

**CENTER FOR DRUG EVALUATION AND
RESEARCH**

APPLICATION NUMBER:

216743Orig1s000

PROPRIETARY NAME REVIEW(S)

PROPRIETARY NAME REVIEW

Division of Medication Error Prevention and Analysis 1 (DMEPA 1)
Office of Medication Error Prevention and Risk Management (OMEPRM)
Office of Surveillance and Epidemiology (OSE)
Center for Drug Evaluation and Research (CDER)

***** This document contains proprietary information that cannot be released to the public*****

Date of This Review:	March 27, 2023
Application Type and Number:	NDA 216743
Product Name and Strength:	Zituvimet (sitagliptin and metformin hydrochloride) tablets, 50 mg/500 mg and 50 mg/1,000 mg
Product Type:	Multiple Ingredient Product
Rx or OTC:	Prescription (Rx)
Applicant/Sponsor Name:	Zydus Pharmaceuticals Inc. (Zydus)
PNR ID #:	2023-1044724917
DMEPA 1 Safety Evaluator:	Ariane O. Conrad, PharmD, BCACP, CDCES
DMEPA 1 Team Leader:	Idalia E. Rychlik, PharmD
DMEPA 1 Director:	Mishale Mistry, PharmD, MPH

Contents

1	INTRODUCTION	1
1.1	Product Information.....	1
2	RESULTS.....	1
2.1	Misbranding Assessment	1
2.2	Safety Assessment.....	1
3	CONCLUSION	3
3.1	Comments to the Applicant/Sponsor	3
4	REFERENCES.....	4
	APPENDICES	5

1 INTRODUCTION

This review evaluates the proposed proprietary name, Zituvimet, from a safety and misbranding perspective. The sources and methods used to evaluate the proposed proprietary name are outlined in the reference section and Appendix A, respectively. Zydus submitted an external name study, conducted by (b) (4), for this proposed proprietary name.

1.1 PRODUCT INFORMATION

The following product information is provided in the proprietary name and labeling submissions received on January 3, 2023.

- Intended Pronunciation: zye too' vi met
- Active Ingredient: sitagliptin and metformin hydrochloride
- Indication of Use: adjunct to diet and exercise to improve glycemic control in adults with type 2 diabetes mellitus
- Route of Administration: oral
- Dosage Form: tablets
- Strength: 50 mg/500 mg and 50 mg/1,000 mg
- Dose and Frequency: (b) (4) tablets twice daily with meals; maximum recommended daily dose is 100 mg of sitagliptin and 2,000 mg of metformin
- How Supplied: bottles of 60, 180, (b) (4) (b) (4) tablets
- Storage: 20° to 25°C (68° to 77°F)
- Reference Listed Drug/Reference Product: Janumet (NDA #022044)

2 RESULTS

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

2.1 MISBRANDING ASSESSMENT

The Office of Prescription Drug Promotion (OPDP) determined that Zituvimet would not misbrand the proposed product on January 17, 2023. The Division of Medication Error Prevention and Analysis 1 (DMEPA 1) concurred with the findings of OPDP's assessment for Zituvimet. The Division of Diabetes, Lipid Disorders, and Obesity (DDLO) concurred with the findings of OPDP's assessment for Zituvimet.

2.2 SAFETY ASSESSMENT

The following aspects were considered in the safety evaluation of the proposed proprietary name, Zituvimet.

2.2.1 United States Adopted Names (USAN) Search

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

2.2.2 Components of the Proposed Proprietary Name

Zyklus indicated in their submission that the proposed proprietary name, Zituvimet, is a “blank canvas”. This proprietary name is comprised of a single word that does not contain any components (i.e., a modifier, route of administration, dosage form, etc.) that can contribute to medication error.

We note that the proposed name ‘Zituvimet’ appears to reference both active ingredients; thus, we considered whether the proposed proprietary name is in accordance with 21 CFR201.6(b), which states:

The labeling of a drug which contains two or more ingredients may be misleading by reason, among other reasons, of the designation of such drug in such labeling by a name which includes or suggests the name of one or more but not all such ingredients, even though the names of all such ingredients are stated elsewhere in the labeling.

The prefix and infix “Zituvi-” represents the proposed proprietary name Zituvio***, which Zyklus has proposed for their sitagliptin product under NDA 211566. The proposed proprietary name Zituvio*** was found conditionally acceptable by DMEPA (PNR ID# 2023-1044724959)^b. The suffix (-met) of the root name represents the metformin active ingredient. We note that the naming strategy of using the suffix “met” has been used in other proprietary names to represent the active ingredient metformin (e.g., Janumet, Avandamet, Invokamet, Actoplus Met). Thus, we conclude that the name is not misleading because each letter string represents both active ingredients.

2.2.3 Comments from Other Review Disciplines at Initial Review

On February 2, 2023, the Division of Diabetes, Lipid Disorders, and Obesity (DDLO) did not forward any comments or concerns relating to Zituvimet at the initial phase of the review.

2.2.4 FDA Name Simulation Studies

Ninety-one (91) practitioners participated in DMEPA’s prescription studies for Zituvimet. The responses did not overlap with any currently marketed products nor did the responses sound or look similar to any currently marketed products or any products in the pipeline. Appendix B contains the results from the prescription simulation studies.

^a USAN stem search conducted on February 28, 2023.

^b Conrad, A. Proprietary Name Memorandum for Zituvio (NDA 211566). Silver Spring (MD): FDA, CDER, OSE, DMEPA 1 (US); 2023 Feb 13. PNR ID No.: 2023-1044724959.

2.2.5 *Phonetic and Orthographic Computer Analysis (POCA) Search Results*

Our POCA search^c identified 115 names with a combined phonetic and orthographic score of $\geq 55\%$ or an individual phonetic or orthographic score $\geq 70\%$. These names are included in Table 1 below.

2.2.6 *Names Retrieved for Review Organized by Name Pair Similarity*

Table 1 lists the 115 names retrieved from our POCA search. These name pairs are organized as highly similar, moderately similar or low similarity for further evaluation.

Table 1. Names Retrieved for Review Organized by Name Pair Similarity	
Similarity Category	Number of Names
Highly similar name pair: combined match percentage score $\geq 70\%$	1
Moderately similar name pair: combined match percentage score $\geq 55\%$ to $\leq 69\%$	110
Low similarity name pair: combined match percentage score $\leq 54\%$	4

2.2.7 *Safety Analysis of Names with Potential Orthographic, Spelling, and Phonetic Similarities*

Our analysis of the 115 names contained in Table 1 determined none of the names will pose a risk for confusion with Zituvimet as described in Appendices C through H.

2.2.8 *Communication of DMEPA's Determination*

On March 24, 2023, DMEPA 1 communicated our determination to the Division of Diabetes, Lipid Disorders, and Obesity (DDLO).

3 CONCLUSION

The proposed proprietary name, Zituvimet, is conditionally acceptable.

If you have any questions or need clarifications, please contact Terrolyn Thomas, OSE project manager, at 240-402-3981.

3.1 COMMENTS TO ZYDUS PHARMACEUTICALS INC.

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

If any of the proposed product characteristics as stated in your submission, received on January 3, 2023, are altered prior to approval of the marketing application, the name must be resubmitted for review.

^c POCA search conducted on February 28, 2023 in version 5.2.

4 REFERENCES

1. **USAN Stems** (<https://www.ama-assn.org/about/united-states-adopted-names-approved-stems>)

USAN Stems List contains all the recognized USAN stems.

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

POCA is a system that FDA designed. As part of the name similarity assessment, POCA is used to evaluate proposed names via a phonetic and orthographic algorithm. The proposed proprietary name is converted into its phonemic representation before it runs through the phonetic algorithm. Likewise, an orthographic algorithm exists that operates in a similar fashion. POCA is publicly accessible.

Drugs@FDA

Drugs@FDA is an FDA Web site that contains most of the drug products approved in the United States 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* and *generic drugs*; *therapeutic biological products*, *prescription* and *over-the-counter* human drugs; and *discontinued drugs* (see Drugs @ FDA Glossary of Terms, available at http://www.fda.gov/Drugs/InformationOnDrugs/ucm079436.htm#ther_biological).

RxNorm

RxNorm contains the names of prescription and many OTC drugs available in the United States. RxNorm includes generic and branded:

- Clinical drugs – pharmaceutical products given to (or taken by) a patient with therapeutic or diagnostic intent
- Drug packs – packs that contain multiple drugs, or drugs designed to be administered in a specified sequence

Radiopharmaceuticals, contrast media, food, dietary supplements, and medical devices, such as bandages and crutches, are all out of scope for RxNorm

(<http://www.nlm.nih.gov/research/umls/rxnorm/overview.html>).

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.

APPENDICES

Appendix A

FDA's Proprietary Name Risk Assessment evaluates proposed proprietary names for misbranding and safety concerns.

1. **Misbranding Assessment:** For prescription drug products, OPDP assesses the name for misbranding concerns. For over-the-counter (OTC) drug products, the misbranding assessment of the proposed name is conducted by DNDP. OPDP or DNDP evaluates proposed proprietary names to determine if the name is false or misleading, such as by making misrepresentations with respect to safety or efficacy. For example, a fanciful proprietary name may misbrand a product by suggesting that it has some unique effectiveness or composition when it does not (21 CFR 201.10(c)(3)). OPDP or DNDP provides their opinion to DMEPA for consideration in the overall acceptability of the proposed proprietary name.
2. **Safety Assessment:** The safety assessment is conducted by DMEPA, and includes the following:
 - a. Preliminary Assessment: 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.) See prescreening checklist below in Table 2*. 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.^d

^d National Coordinating Council for Medication Error Reporting and Prevention. <https://www.nccmerp.org/about-medication-errors> Last accessed 10/05/2020.

***Table 2- Prescreening Checklist for Proposed Proprietary Name**

	Answer the questions in the checklist below. Affirmative answers to any of these questions indicate a potential area of concern that should be carefully evaluated as described in this guidance.
Y/N	Is the proposed name obviously similar in spelling and pronunciation to other names?
	Proprietary names should not be similar in spelling or pronunciation to proprietary names, established names, or ingredients of other products.
Y/N	Are there inert or inactive ingredients referenced in the proprietary name?
	Proprietary names should not incorporate any reference to an inert or inactive ingredient in a way that might create an impression that the ingredient's value is greater than its true functional role in the formulation (21 CFR 201.10(c)(4)).
Y/N	Does the proprietary name include combinations of active ingredients?
	Proprietary names of fixed combination drug products should not include or suggest the name of one or more, but not all, of its active ingredients (see 21 CFR 201.6(b)).
Y/N	Is there a United States Adopted Name (USAN) stem in the proprietary name?
	Proprietary names should not incorporate a USAN stem in the position that USAN designates for the stem.
Y/N	Is this proprietary name used for another product that does not share at least one common active ingredient?
	Drug products that do not contain at least one common active ingredient should not use the same (root) proprietary name.
Y/N	Is this a proprietary name of a discontinued product?
	Proprietary names should not use the proprietary name of a discontinued product if that discontinued drug product does not contain the same active ingredients.

- b. Phonetic and Orthographic Computer Analysis (POCA): Following the preliminary screening of the proposed proprietary name, DMEPA staff evaluates the proposed name against potentially similar names. In order to identify names with potential similarity to the proposed proprietary name, DMEPA enters the proposed proprietary name in POCA and queries the name against the following drug reference databases, Drugs@FDA, Cerner RxNorm, and names in the review pipeline using a 55% threshold in POCA. DMEPA reviews the combined orthographic and phonetic matches and group the names into one of the following three categories:
- Highly similar pair: combined match percentage score $\geq 70\%$.
 - Moderately similar pair: combined match percentage score $\geq 55\%$ to $\leq 69\%$.

- Low similarity: combined match percentage score $\leq 54\%$.

Using the criteria outlined in the check list (Table 3-5) that corresponds to each of the three categories (highly similar pair, moderately similar pair, and low similarity), DMEPA evaluates the name pairs to determine the acceptability or non-acceptability of a proposed proprietary name. The intent of these checklists is to increase the transparency and predictability of the safety determination of whether a proposed name is vulnerable to confusion from a look-alike or sound-alike perspective. Each bullet below corresponds to the name similarity category cross-references the respective table that addresses criteria that DMEPA uses to determine whether a name presents a safety concern from a look-alike or sound-alike perspective.

- For highly similar names, differences in product characteristics often cannot mitigate the risk of a medication error, including product differences such as strength and dose. Thus, proposed proprietary names that have a combined score of ≥ 70 percent are at risk for a look-alike sound-alike confusion which is an area of concern (See Table 3).
- Moderately similar names are further evaluated to identify the presence of attributes that are known to cause name confusion.
 - Name attributes: We note that the beginning of the drug name plays a significant role in contributing to confusion. Additionally, drug name pairs that start with the same first letter and contain a shared letter string of at least 3 letters in both names are major contributing factor in the confusion of drug names^e. We evaluate all moderately similar names retrieved from POCA to identify the above attributes. These names are further evaluated to identify overlapping or similar strengths or doses.
 - Product attributes: Moderately similar names of products that have overlapping or similar strengths or doses represent an area for concern for FDA. The dose and strength information is often located in close proximity to the drug name itself on prescriptions and medication orders, and the information can be an important factor that either increases or decreases the potential for confusion between similarly named drug pairs. The ability of other product characteristics to mitigate confusion (e.g., route, frequency, dosage form) may be limited when the strength or dose overlaps. DMEPA reviews such names further, to determine whether sufficient differences exist to prevent confusion. (See Table 4).
- Names with low similarity that have no overlap or similarity in strength and dose are generally acceptable (See Table 5) unless there are data to suggest that the name might be vulnerable to confusion (e.g., prescription simulation study suggests that the name is likely to be misinterpreted as a marketed product). In these instances, we would reassign

^e Shah, M, Merchant, L, Characteristics That May Help in the Identification of Potentially Confusing Proprietary Drug Names. Therapeutic Innovation & Regulatory Science, September 2016

a low similarity name to the moderate similarity category and review according to the moderately similar name pair checklist.

- c. FDA Prescription Simulation Studies: DMEPA staff also conducts a prescription simulation studies using FDA health care professionals.

Four 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, verbal pronunciation of the drug name or during computerized provider order entry. 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 vulnerability of the proposed name to be misinterpreted by healthcare practitioners during written, verbal, or electronic prescribing.

In order to evaluate the potential for misinterpretation of the proposed proprietary name during written, verbal, or electronic prescribing of the name, written inpatient medication orders, written outpatient prescriptions, verbal orders, and electronic orders are simulated, each consisting of a combination of marketed and unapproved drug products, including the proposed name.

- d. 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.

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

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.

Table 3. Highly Similar Name Pair Checklist (i.e., combined Orthographic and Phonetic score is $\geq 70\%$).

Answer the questions in the checklist below. Affirmative answers to some of these questions suggest that the pattern of orthographic or phonetic differences in the names may render the names less likely to confusion, provided that the pair does not share a common strength or dose.			
<u>Orthographic Checklist</u>		<u>Phonetic Checklist</u>	
Y/N	Do the names begin with different first letters? <i>Note that even when names begin with different first letters, certain letters may be confused with each other when scripted.</i>	Y/N	Do the names have different number of syllables?
Y/N	Are the lengths of the names dissimilar* when scripted? <i>*FDA considers the length of names different if the names differ by two or more letters.</i>	Y/N	Do the names have different syllabic stresses?
Y/N	Considering variations in scripting of some letters (such as z and f), is there a different number or placement of upstroke/downstroke letters present in the names?	Y/N	Do the syllables have different phonologic processes, such as vowel reduction, assimilation, or deletion?
Y/N	Is there different number or placement of cross-stroke or dotted letters present in the names?	Y/N	Across a range of dialects, are the names consistently pronounced differently?
Y/N	Do the infixes of the name appear dissimilar when scripted?		
Y/N	Do the suffixes of the names appear dissimilar when scripted?		

Table 4: Moderately Similar Name Pair Checklist (i.e., combined score is $\geq 55\%$ to $\leq 69\%$).

Step 1	Review the DOSAGE AND ADMINISTRATION and HOW SUPPLIED/STORAGE AND HANDLING sections of the prescribing information (or for OTC drugs refer to the Drug Facts label) to determine if strengths and doses of the name pair overlap or are very similar. Different strengths and doses for products whose names are moderately similar may decrease the risk of confusion between the moderately similar name pairs. Name pairs that have overlapping or similar strengths or doses have a higher potential for confusion and should be evaluated further (see Step 2). Because the strength or dose could be used to express an order or prescription for a particular drug product, overlap in one or both of these components would be reason for further evaluation. For single strength products, also consider circumstances where the strength may not be expressed. For any i.e., drug products comprised of more than one active ingredient, consider whether the strength or dose may be expressed using only one of the components. To determine whether the strengths or doses are similar to your proposed product, consider the following list of factors that may increase confusion: • Alternative expressions of dose: 5 mL may be listed in the prescribing information, but the dose may be expressed in metric weight (e.g., 500 mg) or in non-metric units (e.g., 1 tsp, 1 tablet/capsule). Similarly, a strength or dose of 1000 mg may be expressed, in practice, as 1 g, or vice versa. • Trailing or deleting zeros: 10 mg is similar in appearance to 100 mg which may potentiate confusion between a name pair with moderate similarity. • Similar sounding doses: 15 mg is similar in sound to 50 mg
Step 2	Answer the questions in the checklist below. Affirmative answers to some of these questions suggest that the pattern of orthographic or phonetic differences in the names may reduce the likelihood of confusion for moderately similar names <u>with</u> overlapping or similar strengths or doses.


	Orthographic Checklist (Y/N to each question) - Do the names begin with different first letters? Note that even when names begin with different first letters, certain letters may be confused with each other when scripted. - Are the lengths of the names dissimilar* when scripted? *FDA considers the length of names different if the names differ by two or more letters. - Considering variations in scripting of some letters (such as z and f), is there a different number or placement of upstroke/downstroke letters present in the names? - Is there different number or placement of cross-stroke or dotted letters present in the names? - Do the infixes of the name appear dissimilar when scripted? - Do the suffixes of the names appear dissimilar when scripted?	Phonetic Checklist (Y/N to each question) - Do the names have different number of syllables? - Do the names have different syllabic stresses? - Do the syllables have different phonologic processes, such vowel reduction, assimilation, or deletion? - Across a range of dialects, are the names consistently pronounced differently?
--	--	---

Table 5: Low Similarity Name Pair Checklist (i.e., combined score is $\leq 54\%$).

Names with low similarity are generally acceptable unless there are data to suggest that the name might be vulnerable to confusion (e.g., prescription simulation study suggests that the name is likely to be misinterpreted as a marketed product). In these instances, we would reassign a low similarity name to the moderate similarity category and review according to the moderately similar name pair checklist.

Appendix B: Prescription Simulation Samples and Results

Figure 1. Zituvimet Study (Conducted on January 27, 2023)

Handwritten Medication Order/Prescription	Verbal Prescription
<u>Medication Order:</u> 	Zituvimet 50 mg/500 mg Take 1 tablet by mouth twice daily Dispense 60
<u>Outpatient Prescription:</u> 	
CPOE Study Sample (displayed as sans-serif, 12-point, bold font)	
Zituvimet	

FDA Prescription Simulation Responses (Aggregate Report)

Study Name: Zituvimet

As of Date 3/3/2023

257 People Received Study

91 People Responded

Study Name: Zituvimet

Total	27	23	22	19	
INTERPRETATION	INPATIENT	CPOE	VOICE	OUTPATIENT	TOTAL
XYTUBAMAT	0	0	1	0	1
XYTUVAMET	0	0	1	0	1
ZITEVIMET	1	0	0	0	1
ZITOVAMVET 50MG/500MG	0	0	1	0	1
ZITUBIMET	0	0	0	1	1
ZITURIMET	1	0	0	0	1
ZITURVIMET	1	0	0	0	1
ZITUVAMET	0	0	2	0	2
ZITUVIMEF	1	0	0	0	1
ZITUVIMEN	1	0	0	0	1
ZITUVIMET	22	23	1	18	64
ZYTOVOMIVET	0	0	1	0	1
ZYTUVAMAT	0	0	1	0	1
ZYTUVAMET	0	0	10	0	10
ZYTUVERMET	0	0	1	0	1
ZYTUVIMET	0	0	2	0	2
ZYTUVOMET	0	0	1	0	1

Appendix C: Highly Similar Names (e.g., combined POCA score is $\geq 70\%$)

No.	Proposed name: Zituvimet Established name: sitagliptin and metformin hydrochloride Dosage form: tablets Strength(s): 50 mg/500 mg and 50 mg/1,000 mg Usual Dose: ^{(b) (4)} tablets twice daily with meals	POCA Score (%)	Orthographic and/or phonetic differences in the names sufficient to prevent confusion Other prevention of failure mode expected to minimize the risk of confusion between these two names.
1.	Zituvimet***	100	This name is subject of the review.

Appendix D: Moderately Similar Names (e.g., combined POCA score is $\geq 55\%$ to $\leq 69\%$) with no overlap or numerical similarity in Strength and/or Dose

No.	Name	POCA Score (%)
1.	Rituximab	61
2.	Etesevimab	60
3.	Zinotic Es	59
4.	Zypitamag	58
5.	Zontivity	57
6.	Maftivimab	57
7.	Macuvite	57
8.	Zzztime	56
9.	Zestoretic	56
10.	Sacituzumab	56
11.	Odesivimab	56
12.	Imdevimab	56
13.	Ansuvimab	55

Appendix E: Moderately Similar Names (e.g., combined POCA score is $\geq 55\%$ to $\leq 69\%$) with overlap or numerical similarity in Strength and/or Dose

No.	Proposed name: Zituvimet Established name: sitagliptin and metformin hydrochloride Dosage form: tablets Strength(s): 50 mg/500 mg and 50 mg/1,000 mg Usual Dose: ^{(b) (4)} tablets twice daily with meals	POCA Score (%)	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
1.	Zituvio***	68	The suffixes (-io <i>versus</i> -met) look different and Zituvimet contains a cross-stroke letter 't' which provides additional orthographic differences.

No.	Proposed name: Zituvimet Established name: sitagliptin and metformin hydrochloride Dosage form: tablets Strength(s): 50 mg/500 mg and 50 mg/1,000 mg Usual Dose: ^{(b) (4)} tablets twice daily with meals	POCA Score (%)	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
			The last syllables (vee oh <i>versus</i> vi met) sound different. Zituvio*** is the proprietary name proposed by Zydus for sitagliptin and this name was found acceptable by DMEPA under NDA 211566 (PNR# 2023-1044724959 dated February 13, 2023). Thus, we note that Zydus proposes the name Zituvimet for their proposed sitagliptin and metformin product to incorporate references to both drug components (see Section 2.2.2 <i>Components of the Proposed Proprietary Name</i>).
2.	Treximet	65	This name pair has sufficient orthographic and phonetic differences.
3.	Vivimusta	60	This name pair has sufficient orthographic and phonetic differences.
4.	Zidovudine	59	This name pair has sufficient orthographic and phonetic differences.
5.	Sotrovimab	58	This name pair has sufficient orthographic and phonetic differences.
6.	Sinemet	58	This name pair has sufficient orthographic and phonetic differences.
7.	Mytussin Ac	57	This name pair has sufficient orthographic and phonetic differences.
8.	Zomig-Zmt	56	This name pair has sufficient orthographic and phonetic differences.
9.	Zetacet	56	This name pair has sufficient orthographic and phonetic differences.
10.	Invokamet	56	This name pair has sufficient orthographic and phonetic differences.
11.	Anzemet	56	This name pair has sufficient orthographic and phonetic differences.
12.	Avandamet	55	This name pair has sufficient orthographic and phonetic differences.

Appendix F: Low Similarity Names (e.g., combined POCA score is $\leq 54\%$)

No.	Name	POCA Score (%)
1.	Zimeta	54
2.	Siponimod	53
3.	(b) (4)	50
4.	Disofenin	50

Appendix G: Names not likely to be confused or not used in usual practice settings for the reasons described.

No.	Name	POCA Score (%)	Failure preventions
1.	Sinuvent	69	Name identified in RxNorm database. Product is deactivated and no generic equivalents are available.
2.	Vetrimec	66	Veterinary product.
3.	Nicomide-T	62	Name identified in RxNorm database. Product is deactivated and no generic equivalents are available.
4.	Cetazone T	61	Name identified in RxNorm database. Product is deactivated and no generic equivalents are available.
5.	Betavent	61	Name identified in RxNorm database. Product is deactivated and no generic equivalents are available.
6.	Vicodin Es	60	Brand discontinued with no generic equivalents available. ANDA 089736 withdrawn FR effective 07/17/2014.
7.	Cefetamet	60	Name identified in RxNorm database. Unable to find product characteristics in commonly used drug databases.
8.	Vitussin	58	Name identified in RxNorm database. Product is deactivated and no generic equivalents are available.
9.	Veteribac	58	Name identified in RxNorm database. Unable to find product characteristics in commonly used drug databases.
10.	Luviset 360	58	Name identified in RxNorm database. Unable to find product characteristics in commonly used drug databases.
11.	Zimovane	56	International product marketed in Ireland and the United Kingdom.
12.	Zetamine	56	Veterinary product.

No.	Name	POCA Score (%)	Failure preventions
13.	Ibumetin	56	International product marketed in Austria, Denmark, Finland, the Netherlands, Norway, Sweden, and the United Kingdom.
14.	Ditussin-Hc	56	Name identified in RxNorm database. Product is deactivated and no generic equivalents are available.
15.	Metomidate	55	Veterinary product.

Appendix H: Names not likely to be confused due to absence of attributes that are known to cause name confusion^f.

No.	Name	POCA Score (%)
1.	Dietrim Es	64
2.	Liquimat	63
3.	Citravet	62
4.	Cetuximab	62
5.	Vetribute	61
6.	Vitamin Mk7	60
7.	Vitamin Mk6	60
8.	Vitamin Mk 7	60
9.	Vat Violet 2	60
10.	Tecovirimat	60
11.	Subvenite	60
12.	Sinuvent Pe	60
13.	Mitapivat	60
14.	Ri-Tussin Dm	59
15.	(b) (4)	59
16.	Ezetimibe	59
17.	Vitamin K7	58
18.	Vitamin K3	58
19.	Vitamin K2	58
20.	Vitamin K1	58
21.	Vitamin K 3	58
22.	Vitamin K 2	58
23.	Vitamin K 1	58
24.	Vitamin K	58
25.	Vitamin D3	58

^f Shah, M, Merchant, L, Chan, I, and Taylor, K. Characteristics That May Help in the Identification of Potentially Confusing Proprietary Drug Names. Therapeutic Innovation & Regulatory Science, September 2016

No.	Name	POCA Score (%)
26.	Vitamin D	58
27.	Vetmedin	58
28.	Tisotumab	58
29.	Sedivet	58
30.	Respivent	58
31.	Pseudovent	58
32.	Liptruzet	58
33.	(b) (4)	58
34.	Fetzima	58
35.	Cetrimide	58
36.	Vitravene	57
37.	Siltuximab	57
38.	Salbuvent	57
39.	Mytussin Pe	57
40.	Vivelle-Dot	56
41.	Vitamin B9	56
42.	Vitamin B6	56
43.	Vitamin B12	56
44.	Vitamin B 12	56
45.	Vital-Benz	56
46.	Tivozanib	56
47.	Teplizumab	56
48.	Stimufend	56
49.	Pidotimod	56
50.	Pertussin Es	56
51.	(b) (4)	56
52.	Noxivent	56
53.	Liquicet	56
54.	Isatuximab	56
55.	Gemtuzumab	56
56.	Dupixent	56
57.	Detomised	56
58.	Cutivate	56
59.	Cetrimides	56
60.	Votrient	55
61.	Vitastem	55
62.	Vitamin E	55
63.	Vitamin A	55
64.	Velivet	55
65.	Uni Tussin Pe	55
66.	Tussinate	55
67.	Tepotinib	55
68.	Stimate	55
69.	Netupitant	55

No.	Name	POCA Score (%)
70.	Betavet	55

This is a representation of an electronic record that was signed electronically. Following this are manifestations of any and all electronic signatures for this electronic record.

/s/

ARIANE O CONRAD
03/27/2023 09:19:20 AM

IDALIA E RYCHLIK
03/27/2023 09:56:41 AM

MISHALE P MISTRY
03/27/2023 04:23:29 PM