Active Controlle

Percent of patients

MTX

(N = 217)

ENBREL

(N = 415)

Off-Label Drug Use Needs Better Regulation

'The big question is

whether the average

going to be able to

physician, who's working

80 hours a week, is really

BY JOYCE FRIEDEN Senior Editor

PHILADELPHIA — The Food and Drug Administration needs to change the way it regulates promotion of off-label drug use, according to the chair of the department of health policy and public health at the University of the Sciences in Philadelphia.

This year, the FDA issued draft guidance regarding off-label promotion. The draft guidance states that although any materials promoting off-label use must be peer reviewed, approval by the agency is not required, and the pharmaceutical company does not need to prove its intent to submit a new drug application for the off-label use, Robert I. Field, J.D., Ph.D. said at a

meeting of the American Society of Law, Medicine, and Ethics. "This is considered to be a significant loosening of the requirements, certainly of the FDA's enforcement attitude.

However, the com-

pany must clearly disclose that the suggested use is off-label, and any published negative findings regarding the off-label use must be included in the materials. "The problem is, negative findings don't get published very often, so there's probably not going to be a whole lot of that," he added.

The comment period on the FDA's draft guidance ended several months ago; final guidance has yet to be issued. But there are certainly reasonable arguments for promoting off-label use under certain circumstances, according to Dr. Field.

Medicine only advances when information is shared, "and there are good reasons to allow off-label uses and therefore to allow physicians to know about those off-label uses," he said. "On the other hand, it is clear that lack of oversight will lead to overzealous, aggressive promotion of uses that have limited, if any, scientific substantiation. The big question [is whether the] average physician, who's working 80 hours a week [is] really going to be able to evaluate this information, even if it has a disclosure written at the top?'

Although the ultimate goal should be to get approval for an off-label use, pharmaceutical companies don't have many good reasons to do so, Dr. Field noted. "The problem is that clinical trials take a lot of time and the FDA is an overburdened agency; its reviews are slow.'

Event

Off-label use is abundant and has grown over the last 3 decades, Dr. Field said.

Before 1997, the FDA opposed all off-label promotion. The agency allowed limited distribution of peer-reviewed articles in direct response to physician requests.

In 1997, Congress passed the Food and Drug Administration Modernization Act, which allowed pharmaceutical companies to initiate distribution of articles promoting off-label use if they came from a le-

gitimate peer-reviewed source, such as a journal or book chapter, and they could sponsor continuing medical education if it was done operation.

evaluate this information.' But there were restrictions on these uses-the material to be distributed first

> and the company had to intend to submit a new drug application for the off-label use.

> tion sued the FDA, arguing that the restrictions on article distribution were unconstitutional under the First Amendment. The court said the agency could limit article distribution but could not require prior submission of the materials for FDA approval or require that the company intend to submit a new drug application. A similar lawsuit in 1999 produced the same result.

> These rulings "left questions as to what would and wouldn't be allowed" under the act, Dr. Field said. Other challenges to offlabel promotion rules were not as successful. In 2004, Pfizer Inc. was fined \$430 million for paying physicians to promote the off-label use of gabapentin (Neurontin) with little evidence of benefit. And a psychiatrist was arrested in 2006 for accepting \$100,000 to promote off-label uses for Jazz Pharmaceutical Inc.'s sodium oxybate (Xyrem).

INDEX OF ADVERTISERS

Abbott Laboratories Humira	11-17	McNeil-PPC, Inc. Tylenol
Bayer HealthCare LLC ALEVE	21	Pfizer, Inc. Arthrotec
Centocor, Inc. Remicade	24a-24d, 25-26	Rexall Sundown, Inc. Osteo Bi-Flex
Cypress Bioscience, Inc. Avise PG	9	Roche Laboratories Inc. Actemra
Endo Pharmaceuticals Inc. Opana	29-32	UCB, Inc. Corporate
Ferring Pharmaceuticals Inc. Euflexxa	43-44	University of Pittsburgh Medical Center
Genentech, Inc. Rituxan	3-5	Wyeth Pharmaceuticals Inc.
Gilead Sciences, Inc.	7	EIDIEI

through a third-party

had to be given to the FDA for approval,

In 1998, the Washington Legal Founda-

47

34-36

10

41

22-23

49-52

	(11 - 152)	(11 - 349)	(N - 217)	(11 - 415)	
Injection site reaction	10	37	7	34	
Infection (total)**	32	35	72	64	
Non-upper respiratory infection (non-URI)**	32	38	60	51	
Upper respiratory infection (URI)**	16	29	39	31	
Headache	13	17	27	24	
Nausea	10	9	29	15	
Rhinitis	8	12	14	16	
Dizziness	5	7	11	8	
Pharyngitis	5	7	9	6	
Cough	3	6	6	5	
Asthenia	3	5	12	11	
Abdominal pain	3	5	10	10	
Rash	3	5	23	14	
Peripheral edema	3	2	4	8	
Respiratory disorder	1	5	NA	NA	
Dyspepsia	1	4	10	11	
Sinusitis	2	3	3	5	
Vomiting	-	3	8	5	
Mouth ulcer	1	2	14	6	
Alopecia	1	1	12	6	
Pneumonitis ("MTX lung")	-	-	2	0	
* Includes data from the 6-month study in which patients received concurrent MTX therapy.					
[†] The duration of exposure for patients receiving placebo was less than the ENBREL-treated patients.					
** Infection (total) includes data from all three placebo-controlled trials. Non-URI and URI include data only from the two placebo-controlled tri infections were collected separately from adverse events (placebo N = 110, ENBREL N = 213).					
In controlled trials of RA and psoriatic arthritis, rates of ser	ious adverse e	vents were seen a	t a frequency of approxi	mately 5% am	ong ENBF

Table 10: Percent of RA Patients Reporting Adverse Events in Controlled Clinical Trials*

Placebo

Percent of patients

ENBREI

(N = 349)

Placebot

(N = 152)

In controlled trials of RA and psoriatic arthritis, rates of serious adverse events were seen at a frequency of approximately 5% among ENBREL-and control-treated patients. In controlled trials of plaque psoriasis, rates of serious adverse events were seen at a frequency of <1.5% among ENBREL- and placebo-treated patients in the first 3 months of treatment. Among patients with RA in placebo-controlled, active-controlled, and open-label trials of ENBREL, malignancies (see **WARNINGS: Malignancies, ADVERSE FRACTIONS: Malignancies)** and infections (see **ADVERSE REACTIONS: Infections)** were the most common serious adverse events observed. Other infrequent serious adverse events observed in RA, psoriatic arthritis, ankylosing spondylitis, or plaque psoriasis clinical trials are listed by body system below: Cardiovascular: heart failure, myocardial infarction, myocardial ischemia, hypertension, hypotension, deep vein thrombosis, thrombophlebitis

	unombophieblus
Digestive:	cholecystitis, pancreatitis, gastrointestinal hemorrhage, appendicitis
Hematologic/Lymphatic:	lymphadenopathy
Musculoskeletal:	bursitis, polymyositis
Nervous:	cerebral ischemia, depression, multiple sclerosis (see WARNINGS: Neurologic Events)
D	

Respiratory: Skin: dyspnea, pulmonary embolism, sarcoidosis

Skin: worsening poriasis Urogenital: membranous glomerulonephropathy, kidney calculus In a randomized controlled trial in which 51 patients with RA received ENBREL 50 mg twice weekly and 25 patients received ENBREL 25 mg twice weekly, the following serious adverse events were observed in the 50 mg twice weekly arm: gastrointestinal bleeding, normal pressure hydrocephalus, seizure, and stroke. No serious adverse events were observed in the 25 mg arm. Adverse Reactions in Patients with JIA

Adverse Reactions in Patients with JIA In general, the adverse events in pediatric patients were similar in frequency and type as those seen in adult patients (see WARNINGS and other sections under ADVERSE REACTIONS). Differences from adults and other special considerations are discussed in the following paragraphs. Severe adverse reactions reported in 69 JIA patients ages 4 to 17 years included varicella (see also PRECAUTIONS: Immunizations), gastroenteritis, depression/personality disorder, cutaneous ulcer, esophagitis/gastritis, group A streptococcal septic shock, Type 1 diabetes mellitus, and soft tissue and post-operative wound infection. Forty-three of 69 (62%) children with JIA experienced an infection while receiving ENBREL during three months of study (part 1 open-label), and the frequency and severity of infections was similar in 58 patients completing 12 months of open-label extension therapy. The types of infections reported in JIA patients were generally mild and consistent with those commonly seen in outpatient pediatric populations. Two JIA patients developed varicella infection and signs and symptoms of aseptic meningitis which resolved without sequelae. The following adverse events were reported more commonly in 69 JIA patients receiving 3 months of ENBREL compared to the 349 adult RA patients in placebo-controlled trials. These included headache (19% of patients, 1.7 events per patient-year), nausea (9%, 1.0 events per patient-year), abdominal pain (19%, 0.74 events per patient-year), and vomiting (13%, 0.74 events per patient-year). In open-label clinical studies of children with JIA, adverse events reported in those aged 2 to 4 years were similar to adverse events reported in older children.

lder children

In post-marketing experience, the following additional serious adverse events have been reported in pediatric patients: abscess with bacteremia, optic neuritis, pancytopenia, seizures, tuberculous arthritis, urinary tract infection (see **WARNINGS**), coagulopathy, cutaneous vasculitis, and transaminase elevations. The frequency of these events and their causal relationship to ENBREL therapy are unknown. Patients with Heart Failure

Patients with Heart Failure Two randomized placebo-controlled studies have been performed in patients with CHF. In one study, patients received either ENBREL 25 mg twice weekly, 25 mg three times weekly, or placebo. In a second study, patients received either ENBREL 25 mg once weekly, 25 mg twice weekly, or placebo. Results of the first study suggested higher mortality in patients treated with ENBREL at either schedule compared to placebo. Results of the second study did not corroborate these observations. Analyses did not identify specific factors associated with increased risk of adverse outcomes in heart failure patients treated with ENBREL (see **PRECAUTIONS: Patients with Heart Failure**).

Adverse Reaction Information patients from Spontaneous Reports Adverse Reaction Information from Spontaneous Reports Adverse events have been reported during post-approval use of ENBREL. Because these events are reported voluntarily from a population of uncertain size, it is not always possible to reliably estimate their frequency or establish a causal relationship to ENBREL exposure. Additional adverse events are listed by body extern below:

Additional adverse events are instea by body system below.		
Body as a whole:	angioedema, fatigue, fever, flu syndrome, generalized pain, weight gain	
Cardiovascular:	chest pain, vasodilation (flushing), new-onset congestive heart failure (see PRECAUTIONS: Patients with Heart Failure)	
Digestive:	altered sense of taste, anorexia, diarrhea, dry mouth, intestinal perforation	
Hematologic/Lymphatic:	adenopathy, anemia, aplastic anemia, leukopenia, neutropenia, pancytopenia, thrombocytopenia (see WARNINGS)	
Hepatobiliary:	autoimmune hepatitis	
Musculoskeletal:	joint pain, lupus-like syndrome with manifestations including rash consistent with subacute or discoid lupus	
Nervous:	paresthesias, stroke, seizures, and central nervous system events suggestive of multiple sclerosis or isolated	
	demyelinating conditions such as transverse myelitis or optic neuritis (see WARNINGS)	
Ocular:	dry eyes, ocular inflammation	
Respiratory:	dyspnea, interstitial lung disease, pulmonary disease, worsening of prior lung disorder	
Skin:	cutaneous vasculitis, erythema multiforme, Stevens-Johnson syndrome, toxic epidermal necrolysis, pruritus,	
	subcutaneous nodules, urticaria	

Rx Only. This brief summary is based on ENBREL prescribing information v. 33: 03/2008

Manufactured by: Immunex Corporation Thousand Oaks. CA 91320-1799

U.S. License Number 1132 Marketed by Amgen and Wyeth Pharmaceuticals © 1998 – 2008 Immunex Corporation. All rights reserved. Immunex U.S. Patent Numbers: 5,395,760; 5,605,690; 5,945,397; 6,201,105; 6,572,852; Re. 36,755

AMGEN[®] Wyeth[®]

For more information please call 1-888-436-2735 or visit www.enbrel.com

© 2008 Amgen, Thousand Oaks, CA 91320 and Wyeth Pharmaceuticals Inc., Philadelphia, PA 19101. All rights reserved. 222725-01