

FDA Releases Draft Guidance for Industry on Responding to Unsolicited Requests for Off-Label Information About Prescription Drugs and Medical Devices

RESOURCE LINKS

FDA Draft Guidance

<http://www.fda.gov/downloads/Drugs/GuidanceComplianceRegulatoryInformation/Guidances/UCM285145.pdf>

IMPORTANT DATES

**Comments Due:
March 29, 2011**

On December 27, 2011, the U.S. Food & Drug Administration (“FDA”), Office of Prescription Drug Promotion (“OPDP”) (formerly the Division of Drug Marketing, Advertising, and Communications) released a new draft guidance document titled “Guidance for Industry on Responding to Unsolicited Requests for Off-Label Information About Prescription Drugs and Medical Devices” (the “Draft Guidance”).¹ The OPDP will accept comments on the Draft Guidance through March 29, 2011.²

The FDA has a longstanding policy of permitting pharmaceutical manufacturers to respond to unsolicited requests for medical information about their products, even where such information pertains to unapproved products or uses.³ However, there has

been considerable debate over what constitutes “unsolicited” in this regard. In July 2011, a group of seven manufacturers filed a “citizen petition” with the FDA, requesting FDA clarification of the following issues: (1) Manufacturer Responses to Unsolicited Requests; (2) “Scientific Exchange”; (3) Interactions with Formulary Committees, Payors, and Similar Entities; and (4) Dissemination of Third-Party Clinical Practice Guidelines.⁴

¹ Available at <http://www.fda.gov/downloads/Drugs/GuidanceComplianceRegulatoryInformation/Guidances/UCM285145.pdf>.

² Submit electronic comments on the Draft Guidance to <http://www.regulations.gov>. Submit written comments to the Division of Dockets Management (HFA-305), Food and Drug Administration, 5630 Fishers Lane, rm. 1061, Rockville, MD 20852.

³ See 59 Fed. Reg. 59820, 59823 (Nov. 18, 1994) (stating that manufacturers may respond to unsolicited requests for information with “responsive, nonpromotional, balanced scientific information, which may include information on unapproved uses, without subjecting their products to regulation based on the information”). Additionally, under Section 401 of the Food and Drug Administration Modernization Act (“FDAMA”), 21 U.S.C. § 360aaa *et seq.*, Congress codified that the FDAMA provisions regarding disseminating written information about unapproved uses should not “be construed as prohibiting a manufacturer from disseminating information in response to an unsolicited request from a health care practitioner.” However, FDAMA Section 401 ceased to be effective on September 30, 2006.

⁴ See Citizen Petition on Behalf of Allergan, Inc.; Eli Lilly and Company; Johnson & Johnson; Novartis Pharmaceuticals Corporation; Novo Nordisk, Inc.; Pfizer, Inc.; and sanofi-aventis U.S. LLC (July 5, 2011).

The Draft Guidance relates only to the first of these requests. The Draft Guidance further states that it is not intended to address unsolicited requests for information about products that are not approved for any use.

Significantly, the Draft Guidance clarifies that the FDA continues to believe that appropriate responses to unsolicited requests for off-label information will not be cause for enforcement action. However, the FDA states that responding to “unsolicited requests” in a way other than as set forth in the Draft Guidance “would not constitute a per se violation of the law, but could potentially be introduced as evidence of a new intended use.”

Among other things, the Draft Guidance attempts to clarify parameters regarding responding to requests for information through “emerging electronic media,” which would include many so-called “social media” tools (with the FDA specifically citing examples, such as blogging, YouTube, and Twitter). The Draft Guidance also draws a distinction between “public” unsolicited requests for off-label information and “non-public” unsolicited requests for off-label information. A “non-public” request is “directed privately to a firm using a one-on-one communication approach.” A “public” request is “made in a public forum, whether directed to a firm specifically or to a forum at large.” Some examples of “public” forums cited in the Draft Guidance include product websites, discussion boards, chat rooms, or other public electronic forums that manufacturers maintain and over which they have full control. The Draft Guidance also contemplates manufacturer participation in “third-party sites (i.e., websites and other venues that are either entirely independent of a firm’s control and influence or not fully controlled by a firm)” as “public” communication. In general, the Draft Guidance requires that a firm’s “public response to public unsolicited requests for off-label information about its named product should be limited to providing the firm’s contact information and should not include any off-label information.”

Accordingly, manufacturers will want to carefully review the Draft Guidance in connection with the current policies and procedures, and should also consider whether to submit comments to the FDA. In this regard, the FDA specifically invites comments on the following:

- (1) Whether the proposed collection of information [for example, any requirement in the Draft Guidance to submit reports, keep records, or provide information to a third party] is necessary for the proper performance of the FDA's functions, including whether the information will have practical utility;
- (2) The accuracy of the FDA's estimate of the burden of the proposed collection of information, including the validity of the methodology and assumptions used;
- (3) Ways to enhance the quality, utility, and clarity of the information collected; and
- (4) Ways to minimize the burden of information collected on the respondents, including through the use of automated collection techniques, when appropriate, and other forms of information technology.

In addition, however, manufacturers should evaluate whether there are more substantive concerns or clarifications needed regarding the Draft Guidance. Particular areas of comment may pertain to, for

example, social media implications of the “public” and “solicited” request guidance, website design parameters, speaker programs, and medical affairs issues.

While the Draft Guidance is significant in that it addresses certain “unsolicited request” forums that have not been expressly addressed by the FDA in previous guidance, the FDA’s general position on unsolicited requests, as articulated in the Draft Guidance, does not represent a vast departure from its previous communications regarding unsolicited requests. The difference is the level of specificity provided in the Draft Guidance and the stringent parameters articulated regarding “public” responses to unsolicited requests.

Epstein Becker Green is available to assist with drafting and submitting comments to the Draft Guidance.

* * *

For more information about this issue of *IMPLEMENTING HEALTH AND INSURANCE REFORM*, please contact one of the authors below or the member of the firm who normally handles your legal matters.

Wendy C. Goldstein

Member
EpsteinBeckerGreen
NEW YORK
212-351-3737
wgoldstein@ebglaw.com

Kathleen A. Peterson

Member
EpsteinBeckerGreen
WASHINGTON, DC
202-861-1370
kpeterson@ebglaw.com

Information published in *IMPLEMENTING HEALTH AND INSURANCE REFORM* is not intended to be, nor should it be considered, legal advice. Readers should consult an attorney to discuss specific situations in further detail.

Information published in IMPLEMENTING HEALTH AND INSURANCE REFORM is not intended to be, nor should it be considered, legal advice. Please consult your attorneys in connection with any fact-specific situation under federal law and the applicable state or local laws that may impose additional obligation on you and your company.

www.ebglaw.com

© 2012

Epstein Becker & Green, P.C.
Attorney advertising.

If you would like to be added to our mailing list, please [click here](#), complete the form below or contact:

Kristi Swanson
Practice Development Manager
National Health Care & Life Sciences Practice
Epstein Becker & Green, P.C.
1227 25th St., NW, Suite 700
Washington, D.C. 20037
phone 202/861-4186 -- fax 202/861-3086
kswanson@ebglaw.com

Name: _____ Title: _____

Company/Firm/Organization: _____

Street Address: _____

City: _____ State: _____ Zip Code: _____

Phone No.: _____ Fax No.: _____

E-mail Address: _____

ATLANTA

Robert N. Berg
Michael Coleman
J. Andrew Lemons
Kenneth Menendez
Marisa Pins
Bradley Skidmore
Evan Rosen
Alan B. Wynne

BOSTON

Barry A. Guryan

CHICAGO

Amy Dow
Lisa J. Matyas
Kevin Ryan

HOUSTON

Mark S. Armstrong
Daniel E. Gospin
Patricia D. Tyner

INDIANAPOLIS

Leah R. Kendall
Bradley Merrill Thompson

LOS ANGELES

Dale E. Bonner
Ted Gehring
Susan Graham

NEW YORK

Nicholas Allison
Eric Altman
Jeffrey H. Becker
Michelle Capezza
Aime Dempsey
Kenneth DiGia
Alice Dong
Scott M. Drago
Jerrold I. Ehrlich
Hylan Fenster
James S. Frank
Arthur J. Fried
Paul Friedman
Philip M. Gassel
Jay E. Gerzog
Sarah K. Giesting
John F. Gleason
Robert D. Goldstein
Wendy C. Goldstein
Robert S. Groban, Jr.
Gretchen Harders
Jennifer M. Horowitz
Kenneth J. Kelly

Joseph J. Kempf, Jr.
Jane L. Kuesel
Purvi Badiani Maniar
Wendy Marcari
Eileen Millett
Cynthia Mitchell
Leah Roffman
Tamar Rosenberg
William A. Ruskin
Jackie Selby
Catherine F. Silie
Victoria Sloan
Steven M. Swirsky
Natasha Thoren

NEWARK

Joan A. Disler
James P. Flynn
Daniel R. Levy
Philip D. Mitchell
Maxine Neuhauser
Kerry M. Parker
Michael J. Slocum

WASHINGTON, DC

Mujadala Abdul-Majid
Kirsten M. Backstrom
Emily E. Bajcsi
Clifford E. Barnes
James Boiani

George B. Breen
M. Jason Brooke
Lee Calligaro
Jesse M. Caplan
Jason B. Caron
Jason E. Christ
Eric Conn
Tanya Cramer
O. Benton Curtis, III
Anjali N.C. Downs
Steven B. Epstein
Gregory Epstein
Ross K. Friedberg
Stuart M. Gerson
Shawn M. Gilman
Jennifer K. Goodwin
Daniel G. Gottlieb
Douglas A. Hastings
Robert J. Hudock
William G. Kopit
Jennie B. Krasner
Jay P. Krupin
Amy F. Lerman
Katherine R. Lofft

Julia E. Loyd
Mark E. Lutes
Kara M. Maciel
Benjamin S. Martin
David E. Matyas

Colin McCulloch
Frank C. Morris, Jr.
Leslie V. Norwalk
Jonah D. Retzinger*
Joel C. Rush
Kathleen A. Peterson
Rene Y. Quashie
Robert D. Reif
Serra J. Schlanger
Deepa B. Selvam
Alaap B. Shah
Lynn Shapiro Snyder
Adam C. Solander
David B. Tatge
Daly D.E. Temchine
Carrie Valiant
Dale C. Van Demark
Patricia M. Wagner
Robert E. Wanerman
Dawn R. Welch
Constance A. Wilkinson
Kathleen M. Williams
Lesley R. Yeung

*Not Admitted to the Practice of Law