National Pharma Audioconference: Lessons of BMS' \$515 Million Settlement for Off-label Promotion, Kickbacks and Drug Pricing

Kathleen Meriwether
Principal, ERNST & YOUNG, LLP
Fraud Investigation & Dispute Services

- Clinical Trials Issues in Fraud Investigations and Prosecutions
 - Does the clinical data support the off-label use?
 - Research and Development Plans for New (Off-Label) Indications or Populations - company documents can reflect:
 - change in strategy lack of funding to pursue a new indication or a study in an expanded population;
 - or WORSE that the indication <u>was</u> studied, but the trial failed to achieve safety/efficacy goals necessary for an approval (and no commensurate change in strategy)

- Clinical Trials Issues in Fraud Investigations and Prosecutions
 - Misuse/Misapplication of FDAMA and the Washington Legal Foundation opinion
 - WLF Opinion has limited legal applicability
 - NOT a green light for distribution of any journal article about any use of a product
 - Even within the parameters of WLF is the information a balanced presentation of what is known about the product?
 - Will an indication for the off-label use or new population be forthcoming based on the data that is being distributed?

- Clinical Trials Issues in Fraud Investigations and Prosecutions
 - Critical issue for enforcers is the off-label use putting patients at unwarranted risk?
 - If drug is not proven to be safe and effective, are patients being deprived of an opportunity for treatment with a proven, FDA-approved product or regimen?
 - Is the off-label "campaign" a disincentive to research?
 - Why conduct studies if the company can still capture significant market share without going to the bother and expense of extensive clinical trials?

- Consistent Observations in Off-Label Cases
 - Belief by many inside the Company that the drug was actually safe and effective for the off-label use:
 - Why?
 - Other drugs with similar properties have indications based on good research
 - Preliminary studies were promising
 - But class effect must be proven like anything else
 - See, e.g., Vioxx

- Consistent Observations in Off-Label Cases
 - Why are sales force personnel detailing e.g., pediatricians, when there is no approved indication in this population?
 - Proffered explanations just sampling, they write anyway, other products in my bag are for the pediatrician – usually fall apart under minimal scrutiny
 - How could this happen Call Lists traditionally not part of the regulatory/legal review process or auditing activities - Should they be?
 - BMS CIA may reflect current direction of US Attorney's Offices and HHS-OIG on this issue

- Consistent Observations in Off-Label Cases
 - Strategic planning documents/financial projections for the brand reflect specific goals for off-label sales as well as tactics for achievement
 - Again, not reviewed as promotional materials, so can escape review by counsel and be very problematic from a defense perspective
 - Lack of awareness of legal/regulatory/compliance implications of internal presentations, e-mails, projections

- How is risk minimized and patient safety protected to the greatest extent?
 - Critical examination of all data regarding a product as the full clinical picture develops.
 - Ensure that a common understanding of a product's risks, limitations and market potential exists between commercial operations (sales and marketing) and R & D – look at strategic plans and management presentations.
 - Develop review processes that go beyond traditional "compliance" areas such as promotional materials, consultant agreements and content of speaker programs, and also critically assess, e. g.:
 - Development and modification of sales force call lists and Sales Force Incentive Plans
 - Deployment of Consultants i.e., numbers, activities and fair market value of compensation

- Emerging Issues:
 - FDA Amendments Act of 2007 and its New Compliance Obligations
 - Pediatric Adverse Event Reporting for Newly-Approved Drugs;
 - Clinical Trials Databases and Registry Requirements;
 - Increased Surveillance Requirements for Approved Drugs

Clinical Trial Registries

- Previously Companies under no regulatory or legal requirement to publicly disclose all clinical study results and registry requirements limited
- FDA not required to disclose data in its possession, except in the context of labeling changes, Advisory Committee meetings, etc.
- Registries mainly voluntary in the U.S., with a few exceptions (GSK and Forest settlements with New York Attorney General), NIH database of ongoing studies for serious and life-threatening illnesses

FDA Amendments Act of 2007

- Expansion of Clinical Trials Databases and Registry requirements beyond trials for drugs intended to treat serious and life-threatening conditions.
- Required registration of clinical studies in NIH Clinical Trials Registry
 - "Publicly Available and Searchable Information," about trials must be provided, including status of study; anticipated completion date; description of study; contact information
 - Information must be truthful and not misleading and updated at least annually (unless no changes)

FDA Amendments Act of 2007

- Required submission of study results in the "registry and results data bank"
 - "Non-technical" summary of patient demographics and characteristics
 - Primary and secondary outcomes
 - Disclosure of agreements protecting privacy of study subjects
 - Submitted within one year after study is completed (unless certification is made to NIH that there is a pending application with FDA for a new drug or new use)

Emerging Issues in Enforcement

- Clinical Trial Registries Compliance & Risk Issues
 - What are "full disclosures?"
 - How to characterize the efficacy results
 - How are the safety issues described? Which adverse events are significant enough to be mentioned?
 - Can the data be mischaracterized or otherwise criticized?

FDA Amendments Act of 2007

- Post-approval clinical studies may now be required rather than voluntary
 - FDA must be aware of "new safety information," i.e., a signal or new and unexpected safety issue, and that post-marketing surveillance is insufficient to clarify the issue.
 - FDA Request and Timetable submitted by Sponsor
 - Penalties now provided for non-compliance
- Safety Labeling Changes May be Required
 - FDA may require a labeling change if becomes aware of new safety information that it believes should be added to the label
 - Risk Evaluation and Mitigation Strategies (REMS) plan may be required as part of initial approval or subsequently.

- FDA Amendments Act of 2007 Additional Noteworthy Provisions
 - Additional User Fees for DTC television ads
 - Pediatric assessments required for all applications
 - Expedited reporting of all pediatric adverse events for one year following a pediatric-specific labeling change
 - Changes to pediatric exclusivity provisions