

Food and Drug Administration Rockville MD 20857

SEP 13 2000

NOTICE OF INITIATION OF DISQUALIFICATION PROCEEDINGS AND OPPORTUNITY TO EXPLAIN LETTER

CERTIFIED MAIL RETURN RECEIPT REQUESTED

Roger D. Anderson, M.D. Anderson Clinical Research, Inc. 3339 Ward Street Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania 15213-4330

Dear Dr. Anderson:

Between April 12 and August 4, 1999, Ms. Cynthia L. Rakestraw and Ms. Gladys B. Casper,
representing the Food and Drug Administration (FDA), met with you to review your conduct of a
clinical study (protocol of the investigational drug capsules
7performed for
This inspection is part of the FDA's Bioresearch Monitoring Program, which includes inspections
designed to validate clinical studies on which drug approval may be based and to assure that the
rights and welfare of the human subjects of those studies are protected.

Based on our evaluation of information obtained, the Center for Drug Evaluation and Research of FDA (Center) believes that you have repeatedly or deliberately violated regulations governing the proper conduct of clinical studies involving investigational new drugs as published under Title 21, Code of Federal Regulations (CFR), Part 312 (copy enclosed) and that you submitted false information to FDA or the sponsor.

We reviewed your September 14, 1999, response to the inspectional findings (Form FDA 483 dated August 4, 1999). While we accept your responses to items 2, 4, 7, 8, 9 and 10, we do not accept your responses to items 1, 3, 5 and 6, as detailed below.

This letter provides you with written notice of the matters under complaint and initiates an administrative proceeding, described below, to determine whether you should be disqualified from receiving investigational products as set forth under 21 CFR 312.70.

A listing of the violations follows. The applicable provisions of the CFR are cited for each violation.

3

T		
n	summary	٠
TIT	Juiiiiiiai y	•

[.	You failed to personally conduct or supervise the clinical study, as you committed to do
	when you signed the Form FDA 1572 [21 CFR 312.53(c)(1)(vi)(c)], in violation of 21 CFR
	312.60. Your lack of supervision caused the submission of false information to the sponsor
	in required reports for the study of investigational new drugs that are subject to section 505
	of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act, as demonstrated by the violative conduct
	described more fully below. •

1.	when 312.60 in requoration of the	failed to personally conduct or supervise the clinical study, as you committed to do in you signed the Form FDA 1572 [21 CFR 312.53(c)(1)(vi)(c)], in violation of 21 CFR 60. Your lack of supervision caused the submission of false information to the sponsor equired reports for the study of investigational new drugs that are subject to section 505 are Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act, as demonstrated by the violative conduct wribed more fully below.				
II.	You submitted false information to the sponsor [21 CFR 312.70(a)].					
	A. Data derived from falsified electrocardiograms (ECGs) were submitted					
		1. The E subject	CCG for subject #002 ct #001 on 10/3	on 10/3/97 is the sa 1/97.	me as the ECG for	
		2. The E subject	CCG for subject #007 ct #008]on 11/19/97 is the s	ame as the ECG for	
			CGs for subject #015		both done on 12/8/97,	
		4. The E subject	CCG for subject #014 ct #016 on 1/12/]on 1/14/98 is the same 98.	ne as the ECG for	
	В.	17 subjects as	re falsified. Six subjects	t you claim to have perf s [#007]]#008] have provided sig have confirmed by that you did not perform	7#009厂	
III.	pertine	nt to the invested as a control	stigation on each individ	e records of all observati lual administered the inv n violation of 21 CFR Pa	estigational drug or	
	Α.	_	screening ECG strip (ra FDA inspection.	w data) for subject #001]was not	
	B.	There was no ECGs:	contemporaneous docu	mentation explaining th	e following changes on	
		1. The p	_	nber (ID#) on the ECG a		

	2.		The date, time, ID#, sex, and age, on the ECG ascribed to subject #007 was handwritten after obliterating the printed information.	
		3.	The ID# on the ECG ascribed to subject #011 was handwritten after obliterating the printed ID#.	
-		4.	The printed ID# on the ECG ascribed to subject #010 is identified as #009	
		5.	The time and ID# on the ECG ascribed to subject #015 was overwritten by obliterating the printed information.	
		6.	The printed ID# on the ECG ascribed to subject #003]is identified as #002]	
		7.	The ID# on the ECG ascribed to subject #008 \(\square \text{On } \text{11/21/97} \text{ was overwritten by obliterating the printed ID#.} \)	
		discrep utilize	response does not provide specific explanations for the above mentioned pancies, but in general you attribute them to an inadequate ECG machine d during the trial. However, you have not provided any documentation to by the equipment used or any problems experienced with it during the study.	
	C.	For su report oral date.	bjects #004	
	D.	You durinaly	id not report on page 9 of the CRF the reason for not performing the Visit 1 ysis for subjects #001	
	E.	initials is 52 i 6/22/9	ghout the CRF for subject #009 [] you inaccurately report the subject's as [] In addition, on page 7 of the CRF you report this subject's height niches, and confirmed this height on two data query forms dated 4/23/98 and 18, respectively. The FDA investigator who met and interviewed subject #009 [] reports that the subject was about 61 inches tall.	
IV.	You failed to inform subjects when obtaining their informed consent of the potential risk of developing			

not acceptable because, our inspection and your response reveal that for seven out of seventeen subjects you extended their run-in phase to two weeks in order to stabilize them on and thereby meet eligibility status. You also acknowledge that the IRB was not notified of this deviation from protocol requirement. Furthermore, your argument that the risk of dependence or withdrawal was not included in the consent form because patients were already aware of this risk is not acceptable in light of the fact that the consent form does include other obvious discomforts of the needle insertion during blood draw, as well as eleven other common side effects of such as sleepiness.

This letter is not intended to be an all-inclusive list of deficiencies with your clinical studies of investigational drugs. It is your responsibility to ensure adherence to each requirement of the law and relevant regulations.

On the basis of the above listed violations, the Center asserts that you have repeatedly or deliberately failed to comply with the cited regulations and repeatedly or deliberately submitted false information. The Center proposes that you be disqualified as a clinical investigator. You may reply in writing or at an informal conference in my office to the above stated issues, including an explanation of why you should remain eligible to receive investigational products and not be disqualified as a clinical investigator. This procedure is provided for by regulation 21 CFR 312.70.

• .

Within fifteen (15) days of receipt of this letter, write or call me at (301)594-0020 to arrange a conference time or to indicate your intent to respond in writing. Your written response must be forwarded within thirty (30) days of receipt of this letter. Your reply should be sent to:

Stan W. Woollen
Acting Director
Division of Scientific Investigations
Office of Medical Policy
Center for Drug Evaluation and Research
7520 Standish Place, Room #103
Rockville, Maryland 20855

Should you request an informal conference, we ask that you provide us with a full and complete explanation of the above listed violations. You should bring all pertinent documents with you, and a representative of your choosing may accompany you. Although the conference is informal, a transcript of the conference will be prepared. If you choose to proceed in this manner, we plan to hold such a conference within 30 days of your request.

At any time during this administrative process, you may enter into a consent agreement with the Center regarding your future use of investigational products. Such an agreement would terminate this disqualification proceeding. Enclosed you will find a proposed agreement between you and the Center.

•

The Center will carefully consider any oral or written response. If your explanation is accepted by the Center, the disqualification process will be terminated. If your written or oral responses to our allegations are unsatisfactory, or we cannot come to terms on a consent agreement, or you do not respond to this notice, you will be offered a regulatory hearing before FDA, pursuant to 21 CFR 16 (enclosed) and 21 CFR 312.70. Before such a hearing, FDA will provide you notice of the matters to be considered, including a comprehensive statement of the basis for the decision or action taken or proposed, and a general summary of the information that will be presented by FDA in support of the decision or action. A presiding officer free from bias or prejudice and who has not participated in this matter will conduct the hearing. Such a hearing will determine whether or not you will remain entitled to receive investigational products. You should be aware that neither entry into a consent agreement nor pursuit of a hearing precludes the possibility of a corollary judicial proceeding or administrative remedy concerning these violations.

Sincerely yours,

Stan W. Woollen

Acting Director

Division of Scientific Investigations

Domw. woolle

Office of Medical Policy

Center for Drug Evaluation and Research

Enclosures:

#1 - 21 CFR 312

#2 - 21 CFR 16

#3 - Agreement