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misbranded (monograph conditions) will be effective 12 months after the date of publication of the final monograph in the Federal Register. On or after that date, no OTC drug products that are subject to the monograph and contain nonmonograph condition(s), i.e., conditions that would cause the drug to be not generally recognized as safe and effective or to be misbranded, may be initially introduced or initially delivered for introduction into interstate commerce unless they are the subject of an approved new drug application. Further, any OTC drug products subject to this monograph that are relabeled after the effective date of the monograph must be in compliance with the monograph regardless of the date the product was initially introduced or initially delivered for introduction into interstate commerce. Manufacturers are encouraged to comply voluntarily with the monograph at the earliest possible date.

In the advance notice of proposed rulemaking for OTC external analgesic drug products (published in the Federal Register of December 4, 1979 (44 FR 69768)), the agency suggested that the conditions included in the monograph (Category I) be effective 30 days after the date of publication of the final monograph in the Federal Register and that the conditions excluded from the monograph (Category II) be eliminated from OTC drug products effective 6 months after the date of publication of the final monograph, regardless of whether further testing was undertaken to justify their future use. Experience has shown that relabeling of products covered by the monograph is necessary in order for manufacturers to comply with the monograph. New products containing the monograph labeling have to be written, ordered, received, and incorporated into the manufacturing process. The agency has determined that it is impractical to expect new labeling to be in effect 30 days after the date of publication of the final monograph. Experience has shown also that if the deadline for relabeling is too short, the agency is burdened with extension requests and related paperwork.

In addition, some products have to be reformulated to comply with the monograph. Reformulation often involves the need to do stability testing on the new product. An accelerated aging process may be used to test a new formulation; however, if the stability testing is not successful, and if further reformulation is required, there could be a further delay in having a new product available for manufacture.

The agency wishes to establish a reasonable period of time for relabeling and reformulation in order to avoid an unnecessary disruption of the marketplace that could not only result in economic loss, but also interfere with consumers’ access to safe and effective drug products. Therefore, the agency is proposing that the final monograph be effective 12 months after the date of its publication in the Federal Register. The agency believes that with 12 months after the date of publication most manufacturers can order new labeling and have their products in compliance in the marketplace. However, if the agency determines that any labeling for a condition included in the final monograph should be implemented sooner, a shorter deadline may be established. Similarly, if a safety problem is identified for a particular nonmonograph condition, a shorter deadline may be set for removal of that condition from OTC drug products.

All "OTC Volumes" cited throughout this document refer to the submissions made by interested persons pursuant to the call-for-data notice published in the Federal Register of July 21, 1972 (37 FR 14633) or to additional information that has come to the agency's attention since publication of the advance notice of proposed rulemaking. The volumes are on public display in the Dockets Management Branch.

In the Federal Register of September 7, 1982 (47 FR 39412), FDA issued a notice of reopening of the administrative record for OTC external analgesic drug products to allow for consideration of the Miscellaneous External Panel's recommendations on external analgesic drug products used for the treatment of diaper rash, for prevention of poison ivy, oak, and sumac, for the treatment of fever blisters, as wall, desensitizers, as astringents, and as insect bite neutralizers. The agency will address the use of external analgesic active ingredients for these uses in this rulemaking in a future issue of the Federal Register.

I. The Agency's Tentative Conclusions on the Comments

A. General Comments on External Analgesic Drug Products

1. One comment contended that OTC drug monographs are interpretive, as opposed to substantive, regulations. The comment referred to statements on this issue submitted earlier to other OTC rulemaking proceedings.

The agency addressed this issue in paragraphs 65 through 67 of the preamble to the procedures for classification of OTC drug products, published in the Federal Register of May 11, 1972 (37 FR 9464) and in paragraph 3 of the preamble to the tentative final monograph for antacid drug products, published in the Federal Register of November 12, 1972 (38 FR 31260). The FDA reaffirms the conclusions stated there. Subsequent court decisions have confirmed the agency's authority to issue substantive regulations by rulemaking. See, e.g., National Nutritional Foods Association v. Weinberger, 512 F.2d 888, 896-98 (2d Cir. 1975) and National Association of Pharmaceutical Manufacturers v. FDA, 467 F. Supp. 412 (S.D.N.Y. 1980), aff'd, 637 F.2d 887 (2d Cir. 1981).

2. One comment stated that two products, both containing the active ingredients camphor, menthol, eugenol, and eucalyptus oil, had "grandfathered" status under section 201(p)(1) of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act (the act) (21 U.S.C. 321(p)(1)). The comment pointed out that, although these products do not comply with the Panel's recommended monograph because of their high level of camphor, they have been continuously marketed since 1923. The comment argued that, because of the grandfather status, the conclusions of the OTC drug review should not be applicable to these products.

The agency points out that after this comment was submitted the two products were reformulated to reduce the concentration of camphor from 25 percent to 11 percent, in conformance with the Panel's recommendations. Consequently, the question of grandfather status for those 25 percent products is moot.

The "grandfather" clause in the act of 1938 is not applicable to any drug relabeled or reformulated after June 25, 1938. Similarly, a drug marketed before the 1962 amendments to the act, which was not, then a new drug or covered by a new drug application, is subject to the provisions of these amendments regarding effectiveness if the drug has been reformulated or relabeled. The 1938 and 1962 grandfather clauses apply only to the new drug provisions of the act and not to the adulteration or misbranding provisions. The OTC drug review was designed to implement both the misbranding and the new drug provisions of the act. Therefore, the grandfather clauses do not provide the agency from reviewing any currently marketed OTC drug, regardless of whether it has grandfather protection from the new drug provisions, in order to ensure that the drug is not misbranded.
B. Comments on External Analgesic Ingredients.

3. A number of comments expressed opinions that the Panel’s recommended switch of hydrocortisone to OTC marketing status. The comments that favored OTC marketing pointed out the long history of experience with this drug as well as the savings to the consumer from OTC availability. Several comments stated that the recommended OTC indications would permit informed and prudent use of hydrocortisone products by providing consumers with appropriate examples of self-diagnosable conditions for which hydrocortisone products provide appropriate therapy. Opposing comments stated that hydrocortisone is likely to be used inappropriately because the average consumer is unable to distinguish between a simple rash and such skin conditions as herpes simplex, scabies, seborrhic dermatoses, and tinea cruris (jock itch). The comments added that inappropriate treatment and delay in diagnosis might cause the conditions to spread or become worse at considerable cost to the consumer.

The agency agrees with the Panel that the OTC marketing of hydrocortisone is of significant benefit to consumers because it provides them with an effective drug for self-treatment of certain minor skin irritations. The indications for OTC use are for self-limiting, self-diagnosable conditions. The warning proposed in § 348.50(c)(1)(iii) of this tentative final monograph, "If condition worsens, if symptoms persist for more than 7 days or clear up and occur again within a few days, discontinue use of this product and consult a physician or doctor," is intended to prevent unlimited consumer use of these products for serious conditions that require professional treatment. (See comment 27 below.) The agency tentatively concludes that hydrocortisone is safe and effective for its labeled OTC uses and that the benefits of OTC availability outweigh any potential misuse that may occur.

4. Two comments form the same source requested that the maximum allowable concentration of camphor be reduced from 11 to 2.5 percent. The comments cited the long marketing history of a product containing a higher concentration of camphor with no reports of major problems.

The agency disagrees with the comments. The study submitted by one commenter to justify raising the camphor limit to 25 percent used traditional Draize procedures in which a product containing 25 percent camphor was applied to rabbits’ skin for 21 consecutive days (Ref. 1). This is a standard method of testing topical irritancy. The Panel stated that camphor concentrations above 11 percent is not harmful when used topically, but the Panel was concerned about poisoning if products containing higher concentrations were accidentally ingested (44 FR 69803). Eleven percent was chosen as a maximum limit by the Panel because higher concentrations are not any more effective as counterirritants, but can cause more serious adverse reactions if accidentally ingested. The agency concurs with the Panel’s conclusion.

Furthermore, the product discussed in the comment has been reformulated, lowering the camphor concentration from 25 percent to 11 percent (Ref. 2). The agency is not aware of counterirritant products containing more than 11 percent camphor now on the OTC market. Therefore, the agency finds no reason to consider camphor concentrations greater than 11 percent any further in this document.
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(1) Comment No. C000027, Docket No. 78N-0301, Dockets Management Branch.

5. A number of comments objected to the recommendations of the Miscellaneous External Panel, included in the rulemaking for external analgesic drug products on September 28, 1980 (45 FR 63878), that the quantity of camphor in OTC drug products be limited to 2.5 percent, that no package contain more than 300 milligrams (mg) of camphor, and that safety packaging be used. One comment argued that it is unacceptable to limit household drug products to 350 mg of camphor per container, which would be the equivalent of a small-size container for many products, on the basis that accidental ingestion of larger amounts may cause toxic effects.

Another comment argued that the Miscellaneous External Panel was wrong in basing its calculation of the toxic dose of 30 milligrams/kilogram (mg/kg) on a single report of death following ingestion by a 150-pound man of 2 grams (g) of camphor. The comment argued that other reports place the toxic dose higher than 30 mg/kg and that most of the reported cases of camphor poisoning may not be true poisonings with toxic signs and symptoms. The comment added that of 542 cases of camphor poisoning cited by the Poison Control Center for 1974, only 101 reported any symptoms, and of this number only 77 were hospitalized.

Several comments pointed out that there are no reported fatalities associated with products containing 11 percent or less camphor, and that most of the poisonings described by the Miscellaneous External Panel were due to ingestion of camphorated oil, which contains 20 percent camphor in oil. One comment pointed out that limiting the package size to avoid potential misuse would be a proper consideration for the Consumer Product Safety Commission under the provisions of the Poison Prevention Packaging Act, and should not be incorporated into an OTC drug monograph. Another comment argued that there was no justification for applying the recommendations of the Miscellaneous External Panel to nonliquid formulations of camphor because of the lower risk of ingestion of these formulations.

The agency notes that the Topical Analgesic Panel considered various comments, reports, and editorials submitted to it concerning the toxicity and frequency of poisonings from camphor-containing preparations, particularly in children because that population has the highest incidence of such toxicity. The Panel concluded that the cases of accidental ingestion of products containing 11 percent or less camphor by children rarely resulted in severe adverse reactions and that current regulations and labeling requirements are adequate. The agency has reviewed both panels’ recommendations and the adverse reaction reports for products containing camphor and concludes that, at this time, there is no need to limit camphor content to 360 mg per package for products covered by this tentative final monograph. The camphor concentration is being limited to 11 percent or lower as recommended by the Topical Analgesic Panel. (See comment number 4 above.)

A final rule declaring camphorated oil products to be new drugs and misbranded was published in the Federal Register of September 21, 1982 (47 FR 41716).

There are few reports of adverse reactions from ingestion of solid dosage forms containing camphor; however, the agency believes that safety packaging of liquid products would reduce the risk
that children might ingest these products. The agency strongly recommends that manufacturers voluntarily package such products in child-resistant containers. In addition, these products must bear the warning: "For external use only." The agency recommends that manufacturers voluntarily print this warning in a larger size print and/or in a different color from other information on the label to draw consumers' attention to it. The agency believes that if manufacturers take these additional steps, the number of accidental ingestions can be reduced.

One comment requested clarification of the gap between the dosage ranges for menthol as an analgesic, anesthetist, or antipruritist (0.1 to 1.0 percent) and as a counterirritant (1.25 to 16 percent). The Panel proposed two dosage ranges to emphasize the distinction between the different OTC uses of menthol and the different labeling associated with each use. The agency concurs with the Panel's recommendations of these dosage ranges.

7. Two comments submitted data on the effectiveness of trolamine salicylate (formally triethanolamine salicylate) as a topical analgesic. Based on these data, one of the comments suggested that the monograph include a class of external analgesics that "act upon painful structures below the skin by absorption of the active ingredient directly into subcutaneous structures" and that trolamine salicylate be placed in this class. The comment also suggested the following indications for this class: "For the temporary relief of minor aches, pains of muscles and joints. Also as a topical adjunct for pain due to arthritis and rheumatism." Both comments requested that trolamine salicylate be placed in Category I based on the data submitted.

The agency has reviewed the data submitted and concludes that the studies are not sufficient to support general recognition of effectiveness for trolamine salicylate as an OTC external analgesic.

The studies by Ehrlich (Ref. 1), Charles (Ref. 2), Brown (Ref. 3), and Roth (Ref. 4) were randomized, double-blind, crossover evaluations of 10 percent trolamine cream versus placebo. None of these studies reported any significant differences between active drug and placebo for any of the measurements recorded.

A double-blind, placebo-controlled, crossover study by Bateman and Sanders (Ref. 5) evaluated the effect of 10 percent trolamine salicylate in relieving the pain of arthritis of the hand in two groups of patients. In one group there was cumulative evidence of the superiority of the trolamine cream over placebo, whereas measurable indicators such as hand-grip strength and finger-joint circumference showed no statistically significant improvement. In the other group, trolamine salicylate showed no superiority over the placebo in any of the three measurable criteria. Thus, the testing study did not indicate any clear superiority of trolamine salicylate over placebo.

Golden (Ref. 6) compared topically applied 10 percent trolamine salicylate cream to oral aspirin in a double-blind parallel study of the relief of rheumatic pain, concluding that the topically applied trolamine salicylate was at least as effective as aspirin in providing pain relief. However, the study design had several deficiencies. History of aspirin use, effective dose, and adverse reactions were not recorded for each subject. Without this information about aspirin response, there is a potential for bias against aspirin in treatment response and adverse reactions.

Altshuler and Golden (Ref. 7) studied 10 percent trolamine salicylate cream in patients with musculoskeletal pain. Of the six results reported, one was statistically significant. Furthermore, the selective reporting of these six results renders this report uninformative, and no conclusions can be made concerning the effectiveness of trolamine salicylate.

Patel and Chappelle (Ref. 8) reported results observed from unblinded and uncontrolled clinical trials of trolamine salicylate in two French hospitals. The results cannot be assessed because of the lack of a control group.

The comments also included information on the trolamine salicylate, including in vivo studies in animals, a boiled-egg technique said to demonstrate penetration through protein, and a cup method to demonstrate penetration through muscle and connective tissue. This information is not adequate or suitable to demonstrate effectiveness of trolamine salicylate as a topical analgesic.

Because the submitted information fails to demonstrate that this ingredient would be effective for application at the site of pain or for any use as an external analgesic, the agency does not agree with the comments that trolamine salicylate should be placed in a new class of external analgesic drug products. Trolamine salicylate remains in Category III as an anesthetic, analgesic, and antipruritist in this tentative final monograph. The agency's detailed review of treatment and evaluation of the studies submitted are on file in the Dockets Management Branch (Refs. 9 and 10). In response to the agency's review, a comment submitted additional data on trolamine salicylate (Ref. 11). These data were submitted after the administrative record had closed and will be addressed after publication of this tentative final monograph.
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11. Comment Nos. CR.SUP002, CR001, AMD, and AMD002, Docket No. 78N-0031, Dockets Management Branch.

Comments on Combination Products

One comment argued against the Category III classification of a combination product containing two Category I ingredients and one ingredient classified in Category III for effectiveness. The comment objected to the entire product being placed in Category III, according to the Panel's recommendations, when there had been no question of the product's safety or the effectiveness of the two Category I active ingredients. The comment argued that rather than require reformulation of the product, which would require research, stability testing, and quality
control testing, relabeling to indicate that the Category III ingredient is an inactive ingredient should be permitted.

The agency has published a proposed rule dealing specifically with the use of active ingredients in OTC drug products. (See the Federal Register of April 12, 1977, 42 FR 19156.) The proposal identified suitable physical or technical combinations (e.g., denaturing agents, emollients, colorants, and active ingredients) that an inactive ingredient could perform to be regarded as appropriate for use in OTC drug products. The rule proposed to preclude the retention and redesignation of an active ingredient as an inactive ingredient unless it performs one of these functions. Although this proposal has not yet been published as a final rule, the agency does not sanction arbitrary redesignation to inactive status of ingredients that were submitted as active ingredients and for which data are insufficient to show effectiveness. If such ingredients were retained in a formulation and designated inactive, consumers would be needlessly exposed to them without any corresponding benefit. Many ingredients that are generally recognized as safe are still capable of causing side effects, allergic reactions, etc.

Paragraph 5 of the agency’s “General Guidelines for OTC Drug Combination Products” (Ref. 1) provides that “in some cases an ingredient may be appropriate for use only in a specific combination or may be available only to support the use of the ingredient in combination but not as a single ingredient. In such cases the ingredient will be placed in Category I for use only in permissible combinations and not as a single ingredient.” The comment did not mention the specific ingredients contained in its product, nor did it submit any data to support the use of the Category III ingredient in the combination product only. If data are submitted to support the use of the ingredient in the combination, i.e., showing contribution to the claimed effect, as required by 21 CFR 330.10(a)(iv), then it could be classified as Category I for use in the specific combination but not as a single ingredient.
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9. One comment from the author of the Panel’s minority report on combination products (44 FR 69787–89790), suggested a number of changes in the minority report, which, the comment stated, would make it consistent with the agency’s general guidelines for OTC drug combination products (Ref. 1), which were published after the agency adopted its report. The comment requested that the minority report, with suggested revisions, replace the combination policy recommended by the majority of the Panel members in § 348.20, adding that such a replacement would eliminate the provisions of the majority report that have no therapeutic or scientific basis.

The agency accepts the changes in the minority report and has considered these revisions along with the combination policy developed by the majority of the Panel and other comments received (see comments 8 above and comments 10, 11, and 12 below). The agency’s proposed regulations for combinations of OTC external analgesic active ingredients, based on the consideration of all these factors, are set forth in § 348.20 of this tentative final monograph. The agency believes these proposed regulations have therapeutic and scientific bases and are consistent with the regulations governing combinations of OTC active ingredients in § 330.10(a)(4)(iv) and the agency’s supplementary guidelines (Ref. 1). Therefore, the agency sees no reason for the revised minority report to replace the combination policy recommended by the majority of the Panel.
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11. One comment requested that hydrocortisone be allowed in combination with the ingredients in group II A (the “caine” type analgesics) listed at 44 FR 69786. The comment argued that to prohibit such combinations is a departure from the combination policy set forth in 21 CFR 330.10(a)(4)(iv), that the marketing history of these combinations in prescription products does not show any adverse reactions, and that the effectiveness of such combinations is well documented by the individual ingredients. Another comment requested that hydrocortisone combinations not be classified in Category II because there are various other pharmacological categories of drugs that can properly be combined with hydrocortisone, such as antiinflammatory agents or skin protectants. The comment requested that consideration be given to including under § 348.20(b) combinations of hydrocortisone with the other ingredients listed under recommended § 348.10(b).

The agency does not agree with the comments that hydrocortisone should be allowed to be marketed OTC in combination with other external analgesic active ingredients at this time. The “caine” type analgesics have indications similar to hydrocortisone, but have different mechanisms of action.
FDA's General Guidelines for OTC Drug Combination Products allow for such combinations if the combination is on a benefit-to-risk basis equal to or better than each active ingredient used alone at its therapeutic dose (Ref. 1). However, no evidence has been submitted demonstrating that the combination of hydrocortisone with a "caine" anesthetic would meet this criterion. If such data are received, the agency will consider an addition to § 348.20.

The agency notes that the Panel's recommended monograph for skin protectant drug products, published in the Federal Register of August 4, 1978 (43 FR 34628), provides for certain skin protectants to be labeled for the symptoms of oozing or weeping due to poison oak or poison ivy (§ 347.50(b)(6)), while the recommended monograph for external analgesic drug products includes relief of minor skin irritations, itching, and rash due to poison oak or poison ivy in the label indication for hydrocortisone (§ 348.50(b)(3)). The agency therefore will consider the combination of a skin protectant with hydrocortisone for treatment of the symptoms of poison oak or poison ivy. If data to support such a combination are submitted, combinations of antimicrobial agents and hydrocortisone were considered by the Antimicrobial II Panel in its report on antimicrobial drug products, published in the Federal Register of March 23, 1982 (47 FR 12480). Such combinations will be addressed in that rulemaking.
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13. One comment stated that the Panel's recommended concentration limits for phenol and camphor are not appropriate for a product containing a complex of the two ingredients and requested that 4.7 percent phenol combined with 10.8 percent camphor in light mineral oil be permitted in analgesic, anesthetic, and antipruritic drug products. The comment argued that the clathrate complex that is formed when camphor is combined with phenol significantly reduces the available phenol and camphor. The comment submitted data to show that the combination is less irritating than the same amount of phenol or camphor alone and added that, based on actual consumer use, a product containing this camphor/phenol combination produces remarkably little irritation or erythema (Ref. 1).

Another comment from a manufacturer of products containing camphorated metacresol, which is composed of camphor and metacresol in a 3:1-to-1 ratio, objected to the Category III status of 1 to 3 percent camphorated metacresol and the Category II status of camphorated metacresol over 3 percent concentration (Ref. 2). The comment explained that the action of cresol is not associated with protein binding and would not therefore encourage continued release of "free" metacresol. The comment stated that toxic doses of cresol far exceed the quantities released even by products containing 8 percent camphorated metacresol. The comment argued that its products, which contain from 4 to 88 percent camphorated metacresol (composed of 1 to 22 percent metacresol and 3 to 66 percent camphor), should be placed in Category I based on their long standing on safety and effectiveness, and on data showing that metacresol is the least toxic of the cresols, that metacresol is less toxic than phenol, and that the rate of absorption of metacresol depends more on the area covered than on the concentration (Ref. 3).

The Agency agrees with the comment and the Panel that phenol combined with camphor can be safely used at a higher concentration than phenol alone. Since the Panel adopted its report, the agency has verified that the amount of free phenol is reduced when camphor and phenol are combined (Ref. 4). Although the Panel recommended in its monograph a maximum level of 4 percent phenol and did not provide for a different concentration of phenol in combination with camphor, the Panel stated in its report that "When camphor is added to phenol, a liquid forms. This reduces the severity of the topical reaction and the absorption of phenol" (44 FR 56333). In addition, the summary minutes of the Panel's seventh meeting indicate that the Panel intended to place the combination of 4.7 percent phenol and 10.8 percent camphor into Category I for both safety and effectiveness (Ref. 5). The Panel concluded that both phenol and camphor as single ingredients are Category I. The Panel's Category I recommendation for the complex was inadvertently omitted from its recommended monograph.

Another panel, the Advisory Review Panel on OTC Antimicrobial Drug Products (Antimicrobial I Panel), stated that "when camphor is used with phenol in an oil formulation, the concentration of phenol should be no more than 5 percent" (39 FR 33133). In reviewing data on camphor/phenol combinations, the Antimicrobial I Panel concluded that "the presence of camphor also retards the absorption of phenol after topical application. A 1-hour exposure of the rat tail to a 4.8 percent aqueous solution resulted in the absorption of 71 mg of phenol; whereas, the exposure to 10 percent camphor combined with 4.5 percent phenol resulted in the absorption of only 16 mg of phenol" (39 FR 33122). The agency concluded in the tentative final monograph for OTC topical antimicrobial drug products that "the total concentration of phenol in powders and in aqueous, alcoholic or oil formulations be restricted to less than 1.5 percent. When camphor is used with phenol in an oil formulation, the concentration of phenol should be no more than 5 percent" (43 FR 12388). To reduce the irritating potential of phenol when concentrations of 0.7 percent are used, camphor must be present in an excess of that concentration (Refs. 1 and 4). Accordingly, the agency is proposing that 4.7 percent phenol, when it is combined with 10.8 percent camphor, be included in the tentative final monograph. The agency is proposing to add new paragraph (b)(4) to § 348.20 to read as follows:

(4) Camphor and phenol identified in § 348.10(b)(3) and (6) may be combined in a light mineral oil, USP vehicle.

At this time, the agency is proposing to restrict the vehicle to light mineral oil, USP, because safety and effectiveness have been established in that vehicle only. Different vehicles can change the irritant properties of the combination (Refs. 6 and 7). There is evidence that vehicles containing excipients such as silica, diethylcarbamazine, silicone, and other vehicles are classified as Category III at this time. Interested persons may submit data to support the use of other vehicles.
Regarding camphorated metacresol, the Panel stated that it is either a "complex" formed by the interaction of camphor with metacresol or a solution of the cresol in camphor. Since the panel adopted its report, the agency has determined that metacresol behaves similarly to phenol with respect to bonding with camphor and therefore can be considered a "complex" and categorized as camphorated metacresol (Ref. 4).

As a single ingredient, metacresol was not reviewed by the Panel. However, it has been shown to be somewhat less toxic than phenol based on the following LD₅₀ data (Ref. 3):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Species</th>
<th>Route</th>
<th>Metacresol</th>
<th>Phenol</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mouse</td>
<td>Subcutaneous</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>0.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cat</td>
<td>Subcutaneous</td>
<td>0.18</td>
<td>0.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dog</td>
<td>Subcutaneous</td>
<td>0.46</td>
<td>0.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rat</td>
<td>Intravenous</td>
<td>0.28</td>
<td>0.18</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The results indicate that the range of acute toxicity of metacresol is similar to that of phenol.

Based on the available information, which includes recognition of the combination of phenol and camphor as Category I data showing metacresol is equal to or less toxic than phenol, and the new data showing that metacresol bonds to camphor similarly to phenol, the agency concludes that camphorated metacresol is Category I but only when prepared from camphor and metacresol combined in a 3-to-1 ratio not to exceed a concentration of 10.8 percent camphor. Based on a 3-to-1 ratio of camphor to metacresol with a limit of 10.8 percent camphor, the upper limit for metacresol is 3.6 percent. This 3-to-1 ratio results in reduced irritation (Ref. 2). The agency is proposing a lower limit of 1 percent metacresol based on information on marketed products submitted by the comment (Ref. 2). Accordingly, the agency is proposing to add new paragraph (b) to § 348.3, Definitions, in this tentative final monograph to read as follows:

(b) Camphorated metacresol: a complex consisting of camphor and metacresol combined in a ratio of 3 parts camphor to 1 part metacresol. The comment did not provide sufficient data to establish general recognition of safety of a concentration of metacresol greater than 3.6 percent when this ingredient is combined with camphor. The studies reviewed by the Panel and the studies submitted by the comment (Ref. 2) were very limited in scope and are inadequate to demonstrate safety of higher concentrations. Most of the animal toxicity studies tested only one animal, observed the animal only for a short period of time, and did not include a detailed examination of the animal following drug application. The comment's statements about rate of release of metacresol are unproven because the comment submitted no information on the quantity of metacresol under the conditions of use. The comment also did not submit any data to support the safety of concentrations of camphor above 10.8 percent.

In regard to the comment's claim of "long history of safe use," marketing history alone cannot be regarded as adequate proof of safety. The safety of camphorated metacresol as an external analgesic above the established dosage (not to exceed 3.6 percent metacresol and 10.8 percent camphor) has not been established, and therefore concentrations above this dosage remain in Category III.

References

D. Comment on Testing of External Analgesic Drug Products
14. One comment suggested several methods for testing the actions, effects, and efficacy of external analgesic ingredients. These included a laboratory animal study utilizing trilamine salicylate tagged with Carbon-14 to determined the degree of local penetration and distribution of this ingredient and developing a model to study the effects of topical applied trilamine salicylate on local tissue prostaglandin levels. In addition, the comment suggested a method of testing external analgesic ingredients in humans that is detailed in a published study and involves inducing muscle soreness by a controlled amount of exercise and measuring the bioelectrical activity of the muscle by electromyography before and after external analgesic use to determine muscle soreness and the extent of drug activity (Ref. 1).

In the Federal Register of September 29, 1981, (46 FR 47740), the agency published a policy statement that included procedures for the submission and review of proposed testing protocols, for agency meetings with industry or other interested persons, and for agency communications on submitted test data and other information. Under this policy, the agency provides consultation on protocols or test guidelines, but these communications are not included in the administrative record for the related OTC drug monograph unless they directly influence an agency decision on a particular matter in the monograph or provide the substantiation for the agency's decision on that matter. For example, a protocol or test guideline would not normally become part of the administrative record, but the results of the study would be included in the administrative record. The testing methods suggested by the comment do not influence the agency's decision on the Category III status of trilamine salicylate; therefore, they will not be discussed further in this document.
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E. Comments on Labeling of External Analgesic Drug Products
15. Several comments objected to the agency's policy of specifying a limited list of terms as the only permissible indications for external analgesic products. One of the comments argued that it is improper and inappropriate to legislate the use of words and phrases through a rulemaking. One comment stated that the agency lacks statutory authority to prescribe exclusive lists of terms. All the comments requested that the final monograph allow the use of alternative or additional labeling terms that are truthful, accurate, not
misleading, and intelligible to the
consumer.

During the course of the OTC drug
review, the agency has maintained that
a monograph describing the conditions
under which an OTC drug will be
generally recognized as safe and
effective and not misbranded must
include both specific active ingredients
and specific labeling. (This policy has
become known as the "exclusivity
rule"). The agency's position has been
that it is necessary to limit the
acceptable labeling language to that
developed and approved through the
OTC drug review process in order to
ensure the proper and safe use of OTC
drugs. The agency has never contended,
however, that any list of terms
developed during the course of the
review literally exhausts all the
possibilities of terms that appropriately
can be used in OTC drug labeling.
Suggestions for additional terms or for
other labeling changes may be
submitted as comments to proposed or
tentative final monographs within the
specified time periods or through
petitions to amend monographs under
§ 330.10(a)(12). For example, the labeling
proposed in this tentative final
monograph has been expanded and
revised in response to comments
received.

During the course of the review,
FDA's position on the "exclusivity rule"
has been questioned many times in
comments and objections filed in
response to particular proceedings and
in correspondence with the agency. The
agency has also been asked by The
Proprietary Association to reconsider its
position. To assist the agency in
resolving this policy, FDA conducted an
open public forum on September 29, 1982
at which interested parties presented
their views. The forum was a legislative
type administrative hearing under 21
CFR Part 15 that was held in response to
a request for a hearing on the tentative
final monograph for nighttime sleep-aids
and stimulants (published in the Federal
The agency's final decision on this issue
will be announced in the Federal
Register following conclusion of its
review of the material presented at the
hearing.

19. One comment disagreed with the
Panel's recommendations that active
ingredients and the quantity of the
ingredient be listed in the labeling of
OTC external analgesic drug products.
The comment argued that a list of
inactive ingredients would be
meaningless to all but a few consumers
and that such a list might
overemphasize the importance of the
inactive ingredients, obscure more
meaningful information such as
warnings or directions for use, and be
more confusing than helpful. The
Comment also stated that if the quantity
of the inactive ingredients had to be
listed there would be an additional
problem of changing the labels
every time the quantity of an inactive
ingredient is changed.

The agency agrees with part of the
Panel's recommendation. The Federal
Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act does not
require the identification of all inactive
ingredients in the labeling of OTC drug
products. Section 502(e)(21 U.S.C.
352(e)) does require disclosure of active
ingredients and of certain ingredients,
whether included as active or inactive
components in a product. Although the
inclusion of all inactive ingredients in
OTC drug product labeling is not
required, the agency urges
manufacturers to list all inactive
ingredients voluntarily, as suggested by
the Panel. Consumers with known
allergies or intolerance to certain
ingredients could then select products
with increased confidence of safe use.

With regard to listing the quantity of
inactive ingredients, section 502(e)(21
U.S.C. 352(e)) limits the requirement for
stating the quantity of active ingredients
in OTC labeling to those specifically
named in that section. The agency
cannot require listing of the quantity of
any ingredient, whether active or
inactive, in OTC drug products, except
those designated in the act.

17. One comment questioned the
Panel's qualifications and competence
to evaluate and judge what message
was being communicated to the
consumer, expressed in lay terms, in its
recommended labeling. The comment
stated that in many cases the words and
phrases recommended by the Panel
were based on the Panel's own
perceptions as to what the terms
communicate to the consumer and that
the Panel did not provide any
documentation, surveys, etc., to support
its findings.

Since its inception, the OTC drug
review has focused on developing
labeling of OTC drug products that can
be understood by the average consumer.
While the agency acknowledges that
professional experience in mass
communication was not a criterion for
participation in the OTC drug advisory
review panels, the clinical background
of the physicians, pharmacists, and
other health professionals on each panel
involved direct experience with patients
and an awareness of the terms used by
them to refer to their symptoms. In
addition to members of the scientific
and medical communities, each panel
included representatives from industry
and consumer groups and thus had
access to the experience of these groups
in mass communication of medical
terminology. Finally, any citizen
interested in doing so could participate
in the OTC drug review by presenting
views at panel meetings, and, now that
the panels have concluded their
reviews, by commenting on advance
notices of proposed rulemaking or by
commenting or objecting to tentative
final monographs proposed by the
agency. A number of changes in the
Panel's recommended labeling of
external analgesic drug products have been
incorporated into the agency's proposed
labeling as a result of comments
received. The agency urges anyone
having suggestions for making the
labeling language used in the external
analgesic final monograph more
understandable to the average consumer
to submit these suggestions in comments
responding to this document. After a
final monograph for external analgesic
drug products is issued, suggestions may be
made in the form of a
petition to amend the monograph
according to the procedures described in

18. One comment to the advance
notice of proposed rulemaking for OTC
cold, cough, allergy, bronchodilator, and
antihistaminic drug products (published
in the Federal Register of September 9,
1978; 41 FR 38312) requested that OTC
external analgesic drug products be
included in the table at 41 FR 38320 that
listed specific symptoms and the
corresponding pharmacologic groups of
drugs for the treatment of these
symptoms. The comment suggested that
item 8 of the table, "Generalized
aching," be expanded to include the
Category I labeling indications for
topical analgesics, counterirritants, and
rubefacients recommended by the
Topical Analgesic Panel.

The agency does not agree that
external analgesic drug products are
suitable for inclusion in item 8 of the
Cough/Cold Panel's table because this
inclusion would imply that external
analgesics should be labeled for relief of
symptoms of aching due to common
cold. The agency is not aware of any
data, nor were any submitted, indicating
that these products are effective in
relieving symptoms of aching due to the
common cold. If such data are submitted
in the future, the agency will reconsider
this claim.

19. A comment suggested that the
claims not reviewed by the Topical
Analgesic Panel last considered by these
panels (e.g., "antiseptic," "fungistic for
athlete's foot") and claims deferred to other panels (e.g., "pain due to hemorrhoids," "piles," ) should not have been listed under Category II labeling in paragraphs (d) and (e) [44 FR 68645], but should have been left unclassified, pending classification by the appropriate panels.  

The agency agrees with the comment that the claims under (d) and (e) at 44 FR 68645 should not be classified in Category II in the rulemaking for external analgesic drug products. These claims have been deferred to other panels and are covered in separate rulemaking proceedings. With the exception of claims relating to diaper rash, these claims will no longer be considered in this rulemaking. Drug products for the treatment of diaper rash were reviewed by the Advisory Review Panel on OTC Miscellaneous External Drug Products, which recommended that some of the ingredients in those drug products be evaluated in the external analgesic rulemaking. As noted above the Federal Register of September 7, 1982 [47 FR 39412] included a notice of reopening of the administrative record to include the Miscellaneous External Panel's statement on drug products for the treatment of diaper rash. The agency will address the use of external analgesic active ingredients for the treatment of diaper rash in a future Federal Register publication.

20. One comment stated that there is no evidence that the term "external analgesic," the Panel's recommended statement of identity, is more informative to consumers than other terms such as "topical analgesic" or "pain relieving ointment." The comment suggested that the latter terms be allowed in addition to "external analgesic."

The agency agrees that the terms requested by the comment would be as informative to consumers as the Panel's recommended statement of identity. Therefore, the agency is proposing the following alternative statements of identity in § 348.50(a)(1): "The labeling identifies the product as an 'external analgesic,' "topical analgesic," or "pain relieving (insert dosage form, e.g., cream, lotion, or ointment)."

21. Several comments requested that the statement of identity for OTC hydrocortisone products be changed from "antipruritic" to "anti-itch." The comments argued that "antipruritic" is a technical term that would not be understood by most consumers and that the term "anti-itch" would be more meaningful.

The agency agrees with the comments that the term "antipruritic" may not be well understood by many consumers and, if used, should be associated with a non technical term. Accordingly, the following statements of identity are being proposed for hydrocortisone products in § 348.50(a)(2): "antipruritic (anti-itch)," "anti-itch," and "antipruritic (anti-itch)" or "anti-itch" followed by a description of the dosage form, e.g., "anti-itch cream."

22. One comment stated that hydrocortisone is probably not effective for the relief of itching due to insect bites, or for contact dermatitis due to poison ivy, oak, and sumac and that more potent corticosteroids are usually required for these problems. Another comment questioned "whether consumers can accurately diagnose contact 'dermatitis' due to 'poison oak' or 'poison sumac'" and added that the labeling terminology should be revised.

The agency is aware that severe skin inflammation caused by poison ivy does not respond to topically applied hydrocortisone, and that even the stronger hydrocortisone is not effective when used topically in such instances. Severe poison ivy often requires systemic steroid therapy. Topically applied hydrocortisone is also not effective in relieving severe reactions to insect bites. However, the itching due to mild poison ivy and to normal reactions to insect bites is relieved by topically hydrocortisone at OTC strength (Refs. 1, 2, and 3). The agency believes that the words "temporary" and "minor" in the indications for hydrocortisone are sufficient to alert consumers to the appropriate use of this ingredient. The agency is proposing deletion of the word "dermatitis" from the OTC hydrocortisone label because this word is not apt to be readily understood by consumers. This word is suitable for professional labeling, and a closely related term, "dermatoises," is included under "indications and Usage" in the agency's class labeling guideline for topical corticosteroids (Ref. 4). Manufacturers should follow this guideline in developing professional labeling for hydrocortisone drug products. The terms "poison oak" and "poison sumac" are retained in the proposed OTC labeling because these plants and the rash and itching they cause are familiar to consumers who live in areas in which the plants are found.

References


23. One comment stated that, because the claim "relief of cuts, scratches, abrasions, wounds, etc," is similar to indications recommended by the Panel in § 348.50(b)(2), the Panel must have inadvertently included this claim under Category II labeling at 44 FR 68644-68645.

The Panel concluded that the above claim was confusing and meaningless to consumers because external analgesic drug products relieve the pain of cuts, scratches, abrasions, wounds, etc., but do not provide "relief of cuts." The agency concurs with the Panel's Category II classification of this claim.

24. One comment argued that there is a need for a distinction between the labeling of topical analgesic and topical anesthetic ingredients. The comment stated that the Panel had differentiated between analgesics and anesthetics through distinct definitions in § 348.53(d) and (e), by establishing separate subgroups of external analgesics (44 FR 67986), and in its combination policy. The comment pointed out that topical anesthetics depress cutaneous sensory receptors without necessarily abolishing other sensations (i.e., cause a partial blocking of cutaneous nerve endings), whereas topical anesthetics completely block pain receptors, resulting in a sensation of numbness. The comment concurs that consumers should be informed of these distinctions and suggested the following examples of wording that could be used in the indications for topical anesthetic ingredients: "complete temporary relief * * *

"completely blocks * * *

"temporarily stops * * *

"completely stops * * *"

The agency does not agree that there is a need for a distinction between the labeling of topical analgesic and topical anesthetic products. In use, the effect of topical anesthetics is indistinguishable from the effect of topical analgesics. Topical anesthetics are theoretically capable of completely blocking pain receptors, but factors may affect the penetration of topical anesthetics through the skin and prevent complete blocking of the subcutaneous pain receptor site. Some of the factors affecting penetration of topical