

Annex 2

Guidelines on evaluation of similar biotherapeutic products (SBPs)

1. Introduction	53
2. Aim	54
3. Scope	54
4. Glossary	55
5. Scientific considerations and concept for licensing SBPs	56
5.1 Comparability exercise	57
6. Key principles for the licensing of SBPs	58
7. Reference biotherapeutic products (RBPs)	58
7.1 Considerations for choice of RBP	59
8. Quality	60
8.1 Manufacturing process	61
8.2 Characterization	63
8.2.1 Physicochemical properties	63
8.2.2 Biological activity	64
8.2.3 Immunochemical properties	65
8.2.4 Impurities	65
8.3 Specifications	65
8.4 Analytical techniques	66
8.5 Stability	66
9. Nonclinical evaluation	67
9.1 General considerations	67
9.2 Special considerations	68
9.2.1 In vitro studies	69
9.2.2 In vivo studies	69
10. Clinical evaluation	70
10.1 Pharmacokinetic studies	71
10.2 Pharmacodynamic studies	73
10.3 Confirmatory pharmacokinetic/pharmacodynamic studies	73
10.4 Efficacy studies	74
10.4.1 Advantages and disadvantages of equivalence/non-inferiority designs for SBPs	76
10.4.2 Statistical considerations for the design and analysis of equivalence/non-inferiority trials for SBPs	76

10.5 Safety	78
10.6 Immunogenicity	79
10.7 Extrapolation of efficacy and safety data to other clinical indications	80
11. Pharmacovigilance	81
12. Prescribing information and label	82
13. Roles and responsibilities of national regulatory authorities	83
Authors and acknowledgements	84
References	88

1. Introduction

Biotherapeutic products (biotherapeutics) have a successful record in treating many life-threatening and chronic diseases. However, their cost has often been high, thereby limiting their accessibility to patients, particularly in developing countries. Recently, the expiry of patents and/or data protection for the first major group of originator's biotherapeutics has ushered in an era of products that are designed to be "similar" to a licensed originator product. These products rely for their licensing partly on prior information regarding safety and efficacy obtained with the originator products. The clinical experience and established safety profile of the originator products should contribute to the development of similar biotherapeutic products (SBPs). A variety of terms, such as "biosimilar products", "follow-on protein products" and "subsequent-entry biologics" have been coined to describe these products.

The term "generic" medicine is used to describe chemical, small-molecule medicinal products that are structurally and therapeutically equivalent to an originator product whose patent and/or data protection period has expired. Demonstration of bioequivalence of the generic medicine to a reference product is usually appropriate and sufficient proof of therapeutic equivalence between the two. However, the approach established for generic medicines is not suitable for the development, evaluation and licensing of SBPs since biotherapeutics consist of relatively large and complex proteins that are difficult to characterize. The clinical performance of biotherapeutics can also be much influenced by the manufacturing process and some clinical studies will also be required to support the safety and efficacy of a SBP.

As part of its mandate for assuring global quality, safety and efficacy of biotherapeutics, WHO provides globally accepted norms and standards for the evaluation of these products (1, 2). Written standards established through the Expert Committee on Biological Standardization (ECBS) serve as a basis for setting national requirements for production, quality control and overall regulation of biological medicines. In addition, International Standards for measurement are essential tools for establishing the potency of biological medicines worldwide (3); they are often used as primary standards for calibration of the secondary standards that are directly used in the biological assays.

An increasingly wide range of so-called SBPs¹ is under development or is already licensed in many countries and a need for guidelines for their evaluation and overall regulation was formally recognized by WHO in 2007 (4). This document is intended to provide guidance for the development and evaluation

¹ Not all products deemed to be SBPs will be consistent with the definition of SBPs and/or process for their evaluation described in these guidelines.

of such biotherapeutics; it should be viewed as a “living” document that will be developed further in line with advances in scientific knowledge and experience.

It is essential that the standard of evidence supporting the decisions to license SBPs be sufficient to ensure that the products meet acceptable levels of quality, safety and efficacy for public health purposes. Elaboration of the data requirements and considerations for the licensing of these products is expected to facilitate development of and worldwide access to biotherapeutics of assured quality, safety and efficacy at more affordable prices. In most cases, their authorization will be evaluated on a case-by-case basis, and the amount of data required by a national regulatory authority (NRA) may vary. However, it is expected that Guidelines on the scientific principles for evaluation of SBPs will help to harmonize the requirements worldwide and lead to easier and speedier approval and assurance of the quality, safety and efficacy of these products. It is important to note that biotherapeutics that are not shown to be similar to a reference biotherapeutic product (RBP) as indicated in these Guidelines should neither be described as “similar” nor called SBPs. Such products could be licensed through the usual processes, using more extensive nonclinical and clinical data sets or full licensing applications.

It was recognized that a number of important issues associated with the use of SBPs, including but not limited to the following, need to be defined by NRAs:

- intellectual property issues;
- interchangeability and substitution of RBP with SBP; and
- labelling and prescribing information.

For this reason, these issues are not elaborated in this document.

2. Aim

The intention of this document is to provide globally acceptable principles for licensing biotherapeutic products that are claimed to be similar to biotherapeutic products of assured quality, safety, and efficacy that have been licensed based on a full licensing dossier. On the basis of proven similarity, the licensing of a SBP will rely, in part, on nonclinical and clinical data generated with an already licensed RBP. These Guidelines can be adopted as a whole, or partially, by NRAs worldwide or used as a basis for establishing national regulatory frameworks for licensure of these products.

3. Scope

These Guidelines apply to well-established and well-characterized biotherapeutic products such as recombinant DNA-derived therapeutic proteins. Vaccines and

plasma-derived products and their recombinant analogues, for which WHO Recommendations and regulatory guidance are available elsewhere (<http://www.who.int/biologicals/areas/en/>), are excluded from the scope of this document.

4. Glossary

The definitions given below apply to the terms used in these Guidelines. They may have different meanings in other contexts.

Comparability exercise. Head-to-head comparison of a biotherapeutic product with a licensed originator product with the goal of establishing similarity in quality, safety and efficacy. Products should be compared in the same study using the same procedures.

Drug product. A pharmaceutical product type that contains a drug substance, generally in association with excipients.

Drug substance. The active pharmaceutical ingredient and associated molecules that may be subsequently formulated, with excipients, to produce the drug product. It may be composed of the desired product, product-related substances, and product- and process-related impurities. It may also contain other components such as buffers.

Equivalent. Equal or virtually identical in the parameter of interest. Equivalent efficacy of two medicinal products means they have similar (no better and no worse) efficacy and any observed differences are of no clinical relevance.

Generic medicine. A generic medicine contains the same active pharmaceutical ingredient as, and is bioequivalent to, an originator (comparator) medicine. Since generic medicines are identical in the active pharmaceutical substance, dose, strength, route of administration, safety, efficacy and intended use, they can be substituted for the originator product.

Head-to-head comparison. Direct comparison of the properties of the SBP with the RBP in the same study.

Immunogenicity. The ability of a substance to trigger an immune response or reaction (e.g. development of specific antibodies, T cell response, allergic or anaphylactic reaction).

Impurity. Any component present in the drug substance or drug product that is not the desired product, a product-related substance, or excipient including buffer components. It may be either process- or product-related.

Non-inferior. Not clinically inferior to a comparator in the parameter studied. A non-inferiority clinical trial is one that has the primary objective of showing that the response to the investigational product is not clinically inferior to a comparator by a pre-specified margin.

Originator product. A medicine that has been licensed by the national regulatory authorities on the basis of a full registration dossier; i.e. the approved indication(s) for use were granted on the basis of full quality, efficacy and safety data.

Pharmacovigilance. The science and activities relating to the detection, assessment, understanding and prevention of adverse effects or any other drug-related problems.

Reference biotherapeutic product (RBP). A reference biotherapeutic product is used as the comparator for head-to-head comparability studies with the similar biotherapeutic product in order to show similarity in terms of quality, safety and efficacy. Only an originator product that was licensed on the basis of a full registration dossier can serve as an RBP. The term does not refer to measurement standards such as international, pharmacopoeial or national standards or reference standards.

Similarity. Absence of a relevant difference in the parameter of interest.

Similar biotherapeutic product (SBP). A biotherapeutic product that is similar in terms of quality, safety and efficacy to an already licensed reference biotherapeutic product.

Well-established biotherapeutic product. A biotherapeutic product that has been marketed for a suitable period of time with a proven quality, efficacy and safety.

5. Scientific considerations and concept for licensing SBPs

The regulatory framework for the licensing of generic medicines is well established in most countries. Demonstration of structural sameness and bioequivalence of the generic medicine to the reference product is usually sufficient for therapeutic equivalence between the generic and reference product to be inferred. However, the generic approach is not suitable for the licensing of SBPs since biotherapeutic products usually consist of relatively large and complex entities that are difficult to characterize. In addition, SBPs are manufactured and controlled by processes established by the SBP manufacturer since the manufacturer of an SBP normally does not have access to all the necessary manufacturing information on the originator product. However, minor differences in the manufacturing process may affect the pharmacokinetics, pharmacodynamics, efficacy and/or safety of biotherapeutic products. It has consequently been agreed that the normal method for licensing generic medicines through bioequivalence studies alone is not scientifically appropriate for SBPs.

Decision-making regarding the licensing of SBPs should be based on scientific evidence. The onus is on the manufacturer of an SBP to provide the necessary evidence to support all aspects of an application for licensing. As in any drug development programme, development of an SBP is a stepwise approach that starts with characterization and evaluation of quality attributes of the product and is followed by nonclinical and clinical studies. Comprehensive characterization and comparison showing similarity at the quality level are the basis for possible data reduction in the nonclinical and clinical development. If differences between the

SBP and the RBP are found at any step, the underlying reasons for the differences should be investigated. Differences should always be fully explained and justified and may lead to additional data (e.g. on safety) being required.

In addition to quality data, nonclinical and clinical data are required for any SBP, generated with the product itself. The amount of such data that is considered necessary will depend on the product or class of products, on the extent of characterization possible using state-of-the-art analytical methods, on observed or potential differences between the SBP and the RBP, and on clinical experience with the product class (e.g. safety/immunogenicity concerns in a specific indication). A case-by-case approach is clearly needed for each class of products.

An SBP is intended to be similar to a licensed biotherapeutic product for which substantial evidence exists of safety and efficacy. Authorization of the SBP on the basis of reduced nonclinical and clinical data depends on proof of its similarity to an appropriate RBP through the comparability exercise. Manufacturers should demonstrate both a full understanding of their product and consistent and robust manufacture, and should submit a full quality dossier that includes a complete characterization of the product. Comparison of the SBP and the RBP with respect to quality represents an additional element to the “traditional” full quality dossier. A reduction in data requirements is therefore possible only for the nonclinical and/or clinical parts of the development programme. The dosage form and route of administration of the SBP should be the same as for the RBP.

Studies must be comparative in nature and must employ analytical methods that are capable of detecting potential differences between the SBP and the RBP. The main clinical studies should use the final formulation of the SBP, i.e. derived from the final process material, otherwise, additional evidence will be required to demonstrate that the SBP to be marketed is comparable to that used in the main clinical studies.

If similarity between the SBP and the RBP has been convincingly demonstrated, and if the manufacturer can provide scientific justification for such extrapolation, the SBP may be approved for use in other clinical indications for which the RBP is used but which have not directly been tested in clinical trials (see section 10.7). Any significant differences between the SBP and the chosen RBP detected during the comparability exercise would indicate that the products are not similar and that more extensive nonclinical and clinical data may be required to support the application for licensing.

5.1 Comparability exercise

The comparability exercise is designed to show that the SBP has quality attributes that are highly similar to those of the RBP. To provide an integrated and comprehensive set of comparative data, however, it must also include the nonclinical and clinical studies. At the level of quality, the comparability data can

be considered as additional data, over and above what is normally required for an originator product developed as a new and independent product; this is the basis for reducing the requirements for nonclinical and clinical data.

It is important that a distinction be made between the usual quality data requirements and those presented as part of the comparability exercises. It may be useful to present these as a separate section in the quality module.

6. Key principles for the licensing of SBPs

- The development of an SBP involves stepwise comparability exercise(s) starting with comparison of the quality characteristics of the SBP and the RBP. Demonstration of similarity of an SBP to an RBP in terms of quality is a prerequisite for reducing the nonclinical and clinical data set required for licensure. After each step of the comparability exercise, the decision to proceed further with the development of the SBP should be evaluated.
- The licensing of a product as an SBP depends on its demonstrated similarity to a suitable RBP in quality, nonclinical and clinical parameters. The decision to license the product should be based on evaluation of the whole data package for each of these parameters.
- If relevant differences between the SBP and the RBP are found in the quality, nonclinical or clinical studies, the product is unlikely to qualify as an SBP, and a more extensive nonclinical and clinical data set will probably be required to support its application for licensure. Such a product should not qualify as an SBP as defined in these guidelines.
- If comparability exercises and/or studies with the RBP are not performed throughout the development process as outlined in this document, the final product should not be referred to as an SBP.
- SBPs are not “generic medicines” and many characteristics associated with the authorization process generally do not apply.
- Like other biotherapeutic products, SBPs require effective regulatory oversight for the management of the potential risks they pose and in order to maximize their benefits.

7. Reference biotherapeutic products (RBPs)

Comprehensive information on the RBP provides the basis for establishing the safety, quality and effectiveness profile to which the SBP is compared. The RBP

also provides the basis for dose selection and route of administration, and is used in the comparability studies required to support the licensing application. The demonstration of an acceptable level of similarity between the SBP and RBP provides the rationale for a reduced nonclinical and clinical data set to support the application for market authorization for the SBP. The RBP is thus central to the licensing of an SBP.

To support licensure of the SBP, similarity of the SBP to the RBP should be demonstrated through head-to-head comparisons with the RBP. The same RBP should be used throughout the entire comparability exercise.

The choice of an RBP is critically important for the evaluation of the SBP. The rationale for the choice of RBP should be provided by the manufacturer of the SBP in the submission to the NRA. Traditionally, NRAs have required the use of a nationally licensed reference product for licensing of generic medicines. This practice may not be feasible for countries that lack nationally licensed RBPs, and NRAs may need to consider establishing additional criteria to guide the acceptability of using an RBP licensed or resourced in other countries. The use of reference products with proven efficacy and safety in a given population will be one of the factors to consider; another factor may be market experience in addition to the duration and volume of marketed use.

7.1 Considerations for choice of RBP

Since the choice of RBP is essential to the development of an SBP, the following should be considered.

- The RBP should have been marketed for a suitable duration and have a volume of marketed use such that the demonstration of similarity to it brings into relevance a substantial body of acceptable data regarding the safety and efficacy.
- The manufacturer must demonstrate that the chosen RBP is suitable to support the application for marketing authorization of an SBP.
- The RBP should have been licensed on the basis of full quality, safety, and efficacy data. An SBP should therefore *not* be chosen as an RBP.
- The same RBP should be used throughout the development of the SBP (i.e. throughout the comparative quality, nonclinical, and clinical studies).
- The drug substance of the RBP and the SBP must be shown to be similar.
- The dosage form and route of administration of the SBP should be the same as that of the RBP.
- The following factors should be considered in the choice of an RBP that is marketed in another jurisdiction.

- The RBP should be licensed and widely marketed in another jurisdiction that has a well-established regulatory framework and principles, as well as considerable experience of evaluation of biotherapeutic products and post-marketing surveillance activities.
- The acceptance of an RBP for evaluation of an SBP in a particular country does not imply that the NRA of that country has approved the RBP for use.

8. Quality

The quality comparison showing molecular similarity between the SBP and the RBP provides the essential rationale for predicting that the clinical safety and efficacy profile of the RBP should also apply to the SBP, meaning that the extent of the nonclinical and clinical data required for the SBP can be reduced. Ideally, development of an SBP involves thorough characterization of a number of representative lots of the RBP and then engineering a manufacturing process that will yield a product highly similar to the RBP in all clinically relevant quality attributes, i.e. product attributes that may impact clinical performance. An SBP is generally derived from a separate and independent master cell bank using independent manufacturing processes and control. These should be selected and designed to meet the required comparability criteria. A full quality dossier for both drug substance and drug product is always required and must comply with the standards required by NRAs for originator products.

Increased knowledge of the relationship between biochemical, physicochemical and biological properties of the product and clinical outcomes will facilitate development of an SBP. Because of the heterogeneous nature of proteins (especially those with extensive post-translational modifications, such as glycoproteins), the limitations of some analytical techniques, and the generally unpredictable nature of the clinical consequences of minor differences in protein structural/physicochemical properties, the evaluation of comparability will have to be carried out independently for each product. For example, oxidation of certain methionine residues in one protein may have no impact on clinical activity whereas in another protein it may significantly reduce the intrinsic biological activity or increase immunogenicity. Thus, differences in the levels of methionine oxidation in the RBP and SBP would need to be evaluated and, if present, their clinical relevance would be evaluated and discussed.

To evaluate comparability, the manufacturer should carry out a comprehensive physicochemical and biological characterization of the SBP in head-to-head comparisons with the RBP. All aspects of product quality and heterogeneity should be assessed (see section 8.2).

A high degree of similarity between the SBP and the RBP is the basis for reducing the nonclinical and clinical requirements for licensing. However, some differences are likely to be found, for example as a result of differences in impurities or excipients. Such differences should be assessed for their potential impact on clinical safety and efficacy of the SBP and justification (for example, own study results or published data) for allowing such differences should be provided. Differences of unknown clinical relevance, particularly regarding safety, may have to be addressed in additional studies pre- or post-marketing. Differences in quality attributes known to have potential impact on clinical activity will influence the decision on whether to name such a product as an SBP. For example, if differences are found in glycosylation patterns that alter the biodistribution of the product and thereby change the dosing scheme, this product cannot be considered an SBP. Other differences between the SBP and RBP may be acceptable and would not trigger the need for extra nonclinical and/or clinical evaluation. For example, a therapeutic protein that has lower levels of protein aggregates would, in most cases, be predicted to have a better safety profile than the RBP and would not need added clinical evaluation. In the same way, if heterogeneity in the terminal amino acids of the RBP is known to exist (and is adequately documented) but does not affect the bioactivity, distribution or immunogenicity of the RBP or similar products in its class, there may be no need for added clinical safety or efficacy studies based upon this heterogeneity of the RBP and SBP.

Due to the unavailability of drug substance for the RBP, the SBP manufacturer will usually be using a commercial drug product for the comparability exercise. The commercial drug product will, by definition, be in the final dosage form, containing the drug substance(s) formulated with excipients. It should be verified that these excipients do not interfere with analytical methods and thus have no impact on test results. If the drug substance in the RBP needs to be purified from a formulated reference drug product in order to be suitable for characterization, studies must be carried out to demonstrate that product heterogeneity and relevant attributes of the active moiety are not affected by the isolation process. The approach used for isolating the SBP and comparing it with the RBP should be justified and demonstrated, with data, to be appropriate for the intended purpose. Where possible, the product should be tested with and without manipulation.

8.1 Manufacturing process

Manufacture of an SBP should be based on a comprehensively designed production process, taking all relevant guidelines into account. The manufacturer must demonstrate the consistency and robustness of the manufacturing process by implementing good manufacturing practices (5), modern quality control and assurance procedures, in-process controls, and process validation. The

manufacturing process should meet the same standards as required by the NRA for originator products. It should be optimized to minimize differences between the SBP and RBP in order to (a) maximize the reduction in clinical testing requirements for the SBP based upon the clinical history of the RBP, and (b) minimize any predictable impact on the clinical safety and efficacy of the product. Some differences between the SBP and RBP are expected and may be acceptable, provided that appropriate justification of the lack of impact on clinical performance can be given.

It is understood that a manufacturer developing an SBP will not have access to confidential details of the RBP manufacturing process; thus, unless there is a contractual arrangement with the manufacturer of the RBP, the process will differ from the licensed process for the RBP. The manufacturing process for an SBP should employ state-of-the-art science and technology to achieve a high-quality product that is as similar as possible to the RBP. This will involve extensive evaluation of the RBP before the manufacturing process for the SBP is developed. The SBP manufacturer should assemble all available knowledge of the RBP regarding the type of host cell, the formulation and the container closure system used for marketing the RBP. If applicable, the SBP manufacturer should then determine the potential impact of changing any one of these elements on product quality, safety and efficacy based on available evidence from information in the public domain and experience with use of the RBP. The SBP manufacturer is encouraged to apply this knowledge to the design of the manufacturing process. The rationale for accepting these differences needs to be justified by sound science and by clinical experience with either the SBP or the RBP.

As a general rule, the product should be expressed and produced in the same host cell type as the RBP (e.g. *Escherichia coli*, Chinese hamster ovary cells, etc.) in order to minimize the potential for important changes in critical quality attributes of the protein and to avoid introduction of certain types of process-related impurities (e.g. host cell proteins, endotoxins, or yeast mannans) that could affect clinical outcomes and immunogenicity. The host cell type for manufacture of the SBP should be changed only if the manufacturer can demonstrate convincingly that the structure of the molecule is not affected or that the clinical profile of the product will not change. For example, somatropin produced in yeast cells appears to have similar characteristics to somatropin expressed in *E. coli*. In most cases, however, the use of a different host cell type will not be feasible for glycoproteins because glycosylation patterns vary significantly between different host cell types.

A complete description and data package should be provided that delineates the manufacturing process, starting with development of expression vectors and cell banks, cell culture/fermentation, harvest, purification and modification reactions, filling into bulk or final containers, and storage. The development studies conducted to establish and validate the dosage form, formulation, container closure system (including integrity to prevent microbial

contamination) and usage instructions should be also documented (see relevant guidelines, such as those issued by the International Conference on Harmonisation of Technical Requirements for Registration of Pharmaceuticals for Human Use (ICH)).

8.2 Characterization

Thorough characterization of both RBP and SBP should be carried out using appropriate, state-of-the-art biochemical, biophysical and biological analytical techniques. For the active ingredient(s) (i.e. the desired product), details should be provided on primary and higher-order structure, post-translational modifications (including, but not limited to, glycoforms), biological activity, purity, impurities, product-related (active) substances (variants), and immunochemical properties, where relevant.

When conducting a comparability exercise, head-to-head characterization studies are required to compare the SBP and the RBP. The primary structure of the SBP and the RBP should be identical.

If differences between the SBP and the RBP are found, their potential impact on safety and efficacy of the SBP should be evaluated. The predefined limits need to be considered in advance. Assessment of the results should include investigation of the differences found between the SBP and the RBP. This determination will be based upon knowledge of the relationship between product quality attributes and clinical activity of the RBP and related products, the clinical history of the RBP, and lot-to-lot differences for commercial lots of the RBP. For example, quality attributes such as composition and profile of glycosylation, biological activity that is known to be related to clinical activity, and receptor binding activity should be justified.

Knowledge of the analytical limitations of each technique used to characterize the product (e.g. limits of sensitivity, resolving power) should be applied when determining similarity. Representative raw data should be provided for all complex analytical methods (e.g. high-quality reproductions of gel and chromatograms) in addition to tabular data summarizing the complete data set and showing the results of all release and characterization analyses carried out on the SBP and the RBP.

The criteria outlined in the following sections should be considered when conducting the comparability exercise.

8.2.1 Physicochemical properties

The physicochemical characterization should include determination of primary and higher-order structure (secondary/tertiary/quaternary) using appropriate analytical methods (e.g. mass spectrometry or nuclear magnetic resonance) and other biophysical properties. An inherent degree of structural heterogeneity occurs

in proteins as a result of the biosynthesis process, such that the RBP and the SBP are likely to contain a mixture of post-translationally modified forms. Appropriate efforts should be made to investigate, identify and quantify these forms.

8.2.2 Biological activity

Biological activity is the specific ability or capacity of the product to achieve a defined biological effect. It serves multiple purposes in the assessment of product quality and is required for characterization and for batch analysis. Ideally, the biological assay will reflect the understood mechanism of action of the protein and will thus serve as a link to clinical activity. A biological assay is a quality measure of the “function” of the protein product and can be used to determine whether a product variant has the appropriate level of activity (i.e. a product-related substance) or is inactive (and is therefore defined as an impurity). The biological assay also complements the physicochemical analyses by confirming the correct higher-order structure of the molecule. Thus, the use of relevant biological assay(s) with appropriate precision and accuracy provides an important means of confirming that there is no significant functional difference between the SBP and the RBP.

For a product with multiple biological activities, manufacturers should perform, as part of product characterization, a set of relevant functional assays designed to evaluate the range of activities of the product. For example, certain proteins possess multiple functional domains that express enzymatic and receptor-binding activities. In such situations, manufacturers should evaluate and compare all relevant functional activities of the SBP and the RBP.

Potency is the quantitative measure of the biological activity. A relevant, validated potency assay should be part of the specification for a drug substance and/or drug product. The results of the potency assay should be provided and expressed in units of activity. Where possible (e.g. for in vitro biochemical assays, such as enzyme assays or binding assays), the results may be expressed as specific activities (e.g. units/mg protein). Assays should be calibrated against an international or national standard or reference reagent, when available and appropriate. WHO provides International Standards and Reference Reagents, which serve as reference sources of defined biological activity expressed in an international unit (IU) or unit (U). International Standards and Reference Reagents are intended for calibration of national reference standards (http://www.who.int/biologicals/reference_preparations/en/). International or national standards and Reference Reagents should therefore be used to determine the potency and to express results in IU or U. They are not intended for use as RBPs during the comparability exercise.

Biological assays can be used for purposes other than determination of potency. For example, a relevant biological assay is essential for determining

whether antibodies that develop in response to the product have neutralizing activity that affects the biological activity of the product and/or endogenous counterparts, if present (see section 10.6).

8.2.3 Immunochemical properties

When immunochemical properties are part of the characterization (e.g. for antibodies or antibody-based products), the manufacturer should confirm that the SBP is comparable to the RBP in terms of specificity, affinity, binding kinetics, and Fc functional activity, where relevant.

8.2.4 Impurities

Because access to all necessary information on the manufacturing process as well as on the drug substance of the originator product is limited, it is recognized that evaluation of the similarity of the impurity profiles of the SBP and the RBP will be generally difficult. Nevertheless, process- and product-related impurities should be identified, quantified by state-of-the-art technology and compared between the SBP and RBP. Some differences may be expected because the proteins are produced by different manufacturing processes. If significant differences in the impurity profiles of the SBP and the RBP are observed, their potential impact on efficacy and safety, including immunogenicity, should be evaluated. It is critical to have suitable assays for process-related impurities, specific to the cell line used for production.

8.3 Specifications

Specifications are employed to verify the routine quality of the drug substance and drug product rather than to fully characterize them. Specifications for an SBP, as for any biotherapeutic product, should be set as described in established guidelines and monographs, where these exist. It should be noted that pharmacopoeial monographs may provide only a minimum set of requirements for a particular product, and additional test parameters may be required. Reference to analytical methods used and acceptance limits for each test parameter of the SBP should be provided and justified. All analytical methods referenced in the specification should be validated; the corresponding validation should be documented.

Specifications for an SBP will not be the same as for the RBP since the manufacturing processes will be different and different analytical procedures and laboratories will be used for the assays. Nonetheless, the specifications should capture and control important known product quality attributes for the RBP (e.g. correct identity; purity, potency; molecular heterogeneity in terms of size, charge, and hydrophobicity, if relevant; degree of sialylation; number of individual polypeptide chains; glycosylation of a functional domain;

aggregate levels; impurities such as host cell protein and DNA). The setting of specifications should be based upon the manufacturer's experience with the SBP (e.g. manufacturing history; assay capability; safety and efficacy profile of the product) and the experimental results obtained by testing and comparing the SBP and RBP. Sufficient lots of SBP should be employed in setting specifications. The manufacturer should demonstrate, whenever possible, that the limits set for a given specification are not significantly wider than the range of variability of the RBP over the shelf-life of the product, unless justified.

8.4 Analytical techniques

Although the power of analytical methods for characterization of proteins has increased dramatically over the past few decades, there are still obstacles to complete characterization of complex biotherapeutic products. A battery of state-of-the-art analyses is needed to determine structure, function, purity and heterogeneity of the products. The methods used should separate and analyse different variants of the product based upon different underlying chemical, physical and biological properties of protein molecules. For example, polyacrylamide gel electrophoresis (PAGE), ion exchange chromatography, isoelectric focusing, and capillary electrophoresis all separate proteins based upon charge, but they do so under different conditions and on the basis of different physicochemical properties. As a result, one method may detect variants that another method does not. The goal of the comparability investigation is to be as comprehensive as possible in order to minimize the possibility of undetected differences between the RBP and the SBP that may affect clinical activity. The analytical limitations of each technique (e.g. limits of sensitivity or resolving power) should be considered when determining the similarity between an SBP and an RBP.

The measurement of quality attributes in characterization studies (as opposed to in the specifications) does not necessarily require the use of validated assays, but the assays should be scientifically sound and qualified; that is, they should provide results that are meaningful and reliable. The methods used to measure quality attributes for lot release should be validated in accordance with relevant guidelines, as appropriate. A complete description of the analytical techniques employed for release and characterization of the product should be provided in the licence application.

8.5 Stability

The stability studies should comply with relevant guidance as recommended by the NRA. Studies should be carried out to show which release and characterization methods are stability-indicating for the product. Generally, stability studies should be summarized in an appropriate format, such as tables, and they should

include results from accelerated degradation studies and studies under various stress conditions (e.g. temperature, light, humidity and mechanical agitation).

Accelerated stability studies are an important element of the determination of similarity between an SBP and an RBP because they can reveal otherwise hidden properties of a product that warrant additional evaluation. They are also important for identifying the degradation pathways of a protein product. The results obtained from accelerated stability studies may show that additional controls should be used in the manufacturing process and during shipping and storage in order to ensure the integrity of the product. Head-to-head accelerated stability studies comparing the SBP with the RBP will be of value in determining the similarity of the products by showing a comparable degradation profile. Currently, however, stress testing carried out in a comparative manner does not provide an added value. Representative raw data showing the degradation profiles for the product should be provided in the licence application.

The stability data should support the conclusions regarding the recommended storage and shipping conditions and the shelf-life/storage period for the drug substance, drug product, and process intermediates that may be stored for significant periods of time. Stability studies on drug substance should be carried out using containers and conditions that are representative of the actual storage containers and conditions. Stability studies on drug product should be carried out in the intended drug product container-closure system. Real-time/real-temperature stability studies will determine the storage conditions and expiry dating for the product, which may or may not be the same as for the RBP.

9. Nonclinical evaluation

The nonclinical part of the Guidelines addresses the pharmacotoxicological assessment of the SBP. Establishing the safety and efficacy of an SBP usually requires the generation of some nonclinical data for the SBP.

9.1 General considerations

Demonstrating a high degree of molecular similarity between the SBP and the RBP should significantly reduce the need for nonclinical studies, since the RBP will already have a significant clinical history. Unless otherwise justified, nonclinical studies should be conducted with the final formulation of the SBP intended for clinical use.

The design of an appropriate nonclinical study programme requires a clear understanding of the product characteristics. Results from the physicochemical and biological characterization studies should be reviewed from the point of view of potential impact on efficacy and safety. In the development of an SBP, some existing guidelines (for example, ICH S6, *Preclinical safety evaluation of*

biotechnology-derived pharmaceuticals (6)) may be relevant and should therefore be taken into account.

SBPs often require unique approaches to assessing their safety in nonclinical studies. Problems in the nonclinical evaluation of SBPs containing biotechnology-derived recombinant proteins as drug substance are often related to the fact that these products:

- may show species-specific pharmacodynamic activity such that it is sometimes difficult to identify a relevant species for pharmacodynamic and toxicological evaluation; and/or
- will, as “foreign proteins”, usually elicit an antibody response in long-term animal studies, and the formation of antibody complexes with the drug substance may make it difficult to interpret the results of subchronic or chronic repeat-dose studies.

9.2 Special considerations

Nonclinical evaluation of a new biotherapeutic normally encompasses a broad spectrum of pharmacodynamic, pharmacokinetic and toxicological studies (6). The amount of additional nonclinical data required to establish the safety and efficacy of an SBP is considered to be highly dependent on the product and on factors related to substance class. Factors that often elicit the need for additional nonclinical studies include, but are not restricted to, the following:

- Quality-related factors:
 - significant differences in the cell expression system compared with the RBP;
 - significant differences in purification methods used;
 - the presence of a complex mixture of less well-characterized product- and/or process-related impurities.
- Factors related to pharmacotoxicological properties of the drug substance:
 - mechanism(s) of drug action are unknown or poorly understood;
 - the drug substance is associated with significant toxicity and/or has a narrow therapeutic index;
 - limited clinical experience with the RBP.

Depending on these factors, the spectrum of studies required to establish the safety and efficacy of the SBP may vary considerably and should be defined on a case-by-case basis. For example, in the case of a highly complex

drug substance that is difficult to characterize by analytical techniques and that possesses a narrow therapeutic index, the nonclinical development programme may encompass a significant portion of the spectrum of studies described in relevant guidelines such as ICH S6 (6). On the other hand, for products for which the drug substance and the impurity profile are well characterized by analytical means, which possess a wide therapeutic index and for which extensive clinical experience is available, the nonclinical development programme will probably be more limited. However, a head-to-head repeat-dose toxicity study should usually constitute a minimum requirement for nonclinical evaluation of an SBP. The nonclinical studies constitute a part of the overall comparability exercise. They should therefore be comparative in nature and designed to detect differences in response between the SBP and the RBP and not just the response to the SBP alone. Any deviation from this approach should be appropriately justified.

9.2.1 **In vitro studies**

Assays such as receptor-binding studies or cell-based assays (e.g. cell-proliferation or cytotoxicity assays) should normally be undertaken to establish comparability of the biological/pharmacodynamic activity of the SBP and the RBP. Such data are usually already available from the biological assays described in the quality part of the dossier (see section 8.2.2). Reference to these studies can be made in the nonclinical part of the dossier.

9.2.2 **In vivo studies**

Animal studies should be designed to maximize the information obtained. They should be comparative in nature (see above), should be performed in a species known to be relevant (i.e. a species in which the RBP has been shown to possess pharmacodynamic and/or toxicological activity), and should employ state-of-the-art technology. Where the model allows, consideration should be given to monitoring a number of end-points such as:

- Biological/pharmacodynamic activity relevant to the clinical application. These data should usually be available from biological assays described in the quality part of the dossier (see section 8.2.2) and reference to these studies can be made in the nonclinical part of the dossier. If feasible, biological activity may be evaluated as part of the nonclinical repeat-dose toxicity study (described below). In vivo evaluation of biological/pharmacodynamic activity may be unnecessary if in vitro assays are available that have been validated as reliably reflecting the clinically relevant pharmacodynamic activity of the RBP.

- Nonclinical toxicity as determined in at least one repeat-dose toxicity study carried out in a relevant species and including toxicokinetic measurements. Toxicokinetic measurements should include determination and characterization of antibody responses, including anti-product antibody titres, cross-reactivity with homologous endogenous proteins, and product-neutralizing capacity. The studies should be of sufficient duration to allow detection of potential differences in toxicity and antibody responses between the SBP and the RBP.

Besides being a part of the overall comparability exercise, the comparative repeat-dose toxicity study is considered to provide reassurance that no “unexpected” toxicity will occur during clinical use of the SBP. If performed with the final formulation intended for clinical use, the repeat-dose toxicity study will, in principle, allow for detection of potential toxicity associated both with the drug substance and with product- and process-related impurities.

Although the predictive value of animal models for immunogenicity in humans is considered low, antibody measurements, if applicable, should be included in the repeat-dose toxicity study to aid in the interpretation of the toxicokinetic data and in assessing, as part of the overall comparability exercise, whether important differences in structure or immunogenic impurities exist between the SBP and the RBP (the immunological response may be sensitive to differences not detected by laboratory analytical procedures).

Depending on the route of administration, local tolerance may need to be evaluated. If feasible, this evaluation may be performed as part of the described repeat-dose toxicity study.

On the basis of the demonstration of similarity between the SBP and RBP by the additional comparability exercise performed as part of the quality evaluation, other routine toxicological studies – such as safety pharmacology, reproductive toxicology, genotoxicity and carcinogenicity studies – are not generally requirements for the nonclinical testing of an SBP, unless triggered by results of the repeat-dose toxicity study or the local tolerance study and/or by other known toxicological properties of the RBP (e.g. known adverse effects of the RBP on reproductive function).

10. Clinical evaluation

The main/pivotal clinical data should be generated using the product derived from the final manufacturing process, which reflects the product for which marketing authorization is sought. Any deviation from this recommendation needs to be justified and additional data may be required, such as from pharmacokinetic

bridging studies comparing the pharmacokinetic profiles of the products from the previous and final formulations. For changes in the manufacturing process, ICH Q5E should be followed (7).

Clinical studies should be designed to demonstrate comparable safety and efficacy of the SBP and the RBP and therefore need to employ testing strategies that are sensitive enough to detect any relevant differences between the products.

The clinical comparability exercise is a stepwise procedure that should begin with pharmacokinetic and pharmacodynamic studies and continue with the pivotal clinical trials. If relevant differences between the SBP and the RBP are detected at any stage, the reasons need to be explored and justified. If this is not possible, the new product may not qualify as an SBP and a full licensing (stand-alone) application should be considered.

10.1 Pharmacokinetic studies

The pharmacokinetic profile is an essential part of the basic description of a medicinal product and should always be investigated. Pharmacokinetic studies should generally be performed for the routes of administration applied for and using doses within the therapeutic dose range recommended for the RBP.

Pharmacokinetic studies must be comparative in nature and should be designed to enable the detection of potential differences between the SBP and the chosen RBP. This is usually best achieved by performing single-dose, cross-over pharmacokinetic studies in a homogenous study population and by using a dose at which the sensitivity to detect differences is greatest. For example, for a medicinal product with saturable absorption (saturation kinetics), the lowest therapeutic dose would be most appropriate, provided that the assay used can measure the resulting drug plasma levels with sufficient accuracy and precision. To reduce any variability that is unrelated to differences between products, pharmacokinetic studies could be performed in healthy volunteers (if considered ethical and scientifically justified). If the drug substance under investigation is known to have adverse effects and the pharmacological effects or risks are considered unacceptable for healthy volunteers, it may be necessary to perform the pharmacokinetic studies in the proposed patient population.

In general, single-dose pharmacokinetic studies will suffice. However, in cases of dose- or time-dependent pharmacokinetics, resulting in markedly higher concentrations at steady-state than would be expected from single-dose data, a potential difference in the extent of absorption of the SBP and RBP may be greater at steady state than after single-dose administration. In such cases, it may be advisable for the manufacturer to perform an additional comparative multiple-dose study, to ensure that pharmacokinetic profiles are also similar at steady state, before starting the confirmatory clinical trial(s). In steady-state pharmacokinetic studies, the administration scheme should preferably use the highest dosage customarily recommended for the RBP.

The choice of single-dose studies, steady-state studies or repeated determination of pharmacokinetic parameters, and of the study population should be justified by the manufacturer. The cross-over design eliminates inter-subject variability and therefore, compared with the parallel design, reduces the sample size necessary to show equivalent pharmacokinetic profiles of the SBP and RBP. The treatment phases should be separated by an adequate wash-out phase to avoid carry-over effects. The cross-over design may not be appropriate for biological medicinal products with a long half-life or for proteins that are likely to provoke the formation of anti-product antibodies. In parallel designs, care should be taken to avoid relevant imbalances in all prognostic variables between treatment groups that may affect the pharmacokinetics of the drug substance (e.g. ethnic origin, smoking status, and metabolizer status of the study population).

Pharmacokinetic comparison of the SBP and the RBP should include not only absorption/bioavailability but also elimination characteristics, i.e. clearance and/or elimination half-life, which may differ between the SBP and the RBP.

Acceptance criteria for the demonstration of pharmacokinetic similarity between the SBP and the RBP should be predefined and appropriately justified. It should be noted that the criteria used in standard clinical pharmacokinetic comparability studies (bioequivalence studies) were developed for chemically-derived, orally administered products and may not necessarily be applicable for biotherapeutic products. The lack of established acceptance criteria designed for biologicals means that the traditional 80–125% equivalence range is often used. However, if the 90% confidence intervals of the ratio of the population geometric means (test/reference) for the main parameters under consideration (usually rate and extent of absorption) fall outside this traditional range, the SBP may still be considered similar to the RBP provided that there is sufficient evidence of similarity from the quality, nonclinical, pharmacodynamic, efficacy and safety comparisons.

Other pharmacokinetic studies, such as interaction studies (with drugs likely to be used concomitantly) or studies in special populations (e.g. children, the elderly and patients with renal or hepatic insufficiency), are not usually required for an SBP.

Historically, limitations in the assay methodology for pharmacokinetic evaluation of peptide or protein products have restricted the usefulness of such studies. There should consequently be special emphasis on the analytical method selected and its ability to detect and follow the time course of the protein (the parent molecule and/or degradation products) in a complex biological matrix that contains many other proteins. The method should be optimized to provide satisfactory specificity, sensitivity and a range of quantification with adequate accuracy and precision.

In some cases, the presence of measurable concentrations of endogenous protein may substantially affect the measurement of the concentration–time profile of the administered exogenous protein. In such cases, the manufacturer should describe and justify the approach to minimize the influence of the endogenous protein on the results.

10.2 Pharmacodynamic studies

Although comparative clinical trials are usually required to demonstrate the similar efficacy and safety of the SBP and RBP, it may be advisable for the manufacturer to ensure similar pharmacodynamic profiles before proceeding to clinical trials, particularly if a difference in pharmacokinetic profiles, of unknown clinical relevance has been detected.

In many cases, pharmacodynamic parameters are investigated in the context of combined pharmacokinetic/pharmacodynamic studies. Such studies may provide useful information on the relationship between dose/exposure and effect, particularly if performed at different dose levels. In the comparative pharmacodynamic studies, pharmacodynamic effects should be investigated in a suitable population using a dose or doses within the steep part of the dose–response curve in order to maximize the chance of detecting potential differences between the SBP and the RBP. Pharmacodynamic markers should be selected on the basis of their clinical relevance.

10.3 Confirmatory pharmacokinetic/pharmacodynamic studies

Clinical trials are usually required to demonstrate similar efficacy of the SBP and the RBP. In certain cases, however, comparative pharmacokinetic/pharmacodynamic studies may be appropriate, provided that:

- the pharmacokinetic and pharmacodynamic properties of the RBP are well characterized;
- at least one pharmacodynamic marker is a marker linked to efficacy (e.g. an accepted surrogate marker for efficacy); and
- the relationship between dose/exposure, the relevant pharmacodynamic marker(s) and response/efficacy of the RBP is established.

Euglycaemic clamp studies would be an example for acceptable confirmatory pharmacokinetic/pharmacodynamic studies for comparing the efficacy of two insulins. In addition, absolute neutrophil count and CD34+ cell count are the relevant pharmacodynamic markers for the activity of granulocyte colony stimulating factor (G-CSF) and could be used in pharmacokinetic/pharmacodynamic studies in healthy volunteers to demonstrate the similar efficacy of two G-CSF-containing medicinal products.

The study population and dosage should represent a test system that is known to be sensitive to potential differences between the SBP and the RBP. In the case of insulin, for example, the study population should consist of non-obese healthy volunteers or patients with type 1 diabetes rather than insulin-resistant obese patients with type 2 diabetes. Otherwise, it will be necessary to investigate a relevant dose range to demonstrate that the test system is discriminatory (8). In addition, the acceptance ranges for demonstration of similarity in confirmatory pharmacokinetic and pharmacodynamic parameters should be predefined and appropriately justified. If appropriately designed and performed, such pharmacokinetic/pharmacodynamic studies are often more sensitive in detecting potential differences in efficacy than trials using clinical end-points.

10.4 Efficacy studies

Dose-finding studies are not required for an SBP. Demonstration of comparable potency, pharmacokinetic and pharmacodynamic profiles provide the basis for use of the RBP posology in the confirmatory clinical trial(s).

Similar efficacy of the SBP and the chosen RBP will usually have to be demonstrated in adequately powered, randomized and controlled clinical trial(s). The principles of such trials are laid down in relevant ICH guidelines (8, 9). Clinical studies should preferably be double-blind or at a minimum observer-blind. In the absence of any blinding, careful justification will be required to prove that the trial results are free from significant bias.

Potential differences between the SBP and the RBP should be investigated in a sensitive and preferably well-established clinical model. In the case of growth hormone (GH), for example, treatment-naive children with GH deficiency usually represent the most appropriate study population, as opposed to children with non GH-deficient short stature who are usually less sensitive to the effects of GH. Although adult patients with GH deficiency could also be considered a “sensitive” population, the end-point used to measure the effects of GH treatment (body composition) is less sensitive than the one used in children (longitudinal growth), making an equivalence or non-inferiority margin more difficult to define.

In principle, equivalence designs (requiring lower and upper comparability margins) are clearly preferred for comparing the efficacy and safety of the SBP and the RBP. Non-inferiority designs (requiring only one margin) may be considered if appropriately justified. While both designs can be used, their advantages and disadvantages should be well understood. The designs should be chosen with due regard to the possible advantages and disadvantages of each (see “Advantages and disadvantages of equivalence/non-inferiority designs for SBPs” below). For statistical considerations see section “Statistical considerations for the design and analysis of equivalence/non-inferiority trials for SBPs” below.

Equivalence/non-inferiority margins must be prespecified and justified on the basis of clinical relevance; that is, the selected margin should represent the

largest difference in efficacy that would not matter in clinical practice. Treatment differences within this margin would thus, by definition, be acceptable because they have no clinical relevance.

Similar efficacy implies that similar treatment effects can be achieved when using the same dosage(s); in the head-to-head comparative trial(s), the same dosage(s) of SBP and RBP should be used. In cases where the medicinal product is titrated according to treatment response (e.g. epoetin or insulin) rather than being given at a fixed dosage (e.g. somatropin in GH-deficient children), equivalence/non-inferiority should be demonstrated with regard not only to treatment response but also to dosage. This is best achieved by defining co-primary end-points that also include dosage.

Generally, equivalence trials are clearly preferable to ensure that the SBP is not clinically less or more effective than the RBP when used at the same dosage(s). For medicinal products with a wide safety margin, non-inferiority trials may also be acceptable. However, it should be considered that non-inferior efficacy, by definition, does not exclude the possibility of superior efficacy of the SBP compared with the RBP; this, if clinically relevant, would contradict the principle of similarity.

Before starting the confirmatory clinical trial, all comparative data generated up to this point should therefore be carefully reviewed and analysed to ascertain similarity of the SBP and the RBP. The confirmatory trial marks the last step of the comparability exercise and prior demonstration of similar physicochemical characteristics, potency and pharmacokinetic/pharmacodynamic profiles make superior efficacy of the SBP compared with the RBP highly unlikely. However, in the rare event that, after completion of the study, the results indeed indicate statistically superior efficacy, any clinical relevance of this superiority should be excluded: it could be associated with increased adverse events if the SBP is prescribed at the same dosage as the RBP. In the case of an equivalence trial, clinically meaningful differences – including superior efficacy – between the SBP and the RBP are excluded if the 95% confidence interval of the treatment difference is fully contained within the prespecified two-sided (upper and lower) comparability margins. In the case of a non-inferiority trial, a post-hoc justification of superior efficacy, if observed, having no clinical relevance may be more difficult.

Whatever the predefined study design, the real results obtained from the clinical trial(s) will determine whether the SBP and the RBP can be considered to be clinically similar. If clinically relevant differences are found, the new product should not be considered to be similar to the RBP and should be developed as a stand-alone product.

Whereas several examples exist for licensing of SBPs based on equivalence trials (e.g. recombinant human GH, epoetin and G-CSF in the European Union), experience with non-inferiority trials for this purpose is limited and

based principally on theoretical considerations. An additional advantage of demonstrating equivalent efficacy (rather than non-inferior efficacy) is that this would provide a stronger rationale for the possibility of extrapolation of efficacy data to other indications of the RBP, particularly if these include different dosages from that (or those) tested in the clinical trial (see section 10.7).

10.4.1 **Advantages and disadvantages of equivalence/ non-inferiority designs for SBPs**

An equivalence trial is designed to confirm the absence of a clinically meaningful difference between the SBP and the RBP. This is the most suitable design for confirming that the SBP is equivalent to the RBP; this is in line with the principle of similarity, since a non-inferiority trial does not exclude the possibility that the SBP is shown to be statistically and clinically superior to the RBP (which contradicts the principle of similarity). Table A2.1 below highlights the advantages and disadvantages of each design.

10.4.2 **Statistical considerations for the design and analysis of equivalence/non-inferiority trials for SBPs**

As indicated above, equivalence or non-inferiority studies may be acceptable for the comparison of efficacy and safety of the SBP and the RBP. The choice of clinical trial design will depend on the product in question, its intended use, disease prevalence and the target population. The specific design selected for a particular study should be clearly stated in the trial protocol and justified. Complex, and often very subtle, statistical issues are involved in the design, analysis and interpretation of equivalence and non-inferiority trials. This section is intended to emphasize the importance of the points that need to be considered in designing and analysing equivalence and non-inferiority trials; it does not provide a comprehensive overview of all statistical considerations. In particular, a good understanding of statistical confidence intervals and their application to equivalence and non-inferiority clinical trials is essential.

Irrespective of the trial design selected, a comparability margin should be specified during trial design and clearly documented in the study protocol. For an equivalence trial, both the lower and upper equivalence margins are required, while only one margin is required for a non-inferiority trial. The selection of the margin should be given careful consideration and should be justified both statistically and clinically. Adequate evidence of the effect size of the RBP should be provided to support the proposed margin. The magnitude and variability of the effect size of the RBP derived from historical trials should also be taken into consideration in determining the comparability margin in terms both of the end-point chosen and of the population to be studied. There must be reasonable assurance that the study is capable of showing any difference that exists between the RBP and SBP; this is referred to as “assay sensitivity”.

Table A2.1
Advantages and disadvantages of equivalence/non-inferiority designs for SBPs

Design	Advantages	Disadvantages
Equivalence	<p>Demonstration of equivalence provides a strong rationale for the possibility of extrapolation of efficacy to other indications of the RBP.</p> <p>Current experience for the licensing of SBPs is based on equivalence trials.</p>	<p>An equivalence trial tends to need a larger sample size to achieve the same study power as a non-inferiority trial.</p> <p>A finding of superiority would lead to the failure of the equivalence trial. There would be no option to show that the superiority observed is not clinically relevant. However, a stand-alone application might still be an option, subject to a requirement for additional studies</p>
Non-inferiority	<p>A non-inferiority trial requires a smaller sample size to achieve the same study power as an equivalence trial.</p> <p>A finding of superiority of the SBP compared to the RBP would not lead to failure of a non-inferiority trial, provided that it can be demonstrated that the superiority observed is not clinically relevant.</p>	<p>Post-hoc justification that a finding of statistically superior efficacy is not clinically relevant is difficult. If the superiority observed is considered clinically relevant, the SBP would not be considered to be similar to the RBP and should be developed as a stand-alone product.</p> <p>Demonstration that superior efficacy of the SBP, prescribed at the same dosage as the RBP, is not associated with increased adverse events would be required in all cases.</p> <p>Demonstration of non-inferiority does not provide a strong rationale for the possibility of extrapolation to other indications of the RBP.</p> <p>There is currently no experience with licensing of SBPs based on non-inferiority trials.</p>

Statistical analysis for both equivalence and non-inferiority designs is generally based on the use of two-sided confidence intervals (typically at the 95% level) for the difference between treatments. For equivalence trials, equivalence is demonstrated when the entire confidence interval falls within the lower and upper equivalence margins. Non-inferiority evaluations are one-sided and statistical inference is based only on the lower or upper confidence limit, whichever is appropriate for a given study. For example, if a lower margin is defined, non-inferiority is demonstrated when the lower limit of the confidence interval is above the non-inferiority margin. Analysis of non-inferiority trials can also be based on a one-sided confidence interval at the 97.5% level.

Details of the sample size calculations should be provided in the study protocol. The basis of estimates of any quantities used in the sample size calculation should also be clearly explained, and these estimates will usually be based on results from earlier trials with the RBP or on published literature. Since the formulae for sample size calculations are slightly different between equivalence and non-inferiority trials, and the two-sided equivalence trial tends to need a larger sample size than a one-sided non-inferiority trial, sample size calculations should be based on methods specifically designed for equivalence or non-inferiority trials. In estimating the sample size for equivalence or non-inferiority trials, it is usually assumed that there is no difference between the SBP and the RBP. An equivalence trial could be underpowered if the true difference is not zero. Similarly, a non-inferiority trial could be underpowered if the SBP is actually less effective than the RBP. Determination of the appropriate sample size is dependent on various factors including: the type of primary end-point (e.g. binary, quantitative or time-to-event), the predefined comparability margin, the probability of a type I error (falsely rejecting the null hypothesis) and the probability of a type II error (erroneously failing to reject the null hypothesis). Keeping the probability of a type II error low will increase the ability of the study to show equivalence or non-inferiority of the SBP to the RBP. The expected rates of patient dropouts and withdrawals should also be taken into consideration in the determination of the sample size.

10.5 Safety

Pre-licensing safety data should be obtained in a sufficient number of patients to characterize the safety profile of the SBP. Depending on their size and duration, efficacy trials may be sufficient or may need to be extended to provide an adequate safety database. Comparison with the RBP should include type, frequency and severity of adverse events/reactions. For cases in which similar efficacy is demonstrated in confirmatory pharmacokinetic/pharmacodynamic studies but safety data relevant for the target population cannot be deduced from these studies, data on safety in the target population are still needed. For example, for two soluble insulins, the euglycaemic clamp study is considered the most sensitive method for detecting differences in efficacy. However, immunogenicity and local tolerance of subcutaneously administered SBP cannot be assessed in such a study and should therefore be evaluated in the target population.

Safety data should preferably be comparative. Comparison with an external control group is usually hampered by differences in the investigated patient population and concomitant therapy, observation period and/or reporting.

Safety data obtained from the clinical trials can be expected mainly to detect frequent and short-term adverse events/reactions. Such data are usually sufficient pre-licensing, but further close monitoring of clinical safety of the SBP is usually necessary in the post-marketing phase (see section 11).

10.6 Immunogenicity

Immunogenicity of biotherapeutic products should always be investigated pre-authorization. Even if efficacy and safety of an SBP and RBP have been shown to be similar, immunogenicity may still be different.

The immune response to a biotherapeutic is influenced by many factors including the nature of the drug substance, product- and process-related impurities, excipients and stability of the product, route of administration, dosing regimen, and patient-, disease- and/or therapy-related factors (10).

The consequences of unwanted immunogenicity may vary considerably, from the clinically irrelevant to the serious and life-threatening. Although neutralizing antibodies directly alter the pharmacodynamic effect of a product (i.e. by directly blocking an active site of the protein), binding antibodies often affect pharmacokinetics and thereby also influence pharmacodynamics. Thus, an altered effect of the product as a consequence of anti-product antibody formation might be a composite of pharmacokinetic, pharmacodynamic and safety effects.

Immunogenicity of a biotherapeutic should always be investigated in humans since animal data are usually not predictive of the immune response in humans. The frequency and type of antibodies induced, as well as the possible clinical consequences of the immune response, should be compared for the SBP and the RBP. Comparison with an external control group is not considered appropriate because it is usually hampered by differences in the investigated patient population, observation period, sampling time points, assays employed, and interpretation of results.

Generally, the amount of immunogenicity data obtained from the comparative efficacy trial(s) (i.e. trials that are powered for their primary efficacy end-point) will allow detection of a marked increase in immunogenicity of the SBP compared with the RBP and will be sufficient pre-licensing. Where clinically meaningful or even serious antibody development has been encountered with the RBP (or the substance class) but is too rare to be captured pre-licensing (e.g. cross-reacting neutralizing anti-epoetin antibodies causing pure red cell aplasia), a specific risk management plan for the SBP may be necessary to assess this specific risk post-marketing (see section 11). In case similar efficacy is demonstrated in confirmatory pharmacokinetic/pharmacodynamic studies, immunogenicity data in the target population are still needed (see section 10.5). If the manufacturer intends to extrapolate efficacy and safety data to other approved indications of the RBP (see section 10.7), care should be taken to ensure that immunogenicity is investigated in the patient population that carries the highest risk of an immune response and immune-related adverse events.

The manufacturer will need to justify its antibody testing strategy including the selection, assessment and characterization of assays, identification of appropriate sampling time points including baseline, sample volumes and sample processing/storage as well as selection of statistical methods for analysis

of data. Antibody assays need to be validated for their intended purpose. A screening assay of sufficient sensitivity should be used for antibody detection and a neutralization assay should be available for further characterization of antibodies, if present. Possible interference of the circulating antigen with the antibody assay(s) should be taken into account. Detected antibodies need to be further characterized and their potential clinical implications for safety, efficacy and pharmacokinetics evaluated. For example, the isotype of the antibodies should be determined if they may be predictive of safety (e.g. development of IgE antibodies correlates with the development of allergic and anaphylactic responses). If the antibody incidence is higher with the use of the SBP than with the RBP, the reason for the difference needs to be investigated. Special attention should be paid to the possibility that the immune response seriously affects the endogenous protein and its unique biological function.

The required observation period for immunogenicity testing will depend on the intended duration of therapy and the expected time of antibody development and should be justified by the manufacturer. In the case of chronic administration, one-year data will usually be appropriate pre-licensing to assess antibody incidence and possible clinical implications. This is the case, for example, for somatropin-containing products, where antibody development usually occurs within the first 6–9 months of treatment but potential effects on growth are only seen thereafter. In some cases, shorter pre-licensing observation periods may be sufficient; for insulins, for example, most susceptible patients will develop antibodies within the first 6 months of treatment and clinical consequences, if any, would usually be observed at about the same time as antibody development. If considered clinically relevant, development of antibody titres, their persistence over time, potential changes in the character of the antibody response and the possible clinical implications should be assessed pre- and post-marketing.

Since pre-licensing immunogenicity data are often limited, further characterization of the immunogenicity profile may be necessary post-marketing, particularly if rare antibody-related serious adverse events may occur that are not likely to be detected in the pre-marketing phase.

10.7 **Extrapolation of efficacy and safety data to other clinical indications**

If similar efficacy and safety of the SBP and RBP have been demonstrated for a particular clinical indication, extrapolation of these data to other indications of the RBP (not studied in independent clinical studies with the SBP) may be possible if all of the following conditions are fulfilled:

- A sensitive clinical test model has been used that is able to detect potential differences between the SBP and the RBP.

- The clinically relevant mechanism of action and/or involved receptor(s) are the same; e.g. GH action in different conditions of short stature in children; erythropoiesis-stimulating action of epoetins in different conditions associated with anaemia or for the purpose of autologous blood donation. If the mechanism of action is different or not known, a strong scientific rationale and additional data (e.g. “pharmacodynamic fingerprint”, additional clinical data) will be needed.
- Safety and immunogenicity of the SBP have been sufficiently characterized and no unique or additional safety issues are expected for the extrapolated indication(s), for which clinical data on the SBP are not being provided; e.g. immunogenicity data in immunosuppressed patients would not allow extrapolation to an indication in healthy subjects or patients with autoimmune diseases, although the reverse would be valid.
- If the efficacy trial used a non-inferiority study design and demonstrated acceptable safety and efficacy of the SBP compared to the RBP, the applicant should provide convincing arguments that this finding can be applied to the extrapolated indications; e.g. results from a non-inferiority trial in an indication where a low dose is used may be difficult to extrapolate to an indication where a higher dose is used, from the standpoint of both efficacy and safety.

If these prerequisites for extrapolation of efficacy and safety data of the SBP to other indication(s) of the RBP are not fulfilled, the manufacturer will need to submit clinical data to support the desired indication(s).

If extrapolation of results from clinical studies for one indication to one or more different indications is intended, a detailed scientific discussion on the risk–benefit of such a proposal should be provided, based on the above criteria.

11. Pharmacovigilance

As for most biological medicines, data from pre-authorization clinical studies are usually too limited to identify all potential unwanted effects of an SBP. In particular, rare adverse events are unlikely to be encountered in the limited clinical trial populations being tested with the SBP. Further close monitoring of the clinical safety of an SBP in all approved indications and a continued benefit–risk assessment are therefore necessary in the post-marketing phase.

The manufacturer should submit a safety specification and pharmacovigilance plan at the time of submission of the marketing authorization application. The principles of pharmacovigilance planning can be found in

relevant guidelines such as ICH E2E (11). The safety specification should describe important identified or potential safety issues for the RBP and for the substance class and/or any that are specific for the SBP. The pharmacovigilance plan should describe the planned post-marketing activities and methods based on the safety specification (11). In some cases, risk minimization measures such as educational material for patients and/or treating physicians may enhance the safety of using the SBP.

Any specific safety monitoring imposed on the RBP or product class should be incorporated into the pharmacovigilance plan for the SBP, unless a compelling justification can be provided to show that this is not necessary. Moreover, potential additional risks identified during the review of the data obtained with the SBP should be subject to further safety monitoring (e.g. increased immunogenicity that might result from a difference in the glycosylation profile).

Post-marketing safety reports should include all information on product tolerability received by the marketing authorization holder. The safety information must be evaluated in a scientific manner and should include evaluation of the frequency and causality of adverse events.

Manufacturers should ensure that, at the time of the marketing authorization, they have in place an appropriate pharmacovigilance system, including the services of a qualified person responsible for monitoring pharmacovigilance and the necessary means for notification of adverse reactions that occur in any of the countries where the product is marketed.

After the marketing authorization is granted, it is the responsibility of the NRA to monitor closely the compliance of manufacturers with their marketing commitments, where appropriate, and particularly with their pharmacovigilance obligations (as previously described).

In addition, as for all biotherapeutics, an adequate system for ensuring specific identification of the SBPs (i.e. traceability) is essential. The NRA shall provide a legal framework for proper pharmacovigilance surveillance and ensure the ability to identify any biotherapeutic marketed in its territory that is the subject of adverse reaction reports. This implies that an adverse reaction report for any biotherapeutic should include, in addition to the International Nonproprietary Name (INN) (12), other important indicators such as proprietary (brand) name, manufacturer's name, lot number and country of origin.

12. Prescribing information and label

The SBP should be clearly identifiable by a unique brand name. Where an INN is defined, this should also be stated; WHO policy on INN should be followed (<http://www.who.int/medicines/services/inn/innguidance/en/index.html>).

Provision of the lot number is essential; it is an important part of production information and critical for traceability whenever problems with a product are encountered.

The prescribing information for the SBP should be as similar as possible to that of the RBP except for product-specific aspects, such as different excipient(s). This is particularly important for posology and safety-related information, including contraindications, warnings and adverse events. However, if there are fewer indications for the SBP than for the RBP, the related text in various sections may be omitted unless it is considered important to inform doctors and patients about certain risks, e.g. as a result of potential off-label use. In such cases it should be clearly stated in the prescribing information that the SBP is not intended for use in the specific indication(s) and the reasons why. The NRA may choose to mention in the product information the SBP nature of the product, the studies that have been performed with the SBP and the specific RBP, and/or to include instructions for the prescribing physician on how to use SBP products.

13. Roles and responsibilities of national regulatory authorities

One of the responsibilities of an NRA is to set up appropriate regulatory oversight for the licensing and post-marketing surveillance of SBPs that are developed and/or authorized for use in its area of jurisdiction. The experience and expertise of the NRA in evaluating biotherapeutic products is a key prerequisite for appropriate regulatory oversight of these products. The NRA is responsible for determining a suitable regulatory framework for licensing SBPs. It may choose to use or amend existing pathways or to develop a new pathway for this purpose.

As development of biotherapeutic products is a rapidly evolving area, regular review of NRAs for their licensing, for adequacy of their regulations for providing oversight, and for the processes and policies that constitute the regulatory framework is an essential component of a well-functioning and up-to-date regulatory oversight for biotherapeutics.

An NRA may have the necessary legal basis to approve all new drugs and as such may not need to amend its regulations to authorize SBPs. However, the European Union has specifically amended its regulations to provide an abbreviated regulatory pathway for SBPs (biosimilars) (13–16). This issue is the subject of discussion in a number of other countries where SBPs are being developed. Health Canada and Japan, for example, have recently developed their guidelines for manufacturers, and national guidelines are under development in a number of other countries. The historical perspective of the United States Food and Drug Administration on the assessment of follow-on protein products has also been published (17). In most instances, NRAs will need to provide guidance

to manufacturers on the information needed and regulatory requirements for the authorization of SBPs. Most countries will either use or amend their existing legislation and applicable regulations or will develop entirely novel frameworks for the authorization of SBPs. In some jurisdictions, regulations for licensing subsequent entry versions of biotherapeutic products are intricately linked with policies for innovation. Hence an NRA may need to coordinate with other stakeholders for consistency.

Authors and acknowledgements

The scientific basis for the evaluation and regulation of similar biotherapeutic products was discussed and agreement for developing WHO Guidelines was reached at the first WHO Informal Consultation on Regulatory Evaluation of Therapeutic Biological Medicinal Products, held in Geneva, Switzerland, 19–20 April 2007, attended by the following participants.

Temporary Advisers: Dr A. Bristow, National Institute for Biological Standardization and Control, Potters Bar, England; Dr L.G. Castanheira, Agencia Nacional da Vigilância Sanitária, Brasília, Brazil; Dr A.M. Cheraghali, Iran Blood Transfusion Organization, Tehran, Islamic Republic of Iran; Dr G. Garcia de Oliveira, Agencia Nacional da Vigilância Sanitária, Brasília, Brazil; Dr S.P. Gogoi, Ministry of Health & Family Welfare, Guwahati, India; Dr E. Gray, National Institute for Biological Standardization and Control, Potters Bar, England; Dr E. Griffiths, Health Canada, Ottawa, Canada; Dr U. Kalinke, Paul-Ehrlich-Institute, Langen, Germany; Dr T. Kawanishi, National Institute for Health and Science, Tokyo, Japan; Dr J.C. Krayenbühl, Swissmedic, Berne, Switzerland; Dr K. Nyarko, Health Canada, Ottawa, Canada; Ms M. Poulis, Therapeutic Goods Administration, Woden, ACT, Australia; Dr P. Richardson, European Medicines Agency, London, England; Dr J. Robertson, National Institute for Biological Standardization and Control, Potters Bar, England; Dr H. Schellekens, Utrecht University, Utrecht, the Netherlands; Ms M. Schmid-Appert, Swissmedic, Berne, Switzerland; Dr Y. Sohn, Korea Food and Drug Administration, Seoul, Republic of Korea; Dr J. Southern, Ministry of Health, Cape Town, South Africa; Dr R. Thorpe, National Institute for Biological Standardization and Control, Potters Bar, England; Dr J. Wang, National Institute for the Control of Pharmaceutical and Biological Products, Beijing, China; Dr K. Webber, Food and Drug Administration, Silver Spring, MD, USA; Dr M. Weise, Federal Institute for Drugs and Medical Devices, Bonn, Germany; Dr T. Yamaguchi, National Institute of Health Sciences, Tokyo, Japan.

Representative of the Developing Countries Vaccine Manufacturers' Network (DVCNM): Dr S. Gairola, Serum Institute of India Ltd, Pune, India.

Representatives of the European Generic Medicines Association (EGA): Ms S. Kox, EGA, Brussels, Belgium; Dr M. Schiestl, Sandoz, Kundl, Tirol, Austria.

Representative of the International Association for Biologicals (IABS): Dr A. Eshkol, Merck Serono, Geneva, Switzerland.

Representatives of the International Federation of Pharmaceutical Manufacturers and Associations (IFPMA): Dr A. Fox, Amgen, Cambridge, England; Dr R. Krause, IFPMA, Geneva, Switzerland; Dr J. Mascaro, Hoffman La Roche, Basel, Switzerland.

WHO Secretariat: Dr R. Balocco-Mattavelli, Dr J. Dong and Dr S. Lasseur, Quality Assurance and Safety of Medicines, Medicines Policy and Standards Department, World Health Organization, Geneva, Switzerland; Dr J. Joung, Dr I. Knezevic and Dr D. Wood, Quality, Safety and Standards, Immunization, Vaccines and Biologicals Department, World Health Organization, Geneva, Switzerland.

The first draft of the Guidelines was developed by the members of the WHO drafting group on similar biotherapeutic products following the first drafting group meeting held at the Federal Institute for Drugs and Medical Devices (BfArM), Bonn, Germany, on 5–7 March 2008, attended by the following participants:

Dr E. Griffiths, Biologics and Genetic Therapies Directorate, Health Canada, Ottawa, Canada; Dr H.K. Heim, Federal Institute for Drugs and Medical Devices (BfArM), Bonn, Germany; Dr J. Joung and Dr I. Knezevic, Quality, Safety and Standards, Immunization, Vaccines and Biologicals Department, World Health Organization, Geneva, Switzerland; Dr K. Nyarko, Biologics and Genetic Therapies Directorate, Health Canada, Ottawa, Canada; Dr J. Robertson, National Institute for Biological Standardization and Control, Potters Bar, England; Dr Y. Sohn, Korea Food and Drug Administration, Seoul, Republic of Korea; Dr M. Weise, Federal Institute for Drugs and Medical Devices (BfArM), Bonn, Germany.

Following a WHO Informal Consultation on Regulatory Evaluation of Therapeutic Biological Medicines in Seoul, Republic of Korea, 27–29 May 2008, the second draft of these Guidelines was prepared by: Dr E. Griffiths, Biologics and Genetic Therapies Directorate, Health Canada, Ottawa, Canada; Dr J. Joung and Dr I. Knezevic, Quality, Safety and Standards, Immunization, Vaccines and Biologicals Department, World Health Organization, Geneva, Switzerland; Dr K. Nyarko, Biologics and Genetic Therapies Directorate, Health Canada, Ottawa, Canada; Dr M. Weise, Federal Institute for Drugs and Medical Devices (BfArM), Bonn, Germany.

Acknowledgements are due to the following participants:

Dr A.M. Cheraghali, Iran Blood Transfusion Organization, Tehran, Islamic Republic of Iran; Dr S. P. Gogoi, Ministry of Health & Family Welfare, Guwahati, India; Dr E. Griffiths, Health Canada, Ottawa, Canada; Dr H.K. Heim, Federal Institute for Drugs and Medical Devices, Bonn, Germany; Dr S. Hong,

Korea Food and Drug Administration, Seoul, Republic of Korea; Dr K. Nyarko, Health Canada, Ottawa, Canada; Dr P. Richardson, European Medicines Agency, London, England; Dr E. Shacter, Food and Drug Administration, Bethesda, MD, USA; Dr Y. Sohn, Korea Food and Drug Administration, Seoul, Republic of Korea; Dr J. Southern, Ministry of Health, Cape Town, South Africa; Dr P. Thanaphollert, Food and Drug Administration, Nonthaburi, Thailand; Dr R. Thorpe, National Institute for Biological Standardization and Control, Potters Bar, England; Dr M. Wadhwa, National Institute for Biological Standardization and Control, Potters Bar, England; Dr J. Wang, National Institute for the Control of Pharmaceutical and Biological Products, Beijing, China; Dr M. Weise, Federal Institute for Drugs and Medical Devices, Bonn, Germany; Dr T. Yamaguchi, National Institute of Health Sciences, Tokyo, Japan.

Representatives of DVCMN: Dr S. Gairola, Serum Institute of India Ltd, Pune, India; Dr H. Ji, LG Life Science, Seoul, Republic of Korea.

Representatives of EGA: Dr S. Eisen, Teva, London, England; Ms S. Kox, EGA, Brussels, Belgium; Dr M. Schiestl, Sandoz, Kundl, Tirol, Austria.

Representatives of IFPMA: Dr A. Fox, Amgen, Cambridge, England; Dr R. Krause, IFPMA, Geneva, Switzerland; Dr J. Mascaro, Hoffman La Roche, Basel, Switzerland.

WHO staff: Dr M.L. Pombo, Pan American Health Organization, Washington, DC, USA.

Taking into account comments and advice provided by the WHO Expert Committee on Biological Standardization, the third draft was prepared by the members of the drafting group following the second drafting group meeting in Tokyo, Japan, 16 and 18 February 2009, attended by the following participants:

Dr S. Hong and Dr J. Joungh, Korea Food and Drug Administration, Seoul, Republic of Korea; Dr H.N. Kang and Dr I. Knezevic, Quality, Safety and Standards, Immunization, Vaccines and Biologicals Department, World Health Organization, Geneva, Switzerland; Dr K. Nyarko, Biologics and Genetic Therapies Directorate, Health Canada, Ottawa, Canada; Dr P. Richardson, European Medicines Agency, London, England; Dr E. Shacter and Dr K. Webber, Food and Drug Administration, Bethesda, MD, USA; Dr M. Weise, Federal Institute for Drugs and Medical Devices (BfArM), Bonn, Germany; Dr T. Yamaguchi, National Institute of Health Sciences, Tokyo, Japan.

Following a WHO/Health Canada Consultation on Regulatory Considerations in Evaluating Similar Biotherapeutic Products in Ottawa, Canada, 15–17 July 2009, the fourth draft of these revised Guidelines was prepared by: Dr E. Griffiths, Biologics and Genetic Therapies Directorate, Health Canada, Ottawa, Canada; Dr H.K. Heim, Federal Institute for Drugs and Medical Devices (BfArM), Bonn, Germany; Dr J. Joungh, Korea Food and Drug Administration,

Seoul, Republic of Korea; Dr H.N. Kang and Dr I. Knezevic, Quality, Safety and Standards, Immunization, Vaccines and Biologicals Department, World Health Organization, Geneva, Switzerland; Dr C. Njue and Dr K. Nyarko, Biologics and Genetic Therapies Directorate, Health Canada, Ottawa, Canada; Dr M. Weise, Federal Institute for Drugs and Medical Devices (BfArM), Bonn, Germany; Dr T. Yamaguchi, National Institute of Health Sciences, Tokyo, Japan.

Acknowledgements are due to the following participants:

Mrs A. Abas, Ministry of Health Malaysia, Jalan University, Selangor, Malaysia; Dr K. Baek, Korea Food and Drug Administration, Seoul, Republic of Korea; Ms M. Chultem and Dr A. Klein, Biologics and Genetic Therapies Directorate, Health Canada, Ottawa, Canada; Dr S. Kozlowski, FDA/CDER/OPS, Food and Drug Administration, Bethesda, MD, USA; Dr H.M.J. Leng, School of Pharmacy, University of the Western Cape, Belville, South Africa; Dr J. Luo, States Food and Drug Administration, Beijing, China; Mrs Y.H. Nunez, Centro para el Control Estatal de la Calidad de los Medicamentos, Havana, Cuba; Dr A. Ridgway, Biologics and Genetic Therapies Directorate, Health Canada, Ottawa, Canada; Dr S. Shani, Ministry of Health and Social Welfare, Government of India FDA, New Delhi, India; Dr K. Shokraie, Ministry of Health, Tehran, Islamic Republic of Iran; Dr K. Tungsanga, Chulalongkorn University, Bangkok, Thailand; Dr J. Wang, National Institute for the Control of Pharmaceutical and Biological Products, Beijing, China; Dr J. Wang, Biologics and Genetic Therapies Directorate, Health Canada, Ottawa, Canada.

Representatives of DVCMN: Dr H. Malhotra, SMS Medical College Hospital, Jaipur, India; Dr P.D. Picon, Federal University of Rio Grande do Sul, Rio Grande do Sul, Brazil.

Representatives of EGA: Dr I. Ahmed, Hospira, IL, USA; Dr S. Balsler, Sandoz Biopharmaceuticals, Oberhaching, Germany; Dr S. Eisen, Teva, London, England.

Representatives of IABS: Dr. R. Krause, IFPMA, Geneva, Switzerland.

Representatives of IFPMA: Dr S. Day, Roche Products Ltd, Welwyn Garden City, England; Dr S. Eisen, Teva, London, England; Dr M. Fletcher, Pfizer Global R&D, New London, CT, USA; Dr A. Fox, Amgen, Cambridge, England; Dr J. Mascaro, Elan Pharma International, Dublin, Ireland.

Document WHO/BS/09.2110 was prepared by Dr H.N. Kang and Dr I. Knezevic, WHO, for consideration by the sixtieth meeting of the Expert Committee on Biological Standardization, held in Geneva in 2009. Further changes were made to WHO/BS/09.2110 by the Expert Committee on Biological Standardization, resulting in the present document. Special thanks are due to Dr C. Njue, Health Canada, Ottawa, Canada and Dr M. Bielsky, Medicines and Healthcare Products Regulatory Agency, London, England for their comments and advice during the ECBS meeting.

References

1. Guidelines for assuring the quality of pharmaceutical and biological products prepared by recombinant DNA technology. In: *WHO Expert Committee on Biological Standardization. Forty-first report*. Geneva, World Health Organization, 1991 (WHO Technical Report Series, No. 814), Annex 3.
2. Requirements for the use of animal cells as in vitro substrates for the production of biologicals. In: *WHO Expert Committee on Biological Standardization. Forty-seventh report*. Geneva, World Health Organization, 1998 (WHO Technical Report Series, No. 878), Annex 1.
3. *WHO international biological reference preparations: cytokines/growth factors*. Geneva, World Health Organization, 25 May 2011 (http://www.who.int/bloodproducts/catalogue/Cyto_May2011.pdf, accessed 14 February 2013).
4. Joung J et al. WHO informal consultation on regulatory evaluation of therapeutic biological medicinal products held at WHO Headquarters, Geneva, 19–20 April 2007. *Biologicals*, 2008, 36:269–276.
5. Good manufacturing practices for biological products. In: *WHO Expert Committee on Biological Standardization. Forty-second report*. Geneva, World Health Organization, 1992 (WHO Technical Report Series, No. 822), Annex 1.
6. *Preclinical safety evaluation of biotechnology-derived pharmaceuticals (S6)*. Geneva, International Conference on Harmonisation of Technical Requirements for Registration of Pharmaceuticals for Human Use, 1997.
7. *Comparability of biotechnological/biological products subject to changes in their manufacturing process (Q5E)*. Geneva, International Conference on Harmonisation of Technical Requirements for Registration of Pharmaceuticals for Human Use, 2004.
8. *Choice of control group and related issues in clinical trials (E10)*. Geneva, International Conference on Harmonisation of Technical Requirements for Registration of Pharmaceuticals for Human Use, 2000.
9. *Statistical principles for clinical trials (E9)*. Geneva, International Conference on Harmonisation of Technical Requirements for Registration of Pharmaceuticals for Human Use, 1998.
10. Committee for Medicinal Products for Human Use. *Guideline on immunogenicity assessment of biotechnology-derived therapeutic proteins*. London, European Medicines Agency, 2007 (EMA/CHMP/BMWP/14327/2006).
11. *Pharmacovigilance planning (E2E)*. Geneva, International Conference on Harmonisation of Technical Requirements for Registration of Pharmaceuticals for Human Use, 2004.
12. *WHO Informal Consultation on International Nonproprietary Names (INN) Policy for Biosimilar Products, Geneva, 4–5 September, 2006*. Geneva, World Health Organization, 2006 (http://www.who.int/medicines/services/inn/BiosimilarsINN_ReportSept2006.pdf, accessed 14 February 2013).
13. Directive 2001/83/EC of the European Parliament and of the Council of 6 November 2001 on the Community code relating to medicinal products for human use. *Official Journal of the European Communities*, 2001, L311:67–128 (<http://eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/LexUriServ.do?uri=OJ:L:2001:311:0067:0128:EN:PDF>, accessed 14 February 2013).
14. Committee for Medicinal Products for Human Use. *Guideline on similar biological medicinal products*. London, European Medicines Agency, 2005 (CHMP/437/04).
15. Committee for Medicinal Products for Human Use. *Guideline on similar biological medicinal products containing biotechnology-derived proteins as active substance: quality issues*. London, European Medicines Agency, 2006 (EMA/CHMP/BWP/49348/2005).

16. Committee for Medicinal Products for Human Use. *Guideline on similar biological medicinal products containing biotechnology-derived proteins as active substance: non-clinical and clinical issues*. London, European Medicines Agency, 2006 (EMA/CHMP/BMWP/42832/2005).
17. Woodcock J et al. FDA's assessment of follow-on protein products: a historical perspective. *Nature Reviews Drug Discovery*, 2007, 6:437–442.

