

---

# THE LIFE SCIENCES LAW REVIEW

---

SECOND EDITION

EDITOR  
RICHARD KINGHAM

LAW BUSINESS RESEARCH

# THE LIFE SCIENCES LAW REVIEW

---

Reproduced with permission from Law Business Research Ltd.

This article was first published in The Life Sciences Law Review, 2nd edition  
(published in March 2014 – editor Richard Kingham).

For further information please email  
[nick.barette@lbresearch.com](mailto:nick.barette@lbresearch.com)

# THE LIFE SCIENCES LAW REVIEW

---

Second Edition

Editor  
**RICHARD KINGHAM**

LAW BUSINESS RESEARCH LTD

# THE LAW REVIEWS

THE MERGERS AND ACQUISITIONS REVIEW

THE RESTRUCTURING REVIEW

THE PRIVATE COMPETITION ENFORCEMENT REVIEW

THE DISPUTE RESOLUTION REVIEW

THE EMPLOYMENT LAW REVIEW

THE PUBLIC COMPETITION ENFORCEMENT REVIEW

THE BANKING REGULATION REVIEW

THE INTERNATIONAL ARBITRATION REVIEW

THE MERGER CONTROL REVIEW

THE TECHNOLOGY, MEDIA AND  
TELECOMMUNICATIONS REVIEW

THE INWARD INVESTMENT AND  
INTERNATIONAL TAXATION REVIEW

THE CORPORATE GOVERNANCE REVIEW

THE CORPORATE IMMIGRATION REVIEW

THE INTERNATIONAL INVESTIGATIONS REVIEW

THE PROJECTS AND CONSTRUCTION REVIEW

THE INTERNATIONAL CAPITAL MARKETS REVIEW

THE REAL ESTATE LAW REVIEW

THE PRIVATE EQUITY REVIEW

THE ENERGY REGULATION AND MARKETS REVIEW

THE INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY REVIEW

THE ASSET MANAGEMENT REVIEW

THE PRIVATE WEALTH AND PRIVATE CLIENT REVIEW

THE MINING LAW REVIEW

THE EXECUTIVE REMUNERATION REVIEW

THE ANTI-BRIBERY AND ANTI-CORRUPTION REVIEW

THE CARTELS AND LENIENCY REVIEW

THE TAX DISPUTES AND LITIGATION REVIEW

THE LIFE SCIENCES LAW REVIEW

THE INSURANCE AND REINSURANCE LAW REVIEW

THE GOVERNMENT PROCUREMENT REVIEW

THE DOMINANCE AND MONOPOLIES REVIEW

THE AVIATION LAW REVIEW

THE FOREIGN INVESTMENT REGULATION REVIEW

THE ASSET TRACING AND RECOVERY REVIEW

THE INTERNATIONAL INSOLVENCY REVIEW

THE OIL AND GAS LAW REVIEW

THE FRANCHISE LAW REVIEW

PUBLISHER  
Gideon Roberton

BUSINESS DEVELOPMENT MANAGERS  
Adam Sargent, Nick Barette

ACCOUNT MANAGERS  
Katherine Jablonowska, Thomas Lee, James Spearing, Felicity Bown

PUBLISHING ASSISTANT  
Lucy Brewer

MARKETING ASSISTANT  
Chloe McLauchlan

EDITORIAL ASSISTANT  
Eve Ryle-Hodges

HEAD OF PRODUCTION  
Adam Myers

PRODUCTION EDITOR  
Jo Morley

SUBEDITOR  
Caroline Rawson

MANAGING DIRECTOR  
Richard Davey

Published in the United Kingdom  
by Law Business Research Ltd, London  
87 Lancaster Road, London, W11 1QQ, UK  
© 2014 Law Business Research Ltd  
[www.TheLawReviews.co.uk](http://www.TheLawReviews.co.uk)

No photocopying: copyright licences do not apply.

The information provided in this publication is general and may not apply in a specific situation, nor does it necessarily represent the views of authors' firms or their clients.

Legal advice should always be sought before taking any legal action based on the information provided. The publishers accept no responsibility for any acts or omissions contained herein. Although the information provided is accurate as of March 2014, be advised that this is a developing area.

Enquiries concerning reproduction should be sent to Law Business Research, at the address above. Enquiries concerning editorial content should be directed to the Publisher – [gideon.roberton@lbresearch.com](mailto:gideon.roberton@lbresearch.com)

ISBN 978-1-907606-97-7

Printed in Great Britain by  
Encompass Print Solutions, Derbyshire  
Tel: 0844 2480 112

# ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

---

The publisher acknowledges and thanks the following law firms for their learned assistance throughout the preparation of this book:

ADVOKATFIRMAET BA-HR DA

AXON LAWYERS

BAE, KIM & LEE LLC

BÄR & KARRER AG

CORPORATE LAW GROUP

COVINGTON & BURLING LLP

DIERKS + BOHLE

FAUS & MOLINER

FIEBINGER POLAK LEON & PARTNER RECHTSANWÄLTE GMBH

HOGAN LOVELLS STUDIO LEGALE

KHURSHEED KHAN & ASSOCIATES

LEE AND LI, ATTORNEYS-AT-LAW

MAPLES AND CALDER

MATTOS MURIEL KESTENER ADVOGADOS

NAGASHIMA OHNO & TSUNEMATSU

NORTON ROSE FULBRIGHT

NSN LAW FIRM

PLESNER LAW FIRM

SÁNCHEZ DEVANNY

SOŁTYSIŃSKI KAWECKI & SZLĘZAK

TOBAR & BUSTAMANTE

WONGPARTNERSHIP LLP

# CONTENTS

---

<b>Editor's Preface</b>	.....	vii
	<i>Richard Kingham</i>	
<b>Chapter 1</b>	INTERNATIONAL HARMONISATION .....	1
	<i>Richard Kingham</i>	
<b>Chapter 2</b>	AUSTRALIA.....	7
	<i>Bernard O'Shea</i>	
<b>Chapter 3</b>	AUSTRIA .....	30
	<i>Karina Hellbert</i>	
<b>Chapter 4</b>	BELGIUM .....	45
	<i>Peter Bogaert and Sarah Forest</i>	
<b>Chapter 5</b>	BRAZIL .....	58
	<i>Beatriz MA Camargo Kestener, Rubens Granja and Marco Aurélio Antas Torronteguy</i>	
<b>Chapter 6</b>	CANADA .....	71
	<i>Martha A Healey, Adrienne M Blanchard and Jill Daley</i>	
<b>Chapter 7</b>	CHINA.....	86
	<i>Shaoyu Chen</i>	
<b>Chapter 8</b>	CZECH REPUBLIC.....	106
	<i>Zuzana Valoušková and Eva Bušková</i>	
<b>Chapter 9</b>	DENMARK.....	120
	<i>Mikkel Vittrup and Mette Hygum Clausen</i>	

<b>Chapter 10</b>	ECUADOR .....	136
	<i>Álvaro Sevilla, María del Lourdes Maldonado, Juan Carlos Domínguez, Hipatia Donoso, José Andrés Abad, Juan Fernando Larrea and Francisco Ortiz</i>	
<b>Chapter 11</b>	EUROPEAN UNION.....	151
	<i>Grant Castle and Robin Blaney</i>	
<b>Chapter 12</b>	FRANCE .....	175
	<i>Sophie Pelé</i>	
<b>Chapter 13</b>	GERMANY .....	187
	<i>Christian Dierks and Daniel Geiger</i>	
<b>Chapter 14</b>	INDIA .....	200
	<i>Krishna Sarma, Manisha Singh, Riku Sarma and Bhaskar Bhattacharya</i>	
<b>Chapter 15</b>	IRELAND.....	213
	<i>Maree Gallagher</i>	
<b>Chapter 16</b>	ITALY .....	231
	<i>Francesca Rolla, Christian Di Mauro and Riccardo Frascalzo</i>	
<b>Chapter 17</b>	JAPAN .....	248
	<i>Kenji Utsumi and Kensuke Suzuki</i>	
<b>Chapter 18</b>	KOREA.....	262
	<i>Jung Min Jo and Eun Soo Lim</i>	
<b>Chapter 19</b>	MEXICO .....	275
	<i>José Alberto Campos-Vargas</i>	
<b>Chapter 20</b>	NETHERLANDS .....	292
	<i>Arber Gjunkshi, Annemieke Kooy, Erik Vollebregt and Carine van den Brink</i>	
<b>Chapter 21</b>	NORWAY .....	307
	<i>Are Stenvik, Beret Sundet, Andreas Bjørnebye and Kirsten Wøien Gilhuus</i>	

<b>Chapter 22</b>	PAKISTAN .....	320
	<i>Zulfiqar Khan</i>	
<b>Chapter 23</b>	POLAND .....	331
	<i>Ewa Skrzydło-Tefelska and Jacek Myszko</i>	
<b>Chapter 24</b>	SINGAPORE .....	343
	<i>Melanie Ho</i>	
<b>Chapter 25</b>	SOUTH AFRICA.....	357
	<i>Andrew Parsons, Brian Wimpey, Justin Malherbe, Liesel Kok and Rosalind Lake</i>	
<b>Chapter 26</b>	SPAIN .....	371
	<i>Jordi Faus</i>	
<b>Chapter 27</b>	SWITZERLAND .....	381
	<i>Markus Schott and Markus Wang</i>	
<b>Chapter 28</b>	TAIWAN .....	393
	<i>Katherine YC Juang, Jill Niu and Daisy Wang</i>	
<b>Chapter 29</b>	TURKEY .....	407
	<i>Selma Ünlü</i>	
<b>Chapter 30</b>	UNITED KINGDOM.....	419
	<i>Grant Castle and Sarah Cowlishaw</i>	
<b>Chapter 31</b>	UNITED STATES .....	434
	<i>Richard Kingham and Krista Hessler Carver</i>	
<b>Appendix 1</b>	ABOUT THE AUTHORS.....	469
<b>Appendix 2</b>	CONTRIBUTING LAW FIRMS' CONTACT DETAILS....	491

# EDITOR'S PREFACE

---

The second edition of the *Life Sciences Law Review* provides an overview of legal issues of interest to pharmaceutical, biotechnology and medical device companies in 30 jurisdictions. As before, each chapter contains information on legal requirements relating to the key stages in the life cycle of a regulated product, from discovery, through the clinical development process, registration, manufacturing and promotion, plus other issues of special interest, such as pricing and reimbursement, special liability regimes, competition and commercial transactions in the context of the medical products business. Each of the chapters has been prepared by a recognised expert in the relevant jurisdiction, and the resulting work product will assist industry lawyers, regulatory affairs staff and others who need to have an understanding of the issues in each major market.

This edition also includes a new chapter on international harmonisation, which plays an increasingly important role in the regulation of pharmaceuticals and medical devices. In particular, the guidelines adopted by the International Conference on Harmonisation (ICH) have been incorporated into the national requirements for pharmaceuticals in the European Union, United States, Japan and most other developed countries, and are increasingly influential in developing countries. Readers may find it useful to review this chapter before consulting the national chapters, because it is often key to understanding many of local requirements.

Once again, I wish to thank all of the lawyers who contributed to this reference work. It is a pleasure to be associated with them.

**Richard Kingham**  
Covington & Burling LLP  
Washington, DC  
March 2014

## **Chapter 31**

---

# **UNITED STATES**

*Richard Kingham and Krista Hessler Carver<sup>1</sup>*

### **I INTRODUCTION**

The United States accounts for about 35 per cent of the global pharmaceutical market and is the largest single investor in research and development of new products. Despite recent budget cuts, the National Institutes of Health, the primary federal agency that funds biomedical research, has a budget of \$31 billion for 2013, and manufacturers based in the United States spend substantially more than that each year on research and development.

The principal federal regulatory authority for medicines and medical devices is the Food and Drug Administration (FDA), an agency within the Department of Health and Human Services. The FDA, which has a staff of more than 14,000 and an annual budget in excess of \$4 billion, regulates human drugs, human biological products, medical devices, foods, cosmetics, veterinary medicines, animal feeds, radiation-emitting products and tobacco. A substantial part of the agency's budget comes from 'user fees' imposed on certain of the industries it regulates (including drug and device manufacturers); these may include registration fees for marketing authorisation applications as well as annual fees for manufacturing facilities and marketed products.

The FDA is headed by a Commissioner of Food and Drugs, who is appointed by the President with the approval of the Senate. Only a handful of the Commissioner's subordinates are political appointees; the rest are career civil servants. Approximately half of the FDA's staff are located in the Washington, DC, metropolitan area, many serving in 'centres' that supervise the principal industry sectors that the agency regulates.

---

1 Richard Kingham is a partner and Krista Carver is an associate at Covington & Burling LLP. The authors would like to thank the following colleagues who contributed to the preparation of this chapter: James Dean (competition), Stefanie Doebler (pricing and reimbursement) and John Hurvitz and Edward Dixon (transactional issues).

Among these are the Center for Drug Evaluation and Research (CDER), which regulates small-molecule drugs and most therapeutic protein products; the Center for Biologics Evaluation and Research (CBER), which regulates vaccines, blood products, gene and tissue therapies and certain other biological products; and the Center for Devices and Radiological Health (CDRH), which regulates medical devices and radiation-emitting products. The CDER, CBER and CDRH all fall within the Office of Medical Products and Tobacco, which is headed by a Deputy Commissioner. The Office of Global Regulatory Operations and Policy, also headed by a Deputy Commissioner, manages the agency's inspectional and enforcement programmes, staffed by several thousand employees who are located in regional, district and field offices around the United States and in several foreign countries.<sup>2</sup>

The main statute administered by the FDA is the Federal Food, Drug and Cosmetic Act (FDCA), originally enacted in 1938, which governs foods (including dietary supplements), drugs, devices, cosmetics, veterinary drugs, radiation-emitting products and tobacco.<sup>3</sup> The statute prohibits 'adulteration' and 'misbranding' of regulated products and imposes numerous other requirements for specific types of products (e.g., pre-market approval or clearance procedures for certain drugs and medical devices). The FDA also administers portions of the Public Health Service Act (PHSA), including requirements for licensure of biological products, as well as numerous other regulatory statutes.<sup>4</sup>

The Drug Enforcement Administration (DEA), an agency within the Department of Justice, administers the Controlled Substances Act and other statutes relating to narcotics, psychotropics and other drugs with potential for abuse. Manufacturers of controlled substances are licensed and inspected by the DEA and may be required to obtain permits for specific activities (e.g., import and export licences and manufacturing and import quotas for certain products).

United States attorneys, located in every state, can bring cases to enforce the FDCA and other regulatory statutes governing drugs and devices. Federal prosecutors may act on referrals from FDA or on their own initiative.

The Federal Trade Commission (FTC) regulates the advertising of non-prescription drugs and medical devices (other than restricted devices) and also plays a major role in supervising compliance with the antitrust laws within the medical products industry.

The Office of Inspector General (OIG) in the Department of Health and Human Services investigates allegations of fraud, kickbacks and other abuses affecting federal health-care programmes, including Medicare (for the elderly) and Medicaid (for indigent

---

2 The FDA website ([www.fda.gov](http://www.fda.gov)) contains information on the agency as well as links to relevant statutes, regulations, guidances and other documents.

3 The FDCA is codified at 21 USC, Section 301 et seq. It replaced the Food and Drugs Act, originally passed in 1906.

4 The relevant provisions of the PHSA are set out in 42 USC, Section 262. Requirements for federal licensing of establishments that manufacture biologics were originally enacted in 1902.

persons). It has the power to exclude companies or individuals from participation in those programmes if they are found to have committed specified offences.

The state governments also have the power to regulate drug and device manufacturers. Many states have enacted ‘mini’ food and drug acts, as well as statutes prohibiting health-care and consumer fraud. The states also maintain Medicaid fraud control units to investigate abuses by manufacturers, providers and beneficiaries under that programme.

## **II THE REGULATORY REGIME**

### **i Classification**

The FDCA defines foods, drugs, devices, cosmetics, dietary supplements and certain other types of products, and the PHS Act defines biologics.<sup>5</sup> The same product may, however, be covered by two or more definitions and thus be subject to multiple regulatory requirements. Many of the classifications depend on the ‘intended use’ of an article, which is ordinarily determined by statements made in advertising, labelling or other materials issued by the seller. Thus, a fluoride toothpaste for which anti-cavity claims are made is regulated as a drug because it is intended to prevent tooth decay and a cosmetic because it is intended to clean the teeth and improve their appearance.

For certain borderline products that may be subject to more than one regulatory review process or for which the product category is unclear or in dispute, the FDA has issued regulations and guidelines to determine which review centre will take the lead, and it has established an Office of Combination Products to assign products. These regulations and processes apply to drugs, devices, biological products and combinations thereof, known as ‘combination products’.<sup>6</sup> They do not apply to combinations of two drugs, two devices or two biologics, or to other combinations of regulated products.

The FDA can initiate enforcement actions against borderline products that it believes are marketed without required prior approval. For many years, the FDA often initiated such actions against dietary supplements for which therapeutic claims were made, on the basis that those products were unapproved new drugs. Such actions have

---

5 Under the FDCA, the term ‘drug’ includes articles recognised in official pharmacopoeias; articles intended for use in the diagnosis, cure, mitigation, treatment or prevention of disease; and articles (other than food) intended to affect the structure or any function of the body (21 USC, Section 321(g)). The term ‘device’ is defined in substantially similar terms, but applies to articles that do not achieve their primary intended purposes ‘through chemical action within or on the body...’ and which are not ‘dependent upon being metabolized for the achievement of [their] primary intended purposes’ (21 USC, Section 321(h)). Under the PHS Act, the term ‘biologic’ means a virus, therapeutic serum, toxin, antitoxin, vaccine, blood, blood component or derivative, allergenic product, protein (except any chemically synthesised polypeptide) or analogous product or arsphenamine (or any other trivalent organic arsenic compound) applicable to the prevention, treatment or cure of a disease or condition in humans (42 USC, Section 262(i)(1)).

6 21 CFR, Part 3.

been less frequent since the Dietary Supplement Health and Education Act of 1994 created a separate legal framework to govern those products. The agency continues to monitor the advertising and labelling of cosmetics for which anti-ageing claims are made, and it has taken several enforcement actions in recent years.

## **ii Non-clinical studies**

Non-clinical safety studies that are intended to be submitted to the FDA in support of clinical research applications or marketing authorisation applications must be conducted in compliance with good laboratory practice (GLP) regulations.<sup>7</sup> These are fundamentally the same as the principles established by the Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development, which were based on the FDA rules.

The Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service (APHIS) within the Department of Agriculture administers regulations under the Animal Welfare Act governing research facilities using covered species. Facilities must be registered and comply with applicable welfare requirements and are subject to inspection by APHIS.

## **iii Clinical trials**

The FDA maintains separate regulatory systems for clinical trials of drugs and medical devices. Both are subject to requirements for the protection of human subjects, including rules on informed consent and independent ethical review, performed by organisations known as institutional review boards, or IRBs.<sup>8</sup> FDA regulations also establish requirements for financial disclosures by investigators who conduct clinical trials submitted to the FDA in support of applications for drugs or medical devices.<sup>9</sup> Disclosure must be made if an investigator has a substantial financial interest in the product under investigation or the company that sponsors a trial, subject to detailed criteria set out in the rules.

### ***Drugs***

Clinical trials of unapproved new drugs or biologics must be carried out under an investigational new drug application (IND).<sup>10</sup> The application contains information on the manufacturing process and formulation of the investigational product, non-clinical and existing clinical safety data, the protocol for the proposed trial, a copy of the investigator brochure and information on the investigators who will carry out the trial. The FDA accepts INDs in the common technical document (CTD) format established by the International Conference on Harmonisation (ICH). The IND submission must clearly identify any obligations that the sponsor intends to delegate to another person, including contract research organisations (CROs). If the sponsor does not reside in or have a place of business in the United States, the application must be countersigned by an agent or attorney in the United States.

---

7 21 CFR, Part 58.

8 21 CFR, Parts 50, 56.

9 21 CFR, Part 54.

10 See generally, 21 CFR, Part 312.

Review of an IND is supervised by a division within the CDER or CBER that specialises in the therapeutic area or product type to which the proposed study relates. That division will have lead responsibility for reviewing a marketing authorisation application if one is submitted and will retain supervisory control over the product after approval. As a result, there is considerable continuity in the review process from the earliest stages of clinical development.

Assuming that approval is granted by the relevant IRB, the sponsor may commence a clinical trial 30 days after the agency accepts the application for filing, unless the FDA informs the sponsor that it may commence the trial earlier or imposes a clinical hold. The rules establish several grounds for a clinical hold, but the main focus is on the safety of human subjects. The sponsor has the right to receive a prompt written statement of the reasons for a clinical hold and to take an appeal, which must be decided within 30 days. Once an IND is in effect, new protocols and substantial protocol amendments must be submitted to the FDA before they are initiated, but studies can commence as soon as IRB approval is received. Throughout the process, however, the FDA has the right to impose a clinical hold on studies under the IND if it believes that there is a risk to the safety of human subjects or if certain other criteria apply, subject to an appeal by the applicant.

A sponsor may seek informal, non-binding advice from the FDA at any time during the pendency of the IND. It may also seek advice through an ‘end-of-Phase II’ meeting, which is held to agree the design of the protocols for the pivotal clinical trials, or, for certain drugs, a special protocol assessment (SPA). In either case, barring a significant scientific development, studies conducted in accordance with the agreement will be presumed to be sufficient in objective and design for the purpose of obtaining marketing approval for the drug.

Sponsors and investigators are required to comply with provisions of good clinical practice (GCP), including requirements for informed consent, IRB review, monitoring, recordkeeping, and reporting. Studies conducted in accordance with ICH GCP guidance will normally be acceptable to FDA. There is no requirement for sponsors to maintain insurance or compensate subjects for injuries in clinical trials, but informed consent documents must make clear whether such arrangements have been made. There are requirements for annual reports and expedited reports of serious, unexpected adverse events that may be drug-related and certain significant findings in non-clinical studies.

The FDA will accept data from foreign clinical trials not conducted under a US IND in support of a marketing authorisation application, provided they are performed in accordance with GCP and the FDA is able to validate the data through an on-site inspection, if necessary. It is possible to obtain approval for a drug entirely on the basis of foreign clinical data, but in practice it is ordinarily desirable to carry out at least some part of the pivotal trials in the United States.<sup>11</sup>

---

11 See 21 CFR, Section 312.120.

### *Devices*

Sponsors of device clinical trials must comply with the FDA's investigational device exemption (IDE) regulations. The regulatory requirements for a trial differ depending on whether the device is 'significant risk' (SR). SR devices are defined as those that present a potential for serious risks to the health, safety, or welfare of subjects (e.g., implants and life-supporting and life-sustaining devices).<sup>12</sup> Before beginning an investigation of an SR device, the sponsor must obtain FDA approval of an IDE application. The application has some similarities to an IND (e.g., it must contain the investigational plan and report prior studies of the device). Moreover, following enactment of the FDA Safety and Innovation Act (FDASIA) in 2012, the FDA now has express authority to put a device investigation on clinical hold. FDASIA also provided that the FDA may not disapprove an IDE because the study may not support clearance or approval of the device.<sup>13</sup>

'Abbreviated' IDE requirements apply to investigations of non-significant risk (NSR) devices (i.e., those that do not meet the regulatory definition of SR). The sponsor must obtain IRB approval and informed consent and comply with record keeping and reporting requirements, but need not submit or obtain FDA approval of an IDE before commencing the study.

Device sponsors may obtain informal advice from the FDA on study design and other issues through a 'pre-submission' process (formerly the 'pre-IDE' process). In June 2013, the FDA issued draft guidance proposed a separate 'pre-decisional IDE' process, in which sponsors could voluntarily seek and obtain timely feedback from FDA review staff on a near-final IDE application.<sup>14</sup>

The FDA will accept foreign studies not conducted under an IDE to support a device pre-market approval application (PMA) if the data are valid and the investigators conducted the studies in accordance with the Declaration of Helsinki (1983 version) or the laws of the country where the research is conducted, whichever provides greater protection of trial subjects.<sup>15</sup> In February 2013, the FDA proposed to amend its regulations to permit supportive use of foreign data that are collected in accordance with GCP and subject to validation.<sup>16</sup> The amended regulation would apply to data in other device submissions, not just PMAs.

#### **iv      Named-patient and compassionate use procedures**

There are several procedures under which drugs or devices can be made available to treat patients even though they have not been cleared for commercial distribution.

---

12      21 CFR Section 812.3(m).

13      Pub. L. No. 112-144, Section 601, 126 Stat. 193 (2012) (creating Section 520(g)(4)(C) of the FDCA).

14      FDA, *Draft Guidance for Industry, Clinical Investigators, Institutional Review Boards, and Food and Drug Administration Staff: FDA Decisions for Investigational Device Exemption (IDE) Clinical Investigations* (June 2013).

15      21 CFR, Section 814.15(b).

16      78 Fed Reg 12664 (25 February 2013).

### ***Drugs***

The FDA has established rules for ‘expanded access’ to investigational drug products that are intended to treat serious or life-threatening diseases. These include provisions for emergency INDs that permit physicians to treat individual patients following relatively simple applications to the FDA and treatment INDs, which provide for larger-scale use of investigational products. In certain cases, the FDA can authorise sponsors to charge for investigational drug products under treatment INDs; prices are limited to recovery of direct costs of manufacture and distribution. Treatment INDs require prior approval from the FDA, and sponsors must comply with requirements for informed consent, IRB review and reporting of adverse events.

Pharmacists may prepare ‘compounded’ products as part of the practice of the profession of pharmacy. In 1997, Congress enacted a detailed statutory regime to govern pharmacy compounding,<sup>17</sup> but the Supreme Court held that a provision of that regime that forbade compounders from advertising their services violated the First Amendment to the US Constitution, which guarantees freedom of speech.<sup>18</sup> The lower courts disagreed on the question of whether the Supreme Court’s ruling invalidated the entire statute or only the prohibition on advertising. Recent reports of severe injuries associated with the use of injectable compounded products that were contaminated with infectious organisms led to enactment of legislation to clarify the FDA’s authority. The Compounding Quality Act, signed by the President in November 2013, establishes two regulated entities: traditional compounders, which prepare products at the request of physicians for specific patients, and ‘outsourcing facilities’, which prepare compounded products in larger quantities. Traditional compounders will be regulated primarily by state boards of pharmacy, while outsourcing facilities will be regulated by the FDA. If they register with the agency, submit to inspections and comply with other requirements, their products will not be subject to requirements for premarket approval. The new provisions apply only to drugs and do not contain any exemption from requirements for premarket approval of biologics.<sup>19</sup>

Certain products for the prevention or treatment of pandemic diseases can be sold under an emergency use authorisation (EUA). EUAs can only be approved if the Secretary of Health and Human Services declares that a pandemic is imminent, and authorisations remain valid only while the declaration is in effect.

### ***Devices***

Similar procedures apply to investigational devices intended for serious and immediately life-threatening diseases and conditions. The compassionate use framework permits access for individuals and small groups of patients who do not meet trial inclusion criteria. Prior FDA approval and certain patient protection measures (e.g., informed consent,

---

17 21 USC, Section 353a.

18 *Thompson v. Western States Medical Center*, 535 US 357 (2002).

19 The FDA has issued guidance implementing the new legislation, which appears on the agency’s website at [www.fda.gov/drugs/guidancecomplianceregulatoryinformation/pharmacycompounding/default.htm](http://www.fda.gov/drugs/guidancecomplianceregulatoryinformation/pharmacycompounding/default.htm).

IRB chair concurrence and institutional clearance) are required. The treatment IDE provisions permit wider use of an investigational device, although treatment use may not begin until completion of clinical trials if the disease is serious but not immediately life-threatening. The sponsor must submit an application for treatment use, and treatment use may begin 30 days after FDA receives the application unless FDA objects. As with treatment INDs, sponsors of treatment IDEs must comply with requirements for informed consent, IRB review and reporting of adverse events. Sponsors generally may not charge for the device any more than necessary to recover the costs of manufacturing, research, development and handling. EUAs also are available for devices.

'Custom devices' are exempt from the requirements for an approved PMA and compliance with performance standards under section 520(b) of the FDCA.<sup>20</sup> Traditionally, the FDA has interpreted this exemption narrowly. In 2012, Congress enacted clarifying changes to Section 520(b), including a provision that states that production of custom devices 'is limited to no more than 5 units per year of a particular device type'. The FDA is still in the early stages of implementing these changes.

Laboratory-developed tests (LDTs) present special regulatory issues. LDTs are diagnostic tests that are developed, validated and performed by individual laboratories but not commercially distributed. Clinical laboratories performing LDTs are subject to the requirements of the Clinical Laboratory Improvements Amendments of 1988, including the requirements to validate the LDTs and obtain certifications to perform testing. The FDA has asserted that LDTs are devices subject to regulation under the FDCA, but historically has exercised enforcement discretion and has not required pre-market approval or clearance for LDTs. In June 2010, the FDA announced that it intended to exercise authority over LDTs,<sup>21</sup> and the FDA plans to issue guidance implementing this plan. When Congress enacted the FDASIA, it included a provision that requires FDA to notify Congress 60 days before issuing a draft or final guidance document regarding the regulation of LDTs. At the time of writing, the FDA has not yet given this notice. The FDA also does not require products labelled for research use only (RUO) and certain products labelled for investigational use only (IUO)<sup>22</sup> to comply with most regulatory controls, including premarket clearance requirements. In November 2013, the agency issued final guidance describing its current thinking on when products are properly labelled and distributed as RUO and IUO.<sup>23</sup>

#### v Pre-market clearance

##### *Drugs other than biologics*

'New drugs', which are defined to mean drugs that are not generally recognised as safe and effective for their labelled conditions of use or which are so recognised but have not been used to a material extent or for a material time, may not be introduced

---

20 21 USC, Section 360j(b).

21 75 Fed. Reg. 34463 (17 June 2010).

22 21 CFR, Section 809.10(c)(2).

23 FDA, *Distribution of In Vitro Diagnostic Products Labeled for Research Use Only or Investigational Use Only: Guidance for Industry and Food and Drug Administration Staff* (November 2013).

into interstate commerce unless they are subject to a new drug application (NDA) or abbreviated new drug application (ANDA) approved by the FDA. Drugs that are not new may be marketed without pre-market approval.

In practice, the great majority of non-prescription drug products, which contain old, well-established active ingredients, are marketed in accordance with ‘monographs’ issued under the Over-the-Counter (OTC) Drug Review.<sup>24</sup> Monographs, which govern therapeutic categories (e.g., antacids, topical antimicrobials or ophthalmic drug products), specify permitted active ingredients, dosages and instructions for use. Products in compliance with monographs can be marketed without any prior submission to the FDA.<sup>25</sup> Many therapeutic categories are subject to proposed rather than final OTC monographs, and there are complex procedures for determining which products can be marketed while rulemaking procedures are under way. Newer OTC drug products and virtually all prescription drug products are marketed under approved NDAs or ANDAs.<sup>26</sup>

An NDA for an innovator product must contain information on the manufacturing process and formulation of the product, full reports of non-clinical studies and clinical trials demonstrating the safety and effectiveness of the product and proposed labelling.<sup>27</sup> Although the FDA has not amended its regulations to require use of the common technical document (CTD), in practice the agency expects submissions to be made in that format, and the FDA is in the process of requiring that all submissions be made electronically (in the eCTD format). The FDA also requires submission of tabulations of all patient data from the principal clinical trials, as well as copies of case report forms (CRFs) for patients who died during clinical trials or withdrew due to adverse events, and it can demand CRFs for all patients in pivotal clinical trials. An applicant that does not maintain a place of business in the United States must appoint a US agent, who signs the application and receives official communications from the agency.<sup>28</sup>

---

24 21 CFR, Parts 330-361.

25 General provisions of the FDCA require that all drug establishments register with the FDA and submit periodic product listings, but the system does not entail FDA review or approval. The registration and listing requirements apply to foreign establishments that export drug products to the United States.

26 A handful of older prescription drug products remain on the market pending completion of a review of effectiveness of marketed drug products that was initiated in the 1960s (the Drug Efficacy Study Implementation, or DESI). Eventually, the FDA intends to subject these products to NDAs or remove them from the market. In the meantime, the products are marketed subject to the FDA’s enforcement discretion.

27 An NDA may rely on information contained in another NDA, an IND or a drug master file, subject to a right of reference from the submitter of that information. FDA regulations provide for submission of DMFs for active substances, inactive ingredients and drug packaging materials, as well as other types of information by prior agreement with the agency (21 CFR, Section 314.420).

28 Regulations governing the content and review of NDAs are set out in 21 CFR, Part 314.

Legislation originally enacted in 1992 and known as the Prescription Drug User Fee Act (PDUFA),<sup>29</sup> requires sponsors of originator products to pay fees upon the submission and filing of NDAs and supplemental NDAs (proposing changes in approved NDAs), as well as annual fees for manufacturing establishments and products that are subject to the user fee requirement. The fees are adjusted each year according to a formula set out in the law.<sup>30</sup> As part of the process leading to enactment of each version of the PDUFA, the FDA has made commitments to Congress in the form of performance goals for the NDA review process, including (among many other things) requirements to hold prompt meetings with applicants prior to and during the NDA review process, timelines for the completion of reviews and procedures for appeals of negative decisions. Under current PDUFA commitments, the FDA aims to review non-priority applications within 12 months of submission and priority applications within eight months.<sup>31</sup> In practice, the actual time from submission to approval of most NDAs is more than a year. The review process is carried out by an interdisciplinary team under the direction of the relevant therapeutic review division within the CDER. The FDA may consult with one or more independent expert advisory committees. At the end of a review ‘cycle’, the FDA either issues an approval or a ‘complete response’ informing the applicant why approval was not granted and identifying additional information required for approval.<sup>32</sup>

To approve an NDA, the FDA must determine that the product will be safe and effective for the conditions of use recommended in its labelling, that the manufacturing process and facilities are adequate and in compliance with requirements for current GMP, and that the labelling is not false or misleading. Proof of effectiveness must be based on ‘substantial evidence’ consisting of reports of adequate and well-controlled clinical

- 
- 29 The PDUFA sunsets every five years unless re-enacted by Congress. The most recent enactment, passed in July 2012 as part of the FDA Safety and Innovation Act (FDASIA), is commonly referred to as ‘PDUFA V.’
- 30 For fiscal year 2014, the fees are as follows: for an application containing clinical data, \$2,169,100; for an application that does not contain clinical data, \$1,084,550; for an establishment, \$554,600; for a product, \$104,060.
- 31 Priority designation is granted if FDA determines that a drug would represent a significant improvement in the treatment, diagnosis or prevention of a disease as compared with existing therapies.
- 32 If the sponsor elects to resubmit the NDA with additional studies or other information to correct the deficiencies identified in the complete response, the FDA is ordinarily obligated to act on the resubmission within two or six months, depending on the complexity of the submission. In lieu of resubmitting the NDA, the sponsor may invoke its right to a formal evidentiary hearing, which will eventually lead to a decision by the Commissioner of Food and Drugs that can be appealed to a federal court of appeals. Sponsors rarely invoke this right, however, because the process is time-consuming and seldom leads to a change in the outcome.

investigations. Legislation enacted in 2012 requires the FDA to establish a ‘structured risk-benefit assessment framework’ for the new drug approval process.<sup>33</sup>

As interpreted by the FDA, the Drug Price Competition and Patent Term Restoration Act of 1984 (often called the Hatch-Waxman Act) establishes two pathways for less-than-full applications that refer to prior approvals: ANDAs, submitted under Section 505(j) of the FDCA,<sup>34</sup> which contain no safety or effectiveness data other than reports of bioequivalence studies; and applications submitted under Section 505(b)(2),<sup>35</sup> which rely on the finding of safety and effectiveness for a reference product but contain clinical data or other information in support of a change (e.g., a new indication or dosage form, a new combination of active substances or a different salt or ester of an active moiety). The starting point for such submissions is an FDA publication known as the Orange Book, which lists all products subject to approved NDAs with information on relevant patents and regulatory exclusivity periods (described in more detail below).<sup>36</sup>

A generic product for which an ANDA is submitted must ordinarily be the same as the reference product in terms of active ingredients, dosage form, route of administration and strength; contain safe and suitable inactive ingredients; bear the same labelling as the reference product except for changes due to differences in the manufacturer (e.g., differences in inactive ingredients or in the composition of the product); and be bioequivalent to the reference product. ANDAs must contain full information on the composition, manufacturing process and manufacturing facilities for the generic product.

The FDA permits labelling for generic products to ‘carve out’ indications or other statements in labelling when necessary to comply with regulatory protection periods or patents for the reference product. Minor changes in dosage form (e.g., a capsule instead of a tablet) and certain other product characteristics may be accepted if their safety and effectiveness can be demonstrated solely on the basis of bioequivalence studies and they are first determined to be acceptable by means of a ‘suitability petition’ approved by the FDA.

Responding to staff shortages and major delays in the FDA review process for ANDAs, Congress recently enacted user fee legislation for generic drugs. Under the Generic Drug User Fee Act, the FDA will aim to clear the backlog of pending applications by the end of 2017 and set a 10-month target for review of new applications. Part of the new revenue will fund increased FDA manufacturing inspection programmes in the United States and abroad.<sup>37</sup>

---

33 NDAs must contain data on paediatric use, unless FDA grants a waiver or deferral of the requirement.

34 21 USC, Section 355(j).

35 21 USC, Section 355(b)(2).

36 The official name of the publication is Approved Drug Products with Therapeutic Equivalence Determinations.

37 Application fees for 2013 were \$17,434 for backlog applications, \$51,520 for new ANDAs, \$25,760 for supplements requiring prior approval, \$21,340 for DMFs, \$175,389 for domestic facilities that manufacturer active substances, \$190,389 for foreign facilities that manufacture

### *Biologics*

Biological products are subject to a separate statutory approval system under Section 351 of the PHSA. Sponsors of originator products submit BLAs that contain essentially the same information as NDAs, in the CTD format. The review process is substantially the same as for NDAs and is subject to the same user fees and performance goals under the PDUFA. To be approved, products must be ‘safe, pure and potent’ and be produced in manufacturing facilities that meet standards designed to assure that they continue to comply with these standards. The statute does not expressly require ‘substantial evidence’ of effectiveness (i.e., reports of adequate and well-controlled clinical investigations), and the FDA to an extent, therefore, has more discretion in determining whether efficacy has been demonstrated. In practice, however, the agency has ordinarily demanded the same evidence of efficacy for biologics as it expects for ordinary drugs.

In 2010, Congress enacted legislation<sup>38</sup> establishing an approval process for follow-on versions of biological products, or ‘biosimilars’. Such a product must be ‘highly similar’ to a reference product ‘notwithstanding minor differences in clinically inactive components’; have no clinically meaningful differences from a reference product in safety, purity or potency; be labelled for a condition of use for which the reference product is approved; have the same route of administration, dosage form and strength as the reference product; and be manufactured in facilities designed to assure safety, purity and potency. The legislation contemplates that the showing of biosimilarity will ordinarily be based on analytical tests, non-clinical studies and clinical trials, but the FDA has discretion to waive any of these requirements if it finds that the data are unnecessary. Additional showings are required for the FDA to make a determination that a biosimilar product is ‘interchangeable’ with a reference product.<sup>39</sup>

User fees for biosimilar applications are currently the same as those for originator products. To provide immediate funding for the review programme, however, portions of that fee must be prepaid. A portion of the application fee is due when a sponsor seeks development advice from the FDA, and thereafter, another 10 per cent is due annually as a biosimilar development fee. The initial and annual fees are subtracted from the user fee due when the sponsor submits its application. In 2012, the FDA issued draft guidance covering a number of issues relating to the implementation of the BPCIA, but the programme is still at an early stage and many important issues remain undecided.

---

active substances, \$26,458 for domestic facilities that manufacture finished products, and \$41,458 for foreign facilities that manufacture finished products.

38 The Biologics Price Competition and Innovation Act (BPCIA), Pub. L. No. 111–148, Title VII, Subtitle A, 124 Stat. 119, 804–821 (2010).

39 A small number of biological products, including recombinant insulin and somatropin, were originally approved under the FDCA rather than the PHSA and were therefore eligible for submission of follow-on applications under sections 505(b)(2) and 505(j) before the BPCIA was enacted. FDA approved an application under section 505(b)(2) for a follow-on version of recombinant somatropin in 2006, based on a substantial package of non-clinical and clinical data.

### *Accelerated approval and fast-track procedures*

FDA regulations establish special procedures for the approval of drugs and biologics for serious or life-threatening diseases that provide meaningful benefits over existing therapies. Effectiveness may be demonstrated on the basis of surrogate endpoints, with a commitment to carry out post-marketing studies to confirm the validity of those endpoints as predictors of clinical outcomes. The FDA may impose special restrictions on such drugs (e.g., pre-clearance of promotional materials or restrictions on distribution). If post-marketing studies fail to confirm clinical benefit, approval may be withdrawn through an expedited procedure.

### *Medical devices*

The pre-market clearance requirements for a device depend on the device's class, which in turn depends on the level of risk that the device presents. Class I devices present the least risk, and they generally are exempt from pre-market review. Class II devices present moderate risk, and most require clearance of a pre-market notification under Section 510(k) of the FDCA prior to marketing. Class III devices – the highest-risk category – typically require approval of a PMA before marketing. A special classification rule applies to 'post-amendments' devices (i.e., those that were not in commercial distribution before 28 May 1976, when Congress enacted the Medical Device Amendments to the FDCA). These devices are automatically in Class III. If, however, the manufacturer obtains clearance of a pre-market notification or the agency grants a de novo petition (discussed below), the FDA will place the device in Class I or II and allow the manufacturer to distribute the device.

To obtain clearance of a 510(k), the submitter must show that its device is 'substantially equivalent' to a legally marketed 'predicate' device. A predicate device may be a pre-amendments device, a device already cleared through the 510(k) process, or a device reclassified into Class I or II. To demonstrate substantial equivalence, the submitter must show its device has the same 'intended use' as the predicate device, and either has the same technological characteristics as the predicate device, or has different technological characteristics, but is as safe and effective as, and does not raise different questions of safety and effectiveness than, the predicate device. The 510(k) must contain, among other things, proposed labelling, a device description, and the submitter's rationale for concluding the device is substantially equivalent to the predicate device. In some cases, it may need to contain clinical data. The submitter also must pay a small user fee for the submission. By statute, the FDA must act on 510(k) notifications within 90 days, and the FDA has agreed to performance goals for acting on them. In December 2012, the FDA issued a final guidance describing its 'acceptance review' of 510(k) notifications, and the situations in which the agency will refuse to accept 510(k)s as incomplete;<sup>40</sup> since then, the FDA has refused to

---

40 FDA, Refuse to Accept Policy for 510(k)s: Guidance for Industry and Food and Drug Administration Staff (December 2012).

accept about 60 per cent of submitted 510(k)s.<sup>41</sup> The submitter may not market the device until the FDA has ‘cleared’ the 510(k) notification, even if the FDA misses the applicable deadline.

If the FDA determines that it cannot clear the device, it will issue a ‘not substantially equivalent’ (NSE) determination, indicating that the device is Class III and cannot be marketed without a PMA. The submitter then has 30 days to request *de novo* classification of the device, if desired. This procedure is intended to permit clearance of low or moderate-risk devices that have no predicate device. Under recently enacted statutory amendments, a manufacturer also may submit a *de novo* petition in lieu of submitting a 510(k). The statute calls for the FDA to rule on a *de novo* petition within 120 days, although no performance goals apply to review of *de novo* petitions.

The PMA pathway has some similarities to the NDA pathway for drugs. The PMA must contain manufacturing information, information regarding the device components and principles of operation, proposed labelling, and full reports of all information regarding investigations conducted to assess the device’s safety and effectiveness. The PMA must contain clinical data, and the applicant must pay a substantial user fee. To be approved, the application must show that there is a reasonable assurance that such device is safe and effective for the proposed conditions of use. The FDA generally refers PMAs to an advisory panel for review and input. As with NDAs, the FDA agrees to performance goals for acting on PMAs. Action may take the form of an approval or a deficiency letter.

The FDA also may reclassify devices under a newly streamlined procedure. Prior to the FDASIA, the FDA used notice-and-comment rule making to reclassify devices, and this proved burdensome. As amended by the FDASIA, the statute now permits FDA to reclassify a device by administrative order ‘[b]ased on new information respecting [the] device’ and ‘following publication of a proposed reclassification order in the Federal Register, a meeting of a device classification panel [...] and consideration of comments to a public docket’.<sup>42</sup> Although this language suggests the three activities must occur in chronological order, the FDA recently has relied upon pre-FDASIA classification panel meetings rather than convening a new meeting to consider a proposed reclassification order.<sup>43</sup>

## vi Regulatory incentives

### *Drugs*

The United States has established a complex series of regulatory incentives to encourage the development of innovative medicines and follow-on products. These may be best explained in their chronological order of enactment.

The Orphan Drug Amendments to the FDCA, originally passed in 1983, establish incentives for development of drugs and biologics to treat rare diseases,

---

41 Elizabeth Orr, CDRH Meeting FDASIA Goals, Confirms Compliance Re-Org, Devices & Diagnostics Letter, 30 September 2013, at 1.

42 FDASIA, Section 608 (amending FDCA, Section 513(e)).

43 78 Fed. Reg. 27117 (9 May 2013).

including a seven-year period of market exclusivity (i.e., protection against the approval of the same drug for the same indication). Orphan drug designations may be granted on the basis of prevalence (i.e., that the drug is intended for a disease that affects fewer than 200,000 persons in the United States) or an economic criterion (which has rarely been applied in practice). FDA regulations establish detailed criteria for determining when competitive products may be approved during the orphan exclusivity period, including rules for determining when subsequent products are not the ‘same’ as first entrants (e.g., due to differences in the composition of their active substances or because they are clinically superior).<sup>44</sup>

The Hatch-Waxman Act establishes several incentives for development of originator products, as well as a significant incentive for development of certain follow-ons. First, the statute provides for patent term extensions to restore a portion of the patent life that is lost during clinical development and FDA review of new drugs and biological products. Credit is given for half the time spent in the IND process and all of the time spent in the NDA or BLA review process (subject to a reduction for any period during which the applicant was not pursuing development with due diligence), with a maximum extension of five years and a maximum effective patent life, following FDA approval, of 14 years.<sup>45</sup>

Second, the statute provides for periods of data exclusivity (i.e., protection against approval of ANDAs and Section 505(b)(2) applications) for originator products approved under the FDCA. New chemical entities (NCEs) receive a five-year protection period, while changes in approved products (e.g., new indications or dosage forms) receive three years if they are required to be supported by clinical investigations other than bioequivalence studies. Except as noted below, follow-on applications for NCEs may not be filed until the expiry of the five-year period, so that the effective period of protection includes the time required for review and approval of a follow-on product. Follow-on applications relating to changes in approved products can be submitted during the three-year period but approvals cannot be made effective until the period expires.<sup>46</sup>

Third, the statute contains complex provisions linking the approval of follow-on products to patents for reference drugs. Sponsors of originator products are required to submit patent information for their products, including expiry dates, which the FDA includes in the Orange Book. Sponsors of follow-on products are required to make one of four patent certifications:

- a* that no patents are listed for the reference product;
- b* that all listed patents have expired;
- c* that patents are listed and have not expired, but the applicant wishes that approval of its product be made effective upon expiry; or
- d* that the listed patents are invalid or unenforceable or will not be infringed by the applicant’s product.

---

<sup>44</sup> See 21 USC, Sections 360n-360ff; 21 CFR, Part 316.

<sup>45</sup> 35 USC, Section 156.

<sup>46</sup> 21 USC, Section 355(j).

Submission of a certification under the last provision (a ‘Paragraph IV’ certification) has two consequences: if the reference product is an NCE with an unexpired period of data exclusivity, the follow-on application may be submitted at the end of the fourth year following approval of the originator product, instead of the fifth year; and the follow-on applicant must submit a notification to the patent holder (and NDA sponsor) for the reference product, including a statement of reasons why the patent is invalid or unenforceable or will not be infringed. Submission of a follow-on application with a Paragraph IV certification is deemed an act of infringement under the patent laws, and if the patent holder initiates an infringement action within 45 days of receiving the notification, approval of the follow-on product is stayed for 30 months or until the court rules that the patent is invalid, unenforceable or not infringed.<sup>47</sup>

Finally, the Hatch-Waxman Act provides for a 180-day period of generic marketing exclusivity for the first ANDA applicant that files a successful Paragraph IV certification (e.g., if the patent for the reference product is held to be invalid, unenforceable or not infringed, or in certain other circumstances). The provision, which was intended to create an incentive to challenge patents for reference products and clear the way for early entry of generic products, has been complicated to administer in practice, and the rules have been modified to reduce the potential for abuse or other unintended results.

Legislation originally enacted in 1997, as part of the FDA Modernization Act, provided regulatory incentives for paediatric studies of drugs. An applicant that carries out such testing in compliance with a written request from FDA can receive a six-month extension of every form of regulatory exclusivity pertaining to its product, including five and three-year exclusivity under Hatch-Waxman, seven-year orphan drug exclusivity and protection against approval of ANDAs or Section 505(b)(2) applications prior to patent expiry.<sup>48</sup>

Most recently, the Generating Antibiotic Incentives Now Act, which was included in the FDASIA, established procedures under which certain new antibacterial or antifungal drugs intended for serious infections caused by ‘qualifying pathogens’ (drug-resistant organisms designated by FDA) can receive five-year extensions of all forms of regulatory exclusivity, including five and three-year exclusivity under the Hatch-Waxman Act and seven-year orphan drug exclusivity.<sup>49</sup>

### *Biologics*

Under the BPCIA, applications for biosimilar products may not be filed until four years, and may not be approved until 12 years, after the approval of the reference product. Those periods can be extended by six months if the sponsor of the reference product licence carries out paediatric studies in compliance with an FDA request. A ‘first licensure’

---

47 If the Paragraph IV notification is submitted before the end of the fifth year following approval of the reference product, the period of the stay is adjusted so that the follow-on product may not be approved until seven-and-a-half years after the approval of the reference product.

48 21 USC, Section 355a.

49 21 USC, Section 355f.

provision limits availability of new exclusivity periods for modified versions of previously authorised reference products. In general, it allows for a new exclusivity period when the licence application for the subsequent product is submitted by an entity that is not related to the sponsor of the earlier product, or when the subsequent product differs from the earlier product in structure and in safety, purity or potency. The BPCIA does not provide for patent linkage of the type established by the Hatch-Waxman Act, but it does contain provisions for exchange of information between sponsors of biosimilar and reference products and early resolution of some patent issues.

### *Devices*

A six-year regulatory exclusivity period applies to devices approved pursuant to PMAs. After that exclusivity period expires, the FDA may use safety and effectiveness data in a PMA, but not trade secrets, to approve another device, establish special controls for a class of devices, or classify or reclassify other devices, *inter alia*. Patent term extension is also available for PMA-approved devices.

The humanitarian device exemption (HDE), rather than regulatory exclusivity, is available for sponsors of devices for rare disease or conditions. It exempts the device from compliance with the effectiveness requirements of Section 515, relating to PMA approval, and Section 514, relating to performance standards. To qualify, the sponsor must show that the device: (1) is intended for diagnosis or treatment of a disease or condition affecting fewer than 4,000 individuals in the United States; (2) it will not be available to these patients without the exemption, and no comparable device (other than another humanitarian use device (HUD)) is available for them; and (3) it will not expose patients to an ‘unreasonable or significant risk of illness or injury’, and the probable benefit from using the HUD outweighs its risks. IRB approval is required before use of HUDs. Sponsors may charge a commercial, rather than cost-recovery, price for an HUD intended for use in a paediatric population or subpopulation or a disease or condition that is very rare or non-existent in children, if certain conditions are met. For example, the number of devices distributed annually cannot exceed the ‘annual distribution number’ (i.e., the number of devices reasonably needed to treat, diagnose, or cure 4,000 people in the United States).

## vii Post-approval controls

### *Drugs*

FDA regulations establish requirements for the reporting of adverse events associated with approved drugs and biologics, including expedited (15-day) reports of serious, unexpected events as well as periodic adverse drug experience reports (PADERs). In lieu of PADERs, the FDA will grant waivers to permit submission of periodic safety update reports (PSURs) in the CIOMS format as well as the more recent ICH format for periodic benefit risk evaluation reports. Special rules apply to reports of adverse events associated with non-prescription products that are marketed under OTC drug monographs rather than NDAs.

Holders of approved NDAs and BLAs must also submit reports when they discover defects in products released for commercial distribution. The criteria for making such reports and the deadlines and procedures for their submission are different for drugs and

biologics.<sup>50</sup> Manufacturers of approved drugs and biologics are also required to notify the FDA of discontinuance or interruption in production of certain life-saving drugs.<sup>51</sup>

As part of the approval process, the FDA can impose requirements for risk evaluation and mitigation strategies (REMS), which may include special labelling or ‘elements to assure safe use’, such as patient testing and restricted distribution. The effectiveness of the REMS must be periodically evaluated after approval. The FDA can also impose requirements for post-marketing tests and changes in safety labelling of approved drug products. Sponsors may invoke informal dispute resolution procedures to challenge imposition of these requirements, but there is no provision for formal hearings.

BLAs may impose requirements for testing and certification of each batch of a biologic by the FDA before it can be released for commercial use. Such requirements are imposed on many vaccines and certain other products regulated by the CBER.

FDA regulations establish detailed rules for changes in products that are subject to approved NDAs or BLAs.<sup>52</sup> Major changes (e.g., addition of new indications, new manufacturing facilities or significant changes in the manufacturing process) require submission and approval of a supplemental NDA or BLA (a prior approval supplement, or PAS). Less significant changes can be made after submission of a changes-being-effected (CBE) supplement; in some cases, the applicant is required to wait 30 days before implementing a change, but certain changes can be made immediately upon submission.<sup>53</sup> Minor changes (e.g., minor editorial changes in labelling) can be notified in annual reports to the NDA or BLA file. For drugs, the FDA has issued detailed guidance on classification of changes in the quality aspects of products (manufacturing facilities, manufacturing processes, components, containers, etc.); the guidance for biologics is less detailed.

Ownership of NDAs can be transferred by submission of a letter to the FDA, although related changes may require supplemental applications, including prior approval supplements for new manufacturing facilities. Transfer of ownership of BLAs is somewhat more complex and, depending on the circumstances, may require prior consultation with the FDA, as well as supplemental applications for related changes.

Under the provisions of the FDCA, the FDA cannot ordinarily withdraw approval of an NDA without first affording the sponsor notice and an opportunity for an administrative hearing, a process that can last several years. The Secretary of Health and

---

50 21 CFR, Sections 314.81(b)(1) (drugs), 600.14 (biologics).

51 21 USC, Section 356c.

52 21 CFR, Sections 314.70 (drugs), 601.12 (biologics).

53 The regulations permit sponsors to add or strengthen a contraindication, warning, precaution or adverse reaction to the prescribing information without prior approval from FDA, provided there is a causal relationship to the drug (21 CFR, Section 314.70). The FDA traditionally advised that this regulation did not apply to generic drugs, because their labelling must be the same as that of reference products. In 2013, however, the agency proposed amendments to its regulations that would establish a procedure for generic manufacturers to add new safety information to the labelling for their products (78 Fed. Reg. 67985 (13 November 2013)).

Human Services can, however, suspend approval of a drug pending completion of the required administrative hearing, if it is determined that the drug presents an imminent hazard to public health.<sup>54</sup> Although the PHSA does not contain provisions governing revocation of BLAs, FDA regulations establish a system that is similar to the one for NDAs: the sponsor is ordinarily entitled to notice and an opportunity for a hearing, but the licence may be suspended if there is a danger to health. In practice, when significant safety issues arise, sponsors often withdraw products from the market voluntarily in response to a request from FDA.

Special procedures apply to drugs and biologics authorised under the accelerated approval procedure (e.g., on the basis of surrogate endpoints). If required post-marketing studies fail to confirm the safety or effectiveness of such a product, the FDA can withdraw approval after an informal hearing before a specially constituted advisory committee.

#### *Devices*

The FDCA's 'general controls' apply to all devices, including Class I devices exempt from pre-market review. The general controls include prohibitions on adulteration and misbranding, as well as requirements for establishment registration and device listing and for compliance with the FDA's medical device reporting (MDR) regulations and the quality system regulation (QSR).

Under the MDR regulations, a manufacturer generally must file reports if it becomes aware of information that reasonably suggests that its marketed device: may have caused or contributed to a death or serious injury; or malfunctioned, and recurrence of this malfunction in the device (or any similar device marketed by the manufacturer) would be likely to cause or contribute to a death or serious injury.<sup>55</sup> Importers must report deaths and serious injuries to the FDA and the manufacturer, and they must report malfunctions to the manufacturer. User facilities must report deaths to the FDA and the manufacturer, but need to report serious injuries only to the manufacturer. Manufacturers must usually make their reports within 30 days of becoming aware of the information, although this is shortened to five days for events that require remedial action to prevent an unreasonable risk of substantial harm to the public health.<sup>56</sup> Importers must complete their reports within 30 days, and for user facilities, the deadline is 10 days.<sup>57</sup> In July 2013, the FDA issued a new draft guidance document on MDR reporting for manufacturers, which generally takes a broad view of the situations in which reporting is appropriate.<sup>58</sup>

---

54 This power has been exercised only once, in relation to the oral hypoglycaemic drug phenformin in 1977. See *Forsham v. Califano*, 442 F. Supp. 203 (D.D.C. 1977), appeal denied as moot, CCH Food Drug Cosm. L. Rpts. Paragraph 38,241 (D.C. Cir. 1979).

55 21 CFR, Section 803.50(a).

56 21 CFR, Section 803.40.

57 21 CFR, Section 803.10.

58 FDA, Draft Guidance for Industry and Food and Drug Administration Staff: Medical Device Reporting for Manufacturers (July 2013).

The FDA also requires manufacturers and importers to report certain device corrections and removals within 10 working days of initiating the action. Corrections include actions taken to repair, relabel, destroy or remediate a device at its point of use, whereas removals involve the physical removal of the device to some other location for remediation or destruction.<sup>59</sup> These actions are generally reportable if taken ‘to reduce a risk to health posed by the device’ or ‘to remedy a violation of the act that may present a risk to health’.<sup>60</sup> In February 2013, the agency issued a draft guidance that distinguishes recalls from product enhancements and asserts that certain enhancements are reportable.<sup>61</sup>

The FDA may require post-market surveillance and tracking of certain Class II and Class III devices.<sup>62</sup> The agency may also establish a performance standard for a Class II or Class III device, under Section 514 of the FDCA, if the agency determines that such a standard is appropriate and necessary to provide reasonable assurance of the safety and effectiveness of the device. The FDA also may impose ‘special controls’ for Class II devices, which may include performance standards, patient registries and guidelines for the submission of clinical data in 510(k)s. The FDA also recently finalised regulations generally requiring the labels of devices to bear a unique device identifier (UDI).<sup>63</sup>

Different frameworks apply to post-approval changes to PMA-approved and 510(k)-cleared devices. The PMA requirements are parallel to those for NDAs.<sup>64</sup> Major changes (i.e., those affecting safety or effectiveness) require approval of a PMA supplement. Certain other changes, including some labelling changes and some manufacturing changes, may be implemented with prior notice to the FDA. Other changes may be reported in periodic reports that are required as a condition of device approval. A different approach applies to 510(k)-cleared devices. Some modifications to these devices may be made without submitting a new 510(k), provided that the manufacturer documents the changes in a ‘letter to file’. Others require a new pre-market notification (not a supplement). These changes are those that ‘could significantly affect the safety or effectiveness of the device’ (such as a major modification to the device’s design) or that involve a major change to the device’s intended use.<sup>65</sup>

As with drugs, ownership of PMAs may be transferred upon letter notification to the FDA. If the changes affect device safety or effectiveness or the conditions of approval, the new owner must obtain approval of a PMA supplement before marketing. No notification to the FDA is required for transfers of 510(k)s, but the new owner should document the transfer of ownership in its 510(k) files.

59 21 CFR, Section 806.2(d) and (i).

60 21 CFR, Section 806.10(a).

61 FDA, *Distinguishing Medical Device Recalls from Product Enhancements and Associated Reporting Requirements: Draft Guidance for Industry and Food and Drug Administration Staff* (February 2013).

62 FDCA, Sections 519(e), 522.

63 78 Fed. Reg. 58,786 (24 September 2013).

64 See 21 CFR, Section 814.39.

65 21 CFR, Section 807.81(a)(3).

The FDA has statutory authority to withdraw approval of PMAs, IDEs and HDEs and to suspend an HDE approval after providing notice and an opportunity for a hearing.<sup>66</sup> The FDA also may temporarily suspend approval of a PMA and IDE pending completion of withdrawal proceedings in certain situations where there are serious risks to public health. The FDA has taken the position that it can rescind a 510(k) notification, although there is no specific statutory or regulatory basis for this position. A device manufacturer recently challenged the FDA's claimed authority in court,<sup>67</sup> and the court found that the FDA has inherent authority to rescind a 510(k) clearance in 'rare situation[s]', if the agency acts within a 'reasonable time'.<sup>68</sup> In upholding the FDA's rescission in that case, the court emphasised its conclusion that 'procedural irregularities' occurred throughout the clearance process for the device in question.<sup>69</sup>

### viii Manufacturing controls

#### *Drugs*

Facilities that manufacture drugs or biologics for distribution in the United States, including foreign facilities, must be registered with the FDA, but the procedure is ministerial and there is no requirement for a manufacturing authorisation. NDAs and BLAs contain detailed information on manufacturing facilities, which are normally inspected by the FDA before marketing authorisations are granted. All facilities that manufacture drugs or biologics (including 'old' drugs, such as monograph OTCs, for which prior approval is not required) must comply with regulations governing current GMP<sup>70</sup> which are supplemented by detailed guidances. Transfer of ownership of drug manufacturing facilities does not normally require prior approval from the FDA, but changes must be made in establishment registrations, and other changes resulting from a transfer of ownership may require supplemental applications for products made in an establishment.

#### *Devices*

The FDA also requires establishment registration for device facilities through a ministerial procedure. Devices must be manufactured in accordance with the FDA's QSR, which include provisions governing design control and validation, and GMP.<sup>71</sup> PMAs must contain a detailed description of methods, facilities, and controls used in manufacturing the device.<sup>72</sup> The FDA may also conduct a pre-approval inspection of the manufacturing facility. In contrast, 510(k)s need not contain detailed manufacturing information, and their submitters typically do not undergo pre-market inspections. For PMAs, transfer

---

66 21 USC, Sections 360e(e), 360j(g)(5), 360j(m)(5).

67 *ReGen Biologics, Inc v. Sebelius*, No. 11-cv-01006 (D.D.C. filed 31 May 2011).

68 *Ivy Sports Medicine v. Sebelius et al*, 938 F. Supp.2d 47, 58 (D.D.C. 2013).

69 Id. at 59 and 61.

70 21 CFR, Parts 210, 211.

71 21 CFR, Part 820.

72 21 CFR, Section 814.20(b)(4)(v).

of ownership of the manufacturing facility may require a PMA supplement.<sup>73</sup> For 510(k)-cleared devices, the manufacturer must assess whether a facility change requires a new 510(k) (i.e., whether the change could significantly affect the device's safety or effectiveness).

## **ix      Advertising and promotion**

### *Drugs*

The FDA regulates advertising and promotional labelling for prescription drugs. Detailed rules govern the content of advertisements, including requirements for fair balance, adequate substantiation of claims, consistency with the approved prescribing information, inclusion of a 'brief summary' of the prescribing information and prominent disclosure of the non-proprietary name of the drug product. There is an exemption from some of these requirements for 'reminder' advertisements, which do not make claims; drugs with serious side effects for which 'boxed warnings' are required may not take advantage of this exemption.<sup>74</sup>

Promotional labelling (e.g., brochures and similar materials used by sales representatives) is subject to similar requirements, except that the full prescribing information (in lieu of the brief summary) must accompany all such labelling (except for reminder labelling).

Direct-to-consumer (DTC) advertising of prescription drugs is permitted in the United States. Print advertisements must fully comply with the general rules on prescription drug advertising, using language that is understandable to the ordinary person. Broadcast advertisements, including television advertisements, must maintain fair balance, provide important safety information and incorporate mechanisms by which listeners or viewers can obtain complete information (e.g., websites, print advertisements or other measures). Although FDA pre-clearance of DTC advertisements is not ordinarily required, companies often submit television advertisements for FDA review prior to use.

Oral statements by sales representatives and other agents of drug manufacturers may be taken as evidence of the intended uses of a drug product. If those statements recommend uses that are not included in the approved prescribing information, the FDA will take the position that the drug product is misbranded (and therefore in violation of the FDCA) because its labelling does not include adequate directions for such uses.<sup>75</sup>

The FDA maintains a number of policies that are intended to permit 'free exchange' of scientific information relating to unapproved drug products or new uses for approved products (e.g., drug company support for continuing medical education programmes for health-care professionals, as well as responses to unsolicited requests from health-care

---

73      21 CFR, Section 814.39(a)(3).

74      See 21 CFR, Part 202.

75      See 21 USC, Section 352(f) (requiring that drugs bear adequate directions for use); 21 CFR, Section 201.100 (requiring that the labelling for prescription drugs contain adequate directions for all purposes for which they are 'intended'); and 21 CFR, Section 201.128 (defining the meaning of 'intended uses' to include all expressions of the objective intent of the seller, including oral or written statements).

professionals for information on unapproved uses of drug products), and it also permits disease awareness communications that do not promote specific drugs. In recent years, there has been growing concern that the agency's policies prohibit drug companies from communicating truthful, non-misleading information concerning research on new uses for approved drug products, and that this prohibition infringes the right of freedom of speech guaranteed by the First Amendment to the US Constitution. Under pressure from the federal courts, the FDA has adopted guidance that permits drug companies to distribute reprints of articles from peer-reviewed medical journals and independent medical texts that contain information on unapproved uses of approved drug products.<sup>76</sup> Recent decisions by the US Supreme Court<sup>77</sup> and an influential federal court of appeals<sup>78</sup> suggest the need for the FDA to consider further changes to its existing rules, but as yet there is no indication that the agency plans to do so.

The FDA regulates the labelling of non-prescription drug products, including brochures and point-of-purchase materials. These must be consistent with the terms of approved NDAs or applicable OTC drug monographs, and they must not contain false or misleading information. The Federal Trade Commission regulates the advertising of non-prescription drugs under general provisions of the Federal Trade Commission Act that prohibit unfair or deceptive practices in commerce and special provisions that govern false advertising of drugs. The FTC requires prior substantiation for claims as to the safety or effectiveness of non-prescription drugs. A recent decision by the FTC on the advertising for a food product suggests a possible change in the standard for substantiation of health claims,<sup>79</sup> and a court challenge is likely.

### *Devices*

The FDA and FTC also share responsibility for regulating advertising and promotion of non-restricted devices. The FTC regulates their advertising, and the FDA regulates their labelling (including promotional labelling). With respect to restricted devices, the FDA regulates both labelling and advertising.

The FTC's approach to regulation of device advertising is parallel to its approach to regulating OTC drug advertising. The FTC focuses its efforts on ensuring that advertising claims are not deceptive and are substantiated by competent and reliable evidence.<sup>80</sup> Similarly, the principles for FDA's regulation of device promotion and

---

76 See *Washington Legal Foundation v. Henney*, 202 F. 3d 331 (D.C. Cir. 2000).

77 *Sorrell v. IMS Health Inc*, No. 10-779, 131 S. Ct. 2653 (2011). The decision invalidated a state law that prohibited pharmaceutical marketing research companies, but not other persons, from collecting information from pharmacists on physician prescribing practices.

78 *United States v. Caronia*, 703 F. 3d 149 (2d Cir. 2012). The court reversed the conviction of a pharmaceutical sales representative for 'misbranding' an approved drug product by presenting information on unapproved uses in a conversation with a physician, where there was no allegation that the information was false or misleading.

79 *In the matter of POM Wonderful LLC*, No. 082-3122 (16 January 2013).

80 Michael S Labson, 'Regulation of Advertising, Promotion, and Distribution of Drugs, Medical Devices, and Biologics', Section 6.1.3, in *Fundamentals of Life Sciences Law*.

restricted device advertising are generally consistent with those for regulation of drug promotional labelling and advertising.<sup>81</sup> For example, device promotional materials must be consistent with the device labelling and cannot promote the product for an unapproved or uncleared intended use. Important differences include the lack of a ‘substantial evidence’ standard for substantiation and the lack of an express requirement for ‘fair balance’ in the regulations.<sup>82</sup> Device promotion remains subject to the statutory prohibitions on false and misleading representations, however.<sup>83</sup>

#### **x Distributors and wholesalers**

The FDA does not license distributors or wholesalers, but warehouses and distribution facilities used for drug products may be inspected for compliance with applicable requirements of GMP. Many states impose requirements for licensing of pharmaceutical distributors and distribution facilities, and the FDA has issued guidelines for the states.<sup>84</sup>

The FDA regulations implementing the Prescription Drug Marketing Act establish a number of requirements that apply to manufacturers, wholesalers and distributors, including provisions governing distribution of samples and drugs supplied to charitable institutions, documentation of the chain of distribution and requirements for manufacturers to maintain lists of authorised distributors.<sup>85</sup> The Drug Supply Chain Security Act, signed in November 2013, provides for an electronic system to track and trace prescription drug products, to be implemented by the FDA over a 10-year period.

#### **xi Classification of products**

The FDCA establishes two legal classifications of drug products: prescription drugs, which can be dispensed or administered only on the prescription of or under the supervision of a physician or other licensed practitioner, and non-prescription (or OTC) drugs. There is no federal ‘third class’ of pharmacy-only non-prescription drugs. Some FDA officials have suggested that the process for switching drugs from prescription to OTC status might be facilitated if the agency had the authority to impose additional conditions on newly switched products, perhaps including a transition period during which they were available only after consultation with a pharmacist, but no concrete measures have been proposed.<sup>86</sup> For prescription drugs, elements to ensure safe use, established as part of FDA-imposed REMS, can limit use of a product to certain medical specialties or settings (e.g., hospitals).

---

81 Id.

82 Id.

83 21 USC, Sections 502(a) and (q).

84 21 CFR, Part 205.

85 21 CFR, Part 203.

86 The FDA has approved one product (Plan B, an emergency contraceptive) for OTC use by women 17 years of age or older and as a prescription product for younger patients; in practice, both versions of the product are sold only in pharmacies. In 1985, Florida enacted a law that established a list of prescription drugs that could be dispensed by pharmacists without a physician’s prescription; but the procedure was seldom used, and the law was later repealed.

Devices, like drugs, may be limited to prescription status. The FDA may also classify a device as restricted and limit access and distribution of the device this way, if ‘there cannot otherwise be reasonable assurance of its safety and effectiveness’.<sup>87</sup> Possible restrictions include training requirements for users, limiting use to certain facilities, and labelling requirements. The FDA may impose these restrictions by regulation or through a PMA approval order. Special controls for Class II devices may also limit sale, distribution or use of the device.

### **xii      Imports and exports**

The FDCA includes a limited exemption under which certain drugs and biologics that do not fully comply with requirements for sale in the US may be imported for the purpose of further processing and re-export. Otherwise, imported drugs and devices must fully comply with requirements for shipment in domestic commerce. If they are deemed adulterated or misbranded, or if they fail to comply with a requirement for pre-market clearance, they may be detained at the point of entry, and the FDA can issue import alerts that effectively block entry of a product to the United States. The importer of a detained product has the right to an informal hearing before local FDA officials, but in practice, the agency has great discretion in the use of the import detention power.

The FDCA includes complex provisions governing the export of drugs and devices that do not comply with requirements for shipment in domestic commerce. If such products are ‘adulterated’ or ‘misbranded’, they may be exported provided that they comply with the specifications of the foreign purchaser, do not conflict with the law of the country to which they are exported, are labelled for export and are not reintroduced into domestic commerce.<sup>88</sup> The FDA has interpreted these provisions to impose requirements for recordkeeping and other forms of documentation.

Exports of products that do not comply with requirements for FDA pre-clearance (e.g., NDAs and PMAs) are subject to much more elaborate rules.<sup>89</sup>

### **xiii     Controlled substances**

Narcotics, psychotropics and other drugs that are liable to abuse are regulated under the Controlled Substances Act (CSA),<sup>90</sup> which is administered by the Drug Enforcement Administration in the Department of Justice. Substances are assigned to one of five

---

87      21 USC, Section 360j(e).

88      21 USC, Section 381(e).

89      21 USC, Section 382. See FDA Guidance for Industry: Exports under the FDA Export Reform and Enhancement Act of 1996 (23 July 2007). The FDA takes the position that foreign trade zones, which are exempt from customs requirements, are within the territory of the US for purposes of the FDCA. Thus, goods that are produced within a foreign trade zone can only be exported in compliance with the provisions of the FDCA. See *United States v. Yaron Laboratories*, 365 F. Supp. 917 (N.D. Calif. 1972); FDA Compliance Policy Guide Sec. 110.200.

90      21 USC, Section 801 et seq.

schedules under the statute, which determines the level of controls to be imposed. Schedule I comprises substances (e.g., heroin) that have a high potential for abuse and no currently accepted medical use in the United States, while Schedules II to V include substances with accepted medical uses and decreasing potential for abuse. The DEA issues licences for the manufacture, import, export, distribution, prescribing and dispensing of controlled substances, and imposes requirements for security and record-keeping measures to protect against diversion of controlled substances. For certain controlled substances, DEA issues import and manufacturing quotas based on estimates of legitimate medical needs. DEA agents inspect licensed facilities, and the statute includes multiple enforcement measures, including provisions for seizures of unlawful products and criminal prosecutions.

Companies that are developing new chemical entities with a potential for abuse inform the FDA at the time of submission of an IND or NDA. The FDA then makes a recommendation to the DEA for the appropriate scheduling of the product, although the actual rulemaking to include a new substance in a schedule under the statute is conducted by the DEA.

#### **xiv Enforcement**

The principal formal enforcement measures under the FDCA are seizures of non-complying goods, injunction actions to restrain future violations and criminal prosecutions. The FDA lacks authority to initiate these actions on its own, but must refer them to the Department of Justice. The statute has been interpreted to impose strict criminal liability for misdemeanour (i.e., charges can be lodged against any person who stands in a responsible relationship to the enterprise that causes the violation, with no requirement for proof of intent, negligence or other form of *mens rea*).<sup>91</sup> Felony penalties may be imposed upon proof that a violation was committed with intent to defraud or mislead, or upon a second conviction for a strict liability offence.<sup>92</sup> The FDA also has authority to impose civil monetary penalties for certain violations of the FDCA and the PHSA, subject to judicial review in the federal courts. In practice, the FDA relies heavily on voluntary enforcement measures, including regulatory correspondence ('warning' and 'untitled' letters). The agency also issues public health alerts and other announcements to the news media that can have significant commercial effects on the products and companies to which they relate.

Recent investigations of pharmaceutical and medical device companies by the Department of Justice, often prompted by whistleblower actions under the federal False Claims Act, have led to major civil and criminal penalties, in many cases based in whole or in part on alleged violations of the FDCA. Offences have included improper distribution of free samples, off-label promotion, manufacturing deficiencies

---

91      *United States v. Park*, 421 US 658 (1975); *United States v. Dotterweich*, 320 US 277 (1943).

92      The FDCA imposes penalties of \$1,000 and imprisonment for one year per violation for misdemeanours and \$10,000 or imprisonment for three years for felonies. General federal criminal legislation provides for significantly greater fines than those imposed under the FDCA.

and failure to comply with rules on safety reporting and clinical investigations.<sup>93</sup> Convictions for certain offences under the FDCA may form the basis for mandatory or permissive exclusion of individuals and companies from participation in federal health-care programmes.

### **III PRICING AND REIMBURSEMENT**

Reimbursement for prescription drugs in the United States is provided through a mixed system of private and public coverage. About half of all patients have private insurance, often provided through their employer, which covers prescription drugs,<sup>94</sup> although private insurance plans vary greatly as to the number and types of drugs that are covered and the share of costs for which the patient is responsible. Patients who are enrolled in government-sponsored health programmes, including Medicare, which provides health care for the elderly and disabled, and Medicaid, which provides health care for low-income individuals, receive coverage through these programmes. Beyond Medicare and Medicaid, a range of federal and state programmes offer drug benefits to individuals who meet certain eligibility criteria (for example, TRICARE is a federal health-care programme for military personnel and their dependents, and many states offer AIDS drug assistance programmes). These private and public programmes are known as ‘payers’ and generally do not purchase or dispense drugs directly but instead pay for the products patients receive from their physicians, retail pharmacies, hospitals and other distribution channels.

Both public and private payers use a variety of mechanisms to control drug prices and utilisation. Private payers typically contract with pharmacy benefits managers (PBMs) to manage their prescription drug benefits. PBMs negotiate prices and rebates with drug manufacturers, develop drug formularies (lists of drugs that a health plan will cover), and impose utilisation management techniques, such as prior authorisation and quantity limits. The manner in which public programmes will reimburse prescription drugs is often dictated by statute. For example, states may establish maximum allowable costs (MACs) to cap payments for brand or generic versions of the same drug.<sup>95</sup>

Public programmes also use mechanisms to control costs similar to those used by private plans. Medicare Part D, which covers outpatient prescriptions, imposes significant beneficiary cost sharing in a coverage gap known as the ‘donut hole’.

---

93 It is estimated that total judgments in such cases over the past decade have exceeded \$20 billion. The largest settlement to date related to GlaxoSmithKline, which agreed to pay a total of \$3 billion in civil and criminal penalties to resolve allegations under the FDCA and the False Claims Act relating to multiple drug products in July 2012.

94 Kaiser Family Foundation, Health Care Costs: A Primer 11 (2012), [www.kff.org/insurance/upload/7670-03.pdf](http://www.kff.org/insurance/upload/7670-03.pdf).

95 Most states have adopted rules under which pharmacists are permitted or required to dispense a lower-cost generic equivalent on a prescription for a brand-name product. These rules often rely on therapeutic equivalence evaluations made by FDA and published in the Orange Book.

Drug manufacturers whose products are covered by Medicaid are required to pay rebates to states for their drugs to ensure that the Medicaid programme receives the manufacturer's most favourable pricing. Likewise, states often negotiate supplemental rebates with manufacturers in exchange for placement of the manufacturer's drugs on a preferred drug list.

Access to coverage is likely to expand as a result of the health insurance mandate set forth in the Affordable Care Act (ACA), which is intended to provide health coverage for those individuals (by some estimates, at least 30 million) who are not covered by other programmes. When fully effective, the ACA will establish minimum requirements for health insurance programmes, require most individuals to purchase insurance and subsidise premiums for low-income individuals. In particular, prescription drug coverage is an 'essential health benefit' that must be included in health plans offered by state health insurance exchanges and in the benchmark benefit packages for newly eligible adults under Medicaid.

#### **IV ADMINISTRATIVE AND JUDICIAL REMEDIES**

The FDCA and FDA regulations and policies provide several mechanisms for internal administrative review of agency decisions. Certain decisions (e.g., to refuse or withdraw approval of an NDA) may be contested under statutory procedures that include formal evidentiary hearings before an administrative law judge.<sup>96</sup> The majority of disputes are, however, resolved through less formal mechanisms. The FDA regulations establish a general right to informal review of any decision within the agency hierarchy.<sup>97</sup> Certain FDA commitments made under the PDUFA (e.g., to decide appeals of clinical holds of INDs and complete responses to NDA and BLA submissions) include dispute resolution procedures with deadlines for completion. Statutory provisions authorising the FDA to require REMS, post-approval safety studies and safety labelling changes afford sponsors a right to an informal dispute resolution procedure.<sup>98</sup>

Judicial review of final agency action by the FDA is ordinarily subject to review in the federal courts under provisions of the FDCA and the Administrative Procedure Act (APA).<sup>99</sup> Certain agency decisions (e.g., the refusal or withdrawal of approval of an NDA following a formal evidentiary hearing) are subject to review in a federal court of appeals; the FDA's findings as to facts are deemed conclusive if supported by substantial evidence in the administrative record. In most cases, however, judicial review is available in a federal district court under general provisions of the APA. The court may set aside agency action if it is arbitrary, capricious or otherwise contrary to

---

96 21 USC, Section 355(d), (e).

97 21 CFR, Section 10.75. If a request for review is denied, the requestor may appeal to the agency's Chief Mediator and Ombudsman. In certain circumstances, the person seeking review may request that a scientific controversy be submitted to an FDA advisory committee, although FDA is not required to grant such a request.

98 21 USC, Sections 355(o), 355-1.

99 5 USC, Section 501 et seq.

law, contrary to constitutional right, in excess of statutory power or without observance of required procedure.<sup>100</sup>

The APA also permits judicial review of agency action unlawfully withheld or unreasonably delayed, but the courts will normally hear such cases only if the applicant has exhausted its administrative remedies and the matter is otherwise ripe for a decision. This can make it difficult to challenge general FDA policies that have not been set out in final regulations or guidances, although it is sometimes possible to obtain judicial review following the submission of a ‘citizen petition’ under the FDA’s procedural regulations.<sup>101</sup> The courts have generally held that warning letters and other informal communications used by the FDA to secure voluntary compliance do not constitute final agency action and are not reviewable under the APA.<sup>102</sup>

A person seeking judicial review of FDA action must demonstrate the requisite legal interest (standing). In practice, the rules on standing followed by the federal courts are relatively liberal, and, depending on the facts, challenges to FDA actions may be permitted by competitors, trade associations, professional groups and consumer organisations that are directly affected by FDA decisions.<sup>103</sup>

## **V FINANCIAL RELATIONSHIPS WITH PRESCRIBERS AND PAYORS**

With limited exceptions, the FDA does not enforce federal laws governing financial relationships between pharmaceutical and medical device companies and prescribers or payors.<sup>104</sup> Instead, these are subject to provisions of law enforced by the Department of

---

100 5 USC, Section 706. Subject to somewhat complex rules enunciated by the Supreme Court and the US Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia Circuit, the federal courts often defer to FDA’s interpretation of the statutes and regulations it administers, and in practice they also tend to give great weight to the agency’s findings on matters of science and medicine within its special areas of expertise.

101 21 CFR, Section 10.30. The regulation requires FDA to respond to a petition within 180 days of receipt, but permits the agency to provide a ‘tentative response’ stating that it has been unable to deal with the matter; in practice, the agency sometimes takes several years to provide a final response. Pre-enforcement review is available as to final regulations issued by FDA. *Abbott Laboratories v. Gardner*, 387 US 136 (1967).

102 See, e.g., *Biotics Research Corp v. Heckler*, 710 F.2d 1375 (9th Cir. 1985); but see *Den-Mat Corp v. United States*, CCH Food Drug Cosm. L. Rpts. Paragraph 38,272 (D. Md. 1992).

103 See, e.g., *Upjohn Mfg. Co. v. Schweiker*, 681 F.2d 480 (6th Cir. 1982) (competitor alleging unlawful use by FDA of confidential information in its NDA); *Pharmaceutical Manufacturers Association v. FDA*, 484 F. Supp. 1179 (D. Del. 1980), aff’d per curiam 634 F.2d 106 (3d Cir. 1980) (trade association and physician organisations challenging patient labelling requirements for oestrogen drug products).

104 FDA requires a person submitting a marketing authorisation application for a drug or medical device to disclose specified financial interests of investigators who conducted clinical trials relied on in the application (21 CFR, Part 54).

Justice and the OIG of the Department of Health and Human Services. The federal Anti-Kickback Statute<sup>105</sup> prohibits the exchange of anything of value in an effort to induce or reward the referral of federal health-care programme business. The law is enforced by criminal and civil penalties, coupled with the potential for exclusion from participation in federal health-care programmes. There is no private right of action under the statute, but whistle-blowers (relators) may initiate *qui tam* lawsuits on behalf of the federal government under the False Claims Act (FCA).<sup>106</sup> Such suits may result in penalties equal to three times the cost of unlawful activities to federal health-care programmes, a portion of which may be awarded to the whistleblower.

The OIG has established a number of ‘safe harbours’ to protect specific business practices from enforcement actions under the Anti-Kickback Statute.<sup>107</sup> In addition, the OIG has issued guidance on compliance programmes for pharmaceutical manufacturers,<sup>108</sup> and the principal trade association of the pharmaceutical industry has adopted a code of practice on interactions with health-care professionals.<sup>109</sup>

The states also maintain statutes governing improper payments and other forms of fraud affecting public health-care programmes, and many impose similar controls on improper payments in connection with private health-care programmes. These are typically enforced by state attorneys general and by state Medicaid fraud control units.

The federal Sunshine Act, passed as part of Affordable Care Act in 2010, requires pharmaceutical and medical devices companies to report payments to physicians to the Department of Health and Human Services, with provision for eventual public disclosure. The federal requirement pre-empts some, but not all, such disclosure requirements that had previously been established in some states.

## **VI SPECIAL LIABILITY OR COMPENSATION SYSTEMS**

The US has established several systems governing liability and compensation for injuries associated with drugs and biologics. The most important is the Vaccine Injury Compensation Program (VICP), originally enacted as part of the National Childhood Vaccine Injury Act of 1986.<sup>110</sup> The VICP is a no-fault compensation system for injuries or death associated with vaccines listed in the vaccine injury table issued under the programme, funded by an excise tax on each dose of the listed vaccines. A vaccine is listed following a determination by the Department of Health and Human Services to recommend it for routine administration to children. Compensation claims are submitted to the US Court of Federal Claims and reviewed by special masters within what is popularly known as the ‘Vaccine Court’. Compensation may include actual,

---

105 42 USC, Section 1320a-7b.

106 31 USC, Sections 3729-3733.

107 42 CFR, Section 1001.952.

108 68 Fed. Reg. 23731 (5 May 2003).

109 PhRMA Code on Interactions with Health-care Professionals – [www.phrma.org-guidelines/code-interactions-healthcare-professionals](http://www.phrma.org-guidelines-code-interactions-healthcare-professionals).

110 42 USC, Section 300aa-10 et seq.

unreimbursable expenses for medical care, rehabilitation, custodial care and similar needs; lost earnings; pain and suffering (capped at \$250,000); a \$250,000 payment for a vaccine-related death; and reasonable attorneys' fees. Claimants may reject awards in the no-fault system and bring suits for damages under state tort law, but the statute imposes significant limitations on those suits, including defences based on compliance with FDA standards for product design and labelling, limits on punitive damages, and trial procedures designed to facilitate consideration of scientific evidence as to causation.

Section 304 of the Homeland Security Act of 2002<sup>111</sup> established a special programme to protect covered persons (including doctors and pharmaceutical companies) from liability for injuries caused by a smallpox vaccine during a period of public health emergency declared by the Secretary of Health and Human Services. The Pandemic Readiness and Emergency Preparedness Act of 2005<sup>112</sup> prohibits suits against specified persons (including pharmaceutical manufacturers) for injuries allegedly caused by covered countermeasures during the period of a pandemic declaration issued by the Secretary of Health and Human Services, except for suits alleging wilful misconduct, which may be brought only in the federal district court in Washington.

## VII TRANSACTIONAL AND COMPETITION ISSUES

### i Competition law

One of the most contentious legal issues in the US drug approval system involves the interplay between the Hatch-Waxman Act and the US antitrust laws. To facilitate the marketing of generic products, the Hatch-Waxman Act incentivises generic applicants to challenge the patents of innovative companies at very little financial risk to themselves.<sup>113</sup> And under the Hatch-Waxman Act, patent holders that file an infringement suit within a specified period of time are provided with guaranteed protection of their intellectual property for a period of generally at least 30 months, during which the FDA cannot approve the alleged infringer's product. But once the companies are embroiled in the lengthy, unpredictable patent litigation encouraged under the structure of the Hatch-Waxman Act, the companies often wish to resolve the litigation.

These settlements take many forms, and may include a payment or other consideration that flows to the generic company, such as manufacturing assistance from the innovative company, and an agreement that the generic may enter the market on a certain date prior to the expiration of the innovative company's patent. Consideration

---

111 42 USC, Section 233(p). Suits must instead be brought against the United States, which has a right to recover for gross misconduct or violations of contractual obligations on the part of covered persons.

112 42 USC, Section 247d-6d.

113 The number of lawsuits between pioneer and generic drug companies increased significantly after the enactment of the Hatch-Waxman Act. FTC, *Generic Drug Entry Prior to Patent Expiration: An FTC Study* (July 2002) (FTC Generic Drug Entry Report), available at [www.ftc.gov/os/2002/07/genericdrugstudy.pdf](http://www.ftc.gov/os/2002/07/genericdrugstudy.pdf).

does not usually flow the other way, aside from the value of settlement and the certainty that it brings, because the Hatch-Waxman Act results in infringement actions being filed before the generic company has entered the market (i.e., before infringing sales have been made). This is in contrast with other types of patent litigation, where the patent holder has a damages claim and where, as a result, consideration to settle a matter might be expected to flow from the alleged infringer to the patent holder.

The FTC has sought for over a decade to demonstrate that settlements that involve consideration flowing back to the generic company are anti-competitive. In particular, the FTC has argued that but for the consideration given by the innovative company to the generic company, the generic company would have entered the market earlier, resulting in lower-cost generic drugs for consumers.<sup>114</sup>

Notwithstanding the FTC's concerns, most courts that considered the issue recognised the importance of settlement of Hatch-Waxman patent infringement cases to maintaining the careful balance established by the Act. The Federal, Eleventh and Second Circuits have consistently held that the antitrust laws allow patent settlements that include consideration flowing from an innovative manufacturer to a generic manufacturer along with an agreed entry date for the generic product, so long as the settlement does not exclude competition beyond the scope of the patent.<sup>115</sup> This conclusion flows from the courts' recognition that the patent grant provides the innovative company with the lawful right to exclude.

Thus, under the 'scope of the patent' standard, these settlements were lawful unless the patent was procured by fraud; the underlying infringement action was objectively baseless; or the settlement obtains more coverage than the patent grant, for example, by excluding products not covered by the patent from the market or by excluding products covered by the patent from the market until some point after the patent expires.<sup>116</sup>

The Third Circuit rejected the 'scope of the patent' standard in a significant recent decision, *In re K-Dur Antitrust Litigation*.<sup>117</sup> The Third Circuit held that any payment from a patent holder to a generic patent challenger who agrees to delay entry into the market constitutes *prima facie* evidence of an unreasonable restraint of

---

114 A 2010 analysis by the FTC asserts that reverse payment settlements cost consumers \$3.5 billion annually. FTC, *Pay-for-Delay: How Drug Company Pay-Offs Cost Consumers Billions*, at 8 (2010), available at [www.ftc.gov/os/2010/01/100112 payfordelayrpt.pdf](http://www.ftc.gov/os/2010/01/100112 payfordelayrpt.pdf). The FTC estimates that one year after a generic product enters the market the generic captures over 90 per cent of the pioneer drug's sales and sells for 15 per cent of the price of the pioneer. Id.

115 *FTC v. Watson Pharms. Inc*, 677 F.3d 1298 (11th Cir. 2012); *In re Ciprofloxacin Hydrochloride Antitrust Litig*, 544 F.3d 1323 (Fed. Cir. 2008), cert. denied, 557 US 920 (2009); *In re Tamoxifen Citrate Antitrust Litig*, 466 F.3d 187 (2d Cir. 2006), cert. denied, 551 US 1144 (2007); *Valley Drug Co v. Geneva Pharms Inc*, 344 F.3d 1294 (11th Cir. 2003), cert. denied, 543 US 939 (2004); *Schering-Plough Corp v. FTC*, 402 F.3d 1056 (11th Cir. 2005), cert. denied, 548 US 919 (2006).

116 See, e.g., *In re Tamoxifen Citrate Antitrust Litig*, 466 F.3d at 213.

117 See *In re K-Dur Antitrust Litig*, 686 F.3d 197 (3d Cir. 2012).

trade, and the patent holder then bears the burden of showing that the payment was for a purpose other than delayed entry or offers some pro-competitive benefit.<sup>118</sup> In adopting such a standard, the Third Circuit stated that the scope of the patent test ‘improperly restricts the application of antitrust law and is contrary to the policies underlying the Hatch-Waxman Act’.<sup>119</sup> The Third Circuit’s explicit rejection of the standard applied by the majority of other courts to consider the issue has generated considerable uncertainty as to how such settlements will be evaluated in future cases.

In June 2013, the Supreme Court rejected both the ‘scope of the patent’ standard and the more stringent approach taken by the Third Circuit in *FTC v. Actavis*.<sup>120</sup> The *Actavis* decision held that reverse payment settlements can in some circumstances violate the antitrust laws and that they should be evaluated under a traditional rule-of-reason analysis, which involves comparing the likely anti-competitive effects of the settlement versus any procompetitive benefits. The application of the *Actavis* ruling to particular cases is extremely fact-intensive. Significant uncertainty remains as the lower courts begin to evaluate a number of settlements now subject to renewed litigation following the Supreme Court ruling.

Generic manufacturers have often brought antitrust suits against manufacturers of reference products that submitted citizen petitions to the FDA identifying scientific, medical or legal reasons why generic marketing authorisation applications should not be approved, or suggesting additional testing necessary to ensure the safety or effectiveness of generic products. Although petitions submitted to federal agencies are normally protected under the First Amendment to the US Constitution, which guarantees the right to petition the government for redress of grievances, generic manufacturers have argued that citizen petitions relating to their products are a sham intended solely to delay market entry. Amendments to the FDCA enacted in 2007 impose specific requirements for submission of petitions relating to the generic drug approval process and expressly prohibit the FDA from delaying action on a generic application unless necessary to protect public health.<sup>121</sup> In view of these provisions, courts may be reluctant to hear antitrust claims based on the allegation that citizen petitions delayed market entry of generics.<sup>122</sup>

## **ii      Transactional issues**

Although licence agreements, collaborations and other transactions in the life sciences industry in the United States have many elements in common with transactions in Europe, there are certain aspects that are unique. Perhaps the most noticeable difference

---

<sup>118</sup> *Id.* at 219.

<sup>119</sup> *In re K-Dur Antitrust Litig.*, 686 F.3d 197, 214 (3d Cir. 2012). The Supreme Court recently granted *certiorari* in the Eleventh Circuit’s *Androgel* case on the appropriate antitrust standard for reverse payment settlements. See *FTC v. Watson Pharms Inc*, petition for cert. filed, 4 October 2012 by the FTC (No. 12-416), granted 7 December 2012.

<sup>120</sup> *Federal Trade Commission v. Actavis Inc*, 570 US (2013).

<sup>121</sup> 21 USC, Section 355(q).

<sup>122</sup> See *Apotex Inc v. Acorda Therapeutics Inc*, No. 11 Civ. 8803 (LTS) (S.D.N.Y. 7 February 2013).

is in the transactional documents themselves – US documents tend to be more detailed than their European counterparts, and persons not familiar with US practice are often surprised by the length and complexity of US agreements. The goal is to provide a comprehensive and precise roadmap, anticipating where possible significant actions and decision points might arise in order to eliminate ambiguities as to the parties' rights and obligations and reduce the likelihood of disputes. For this reason, drafting and negotiating these agreements requires input from a wide range of functional experts with knowledge of industry practice and legal requirements, including regulatory, intellectual property, tax, product liability, commercial and antitrust issues.

The IP and regulatory regimes also differ from those in Europe in ways that must be expressly addressed in agreements for the United States. For example, joint patent owners have an equal and undivided interest in the joint patent, and in the absence of contract language to the contrary each may exploit it freely without accounting to the other. In addition, patent and regulatory regimes for drug products are linked, which requires special provisions dealing with patent listings, patent term restoration and the enforcement of patents against generic competitors.

Product liability is also a more significant consideration in the United States than elsewhere, which requires attention to indemnification and insurance provisions, as well as dispute resolution mechanisms.

US bankruptcy law also affords special protection to licensees of patents and certain other IP rights. Generally, a party that declares bankruptcy in the United States has the right to stop performing, or reject, its obligations under agreements to which it is a party. But the US bankruptcy statute provides that a licensee of IP rights under a licence agreement retains its licence in the event that the licensor rejects the agreement. The statutory provisions are, however, complex, and licensees must structure agreements carefully to take full advantage of them.

## **VIII CURRENT DEVELOPMENTS**

The most significant legislative development in 2013 was the enactment of the Drug Quality and Security Act, which included provisions that will eventually lead to an electronic 'track and trace' system for prescription drug products in the United States, as well as new requirements for pharmacy compounders and 'outsourcing facilities' that formulate drug products which are not subject to FDA approvals. Congress continues to consider new legislation governing medical devices, including possible revisions to the system for regulation of *in vitro* diagnostic products, but it is unclear whether action will be taken in the coming year.

There is the potential for further court challenges to the FDA's regulations governing 'off-label' promotion of approved prescription drugs and devices, based on the argument that they prohibit truthful claims in violation of the First Amendment to the US Constitution. Even if these are successful, it is unlikely that enforcement actions by the FDA or the Department of Justice will abate significantly, since it will remain possible to pursue cases relating to fraudulent and misleading claims.

## Appendix 1

---

# ABOUT THE AUTHORS

### RICHARD KINGHAM

*Covington & Burling LLP*

Richard Kingham is a partner in the firm of Covington & Burling LLP, where he serves as co-head of the life sciences industry group and the industry, regulatory and legislative practice group. He previously served as the managing partner of the firm's London office and as a member of the firm-wide management committee. Since joining the firm in 1973, he has concentrated on regulation of pharmaceuticals and related products. He has acted for most of the major pharmaceutical and biotechnology companies in the US and Europe, as well as the principal trade associations of the pharmaceutical industry. He has served on committees of the World Health Organization, the Center for Global Development, the Institute of Medicine of the US National Academy of Sciences and the National Institutes of Health. He is currently an adjunct professor at the Georgetown University Law Center, and he has lectured at the University of Virginia School of Law and the graduate programme in pharmaceutical medicine at Cardiff University. He received his law degree in 1973 from the University of Virginia, where he served as articles editor of the law review and was elected to the Order of the Coif (the law school honorary society).

### KRISTA HESSLER CARVER

*Covington & Burling LLP*

Krista Carver is a senior associate in the firm of Covington & Burling LLP. She has a wide-ranging practice that includes FDA regulatory, compliance, transactional, and legislative matters for companies in the biotechnology, pharmaceutical, medical device, and cosmetic industries. She has particular experience with legal and regulatory issues related to biosimilars, medical devices, personalised medicine (including companion diagnostics), and appeals within the FDA. With respect to biosimilars, she assisted biotechnology innovators in legislative matters leading up to enactment of the Biologics

Price Competition and Innovation Act of 2009 (BPCIA) and now represents clients in connection with FDA interpretation and implementation of the BPCIA. She is chair of the Biotechnology Law Committee of the ABA Section of Science and Technology Law and a member of the Section Council. She also serves as co-editor-in-chief of Covington's InsideMedicalDevices blog. She received her law degree, *magna cum laude*, from Harvard Law School in 2006.

**COVINGTON & BURLING LLP**

1201 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW

Washington, DC 20004-2401

United States

Tel: +1 202 662 5268 / 5197

Fax: +1 202 778 5268 / 5197

rkingham@cov.com

kcarver@cov.com

[www.cov.com](http://www.cov.com)