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Risk-based Approach in Evaluating E&L

- **Safety considerations** (e.g., toxicity, immunogenicity, etc.)
- **Efficacy considerations** (e.g., L interacting with a product → loss of activity; L may induce development of neutralizing activity via NAb formation)
- **Quality considerations** (e.g., impact on the manufacturing process, product stability, etc.)
Safety considerations

- Toxicity (e.g., acute, chronic, synergistic, additive, carcinogenicity, endocrine dysregulation, etc.)

- Adjuvant effects:
  - Adjuvants are substances that increase the activity of the immune system without having any specific antigenic effect
  - In contrast to vaccines where adjuvant effect is a desired effect, this may be a serious safety concern for therapeutic proteins
  - May promote development of anti-drug antibodies
    - A decrease or loss of efficacy due to development of neutralizing activity
    - May be life-threatening if NAbs are developed against a non-redundant endogenous protein (e.g., erythropoietin - anemia/PRCA; thrombopoietin - thrombocytopenia)
    - Altering the PK of the drug
  - May promote non-specific inflammation
Safety considerations (cont.)

- Drug dose, mode and frequency of administration (e.g., SC vs. IV, life-time dosing and chronic exposure)
- Prior clinical exposure to leachables may enhance sensitivity in case of re-exposure
- Therapeutic necessity of the drug (higher levels may be tolerated if drug is considered a part of essential therapy)
Manufacturing considerations

- Place in the process stream (e.g., upstream vs. downstream; typically risks are greater as production moves closer to the finished product)
- Type of the processed/stored material (e.g., purification buffer vs. final product)
- Storage temperature (e.g., freezing vs. 2-8 °C)
- Surface-to-volume ratio
- Contact time
- Type of polymeric material (e.g., PVC at risk for leaching di(2-ethylhexyl)phthalate, which is linked to various toxicities)
- Formulation/choice of excipients; (e.g., liquid vs. lyophilized; pH; phosphate buffer)
- Risks often assessed on a case-by-case basis
What’s done in practice...

• Extractables studies are performed using exaggerated conditions (organic solvents, accelerated T°, pH, etc.)
  ➢ Alternatively, the drug manufacturer may rely on the E studies done by the vendor
  ➢ Note: Drug Product vehicle may or may not be used as an extraction medium (*role of excipients important*)

• Analysis of extractables is done in conjunction with stability studies, which monitor changes in product quality over time

• Leachables studies are often omitted
Risk assessment and risk reduction with regard to leachables studies

- Safety considerations:
  - Toxicity studies are usually acute studies that do not measure chronic exposure to potential leachables
  - Potential for adjuvant effect and immunogenicity is not addressed
  - Mode of administration (e.g., SC is often more immunogenic than IV)
  - Product that is at the end of its dating period is rarely evaluated in clinic

- Product Quality considerations:
  - Stability studies are often not geared to detect leachable impurities (e.g., inorganic leachables such as tungsten, Fe, Al, etc., are never evaluated and organic leachables may be missed)
  - Differences in the levels of leachables at the extremes of the manufacturing, storage and transportation conditions (no worst case scenario risk assessment)
  - Inappropriate sample size that is needed to understand the true variability in the C/C system (e.g., tungsten and PFS syringes)
Leachables studies

• Monitor the clinical outcome in conjunction with measuring leachables over the entire shelf-life of the product
  ➢ In the presence of product
  ➢ Without the product (i.e., in placebo alone)

• Ideally, Drug Product material that is at the end of its shelf-life should be tested in clinic

• Perform stability studies, which monitor impurities and product physico-chemical and biological properties throughout the expiry period
Leachables as adjuvant and/or immunomodulatory factors

Some support in the literature
Leachables as adjuvant and/or immunomodulatory factors

- Silicone oil – polydimethylsiloxane and octamethylcyclotetrasiloxane (D4)
  - Naim et al., 1995, Immunol Invest, 24:537-547
  - Locatelli et al., 2004, Nephrol Dial Transplant, 19:288-293
Leachables as adjuvant and/or immunomodulatory factors (cont.)

• Di-(2-ethylhexyl) phthalate (DEHP) and Mono-2-ethylhexyl phthalate (MEHP)
  ➢ Larsen et al., 2001, Tox Letters, 125:11-18
  ➢ Larsen et al., 2001, Toxicology, 169:37-51
  ➢ Larsen et al., 2007, Tox Letters, 170:223-228

• Polycyclic aromatic hydrocarbons (PAH)
  ➢ Lovik et al., 1997, Toxicology, 121:165-78
  ➢ Nilsen et al., 1997, Toxicology, 124:225-232
Leachables as adjuvant and/or immunomodulatory factors (cont.)

- **Soluble iron**
  - Beck-Speier et al., 2009, Particle and Fibre Toxicology, 6: 34-46
- **Cadmium**
- **Nickel**
  - Schmidt et al., 2010, Nature Immunology, 11:814-820
- **Alkyl phenols**
  - Yano et al., 2003, J Health Sci, 49:195-204
Establishing threshold levels for leachables in biologics:

Known's and Unknown's
What we know

• Toxicological threshold levels have been proposed and/or established (e.g., PQRI, ICH Q3C, published literature, etc.) that can be applied across board

• What we don’t know: Can the same approach be applied to biologics?
A feasibility exercise

• Threshold for the adjuvant effect:
  ➢ Adjuvant effects of leachables may be studied in animal models (e.g., in mice)
  ➢ Such studies may be useful in looking at relative differences (e.g., after a change in the C/C system) and in identifying potential risks
  ➢ However, the threshold levels identified in animal studies are unlikely to be predictive of the clinical outcome (e.g., mice are 1,000x less sensitive to LPS compared to humans)

• Threshold for product quality
  ➢ Needs to be assessed on a case-by case basis due to diversity of protein products, formulation composition and C/C systems
  ➢ E.g., tungsten oxides had a very different effect on two analogous API that had different formulation: in one case tungsten caused unfolding and aggregation, whereas in another case, it had no effect
Biologics may deserve a special consideration for the following additional reasons...

- **Manufacturing and stability issues:**
  - Protein conformation (e.g., secondary, tertiary) is sensitive to external environment
  - Aggregation and/or degradation
  - Deamidation and/or oxidation
  - Changes in glycosylation

- Routine analytical testing often doesn’t detect finite changes in the protein (e.g., release testing is unlikely to detect areas of protein unfolding unless it impacts the function)

- Large size (e.g., MAb 150 KD) and extensive surface area ensures → high frequency of potential sites of interaction

- Proteins may be more efficient in solubilizing leachables due to abundance of both hydrophilic and hydrophobic sites (the latter are usually buried in the interior of the protein)

- Drug dose, mode and frequency of administration (e.g., many biologics are sterile injectables administered frequently at relatively high volumes and doses of mg/ml)
Case studies
Leachables from the uncoated stoppers

- Change from HSA to polysorbate formulation
- C/c system: pre-filled syringes with uncoated rubber stoppers
- Source: Vulcanizing agents leached from the rubber stopper during storage (e.g., Vultac 2 di, tri, tetra, penta, hexasulfide, etc.)
- Impact:
  - no notable changes in protein physico-chemical properties
  - safety: serious adverse event (pure red cell aplasia, PRCA)
- Hypothetical MoA: leachables acted as adjuvants leading to formation of neutralizing Abs to endogenous protein
- Resolution:
  - Switch to teflon-coated stoppers
  - Stricter control of the cold-chain from manufacture to administration
  - S.c. route of administration was contraindicated in CRF patients, which was subsequently reversed
RP-HPLC profile of the drug + leachables
(Sharma et al., 2004, Eur J Hospital Pharm, 5:86-91)

A
coated rubber stoppers

B
uncoated rubber stoppers

C
placebo w/ uncoated rubber stoppers
Fe leachables cause formation of protein-preservative adducts

- Change: extension of the expiry period from 15 to 18 months
- Source: uncoated rubber stoppers released iron at levels <1 ppm
- Critical excipients: preservative and other components
- Impact:
  - Fe catalyzed oxidation of the preservative + additional excipient triggering formation of the protein-preservative adducts
  - Several sites on the protein were modified primarily at the N-terminus (primary targets were peptides with – OH, – NH$_3$ and –SH groups)
    - OOS result for protein content (e.g., >50% of the product was modified)
    - moderate decrease in potency
- Action: >10 DP lots were recalled due to OOS results
- Resolution:
  - Return to the original dating period of 15 months
  - Implement Teflon coated stoppers
  - Conduct additional studies to determine the impact on product Q and S
  - Eventually, the problematic presentation was removed from the market
Metal leachables cause product truncation via metalloprotease activation

- **Change:** from lyophilized to a liquid formulation
- **Source:** rubber stopper released divalent metal cations
- **Uncovered during stability study under inverted conditions**
- **Mechanism:** activation of a metalloprotease (process-related impurity co-eluted with API)
- **Impact:** product truncation at the N-terminus
- **Resolution:** chelator (EDTA) added to DP formulation buffer
- **Adverse outcome:** new formulation led to cardiovascular adverse events and a change in PK values; it was withdrawn from the market and replaced with the original one; Teflon coated stoppers implemented
Tungsten leachables from PFS barrels #1

- Container closure system: prefilled syringes
  - Tungsten filaments are used to perforate syringe barrel onto which a needle is attached
- Source: tungsten salts and tungsten oxides are deposited on the glass and into the product when contacted with liquid
- Impact: tungsten caused unfolding and aggregation of the protein
- Clinical outcome: Patients developed neutralizing Abs to the endogenous protein
- Resolution: Continue product development in vials and discontinue PFS
Tungsten leachables from PFS barrels #2

- Container closure system: prefilled syringes
- Impact: tungsten salts caused protein oxidation followed by aggregation
  - Up to 60% of aggregated product found in some syringes
  - Up to 1% PFS tested positive for aggregates
- Resolution (different approaches were used by different Sponsors):
  - Optimal - switch to platinum instead of tungsten filaments
  - Alternative - establish tungsten specifications, nitrogen overlay process, special washing procedure, etc.
Alkali oxide extractables cause delamination of glass vials

- Container closure system: Type I borosilicate glass vials
- Glass pitting and surface delamination is initiated by ion exchange at the glass-solution interface causing breaking of Si-O bonds and weakening of the surface layer
- Risk factors promoting delamination (not listed in the order of importance):
  - Glass vials with high surface alkalinity have higher propensity for delamination
  - Specific vial manufacturing process
  - Drug solutions formulated at alkaline pH
  - Certain buffers
  - High ionic strength
  - Contact time (delamination is a time-dependent process) and temperature
- Risk mitigation strategies include the following:
  - Switch to highly resistant glass (high coefficient of thermal expansion)
  - Switch to a different vial manufacturing process with more stringent temperature control (leads to lower surface alkalinity)
  - Switch to lower risk formulation (e.g., pH, buffers, etc.)
  - Reduce product dating period
Aluminum leachables from glass form particulates

- Change: change from molded to tubing glass vials
- Source: aluminum oxide leached from the new glass vials
- Mechanism: aluminum interacted with sodium phosphate in the formulation forming aluminum phosphate crystals
  - Aluminum phosphate (i.e., alum) is widely used as adjuvant in vaccines, although at concentration leached, it is unlikely to exert such an effect
- Impact: visible particles (up to 150 μm diam) observed in stability samples over 12 month of age with no other OOS results
- Resolution:
  - Recall of lots that failed the particulate spec
  - New glass vials are coated using a baked-on siliconization process
Barium leachables from glass form particulates

- Change: vendor for glass vials
- Source: barium leached from new glass vials
- Mechanism: barium interacted with sodium sulfate in the formulation forming barium sulfate crystals
- Impact: visible particles observed in 18 month stability samples with no other OOS results
- Resolution: acceptance limit for barium established with commitment to generate stability data for 10 new vial lots
Silicone oil leachables cause product aggregation

- **Source:** silicone oil spray was used as a lubricating agent to coat prefilled syringes
- **Observation:** silicone oil was shed (break-loose effect) from the syringe barrel into the product
- **Silicone oil forms micelles in solution, which can interact with proteins and cause protein denaturation and aggregation** *(J Pharm Sci, 2005, 94:918-927)*
- **Outcome:** formation of amorphous polymers visible by the naked eye
- **Resolution:** product now packaged in non-siliconized syringes
Points to consider…

- Greater emphasis should be placed on the leachables testing, in conjunction with clinical data mining, in order to reduce clinical uncertainty and minimize patients’ exposure to unnecessary risks.
- Consideration for the improvement and standardization of E&L testing.
- Consideration of E&L for disposable (i.e., single use) systems.
Summary

• Biologic products can be sensitive to minor impurities and changes in the C/C system and/or formulation

• Undetected differences in product impurities may have a significant impact on clinical safety and efficacy (e.g., leachables acting as adjuvants triggering NAb response)

• It’s important to monitor leachables over time (e.g., extended time points reflective of product dating period should be included)

• Corrective actions should employ a simplest approach to resolve a problem while minimizing changes to product quality as it relates to safety and efficacy

• Lack of transparency between a product quality attribute and its safety & efficacy doesn’t reduce risk, it’s simply, uncontrolled risk (Barry Cherney)
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Questions? Comments?
Extractables analysis

• Appropriate extraction procedure is relevant
  ➢ Determines chemical profile and maximal levels of extractables (depends on the specific extraction conditions)
  ➢ Highlights immediate safety concerns (if any)
  ➢ Ensures that methods with appropriate specificity and sensitivity are used

• Justification of selected extraction conditions is generally poorly described in submissions
Examples of more common E&L

- Phthalates (e.g., Di(2-ethylhexyl) phthalate - DEHP)
- Metals (e.g., Zn, Fe, Ba, Ca, Al, Ni, etc.)
- Fatty acids (e.g., stearic, palmitic myristic, etc.)
- Cyclic esters (from polyurethane adhesives)
- Silicone oil (e.g., polydimethylsiloxane)
- Organic solvents (e.g., acetone, isopropanol, etc.)
- Nitrosamines (e.g., diphenyl nitrosamines, etc.)
- Vulcanizing agents (e.g., Vultac 2, etc.)
- Accelerators (e.g., thiuram, sulfenamide, guanidine, dithiocarbamate, etc.)
- Antioxidants (e.g., BHT, Irganox, Irgafos, etc.)
- Polycyclic aromatic hydrocarbons
- Antistatic agents
- Cleaning agents