion rate is 25 mg/minute or 10 to 100 mg intramuscularly</p> <p>Route of Administration: intravenous or intramuscular</p>	<p>Orthographic similarity: Both names begin with the letter 'B', the letter string 'Buna' is similar in shape to the letter string 'Bana', the suffix 'vail' may look similar to the suffix 'ril' when scripted.</p> <p>Phonetic: The letter string 'Bana' can sound similar to the letter string 'Buna' when spoken. Both names end with the letter string 'il'.</p>	<p>Phonetic: The letter 'r' in Banaril does not sound similar to the letter 'v' in Bunavail</p> <p>Strength: Bunavail contains multiple strengths that would need to be indicated on the prescription. There is no overlap or numerical similarity in strength between the two products.</p> <p>Dose: 1 to 2 films vs. 10 mg to 50 mg</p> <p>Frequency: once daily vs. once or as needed</p> <p>Route: Oral vs. intravenous or intramuscular</p>

No.	<p>Proposed name: Bunavail</p> <p>Dosage Form: Buccal Film</p> <p>Strengths: (b) (4) 2.1/0.348 mg, 4.2/0.696 mg, 6.3/1.044 mg</p> <p>Usual Dose: 1 to 2 film(s) buccally once daily</p>	<p>Failure Mode: Incorrect Product Ordered/ Selected/Dispensed or Administered because of Name confusion Causes (could be multiple)</p>	<p>Prevention of Failure Mode</p> <p>In the conditions outlined below, the following combination of factors, are expected to minimize the risk of confusion between these two names</p>
14.	<p>Banzel (Rufinamide)</p> <p>Tablets – 200 mg and 400 mg Oral Suspension – 40 mg/mL</p> <p>Usual Dose: 200 mg to 1200 mg orally twice daily</p>	<p>Orthographic: The letter string ‘Ban’ can look similar to the letter string ‘Bun when scripted and the letter string ‘el’ can look similar to the letter string ‘il’ when scripted.</p> <p>Phonetic: The letter string ‘Ban’ can sound similar to the letter string ‘Bun and the letter string ‘el’ can sound similar to the letter string ‘il’ when scripted.</p> <p>Route of Administration: Both can be given via the oral route</p> <p>Dose: Both products can be prescribed as ‘take 1’.</p>	<p>Orthographic: The letter ‘ze’ does not look similar to the letter string ‘ava’ when scripted. Bunavail contains 8 letters and Banzel contains 6 letters; thus, Bunavail appears longer when scripted.</p> <p>Phonetic: Bunavail has three syllables where Banzel has two. The letter ‘z’ does not sound similar to the letter string ‘ava’.</p> <p>Strength: Bunavail contains multiple strengths that would need to be indicated on the prescription. There is no overlap or numerical similarity in strength between the two products.</p>

No.	Proposed name: Bunavail Dosage Form: Buccal Film Strengths: <small>(b) (4)</small> 2.1/0.348 mg, 4.2/0.696 mg, 6.3/1.044 mg Usual Dose: 1 to 2 film(s) buccally once daily	Failure Mode: Incorrect Product Ordered/ Selected/Dispensed or Administered because of Name confusion Causes (could be multiple)	Prevention of Failure Mode In the conditions outlined below, the following combination of factors, are expected to minimize the risk of confusion between these two names
15.	Menaval-20 (Estradiol Valerate) Oil for Injection – 20 mg/mL Usual Dose: 10 to 20 mg intramuscularly once every 4 weeks as necessary	Orthographic: The letter string ‘enaval’ can look similar to the letter string ‘unavail’ when scripted. Phonetic: The letter string ‘enaval’ can sound similar to the letter string ‘unavail’.	Orthographic: The letter ‘M’ at the beginning of the name Menaval-20 does not look similar to the letter ‘B’ at the beginning of Bunavail. The modifier ‘-20’ provides additional differentiation when scripted. Phonetic: The letter ‘M’ does not sound similar to the letter ‘B’ when spoken. The modifier ‘-20’ provides additional differentiation when spoken. Strength: Bunavail contains multiple strengths that would need to be indicated on the prescription. There is no overlap or numerical similarity in strength between the two products. Frequency: once daily vs. once every 4 weeks

No.	<p>Proposed name: Bunavail</p> <p>Dosage Form: Buccal Film</p> <p>Strengths: (b) (4) 2.1/0.348 mg, 4.2/0.696 mg, 6.3/1.044 mg</p> <p>Usual Dose: 1 to 2 film(s) buccally once daily</p>	<p>Failure Mode: Incorrect Product Ordered/ Selected/Dispensed or Administered because of Name confusion Causes (could be multiple)</p>	<p>Prevention of Failure Mode</p> <p>In the conditions outlined below, the following combination of factors, are expected to minimize the risk of confusion between these two names</p>
16.	<p>Beta-Val (Betamethasone valerate)</p> <p>Strength: 0.1%</p> <p>Dosage form: topical cream and lotion</p> <p>Dose: Apply cream as thin film to affected skin areas 1 to 3 times daily. Once or twice a day is often effective. Apply lotion as a few drops twice daily to affected areas</p> <p>Route of Administration: topical</p>	<p>Orthographic similarity: Both names begin with 'B', and the suffix 'vail' may look similar to the suffix 'val' when scripted</p> <p>Phonetic: The letter string 'Be' can sound similar to the letter string 'Bu' and the letter string 'aval' can sound similar to the letter string 'avail'.</p> <p><u>Overlapping product characteristics:</u></p> <p>Frequency: once daily</p>	<p>Orthographic differences: The prefix "Buna" is not similar to the prefix "Beta" when scripted since "Beta" has an upstroke letter 't' in its 3rd position</p> <p>Phonetic: The letter 't' does not sound similar to the letter 'n'</p> <p><u>Product characteristic differences:</u></p> <p>Strength: Bunavail contains multiple strengths that would need to be indicated on the prescription. There is no overlap or numerical similarity in strength between the two products.</p>

No.	<p>Proposed name: Bunavail</p> <p>Dosage Form: Buccal Film</p> <p>Strengths: (b) (4) 2.1/0.348 mg, 4.2/0.696 mg, 6.3/1.044 mg</p> <p>Usual Dose: 1 to 2 film(s) buccally once daily</p>	<p>Failure Mode: Incorrect Product Ordered/ Selected/Dispensed or Administered because of Name confusion Causes (could be multiple)</p>	<p>Prevention of Failure Mode</p> <p>In the conditions outlined below, the following combination of factors, are expected to minimize the risk of confusion between these two names</p>
17.	<p>Boniva (Ibandronate) Strength: 150 mg and 3 mg/3ml</p> <p>Dosage form: oral tablet and intravenous solution</p> <p>Dose: 150 mg orally once monthly or 3 mg IV every 3 months</p> <p>Route of Administration: oral and intravenous</p>	<p>Orthographic similarity: Both names begin with 'B', the letter string 'Bunava' is similar in shape to the letter string 'Boniva'</p> <p>Phonetic: The letter string 'Boniv' can sound similar to the letter string 'Bunav'</p> <p><u>Overlapping product characteristics:</u></p> <p>Route: Oral</p>	<p>Orthographic differences: The suffix 'vail' appears more orthographically elongated with an upstroke letter 'l' compared to the suffix 'va'. Thus, the ends of the names are not orthographically similar when scripted.</p> <p>Phonetic: The ending letter 'a' in Boniva (pronounced like ah) does not sound like the letter string 'ail' in Bunavail</p> <p><u>Product characteristic differences:</u></p> <p>Strength: Bunavail contains multiple strengths that would need to be indicated on the prescription. There is no overlap or numerical similarity in strength between the two products.</p> <p>Frequency: Bunavail once daily vs. Boniva once monthly or every 3 months</p>

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

/s/

JAMES H SCHLICK
01/14/2014

TODD D BRIDGES on behalf of IRENE Z CHAN
01/14/2014