

FOOD AND DRUG ADMINISTRATION

+ + + + +

CENTER FOR DRUG EVALUATION AND RESEARCH

+ + + + +

JOINT MEETING OF THE ANESTHETIC AND LIFE
SUPPORT DRUGS ADVISORY COMMITTEE AND DRUG
SAFETY & RISK MANAGEMENT ADVISORY COMMITTEE

+ + + + +

OPEN SESSION

+ + + + +

MONDAY,

MAY 5, 2008

+ + + + +

The Committees convened at 9:25
a.m. in the Grand Ballroom of the Holiday
Inn Gaithersburg, 2 Montgomery Village
Avenue, Gaithersburg, Maryland, John T.

Farrar, M.D., Chair, presiding.

ANESTHETIC AND LIFE SUPPORT ADVISORY
COMMITTEE MEMBERS (voting) PRESENT:

JOHN T. FARRAR, M.D., Chair

KANAWALJEET J.S. ANAND, M.D., Ph.D.

JEFFREY R. KIRSCH, M.D.

NANCY A. NUSSMEIER, M.D.

DONALD S. PROUGH, M.D.

ATHENA F. ZUPPA, M.D.

DRUG SAFETY AND RISK MANAGEMENT ADVISORY
COMMITTEE MEMBER (voting) PRESENT:

TIMOTHY S. LESAR, Pharm.D.

TEMPORARY VOTING MEMBERS PRESENT:

DIANE ARONSON, B.S., Acting Consumer
Representative

WARREN K. BICKEL, Ph.D.

CHARLES CORTINOVIS, M.D.

RUTH S. DAY, Ph.D.

THOMAS R. FLEMING, Ph.D.

JACQUELINE S. GARDNER, Ph.D.

THOMAS KOSTEN, M.D.

SUSAN KRIVACIC, Patient Representative

JANE C. MAXWELL, Ph.D.

LEWIS NELSON, M.D.

STEVEN D. PASSIK, Ph.D.

LEONARD J. PAULOZZI, M.D., M.P.H.

CHRISTINE SANG, M.D., Ph.D.

SULPICIO de GUZMAN SORIANO, III, M.D

FRANK VOCCI, Ph.D.

SIDNEY WOLFE, M.D., Acting Consumer
Representative (DsaRM)

MICHAEL YESENKO, Patient
Representative

ACTING INDUSTRY REPRESENTATIVES (non-voting)
PRESENT:

D. BRUCE BURLINGTON, M.D. (DsaRM)

CHARLES McLESKEY, M.D. (ALSDAC)

FDA CENTER FOR DRUG EVALUATION AND RESEARCH
PARTICIPANTS AT THE TABLE (non-voting)
PRESENT:

HENRY FRANCIS, M.D.

SHARON HERTZ, M.D

SANDRA KWEDER, M.D.

BOB RAPPAPORT, M.D.

CURTIS ROSEBRAUGH, M.D.

GUEST SPEAKERS (non-voting) PRESENT:

JOE GFROERER

JUDY K. BALL, Ph.D., M.P.A.

DEBORAH TRUNZO

DESIGNATED FEDERAL OFFICIAL PRESENT:

TERESA WATKINS, Pharm.D.

A G E N D A

CALL TO ORDER/INTRODUCTION OF COMMITTEE7
John T. Farrar, M.D.
Acting Chair, ALSDAC

CONFLICT OF INTEREST STATEMENT 12
Teresa Watkins, Pharm.D., R.Ph.
Acting Designated Federal Officer,
ADSDAC/DSaRM

OPENING REMARKS 17

Bob A. Rappaport, M.D.
Director, Division of Anesthesia,
Analgesia & Rheumatology Products
CDER/FDA

SPONSOR PRESENTATIONS 27
J. David Haddox, DDS, M.D.

Vice President,
Risk Management and Health Policy
Purdue Pharma, L.P.

Jack E. Henningfield, Ph.D.
Vice President,
Research and Health Policy
Pinney Associates

Richard Mannion, BPharm., Ph.D.
Senior Director, Pharmaceuticals
Purdue Pharma, L.P.

HISTORY OF OXYCONTIN LABELING AND RISK
MANAGEMENT PROGRAM 75

Mwango Kashoki, M.D.
Lead Medical Officer
Division of Anesthesia, Analgesia &
Rheumatology Products, CDER/FDA

UTILIZATION TRENDS 92
 LCDR Kendra Worthy, Pharm.D.
 U.S. Public Health Service
 Commissioned Corps
 Drug Utilization Analyst

 Division of Epidemiology
 Office of Surveillance and
 Epidemiology
 (OSE) CDER/FDA

BREAK102

PREVALENCE AND PATTERNS OF NON-MEDICAL USE
 OF OXYCONTIN AND OTHER PAIN RELIEVERS103
 Joe Gfroerer
 Director, Division of Population
 Surveys
 Office of Applied Studies, SAMHSA

MISUSE/ABUSE OF OPIOID ANALGESICS: FINDINGS
 FROM THE DRUG ABUSE WARNING NETWORK (DAWN). .118
 Judy K. Ball, Ph.D., MPA
 Director, Division of Facility Surveys
 Office of Applied Studies, SAMHSA

ADMISSIONS TO SUBSTANCE ABUSE TREATMENT
 FOR THE ABUSE OF OPIOID ANALGESICS:

FINDINGS FROM THE TREATMENT EPISODE
 DATA SET (TEDS)139
 Deborah Trunzo
 Team Leader, Drug and Alcohol Services
 Information Systems (DASIS)
 Office of Applied Sciences, SAMHSA

QUESTIONS FOR THE SAMHSA PRESENTERS151

SUMMARY OF DRUG ABUSE RATES IN THE US177
 Cathy Dormitzer, Ph.D., MPH
 Division of Epidemiology
 Office of Surveillance and
 Epidemiology

 (OSE) CDER/FDA

OVERVIEW OF REPORTS OF MANIPULATION OF
OXYCONTIN TABLETS184

LCDR Kristina C. Arnwine, PharmD
U.S. Public Health Service
Commissioned

Corps, Acting Team Leader
Division of Medication Error
Prevention
Office of Surveillance and
Epidemiology
(OSE) CDER/FDA

LUNCH192

OPEN PUBLIC HEARING193

QUESTIONS TO THE PRESENTERS241

ADJOURN

1 P R O C E E D I N G S

2 (9:25 a.m.)

3 CHAIR FARRAR: Good morning.

4 Sorry for the slight delay. I'm sure we can
5 make it up. Everybody's presentation will be
6 short and on time, no doubt.

7 My name is John Farrar. I'm the
8 Acting Chair of the Committee. I'd like to
9 call this meeting to order, and would like to
10 start with introduction going around the
11 table. Dr. Henry Francis.

12 DR. FRANCIS: Dr. Henry Francis,
13 Deputy Director, Office of Surveillance and
14 Epidemiology.

15 DR. KWEDER: Sandra Kweder, the
16 Deputy Director of the Office of New Drugs.
17 Good morning.

18 DR. ROSEBRAUGH: Curt Rosebraugh,
19 Acting Director, Office of Drug Evaluation II.

20 DR. RAPPAPORT: Bob Rappaport,
21 Director of Division of Anesthesia, Analgesia,
22 and Rheumatology Products.

1 DR. HERTZ: Sharon Hertz, Deputy
2 Director, Division of Anesthesia, Analgesia &
3 Rheumatology Products.

4 MR. YESENKO: Michael Yesenko,
5 Patient Representative.

6 DR. SANG: Christine Sang,
7 Anesthesiologist and Pain Specialist at the
8 Brigham and Women's Hospital in Boston.

9 DR. PASSIK: Steve Passik,
10 Psychologist, Memorial Sloan Kettering Cancer
11 Center in New York.

12 DR. MAXWELL: Jane Maxwell,
13 Addiction Research Institute, the University
14 of Texas at Austin.

15 DR. GARDNER: Jacqueline Gardner,
16 Professor, University of Washington School of
17 Pharmacy.

18 DR. FLEMING: Thomas Fleming,
19 Professor of Biostatistics, University of
20 Washington.

21 DR. CORTINOVIS: Charles
22 Cortinovis, Anesthesiologist, University of

1 Pittsburgh, VA Medical Center.

2 DR. ZUPPA: Athena Zuppa,
3 Pediatric Intensivist and Clinical
4 Pharmacologist at the Children's Hospital,
5 Philadelphia.

6 DR. LESAR: Timothy Lesar,
7 Director of Clinical Pharmacy Services, Albany
8 Medical Center, Albany, New York.

9 DR. SORIANO: Sul Soriano,
10 Pediatric Anesthesiologist at Children's
11 Hospital, Boston.

12 DR. WATKINS: Teresa Watkins,
13 Acting Designated Federal Official for this
14 Committee.

15 CHAIR FARRAR: John Farrar,
16 Neurologist and Pain Specialist at the
17 University of Pennsylvania.

18 DR. DAY: Ruth Day, Director of
19 the Medical Cognition Laboratory at Duke
20 University.

21 DR. KIRSCH: Jeff Kirsch, Chair of
22 the Department of Anesthesiology at Oregon

1 Health Science University.

2 DR. PAULOZZI: Len Paulozzi,
3 Medical Epidemiologist at the Centers for
4 Disease Control.

5 DR. PROUGH: Don Prough, Chair of
6 Anesthesiology, the University of Texas
7 Medical Branch in Galveston, Texas.

8 DR. BICKEL: Warren Bickel, Center
9 for Addiction Research, University of Arkansas
10 for Medical Sciences.

11 DR. ANAND: Kanawaljeet Anand,
12 Intesivist and Pain Researcher, University of
13 Arkansas for Medical Sciences.

14 DR. KOSTEN: Thomas Kosten,
15 Professor of Psychiatry and Neuroscience,
16 Baylor College of Medicine.

17 DR. NELSON: Lewis Nelson,
18 Emergency Physician and Medical Toxicologist,
19 New York University.

20 DR. NUSSMEIER: Nancy Nussmeier,
21 Chair of Anesthesiology at SUNY Upstate
22 Medical University in Syracuse.

1 DR. VOCCI: Frank Vocci, Division
2 of Pharmacotherapies and Medical Consequences
3 of Drug Abuse, National Institute on Drug
4 Abuse.

5 MS. KRIVACIC: Susan Krivacic,
6 Patient Representative, Austin, Texas.

7 MS. ARONSON: Diane Aronson,
8 Consumer Representative.

9 DR. WOLFE: Sid Wolfe, Health
10 Research Group, a public citizen.

11 DR. McLESKEY: Charlie McLeskey,
12 Industry Rep from ALSDAC.

13 DR. BURLINGTON: Bruce Burlington,
14 Industry Rep, retired, formerly with Wyeth.

15 CHAIR FARRAR: To begin with, for
16 the topics, such as those being discussed at
17 today's meeting, there are often a variety of
18 opinions, some of which are quite strongly
19 held. Our goal is that today's meeting will
20 be a fair and open forum for the discussion of
21 these issues, and that individuals can express
22 their views without interruption. Thus, as a

1 general reminder, individuals will be allowed
2 to speak into the record only if recognized by
3 the Chair. We look forward to a productive
4 meeting, and thank you.

5 DR. WATKINS: Good morning. I'd
6 like to remind everyone to please silence
7 their cell phones, pagers, and Blackberries,
8 if you've not already done so. I would also
9 like to identify the press contacts for this
10 meeting. It's Ms. Susan Cruzan and Chris
11 Kelly, if you could please stand. Thank you.

12 Now I'll read into the record the
13 conflict of interest statement. The Food and
14 Drug Administration is convening today's Joint
15 Meeting of the Anesthetic and Life Support
16 Drugs and the Drug Safety and Risk Management
17 Advisory Committees under the authority of the
18 Federal Advisory Committee Act of 1972.

19 With the exception of the industry
20 representatives, all members and temporary
21 voting members are special government
22 employees, or regular federal employees from

1 other agencies, and are subject to federal
2 conflict of interest laws and regulations.

3 The following information on the
4 status of the Committee's compliance with
5 federal ethics and conflict of interest laws
6 covered by, but not limited to those found in
7 18 USC 208 and 712 of the Federal Food, Drug
8 & Cosmetic Act, as being provided to
9 participants in today's meeting, and to the
10 public.

11 FDA has determined that members,
12 and temporary voting members of these
13 Committees are in compliance with the federal
14 ethics and conflicts of interest laws. Under
15 18 USC 208, Congress has authorized FDA to
16 grant waivers to special and regular
17 government employees who have potential
18 financial conflicts of interest when it is
19 determined that the Agency's need for a
20 particular individual's services outweighs his
21 or her potential financial conflict of
22 interest.

1 Under 712 of the FD&C Act,
2 Congress has authorized FDA to grant waivers
3 to special government employees and regular
4 government employees for potential financial
5 conflicts, when necessary, to afford the
6 Committee essential expertise.

7 Related to today's discussions of
8 today's meeting, members and temporary voting
9 members of these Committees have been screened
10 for potential financial conflicts of interest
11 of their own, as well as those imputed to
12 them, including those of their spouses or
13 minor children. And for purposes of 18 USC
14 208, their employers. These interests may
15 include investments, consulting, expert
16 witness testimony, contracts, grants, CRADAs,
17 teaching, speaking, writing, patents and
18 royalties, and primary employment.

19 Today's agenda involves
20 discussions of new drug application, NDA 22-
21 272, a new formulation of Oxycodone
22 Hydrochloride Controlled-Release Tablets,

1 trade name OxyContin, Purdue Pharma, L.P., and
2 its safety for the proposed indication of
3 management of moderate to severe pain when a
4 continuous around-the-clock analgesic is
5 needed for an extended period of time.

6 Based on the agenda for today's
7 meeting and all financial interests reported
8 by the Committee members and temporary voting
9 members, conflict of interest waivers have
10 been issued in accordance with 18 USC
11 208(b)(1), and 712 of the FD&C Act for Dr.
12 Thomas Kosten, for his stock ownership in a
13 competing firm, worth between \$25,001 and
14 \$50,000. The waivers allow this individual to
15 participate fully in today's deliberations.

16 FDA's reasons for issuing the
17 waivers are described in the waiver documents,
18 which were posted on FDA's website at
19 www.fda.gov/ohrms/dockets/default.htm. Copies
20 of the waivers may also be obtained by
21 submitting a written request to the Agency's
22 Freedom of Information Office, Room 6-30 of

1 the Parklawn Building. A copy of this
2 statement will be made available for review at
3 the registration table during this meeting,
4 and will be included as part of the official
5 transcript.

6 Dr. Charles McLeskey and Dr. Bruce
7 Burlington are serving as industry
8 representatives acting on behalf of regulated
9 industry. Dr. McLeskey is an employee of
10 Baxter Healthcare Corporation, and Dr.
11 Burlington is self-employed by D.B. Burlington
12 of Gaithersburg, Maryland.

13 We would like to remind members
14 and temporary voting members that if the
15 discussions involve any other products or
16 firms not already on the agenda, for which an
17 FDA participant has a personal or imputed
18 financial interest, the participants need to
19 exclude themselves from such involvement, and
20 their exclusion will be noted for the record.

21 FDA encourages all other
22 participants to advise the Committee of any

1 financial relationships that they may have
2 with any firms at issue. Thank you.

3 CHAIR FARRAR: I'd now like to ask
4 Bob Rappaport to provide some introductory
5 words.

6 DR. WATKINS: Just as a
7 housekeeping, we do have an overflow room.
8 It's the Montgomery Room located right behind
9 the restaurant, so if seating gets full, there
10 is another room to go to.

11 DR. RAPPAPORT: Good morning. Dr.
12 Farrar, Members of the Anesthesia and Life
13 Support Drugs and Drug Safety and Risk
14 Management Advisory Committees, invited
15 guests, thank you for your participation in
16 this important meeting.

17 We are facing many difficult
18 decisions regarding the risks and benefits of
19 new formulations and new indications for
20 opioid drug products. In the last few years,
21 as numerous new formulations of existing
22 opioid drugs have been developed, there has

1 also been an increase in the misuse, abuse,
2 and diversion of prescription opioid drug
3 products in the United States.

4 This, in turn, has led to the
5 significant Public Health burden of
6 innumerable cases of addiction, overdose, and
7 death. Many of those directly affected have
8 been previously healthy people, both young and
9 old.

10 Together with our colleagues and
11 other government agencies, we at FDA have been
12 working to find better strategies to mitigate
13 this Public Health burden. It is essential
14 that we address how we can balance the real
15 unmet needs of patients living with
16 inadequately treated pain, with the potential
17 for the very treatments for that pain to be
18 diverted, misused, and abused.

19 Today and tomorrow you will be
20 presented with a great deal of information
21 concerning the abuse and diversion of
22 prescription opioid drug products in the

1 United States. This will include, during our
2 Open Public Session, the personal stories of
3 some of the families who have lost loved ones,
4 including even their children, in terrible and
5 unfortunate deaths that all of us wish we
6 could have prevented.

7 Over the past decade, in
8 collaboration with other federal agencies,
9 academic experts, and the pharmaceutical
10 industry, we at FDA have employed our
11 regulatory authority to limit the abuse and
12 misuse of these products by carefully
13 addressing these problems in risk management
14 plans for the opioid analgesics.

15 These plans have been meticulously
16 crafted to try to limit the exposure of potent
17 opioid products to legitimate patients, and to
18 provide educational information to
19 prescribers, pharmacists, and patients and
20 their families and caregivers, regarding the
21 potential for misuse and abuse, and the risks
22 of addiction, overdose, and death associated

1 with these medications.

2 In addition to requiring strong
3 warnings in the product labels, we have
4 required the companies who manufacture and
5 distribute opioid analgesics to institute
6 surveillance plans that monitor for diversion
7 and signals of increasing levels of abuse.

8 When criminal activity or evidence
9 of increasing abuse is discovered through
10 these surveillance programs, we have required
11 that the companies provide reasonable
12 interventions to attempt to resolve the
13 problem. Unfortunately, in spite of our
14 efforts, misuse, abuse, and diversion persist
15 and continue to grow.

16 On the other hand, the under-
17 treatment of chronic pain in the United States
18 has only been addressed by the medical
19 community since the 1970s. The early work in
20 this critical arena by pioneers in pain
21 management made significant strides in the
22 proper treatment of pain in the last part of

1 the 20th century. Yet, millions of Americans
2 with acute and chronic pain still receive
3 inadequate analgesia, even today in the 21st
4 century, often with a devastating impact on
5 their quality of life, sometimes even
6 resulting in suicide. Today and tomorrow you
7 will also hear from these patients and their
8 physicians, caretakers, and families.

9 The challenge for FDA, and for
10 society is how do we continue to provide
11 adequate availability of these potent opioid
12 products to the patients who truly need them
13 in order to avoid unreasonable suffering, and
14 yet prevent the terrible effects that are
15 occurring in our communities due to diversion
16 and abuse of these products?

17 There are simply no easy answers
18 to this challenge, but perhaps with your
19 collective advice, we can find reasonable
20 compromises that will have a significant
21 impact on abuse without negatively impacting
22 patients in pain.

1 Today we will be discussing an
2 application from Purdue Pharma for a new
3 formulation of OxyContin that have novel
4 physiochemical features. The Applicant
5 contends that these changes in the formulation
6 will provide a significant decrease in the
7 ability of abusers to defeat the controlled-
8 release features of the product; and, thereby,
9 reduce the likelihood that it will be abused,
10 potentially resulting in fewer instances of
11 addiction, overdose, and death.

12 Following presentations from
13 Purdue and from FDA, we will ask you to
14 address several questions. First, are there
15 tools that can adequately assess the
16 abusability of this type of product, and
17 whether the new features of this specific
18 formulation are likely to result in less abuse
19 of the product.

20 Second, if you do conclude that
21 there is evidence to support that the
22 controlled-release mechanism of this new

1 formulation of OxyContin is less likely to be
2 defeated than the earlier formulation, is this
3 difference of such a degree that it should be
4 included in the product labeling, which would
5 result in an at least implicit claim of
6 reduced abuse liability.

7 Next, if such a claim were to be
8 included in the product labeling, what
9 potential exists that it might lead to a
10 misconception in the medical and patient
11 communities that the product is safer than
12 other opioids, perhaps resulting in a lower
13 threshold for prescribing, and ultimately
14 resulting in more product available for
15 diversion and abuse.

16 Also, would the inclusion of the
17 results of the Applicant's studies performed
18 to demonstrate the abuse resistant features of
19 the formulation potentially provide a roadmap
20 to defeat of these features by determined
21 abusers?

22 The Applicant has chosen to submit

1 their NDA before they have been able to
2 successfully reformulate the highest OxyContin
3 dose. If the new formulation is marketed, it
4 will replace the existing OxyContin 10
5 milligram, 15 milligram, 20, 30, and 40
6 milligram strength tablets. The 80 milligram
7 strength OxyContin would remain on the market
8 in its current formulation.

9 We will ask you to consider the
10 potential consequences of this marketing
11 strategy. Specifically, what is the risk that
12 marketing and promotion of the lower dose
13 tablets in a less abusable formulation will
14 result in a misperception by patients and
15 prescribers that the higher strength tablet
16 also includes these characteristics? In
17 particular, would having different
18 formulations for the different dosages result
19 in a potential risk of inadvertent serious
20 medication errors with the higher dosage?

21 If you do conclude that this new
22 formulation of OxyContin is less likely to be

1 abused, we will then ask you to discuss which
2 features of the formulation should be included
3 in the product labeling. We'll ask you to
4 consider not only the value of incorporating
5 this information for patients and prescribers,
6 but also to weight this against the potential
7 for the misconception to occur in patients and
8 prescribers that this product is free of risks
9 of diversion and abuse, and against the
10 possible use of this information by abusers of
11 opioid drug products.

12 Finally, we will ask you to
13 address which risk mitigation strategies would
14 be useful in preventing further abuse, misuse
15 and diversion of a reformulated, possibly less
16 abusable OxyContin product.

17 These questions are extremely
18 difficult to answer, and that's why we have
19 asked you to help us to do so. It's also why
20 we have specifically brought together a panel
21 with varied professional expertise to address
22 the challenge. Your responses to our

1 questions, and especially your discussions
2 underlying those responses, will be critical
3 to us, as we attempt to make a well-informed,
4 fair, and reasoned decision regarding this
5 application's approvability with as much
6 transparency as possible in the process.

7 Your advice and our decision will
8 set precedents for future applications for
9 abuse-resistant formulations of opioid drug
10 products. Thank you for undertaking this
11 difficult challenge.

12 CHAIR FARRAR: Thank you. Dr.
13 Rappaport.

14 We will now proceed to the
15 Sponsor's presentation for today's meeting.
16 Before Purdue's presentation, I would like to
17 remind the public observers at this meeting
18 that while this meeting is open for public
19 observation, public attendees may not
20 participate, except at the specific request of
21 the Chair.

22 I'd like to call on Dr. David

1 Haddox to begin the session.

2 DR. HADDOX: Good morning, and
3 thank you. I am David Haddox, Purdue Pharma's
4 Vice President for Risk Management and Health
5 Policy. Prior to joining Purdue, I was a
6 practicing pain physician. I spent most of my
7 clinical career in academic settings teaching
8 pain medicine, anesthesiology, psychiatry, and
9 addiction medicine.

10 I am certified in psychiatry with
11 a sub-specialty certificate in pain
12 management. I'm also certified by the
13 American Board of Pain Medicine, of which I'm
14 a past president. I am a past president of
15 the American Academy of Pain Medicine, and a
16 former director of the American Pain Society.

17 Prior to introducing our other
18 speakers, I would like to make an introductory
19 remark, and provide a very brief outline of
20 our presentation.

21 As Dr. Rappaport indicated, the
22 FDA has convened this meeting for specific

1 purposes that have been communicated to you.
2 If we step back for a moment, we are all here
3 today because of one phenomenon, the
4 intersection of two epidemics; the epidemic of
5 persistent pain, and the epidemic of
6 unprecedented non-medical use of opioid
7 analgesics.

8 It will come as no surprise to you
9 that we, at Purdue, have given a great deal of
10 thought to these epidemics. We welcome the
11 opportunity to share our views on those inter-
12 related Public Health issues, provide you with
13 information on our newly formulated OxyContin,
14 and to present our position on the importance
15 of clear and accurate labeling for modified
16 release, opioid analgesic products that are
17 specifically designed to impede intentional or
18 accidental misuse by physical or chemical
19 tampering.

20 I will provide a very brief
21 overview of the use and abuse of OxyContin,
22 present some high-level information on the

1 newly formulated product, and introduce our
2 position on the importance of approved
3 labeling language to form the basis of our
4 communications with the community of
5 healthcare professionals.

6 Dr. Jack Henningfield, Vice
7 President for Research and Health Policy at
8 Pinney Associates, and an Adjunct Professor in
9 the Department of Psychiatry and Behavioral
10 Sciences at the Johns Hopkins University
11 School of Medicine, and former Chief of
12 Clinical Pharmacology at NIDA will follow me
13 with a brief review of information on abuse
14 of, and addiction to OxyContin, specifically,
15 which will augment the information to be
16 presented later by the officials from the
17 Federal Substance Abuse and Mental Services
18 Administration.

19 Following Dr. Henningfield will be
20 my colleague, Dr. Richard Mannion, a
21 Pharmacist Scientist who will describe in some
22 detail the tamper resistance test battery, and

1 the performance of the new formulation.

2 I will then return to the podium
3 and review the epidemiology study being
4 conducted for the new formulation as part of
5 the revised risk map, provide a summation of
6 our remarks, and moderate for Purdue during
7 the question and answer period.

8 In addition to the speakers
9 listed, we are also joined by another expert
10 in addition, Dr. Edward Cone. He is a
11 scientific consultant with Pinney Associates.
12 He is an Associate Professor Adjunct status in
13 the Department of Psychiatry and Behavioral
14 Sciences at Johns Hopkins University School of
15 Medicine, and is formerly the Chief of
16 Chemistry and Drug Metabolism at NIDA, and he
17 will be available to answer questions you may
18 have relative to behaviors employed by drug
19 abusers, his particular area of expertise.

20 Almost everyone has experienced
21 acute pain from trauma or disease, a broken
22 bone, a dental abscess, a bad sprain, a

1 surgical procedure. Acute pain, even if
2 intense, significantly tends to improve with
3 the resolution of the inciting event.
4 However, for approximately 50 million
5 Americans, the pain doesn't go away. It
6 persists around the clock, and if moderate to
7 severe in intensity, significantly impacts the
8 quality of life.

9 This is a brief overview of the
10 treatment of persistent pain. It begins with
11 identifying the underlying cause of pain, and
12 correcting it, if possible. However, as many
13 of the clinicians here know in experiences
14 similar to mine, sometimes we can make a
15 definitive diagnosis, but we can't correct the
16 problem.

17 Identifying and addressing the co-
18 morbidities are key to effective treatment.
19 Non-pharmacological approaches, such as
20 physical and occupational therapy, are often
21 utilized to aid in the achievement of specific
22 treatment objectives. Psychological therapies

1 can be extremely helpful to many patients with
2 persistent pain, and complement the biomedical
3 therapies. Pharmacological approaches begin
4 in a stepwise fashion, starting with non-
5 steroidal anti-inflammatory drugs, if they are
6 appropriate, and if the patient can tolerate
7 them. The addition of adjuvant analgesics,
8 such as anti-depressants or anti-convulsants
9 that have their own unique analgesic
10 properties are also utilized. And then, when
11 appropriate, the use of opioid analgesics.

12 Opioid analgesics comprise two
13 classes, immediate release, and long-acting
14 opioid. The immediate release opioids are
15 further classified as combination products;
16 that is, combined with aspirin, acetaminophen,
17 or ibuprofen, or as single entity products
18 containing the opioid as the only
19 pharmaceutical ingredient.

20 In some patients with persistent
21 pain, the clinical utility of the combination
22 agents is limited because of the dose-limiting

1 toxicity from the non-opioid analgesic
2 component. The long-acting opioids are all a
3 single entity, but they also have two classes,
4 those that are pharmaceutically long-acting -
5 excuse me - inherently long-acting, such as
6 Levorphanol and Methadone, and those that are
7 pharmaceutically long-acting, that is created
8 to be long-acting, such as Fentanyl,
9 Oxycodone, Oxymorphone, and Morphine.

10 The importance of these long-
11 acting opioid analgesics in the treatment of
12 persistent pain has been recognized by a
13 number of organizations, including the
14 American Medical Association, the American
15 Geriatric Society, and the Department of
16 Defense, Division of Veteran Health Affairs in
17 their clinical practice guideline for the use
18 of opioid analgesics in the treatment of
19 chronic pain.

20 The intersection of these two co-
21 occurring epidemics, persistent pain and non-
22 medical use of opioid analgesics, the very

1 drugs that are often used to treat persistent
2 pain, led us to develop the research
3 objectives that gave rise to the drug product
4 being considered today. You will note that
5 from time to time we refer to this product by
6 its internal product designation, OTR, so
7 you'll hear that term periodically.

8 The objectives of our research
9 were two-fold. First and foremost, maintain
10 the benefits to patients, and introduce
11 impediments that would reduce the desirability
12 of the drug to abusers. We have developed a
13 new formulation that has met the statistical
14 standards for bioequivalence to the original
15 formulation, and, as Dr. Mannion will point
16 out in some detail, with in vitro testing
17 compared to the original formulation
18 introduces demonstrable barriers to physical
19 manipulation and extraction of Oxycodone,
20 collectively referred to as tampering with the
21 formulation.

22 We submitted an NDA for the 10-40

1 milligram tablet strengths of the new
2 formulation. We are completing an SNDA for
3 the 60 and 80 milligram tablets of the new
4 formulation, and will be prepared to submit
5 that shortly after approval of the 10 through
6 40 milligram.

7 It was our original intention to
8 have all tablet strengths approved at the same
9 time. However, development of the 60 and 80
10 milligram formulations with the required
11 product attributes took longer. The potential
12 public health benefit of the newly formulated
13 lower strength tablets that comprise
14 approximately 83 percent of the current
15 prescriptions for controlled-release OxyCodone
16 products warrant their introduction prior to
17 the approval of the 60 and 80 milligram
18 tablets.

19 Regarding the abuse of OxyContin,
20 the 12-hour dose of Oxycodone in each tablet
21 that contributes to OxyContin being an
22 effective pain reliever unfortunately makes it

1 a target for drug abusers. Abusers often
2 crush, break, or chew the tablets to destroy
3 the controlled-release delivery system
4 rendering a 12-hour dose of Oxycodone
5 immediately available for abuse. Crushing the
6 tablets results in a powder that can be
7 readily swallowed, snorted, or dissolved for
8 injection.

9 The dangers of this type of abuse
10 and misuse following tampering with the
11 controlled-release delivery system are great
12 enough to warrant the following in the current
13 box warning for OxyContin. "Taking broken,
14 chewed, or crushed OxyContin tablets leads to
15 rapid release and absorption of a potentially
16 fatal dose of Oxycodone."

17 This new formulation represents a
18 meaningful incremental improvement over the
19 original formulation. It provides improvement
20 in creating impediments to some forms of
21 compromising OxyContin's controlled-release
22 delivery system. The in vitro studies

1 indicate the reformulated tablet is
2 substantially more difficult than the original
3 formulation to crush and inject, and also
4 suggests that it will be more difficult to
5 chew or snort. An epidemiological study to
6 assess the correlation between in vitro tamper
7 testing results and any abuse resistance will
8 be conducted following introduction of the new
9 formulation.

10 We share FDA's concern that
11 information about the new formulation be clear
12 and accurate. There are already
13 misconceptions and confusion about the new
14 formulation. It is being mischaracterized in
15 public discussions, including some stories in
16 the media, and posts on blogs, as abuse-proof,
17 which it is certainly not.

18 Some of this discussion has also
19 falsely suggested that the statements arose
20 from comments made by Purdue to the press.
21 Purdue has made no such statements about this
22 new drug to the press. Our approach is to add

1 clear and accurate information about the in
2 vitro tests to the description section of the
3 full prescribing information or FPI, and to
4 make no claims of abuse reduction until they
5 are proven.

6 Providing in vitro information in
7 the FPI will reduce misconceptions and
8 confusion. Including, rather than excluding,
9 accurate information provides clarity. Having
10 a summary of in vitro information included
11 will maintain the FPI as the definitive source
12 of product information for healthcare
13 professionals, a source upon which we rely for
14 facts about any drug product. And, very
15 importantly, including such language provides
16 uniform, approved language to facilitate clear
17 and consistent communication about the
18 medication.

19 I reiterate, we will make no claim
20 that the new formulation reduces abuse unless
21 and until we submit the results from an
22 appropriately designed study, and FDA approves

1 the language of any claims based upon those
2 results.

3 The 10-40 milligram tablets would
4 be available before the 60 and 80 milligram
5 tablets because of some technical difficulties
6 I alluded to we initially encountered in
7 formulating the higher strengths, which were
8 successfully resolved, but which delayed our
9 ability to complete an approval package for
10 those strengths within the time frame for the
11 submission of the 10-40 milligram strengths.
12 The sooner any tamper resistant tablet
13 strengths are available, the sooner there may
14 be a significant Public Health benefit.

15 FDA is concerned that the
16 availability of the newly formulated 10-40
17 milligram tablets before the 60 and 80
18 milligram tablets are available in the new OTR
19 formulation could lead prescribers and
20 patients to mistakenly assume that all
21 strengths have the same features. Our
22 approach to resolving this is to include in

1 the FPI a precise description of the in vitro
2 tests, making clear that the description
3 applies only to the 10-40 milligram tablets,
4 until such time as the 60 and 80 milligram
5 tablets are approved in the new formulation.
6 Including precise information in the FPI is
7 better than providing no information, which,
8 itself, as we've seen already, can lead to
9 misconceptions and confusion.

10 In summary, adding appropriate and
11 precise language to the FPI regarding the in
12 vitro studies of the new formulation as each
13 tablet strength is approved would provide
14 healthcare professionals accurate information
15 about the medicine, and minimize
16 misconceptions.

17 In my overview, I made reference
18 to the abuse of OxyContin. It is now my
19 pleasure to introduce Dr. Jack Henningfield,
20 a leading expert in addiction, to go into more
21 detail about this phenomenon, which will be
22 further augmented later today by

1 representatives from SAMHSA. Dr.
2 Henningfield.

3 DR. HENNINGFIELD: Good morning.
4 It's a pleasure to have the opportunity to
5 help you understand OxyContin abuse, and
6 implications of the new formulation.

7 Today you are considering a
8 technology that I believe has the potential to
9 effectively treat pain, while simultaneously
10 reducing certain avenues to abuse. A few
11 terms and concepts are important to understand
12 in my presentation, and throughout the day.

13 First, tamper resistance is the
14 performance of a drug product in bench testing
15 that has been designed to simulate methods of
16 formulation tampering that are commonly
17 employed by drug abusers. Abuse-resistance is
18 the ability of a tamper resistant drug product
19 to present sufficient barriers to non-labeled
20 use of the formulation in such a way that a
21 meaningful decrease in one or more methods of
22 abuse can be scientifically demonstrated.

1 Epidemiological studies would be needed,
2 however, to determine if this has actually
3 been achieved. Abuse-proof is a term used to
4 describe a therapeutic drug product that
5 cannot be abused in any manner. This is a
6 theoretical ideal. By abuse, I mean the use
7 of prescription opioids motivated, in part, by
8 the psychoactive effects of the drug, and not
9 for the purposes of pain treatment.

10 Now, let me turn to the prevalence
11 of opioid abuse, in general, and OxyContin
12 abuse, in particular. Later this morning, Dr.
13 Gfroerer from SAMHSA will provide a much more
14 extensive analysis of prescription drug abuse,
15 but I want to highlight a couple of points.

16 Federal surveys show that opioid
17 analgesics have the highest rate of non-
18 medical use of all prescription drugs. This
19 slide summarizes data from the National Survey
20 on Drug Use and Health. It shows that the
21 highest rates of non-medical use are reported
22 for 18 to 25 year olds. This is male and

1 females, and the rates are higher in males
2 than females, by the way.

3 As you can see, 4.9 percent
4 reported pain reliever use in the past month,
5 .4 percent had used OxyContin in the last
6 month, two percent reported tranquilizer use,
7 1.3 stimulant use, and .2 percent sedative
8 use. Although the percentage for OxyContin
9 may appear small, it is a very serious
10 problem, and the reason we're here today.

11 Well, what put OxyContin on the
12 radar screen of drug abuse, drug abusers and
13 Public Health professionals alike?
14 Undoubtedly, there were many contributing
15 factors, but a major one was the fact that the
16 controlled-release technology could be readily
17 defeated by crushing. In fact, as we have
18 seen over the past decade, many drug abusers
19 did chew and crush OxyContin tablets to obtain
20 stronger, faster effects.

21 The ability to readily pulverize
22 the tablet and extract the drug made it

1 possible to obtain still faster effects by
2 nasal insufflation, often referred to as
3 "snorting", or intravenous injection. These
4 routes, in turn, are associated with an even
5 higher risk of serious adverse effects because
6 of the explosively high levels of drug that
7 can be quickly absorbed.

8 The proportion of people using
9 various routes varies across study. Crushing,
10 chewing, injecting, and nasally insufflating
11 are especially attractive to many drug
12 abusers, however, because these methods
13 produce the rapid delivery of high doses that
14 many of them seek. Unfortunately, these are
15 also the most dangerous methods of use.

16 The category of oral use, which
17 you will hear discussed today, also includes
18 people who crush, then use orally. Oral use
19 can include people who put the tablet in their
20 mouth and chew it, and oral use can also
21 include use by swallowing an intact tablet.

22 Now, how drug abusers in the real

1 world actually use OxyContin is important to
2 know in considering the potential benefits and
3 the limitations of the new formulation.

4 This slide shows rates of abuse by
5 various routes of administration. You can see
6 that 17 percent were injecting, 11 percent
7 intra-nasally. That's about 28 percent by
8 those two routes; 72 percent were using
9 orally. However, these data do not tell us
10 what percentage of the oral users were
11 crushing and chewing.

12 Another thing we know is that some
13 OxyContin users began by swallowing in-tact
14 tablets, began by some form of oral use, and
15 then progressed to nasal use, or intravenous
16 injection.

17 This slide shows the results of
18 one study that examined the progression of
19 OxyContin use and abuse among drug abusers who
20 registered for treatment at a facility in
21 Kentucky. The red bars show how OxyContin
22 users reported that they were actually using

1 the drug at the time of their admission to
2 treatment. About 20 percent reported that
3 they were using it orally, about 60 percent
4 reported nasally, and about 20 percent were
5 intravenous injectors. This is how they
6 reported they were using at their admission to
7 treatment. However, they were asked how they
8 initially used the drug, and that's shown in
9 the green bars. About 80 percent reported
10 that they began use of OxyContin orally, about
11 17 percent by the nasal route, and about one
12 percent only by the intravenous route.

13 This study begins to help us
14 understand the progression that has occurred
15 with OxyContin. One of the things that we
16 learn, however, is that abuse usually starts
17 with oral ingestion. It may lead to other
18 forms of abuse. It may lead to addiction. I
19 believe that the new OxyContin formulation
20 will impede this progression, because it will
21 make OxyContin more difficult to crush,
22 powder, inject, or nasally insufflate. The

1 original formulation could be easily and
2 quickly crushed; the new formulation is
3 tougher. I believe that the appropriate label
4 for such a formulation is tamper resistant.

5 Now, in considering the potential
6 contribution of a tamper resistant
7 formulation, we can look to laboratory
8 studies. Some of this research is similar to
9 the kind of research I have done over the
10 years with other drugs. And this kind of
11 research has led us to a number of
12 identification of the kinds of factors that
13 appear more attractive to drug abusers.

14 In general, rapid onset of drug
15 effects is more attractive, and some of these
16 studies have been done with various drugs in
17 animals and people. High-intensity of
18 effects, that is, high brain levels, or what
19 we often refer to as the dose response
20 relationship. Rapid offset of drugs. The new
21 OxyContin formulation, I think is an important
22 step in applying drug formulation technology

1 to deterring such effects, while retaining the
2 desirable therapeutic profile.

3 Now, as you have heard and will
4 see in greater detail in the next
5 presentation, the new formulation does not
6 make tampering or abuse impossible. I am
7 convinced, however, by the data that I have
8 seen that the new formulation will make
9 tampering and abuse by several routes more
10 difficult.

11 Let me summarize, in conclusion,
12 some implications for the new OxyContin
13 formulation. First, laboratory studies of
14 humans and animals indicate that intake and
15 adverse effects can also be reduced when the
16 effort or cost per dose is increased. In my
17 specialty area of behavioral pharmacology, we
18 refer to this as response cost.

19 Second, at high levels of effort
20 requirement, self-administration effects often
21 cease. We often refer to this as a break
22 point. I think I skipped the first point,

1 which is that decreased intake is generally
2 directly related to the increase in effort or
3 the response cost. And, finally, individuals
4 differ in the break points. It's not that
5 animals and humans are different, as this
6 slide suggests, but it's that individuals are
7 different in what level of effort it takes to
8 cease their use, or extinguish the behavior of
9 drug self-administration.

10 Taken together, these findings
11 suggest that the impediments to tampering
12 posed by the new formulation may reduce self-
13 administration. However, real-world
14 experience will be necessary to confirm this.
15 Thank you.

16 DR. HADDOX: Thank you, Dr.
17 Henningfield.

18 FDA has discussed with Purdue its
19 views concerning what the full prescribing
20 information should state concerning the tamper
21 resistant qualities of the new formulation.
22 Based on these discussions, Purdue proposed an

1 addition to the description section of the FPI
2 applicable only to the 10-40 milligram tablets
3 of the new formulation, which has been
4 provided in your background information from
5 FDA, and reads, in part, as follows:

6 "During in vitro testing, tablets
7 were manipulated to recover Oxycodone by
8 crushing, milling, heating, and crushing
9 followed by boiling and filtering fragments,
10 and crushing followed by extracting with
11 various solvents, including ethanol. The
12 tablets either did not break, or broke into
13 fragments that retained some of the
14 controlled-release characteristics. When in
15 contact with aqueous media, the tablets or the
16 fragments formed a gelatinous mass."

17 As our next speaker will
18 demonstrate, this proposed wording accurately
19 describes the data from our in vitro tamper-
20 testing protocol; that is, OTR has some degree
21 of tamper resistance, as defined by Dr.
22 Henningfield, but this language does not make

1 any claim about abuse resistance, the impact
2 these attributes may have on abuse, as that
3 cannot be studied systematically until OTR is
4 available.

5 Just before I introduce our next
6 speaker from Purdue's Pharmaceuticals Group, let
7 me review the charge we gave to our
8 formulators. We took information from the
9 literature and from other sources about how
10 abusers compromise, or might attempt to
11 compromise a controlled-release Oxycodone-
12 containing formulation.

13 We know that some of the most
14 lethal methods of abuse involve crushing the
15 tablet as a preparatory step. We also know
16 that IV drug abusers typically crush a tablet
17 and dissolve it in a small amount of hot water
18 for injection.

19 We charged the formulators with
20 the following; make an OxyContin that will
21 meet the research objectives of maintaining
22 the current clinical benefits to patients,

1 while introducing impediments to these known
2 methods of tampering with OxyContin.

3 It is now my pleasure to introduce
4 my colleague, Dr. Richard Mannion.

5 DR. MANNION: Hello. I will
6 briefly review the development and
7 technological basis of the new formulation.
8 I will then describe the extensive range of
9 testing to which the new formulation was
10 subjected in order to evaluate the resistance
11 to defeat of the controlled-release mechanism,
12 and show the results obtained for these tests.
13 The objectives and challenges in developing
14 this product from a pharmaceutical perspective
15 can be divided into two categories.

16 Developing a product with tamper
17 resistant properties, but also developing a
18 product with the properties required to be an
19 effective medication, the product needs to
20 have resistance to physical and chemical
21 methods of tampering. We placed on an
22 emphasis on the resistance to breaking of the

1 dosage form, and the barrier this difficulty
2 presents to subsequent extraction of the
3 active ingredient.

4 There is also a requirement that,
5 like the original OxyContin product, drug
6 release not be accelerated by the presence of
7 ethanol. Just being tamper resistant is not
8 enough. In addition, the product must meet
9 the requirements of any reformulation. It
10 must be bioequivalent to the original
11 formulation. It must be possible to
12 manufacture the product reproducibly at
13 commercial scale, and it must be stable.

14 New formulation OxyContin tablets
15 have a similar, but not identical, appearance
16 to the original formulation. The dimensions
17 of the reformulated tablets are slightly
18 different to those of the original
19 formulation. The reformulated tablet is
20 thicker. For some strengths, but not the 40
21 milligram shown, there will be a change in
22 tablet diameter. Also, the indicia on one

1 face has been changed to OP on the renewed
2 formulation, instead of OC on the original.
3 There is no change in the color of any of the
4 tablets. All, except the 60 milligram, will
5 use the same cosmetic coating material as the
6 equivalent strength of the original
7 formulation. The 60 milligram will continue
8 to be red, but a different dye will be used in
9 the coat, resulting in this strength being a
10 different shade. The differences in
11 appearance between the new formulation and
12 original tablets are apparent.

13 The development of a tamper
14 resistant dosage form is something Purdue have
15 been working on for many years. Purdue
16 developed and evaluated multiple technology
17 platforms prior to selecting the compositions
18 containing the specific polymer which are the
19 basis for the new formulation. It is this
20 polymer, that when subjected to a novel
21 manufacturing process, makes the tablets
22 difficult to break or crush. If breaking the

1 tablets is achieved, tablet fragments retain
2 some controlled-release properties, and by
3 this, I mean that they continue to release
4 Oxycodone over an extended time period. They
5 don't become immediate release. Also, on
6 hydration of tablet fragments, the polymer
7 becomes a viscous gel that inhibits extraction
8 of active ingredient for injection.

9 So how difficult is it to break
10 these tablets? During the development of this
11 product, one of the tests which we used is a
12 rapid evaluation of whether the product have
13 the desired tamper resistant properties, was
14 to strike the tablet several times with a
15 hammer. This wasn't part of the standardized
16 testing protocol, but it gave a good high-
17 level indication of the properties of the
18 tablet. It is a simulation of a real-life
19 situation where a blunt instrument of some
20 kind is used to defeat the controlled-release
21 mechanism.

22 The photograph on the left shows

1 the results of striking one of the 40
2 milligram reformulated tablets several times
3 with a hammer. The one on the right shows
4 that the tablet is not broken into pieces. A
5 conventional tablet would be reduced to a fine
6 powder if treated in the same way.

7 One common method of tampering
8 with the original formulation of OxyContin is
9 to crush the tablets between two spoons. In
10 contrast to the original formulation on the
11 right, the new formulation on the left cannot
12 be crushed in this manner.

13 As I move between the images, the
14 difference is apparent. The original
15 formulation is reduced to a fine powder;
16 whereas the new formulation is only slightly
17 deformed, and has one small crack.

18 There are no industry-wide
19 standards for testing to assess tamper
20 resistance properties. Purdue has published
21 and presented strategies for tamper testing.
22 The protocol used for the new formulation

1 includes a series of internally standardized
2 tests. The protocol was submitted to FDA for
3 review several months prior to the NDA
4 submission, and FDA comments were incorporated
5 into the protocol.

6 Our strategy was to perform a
7 series of tests in the laboratory that
8 simulate methods used to defeat the
9 medication's controlled-release mechanism.
10 These include simulations of methods known to
11 be used by those abusing controlled-release
12 tablets, but also go beyond this to evaluate
13 tampering by more complex methods, which
14 require significant knowledge of chemistry.

15 The testing employed increasingly
16 aggressive methods of tampering. The levels
17 of physical manipulation to break the tablets
18 start with manual crushing using a tool
19 designed to crush or break items, and then
20 progressed to a mechanical mill.

21 Each manipulation was followed by
22 a dissolution test and an extraction test on

1 the resultant material. The chemical
2 extraction studies are classified as either
3 simple, moderate, or advanced. The
4 classification is driven by the availability
5 of the solvents, the toxicity of the solvents,
6 the time, and the temperature used for this
7 extraction.

8 Simple extraction is at room
9 temperature with readily available non-toxic
10 solvents, and involves shorter durations.
11 Moderate extraction is also at room
12 temperature, but with less readily available
13 and more harmful solvents. Advanced
14 extraction utilize higher temperature, longer
15 duration or organic solvents which are more
16 toxic, some of which need a secondary
17 extraction. The protocol also includes a
18 simulated preparation for IV abuse.

19 The initial level of physical
20 manipulation used in the protocol is manual
21 crushing using a significantly more aggressive
22 tool than many real-world techniques, such as

1 spoons. Even then, the new formulation
2 remains in large pieces, as illustrated in the
3 image on the left. In contrast, the original
4 formulation on the right can be crushed easily
5 into a fine powder.

6 We subjected tablets treated in
7 this way to a dissolution test to measure the
8 amount of Oxycodone released. The dissolution
9 test is the industry recognized way of
10 measuring drug release from a dosage form.
11 Testing in this way is an approximate
12 simulation of drug release if the tablets were
13 crushed or swallowed.

14 The table shows the range for the
15 amounts released from the original and new
16 formulations. In this and subsequent slides
17 the range is low to high, are the lowest to
18 highest values obtained, and the low value
19 does not, necessarily, correspond to the 10
20 milligram strength, and the high value to the
21 80 milligram.

22 The data show that the original

1 formulation releases essentially all of the
2 Oxycodone in the specific time period,
3 indicating that the controlled-release
4 mechanism has been defeated by manual
5 crushing. In contrast, the new formulation
6 released between 20 and 49 percent of the
7 Oxycodone, at the product was not rendered
8 immediate release. The large pieces generated
9 by manual crushing retained some of the
10 controlled-release properties of the intact
11 tablets.

12 The extraction studies conducted
13 on the materials obtained after manual
14 crushing are classified internally as simple
15 extraction. They used readily available non-
16 toxic solvents at room temperature, and do not
17 continue for extended time periods. The data
18 presented show the range for the amounts
19 extracted from the new and original
20 formulations.

21 The original formulation tablets
22 released essentially all of the Oxycodone in

1 the effective solvents. The amounts of
2 Oxycodone released in the effective solvents
3 from the new formulation were much lower,
4 indicating that manual crushing, followed by
5 simple extraction, did not defeat the
6 controlled-release mechanism of the tablets.

7 The next level of physical
8 manipulation evaluated was the use of a
9 mechanical mill. The difference in
10 convenience and potential for spontaneity
11 between this and something equivalent to the
12 equipment used for manual crushing is large.
13 Greater planning and effort are required,
14 compared to crushing by a non-mechanical
15 method, and it places restrictions on where
16 the tampering can take place.

17 However, even with this more
18 aggressive technique, we only managed to break
19 the new formulation tablets into pieces that
20 are visibly larger than those achieved by
21 manually crushing the original formulation, as
22 shown in the contrast between the two images.

1 Because the original formulation
2 of OxyContin could be manually crushed
3 effectively, material from tablets manipulated
4 by this method was used for subsequent tests.
5 Using a more complex procedure was not
6 necessary.

7 The data in this table show the
8 range of amounts released from the milled new
9 formulation and crushed original formulation.
10 The data for the crushed original formulation
11 are the same data shown earlier in the
12 presentation, and show that essentially all of
13 the Oxycodone has been released. This
14 contrasts with the new formulation, where
15 amounts released were only approximately 20 to
16 30 percent higher than from intact tablets
17 tested in the same way. However, the table
18 does not show the whole story. In order to
19 obtain a greater understanding of what was
20 happening, a separate test was done on the 10
21 milligram tablets, where samples were taken
22 every five minutes.

1 This plot shows time from zero to
2 50 minutes on the X-axis, and percent released
3 on the Y-axis. The crushed original
4 formulation tablet released all of its drug
5 load after five minutes, or less. Crushing
6 has reduced the original controlled-release
7 tablet to being extremely immediate release.
8 Contrast this result with the milled new
9 formulation tablet. It's not turned into an
10 immediate release product. The large pieces
11 retain some of the controlled-release
12 properties of the intact tablet, and the
13 active ingredient is released gradually
14 throughout the duration of the test.

15 The single data points on the
16 lower right of the graph represent the percent
17 released from intact tablets of the original
18 and new formulation when tested in the same
19 way. In fact, the amount released after 40
20 minutes from the milled new formulation is
21 only a few percent higher than the amount
22 released from the intact original formulation

1 tablets when subjected to the same dissolution
2 test.

3 The gelling of the polymer, which
4 causes pieces of tablets to retain some
5 controlled-release properties, also acts to
6 inhibit tampering to obtain something which
7 can be injected.

8 In order to evaluate tampering for
9 IV abuse, the tablets were first milled in the
10 case of the new formulation, or crushed in the
11 case of the original formulation. Water was
12 added to enable extraction of the active
13 ingredient for injection. The picture on the
14 left shows the results of executing this
15 procedure in a 40 milligram new formulation
16 tablet. The addition of water to the milled
17 tablet has caused the formation of a
18 gelatinous mass, which could not be drawn into
19 a syringe. The syringe is empty.

20 This contrasts with the image on
21 the right, showing the results of conducting
22 this procedure on an original formulation 40

1 milligram tablet. The syringe is full of the
2 liquid used to extract the drug.

3 The results of testing are shown
4 in the table. The values obtained for the new
5 formulation reflect the difficulty in
6 extracting the drug by this method. In
7 contrast, the data obtained for the original
8 formulation show that 49 to 58 percent of the
9 Oxycodone is made available for IV abuse.

10 We also evaluated whether thermal
11 treatment could be used to extract the drug
12 from the original and new formulation. Milled
13 new formulation and crushed original
14 formulation were added to a solvent and boiled
15 for a preset time. The milled new formulation
16 tablets released 21 to 48 percent less
17 Oxycodone than the corresponding strength of
18 the crushed original formulation.

19 Additional extraction studies were
20 conducted on the milled new formulation and
21 crushed original formulation. The solvents
22 used for these studies and the manipulation of

1 the tablets using the mill instead of manual
2 crushing resulted in these being classified
3 internally as moderate extraction studies.

4 The table shows the range of data
5 obtained in each solvent for the new and
6 original formulation. Release from the new
7 formulation in medium solvents I and II was
8 lower than release from the original
9 formulation. Medium solvent III was not a
10 good solvent for extracting out Oxycodone.

11 Longer extraction times were
12 evaluated with a broader range of solvents.
13 The degree of complexity and time combined
14 with the toxicity of some of the solvents
15 caused these tests to be classified internally
16 as advanced extraction. The range of results
17 for the new and original products in each
18 solvent are presented. The results obtained
19 for the new formulation are an incremental
20 improvement than those of the original
21 formulation. The data show that with some
22 solvents and an extended time period,

1 significant amounts of Oxycodone can be
2 extracted from the formulation. The best
3 solvent for extracting Oxycodone from the new
4 formulation, Complex Solvent I, is not
5 something which can be ingested. And because
6 of the toxic nature of this solvent, a
7 secondary extraction or equivalent would be
8 needed to obtain the drug in a usable form.

9 When assessing the meaning of
10 data, such as that obtained for Complex
11 Solvent I, the activities required to extract
12 the drug need to be taken into consideration.
13 The tablets have been milled and shaken with
14 a toxic organic solvent for an extended time.
15 In order to get the drug into an ingestible or
16 injectable form, a secondary extraction would
17 be required. This is a complicated and
18 lengthy procedure.

19 This table shows the impact of a
20 higher temperature on these advanced
21 extraction studies. The data show that
22 release is generally not accelerated by

1 heating the samples.

2 In summary, the in vitro testing
3 was rigorous and extensive. It simulated
4 increasingly aggressive methods for defeating
5 the controlled-release mechanism. The tablets
6 are difficult to break. If they break, they
7 break into fragments which retain controlled-
8 release characteristics. A gelatinous mass
9 forms when tablets or fragments are in contact
10 with aqueous media, and the active ingredient
11 is difficult to extract. Thank you.

12 DR. HADDOX: Thank you, Dr.
13 Mannion. Dr. Mannion has provided you with
14 the laboratory evidence of the new
15 formulation's performance on our tamper
16 resistant protocol, and supports the labeling
17 language we proposed to FDA that applies
18 specifically to the 10 to 40 milligram tablets
19 of the new formulation. The wording is
20 consistent with our understanding of
21 discussion with FDA, and meets the dual goals
22 of not making claims for abuse-resistance, nor

1 providing clear instructions on how to tamper
2 with the product.

3 The proposed FPI for the new
4 formulation includes the same boxed warning,
5 all other warnings, all precautions, and all
6 the information about drug abuse as the
7 current OxyContin FPI.

8 Healthcare professionals should
9 know that there is a difference between the
10 new and the original formulations, and make
11 their prescribing decisions based on full
12 information. As with any product safety
13 concern, healthcare professionals should be
14 warned about potential issues, and advised of
15 the product characteristics that may effect
16 those issues. In this case, adding
17 appropriate language to the FPI regarding the
18 tamper resistant qualities of the new
19 formulation would provide healthcare
20 professionals accurate information about the
21 medication, and minimize misconceptions.

22 As you know, as Dr. Rappaport

1 pointed out, many drugs now have RiskMAPs
2 associated with them, especially those drugs
3 that have abuse potential. We've had a risk
4 management program for OxyContin for some
5 time, even predating the RiskMAP guidance.
6 The history of our RiskMAP will be reviewed in
7 detail by FDA later this morning.

8 The goals of the RiskMAP for
9 OxyContin's new formulation are three; to
10 minimize the abuse of OxyContin, to minimize
11 the diversion of OxyContin, and to minimize
12 exposure to OxyContin among those under the
13 age of 18.

14 As you know from the RiskMAP
15 guidance, each goal must have at least one
16 objective supporting it, employ one or more
17 tools aimed at achieving the objective, and
18 have an evaluation plan using one or more
19 tools or methods of evaluation, if possible,
20 to determine if the objective has been
21 reached, or to inform subsequent efforts to
22 achieve that objective.

1 Our new RiskMAP incorporates the
2 new formulation itself as a key risk
3 management tool. Our RiskMAP also insures
4 accurate and clear information about the
5 appropriate use of the product through
6 education of healthcare professionals about
7 OxyContin. It also evaluates the impact of
8 the new formulation on the abuse of OxyContin
9 through a long-term epidemiological study.
10 I'd like to take a few moments to talk about
11 that in some detail.

12 We planned this study to assess
13 the impact of the new formulation on abuse.
14 We will compare the prevalence of OxyContin
15 abuse by participating site among enrollees to
16 one of 68 opioid treatment programs or OTPs,
17 that use Methadone maintenance to treat
18 addiction. We will gather data before and
19 after the availability of the new formulation.

20 The OTP study is a component of
21 the RADARS system that is owned and operated
22 by Denver Health, the not-for-profit that

1 operates Denver's Public Safety Net Hospital
2 and the Rocky Mountain Poison and Drug Center.
3 Our study will involve a secondary analysis of
4 data collected in the ongoing OTP study.

5 The primary objective will be to
6 assess the impact of the launch of OTR on the
7 proportion of OTP study participants reporting
8 past month use of OxyContin to get high. The
9 design is a pre/post method. The pre period
10 will be four quarters prior to the
11 availability of the 10 through 40 milligram
12 new formulation tablets data collection which
13 is ongoing now. The post period will be four
14 quarters following the availability of all
15 strengths of the new formulation. The unit of
16 analysis will be at the opioid treatment
17 program level.

18 The data collection instrument
19 used by the RADARS system is a one-page self-
20 administered questionnaire. It is conducted
21 at the point of intake to the program. The
22 data are anonymous with the exception of the

1 ZIP code of the reporter. The participants
2 receive a token reward to enhance their
3 participation. The items assess the
4 demographics of the individual, record the
5 site, of course, since that's a unit of
6 analysis, and include a checklist of drugs
7 used to get high in the past month, including
8 Heroin, OxyContin, and 13 other opioid
9 analgesic products. The survey also asks the
10 primary drug of abuse before seeking admission
11 to the opioid treatment program.

12 The analysis will include a two-
13 sample Z-test to test the null hypothesis that
14 the proportion of study participants in each
15 OTP who report the use of OxyContin within the
16 past month to get high has stayed the same or
17 increased in the post period, versus the
18 alternative hypothesis, that the proportion
19 has decreased. The null hypothesis will be
20 tested at the level of each participating
21 opioid treatment program. The reason for this
22 is that we know from RADARS and other data

1 that there are geographic variations in trends
2 around the country in terms of drug abuse.
3 The P-values from each of these two sample
4 tests will be pooled according to Fisher's
5 rule for combining significant probabilities,
6 and the analysis results will be declared
7 statistically significant if the overall P-
8 value is less than 0.025.

9 In conclusion, the introduction of
10 the new OxyContin formulation has the
11 potential for meaningful public health
12 benefits. The new formulation of OxyContin is
13 intended to be every bit as effective for
14 patients as the original, with a potential to
15 reduce abuse. The new formulation resists
16 crushing and other common methods of
17 tampering. We hope this will translate into
18 reduced abuse, but agree with FDA that post-
19 approval study is required to determine if
20 this goal is achieved. The new formulation
21 will not eliminate abuse. The inclusion in
22 labeling of descriptive information will help

1 clarify understanding, and minimize
2 misconceptions. Thank you.

3 CHAIR FARRAR: Thank you very
4 much. We'll move right into the FDA
5 presentation, and I'd like to ask Mwango
6 Kashoki to come and give the first
7 presentation.

8 DR. KASHOKI: Good morning. My
9 name is Mwango Kashoki, and I'm a Medical Team
10 Leader in the Division of Anesthesia,
11 Analgesia and Rheumatology Products. My
12 presentation will outline the history of
13 OxyContin to date, and will include events
14 relating to the product label, and the risk
15 management plan.

16 OxyContin was approved in December
17 of 1995, and the approval occurred during a
18 period of growing recognition that many
19 patients with pain are inadequately treated.
20 And, also, that there was an increase in abuse
21 and diversion of prescription drugs.

22 The '95 label indicated that

1 OxyContin is a Schedule II drug. And the
2 clinical trial section of the label describe
3 the results of several studies, including
4 trials in both cancer and non-cancer pain.
5 The non-cancer pain trials were in patients
6 with arthritis and post-operative pain. The
7 use of OxyContin in opioid-naive patients was
8 also described in the clinical trial section,
9 and the results of open label and equivalence
10 trials were also reported in that section.

11 Initially, OxyContin was indicated
12 for the management of moderate to severe pain
13 when an opioid would be required for more than
14 a few days. The warnings and drug abuse and
15 dependence sections of the label cautioned
16 against crushing, or breaking, or otherwise
17 destroying the integrity of the tablets due to
18 the release of a potentially toxic amount of
19 Oxycodone. Notably, the drug abuse and
20 dependence section stated that delayed
21 absorption of the OxyContin that resulted from
22 the controlled-release properties of the drug

1 was believed to reduce the abuse liability of
2 OxyContin.

3 At that time, the thinking was
4 that the pharmacokinetics of a delayed or
5 controlled release formulation, namely, the
6 slower and lower Cmax or p-concentration, as
7 well as fewer peaks and troughs would reduce
8 the reinforcing effects of the drug. And this
9 is what led to the inclusion of such language
10 about reduced abuse liability in the label.

11 In 1996, the 80 milligram strength
12 was approved. The label was modified to
13 reflect that this highest dose was to be used
14 only in opioid tolerant patients who would
15 require minimum daily dose of 160 milligrams,
16 but the label language otherwise remained the
17 same.

18 In 2000, an even higher strength
19 tablet, 160 milligrams, was approved. Again,
20 the label was revised to reflect that this
21 high strength should also be used in opioid
22 tolerant patients who needed daily doses of at

1 least 320 milligrams. But, otherwise, no new
2 modifications to the label.

3 Now, around the time that the 160
4 milligram strength was approved and released,
5 Purdue began a fairly aggressive marketing
6 campaign for OxyContin. Through considerable
7 advertising and other strategies directed at
8 physicians, the company promoted the use of
9 OxyContin primarily among primary care
10 providers, as compared to pain specialists.
11 And Purdue also promoted the use of OxyContin
12 for non-cancer pain, including pain due to
13 arthritis or post-operative pain. And, also,
14 OxyContin was promoted as first line therapy
15 for chronic pain, which was inconsistent with
16 pain treatment guidelines.

17 In May of 2000, the Division of
18 Drug Marketing, Advertising, and
19 Communications, also known as DDMAC, issued an
20 untitled letter to Purdue regarding some of
21 its promotional materials. The letter cited
22 the company for making misleading efficacy

1 claims. For example, some of the materials
2 described the use of the 160 milligram
3 strength in a manner that was inconsistent
4 with the label, and also described prompt
5 effect, which was inconsistent with the data,
6 and made claims about effects on other patient
7 symptoms, such as improved sleep and mood,
8 which was not substantiated by the data.

9 With regard to the safety
10 information, some of the materials had safety-
11 related text that was presented in such a way
12 that either reduced its readability or
13 prominence in the materials. And, also, there
14 was incomplete information regarding proper
15 administration of the drug. Following receipt
16 of the letter, Purdue ceased dissemination of
17 these advertisements.

18 In that same year, the media in
19 certain states began to report cases of abuse
20 and diversion of OxyContin. The drug was
21 being crushed and administered by non-oral
22 routes. As a result, patients experienced

1 adverse events or effects, including addiction
2 and even fatalities. And some states were
3 more effective than others, including the
4 Appalachian states, New England states, and
5 Ohio. Also worrisome was the fact that
6 teenagers were amongst the populations that
7 were abusing OxyContin.

8 There are several possible reasons
9 why OxyContin became a favored drug of abuse
10 and diversion. A recent study suggests that
11 Oxycodone is more reinforcing than Morphine.
12 And with respect to the drug formulation,
13 OxyContin has a higher Oxycodone content
14 compared to immediate release Oxycodone. And
15 even those initially believed that the
16 pharmacokinetics of a controlled-release
17 formulation would render a drug less abusable,
18 more recent experience has shown that this
19 isn't the case if the controlled-release
20 properties of the drug are defeated.

21 Additionally, there's more drug
22 available, in general, with the emphasis on

1 good pain management, prescribers are probably
2 becoming more comfortable in terms of
3 prescribing opioid analgesics. There's also
4 Purdue's push to promote OxyContin that could
5 have led to increased availability of the
6 drug. And, finally, the product labeling
7 could have been a factor. The language about
8 the release of a high dose of Oxycodone with
9 crushing of the pill could have alerted some
10 abusers as to how they could misuse the drug.
11 And, also, the language about lower abuse
12 potential of OxyContin may have misled
13 patients and prescribers about the actual
14 addictive risks of OxyContin.

15 Now, initially in response to the
16 reports of OxyContin abuse and diversion,
17 Purdue contacted the Agency to discuss these
18 issues. Also, formed a response team to look
19 at the problems developing in Maine. That was
20 a hotspot area. And the company also elected
21 to discontinue marketing of the highest
22 strength 160 milligram tablet.

1 The Agency requested additional
2 information from various sources, and we
3 reviewed all available data to look at
4 OxyContin prescribing practices, as well as
5 adverse events. And we met with Purdue to
6 discuss these problems.

7 As a result of what was learned
8 about abuse and diversion of OxyContin, the
9 Agency decided to revise the product label for
10 the drug. A labeling supplement proposing
11 other revisions to the label had previously
12 been submitted, and so we used this as an
13 opportunity to reconsider the language of the
14 entire label.

15 The revised OxyContin label was
16 approved in July of 2001, and key changes were
17 as follows. First, a boxed warning was added
18 that describes the potential for abuse,
19 misuse, and diversion of OxyContin, and
20 emphasizes the proper patients for treatment.
21 The clinical trial section was restricted to
22 the sole adequate and well-controlled study,

1 and the indications section was rewritten to
2 specify the appropriate treatment population.

3 The indications section now states
4 that OxyContin is indicated for patients with
5 moderate to severe pain who require around-
6 the-clock analgesia for an extended period of
7 time. The indications section also states the
8 patients for whom OxyContin is not
9 appropriate, including those who need PRN, or
10 as-needed dosing, and those in the immediate
11 post-operative period.

12 The warning section cautions
13 against destroying the integrity of the pills,
14 and there is now more prominently under the
15 warning section, detailed language that
16 describes the potential for misuse, abuse, and
17 diversion of OxyContin. The previous label
18 just had a few sentences about these risks
19 under the drug abuse and dependence section.

20 With respect to the drug abuse and
21 dependence section, the sentence implying
22 reduced abuse liability of OxyContin because

1 of the controlled-release formulation has been
2 deleted.

3 In addition to rewriting the
4 product label, the Agency specified to Purdue
5 that all material that was to promote
6 OxyContin had to be based on the revised
7 product label, and if any new risk information
8 was added to the package insert or to the
9 product label, the promotional materials had
10 to be revised to reflect this.

11 Now, while negotiations about the
12 revised product label were underway, the
13 Agency and Purdue began discussions regarding
14 the implementation of a risk management plan.
15 I'll abbreviate that, RMP, in my talk. You've
16 also heard it referred to as a RiskMAP.

17 The ideal components of an RMP
18 were considered, and clearly, prevention of
19 abuse, misuse, and diversion was important.
20 And adequate product labeling, patient and
21 prescriber education, and the development of
22 an abuse deterrent or an abuse-resistant

1 formulation were considered important
2 prevention strategies.

3 Surveillance was another important
4 component of the RMP, and risk management
5 involving assessment of the scope of the
6 problem, and the effectiveness of any
7 interventions that were taking place in
8 response to a signal were also employed,
9 should be employed in an RMP.

10 So the initial draft of the
11 OxyContin RMP was submitted to the Agency in
12 August of 2001, and the RMP had multiple
13 features, including education and
14 surveillance, as well as strategies for
15 intervention should a signal be detected about
16 abuse, misuse, or diversion.

17 The surveillance component of the
18 RMP makes use of existing data collection
19 systems, and also established a new one known
20 as RADARS that was previously described.
21 You'll be hearing about some of these other
22 data collection systems in other talks to be

1 presented.

2 In addition, in 2002, product
3 labeling in the form of a patient package
4 insert was approved, and the patient package
5 insert, or PPI, describes the patients who are
6 supposed to be treated with OxyContin, how to
7 take the drug properly, and also describes
8 OxyContin as a highly favored drug for abuse
9 and diversion, and what strategies patients
10 can take in order to minimize these risks.

11 Later in 2002, the Agency held an
12 Advisory Committee meeting to discuss the use
13 of opioid analgesics in pain patients, as well
14 as their potential for abuse and misuse. And
15 at this meeting, it was concluded that while
16 abuse of opioids is a significant Public
17 Health problem, these drugs are important for
18 proper pain management. And an overly
19 restrictive risk management plan may limit the
20 proper use of these drugs in legitimate
21 patients.

22 Following the 2002 Advisory

1 Committee meetings, Purdue and the FDA began
2 discussions regarding development of a
3 reformulated OxyContin product that was
4 potentially less abusable. And over the
5 years, many ways of reformulating the product
6 have been discussed.

7 Meanwhile, in 2003, DDMAC issued a
8 warning letter to Purdue regarding certain
9 advertisements that appeared in medical
10 journals. As presented, DDMAC stated that the
11 ads minimized the risks of OxyContin, and
12 promoted broader use of the drug than as
13 described in the product label. Following
14 receipt of the letter, Purdue stopped
15 disseminating those ads.

16 In addition to the warning letter,
17 the Agency has issued other untitled letters
18 to Purdue regarding some of its promotional
19 materials. These issues have basically been
20 that the ads minimize risk, imply broader use
21 than is actually approved, and did not
22 completely state how OxyContin is to be

1 administered appropriately.

2 In 2003, the Agency held another
3 Advisory Committee meeting, this time to
4 discuss risk management plans, in general, and
5 specifically one that had been proposed for
6 Palladone. At the end of the meeting, it was
7 generally agreed that the RMP should have the
8 components of prescriber and patient
9 education, and surveillance of drug use, and
10 should also assess the impact of opioid
11 prescribing practices.

12 The following year, in 2004, the
13 first generic extended release Oxycodone
14 products were approved, and each of those had
15 a risk management plan. While the generic
16 applications were still under review, Purdue
17 filed suit against the generics for patient
18 infringement. The initial ruling was made by
19 the District Court in 2004, and was in favor
20 of the generic companies. And the District
21 Court's ruling was affirmed the following year
22 by the Federal Circuit.

1 In February 2006, however, the
2 Federal Circuit withdrew its affirmance, and
3 also vacated the District Court decision. And
4 in October of 2006, Purdue settled with the
5 generic companies, and the final agreement was
6 that the generic versions of extended release
7 Oxycodone would be discontinued, but only
8 after a certain time after the settlement
9 agreement.

10 So with regard to the generic
11 extended release Oxycodone products, the
12 current status is as follows. Teva and Impax
13 remain approved, but are no longer marketed.
14 The final approved for Endo's Oxycodone
15 extended release generic was rescinded, and is
16 now in tentative approval status. Watson has
17 the only generic extended Oxycodone on the
18 market. The Watson product is actually
19 Purdue's generic OxyContin, and Watson is
20 Purdue's authorized distributor for this drug.

21 Another notable event in the
22 history of OxyContin is the guilty plea that

1 Purdue and three of its executives made to
2 charges that they misled the public about the
3 risks of OxyContin. The charges were
4 regarding promotional activities that occurred
5 prior to mid-2001, which is when the product
6 label was revised.

7 Last year, the new drug
8 application for the tamper resistant
9 reformulation of OxyContin was submitted, and
10 all but the 80 milligram strength, which is
11 currently the highest marketed strength, have
12 been reformulated. And the reformulated
13 tablets are purportedly more resistant to
14 physical and chemical manipulation. And
15 testing, as we have heard, for tamper
16 resistance was based on known methods of
17 abuse.

18 Purdue proposes inclusion in the
19 product label language that describes the
20 effects of physical manipulation on the
21 reformulated product. Additionally, there'll
22 be other surveillance components that have

1 been proposed for the risk management plan or
2 program. The surveillance will include
3 assessment of OxyContin abuse patterns after
4 approval of the reformulation, and a
5 comparison of abuse methods and adverse
6 effects of the reformulated versus non-
7 reformulated OxyContin products.

8 So the status is today that the
9 Agency and Purdue have worked to strength
10 OxyContin's product label and the risk
11 management plan. Nevertheless, abuse and
12 diversion of OxyContin continue to be
13 considerable health problems. And while it's
14 desirable to have less abusable controlled-
15 release Oxycodone on the market, we don't know
16 what the actual impact of such a drug will be.
17 Thank you.

18 CHAIR FARRAR: Thank you for that
19 presentation. We're going to move on to
20 Lieutenant Commander Kendra Worthy's
21 presentation. I'd advise the Board that the
22 questions and answers for this section will

1 come after lunch.

2 DR. WORTHY: Good morning. My
3 name is Kendra Worthy, and I am a Drug
4 Utilization Analyst in the Division of
5 Epidemiology in the Office of Surveillance and
6 Epidemiology, and I will be discussing out-
7 patient drug utilization trends for Oxycodone
8 products.

9 Outlining my talk this morning, I
10 will be discussing sales distribution data
11 that was provided by IMS Health, IMS National
12 Sales Perspectives, Retail and non-Retail. We
13 will be looking at retail prescription data,
14 specifically trends within the opioid market,
15 state level data, and prescriber specialty
16 data from Verispan's Vector One National,
17 otherwise known as VONA.

18 Please note that VONA does not
19 include data from mail-order pharmacies, out-
20 patient clinics, long-term care facilities, or
21 same-day surgery centers. An age distribution
22 of patient-level data from Verispan's total

1 patient tracker is also included. Lastly, I
2 will summarize with conclusions.

3 We will now take a look at sales
4 distribution data from year 2007, with a brief
5 description of the database. The IMS Health,
6 IMS National Sales Perspectives Database
7 measures volume information and unit sales of
8 a given product from the manufacturer to
9 various channels of distribution. The units
10 measured in these databases are extended
11 units, which are, for example, individual
12 tablets and capsules.

13 The retail perspective measures
14 chain, independent, mass merchandisers, food
15 stores with pharmacies, and mail-order
16 pharmacies. The non-retail perspective
17 measures federal facilities, non-federal
18 hospitals, clinics, long-term care facilities,
19 home healthcare, HMOs, and miscellaneous
20 channels, such as prisons and universities.

21 This pie chart shows the number of
22 combined OxyContin and generic Oxycodone ER

1 tablets sold from the manufacturer to retail
2 and non-retail pharmacies in the year 2007.
3 Approximately 87 percent of sales were to
4 retail channels of distribution; therefore,
5 this presentation will focus on retail data.

6 Moving on to prescription and
7 patient-level data with a brief description of
8 the database. Verispan's Vector One National,
9 VONA, is a national-level projected
10 prescription and patient-centric tracking
11 service. They receive over two billion
12 prescription claims per year, representing
13 over 160 million unique patients. The number
14 of dispensed prescriptions is obtained from a
15 sample of approximately 59,000 pharmacies
16 throughout the United States, accounting for
17 nearly all retail pharmacies, and represent
18 nearly half of retail prescriptions dispensed
19 nationwide.

20 Retail pharmacies include national
21 retail chains, mass merchandisers, pharmacy
22 benefit managers and their data systems, and

1 provider groups. Data on prescribing
2 specialty and patient age and gender are
3 available, as well as state-level data.

4 This graph shows the utilization
5 trend of frequently dispensed opioids since
6 1997. Hydrocodone products dominate the
7 opioid market. For the past 10 years,
8 Hydrocodone, shown here in red, has been the
9 number one dispensed product out of all
10 prescription drug products. Oxycodone
11 products, shown here in gold, come in at a
12 distant second to Hydrocodone, with
13 approximately 42 million prescriptions
14 dispensed in 2007.

15 This graph removes Hydrocodone and
16 takes a closer look at the dispensing trends
17 of other leading opioid products since 1997.
18 Of the 42 million Oxycodone prescriptions
19 dispensed in year 2007 that were mentioned on
20 the previous slide, 7.5 million of those were
21 extended-release Oxycodone, shown here in red.
22 Of those, approximately 5.5 million were

1 generic Oxycodone ER prescriptions, and two
2 million were OxyContin prescriptions.

3 Fentanyl, which is represented by
4 the gold line, and Morphine in the green, tied
5 for third among opioid prescriptions dispensed
6 in 2007, with approximately 5.5 retail
7 prescriptions each. Approximately four
8 million Methadone prescriptions, and 1.6
9 million Hydromorphone prescriptions were
10 dispensed in 2007.

11 This bar graph shows the trend for
12 Oxycodone products immediate-release versus
13 extended-release since 1997. The extended-
14 release Oxycodone market, which is represented
15 by the blue bars, has held constant at
16 approximately 6 to 8 million prescriptions,
17 while prescriptions for the immediate-release
18 formulations, which are represented by the
19 green bars, have continued to increase since
20 the late 1990s. Just under 35 million
21 immediate-release Oxycodone prescriptions were
22 dispensed in year 2007.

1 The following shows a distribution
2 of retail prescriptions dispensed for
3 extended-release Oxycodone products by state
4 for year 2007. The top five states with the
5 highest volume of extended-release Oxycodone
6 prescriptions are Florida, California,
7 Pennsylvania, Ohio, New York, and New Jersey.

8 This graph takes a look at
9 extended-release Oxycodone by company. The
10 Teva brand, which is shown in red, led the
11 market share in 2007, accounting for
12 approximately 2.8 million retail prescriptions
13 representing 37 percent of the extended-
14 release Oxycodone market. Purdue, which is
15 shown in orange, was second with 27 percent of
16 market share at approximately two million
17 retail prescriptions. Watson, which is shown
18 in the green, is Purdue's authorized
19 distributor for generic Oxycodone ER. In
20 2007, approximately 1.4 million prescriptions
21 for Watson's extended-release Oxycodone ER
22 were dispensed, representing 18 percent of the

1 extended release Oxycodone market. As
2 previously mentioned, most of the generic
3 extended-release Oxycodones have discontinued
4 marketing in late 2007, and early 2008.

5 This slide shows the number of
6 OxyContin and generic Oxycodone ER retail
7 prescriptions dispensed since 1998. Between
8 years 2003 and 2004, retail prescriptions
9 dispensed for OxyContin, shown here as the
10 green line, decreased approximately nine
11 percent, from 6.6 million to 6.1 million
12 prescriptions. With the introduction of
13 generic Oxycodone ER, shown in red, to the
14 market in 2004, OxyContin prescriptions
15 continued to drop approximately 77 percent,
16 and please update your handout to this. They
17 dropped approximately 77 percent, from 6.1
18 million during year 2004, to 1.4 million
19 prescriptions during year 2006, when Oxycodone
20 ER prescription volume peaked at 5.5 million
21 prescriptions.

22 This graph shows the trend of

1 extended-release Oxycodone products by
2 strength. The 20 milligram strength has led
3 the market share with 2.4 million
4 prescriptions dispensed in year 2007. The 40
5 milligram strength has been second since 2002,
6 with 2.3 million prescriptions dispensed in
7 year 2007. Both the 10 milligram and 80
8 milligram strength had 1.4 million
9 prescriptions dispensed in year 2007.

10 This graph is of the number of
11 retail OxyContin and generic Oxycodone ER
12 prescriptions dispensed by prescribing
13 physician specialties since 1998. General
14 practitioners, which are represented by the
15 family medicine, osteopathic medicine, and
16 general practice specialties, and is shown
17 here in red, are leading prescribing
18 specialties, followed by internal medicine,
19 which is shown in gold.

20 General practitioners prescribed
21 approximately 2.1 million or 28 percent of
22 retail extended-release Oxycodone

1 prescriptions dispensed in year 2007.

2 Internal medicine physicians prescribed 1.3
3 million, or 18 percent.

4 This slide shows a comparison of
5 retail prescriptions on the left, and unique
6 patients on the right, for extended-release
7 Oxycodones stratified by age. As you can see,
8 the trend is very similar between
9 prescriptions and patients. Approximately 1.3
10 million patients filled a retail prescription
11 for generic Oxycodone ER in 2007, and
12 approximately 400,000 patients filled a
13 prescription for OxyContin during the same
14 time period. Collectively, patients aged 41
15 to 65 years filled the majority of long-acting
16 Oxycodone prescriptions. Pediatric patients
17 age zero to 16 years account for less than 1
18 percent of patients that fill prescriptions
19 for these products.

20 In summary, Hydrocodone products
21 are the number one dispensed prescription
22 product, with 119 million prescriptions