

HEALTH LAW, ETHICS, AND HUMAN RIGHTS

Mary Beth Hamel, M.D., M.P.H., *Editor***New FDA Breakthrough-Drug Category —
Implications for Patients**

Jonathan J. Darrow, S.J.D., J.D., M.B.A., Jerry Avorn, M.D., and Aaron S. Kesselheim, M.D., J.D., M.P.H.

U.S. pharmaceutical regulations are based on the principle that patients should not be exposed to new prescription drugs until their efficacy and safety have been shown. Since 1962, the Food and Drug Administration (FDA) and Congress have balanced the efficient review of investigational drugs with the need to withhold judgment until sufficient evidence is available to clarify the benefit–risk relationship. Misjudging these competing interests in either direction causes important problems. On the one hand, the evidentiary hurdles of the FDA are often criticized by pharmaceutical companies and patient advocacy groups for slowing access to promising therapies. On the other hand, truncated premarket review can lead to the approval of drugs that are ineffective, unsafe, or both.

These dangers were once again made clear in October 2013 when approval was briefly suspended for ponatinib, a medication to treat leukemia that had been approved just the year before on an accelerated basis. Emerging data showed that 24% of the patients who had been followed for a median of 1.3 years and 48% of those who had been followed for a median of 2.7 years had serious thromboembolic events, including myocardial infarction and stroke.¹ The drug was allowed back on the market in December 2013 with more limited indications and a restricted distribution system.

The latest development in the FDA approach to ensuring the safety and effectiveness of marketed prescription drugs occurred in July 2012, when Congress created a new category of “breakthrough therapy” in the FDA Safety and Innovation Act (FDASIA). A breakthrough therapy was defined as a new product to treat a serious disease for which preliminary clinical evidence suggested substantial superiority over existing options on one or more clinically significant end points.² Lawmakers intended the designation to speed to market a limited number of prod-

ucts that showed “exceptional results for patients.”³ Lauded by policymakers,⁴ consumer advocates,^{5,6} and the FDA itself,⁷ the breakthrough-drug pathway has been embraced by industry⁸ and has produced early results far exceeding predictions. From October 2012 through September 2013, the FDA received 92 applications for the breakthrough-therapy designation, of which 27 were approved and 41 denied (24 applications were still pending).⁹ Although some of these agents may end up being truly transformative for patient care, the breakthrough-therapy designation also raises the possibility of a surge in new drugs that have been approved on the basis of limited clinical data.

There is ongoing controversy over the FDA standards for the approval of investigational drugs. In this article, we briefly summarize prior or government efforts to expedite the availability of new therapeutics, and we discuss the clinical, ethical, and regulatory implications of the breakthrough-therapy designation.

HISTORY OF EARLY-ACCESS
AND EXPEDITED-APPROVAL PROGRAMS

The Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act (FDCA) of 1938 prohibited the routine therapeutic use of investigational drugs, although in practice physicians easily obtained such drugs outside of clinical trials.¹⁰ A sea change came when the 1962 Kefauver–Harris Amendments to the FDCA required affirmative FDA approval on the basis of trials in humans before new drugs could be marketed. Regulations in 1963 divided these trials into three phases — small, phase 1 safety trials; intermediate-size, phase 2 efficacy studies; and large, controlled, phase 3 studies — forming the basis for a new drug application (NDA).

There was concern that extended study before approval could prevent timely patient access to potentially lifesaving medicines. The FDA first

responded by adopting pathways to allow treatment use before approval. In the 1960s, early-access programs (also called compassionate-use programs) allowed limited patient access to investigational drugs, although these programs had no written rules and were flexibly applied. The demand for experimental cancer drugs was particularly strong, leading the FDA to publish in 1979 its first official early-access policy for such drugs.

Pressure from physicians and patients intensified with the AIDS crisis of the 1980s, a pivotal episode in the evolution of the FDA drug-approval policies. Demonstrations by AIDS activists at FDA headquarters brought widespread attention to the lag times between submission and agency approval of new medications,¹¹ although the perception that the FDA did not rapidly assess drugs intended for patients with human immunodeficiency virus (HIV) infection may have been exaggerated.¹² In 1987, regulations for treatment investigational new drug applications (treatment INDs) formalized the procedures for obtaining early access to investigational drugs outside of clinical trials.¹³ Three years later, the FDA proposed making unapproved drugs for HIV/AIDS available even sooner by means of a parallel-track mechanism¹⁴ for patients with HIV/AIDS who were unable to enroll in clinical trials.

In the 1980s, early-access options were joined by FDA initiatives to hasten drug approval. In 1988, the FDA created a fast-track component (Subpart E) of its rules to “expedite the development, evaluation, and marketing of new therapies”¹⁵ for serious and life-threatening conditions by, for example, eliminating phase 3 trials. The provisions were modeled on the testing and approval of the HIV drug zidovudine, which occurred over a period of only 2 years and included a single, well-designed phase 2 trial. In 1992, the FDA initiated an accelerated-approval pathway (Subpart H) to allow approval on the basis of surrogate end points that were seen as reasonably likely to predict patient benefit.¹⁶ Subpart H shortened the clinical-investigation process by permitting trials to end before the occurrence of hard clinical end points (e.g., hospitalization, myocardial infarction, and death).

The same year that the FDA finalized Subpart H, Congress enacted the Prescription Drug User Fee Act (PDUFA), which authorized the FDA to collect “user fees” from pharmaceutical manufacturers. Although increased Congressional ap-

propriations to the FDA had already reduced NDA review times by the late 1980s,¹⁷ PDUFA allowed the FDA to hire more scientists and further expedite the review of drug applications.¹⁸ PDUFA also set formal deadlines of 6 months for priority applications and 12 months for standard applications (shortened to 10 months in 2002). Within 1 year after the enactment of PDUFA, the FDA had acted on 93% of NDAs within the new deadlines.¹⁹ The user fees were restricted to the approval of products; it was not until 2007 that the FDA had the authority to allocate them to postapproval drug-safety activities.²⁰ Under FDASIA, the FDA review deadlines now begin to run 60 days after NDA submission.²¹

BENEFITS AND RISKS OF EXPANDED ACCESS AND EARLY APPROVAL

The FDA has estimated that more than 100,000 patients have received investigational drugs for serious or life-threatening conditions through the use of treatment INDs.²² For investigational drugs that ultimately prove to be superior to existing options, these early-access programs benefit patients by allowing new therapies to reach them sooner. In addition, expedited development and approval programs have shortened the clinical development period, allowing earlier access for the broader patient population. Subpart E, for example, reduced the average clinical development time from 8.9 to 6.2 years, whereas drugs benefiting from accelerated approval averaged just 4.2 years.²³ NDA review times have also decreased dramatically, from more than 30 months in the 1980s to 14.5 months by 1997²⁴ and to 9.9 months for applications received in 2011.²⁵

The immediate result of PDUFA was a spike in approvals during the mid-1990s as backlogged applications were processed,²⁶ but the number of approvals each year soon returned to historical averages.²⁷ Although the FDA was once considered by some to approve drugs too slowly,²⁸ drug approvals since 2000 have been quicker in the United States than in Canada or Europe. From 2001 through 2010, the FDA approved 64% of novel therapeutic agents earlier than the European Medicines Agency.²⁹

However, early access and shortened development and review times have also been associated with negative public health outcomes. Drugs approved shortly before the PDUFA-imposed deadlines have been found to be more likely to

have postmarketing safety problems — including safety withdrawals and added black-box warnings — than were drugs approved at any other time.^{30,31} Other investigators have reported that drugs receiving faster reviews have more spontaneous reports of drug-related adverse events, although these data are controversial.³²⁻³⁵ Among drugs first approved abroad, those with more foreign-market experience before U.S. approval are less often associated with serious adverse drug reactions.^{35,36}

Such findings are predictable because of the more limited data on which expedited drug approvals are based. Although neither the fast-track nor the accelerated-approval pathways changed the legal standard for approval — which is still effectiveness with acceptable risk — they reduced the quantity of evidence needed to meet this standard and altered the nature of that evidence. For example, cancer drugs approved during the previous decade on the basis of limited clinical trials — nonrandomized, unblinded, single-group, phase 1 and phase 2 trials that used intermediate end points rather than patient survival — had a 72% greater odds of serious adverse events occurring in their pivotal trials than did cancer drugs that were approved with more-rigorous studies.³⁷ A recent study showed that drugs benefiting from expedited approval programs were tested for efficacy in a median of only 104 patients, as compared with 580 patients for nonexpedited review.³⁸ Data collected with the use of early-stage clinical-trial methods are unstable and may be subsequently disproved in larger, more-rigorous trials.

Concerns about potentially inaccurate assessments of the benefit–risk ratios led the FDA, beginning in approximately 1970, to condition some approvals on the conduct of postapproval (phase 4) confirmatory studies. The proportion of new drugs that were subject to these post-approval obligations increased from approximately 30% in the early 1980s to approximately 80% in the early 2000s.³⁹ Unfortunately, the performance of these follow-up studies has often been markedly delayed⁴⁰ or not initiated at all.⁴¹ Gemtuzumab ozogamicin was approved in 2000 for the treatment of a rare type of leukemia on the basis of limited data, but it was withdrawn from the market in 2010 after confirmatory trials initiated in 2004 showed increased mortality and no efficacy.⁴²

Concern over the timely conduct of post-

approval studies led Congress to strengthen the enforcement authority of the FDA in the FDA Amendments Act of 2007. However, as recently as 2011, postmarketing-study commitments for more than 40% of drugs had not yet been started, whereas the number with delays had doubled since 2007 to approximately 13%.^{38,43} Completion times also appear to range widely: a report from the Office of Oncology Drug Products regarding a sample of oncology drugs approved by way of the accelerated-approval pathway showed that it took 0.8 to 12.6 years before postmarketing trials were completed (median, 3.9 years).⁴⁴ Bedaquiline, a medication for the treatment of multidrug-resistant (MDR) tuberculosis, was approved in 2012 on the basis of the surrogate end point of sputum-culture conversion, even though the pivotal studies also showed an incidence of death (generally from tuberculosis) that was five times as high among patients given the drug than among those randomly assigned to receive standard treatment for MDR tuberculosis. The impact on individual patients must be further studied since there is a need for additional treatment options for this highly contagious disease. The confirmatory randomized trial that was mandated for bedaquiline was not required by the FDA to be completed until 2022.⁴⁵

BREAKTHROUGH THERAPY —
RATIONALE AND POTENTIAL OUTCOMES

In approving FDASIA, Congress anticipated that the use of modern evaluation tools earlier in the drug-development cycle could result in “fewer, smaller, or shorter clinical trials.” During Congressional hearings in 2012, advocacy and industry organizations supported the creation of the new breakthrough-therapy designation to abbreviate or combine traditional clinical phases to enhance earlier patient access.^{46,47} Support for the law also came from officials within the FDA Center for Drug Evaluation and Research who, in November 2013, praised the “much larger treatment effect” achieved by some recent “molecularly targeted therapies” that aim to benefit subgroups of patients with “cancer, genetic diseases, and . . . other serious illnesses.”⁴⁷ The article defended the new expedited-development program, suggesting that “when a large effect in a serious disease is observed early in drug development, it seems excessive to conduct a prolonged clinical development program that encompasses

traditional trial phases.⁷⁷ According to this view, the new designation could make possible streamlined clinical development that would lead to more rapid approval.

The breakthrough-therapy designation is the latest addition to the expanded-access and expedited-approval programs of the FDA (Table 1). In recent years, the exceptions have been more common than the rule; among the 39 new drugs approved in 2012, a total of 22 (56%) were approved by means of at least one of the accelerated-approval, fast-track, and priority review programs, and 9 of these (23% of the total) qualified for more than one program.

Regulatory efficiency was identified as a major outcome of the breakthrough-therapy designation,⁸ but the benefits offered in FDASIA are already largely available through existing legislation, regulations, or standard FDA practice. For example, FDASIA commits the FDA to working closely with sponsors of breakthrough therapies.⁷ However, Subpart E (1988) offered “early consultation between FDA and drug sponsors,” emphasized the importance of meeting with the FDA to ensure efficient phase 2 trial design, and specified that senior FDA officials would actively facilitate the conduct and evaluation of clinical trials.⁵⁶ FDASIA notes that breakthrough therapies may also benefit from the assignment of a “cross-disciplinary project lead” to facilitate efficient review, but it is unclear how this will improve on existing coordination of staff efforts.

The breakthrough-therapy designation continued the trend of applying increasingly flexible evidentiary standards to determine the qualification for expedited development and approval programs. Certain drugs have long been approved on the basis of well-established surrogate end points.⁵¹ The accelerated-approval pathway (1992) began to allow approval on the basis of “less than well-established surrogate endpoint[s].”⁵¹ By contrast, one way to qualify for the new breakthrough-therapy designation (2012) is by showing “an effect on a pharmacodynamic biomarker(s) that does not meet criteria for an acceptable surrogate endpoint, but strongly suggests the potential for a clinically meaningful effect on the underlying disease.”⁵⁵ This more flexible standard would apply to a broader range of potential new therapies. The law requires that breakthrough drugs must eventually be approved or rejected under the normal FDA approval standards, but as was seen with

the bedaquiline approval for MDR tuberculosis, such confirmation may not be required for years.⁴⁵

Once the breakthrough-therapy status has been granted on the basis of preliminary evidence, it may be difficult to temper demand (whether early access or postapproval) even if the drug is revealed to be less effective or more harmful than initially believed. Decision theory suggests that when a decision is less reversible, more care should be taken in reaching the initial determination.⁵⁷ This tension emerged most recently around bevacizumab, which was approved for the treatment of metastatic breast cancer on the basis of surrogate end points under the accelerated-approval pathway. When subsequent studies showed no increase in patient survival, withdrawing the indication took nearly a year and generated substantial opposition.⁵⁸ Some insurers still cover off-label use of the drug for this non-evidence-based purpose.

Deferring rigorous study until after a drug is approved can also undermine and delay evaluation of its benefit-risk profile.³⁸ Once a drug is approved, enrolling patients in clinical trials to determine efficacy is more challenging than before approval, because patients have the choice of receiving the drug in the normal course of therapy or enrolling in a trial in which they may be randomly assigned to usual care. This concern is magnified when deferred study is paired with earlier designations that may be interpreted as official endorsements.

CONCLUSIONS

The 27 breakthrough-therapy designations granted by the FDA in the first 9 months of 2013 are unlikely to represent a sudden and dramatic increase in the pace of pharmaceutical innovation, given that an average of 25 new molecular entities were approved annually during the previous decade. Another interpretation of the rapid popularity of the designation is that it has created the appearance of progress while enhancing the visibility of promising early-stage drugs that may be no more likely than before FDASIA to confer large benefits to patients. The breakthrough-therapy designation is also likely to further increase public pressure on the FDA to approve such products. Few would argue about the need for pathways to bring safe and effective new drugs to market quickly, especially for life-

Table 1. Early-Access and Expedited-Approval Programs of the Food and Drug Administration (FDA).*

Program	Year Created	Origin	Limited to Serious or Life-Threatening Conditions	Provisions Addressing Efficacy or Evidence of Efficacy
Early access Group C	1979†	FDA and National Cancer Institute	Yes, cancer	NA‡
Orphan Drug Act, with open protocols§	1983†	Congress	No	Applies to all drugs treating diseases occurring in fewer than 200,000 persons in the United States, regardless of efficacy
Treatment IND	1987†	FDA, later codified by Congress	Yes	In the case of serious disease: requires sufficient evidence of safety and effectiveness, and may be made available for use during phase 3 or during phase 2 in “appropriate circumstances”; in the case of immediately life-threatening disease: requires that the “available scientific evidence, taken as a whole . . . provide a reasonable basis for concluding that the drug” may be effective and may be made available “ordinarily not earlier than Phase 2” ¹³
Parallel track	1992	FDA	Yes, HIV/AIDS	Requires “promising evidence of efficacy based on an assessment of all laboratory and clinical data” as well as “evidence of a lack of satisfactory alternative therapy for defined patient populations” ¹⁴
Expedited approval				
Priority review A, B, and C ⁴⁸	1974 ⁴⁹	FDA	No ⁵⁰	A indicates important therapeutic gain, B modest therapeutic gain, and C little or no therapeutic gain
Priority review AA	1987	FDA	Yes, HIV/AIDS	“All [NDAs] for AIDS and HIV-related conditions will be classified as AA . . . regardless of their therapeutic potential” ⁵⁰
Fast-track review, under Subpart E ¹⁵	1988	FDA, later codified by Congress	Yes	Allows drug to be approved after phase 2; process allows approval on the basis of “well-established surrogate endpoints” ⁵¹
Priority review¶	1992 ^{52,53}	FDA	No ⁵¹	Priority review means that the drug appears to represent therapeutic advance; standard review means that the drug appears to have therapeutic qualities similar to those of already marketed drugs
Accelerated approval, under Subpart H	1992	FDA, later codified by Congress	Yes	Approval on the basis of surrogate end points is reasonably likely to predict clinical benefit; post-marketing studies are required “to verify and describe . . . clinical benefit” ¹⁶
Priority-review voucher	2007	Congress	No	Approval of a tropical disease–treating drug entitles sponsor to transferable voucher to obtain priority review of any new drug
GAIN section of FDASIA	2012	Congress	Yes ⁵⁴	Qualified infectious-disease products are automatically eligible for fast-track designation and priority review
Breakthrough therapy	2012	Congress	Yes	Preliminary clinical evidence indicates that the drug may show substantial improvement over existing therapies; designation on the basis of “an effect on a pharmacodynamic biomarker(s) that does not meet criteria for an acceptable surrogate endpoint” ⁵⁵

* FDASIA denotes Food and Drug Administration Safety and Innovation Act, GAIN Generating Antibiotic Incentives Now, HIV human immunodeficiency virus, IND investigational new drug, NA not applicable, and NDA new drug application.

† Ad hoc FDA procedures made preapproval access available on an informal basis before this date.

‡ Group C drugs were authorized under the treatment IND program, and informally before that.

§ “Open protocols” and “compassionate use INDs” were some of the terms used to describe types of informal “treatment uses” before the codification of the treatment IND in 1987.

¶ This process replaced the A, B, and C system for new drugs.

threatening diseases for which current treatment options are inadequate. Efforts to promote early access, expedited development, and early approval have existed for decades. Unfortunately, these efforts generally have not been followed by equally energetic efforts to develop rigorous confirmatory data that could refine the indications for the drug or even change its approval status.

There has also been little discussion of the implications of approving breakthrough drugs on the basis of limited data for patients considering therapeutic options and for their physicians. Expedited approval has been championed by patient advocacy groups who think that FDA requirements that delay access to new products infringe on personal autonomy. Of course, this view is not universal among patients.⁵⁹ How will patients make informed choices about breakthrough drugs approved with new clinical-trial techniques rather than with traditional randomized trials?

This question is particularly salient for patients with life-threatening illness. Previous research has uncovered important deficiencies in decision making by patients in such precarious situations. One survey showed that, as compared with healthier patients, severely ill patients had less retention of the information that was discussed in the informed-consent process and less-clear understanding of the risks of therapy.⁶⁰ Some have suggested that insurers will act as an effective counterweight in the post-approval marketplace by refusing to cover breakthrough products with clinical activity that is either unconfirmed or does not justify the high cost.⁶¹ In Europe, centralized payers serve as a barrier to the widespread use of available but marginally useful clinical therapies.^{62,63} However, in the United States, the greater fragmentation of the insurance market and the greater sense of entitlement to all available treatments make it unlikely that this counterbalance will be as effective.

Even before the first breakthrough drug has been approved, lawmakers have started discussing the next pathway aimed at further reducing evidentiary requirements to speed drugs to market.⁶⁴ On December 12, 2013, a bill was introduced in Congress that would allow the approval of new antibiotic and antifungal medicines on the basis of alternative end points and data sets of limited size so long as the labeling prominently stated that the drugs were indicated for

use in a limited and specific population of patients.⁶⁵ The bill did not restrict the ability to prescribe such drugs off-label. In the next few years, evidence will accumulate to indicate how well the new breakthrough-therapy designation improves the options of patients with serious and intractable diseases and to what extent it facilitates the market entry of treatments that promise more than they can deliver.

Disclosure forms provided by the authors are available with the full text of this article at NEJM.org.

From the Division of Pharmacoepidemiology and Pharmacoeconomics, Department of Medicine, Brigham and Women's Hospital and Harvard Medical School, Boston (J.J.D., J.A., A.S.K.).

This article was updated on July 3, 2014, at NEJM.org.

1. Grady D. Serious danger of blood clots halts sales of leukemia drug. *New York Times*. October 31, 2013;B4.
2. Pub. L. No. 112-144, § 902, 126 Stat. 993 (2012).
3. McCrimmon KK. 'Breakthrough' drugs speed path to cures and the NBA. *Health Policy Solutions*. 2013 (<http://www.healthpolicysolutions.org/2013/05/15/breakthrough-drugs-speed-path-to-cures-and-the-nba>).
4. Bennet M. Food and Drug Safety and Innovation Act. 158 Cong. Rec. S3400, S3418 (May 22, 2012).
5. Burr R. Food and Drug Safety and Innovation Act. 158 Cong. Rec. S4610, S4618 (June 26, 2012).
6. McClellan M, Sigal E. Getting drugs to market place faster. *The Hill*. April 20, 2012 (<http://thehill.com/blogs/congress-blog/healthcare/222771-getting-drugs-to-market-place-faster>).
7. Sherman RE, Li J, Shapley S, Robb M, Woodcock J. Expediting drug development — the FDA's new "breakthrough therapy" designation. *N Engl J Med* 2013;369:1877-80.
8. Fischer S. BIO hails house passage of reconciled user fee package (press release). Washington, DC: Biotechnology Industry Organization, June 21, 2012.
9. Food and Drug Administration. Frequently asked questions: breakthrough therapies — CDER BT totals as of 8/23/13. Silver Spring, MD: FDA (<http://www.fda.gov/RegulatoryInformation/Legislation/FederalFoodDrugandCosmeticActFDCAct/SignificantAmendmentstotheFDCAct/FDASIA/ucm341027.htm>).
10. Expanding access to investigational therapies for HIV infection and AIDS. Washington, DC: Institute of Medicine, 1991.
11. Carpenter D. Reputation and power: organizational image and pharmaceutical regulation at the FDA. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 2010.
12. Kessler DA. Remarks by the Commissioner of Food and Drugs. *Food Drug Law J* 1996;51:207-15.
13. Investigational new drug, antibiotic, and biological drug product regulations: treatment use and sale. *Fed Regist* 1987;52:19476.
14. Expanded availability of investigational new drugs through a parallel track mechanism for people with AIDS and HIV-related disease. *Fed Regist* 1990;55:20857.
15. Investigational new drug, antibiotic, and biological drug product regulations: procedures for drugs intended to treat life-threatening and severely debilitating illnesses. *Fed Regist* 1988; 53:41516.
16. New drug, antibiotic, and biological drug product regulations: accelerated approval. *Fed Regist* 1992;57:58958.
17. Carpenter D, Chernew M, Smith DG, Fendrick AM. Approval times for new drugs: does the source of funding for FDA staff matter? *Health Aff (Millwood)* 2003;Suppl Web Exclusives: W3-618–W3-624.
18. Zelenay JL Jr. The Prescription Drug User Fee Act: is a faster Food and Drug Administration always a better Food and Drug Administration? *Food Drug Law J* 2005;60:261-338.

19. Shulman SR, Kaitin KI. The Prescription Drug User Fee Act of 1992: a 5-year experiment for industry and the FDA. *Pharmacoeconomics* 1996;9:121-33.
20. Food and Drug Administration Amendments Act of 2007, Pub. L. No. 110-85, § 101(c), 121 Stat. 863 (2007).
21. Letter from the Secretary of Health and Human Services Re: Medical Device User Fee Program. 158 Cong. Rec. S8272 (December 20, 2012).
22. Expanded access to investigational drugs for treatment use. *Fed Regist* 2006;71:75148.
23. Shulman SR, Brown JS. The Food and Drug Administration's early access and fast-track approval initiatives: how have they worked? *Food Drug Law J* 1995;50:503-31.
24. Kaitin KI. The prescription Drug User Fee Act of 1992 and the new drug development process. *Am J Ther* 1997;4:167-72.
25. Food and Drug Administration. FY 2012 Innovative drug approvals. Silver Spring, MD: FDA, December 2012 (<http://www.fda.gov/downloads/aboutfda/reportsmanualsforms/reports/ucm330859.pdf>).
26. Munos B. Lessons from 60 years of pharmaceutical innovation. *Nat Rev Drug Discov* 2009;8:959-68.
27. Food and Drug Administration. Summary of NDA approvals and receipts, 1938 to the present. Silver Spring, MD: FDA, January 18, 2013 (<http://www.fda.gov/AboutFDA/WhatWeDo/History/ProductRegulation/SummaryofNDAAApprovalsReceipts1938tothepresent/default.htm>).
28. Schultz WB. Bolstering the FDA's drug-safety authority. *N Engl J Med* 2007;357:2217-9.
29. Downing NS, Aminawung JA, Shah ND, Braunstein JB, Krumholz HM, Ross JS. Regulatory review of novel therapeutics — comparison of three regulatory agencies. *N Engl J Med* 2012;366:2284-93.
30. Carpenter D, Zucker EJ, Avorn J. Drug-review deadlines and safety problems. *N Engl J Med* 2008;358:1354-61.
31. Carpenter D, Chattopadhyay J, Moffitt S, Nall C. The complications of controlling agency time discretion: FDA review deadlines and postmarket drug safety. *Am J Pol Sci* 2012;56:98-114.
32. Lexchin J. New drugs and safety: what happened to new active substances approved in Canada between 1995 and 2010? *Arch Intern Med* 2012;172:1680-1.
33. Olson MK. The risk we bear: the effects of review speed and industry user fees on new drug safety. *J Health Econ* 2008;27:175-200.
34. Reaves N. Drug approvals and drug safety: preliminary results. Presented at the Annual Conference of the Pennsylvania Economic Association, West Chester, PA, June 4–6, 2009.
35. Grabowski H, Wang YR. Do faster Food and Drug Administration drug reviews adversely affect patient safety? An analysis of the 1992 Prescription Drug User Fee Act. *J Law Econ* 2008;51:377-406.
36. Olson MK. Eliminating the U.S. drug lag: implications for drug safety. *J Risk Uncertain* 2013;47:1-30.
37. Kesselheim AS, Myers JA, Avorn J. Characteristics of clinical trials to support approval of orphan vs nonorphan drugs for cancer. *JAMA* 2011;305:2320-6.
38. Moore TJ, Furberg CD. Development times, clinical testing, post-market follow-up, and safety risks for the new drugs approved by the US Food and Drug Administration: the class of 2008. *JAMA Intern Med* 2014;174:90-5.
39. Steenburg C. The Food and Drug Administration's use of postmarketing (phase IV) study requirements: exception to the rule? *Food Drug Law J* 2006;61:295-383.
40. Avorn J. Paying for drug approvals — who's using whom? *N Engl J Med* 2007;356:1697-700.
41. Harris G. F.D.A. backtracks and returns drug to market. *New York Times*. September 3, 2010:A11.
42. Food and Drug Administration. Mylotarg (gemtuzumab ozogamicin): market withdrawal. Silver Spring, MD: FDA, June 21, 2010 (<http://www.fda.gov/Safety/MedWatch/SafetyInformation/SafetyAlertsforHumanMedicalProducts/ucm216458.htm>).
43. Fain K, Daubresse M, Alexander GC. The Food and Drug Administration Amendments Act and postmarketing commitments. *JAMA* 2013;310:202-4.
44. Johnson JR, Ning YM, Farrell A, Justice R, Keegan P, Pazdur R. Accelerated approval of oncology products: the Food and Drug Administration experience. *J Natl Cancer Inst* 2011;103:636-44.
45. Avorn J. Approval of a tuberculosis drug based on a paradoxical surrogate measure. *JAMA* 2013;309:1349-50.
46. Allen J. Hearing before the Subcommittee on Health of the Committee on Energy and Commerce, House of Representatives, 112th Cong., 2d. Sess 2012:65.
47. Maraganore J. Hearing before the Subcommittee on Health of the Committee on Energy and Commerce, House of Representatives, 112th Cong., 2d. Sess 2012:52-3.
48. Crawford SY. Changes in FDA drug classification and priority review policy. *Am J Hosp Pharm* 1992;49:2383, 2386.
49. Providing a breakthrough for drugs with promise. *FDA Consum* 1979;July–August:25-6.
50. Drug classification and priority review policy: FDA Staff Manual Guide 4820.3. Silver Spring, MD: Center for Drug Evaluation and Research, January 22, 1992.
51. Food and Drug Administration. Guidance for industry: fast-track drug development programs: designation, development and application review. January 2006 (<http://www.fda.gov/downloads/Drugs/Guidances/ucm079736.pdf>).
52. *Idem*. Guidance for industry: fast track drug development programs: designation, development, and application review. July 2004 (<http://www.fda.gov/downloads/Drugs/GuidanceComplianceRegulatoryInformation/Guidances/ucm077104.pdf>).
53. Prescription Drug User Fee Act of 1992. 138 Cong. Rec. H9095 (1992).
54. Pub. L. No. 112-144, Sec. 801-03, 126 Stat. 993 (2012).
55. Food and Drug Administration. Fast track, breakthrough therapy, accelerated approval and priority review. June 26, 2013 (<http://www.fda.gov/ForConsumers/ByAudience/ForPatientAdvocates/SpeedingAccessImportantNewTherapies/ucm128291.htm>).
56. Investigational new drug, antibiotic, and biological drug product regulations: procedures for drugs intended to treat life-threatening and severely debilitating illnesses. *Fed Regist* 1988;53:41517.
57. Etzioni A. The active society: a theory of societal and political processes. London: Collier–Macmillan, 1968.
58. Department of Health and Human Services, Food and Drug Administration. Proposal to withdraw approval for the breast cancer indication for Avastin (bevacizumab): decision of the Commissioner. November 18, 2011 (<http://www.fda.gov/downloads/NewsEvents/Newsroom/UCM280546.pdf>).
59. Mayer M. Listen to all the voices: an advocate's perspective on early access to investigational therapies. *Clin Trials* 2006;3:149-53.
60. Schaeffer MH, Krantz DS, Wichman A, Masur H, Reed E, Vinicky JK. The impact of disease severity on the informed consent process in clinical research. *Am J Med* 1996;100:261-8.
61. Bompey N. Insurers' 'wait and see' stance worries makers of breakthrough drugs. *Friends of Cancer Research*. September 13, 2013 (<http://www.focr.org/9-13-2013-inside-health-policy-insurers-wait-and-see-stance-worries-makers-breakthrough-drugs>).
62. Hirschler B. UK says Novartis, Bristol cancer drugs too costly. *Reuters*. February 8, 2010 (<http://www.reuters.com/article/2010/02/09/britain-cancer-idUSLDE61718V20100209>).
63. Basu S, Hassenplug JC. Patient access to medical devices — a comparison of U.S. and European review processes. *N Engl J Med* 2012;367:485-8.
64. Creating an alternative approval pathway for certain drugs intended to address unmet medical need. *Fed Regist* 2013;78:3005-8.
65. Antibiotic Development to Advance Patient Treatment Act of 2013, H.R. 3742, 113th Cong., 1st Sess. (Dec. 2013). DOI: 10.1056/NEJMh1311493

Copyright © 2014 Massachusetts Medical Society.

New FDA Breakthrough-Drug Category — Implications for Patients

TO THE EDITOR: Darrow et al. (March 27 issue)¹ present an incomplete and misleading review of the Food and Drug Administration (FDA) programs that are available to expedite drug development, review, and approval. As the authors note, drug regulation involves balancing the potential benefits of access to a therapy against the potential risks associated with the drugs and the prognoses of patients with the diseases that the therapies are intended to treat, on the basis of evidence of safety and effectiveness. Any evaluation of drug regulation should present a complete picture of the available evidence regarding the effect of reforms, including their impact on facilitating the generation and effective use of evidence.

The FDA has four distinct mechanisms to speed the development and availability of drugs for treating serious or life-threatening conditions: priority review, accelerated approval, fast-track review, and most recently, breakthrough therapy.² Although these approaches all aim to advance the availability of safe and effective

products, they use different selection criteria and target different parts of the drug-development process.

Darrow et al. claim that the FDA applies expedited-approval programs too liberally, noting that 56% of drugs approved in 2012 used expedited-approval pathways. However, the authors offer no analysis of these drugs and do not acknowledge that almost half the new drugs that were approved in 2012 were for orphan diseases or cancers, many of which had no effective treatment option.

Most drugs that have received accelerated approval have completed rigorous postmarketing studies, been converted to full approval, and often become standard of care. Furthermore, the FDA has taken notable steps, including its Sentinel Initiative, to enhance the availability of postmarketing safety evidence that is very difficult to obtain in the premarket setting.³

Nothing in law or FDA guidance indicates that the breakthrough-therapy designation lowers the standards for approval, nor do the au-

thors provide evidence to support this claim. The breakthrough-therapy designation was created to facilitate a collaborative “all hands on deck” approach between the FDA and the drug sponsor on the basis of preliminary clinical evidence of substantial improvement over existing therapies for a serious or life-threatening disease.⁴ This approach does not confer a less rigorous path to approval. The majority of the drugs receiving the designation are still undergoing clinical trials, and only four have received FDA approval. All four are clear advances in the treatment of life-threatening diseases that previously lacked effective therapies. FDA programs have evolved over recent years to support the development and review of products that have had a lasting effect on disease treatment in the United States, positively affecting thousands of lives.

Mark McClellan, M.D., Ph.D.

Brookings Institution
Washington, DC

Ellen Sigal, Ph.D.

Friends of Cancer Research
Washington, DC
esigal@focr.org

Dr. McClellan reports receiving payment to serve on the board of directors of Johnson & Johnson. No other potential conflict of interest relevant to this letter was reported.

1. Darrow JJ, Avorn J, Kesselheim AS. New FDA breakthrough-drug category — implications for patients. *N Engl J Med* 2014; 370:1252-8.
2. Food and Drug Administration. Guidance for industry: expedited programs for serious conditions — drugs and biologics. July 2013 (<http://www.fda.gov/downloads/Drugs/GuidanceComplianceRegulatoryInformation/Guidances/UCM358301.pdf>).
3. Robb MA, Racoosin JA, Sherman RE, et al. The US Food and Drug Administration's Sentinel Initiative: expanding the horizons of medical product safety. *Pharmacoepidemiol Drug Saf* 2012; 21:Suppl 1:9-11.
4. Sherman RE, Li J, Shapley S, Robb M, Woodcock J. Expedited drug development — the FDA's new “breakthrough therapy” designation. *N Engl J Med* 2013;369:1877-80.

DOI: 10.1056/NEJMc1405337

TO THE EDITOR: The Infectious Diseases Society of America (IDSA) is concerned that the article by Darrow et al. misrepresents new legislation that would allow the FDA to approve antibiotic agents on the basis of small clinical trials in limited populations — specifically, in patients with serious or life-threatening infections and no other treatment options. New antibiotics that are ap-

proved through this pathway must be shown to be safe and effective and would carry a special label telling clinicians to use them with extreme care and only for patients with unmet needs. The bill also directs the FDA to review marketing materials in advance and directs the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention to monitor the use of these drugs.

As an infectious diseases physician, I share the authors' concern about approving potentially risky drugs. But that concern must be balanced with the reality that patients are dying because we lack effective antibiotics to treat the infecting organisms. For years, the IDSA has been fearful of a return to a preantibiotic era. Sadly, for more and more patients, that fear is today's reality because the antibiotic pipeline is nearly dry.

Barbara E. Murray, M.D.

University of Texas Medical School
Houston, TX
bem.asst@uth.tmc.edu

Dr. Murray reports serving as the president of the Infectious Diseases Society of America; receiving consulting fees from Rib-X Pharmaceuticals, Durata Therapeutics, the Medicines Company, Achaogen, GlaxoSmithKline, Theravance, and the Innovative Medicines Initiative Joint Undertaking (European Union grants review); receiving lecture fees from Pfizer; and receiving research funding from Johnson & Johnson, Astellas Pharma, Cubist Pharmaceuticals, Forest Pharmaceuticals, and Theravance. No other potential conflict of interest relevant to this letter was reported.

DOI: 10.1056/NEJMc1405337

TO THE EDITOR: Darrow et al. imply that the ability of severely ill patients to make critical decisions about their therapy is impaired by their dire situations. The Leukemia and Lymphoma Society (LLS) believes that patients, in concert with their physicians, are in the best position to determine what is right for them and how much risk they are willing to take. Such treatment decisions are increasingly personalized, thus making it difficult for broad populations to be treated similarly. Therefore, the LLS is fully supportive of early-access programs, including compassionate-use programs, for patients who are out of other options. Moreover, our patients have benefited from expedited-approval pathways at the FDA, because such approaches accelerate access. We applaud the FDA for approving two breakthrough-therapy medications for hematologic cancers (ibrutinib [Imbruvica, Pharmacyclics and Janssen Biotech]

and obinutuzumab [Gazyva, Genentech]) that are offering promise for patients with limited alternatives. We do agree that regulations requiring pharmaceutical and biotechnology companies to follow through on postmarketing studies to confirm data in a timely fashion should be strictly enforced and that the FDA should continue to ensure compliance with these regulations.

Mark Velleca, M.D., Ph.D.

Leukemia and Lymphoma Society
Washington, DC
mark.velleca@lls.org

No potential conflict of interest relevant to this letter was reported.

DOI: 10.1056/NEJMc1405337

TO THE EDITOR: The article by Darrow et al. summarizes prior government efforts to expedite the availability of new therapeutics and discusses the implications of the breakthrough-therapy designation. It is worth clarifying that gemtuzumab ozogamicin was not approved for the treatment of pediatric leukemia.

Three trials evaluated the efficacy and safety of the single agent gemtuzumab ozogamicin. The population for the initial report included 142 patients with a median age of 61 years who had a first relapse of acute myeloid leukemia (AML).¹ A total of 30% of the patients had remission. The FDA granted approval for gemtuzumab ozogamicin in the treatment of patients with a first relapse of CD33-positive AML who were 60 years of age or older and who were not considered candidates for cytotoxic chemotherapy.^{2,3}

However, the required postapproval study, combining gemtuzumab ozogamicin with daunorubicin and cytarabine in adults under the age of 61 years with new-onset AML, did not confirm clinical benefit.⁴ This confirmatory study was performed in a clinical setting that differed from the setting of the original studies.² The sponsor voluntarily withdrew the new drug application in 2010.

Alejandro D. Ricart, M.D.

Instituto Oncológico Henry Moore
Buenos Aires, Argentina
aricart@sbcglobal.net

Dr. Ricart reports owning stock in Pfizer. No other potential conflict of interest relevant to this letter was reported.

1. Sievers EL, Larson RA, Stadtmauer EA, et al. Efficacy and safety of gemtuzumab ozogamicin in patients with CD33-positive acute myeloid leukemia in first relapse. *J Clin Oncol* 2001; 19:3244-54.
2. Ricart AD. Antibody-drug conjugates of calicheamicin derivative: gemtuzumab ozogamicin and inotuzumab ozogamicin. *Clin Cancer Res* 2011;17:6417-27.
3. Bross PF, Beitz J, Chen G, et al. Approval summary: gemtuzumab ozogamicin in relapsed acute myeloid leukemia. *Clin Cancer Res* 2001;7:1490-6. [Erratum, *Clin Cancer Res* 2002;8:300.]
4. Petersdorf SH, Kopecky KJ, Slovak M, et al. A phase 3 study of gemtuzumab ozogamicin during induction and postconsolidation therapy in younger patients with acute myeloid leukemia. *Blood* 2013;121:4854-60.

DOI: 10.1056/NEJMc1405337

THE AUTHORS REPLY: McClellan and Sigal overlook the fact that the FDA itself acknowledges that its innovations expediting drug approval lower the required evidentiary threshold. The agency describes the fast-track designation as a result of patients' willingness to accept "greater risks" from products treating life-threatening illnesses¹ and has noted that accelerated approval may expose patients to "drug[s] that will ultimately not be shown to provide an actual clinical benefit."²

The new breakthrough-therapy designation may not lower evidentiary standards in the same manner as other expedited-approval programs, but it can do so indirectly by generating premature enthusiasm that increases pressure to approve and prescribe a drug. This approach can lead to uncontrolled or truncated trial designs that are less robust than standard trials, and it can normalize the regulatory use of biomarkers that are less likely to predict clinical outcome.² These expedited-approval programs have indeed altered approval standards: although the legal standards of "safe" and "effective" remain, the evidentiary standards for meeting those criteria have been loosened. Although the FDA Sentinel Initiative can provide some postmarketing information, the agency is still learning how to use this tool,³ and postmarketing surveillance should not replace adequate premarket assessment.

Although Murray's warning of a return to a preantibiotic era is a call to action, so too is the possibility of regressing to the pre-1962 era during which ineffective drugs often received FDA approval. This concern is particularly salient for

new antibiotics, which are usually approved on the basis of trials showing noninferiority (rather than superiority) to comparator agents. These agents are also withdrawn from the market more commonly than all other drug categories.⁴ Early access can benefit patients, as Velleca asserts, but only if the drug is in fact effective — the very question that only rigorous evidence development can answer. His contention that patients and physicians “are in the best position to determine . . . how much risk they are willing to take” may be true but minimizes the crucial role of governmental benefit–risk assessment of medications. Pressing treatment needs should be met with intensified development efforts, not new designations.

Ricart clarifies the original indication of gemtuzumab ozogamicin, which is now reflected in the online version of our article.

Jonathan J. Darrow, S.J.D., J.D.

Jerry Avorn, M.D.

Aaron S. Kesselheim, M.D., J.D.

Brigham and Women's Hospital
Boston, MA
akesselheim@partners.org

Since publication of their article, the authors report no further potential conflict of interest.

1. Investigational new drug, antibiotics, and biological drug product regulations: procedures for drugs intended to treat life-threatening and severely debilitating illnesses. *Fed Regist* 1988; 53:41516-24.

2. Food and Drug Administration. Guidance for industry: expedited programs for serious conditions — drugs and biologics. July 2013 (<http://www.fda.gov/downloads/Drugs/GuidanceComplianceRegulatoryInformation/Guidances/UCM358301.pdf>).

3. Avorn J. The promise of pharmacoepidemiology in helping clinicians assess drug risk. *Circulation* 2013;128:745-8.

4. Outterson K, Powers JH, Seoane-Vazquez E, Rodriguez-Monguio R, Kesselheim AS. Approval and withdrawal of new antibiotics and other anti-infectives in the U.S., 1980-2009. *J Law Med Ethics* 2013;41:688-96.

DOI: 10.1056/NEJMc1405337