1.3.5.1. PATENT INFORMATION

In accordance with 21CFR 314.53, HQ Specialty Pharma Corporation hereby submits patent number US8829045 to NDA 205703 – Esmolol Hydrochloride Premixed Injection.
EXCLUSIVITY SUMMARY

NDA # 205703 SUPPL # HFD #

Trade Name N/A

Generic Name Esmolol Hydrochloride in Water for Injection

Applicant Name HQ Specialty Pharma Corporation

Approval Date, If Known 4/7/2016

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)

   b) Did it require the review of clinical data other than to support a safety claim or change in labeling related to safety? (If it required review only of bioavailability or bioequivalence data, answer "no.")

      YES ☐ NO ☒

      If your answer is "no" because you believe the study is a bioavailability study and, therefore, not eligible for exclusivity, EXPLAIN why it is a bioavailability study, including your reasons for disagreeing with any arguments made by the applicant that the study was not simply a bioavailability study.

If it is a supplement requiring the review of clinical data but it is not an effectiveness supplement, describe the change or claim that is supported by the clinical data:
c) Did the applicant request exclusivity?  

YES ☐ NO ☑

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

d) 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#

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?** (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 application contain reports of clinical investigations referred to in another application, do not complete remainder of summary for that investigation.

- **YES**
- **NO**
2. A clinical investigation is "essential to the approval" if the Agency could not have approved the application or supplement without relying on that investigation. Thus, the investigation is not essential to the approval if 1) no clinical investigation is necessary to support the supplement or application in light of previously approved applications (i.e., information other than clinical trials, such as bioavailability data, would be sufficient to provide a basis for approval as an ANDA or 505(b)(2) application because of what is already known about a previously approved product), or 2) there are published reports of studies (other than those conducted or sponsored by the applicant) or other publicly available data that independently would have been sufficient to support approval of the application, without reference to the clinical investigation submitted in the application.

(a) In light of previously approved applications, is a clinical investigation (either conducted by the applicant or available from some other source, including the published literature) necessary to support approval of the application or supplement?

YES ☐ NO ☐

If "no," state the basis for your conclusion that a clinical trial is not necessary for approval AND GO DIRECTLY TO SIGNATURE BLOCK ON PAGE 8:

(b) Did the applicant submit a list of published studies relevant to the safety and effectiveness of this drug product and a statement that the publicly available data would not independently support approval of the application?

YES ☐ NO ☐

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

YES ☐ NO ☐

If yes, explain:

(2) If the answer to 2(b) is "no," are you aware of published studies not conducted or sponsored by the applicant or other publicly available data that could independently demonstrate the safety and effectiveness of this drug product?

YES ☐ NO ☐

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

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

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

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

Investigation #1
YES □ NO □
Investigation #2
YES □ NO □

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

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

Investigation #1
YES □ NO □
Investigation #2
YES □ NO □
If you have answered "yes" for one or more investigation, identify the NDA in which a similar investigation was relied on:

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 NO

Explain:

Investigation #2

IND #

YES NO

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 □ NO □
Explain: Explain:

Investigation #2

YES □ NO □
Explain: Explain:

(c) Notwithstanding an answer of "yes" to (a) or (b), are there other reasons to believe that the applicant should not be credited with having "conducted or sponsored" the study? (Purchased studies may not be used as the basis for exclusivity. However, if all rights to the drug are purchased (not just studies on the drug), the applicant may be considered to have sponsored or conducted the studies sponsored or conducted by its predecessor in interest.)

YES □ NO □

If yes, explain:

Name of person completing form:  Brian Proctor
Title:  Regulatory Project Manager
Date:  April 5, 2016

Name of Office/Division Director signing form:
Title:
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# ACTION PACKAGE CHECKLIST

## APPLICATION INFORMATION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NDA #</th>
<th>205703</th>
<th>NDA Supplement #</th>
<th>BLA #</th>
<th>BLA Supplement #</th>
<th>If NDA, Efficacy Supplement Type: (an action package is not required for SE8 or SE9 supplements)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Proprietary Name: Established/Proper Name:</td>
<td>Esmolol Hydrochloride in Water for Injection</td>
<td>Dosage Form: 2500 mg/250 mL (10 mg/mL) and 2000 mg/100 mL (20 mg/mL).</td>
<td>Applicant: HQ Specialty Pharma Corporation</td>
<td>Agent for Applicant (if applicable):</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RPM:</td>
<td>Brian Proctor</td>
<td>Division: Cardiovascular and Renal Products</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NDA Application Type:</td>
<td>✔ 505(b)(1) ☑ 505(b)(2)</td>
<td>Efficacy Supplement:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BLA Application Type:</td>
<td>☑ 351(k) ☐ 351(a)</td>
<td>Efficacy Supplement:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**For ALL 505(b)(2) applications, two months prior to EVERY action:**

- Review the information in the 505(b)(2) Assessment and submit the draft\(^2\) to CDER OND IO for clearance.
- Check Orange Book for newly listed patents and/or exclusivity (including pediatric exclusivity)

- No changes
- New patent/exclusivity (notify CDER OND IO)

Date of check: 4/6/2016

**Note:** 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: Approval
- User Fee Goal Date is ☑ AP 4/7/2016
- Previous actions: ☑ Tentative Approval 4/14/2014

### 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 ☐ Received

### Application Characteristics\(^3\)

---

1 The **Application Information** Section is (only) a checklist. The **Contents of Action Package** Section (beginning on page 2) lists the documents to be included in the Action Package.

2 For resubmissions, 505(b)(2) applications must be cleared before the action, but it is not necessary to resubmit the draft 505(b)(2) Assessment to CDER OND IO unless the Assessment has been substantively revised (e.g., new listed drug, patent certification revised).

3 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.
Review priority:  □ Standard  □ Priority
Chemical classification (new NDAs only):
(confirm chemical classification at time of approval)

☐ Fast Track  ☐ Rx-to-OTC full switch
☐ Rolling Review  ☐ Rx-to-OTC partial switch
☐ Orphan drug designation  ☐ Direct-to-OTC
☐ Breakthrough Therapy designation

*(NOTE: Set the submission property in DARRTS and notify the CDER Breakthrough Therapy Program Manager; Refer to the “RPM BT Checklist for Considerations after Designation Granted” for other required actions: CST SharePoint)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NDAs: Subpart H</th>
<th>BLAs: Subpart E</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>☐ Accelerated approval (21 CFR 314.510)</td>
<td>☐ Accelerated approval (21 CFR 601.41)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐ Restricted distribution (21 CFR 314.520)</td>
<td>☐ Restricted distribution (21 CFR 601.42)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐ Approval based on animal studies</td>
<td>☐ Approval based on animal studies</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

☐ Submitted in response to a PMR  ☐ MedGuide
☐ Submitted in response to a PMC  ☐ Communication Plan
☐ Submitted in response to a Pediatric Written Request  ☐ ETASU

Comments:

- BLAs only: Is the product subject to official FDA lot release per 21 CFR 610.2 *(approvals only)*
  - Yes  □ No

- Public communications *(approvals only)*
  - Office of Executive Programs (OEP) liaison has been notified of action
    - Yes  □ No
    - None  ☐ FDA Press Release
    - None  ☐ FDA Talk Paper
    - None  ☐ CDER Q&As
    - None  ☐ Other
  - Indicate what types (if any) of information were issued

- Exclusivity
  - Is approval of this application blocked by any type of exclusivity (orphan, 5-year NCE, 3-year, pediatric exclusivity)?
    - Yes  □ No
  - If so, specify the type

- Patent Information (NDAs only)
  - Patent Information: Verify that form FDA-3542a was submitted for patents that claim the drug for which approval is sought.
    - Verified  □ Not applicable because drug is an old antibiotic.

### CONTENTS OF ACTION PACKAGE

#### 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) Tentative Approval 4/14/2014; Approval 4/7/2016

## 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)*
    - Included
  - Original applicant-proposed labeling
    - Included

- Medication Guide/Patient Package Insert/Instructions for Use/Device Labeling *(write submission/communication date at upper right of first page of each piece)*
  - Most-recent draft labeling *(if it is division-proposed labeling, it should be in track-changes format)*
    - Included
  - Original applicant-proposed labeling
    - Included

- Labels *(full color carton and immediate-container labels)* *(write submission/communication date on upper right of first page of each submission)*
  - Most-recent draft labeling
    - Included

- Proprietary Name
  - Acceptability/non-acceptability letter(s) *(indicate date(s))*
  - Review(s) *(indicate date(s))*

- Labeling reviews *(indicate dates of reviews)*
  - RPM: ☒ 4/6/2016
  - DMEPA: ☒ 3/10/2014
  - DMPP/PLT (DRISK): None
  - OPDP: None
  - SEALD: None
  - CSS: None
  - Product Quality: None
  - Other: None

## Administrative / Regulatory Documents

- RPM Filing Review/Memo of Filing Meeting *(indicate date of each review)*
- All NDA 505(b)(2) Actions: Date each action cleared by 505(b)(2) Clearance Committee
  - RPM Filing Review 8/22/2013 Cleared by 505(b)(2) Committee 2/17/2016

- 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

---

4 Filing reviews for scientific disciplines are NOT required to be included in the action package.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Details</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>This application is on the AIP</strong></td>
<td>- Yes □  No ☒ (Optional)**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- If yes, Center Director’s Exception for Review memo (indicate date)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- If yes, OC clearance for approval (indicate date of clearance communication)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Pediatrics (approvals only)</strong></td>
<td>N/A, exempt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Date reviewed by PeRC</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- If PeRC review not necessary, explain:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Breakthrough Therapy Designation</strong></td>
<td>N/A □  Clinical ▒  None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Breakthrough Therapy Designation Letter(s) (granted, denied, an/rescinded)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- CDER Medical Policy Council Breakthrough Therapy Designation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Determination Review Template(s) (include only the completed template(s) and not the meeting minutes)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- CDER Medical Policy Council Brief – Evaluating a Breakthrough Therapy Designation for Recission Template(s) (include only the completed template(s) and not the meeting minutes)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Outgoing communications: letters, emails, and faxes considered important to include in the action package by the reviewing office/division (e.g., clinical SPA letters, RTF letter, Formal Dispute Resolution Request decisional letters, etc.) (do not include OPDP letters regarding pre-launch promotional materials as these are non-disclosable; do not include Master File letters; do not include previous action letters, as these are located elsewhere in package)</strong></td>
<td>NA □  Clinical ▒  None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Internal documents: memoranda, telecons, emails, and other documents considered important to include in the action package by the reviewing office/division (e.g., Regulatory Briefing minutes, Medical Policy Council meeting minutes)</strong></td>
<td>NA □  Clinical ▒  None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Minutes of Meetings</strong></td>
<td>N/A □  Clinical ▒  None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- If not the first review cycle, any end-of-review meeting (indicate date of mtg)</td>
<td>N/A or no mtg</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Pre-NDA/BLA meeting (indicate date of mtg)</td>
<td>No mtg</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- EOP2 meeting (indicate date of mtg)</td>
<td>No mtg</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Mid-cycle Communication (indicate date of mtg)</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Late-cycle Meeting (indicate date of mtg)</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Other milestone meetings (e.g., EOP2a, CMC focused milestone meetings) (indicate dates of mtgs)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Advisory Committee Meeting(s)</strong></td>
<td>No AC meeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Date(s) of Meeting(s)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Decisional and Summary Memos**

- **Office Director Decisional Memo (indicate date for each review)** | None □  Clinical ▒  None                                                                                                               |
- **Division Director Summary Review (indicate date for each review)** | 4/12/2014, 4/7/2016                                                                                                                 |
- **Cross-Discipline Team Leader Review (indicate date for each review)** | 4/4/2014                                                                                                                               |
- **PMR/PMC Development Templates (indicate total number)** | None □  Clinical ▒  None                                                                                                               |

Reference ID: 3916533
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Details</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Clinical Reviews</td>
<td>Clinical Team Leader Review(s) (indicate date for each review)</td>
<td>No separate review</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Clinical review(s) (indicate date for each review)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Social scientist review(s) (if OTC drug) (indicate date for each review)</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Financial Disclosure reviews(s) or location/date if addressed in another review</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Clinical reviews from immunology and other clinical areas/divisions/Centers (indicate date of each review)</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Controlled Substance Staff review(s) and Scheduling Recommendation (indicate date of each review)</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Risk Management</td>
<td>REMS Documents and REMS Supporting Document (indicate date(s) of submission(s))</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>REMS Memo(s) and letter(s) (indicate date(s))</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>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)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>OSI Clinical Inspection Review Summary(ies) (include copies of OSI letters to investigators)</td>
<td>None requested</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clinical Microbiology</td>
<td>Clinical Microbiology Team Leader Review(s) (indicate date for each review)</td>
<td>No separate review</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Clinical Microbiology Review(s) (indicate date for each review)</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Biostatistics</td>
<td>Statistical Division Director Review(s) (indicate date for each review)</td>
<td>No separate review</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Statistical Team Leader Review(s) (indicate date for each review)</td>
<td>No separate review</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Statistical Review(s) (indicate date for each review)</td>
<td>1/31/2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clinical Pharmacology</td>
<td>Clinical Pharmacology Division Director Review(s) (indicate date for each review)</td>
<td>No separate review</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Clinical Pharmacology Team Leader Review(s) (indicate date for each review)</td>
<td>No separate review</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Clinical Pharmacology review(s) (indicate date for each review)</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>OSI Clinical Pharmacology Inspection Review Summary (include copies of OSI letters)</td>
<td>None requested</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5 For Part 3 combination products, all reviews from the reviewing Center(s) should be entered into the official archive (for further instructions, see “Section 508 Compliant Documents: Process for Regulatory Project Managers” located in the CST electronic repository).
### Nonclinical

**Pharmacology/Toxicology Discipline Reviews**
- ADP/T Review(s) *(indicate date for each review)* □ No separate review
- Supervisory Review(s) *(indicate date for each review)* □ No separate review
- Pharm/tox review(s), including referenced IND reviews *(indicate date for each review)* □ 9/3/2013

**Review(s) by other disciplines/divisions/Centers requested by P/T reviewer *(indicate date for each review)* □ None

**Statistical review(s) of carcinogenicity studies *(indicate date for each review)* □ No carc

**ECAC/CAC report/memo of meeting** □ None Included in P/T review, page

**OSI Nonclinical Inspection Review Summary *(include copies of OSI letters)* □ None requested

### Product Quality

**Product Quality Discipline Reviews**
- Tertiary review *(indicate date for each review)* □ None
- Secondary review *(e.g., Branch Chief)* *(indicate date for each review)* □ None
- Integrated Quality Assessment *(contains the Executive Summary and the primary reviews from each product quality review discipline)* *(indicate date for each review)* Quality 2/26/2014
  - Biopharm 3/20/2014
  - Micro 2/26/2014

**Reviews by other disciplines/divisions/Centers requested by product quality review team *(indicate date of each review)* □ None

**Environmental Assessment (check one) (original and supplemental applications)**
- Categorical Exclusion *(indicate review date)* *(all original applications and all efficacy supplements that could increase the patient population)* 2/26/2014
- Review & FONSI *(indicate date of review)* □ □
- Review & Environmental Impact Statement *(indicate date of each review)* □ □

**Facilities Review/Inspection**
- Facilities inspections *(action must be taken prior to the re-evaluation date)* *(only original applications and efficacy supplements that require a manufacturing facility inspection (e.g., new strength, manufacturing process, or manufacturing site change)* □ Acceptable
  - Re-evaluation date: 4/7/2016
  - Withhold recommendation □ □
  - Not applicable □ □

---

6 Do not include Master File (MF) reviews or communications to MF holders. However, these documents should be made available upon signatory request.
### Day of Approval Activities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>For all 505(b)(2) applications:</td>
<td>No changes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Check Orange Book for newly listed patents and/or exclusivity (including</td>
<td>New patent/exclusivity (Notify CDER OND IO)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pediatric exclusivity)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Finalize 505(b)(2) assessment</td>
<td>Done</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>For Breakthrough Therapy (BT) Designated drugs:</td>
<td>Done</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Notify the CDER BT Program Manager</td>
<td>Done</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Notify the Division of Online Communications, Office of Communications</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>For products that need to be added to the flush list (generally opioids):</td>
<td>Done</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Notify the Division of Online Communications, Office of Communications</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Send a courtesy copy of approval letter and all attachments to applicant</td>
<td>Done</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Send a courtesy copy of approval letter and all attachments to applicant</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- If an FDA communication will issue, notify Press Office of approval</td>
<td>Done</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>action after confirming that applicant received courtesy copy of approval letter</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Ensure that proprietary name, if any, and established name are listed in</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Application Product Names section of DARRTS, and that the proprietary</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>name is identified as the “preferred” name</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Ensure Pediatric Record is accurate</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Send approval email within one business day to CDER-APPROVALS</td>
<td>Done</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/

BRIAN L PROCTOR
04/13/2016
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