

Making Medicines Affordable

SUCCESS STORY of the EU Biosimilars Framework and Information Challenge Bratislava, 3 June 2013 Suzette Kox

Senior Director Scientific Affairs Coordinator of European Biosimilars Group, EGA sector group





- Communalities/differences-generics/biosimilars
- EU biosimilars framework
- Information challenge
 - Terminology
 - Misleading mantra: similar but not identical»
 - Extrapolation of indications-Biosimilarity
 - Immunogenicity
 - Pharmacovigilance; identification in case of ADRs
 - EU consensus definitions: interchange, substitution
 - Further reading list

Suzette Kox, 3 June 2013



Communalities/Differences-Generics/Biosimilars

Suzette Kox, 3 June 2013



Communalities Generics-Biosimilars

Both generics and biosimilars can only be authorised for use once the data exclusivity of the originator reference product has expired

No patent linkage in the EU

Both generics and biosimilars can only be marketed once the respective patents of the originator product have expired

They are off patent medicines



What is a Generic Medicine? What is a Biosimilar Medicine?

Directive 2001/83/EC (as amended)

• **Definition (Art. 10(2a)):** "Generic medicinal product shall mean a medicinal product which has the same qualitative and quantitative composition in active substances and the same pharmaceutical form as the reference medicine, ...(...)"

• Legal basis for biosimilar applications (Art. 10(4)) "Where a biological medicinal product which is similar to a reference biological product does not meet the conditions in the definition of generic medicinal products, owing to, in particular, differences relating to raw materials or in manufacturing processes of the biological medicinal product and the reference biological medicinal product, the results of appropriate preclinical tests or clinical trials relating to these conditions must be provided......(..)"



Differences Biosimilars-Generics

Biosimilar Medicine

Generic Medicine

- •Biological product made by or derived from a biological source
- Complex molecule
- •Essentially the same biological substance as reference product

Chemical product made by chemical synthesis
Small molecule
Same chemical active substance as reference product

Manufacture

Example

Vature

Costs: EUR 100-250 M Development time: 7-8



Monoclonal antibody (IgG) ~25,000 atoms Molecular weight: 150 000 Daltons 1300 amino acids •Costs: EUR 2-5 M •Development time: 2-4 years



acetylsalicylic acid 21 atoms Molecular weight: 180 Daltons <mark>0 amino acids</mark>

Suzette Kox, 3 June 2013



- Biologicals: Spectrum of Complexity

- Only Living Organisms are able to Reproduce such Complexity





EU Biosimilars Framework

Suzette Kox, 3 June 2013



EU Biosimilars Scientific & Regulatory Framework Inspiring the World



Guidelines for biosimilars

EMA slide as presented at EGA Biosimilars Conference April 2013

Overarching Guidelines:

| Defines principles | Overarching Guideline (CHMP/437/04) "Guideline on Similar Biological Medicinal Products" | | | | | | | | | | | |
|-----------------------------------|--|-----------------|------------------|-------|------------------|---|-------|---------------------|--|--|--|--|
| General Guidelines on Q/S/E | Overarch Guideline Under Rev | ning non-c e | clinical/clin | ical | Overa | Overarching Quality Guideline Draft Rev | | | | | | |
| Insulin | Somatropin | G-CSF | Epoetin | IFN-α | LMWH | mAbs | IFN-B | Follitropin alfa | | | | |
| 2006 Rev 2012 | 2006 | 2006 | 2006 Rev 2010 | 2009 | 2009 Rev 2013 | 2012 | 2013 | 2013 | | | | |
| Public C. | | | | | Public C. | | 5 | | | | | |



Overarching Guidelines:

| Defines principles | Overarch "Guidelir | Draft GL ~May 2013 | | | | | | | |
|-----------------------------------|-----------------------------------|-----------------------|------------------|----------------|----------|-------------------|--------------------------------|-------|---------------------|
| General Guidelines on Q/S/E | Overarch Draft GL ~May 2013 | ning non-c | :linical/clin | ical | | Overa | eline Final GL ~Dec 2013 | | |
| Class-specifi | ic Guidelines: nor | n-clinical/clii | nical aspects | | | | | | |
| Insulin | Somatropin | G-CSF | Epoetin | IFN-α | L/ | мwн | mAbs | IFN-B | Follitropin alfa |
| 2006 Rev 2012 | 2006 | 2006 | 2006 Rev 2010 | 2009 | 20 Re | 009 ev 2013 | 2012 | 2013 | 2013 |
| 30 Jun 2013 | | X | 3 | 31 Jul 2013 | | Implem 1 Sep 2 | Implementation 1 Sep 2013 | | |

For updates: visit EMA Website





How Come that this Framework Became Possible?

- Science and technology have evolved tremendously: proteins can be well characterized (at least up to the complexity of monoclonal antibodies), which makes the comparability exercise possible
 - "Regulatory authorities have reviewed literally hundreds of applications where comparability data have been submitted. Thus, the regulators are very experienced in assessing comparability, probably more so than anyone else". (Topra interview with Dr. Pekka Kurki, first Chair of the Biosimilar Medicinal Products Working Party, 2006)
 - "The scientific principles underlying the comparability exercise required for changes in the manufacturing process of a given biological product and for the development of a biosimilar product are the same" (Weise et al in Biosimilars-why terminology matters, Nature Biotechnology, 2011; see also revised draft over-arching guideline)



Comparability and Biosimilarity

- Comparability of biotechnology-derived medicinal products after a change in the manufacturing process
- ICH Q5E (2003)
- "The demonstration of comparability does not necessarily mean that the quality attributes of the pre-change and post-change product are identical, but that they are highly similar and that the existing knowledge is sufficiently predictive to ensure that any difference s in quality attributes have no adverse impact upon safety or efficacy of the drug product"
- This is called "comparability exercise"



Comparability Exercise: Cornerstone of Biosimilar Development



BIOSIMILAR DEVELOPMENT IS FUNDAMENTALLY COMPARATIVE

Suzette Kox, 3 June 2013



Example of an Biosimilar Filgrastim: Highly Similar to Reference Product



Bioactivity – Surface plasmon resonance spectroscopy





Comparability performed for EU Biosimilar application shows highly similar results with state of the art methods



Approved EU Biosimilar: Biosimilar and Reference Product Super Imposable Results

Gel A

Gel B

Comparison of isoform pattern for epoetin alfa by isoelectric focusing gel electrophoresis



Sample

1 (biosimilar)2 (reference)3 (biosimilar)4 (reference)Brockmeyer C & Seidl A et al. Eur J Hosp Pharm Pract 2009;15:34-40

Suzette Kox, 3 June 2013



Information Challenge

- Terminology
- «Misleading mantra: similar but not identical»
- Extrapolation of indications-Biosimilarity
- Immunogenicity
- Pharmacovigilance; identification in case of ADRs
- Continued education



Terminology is important

- Inconsistency in nomenclature for biosimilars has caused confusion
- The term 'biosimilar' is often used as a blanket statement and used for poor quality of some noncomparable follow-biologicals not approved in the EU
 - Leading to fears about safety and efficacy of EU biosimilars
- "Biosimilar" is a regulatory term and stands for a biological product which has demonstrated high similarity with a reference product based on a comprehensive comparability exercise



Non-EU Non-Comparable Follow-on Biologicals "Bio-questionables"

Isoelectric focusing gels



Schellekens H et al. Eur J Hosp Pharm Pract 2004;3:43-7

Official Journal of the

Generics and biosimilars initiative Generics and biosimilars initiative

Building trust in cost-effective treatments

PERSPECTIVE

Biosimilars Educational Series

GaBiJournal Generics and Biosimilars Initiative Journal

Terminology for biosimilarsa confusing minefield

Robin Thorpe, PhD, FRCPath; Meenu Wadhwa, PhD

Biosimilars are firmly established in the EU as copy biologicals with a clear and effective regulatory route for approval. Unfortunately, inconsistency in nomenclature for biosimilars has caused confusion. This problem of terminology has been the subject of a recent publication. The confusion is not just a potential concern for patient safety and efficacy, but also can lead to misconceptions in published reports. Several examples of this have occurred, some of which are discussed below. The definitions provided should be adopted for clarity in the future.

Keywords: Comparability, efficacy, guidelines, 'non-innovator biologic', quality, safety

B iosimilars are now firmly established in the EU as copy biologicals with a clear and effective regulatory route for approval, which allows marapproach to the EU for approval of biosimilars, e.g. Australia, Canada, Japan. In addition, the World Health Organization (WHO), with the aim of achieving harmony in regulations and increasing access to safe medicines alobally boot 1, (2012) = 132-134

paper also recommends the use of more precise terminology for biosimilars (and non-biosimilars) to attempt to clarify the confusing situation.

The confusion over terminology is not just a potential concern for patient safety and efficacy, but also can lead to misconceptions which arise from misleading published reports on apparent problems with 'biosimilars'. Several examples of this have already occurred, some of which are discussed below.

A case of pure red cell aplasia (PRCA) in an end-stage renal disease patient associated with induction of antibodies to administered erythropoietin (EPO) was described in India [10]. The patient had received the EPO product Wepox (Wockhardt Limited, India) which is referred to as a 'follow-on' product. In the paper the authors state that 'in Europe, follow-on EPOs are also referred to as biosimilar EPOs'. However, there is no evidence that this product has been approved using the comparability approach required in the EU for biosimilarity and described in the WHO and other guidelines. This is in fact unlikely as the Indian regulatory process at that time did not include biosimilars (or follow-on and approved non-innovator



Misleading 'Mantra': «Similar but Non-Identical»

- No biological can ever be identical to another, not even one batch to the other of the same product (inherent variability)
- This inherent variability is a scientific fact that has been accepted by the scientific and regulatory community since the introduction of biotech medicines
- Furthermore, all originator biological products have undergone manufacturing changes after initial authorisation



Biological products always vary in the human body from batch to batch after manufacturing changes between manufacturers

"Similar but not identical"

- "Non-identicality" is a normal principle in biotechnology.
- No batch of any biological is "identical" to the others



• The "art" is to demonstrate that the biosimilar is as close as possible to its reference product in all relevant functional and structural aspects, within current technical and scientific limitations (inherent variability)

© Christian Schneider

 $\ensuremath{\mathbb{O}}$ Christian Schneider, presented at 25th Annual EuroMeeting, Amsterdam, 2013

nature biotechnology

nature.com > journal home > archive > issue > opinion and comment > correspondence > full text

NATURE BIOTECHNOLOGY | OPINION AND COMMENT | CORRESPONDENCE

Biosimilars—why terminology matters

Martina Weise, Marie-Christine Bielsky, Karen De Smet, Falk Ehmann, Niklas Ekman, Gopalan Narayanan, Hans-Karl Heim, Esa Heinonen, Kowid Ho, Robin Thorpe, Camille Vleminckx, Meenu Wadhwa & Christian K Schneider

Affiliations | Corresponding author

Nature Biotechnology 29, 690-693 (2011) | doi:10.1038/nbt.1936 Published online 05 August 2011

To the Editor:

As members of the Biosimilar Medicinal Products Working Party (BMWP) at the European Medicines Agency (EMA; London), we would like to draw readers' attention to problems arising from imprecise usage of the term biosimilar (similar biological medicinal product) in the literature. We have repeatedly noticed misinterpretations of the biosimilar concept as well as inconsistent use of terminology and are concerned about potential implications of this, such as negative perception and impaired acceptance of biosimilars among prescribing physicians and patients. Here we outline the scientific principles underlying the biosimilar concept in the European Union (EU; Brussels). We also address problems in terminology in the context of global emergence of copy biologicals (including 'true' biosimilars) and 'biobetters', and the potential for unjustified concerns about the efficacy and safety of biosimilars in their stricter sense.



Variability of Reference Product, from Batch to Batch and After Manufacturing Changes

- Glycoproteins are not single structures, but mixtures of closely related substances
 - Even for a single manufacturer, these mixtures vary from batch to batch and after manufacturing changes





Microheterogeneity: a «Normal» Feature of Any Biological Medicine

- ...» no batch of any reference product is 'identical' to the previous one-'non-identicality' is a normal feature of biotechnolgy that has to be controlled by tight specifications of critical product attributes, within current technical and scientific limitations (inherent variability).
 - The 'art' for a biosimilar is to demonstrate that the biosimilar is as close as possible to its reference product in all relevant functional and structural aspects, again within current technical and scientific possibilities and its inherent variability'...
 - Schneider K Christian Biosimilars in rheumatology: the wind of change Annals of the Rheumatic Diseases 2013



Similarity-Same Safety & Efficacy

Revised EMA Questions and Answers on biosimilar medicines 27 September 2012

- "A biosimilar medicine is a biological medicine that is developed to be similar to an existing biological medicine (the 'reference medicine').....
- The active substance of a biosimilar and its reference medicine is essentially the same biological substance, though there may be minor differences due to their complex nature and production methods. Like the reference medicine, the biosimilar has a degree of natural variability. When approved, its variability and any differences between it and its reference medicine will have been shown not to affect safety or effectiveness."......



Extrapolation of Indications-Biosimilarity

 The primary purpose of biosimilar development is not to re-establish safety and efficacy of a known biological substance (this has been done for the reference product before);
 The aim of a biosimilar development is to establish biosimilarity and proving biosimilarity is different than proving efficacy *de-novo*



Proving Efficacy of New Product versus Clinical Biosimilarity

- Proving efficacy of a new medicine requires testing in each indication sought in 'real life' patient populations
- Clinical study performed with the biosimilar is to confirm biosimilarity with the reference product
 - «The clinical study is selected to represent the most sensitive model to study differences
 - Thus, trial design might be (entirely) different from the normal guideline principles!»
 - Dr. Med. Christian Schneider; What are biological medicinal products and biosimilars - an introduction; Meeting of the Project group on Access and Uptake of Biosimilars; Copenhagen 18 April 2012



All Approved Indications are Based on Science

Every indication granted for licensed biosimilars has been 'actively' granted based on data or solid scientific justification (i.e. has not been granted automatically) "Every word in the Summary of Product Characteristics (SmPC) that informs the prescriber has been assessed and approved including the indications granted for a biosimilar"....

Schneider K Christian - Biosimilars in rheumatology: the wind of change Annals of the Rheumatic Diseases 2013



Immunogenicity

A concern for all biolgicals

- Usually cannot be predicted from analytical or nonclinical comparison alone
 - therefore immunogenicity data requested preapproval

Applicable to all biologicals: "When filing a Marketing Authorisation Application, it is recommended that applicants present an integrated summary of their strategy on risk identification, characterisation, monitoring, minimization and mitigation"



Pharmacovigilance (PV) Same for all Biologicals

EU PV legislation requires that approved name + batch number be of ADR reports



Importance of brand name (i.e. unique identifier) for all biologicals, including biosimilars

Necessity to record detailed exposure information (including batch number) for all biopharmaceuticals



"Vermeer study" on Traceability of Biopharmaceuticals in EU and US Spontaneous Reporting Systems

- Study shows that product identification of biosimilars was well ensured in Europe:
 - 96.2% across 3 product classes.
 - For epoetins, the product identification was as high as 98/9%.
 - This study was presented in July 2012 at an EMA stakeholder meeting by Sabine Strauss/MEB, Member of the EMA Pharmacovigilance Risk Assessment Committee
 - Study covered the period 2004-2010 i.e. <u>before</u> the new EU PV legislation came into effect



EU Consensus Definitions

Interchange/eability

The medical practice of changing one medicine for another that is expected to achieve the same clinical effect in a given clinical setting and in any patient on the initiative, or with the agreement of the prescriber

Substitution

practice of dispensing one medicine instead of another equivalent and interchangeable medicine at the pharmacy level without consulting the prescriber



Continued Education of All Stakeholders Needed

- EC-DG Enterprise Project Group on Market Access and Uptake of Biosimilars
 Consensus information document prepared by
 - all EU key stakeholders published since 22 April



What you Need to Know about Biosimilar Medicinal Products



Process on Corporate Responsibility in the Field of Pharmaceuticals



2nd Edition of the EGA **BIOSIMILARS HANDBOOK**



Making Medicines Affordable

Suzette Kox, 3 June 2013



The EMA Regulatory Guidance for Biosimilars!

 EMA Procedural advice for users of the Centralised Procedure for Similar Biological Medicinal Products applications
 Updated March 2013-EMA/940451/201

It provides an overview of the EMA position on issues, which are typically addressed during the course of Pre-Submission Meetings



Further Reading List



- Weise Martina et al Biosimilars why terminology matters, published in Nature Biotechnology, Volume 29, Number 8, Aug. 2011, page 690
- Schneider K Christian et al Setting the stage for biosimilar monoclonal antibodies, published in Nature Biotechnology, Volume 30, Number 12, December 2012; 1179-85
 - Schneider K Christian et al In support of the European Union biosimilar framework, published in Nature Biotechnology, Volume 30, Number 8, August 2012
 - Thorpe Robin and Wadhwa Meenu Terminology for biosimilars-a confusing minefield, published in Generics and Biosimilars Initiative (GABI) Journal, Volume 1, 2012, Issue 3-4
 - Weise Martina et al Biosimilars: what clinicians should know pre-published online in blood, October 23, 2012, doi:10.1182/blood- 2012-04-425744 Schneider K Christian - Biosimilars in rheumatology: the wind of change Annals of the Rheumatic Diseases 2013; 72:315-318



Concluding Message

 ..»Regulators evaluate biosimilars cautiously, and a biosimilar is only registered if the applicant has demonstrated in sufficient detail that the biosimilar is of good quality and equivalent in efficacy and safety to its reference medicinal product. Authorised biosimilars are as good, safe and efficacious as originator biologicals.»

Schneider K Christian - Biosimilars in rheumatology: the wind of change Annals of the Rheumatic Diseases 2013



Making Medicines Affordable

Thank you





ADR-Adverse Drug Reaction EMA-European Medicines Agency EPAR-European Public Assessment Report **EU-European Union PV- pharmacovigilance SmPC-Summary of Product Characteristics**

Suzette Kox, 3 June 2013



Life in the Red Zone **Annual Deficit by Country**

Life in the Red Zone

| Euro-zone governments have increasingly broken heir self-imposed limit of annual budget deficits of no more than 3% of gross domestic product. | | THE HIGH GROUND Not yet in the euro zone Surplus | | | OUND | WITHIN THE TARGET Deficit of 3.0% or less | | BREAKING THE RULE Deficit of 3.1%-6.0% | | DOUBLING THE LOAD Deficit of 6.1% of GDP or more | | | |
|--|------|---|------|------|------|--|------|---|------|---|-------|-------|-------------|
| | | Limit under the Maastricht Treaty: Deficit of 3.0% of GDP | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | 1999 | 2000 | 2001 | 2002 | 2003 | 2004 | 2005 | 2006 | 2007 | 2008 | 2009 | 2010 | 2011 estima |
| Euro area | -1.5 | -0.1 | -2.0 | -2.7 | -3.1 | -2.9 | -2.5 | -1.4 | -0.7 | -2.1 | -6.4 | -6.2 | -4.1 |
| Austria | -2.3 | -1.7 | 0 | -0.7 | -1.5 | -4.4 | -1.7 | -1.5 | -0.9 | -0.9 | -4.1 | -4.4 | -3.4 |
| Belgium | -0.6 | 0 | 0.4 | -0.1 | -0.1 | -0.3 | -2.7 | 0.1 | -0.3 | -1.3 | -5.8 | -4.1 | -3.6 |
| Cyprus | -4.3 | -2.3 | -2.2 | -4.4 | -6.6 | -4.1 | -2.4 | -1.2 | 3.5 | 0.9 | -6.1 | -5.3 | -6.7 |
| Estonia | -3.5 | -0.2 | -0.1 | 0.3 | 1.7 | 1.6 | 1.6 | 2.5 | 2.4 | -2.9 | -2.0 | 0.2 | 0.8 |
| Finland | 1.6 | 6.8 | 5.0 | 4.0 | 2.4 | 2.3 | 2.7 | 4.0 | 5.3 | 4.3 | -2.5 | -2.5 | -1.0 |
| France | -1.8 | -1.5 | -1.6 | -3.3 | -4.1 | -3.6 | -2.9 | -2.3 | -2.7 | -3.3 | -7.5 | -7.1 | -5.8 |
| Germany | -1.6 | 1.1 | -3.1 | -3.8 | -4.2 | -3.8 | -3.3 | -1.6 | 0.2 | -0.1 | -3.2 | -4.3 | -1.3 |
| Greece | -3.1 | -3.7 | -4.5 | -4.8 | -5.7 | -7.6 | -5.5 | -5.7 | -6.5 | -9.8 | -15.8 | -10.6 | -8.9 |
| Ireland | 2.7 | 4.7 | 0.9 | -0.4 | 0.4 | 1.4 | 17 | 2.9 | 0.1 | -7,3 | -14.2 | -31.3 | -10.3 |
| Italy | -2.0 | -0.8 | -3.1 | -3.1 | -3.6 | -3.5 | -4.4 | -3.4 | -1.6 | -2.7 | -5.4 | -4.6 | -4.0 |
| Luxembourg | 3.4 | 6.0 | 6.1 | 2.1 | 0.5 | -1.1 | 0 | 1.4 | 3.7 | 3.0 | -0.9 | -1.1 | -0.6 |
| Malta | -7.7 | -5.8 | -6.4 | -5.8 | -9.2 | -4.7 | -2.9 | -2.8 | -2.4 | -4.6 | -3.7 | -3.6 | -3.0 |
| Netherlands | 0.4 | 2.0 | -0.2 | -2.1 | -3.1 | -1.7 | -0.3 | 0.5 | 0.2 | 0.5 | -5.6 | -5.1 | -4.3 |
| Portugal | -2.7 | -2.9 | -4.3 | -2.9 | -3.0 | -3.4 | -5.9 | -4.1 | -3.1 | -3.6 | -10.1 | -9.8 | -5.8 |
| Slovakia | -7.4 | -12.3 | -6.5 | -8.2 | -2.8 | -2.4 | -2.8 | -3.2 | -1.8 | -2.1 | -8.0 | -7.7 | -5.8 |
| Slovenia | -3.0 | -3.7 | -4.0 | -2.4 | -2.7 | -2.3 | -1.5 | -1.4 | 0 | -1.9 | -6.1 | -5.8 | -5.7 |
| Spain | -1.2 | -0.9 | -0.5 | -0.2 | -0.3 | -0.1 | 1.3 | 2.4 | 1.9 | -4.5 | -11.2 | -9.3 | -6.6 |

Note: Data include debt ratios for Greece, Slovenia, Cyprus, Malta, Slovakia and Estonia since 1999, even though they joined the euro zone later.

Source: European Commission



First Time Health Spending has Fallen in Europe since 1975

5.2.2. Annual average growth rate in health expenditure per capita, in real terms, 2000 to 2010 (or nearest year)



Source: OECD Health Data 2012; Eurostat Statistics Database; WHO Global Health Expenditure Database.

Pharmaceutical Expenditure Growth Rate Turned Negative in Several Countries (2010)

5.5.2. Average annual growth in pharmaceutical expenditure per capita, in real terms, 2000 to 2010 (or nearest year)



Source: OECD Health Data 2012; Eurostat Statistics Database.



Ageing Population will Drive Future Healthcare Costs across the EU

Healthcare Costs for Patients 65+ are Increasing Significantly



Biosimilars: 11% Share of the Accessible European Market

Making Medicines Affordable

EU + NO, CH share of biosimilar accessible market by product type,

% of DDD, Mat to M6 2011



In the 12 month period, biosimilar products represent 19 million, of a total market estimate of 175 million DDD (11%)

Source: IMS MAIDAS Q6 2011.



EU8: Cumulative Savings, 2007-2020: between €11.8 to 33.4 bn (IGES Study)

EU8: Cumulative savings by biosimilars (all compounds included, 2007 to 2020)



Source: EGA International Symposium London, April 19th, 2012 / Bertram Häussler IGES Institut, Berlin Germany

- EU8 = Germany, France, the UK, Italy, Spain, Sweden, Poland and Romania
- All compounds = Epoetin, Filgrastim, mAbs
- BS = biosimilar
- Market entry: immediate at IP expiry or 2 years later