

**CENTER FOR DRUG EVALUATION AND
RESEARCH**

APPLICATION NUMBER:

217202Orig1s000

PROPRIETARY NAME REVIEW(S)

PROPRIETARY NAME REVIEW

Division of Medication Error Prevention and Analysis 2 (DMEPA 2)
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:	August 26, 2024
Application Type and Number:	NDA 217202
Product Name, Dosage Form, and Strength:	Rapiblyk (landiolol) for Injection, 280 mg/vial
Product Type:	Single Ingredient Product
Rx or OTC:	Prescription (Rx)
Applicant/Sponsor Name:	AOP Orphan Pharmaceuticals GmbH (AOP)
PNR ID #:	2024-1044725813
DMEPA 2 Safety Evaluator:	Jody Kundreskas, PharmD
DMEPA 2 Team Leader:	Nicole Iverson, PharmD, BCPS
DMEPA 2 Associate Director for Nomenclature and Labeling:	Hina Mehta, PharmD

Table of Contents

1	INTRODUCTION	3
1.1	REGULATORY HISTORY	3
1.2	PRODUCT INFORMATION	3
2	DISCUSSION	4
2.1	MISBRANDING ASSESSMENT	4
2.2	SAFETY ASSESSMENT	4
2.2.1	United States Adopted Names (USAN) Search	4
2.2.2	Components of the Proposed Proprietary Name	5
2.2.3	Comments from Other Review Disciplines at Initial Review	5
2.2.4	FDA Prescription Simulation Studies	5
2.2.5	Phonetic and Orthographic Computer Analysis (POCA) Search Results	5
2.2.6	Names Retrieved for Review Organized by Name Pair Similarity	6
2.2.7	Safety Analysis of Names with Potential Orthographic, Spelling, and Phonetic Similarities	6
2.2.8	Communication of DMEPA's Determination	6
3	CONCLUSION	6
3.1	Comments to AOP Orphan Pharmaceuticals GmbH	6
4	REFERENCES	7
5	APPENDICES	8

1 INTRODUCTION

This review evaluates the proposed proprietary name, Rapiblyk, 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. AOP did not submit an external name study for this proposed proprietary name.

1.1 REGULATORY HISTORY

AOP previously submitted the proposed proprietary name, (b) (4)*** under NDA 217202 on July 14, 2022. However, on October 4, 2022, we found the name (b) (4)*** unacceptable due to orthographic similarities with the proprietary name, (b) (4) and orthographic and phonetic similarities and overlapping product characteristics with the proprietary name (b) (4) a.

AOP then submitted the proposed proprietary name, (b) (4)*** under NDA 217202 on November 15, 2022. However, on February 13, 2023, we found the name, (b) (4)*** unacceptable due to phonetic similarities and overlapping product characteristics with the proprietary name, (b) (4) b.

Thus, AOP submitted the proposed proprietary name, Rapiblyk, for review on May 29, 2024 under NDA 217202.

1.2 PRODUCT INFORMATION

The following product information is provided in the proprietary name submission received on May 29, 2024^c, and the prescribing information received on June 6, 2024^d.

Table 1. Relevant Product Information for Rapiblyk	
Intended pronunciation:	RAP-ee-blik
Active ingredient:	landiolol
Indication:	for the short-term reduction of ventricular rate in adult patients with supraventricular tachycardia including atrial fibrillation and atrial flutter.
Dosage Form:	for Injection

^a Black, S. Proprietary Name Review for (b) (4)*** (NDA 217202). Silver Spring (MD): FDA, CDER, OSE, DMEPA 2 (US); 2022 OCT 04. PNR ID No. 2022-1044724664.

^b Kundreskas, J. Proprietary Name Review for (b) (4)*** (NDA 217202). Silver Spring (MD): FDA, CDER, OSE, DMEPA 2 (US); 2023 FEB 13. PNR ID No. 2022-1044724844.

^c Request for Proprietary Name Review for Rapiblyk (NDA 217202). Vienna (Austria): AOP Orphan Pharmaceuticals GmbH; 2024 MAY 29. Available from: <\\CDSESUB1\EVSPROD\nda217202\0032\m1\us\118-proprietary-names\request-for-proprietary-name-review.pdf>.

^d Proposed prescribing information for Rapiblyk. Vienna (Austria): AOP Orphan Pharmaceuticals GmbH; 2024 JUN 06. Available from: <\\CDSESUB1\EVSPROD\nda217202\0033\m1\us\114-labeling\draft\labeling\draft-labeling-text.pdf>.

Table 1. Relevant Product Information for Rapiblyk			
Strength:	280 mg/vial		
Route of administration:	Intravenous infusion		
Dose and frequency:	Administer as a continuous intravenous infusion, titrating as needed for heart rate control.		
	There (b) (4) beyond 24 hours.		
		Normal cardiac function	Impaired cardiac function (b) (4)
	Starting dose	9.3 mcg/kg/min	(b) (4) mcg/kg/min
	Titration interval	10 min	15 min
	Titration step	9.3 mcg/kg/min	(b) (4) mcg/kg/min
	Maximum dose	37.3 mcg/kg/min	37.3 mcg/kg/min
How Supplied:	As a white to almost white lyophilized powder in single dose vials containing 280 mg landiolol for injection (equivalent to 300 mg landiolol HCl). Each vial is supplied in a carton.		
Storage:	Store unreconstituted product at 20°C to 25°C (68°F to 77°F) [see USP Controlled Room Temperature], with excursions permitted to 15°C to 30°C (59°F to 86°F).		

2 DISCUSSION

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

2.1 MISBRANDING ASSESSMENT

The Office of Prescription Drug Promotion (OPDP) determined that Rapiblyk would not misbrand the proposed product. The Division of Medication Error Prevention and Analysis 2 (DMEPA 2) concurred with the findings of OPDP's assessment for Rapiblyk. The Division of Cardiology and Nephrology (DCN) concurred with the findings of OPDP's assessment for Rapiblyk.

2.2 SAFETY ASSESSMENT

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

2.2.1 UNITED STATES ADOPTED NAMES (USAN) SEARCH

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

2.2.2 COMPONENTS OF THE PROPOSED PROPRIETARY NAME

AOP did not provide a derivation or intended meaning for the proposed proprietary name, Rapiblyk, in their submission. 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.

2.2.3 COMMENTS FROM OTHER REVIEW DISCIPLINES AT INITIAL REVIEW

On June 17, 2024, the Division of Cardiology and Nephrology (DCN) did not forward any comments or concerns relating to Rapiblyk at the initial phase of the review.

2.2.4 FDA PRESCRIPTION SIMULATION STUDIES

Ninety (90) practitioners participated in DMEPA's prescription simulation studies for Rapiblyk.

One inpatient study participant misinterpreted the proposed proprietary name as "Rapifylk", which is a close variation of the product "Rapiflux". We evaluated this name pair based on this misinterpretation.

Rapiblyk vs. Rapiflux

Orthographically, Rapiblyk contains the downstroke letter 'y' and the upstroke letter 'k' in the suffix while Rapiflux has a cross stroke letter 'x' in the suffix which provide some differences when scripted.

Phonetically, the last syllables ('blik' vs. 'flux') sound different.

Although both products are single strength products (280 mg/vial and 20 mg), where the strength may be omitted on an order, the products differ in dosage form (for injection vs. tablet), route (intravenous infusion vs. oral), and frequency (continuous intravenous infusion titrated as needed for heart rate control vs. once or twice daily).

Rapiflux is a deactivated branded generic of fluoxetine hydrochloride 20 mg tablet (last price effective date 10/30/2005) without an assigned Orange Book code per Redbook. Thus, it does not appear to be therapeutically equivalent to another fluoxetine hydrochloride product.

Thus, in this specific case, we find the risk of name confusion between the name pair is minimized (see Appendix E).

The remaining 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.

^e USAN stem search conducted on July 17, 2024.

2.2.5 PHONETIC AND ORTHOGRAPHIC COMPUTER ANALYSIS (POCA) SEARCH RESULTS

Our POCA search^f identified 33 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 2 below.

2.2.6 NAMES RETRIEVED FOR REVIEW ORGANIZED BY NAME PAIR SIMILARITY

Table 2 provides the number of names retrieved from our POCA search. These name pairs are organized as highly similar, moderately similar, or low similarity for further evaluation.

Table 2. Names Retrieved for Review Organized by Name Pair Similarity	
Similarity Category	Number of Names
Highly similar name pair: combined match percentage score $\geq 70\%$	2
Moderately similar name pair: combined match percentage score $\geq 55\%$ to $\leq 69\%$	31
Low similarity name pair: combined match percentage score $\leq 54\%$	0

2.2.7 SAFETY ANALYSIS OF NAMES WITH POTENTIAL ORTHOGRAPHIC, SPELLING, AND PHONETIC SIMILARITIES

Our analysis of the 33 names contained in Table 2 determined none of the names will pose a risk for confusion with Rapiblyk as described in Appendices C through H.

2.2.8 COMMUNICATION OF DMEPA'S DETERMINATION

On August 26, 2024, DMEPA 2 communicated our determination to the Division of Cardiology and Nephrology (DCN).

3 CONCLUSION

The proposed proprietary name, Rapiblyk, is conditionally acceptable.

3.1 COMMENTS TO AOP ORPHAN PHARMACEUTICALS GMBH

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

^f POCA search conducted on July 17, 2024 in version 5.9.

4 REFERENCES

1. *United States Adopted Names (USAN) Stems*

USAN Stems List contains all the recognized USAN stems, available at <https://www.ama-assn.org/about/united-states-adopted-names/united-states-adopted-names-approved-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 <https://www.fda.gov/drugs/drug-approvals-and-databases/drugsfda-glossary-terms>).

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>).

Purple Book

The Purple Book is an online database that contains information about biological products, including biosimilar and interchangeable biological products, licensed (approved) by the FDA under the Public Health Service (PHS) Act. See Purple Book: Lists of Licensed Biological Products with Reference Product Exclusivity and Biosimilarity or Interchangeability Evaluations, available at <https://www.fda.gov/drugs/therapeutic-biologics-applications-bla/purple-book-lists-licensed-biological-products-reference-product-exclusivity-and-biosimilarity-or>.

Division of Medication Errors Prevention and Analysis pending proprietary name requests

This is a list of proposed and pending names that is generated by the Division of Medication Error Prevention and Analysis.

5 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, the Office of Prescription Drug Promotion (OPDP) assesses the name for misbranding concerns. For over-the-counter (OTC) drug products, the misbranding assessment of the proposed name is conducted by the Office of Non-Prescription Drugs (ONPD). OPDP or ONPD 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 ONPD 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 3*. 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.⁹

*Table 3. 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.

⁹ National Coordinating Council for Medication Error Reporting and Prevention. <https://www.nccmerp.org/about-medication-errors>. Last accessed 10/05/2020.

*Table 3. 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 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, Purple Book, 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 4-6) 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 4).
- Moderately similar names are further evaluated to identify the presence of attributes that are known to cause name confusion.
 - o 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^h. 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.

- o 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 5).
 - Names with low similarity that have no overlap or similarity in strength and dose are generally acceptable (See Table 6) 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.
- c. FDA Prescription Simulation Studies: DMEPA also conducts 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), Office of Generic Drugs (OGD), and/or Office of Pharmaceutical Quality (OPQ) 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.

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

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 OPQ 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 Safety Evaluator 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 4. 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.			
Orthographic Checklist		Phonetic Checklist	
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 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 5: 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 with 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	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: Moderately Similar Name Pair Checklist (i.e., combined score is $\geq 55\%$ to $\leq 69\%$).

	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?	
--	--	--

Table 6. 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. Rapiblyk Study (Conducted on 6/7/2024)

Handwritten Medication Order Prescription	Verbal Prescription
<u>Medication Order:</u> Rapiblyk Begin infusion at 650 mcg/min and titrate every 10 minutes	Rapiblyk Bring to Clinic Dispense 1 vial
<u>Outpatient Prescription:</u> Rapiblyk Bring to clinic #1	
CPOE Study Sample (displayed as sans-serif, 12-point, bold font) Rapiblyk	

FDA Prescription Simulation Responses (Aggregate Report)					
Study Name: Rapiblyk					
People Received Study: 196					
People Responded: 90					
Total	20	28	20	22	90
INTERPRETATION	INPATIENT	OUTPATIENT	VOICE	CPOE	TOTAL
PAPIBLYK	0	1	0	0	1
RAPIBLELE	0	1	0	0	1
RAPIBLEQ	0	0	1	0	1
RAPIBLIC	0	0	2	0	2
RAPIBLICK	0	0	4	0	4
RAPIBLIK	0	0	5	0	5
RAPIBLIP	0	0	1	0	1
RAPIBLIQ	0	0	4	0	4
RAPIBLIYK	0	1	0	0	1
RAPIBLYFE	0	1	0	0	1
RAPIBLYK	16	23	0	22	61
RAPIBLYYK	1	0	0	0	1
RAPIDBLYK	0	1	0	0	1
RAPIFLYK	1	0	0	0	1
RAPIFYK	1	0	0	0	1
RAPILLYK	1	0	0	0	1
RAPPIBLIC	0	0	1	0	1
RAPPYBLICK	0	0	1	0	1
RAPYBLIK	0	0	1	0	1

APPENDIX C. HIGHLY SIMILAR NAMES (e.g., combined POCA score is ≥70%)

No.	Proposed name: Rapiblyk Pronunciation: RAP-ee-blik Established name: landiolol Dosage form: for Injection Strength(s): 280 mg/vial Dosage: Give by intravenous infusion. Start at 9.3 mcg/kg/min and titrate every 10 minutes by 9.3 mcg/kg/min to a maximum of 37.3 mcg/kg/min. Alternatively, start at ^{(b) (4)} mcg/kg/min and titrate every 10 minutes by ^{(b) (4)} mcg/kg/min to a maximum of 37.3 mcg/kg/min.	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.	Rapiblyk	100	This name is the subject of this review.
2.	^{(b) (4)} ***	85	Proposed proprietary name for NDA 217202 was found unacceptable by DMEPA (OSE# 2022-1044724664) due to marketed products. Another name, ^{(b) (4)} , was submitted and was also found unacceptable (OSE # 2022-1044724844) due to a marketed product. The proposed proprietary name for NDA 217202, Rapiblyk***, was submitted and is the subject of this review.

APPENDIX D. MODERATELY SIMILAR NAMES (e.g., combined POCA score is ≥55% to ≤69%) with no overlap or numerical similarity in Strength and/or Dose

No.	Name	POCA Score (%)
1.	N/A	

APPENDIX E. MODERATELY SIMILAR NAMES (e.g., combined POCA score is ≥55% to ≤69%) with overlap or numerical similarity in Strength and/or Dose

No.	Proposed name: Rapiblyk Pronunciation: RAP-ee-blik Established name: landiolol Dosage form: for Injection Strength(s): 280 mg/vial Dosage: Give by intravenous infusion. Start at 9.3 mcg/kg/min and titrate every 10 minutes by 9.3 mcg/kg/min to a maximum of 37.3 mcg/kg/min. Alternatively, start at ^{(b) (4)} mcg/kg/min and titrate every 10 minutes by ^{(b) (4)} mcg/kg/min to a maximum of 37.3 mcg/kg/min.	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.	Rapiflux	66	See FMEA in Section 2.2.4.
1.	Ribapak	64	This name pair has sufficient orthographic and phonetic differences.
2.	Rapivab	63	Orthographically, the suffixes differ in shape where Rapiblyk contains 3 upstrokes and a downstroke ('blyk') and Rabivab contains one upstroke and no downstrokes ('vab'). Phonetically, the third syllables ('blik' vs. 'rab') sound different.
3.	^{(b) (4)} ***	62	This name pair has sufficient orthographic and phonetic differences.
4.	Ramipril	60	This name pair has sufficient orthographic and phonetic differences.
5.	Brevibloc	58	This name pair has sufficient orthographic and phonetic differences.
6.	Rapaflo	58	Orthographically, Rapiblyk contains the dotted letter 'i' in the infix while Rapaflo contains the rounded letter 'a' in the infix which differ in shape. Rapiblyk also contains the downstroke letter 'y' and the upstroke letter 'k' in the suffix while Rapaflo has the rounded 'o' which

No.	Proposed name: Rapiblyk Pronunciation: RAP-ee-blik Established name: landiolol Dosage form: for Injection Strength(s): 280 mg/vial Dosage: Give by intravenous infusion. Start at 9.3 mcg/kg/min and titrate every 10 minutes by 9.3 mcg/kg/min to a maximum of 37.3 mcg/kg/min. Alternatively, start at ^{(b) (4)} mcg/kg/min and titrate every 10 minutes by ^{(b) (4)} mcg/kg/min to a maximum of 37.3 mcg/kg/min.	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
			provide sufficient visual differences when scripted. This name pair has sufficient phonetic differences. There is no direct overlap in strength (280 mg/vial vs. 4 mg and 8 mg), and since Rapaflo is available in multiple strengths, a strength would need to be specified on a prescription for Rapaflo. The products also differ in dosage form (for injection vs. capsule), route (intravenous infusion vs. oral), and frequency (continuous infusion titrated as needed for heart rate control vs. once daily). Thus, in this specific case, the risk of name confusion between the name pair is minimized in this case.
7.	^{(b) (4)} ***	56	^{(b) (4)}

No.	Proposed name: Rapiblyk Pronunciation: RAP-ee-blik Established name: landiolol Dosage form: for Injection Strength(s): 280 mg/vial Dosage: Give by intravenous infusion. Start at 9.3 mcg/kg/min and titrate every 10 minutes by 9.3 mcg/kg/min to a maximum of 37.3 mcg/kg/min. Alternatively, start at ^{(b) (4)} mcg/kg/min and titrate every 10 minutes by ^{(b) (4)} mcg/kg/min to a maximum of 37.3 mcg/kg/min.	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
			(b) (4)
8.	(b) (4) ***	56	This name pair has sufficient orthographic and phonetic differences.

No.	Proposed name: Rapiblyk Pronunciation: RAP-ee-blik Established name: landiolol Dosage form: for Injection Strength(s): 280 mg/vial Dosage: Give by intravenous infusion. Start at 9.3 mcg/kg/min and titrate every 10 minutes by 9.3 mcg/kg/min to a maximum of 37.3 mcg/kg/min. Alternatively, start at (b) (4) mcg/kg/min and titrate every 10 minutes by (b) (4) mcg/kg/min to a maximum of 37.3 mcg/kg/min.	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
9.	(b) (4) * * *	56	This name pair has sufficient orthographic and phonetic differences.
10.	Rucaparib	55	This name pair has sufficient orthographic and phonetic differences.

APPENDIX F: LOW SIMILARITY NAMES (e.g., combined POCA score is ≤54%)

No.	Name	POCA Score (%)
1.	N/A	

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
2.	(b) (4) * * *	64	(b) (4)
3.	Trapidil	61	Name identified in RxNorm database. Unable to find product characteristics in commonly used drug databases.

No.	Name	POCA Score (%)	Failure preventions
4.	Urapidil	61	Name identified in RxNorm database. Unable to find product characteristics in commonly used drug databases.
5.	Raplixa	60	Name identified in RxNorm database. Product is deactivated and no generic equivalents are available.
6.	Ramiprilat	58	Name identified in RxNorm database. Unable to find product characteristics in commonly used drug databases.
7.	Rapinovel	57	Name identified in RxNorm database. Unable to find product characteristics in commonly used drug databases.
8.	Rabdolax	56	Name identified in RxNorm database. Unable to find product characteristics in commonly used drug databases.
9.	Rapi-Ject	56	Product is not a drug. It is a fluid delivery tubing that is discontinued per Redbook.
10.	(b) (4) ***	56	(b) (4)
11.	Renapulus	56	Veterinary product.
12.	Respillin	55	Name identified in RxNorm database. Unable to find product characteristics in commonly used drug databases.

APPENDIX H. Names not likely to be confused due to absence of attributes that are known to cause name confusionⁱ.

No.	Name	POCA Score (%)
-----	------	----------------

ⁱ 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 (%)
1.	Acid Black 52	62
2.	(b) (4) ***	60
3.	Prepopik	58
4.	Primabalt	58
5.	Ivy Block	56
6.	Pre Milk	56
7.	Vaniply	56
8.	Kraftpleg	55
9.	Prepidil	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/

JODY K KUNDRESKAS
08/26/2024 02:13:28 PM

NICOLE F IVERSON
08/26/2024 03:14:20 PM

HINA S MEHTA
08/27/2024 11:18:00 AM

PROPRIETARY NAME REVIEW

Division of Medication Error Prevention and Analysis 2 (DMEPA 2)
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:	02/13/2023
Application Type and Number:	NDA 217202
Product Name and Strength:	(b) (4) (landiolol) for injection, 280 mg/vial
Product Type:	Single Ingredient Product
Rx or OTC:	Prescription (Rx)
Applicant/Sponsor Name:	AOP Orphan Pharmaceuticals HmbH (AOP)
PNR ID #:	2022-1044724844
DMEPA 2 Safety Evaluator:	Jody Kundreskas, PharmD
DMEPA 2 Team Leader:	Hina Mehta, PharmD
DMEPA 2 Deputy Director:	Chi-Ming (Alice) Tu, PharmD

32 Page(s) have been Withheld in Full as
b4 (CCI/TS) immediately following this
page

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/

JODY K KUNDRESKAS
02/13/2023 10:27:00 AM

HINA S MEHTA
02/13/2023 11:28:11 AM

CHI-MING TU
02/13/2023 11:52:57 AM

PROPRIETARY NAME REVIEW

Division of Medication Error Prevention and Analysis 2 (DMEPA 2)
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:	October 04, 2022
Application Type and Number:	NDA 217202
Product Name and Strength:	(b) (4) (landiolol hydrochloride) for injection, 300 mg/vial
Product Type:	Single Ingredient Product
Rx or OTC:	Prescription (Rx)
Applicant/Sponsor Name:	AOP Orphan Pharmaceuticals GMBH (AOP)
PNR ID #:	2022-1044724664
DMEPA 2 Safety Evaluator:	Sue Black, PharmD
DMEPA 2 Team Leader:	Hina Mehta, PharmD
DMEPA 2 Associate Director for Nomenclature and Labeling:	Chi-Ming (Alice) Tu, PharmD

23 Page(s) have been Withheld in Full as b4
(CCI/TS) immediately following this page

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/

SUE L BLACK
10/04/2022 06:02:50 PM

HINA S MEHTA
10/05/2022 12:19:49 PM

CHI-MING TU
10/05/2022 02:23:29 PM