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Two new draft regulatory documents for Immunogenicity

Assay Development and Validation for Immunogenicity Testing of Therapeutic Protein Products

Guidance for Industry

DRAFT GUIDANCE

This guidance document is being distributed for comment purposes only.

Comments and suggestions regarding this draft document should be submitted within 60 days of publication in the Federal Register of the notice announcing the availability of the draft guidance. Submit electronic comments to http://www.regulations.gov. Submit written comments to the Division of Dockets Management (HFA-305), Food and Drug Administration, 5600 Fishers Lane, rm. 1061, Rockville, MD 20852. All comments should be identified with the docket number listed in the notice of availability that publishes in the Federal Register.

For questions regarding this draft document, contact (CDER) Susan Kaylaer at 301-827-1731; (CBER) Office of Communication, Outreach and Development, 800-855-4709 or 301-402-8010; or (CDRH) Office of Communication and Education, 800-638-2041 or 301-795-7100.
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EBF process

1. EBF members informed of draft documents and invited to comment
2. Expert Group (EG) formed; comments collated and reviewed
3. EG output reviewed and approved by EBF Steering Committee
4. Submission to the respective regulatory authority
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EBF Comments received for EMA draft guideline

EG involved in summarizing EBF comments: Marianne Scheel Fjording (Lead), Birgitte Buur Ramussen, James Munday, Jo Goodman
EBF comments received for FDA draft guidance

EG involved in summarizing EBF comments:
Jo Goodman (Lead), Jonas Blanes, David Egging, James Munday, Robert Nelson, Elizabeth Wilson
Key themes: general comments

**EMA**
- Assay requirements/details have been removed in new draft
- Recommend addition of a section on reporting for clinical immunogenicity

**FDA**
- Inserting a section on target interference
- Add an integrated assessment of PK, PD and ADA to evaluate neutralising capacity of the immunogenic response. The guidance should provide clear direction on how the risk assessment should translate into ADA/nAb sampling and testing strategy.
- Clarify the use of (purified) ADA compared with positive control antibodies in relation to sensitivity, selectivity and matrix interference
- A medium positive control is not considered informative, and we suggest to omit in the guidance
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Molecule formats

**EMA**
- Recommendation that the scope is further defined
- Include what the expectation is for other molecule formats such as ADCs (and DAR species), DNA/RNA, oligonucleotides, gene therapy, chemically synthesised peptides

**FDA**
- Include expectation for other molecule formats
- Multiple functional domain molecules; request for further clarity whether specific assays are needed for all components
- Would whole molecule be sufficient in early clinical phases?
- Examples of risk categories for different therapeutics
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Biosimilars

EMA

• “Analytical assays should be performed with both the reference and biosimilar molecule in parallel (in a blinded fashion) to measure the immune response against the product that was received by each patient”

• EBF recommends the use of a single assay

FDA

• “When a true comparison of immunogenicity across different therapeutic protein products that have homology is needed, it should be obtained by conducting a head-to-head clinical study using a standardized assay under the same conditions that has equivalent sensitivity and specificity for both therapeutic protein products”
Sensitivity

• “FDA recommends that screening and confirmatory ADA assays achieve a sensitivity of at least 100 nanograms per milliliter (ng/mL)”

• Positive control is normally a surrogate and defines the sensitivity
• May not reflect the clinical situation
• Too stringent for such assay platforms (e.g. SPR)
• How many cases where patient safety was impacted by a less sensitive assay, i.e. 250-500 ng/mL sensitivity?
• PK assays often more sensitive and will pick up potentially impactful ADA responses
Positive control (PC)/negative control (NC)

**EMA**

- “Ideally, an antibody positive control should be a human preparation with a significant antibody content which is available in sufficient quantity for continued use”

  - Virtually impossible in sufficient quantity at the timing required
  - Informed consent for further use

**FDA**

- Allows use of human derived PC but also makes reference to the lack of availability in early trials
- EBF Recommend no benefit from including a mid PC in validation
- Long-term stability should not be a requirement (Pihl *et al.* (2014))
- % CV criteria too stringent; recommend 25% CV for PCs and 30% CV for NCs
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Drug tolerance (DT)

**EMA**
- “Applicant has to demonstrate that the drug-tolerance of the assay exceeds the levels of the therapeutic protein in the samples for ADA testing.”
- Not always possible
- Sampling includes times when drug is cleared
- Recommend that the sponsor should evaluate and define DT relative to their PC

**FDA**
- Recommend defining what is acceptable for nAb assays
- What approaches would the Agency find acceptable for overcoming DT?
Cut points (CPs)

EMA

• “A statistical approach should be used to establish the assay cut-off value. Alternatively, real data (e.g. double background value) can be used to determine what will be considered the lowest positive result”

• Contradicts the expectation of no false negatives

FDA

• Substantial text on in-study CPs, statistics and outliers
• Recommend that sponsors can justify their cut point approach and that the Agency include clarification on whether they would accept non-statistically derived approaches
• In-study cut points EBF recommends not using unless the patient populations differ
Characterisation/specificity

**EMA**

• “Antibodies present in confirmed positive samples need to be examined for specificity for the active protein and, in relevant cases, distinguished from antibodies which bind to product-related and process-related components (e.g., host cell proteins)”

  • Recommend further clarification for HCP assays and how isolated forms are produced

**FDA**

• “Isotyping and cross-reactivity assay designs should be discussed with FDA”

  • Is this only for endogenous counterparts or is isotyping routinely expected?
  • Is a confirmatory assay using endogenous counterpart acceptable for cross-reactivity?
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Neutralising antibodies (nAb)

EMA
- Recommend to see an integrated PK/PD/ADA approach
- Use of relevant biomarkers in the place of nAb assays

FDA
- Recommend to see an integrated PK/PD/ADA approach
- More detail around expectations of sensitivity and drug tolerance
- Clear guidance on when LBA is acceptable; if the LBA is more sensitive and drug tolerant, EBF would recommend LBA over CBA
EMA workshop 9th March 2016, London

- Attendees on behalf of EBF:
  - Michaela Golob
  - Jo Goodman
  - James Munday
  - Andy Roberts

- 500+ pages of comments received
- Presentations
- Panel Sessions
- Discussions
- Possibility of another workshop once comments fully reviewed
- Full meeting and slides available on EMA website
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