



**ICH Topic S6 (R1)  
Preclinical Safety Evaluation of Biotechnology-Derived Pharmaceuticals**

**Step 3**

**NOTE FOR GUIDANCE ON  
PRECLINICAL SAFETY EVALUATION OF BIOTECHNOLOGY-DERIVED  
PHARMACEUTICALS  
(CHMP/ICH/302/95)**

TRANSMISSION TO CHMP	November 1996
TRANSMISSION TO INTERESTED PARTIES	November 1996
COMMENTS REQUESTED BEFORE	May 1997
FINAL APPROVAL BY CHMP	September 1997
DATE FOR COMING INTO OPERATION	March 1998
INCORPORATION OF ADDENUM	October 2009
TRANSMISSION TO CHMP	November 2009
TRANSMISSION TO INTERESTED PARTIES	November 2009
DEADLINE FOR COMMENTS	February 2010

Please forward your comments on the addendum to the following email address:  
[ich@emea.europa.eu](mailto:ich@emea.europa.eu)

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

<b>1.</b>	<b>INTRODUCTION .....</b>	<b>4</b>
1.1	Background.....	4
1.2	Objectives .....	4
1.3	Scope.....	4
<b>2.</b>	<b>SPECIFICATION OF THE TEST MATERIAL .....</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>3.</b>	<b>PRECLINICAL SAFETY TESTING .....</b>	<b>5</b>
3.1	General principles .....	5
3.2	Biological activity/ pharmacodynamics .....	5
3.3	Animal species/model selection .....	6
3.4	Number/ gender of animals .....	7
3.5	Administration/dose selection.....	7
3.6	Immunogenicity .....	7
<b>4.</b>	<b>SPECIFIC CONSIDERATIONS.....</b>	<b>8</b>
4.1	Safety pharmacology .....	8
4.2	Exposure assessment .....	8
4.3	Single dose toxicity studies .....	9
4.4	Repeated dose toxicity studies .....	9
4.5	Immunotoxicity studies .....	9
4.6	Reproductive performance and developmental toxicity studies.....	10
4.7	Genotoxicity studies .....	10
4.8	Carcinogenicity studies.....	10
4.9	Local tolerance studies .....	11
<b>ADDENDUM TO ICH S6: PRECLINICAL SAFETY EVALUATION OF BIOTECHNOLOGY-DERIVED PHARMACEUTICALS S6 (R1) .....</b>		<b>12</b>
<b>1.</b>	<b>INTRODUCTION .....</b>	<b>13</b>
1.1	Purpose of the Addendum .....	13
1.2	Background.....	13
1.3	Scope of the Guideline .....	13
<b>2.</b>	<b>SPECIES SELECTION .....</b>	<b>13</b>
2.1	General Principles .....	13
2.2	Tissue Cross-Reactivity: .....	14
2.3	One or Two Species .....	14
2.4	Use of Homologous Proteins, Transgenic Models, KOs and Disease Models: .....	14
<b>3.</b>	<b>STUDY DESIGN .....</b>	<b>15</b>

3.1	Dose Selection and application of PK/PD Principles .....	15
3.2	Duration of Studies .....	15
3.3	Recovery.....	15
3.4	Exploratory Clinical Trials.....	15
<b>4.</b>	<b>IMMUNOGENICITY.....</b>	<b>15</b>
<b>5.</b>	<b>REPRODUCTIVE AND DEVELOPMENTAL TOXICITY .....</b>	<b>16</b>
5.1	General Comments.....	16
5.2	Fertility.....	16
5.3	Embryo-fetal and Pre/Post-Natal Development .....	17
5.4	Timing of studies .....	17
<b>6.</b>	<b>CARCINOGENICITY.....</b>	<b>18</b>
<b>7.</b>	<b>ENDNOTES .....</b>	<b>19</b>
<b>8.</b>	<b>REFERENCES.....</b>	<b>20</b>

## **1. INTRODUCTION**

### **1.1 Background**

Biotechnology-derived pharmaceuticals (biopharmaceuticals) were initially developed in the early 1980s. The first marketing authorisations were granted later in the decade. Several guidelines and points-to-consider documents have been issued by various regulatory agencies regarding safety assessment of these products. Review of such documents, which are available from regulatory authorities, may provide useful background in developing new biopharmaceuticals.

Considerable experience has now been gathered with submission of applications for biopharmaceuticals. Critical review of this experience has been the basis for development of this guidance that is intended to provide general principles for designing scientifically acceptable preclinical safety evaluation programs.

### **1.2 Objectives**

Regulatory standards for biotechnology-derived pharmaceuticals have generally been comparable among the European Union, Japan and United States. All regions have adopted a flexible, case-by-case, science-based approach to preclinical safety evaluation needed to support clinical development and marketing authorisation. In this rapidly evolving scientific area, there is a need for common understanding and continuing dialogue among the regions.

The primary goals of preclinical safety evaluation are: 1) to identify an initial safe dose and subsequent dose escalation schemes in humans; 2) to identify potential target organs for toxicity and for the study of whether such toxicity is reversible; and 3) to identify safety parameters for clinical monitoring. Adherence to the principles presented in this document is intended to improve the quality and consistency of the preclinical safety data supporting the development of biopharmaceuticals.

### **1.3 Scope**

This guidance is intended primarily to recommend a basic framework for the preclinical safety evaluation of biotechnology-derived pharmaceuticals. It applies to products derived from characterised cells through the use of a variety of expression systems including bacteria, yeast, insect, plant, and mammalian cells. The intended indications may include *in vivo* diagnostic, therapeutic, or prophylactic uses. The active substances include proteins and peptides, their derivatives and products of which they are components; they could be derived from cell cultures or produced using recombinant DNA technology including production by transgenic plants and animals. Examples include but are not limited to: cytokines, plasminogen activators, recombinant plasma factors, growth factors, fusion proteins, enzymes, receptors, hormones, and monoclonal antibodies.

The principles outlined in this guidance may also be applicable to recombinant DNA protein vaccines, chemically synthesised peptides, plasma derived products, endogenous proteins extracted from human tissue, and oligonucleotide drugs.

This document does not cover antibiotics, allergenic extracts, heparin, vitamins, cellular blood components, conventional bacterial or viral vaccines, DNA vaccines, or cellular and gene therapies.

## **2. SPECIFICATION OF THE TEST MATERIAL**

Safety concerns may arise from the presence of impurities or contaminants. It is preferable to rely on purification processes to remove impurities and contaminants rather than to establish a preclinical testing program for their qualification. In all cases, the product should be sufficiently characterised to allow an appropriate design of preclinical safety studies.

There are potential risks associated with host cell contaminants derived from bacteria, yeast, insect, plants, and mammalian cells. The presence of cellular host contaminants can result in allergic reactions and other immunopathological effects. The adverse effects associated with nucleic acid contaminants are theoretical but include potential integration into the host genome. For products derived from insect, plant and mammalian cells, or transgenic plants and animals there may be an additional risk of viral infections.

In general, the product that is used in the definitive pharmacology and toxicology studies should be comparable to the product proposed for the initial clinical studies. However, it is appreciated that during the course of development programs, changes normally occur in the manufacturing process in order to improve product quality and yields. The potential impact of such changes for extrapolation of the animal findings to humans should be considered.

The comparability of the test material during a development program should be demonstrated when a new or modified manufacturing process or other significant changes in the product or formulation are made in an ongoing development program. Comparability can be evaluated on the basis of biochemical and biological characterisation (i.e., identity, purity, stability, and potency). In some cases additional studies may be needed (i.e., pharmacokinetics, pharmacodynamics and/or safety). The scientific rationale for the approach taken should be provided.

### **3. PRECLINICAL SAFETY TESTING**

#### **3.1 General principles**

The objectives of the preclinical safety studies are to define pharmacological and toxicological effects not only prior to initiation of human studies but throughout clinical development. Both *in vitro* and *in vivo* studies can contribute to this characterisation. Biopharmaceuticals that are structurally and pharmacologically comparable to a product for which there is wide experience in clinical practice may need less extensive toxicity testing.

Preclinical safety testing should consider: 1) selection of the relevant animal species; 2) age; 3) physiological state; 4) the manner of delivery, including dose, route of administration, and treatment regimen; and 5) stability of the test material under the conditions of use.

Toxicity studies are expected to be performed in compliance with Good Laboratory Practice (GLP); however, it is recognised that some studies employing specialised test systems which are often needed for biopharmaceuticals, may not be able to comply fully with GLP. Areas of non-compliance should be identified and their significance evaluated relative to the overall safety assessment. In some cases, lack of full GLP compliance does not necessarily mean that the data from these studies cannot be used to support clinical trials and marketing authorisations.

Conventional approaches to toxicity testing of pharmaceuticals may not be appropriate for biopharmaceuticals due to the unique and diverse structural and biological properties of the latter that may include species specificity, immunogenicity, and unpredicted pleiotropic activities.

#### **3.2 Biological activity/ pharmacodynamics**

Biological activity may be evaluated using *in vitro* assays to determine which effects of the product may be related to clinical activity. The use of cell lines and/or primary cell cultures can be useful to examine the direct effects on cellular phenotype and proliferation. Due to the species specificity of many biotechnology-derived pharmaceuticals, it is important to select relevant animal species for toxicity testing. *In vitro* cell lines derived from mammalian cells can be used to predict specific aspects of *in vivo* activity and to assess quantitatively the relative sensitivity of various species (including human) to the biopharmaceutical. Such studies may be designed to determine, for example, receptor occupancy, receptor affinity,

and/or pharmacological effects, and to assist in the selection of an appropriate animal species for further *in vivo* pharmacology and toxicology studies. The combined results from *in vitro* and *in vivo* studies assist in the extrapolation of the findings to humans. *In vivo* studies to assess pharmacological activity, including defining mechanism(s) of action, are often used to support the rationale of the proposed use of the product in clinical studies.

For monoclonal antibodies, the immunological properties of the antibody should be described in detail, including its antigenic specificity, complement binding, and any unintentional reactivity and/or cytotoxicity towards human tissues distinct from the intended target. Such cross-reactivity studies should be carried out by appropriate immunohistochemical procedures using a range of human tissues.

### **3.3 Animal species/model selection**

The biological activity together with species and/or tissue specificity of many biotechnology-derived pharmaceuticals often preclude standard toxicity testing designs in commonly used species (e.g., rats and dogs). Safety evaluation programs should include the use of relevant species. A relevant species is one in which the test material is pharmacologically active due to the expression of the receptor or an epitope (in the case of monoclonal antibodies). A variety of techniques (e.g., immunochemical or functional tests) can be used to identify a relevant species. Knowledge of receptor/epitope distribution can provide greater understanding of potential *in vivo* toxicity.

Relevant animal species for testing of monoclonal antibodies are those that express the desired epitope and demonstrate a similar tissue cross-reactivity profile as for human tissues. This would optimise the ability to evaluate toxicity arising from the binding to the epitope and any unintentional tissue cross-reactivity. An animal species which does not express the desired epitope may still be of some relevance for assessing toxicity if comparable unintentional tissue cross-reactivity to humans is demonstrated.

Safety evaluation programs should normally include two relevant species. However, in certain justified cases one relevant species may suffice (e.g., when only one relevant species can be identified or where the biological activity of the biopharmaceutical is well understood). In addition even where two species may be necessary to characterise toxicity in short term studies, it may be possible to justify the use of only one species for subsequent long term toxicity studies (e.g., if the toxicity profile in the two species is comparable in the short term).

Toxicity studies in non-relevant species may be misleading and are discouraged. When no relevant species exists, the use of relevant transgenic animals expressing the human receptor or the use of homologous proteins should be considered. The information gained from use of a transgenic animal model expressing the human receptor is optimised when the interaction of the product and the humanised receptor has similar physiological consequences to those expected in humans. While useful information may also be gained from the use of homologous proteins, it should be noted that the production process, range of impurities/contaminants, pharmacokinetics, and exact pharmacological mechanism(s) may differ between the homologous form and the product intended for clinical use. Where it is not possible to use transgenic animal models or homologous proteins, it may still be prudent to assess some aspects of potential toxicity in a limited toxicity evaluation in a single species, e.g., a repeated dose toxicity study of  $\leq 14$  days duration that includes an evaluation of important functional endpoints (e.g., cardiovascular and respiratory).

In recent years, there has been much progress in the development of animal models that are thought to be similar to the human disease. These animal models include induced and spontaneous models of disease, gene knockout(s), and transgenic animals. These models may provide further insight, not only in determining the pharmacological action of the product, pharmacokinetics, and dosimetry, but may also be useful in the determination of safety (e.g., evaluation of undesirable promotion of disease progression). In certain cases, studies performed in animal models of disease may be used as an acceptable alternative to toxicity

studies in normal animals (Note 1). The scientific justification for the use of these animal models of disease to support safety should be provided.

### **3.4 Number/ gender of animals**

The number of animals used per dose has a direct bearing on the ability to detect toxicity. A small sample size may lead to failure to observe toxic events due to observed frequency alone regardless of severity. The limitations that are imposed by sample size, as often is the case for non-human primate studies, may be in part compensated by increasing the frequency and duration of monitoring. Both genders should generally be used or justification given for specific omissions.

### **3.5 Administration/dose selection**

The route and frequency of administration should be as close as possible to that proposed for clinical use. Consideration should be given to pharmacokinetics and bioavailability of the product in the species being used, and the volume which can be safely and humanely administered to the test animals. For example, the frequency of administration in laboratory animals may be increased compared to the proposed schedule for the human clinical studies in order to compensate for faster clearance rates or low solubility of the active ingredient. In these cases, the level of exposure of the test animal relative to the clinical exposure should be defined. Consideration should also be given to the effects of volume, concentration, formulation, and site of administration. The use of routes of administration other than those used clinically may be acceptable if the route must be modified due to limited bioavailability, limitations due to the route of administration, or to size/physiology of the animal species.

Dosage levels should be selected to provide information on a dose-response relationship, including a toxic dose and a no observed adverse effect level (NOAEL). For some classes of products with little to no toxicity it may not be possible to define a specific maximum dose. In these cases, a scientific justification of the rationale for the dose selection and projected multiples of human exposure should be provided. To justify high dose selection, consideration should be given to the expected pharmacological/physiological effects, availability of suitable test material, and the intended clinical use. Where a product has a lower affinity to or potency in the cells of the selected species than in human cells, testing of higher doses may be important. The multiples of the human dose that are needed to determine adequate safety margins may vary with each class of biotechnology-derived pharmaceutical and its clinical indication(s).

### **3.6 Immunogenicity**

Many biotechnology-derived pharmaceuticals intended for human are immunogenic in animals. Therefore, measurement of antibodies associated with administration of these types of products should be performed when conducting repeated dose toxicity studies in order to aid in the interpretation of these studies. Antibody responses should be characterised (e.g., titer, number of responding animals, neutralising or non-neutralising), and their appearance should be correlated with any pharmacological and/or toxicological changes. Specifically, the effects of antibody formation on pharmacokinetic/pharmacodynamic parameters, incidence and/or severity of adverse effects, complement activation, or the emergence of new toxic effects should be considered when interpreting the data. Attention should also be paid to the evaluation of possible pathological changes related to immune complex formation and deposition.

The detection of antibodies should not be the sole criterion for the early termination of a preclinical safety study or modification in the duration of the study design unless the immune response neutralises the pharmacological and/or toxicological effects of the biopharmaceutical in a large proportion of the animals. In most cases, the immune response to biopharmaceuticals is variable, like that observed in humans. If the interpretation of the data

from the safety study is not compromised by these issues, then no special significance should be ascribed to the antibody response.

The induction of antibody formation in animals is not predictive of a potential for antibody formation in humans. Humans may develop serum antibodies against humanised proteins, and frequently the therapeutic response persists in their presence. The occurrence of severe anaphylactic responses to recombinant proteins is rare in humans. In this regard, the results of guinea pig anaphylaxis tests, which are generally positive for protein products, are not predictive for reactions in humans; therefore, such studies are considered of little value for the routine evaluation of these types of products.

## **4. SPECIFIC CONSIDERATIONS**

### **4.1 Safety pharmacology**

It is important to investigate the potential for undesirable pharmacological activity in appropriate animal models and, where necessary, to incorporate particular monitoring for these activities in the toxicity studies and/or clinical studies. Safety pharmacology studies measure functional indices of potential toxicity. These functional indices may be investigated in separate studies or incorporated in the design of toxicity studies. The aim of the safety pharmacology studies should be to reveal any functional effects on the major physiological systems (e.g., cardiovascular, respiratory, renal, and central nervous systems). Investigations may also include the use of isolated organs or other test systems not involving intact animals. All of these studies may allow for a mechanistically-based explanation of specific organ toxicities, which should be considered carefully with respect to human use and indication(s).

### **4.2 Exposure assessment**

#### **4.2.1 Pharmacokinetics and toxicokinetics**

It is difficult to establish uniform guidelines for pharmacokinetic studies for biotechnology-derived pharmaceuticals. Single and multiple dose pharmacokinetics, toxicokinetics, and tissue distribution studies in relevant species are useful; however, routine studies that attempt to assess mass balance are not useful. Differences in pharmacokinetics among animal species may have a significant impact on the predictiveness of animal studies or on the assessment of dose response relationships in toxicity studies. Alterations in the pharmacokinetic profile due to immune-mediated clearance mechanisms may affect the kinetic profiles and the interpretation of the toxicity data. For some products there may also be inherent, significant delays in the expression of pharmacodynamic effects relative to the pharmacokinetic profile (e.g., cytokines) or there may be prolonged expression of pharmacodynamic effects relative to plasma levels.

Pharmacokinetic studies should, whenever possible, utilise preparations that are representative of that intended for toxicity testing and clinical use, and employ a route of administration that is relevant to the anticipated clinical studies. Patterns of absorption may be influenced by formulation, concentration, site, and/or volume. Whenever possible, systemic exposure should be monitored during the toxicity studies.

When using radiolabeled proteins, it is important to show that the radiolabeled test material maintains activity and biological properties equivalent to that of the unlabeled material. Tissue concentrations of radioactivity and/or autoradiography data using radiolabeled proteins may be difficult to interpret due to rapid *in vivo* metabolism or unstable radiolabeled linkage. Care should be taken in the interpretation of studies using radioactive tracers incorporated into specific amino acids because of recycling of amino acids into non-drug related proteins/peptides.

Some information on absorption, disposition and clearance in relevant animal models should be available prior to clinical studies in order to predict margins of safety based upon exposure and dose.



## **4.2.2 Assays**

The use of one or more assay methods should be addressed on a case-by-case basis and the scientific rationale should be provided. One validated method is usually considered sufficient. For example, quantitation of TCA-precipitable radioactivity following administration of a radiolabeled protein may provide adequate information, but a specific assay for the analyte is preferred. Ideally the assay methods should be the same for animals and humans. The possible influence of plasma binding proteins and/or antibodies in plasma/serum on the assay performance should be determined.

## **4.2.3 Metabolism**

The expected consequence of metabolism of biotechnology-derived pharmaceuticals is the degradation to small peptides and individual amino acids. Therefore, the metabolic pathways are generally understood. Classical biotransformation studies as performed for pharmaceuticals are not needed.

Understanding the behaviour of the biopharmaceutical in the biologic matrix, (e.g., plasma, serum, cerebral spinal fluid) and the possible influence of binding proteins is important for understanding the pharmacodynamic effect.

## **4.3 Single dose toxicity studies**

Single dose studies may generate useful data to describe the relationship of dose to systemic and/or local toxicity. These data can be used to select doses for repeated dose toxicity studies. Information on dose- response relationships may be gathered through the conduct of a single dose toxicity study, as a component of pharmacology or animal model efficacy studies. The incorporation of safety pharmacology parameters in the design of these studies should be considered.

## **4.4 Repeated dose toxicity studies**

For consideration of the selection of animal species for repeated dose studies see section 3.3. The route and dosing regimen (e.g., daily versus intermittent dosing) should reflect the intended clinical use or exposure. When feasible, these studies should include toxicokinetics.

A recovery period should generally be included in study designs to determine the reversal or potential worsening of pharmacological/toxicological effects, and/or potential delayed toxic effects. For biopharmaceuticals that induce prolonged pharmacological/toxicological effects, recovery group animals should be monitored until reversibility is demonstrated. The duration of repeated dose studies should be based on the intended duration of clinical exposure and disease indication. This duration of animal dosing has generally been 1-3 months for most biotechnology-derived pharmaceuticals. For biopharmaceuticals intended for short-term use (e.g.,  $\leq$  to 7 days) and for acute life-threatening diseases, repeated dose studies up to two weeks duration have been considered adequate to support clinical studies as well as marketing authorisation. For those biopharmaceuticals intended for chronic indications, studies of 6 months duration have generally been appropriate although in some cases shorter or longer durations have supported marketing authorisations. For biopharmaceuticals intended for chronic use, the duration of long term toxicity studies should be scientifically justified.

## **4.5 Immunotoxicity studies**

One aspect of immunotoxicological evaluation includes assessment of potential immunogenicity (see section 3.6). Many biotechnology-derived pharmaceuticals are intended to stimulate or suppress the immune system and therefore may affect not only humoral but also cell-mediated immunity. Inflammatory reactions at the injection site may be indicative of a stimulatory response. It is important, however, to recognise that simple injection trauma and/or specific toxic effects caused by the formulation vehicle may also result in toxic changes at the injection site. In addition, the expression of surface antigens on target cells

may be altered, which has implications for autoimmune potential. Immunotoxicological testing strategies may require screening studies followed by mechanistic studies to clarify such issues. Routine tiered testing approaches or standard testing batteries, however, are not recommended for biotechnology-derived pharmaceuticals.

#### **4.6 Reproductive performance and developmental toxicity studies**

The need for reproductive/developmental toxicity studies is dependent upon the product, clinical indication and intended patient population (Note 2). The specific study design and dosing schedule may be modified based on issues related to species specificity, immunogenicity, biological activity and/or a long elimination half-life. For example, concerns regarding potential developmental immunotoxicity, which may apply particularly to certain monoclonal antibodies with prolonged immunological effects, could be addressed in a study design modified to assess immune function of the neonate.

#### **4.7 Genotoxicity studies**

The range and type of genotoxicity studies routinely conducted for pharmaceuticals are not applicable to biotechnology-derived pharmaceuticals and therefore are not needed. Moreover, the administration of large quantities of peptides/proteins may yield uninterpretable results. It is not expected that these substances would interact directly with DNA or other chromosomal material (Note 3).

Studies in available and relevant systems, including newly developed systems, should be performed in those cases where there is cause for concern about the product ( e.g., because of the presence of an organic linker molecule in a conjugated protein product). The use of standard genotoxicity studies for assessing the genotoxic potential of process contaminants is not considered appropriate. If performed for this purpose, however, the rationale should be provided.

#### **4.8 Carcinogenicity studies**

Standard carcinogenicity bioassays are generally inappropriate for biotechnology-derived pharmaceuticals. However, product-specific assessment of carcinogenic potential may still be needed depending upon duration of clinical dosing, patient population and/or biological activity of the product (e.g., growth factors, immunosuppressive agents, etc.) When there is a concern about carcinogenic potential a variety of approaches may be considered to evaluate risk.

Products that may have the potential to support or induce proliferation of transformed cells and clonal expansion possibly leading to neoplasia should be evaluated with respect to receptor expression in various malignant and normal human cells that are potentially relevant to the patient population under study. The ability of the product to stimulate growth of normal or malignant cells expressing the receptor should be determined. When *in vitro* data give cause for concern about carcinogenic potential, further studies in relevant animal models may be needed. Incorporation of sensitive indices of cellular proliferation in long term repeated dose toxicity studies may provide useful information.

In those cases where the product is biologically active and non-immunogenic in rodents and other studies have not provided sufficient information to allow an assessment of carcinogenic potential then the utility of a single rodent species should be considered. Careful consideration should be given to the selection of doses. The use of a combination of pharmacokinetic and pharmacodynamic endpoints with consideration of comparative receptor characteristics and intended human exposures represents the most scientifically based approach for defining the appropriate doses. The rationale for the selection of doses should be provided.

## 4.9 Local tolerance studies

Local tolerance should be evaluated. The formulation intended for marketing should be tested; however, in certain justified cases, the testing of representative formulations may be acceptable. In some cases, the potential adverse effects of the product can be evaluated in single or repeated dose toxicity studies thus obviating the need for separate local tolerance studies.

### NOTES

#### Note 1

Animal models of disease may be useful in defining toxicity endpoints, selection of clinical indications, and determination of appropriate formulations, route of administration, and treatment regimen. It should be noted that with these models of disease there is often a paucity of historical data for use as a reference when evaluating study results. Therefore, the collection of concurrent control and baseline data is critical to optimise study design.

#### Note 2

There may be extensive public information available regarding potential reproductive and/or developmental effects of a particular class of compounds (e.g., interferons) where the only relevant species is the non-human primate. In such cases, mechanistic studies indicating that similar effects are likely to be caused by a new but related molecule, may obviate the need for formal reproductive/developmental toxicity studies. In each case, the scientific basis for assessing the potential for possible effects on reproduction/development should be provided.

#### Note 3

With some biopharmaceuticals there is a potential concern about accumulation of spontaneously mutated cells (e.g., via facilitating a selective advantage of proliferation) leading to carcinogenicity. The standard battery of genotoxicity tests is not designed to detect these conditions. Alternative *in vitro* or *in vivo* models to address such concerns may have to be developed and evaluated.

## **ADDENDUM TO ICH S6: PRECLINICAL SAFETY EVALUATION OF BIOTECHNOLOGY-DERIVED PHARMACEUTICALS S6 (R1)**

Having reached Step 2 of the ICH Process at the ICH Steering Committee meeting on October 29, 2009, this guideline is recommended for release for internal and external consultation, according to national or regional procedures of the three regulatory parties to ICH.

### **LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS**

ADA	Anti-drug antibodies
ADC	Antibody drug conjugate
ePPND	Enhanced pre- and post-natal development
EU	European Union
GD	Gestational Day
ICH	International Conference on Harmonisation of Technical Requirements for Registration of Pharmaceuticals for Human Use
i.v.	Intravenous
NHP	Non Human Primate
PK	Pharmacokinetics
PD	Pharmacodynamics
WOCBP	Women of Childbearing Potential

## **1. INTRODUCTION**

### **1.1 Purpose of the Addendum**

The purpose of the addendum is to provide clarification on and an update of the following topics discussed in the original ICH S6 guidance: species selection, study design, immunogenicity, reproductive and developmental toxicity and assessment of carcinogenic potential. Scientific advances and experience gained since publication of the original ICH S6 guidance call for this addendum.

This harmonised addendum will help to define the current recommendations and reduce the likelihood that substantial differences will exist among regions.

This guidance should facilitate the timely conduct of clinical trials, reduce the use of animals in accordance with the 3Rs (reduce/refine/replace) principles and reduce the use of other drug development resources. Although not discussed in this guidance, consideration should be given to use of new *in vitro* alternative methods for safety evaluation. These methods, if validated and accepted by all ICH regulatory authorities, can be used to replace current standard methods.

This guidance promotes safe and ethical development and availability of new pharmaceuticals.

### **1.2 Background**

The recommendations of this addendum further harmonise the nonclinical safety studies to support the various stages of clinical development among the regions of European Union (EU), Japan, and the United States. The present guidance represents the consensus that exists regarding the safety evaluation of biotechnology-derived pharmaceuticals.

### **1.3 Scope of the Guideline**

This addendum does not alter the scope of the original ICH S6 guideline.

## **2. SPECIES SELECTION**

### **2.1 General Principles**

A number of factors should be taken into account when determining species relevancy. Comparisons of target sequence homology between species can be an appropriate starting point, followed by cell-based assays to make qualitative and quantitative cross-species comparisons of relative target binding affinities and receptor/ligand occupancy and kinetics. Assessments of functional activity are also recommended. Functional activity can be demonstrated in species-specific cell-based systems and/or *in vivo* pharmacology or toxicology studies. Modulation of a known biologic response or of a pharmacodynamic marker can provide evidence for functional activity to support species relevance.

Consideration of cross-species differences in target binding and functional activity in the context of the intended dosing regime should provide confidence that a model is capable of demonstrating any potentially adverse consequences of target modulation. When the target is not constitutively expressed in typical preclinical species, binding affinity and activity in cell-based systems can be sufficient to guide species selection.

For monoclonal antibodies and related products directed at foreign targets (i.e. bacterial, viral, etc.), it is desirable to evaluate safety in an animal model of disease. Where this is not feasible, a short-term safety study (see ICH S6) in one species (choice of species to be justified by the sponsor) can be considered and appropriate risk mitigation strategies should be adopted for clinical trials. No additional toxicity studies are appropriate.

As described in ICH S6, when no relevant species can be identified because the biopharmaceutical does not interact with the orthologous target in any species, use of homologous molecules, transgenic models and/or animal models of disease can be considered.

The potential for toxicity arising from a novel toxin or toxicant incorporated as an antibody-drug/toxin conjugate (ADC) is likely to occur in a target-independent manner and should be assessed in two species (one rodent and one non-rodent). Where possible, preference should be given to species that exhibit target-specific binding. For toxins or toxicants which are not novel and for which there is a sufficient body of scientific information available, safety evaluation of ADC in a single relevant species should suffice.

## **2.2 Tissue Cross-Reactivity:**

Based on recent scientific data, the text in ICH S6, Section 3.3 paragraph 2 is no longer appropriate. Immunohistochemical examination of potential binding of monoclonal antibodies and related products to the target epitope (tissue cross reactivity) should not be used for selection of relevant species for safety evaluation. Other techniques that assess target expression (e.g. in situ hybridization, flow cytometry) can provide supportive information for species selection.

However, tissue cross-reactivity data with human tissues can provide useful information to supplement knowledge of target distribution and can provide information on unexpected epitope binding. Tissue cross reactivity studies in nonclinical species are considered to have limited value and therefore are not generally recommended.

Binding to areas not typically accessible to the biopharmaceutical in vivo i.e. cytoplasm might not be relevant.

For bi-specific antibodies, evaluating each binding site separately in this assay is not called for.

## **2.3 One or Two Species**

If there are two pharmacologically relevant species for the clinical candidate (one rodent and one non-rodent), then both species should be used for short-term (up to 1 month duration) toxicology studies. If the toxicological findings from these studies are similar in both species, then longer-term studies in one species are usually considered sufficient; the rodent species should be considered unless there is a rationale for using non-rodents. Studies in two non-rodent species are not appropriate.

The use of one species is justified when the biological activity of the biopharmaceutical is well understood or the clinical candidate is pharmacologically active in only one species. Studies in a second species with a homologous product are not considered to add further value for risk assessment and are not recommended.

## **2.4 Use of Homologous Proteins, Transgenic Models, KOs and Disease Models:**

In some cases, alternative approaches to evaluating safety in a pharmacologically-relevant animal species should be used. ICH S6 section 3.3 can be referenced for further information.

Homologous proteins can be used for hazard detection and understanding the potential for adverse effects due to exaggerated pharmacology, not for exposure-based quantitative risk assessment. It can be possible to conduct safety evaluation studies with homologous proteins using a control group and one dose group provided there is a scientific justification for the dose level selected.

### **3. STUDY DESIGN**

#### **3.1 Dose Selection and application of PK/PD Principles**

The toxicity of most biopharmaceuticals is related to their targeted mechanism of action; therefore, relatively high doses can elicit adverse effects which are apparent as exaggerated pharmacology.

A rationale should be provided for high dose selection. PK-PD approaches can assist in high dose selection by identifying i) a dose which gives the maximum intended pharmacological effect in the preclinical species and ii) a dose which gives an up to 10-fold exposure multiple over the maximum exposure to be achieved in the clinic. The highest of these two doses should be chosen as the high dose group in pre-clinical toxicity studies unless scientific data supports a lower dose.

Where PD endpoints are not available, then an up to 10-fold multiple over the highest anticipated clinical exposure is sufficient, provided that corrections are made for differences in target binding and in vitro pharmacologic activity between the nonclinical species and humans. For example, a large relative difference in binding affinity and/or in vitro potency might suggest the need for higher doses in the nonclinical studies. In the event that toxicity cannot be demonstrated by this approach, then additional toxicity studies at higher multiples of human dosing are unlikely to provide additional useful information.

#### **3.2 Duration of Studies**

For chronic use products, the adequacy of 6-month chronic studies is supported by the scientific experience with biopharmaceuticals to date. Studies of longer duration are not anticipated to provide useful information to change the clinical course of development.

#### **3.3 Recovery**

Recovery of pharmacological and toxicological effects with potential adverse clinical impact should be understood. This information can be obtained by including a non dosing period in at least one study. The purpose of the non dosing period is to examine reversibility of these effects, not to assess delayed toxicity. The demonstration of complete recovery is not considered essential. An evaluation of recovery is not warranted if there are no adverse effects at the end of the dosing period or sufficient scientific justification can be provided (e.g. evidence that an adverse effect is generally reversible, or an adequate margin of safety exists for the proposed clinical population).

The addition of a recovery period just to assess for immunogenicity is not appropriate.

#### **3.4 Exploratory Clinical Trials**

The flexible approaches to support exploratory clinical trials as outlined in ICH M3 (R2) can be applicable to biopharmaceuticals. It is recommended that these approaches be discussed and agreed upon with the appropriate regulatory authority.

### **4. IMMUNOGENICITY**

Immunogenicity assessments are conducted to assist in the interpretation of the study results and design of subsequent studies. Such analyses in nonclinical animal studies are not relevant in terms of predicting potential immunogenicity of human or humanized proteins in humans.

Measurement of anti-drug antibodies (ADA) in nonclinical studies is not routinely warranted if there is evidence of sustained pharmacodynamic activity, no unexpected changes in the pharmacokinetics of the test article during the dosing or recovery phase, and/or no

evidence of immune-mediated reactions (immune complex-related, vasculitis, anaphylaxis, etc.). However, it is difficult to predict whether such analysis will be called for prior to completion of the in-life phase of the study; therefore, it is often useful to obtain appropriate samples during the course of the study, which can subsequently be analyzed if needed to aid in interpretation of the study results. When study results suggest there is a need to understand immunogenicity to interpret study data, potential for immunogenicity antibody detection assays should be conducted to evaluate the presence of ADAs. When ADAs are detected, the effect on the study results should be assessed, including effects on PK and drug clearance, pharmacology effects, and toxicity. Characterization, specifically of neutralizing potential, is generally not warranted, particularly if adequate exposure and pharmacological effect can be demonstrated by a pharmacodynamic marker of activity in the in vivo toxicology studies. In the event that neutralizing antibody assessment is deemed appropriate to interpret the study findings, assessment of neutralizing activity can be addressed indirectly with ex-vivo bioactivity assay, a combination of assay formats for PK-PD, or directly in a specific neutralizing antibody assay.

## **5. REPRODUCTIVE AND DEVELOPMENTAL TOXICITY**

### **5.1 General Comments**

Reproductive toxicity studies should be conducted in accordance with the principles outlined in with ICH S5(R2); however, the specific study design and dosing schedule can be modified based on an understanding of species specificity, the nature of the product and mechanism of action, immunogenicity and/or pharmacokinetic behaviour and embryo-fetal exposure.

Note 2 of ICH S6 still applies with respect to products where there is public knowledge regarding toxicity to reproduction.

The evaluation of toxicity to reproduction should be conducted only in pharmacologically relevant species. When the clinical candidate is pharmacologically active in rodents and rabbits, these species should be used unless there is a scientific reason to use a NHP. As per ICH S5 Note 5 (2.1), one species can be sufficient to address effects on embryo-fetal development if there is more than one relevant species (see section on species selection). The sponsor should provide a scientific rationale for selection of species for assessment of effects on embryo-fetal development.

When the clinical candidate is pharmacologically active only in NHP, an appropriate assessment of reproductive toxicity in NHPs is generally preferred over alternative approaches such as studies with homologous products in other species. However, the sponsor should provide a scientific justification when these alternative approaches are proposed. When the weight of evidence (e.g. mechanism of action, phenotypic data from KO mice, class effects) suggests that there will be an adverse effect on pregnancy outcome, these data might provide adequate information to communicate risk, and additional nonclinical studies might not be warranted.

When no relevant animal species exists for the clinical candidate, the use of transgenic mice expressing the human target or homologous protein in a species expressing the human ortholog should be considered.

### **5.2 Fertility**

For products where rodents are a relevant species, an assessment of fertility can be made in a rodent species. The design of the study should be amended as appropriate, for example, to address the nature of the product and potential for immunogenicity.



When the NHP is the only relevant species, the potential for effects on male and female fertility can be assessed by standard histopathological evaluation and assessment of menstrual cyclicity in repeat dose toxicity studies of at least 3 months duration using sexually mature NHPs. If there is a specific cause for concern, specialized assessments such as sperm count, sperm morphology/motility, testicular volume, and male or female reproductive hormone levels should be evaluated in the repeat dose toxicity study.

It is recognized that mating studies are not practical for NHPs. If there is a specific concern from the pharmacological activity about potential effects on conception / implantation and the NHP is the only relevant species, the concern should be addressed experimentally. A homologous product or transgenic model could be the only practical means to assess potential effects on conception or implantation when those are of specific concern. However, it would not be appropriate to produce a homologous product or transgenic model only to conduct mating studies in rodents.

### **5.3 Embryo-fetal and Pre/Post-Natal Development**

The type of molecule and potential differences in placental transfer should be considered in the choice of species for testing – see note 1.

For products pharmacologically active only in NHPs, one well-designed study in NHPs (stage C to E ICH S5a) which includes dosing from day 20 of gestation to birth can be considered. It is also possible for the sponsor to provide a scientific justification for the evaluation of effects on embryo-fetal and postnatal development using alternative study designs or a homologous product in rodents.

For the single NHP study design addressing ICH S5a stages C to E, no caesarian section group is warranted, but assessment of pregnancy outcome at natural delivery should be performed. This study should also evaluate offspring viability and survival, external malformations, skeletal effects (e.g. by X-ray) and, ultimately, visceral morphology at necropsy. Ultrasound is useful to track maintenance of pregnancy but not for monitoring embryo-fetal development or detecting malformations. Other endpoints in the offspring can also be evaluated if relevant for the pharmacological activity (e.g. immune function or neurobehavioural assessment). The duration of the postnatal phase will be dependent on which additional endpoints are considered relevant for the pharmacological activity.

The numbers of confirmed pregnant cynomolgus monkeys per group should be sufficient to detect 3-fold increase in pregnancy/parturition-associated losses with 80% power with 95% confidence interval (Jarvis P et al, abstract European Teratology Society Meeting, 2009). The sponsor should justify the study design if other NHP species are used.

Because the developmental toxicity study in NHP as outlined above is a hazard identification study, it might be possible to conduct these studies using a control group and one dose group, provided there is a scientific justification for the dose level selected. An example of an appropriate scientific justification would be a monoclonal antibody which binds a soluble target and the clinical dosing regimen is intended to saturate target binding. If such a saturation of target binding can be demonstrated in the animal species selected and there is an up to 10-fold exposure multiple over therapeutic drug levels, a single dose level and control group would provide adequate evidence of hazard to embryo-fetal development.

These study design principles can also be more appropriate than separate ICH S5a C and D to E studies for biopharmaceuticals other than monoclonal antibodies.

### **5.4 Timing of studies**

For monoclonal antibodies for which embryo-fetal exposure during organogenesis is understood to be low in humans based on current scientific knowledge, the embryo-fetal

development toxicity study can be conducted during Phase III (see ICH M3 (R2)). The completed reports should be available to support submission of a marketing application. For other biological products where embryo-fetal exposure is demonstrated to be low during organogenesis, the same timing for testing can be applicable. Where there is embryo-fetal exposure during organogenesis and the product is pharmacologically active only in NHPs and a sponsor elects to use the ePPND study design, an interim report (see note 2) for data to day 7 post-partum for all animals is called for to support Phase III.

If the rodent or rabbit is a relevant species and embryo-fetal exposure is demonstrated, see ICH M3 (R2) for timing of reproductive toxicity studies. ICH M3 (R2) should also be followed for the timing of data on fertility for products where rodents are relevant species.

For oncology products which fall within the scope of ICH S9, see this guidance for aspects relating to timing.

## **6. CARCINOGENICITY**

The need for a product-specific assessment of the carcinogenic potential for biopharmaceutical should be determined with regard to the intended clinical population and treatment duration (see ICH S1a). When an assessment is warranted, the sponsor should design a strategy to address the issue.

This strategy could be based on a review of relevant data from a variety of sources. The data sources can include published data (e.g. information from transgenic, knock-out or animal disease models, human genetic diseases), information on class effects, detailed information on target biology, in vitro data, data from chronic toxicity studies and clinical data.

The product specific assessment of carcinogenic potential is used to communicate risk and provide input to the risk management plan along with labelling proposals, clinical monitoring, post-marketing surveillance, or a combination of these approaches.

In some cases, the available information can be considered sufficient to address carcinogenic potential and inform clinical risk without warranting additional nonclinical studies. For example, immunomodulators and growth factors pose a potential carcinogenic risk which can best be evaluated by post-marketing clinical surveillance rather than further nonclinical studies.

The mode of action of some biopharmaceuticals might raise concern regarding potential for neoplasm induction or tumour promotion. Rodent bioassays are not warranted if data from in vitro or chronic toxicity studies support the concern regarding carcinogenic potential. When in vitro and chronic toxicity studies do not support this theoretical risk but the sponsor prefers not to label on this basis, the sponsor can propose additional studies that could mitigate the concern.

For products where there is insufficient knowledge about specific product characteristics and mode of action in relation to carcinogenic potential, a more extensive assessment might be appropriate. The sponsor should consider the inclusion of additional endpoints in toxicity studies. If the weight of evidence from the product-specific assessment (e.g. in vitro and chronic toxicity studies) does not suggest carcinogenic potential, a rodent bioassay is not recommended. If the weight of evidence suggests a concern about carcinogenic potential, then the label should reflect the concern or the sponsor can propose additional nonclinical studies that could mitigate the concern.

Rodent bioassays or short-term carcinogenicity studies with homologous products are generally of limited value to assess carcinogenic potential of the clinical candidate.

There is clearly a need for better assessment tools. Alternative approaches can be considered as new strategies / assays are developed.

## **7. ENDNOTES**

### **Note 1**

High molecular weight proteins (>5,000 D) do not cross the placenta by simple diffusion. For monoclonal antibodies with molecular weight as high as 150,000 D, there exists a specific transport mechanism, (FcRn) which determines fetal exposure and varies across species.

In the NHP and human, IgG does not begin to cross the placenta until early second trimester and increases to higher levels late in the third trimester; thus, in NHPs and humans, IgG crosses the placenta only after organogenesis (Pentsuk and Van der Laan, 2009). Therefore, standard embryo-fetal studies in NHPs, which are dosed from early pregnancy up to Gestation Day 50, are not representative of human fetal exposure throughout pregnancy for a parenterally administered therapeutic IgG and might assess only indirect effects on embryo-fetal development. Therefore, this might not be the optimal study design to assess indirect and direct effects of treatment throughout gestation.

IgG crosses the yolk sac in rodent/rabbits by FcRn transport mechanism and exposure will occur during late organogenesis. In addition, offspring of rat/mouse dams dosed during lactation will be exposed via the milk.

### **Note 2**

Endpoints to be included in interim report of ePPND study in non human primates;

Dam data: survival, clinical observations, bodyweight, gestational exposure data (if available), any specific PD endpoints;

Pregnancy data: number of pregnant animals started on study, pregnancy status at end of organogenesis (GD50) and at GD100 as a minimum, abortions and timing of abortions. There is no need for ultrasound observations of fetal size in the interim report; these are not considered essential since actual birth weight will be available;

Pregnancy outcome data: number of live births / still births, infant birth weight, infant survival and bodyweight at day 7 post-partum, qualitative external morphological assessment (i.e. confirming appearance is within normal limits), infant exposure data (if available), any specific PD endpoints in the infant if appropriate.

## 8. REFERENCES

1. ICH Topic S6 Document “Safety Studies for Biotechnological Products”
2. ICH Topic S5(R2) Document “Detection of Toxicity to Reproduction for Medicinal Products and Toxicity to Male Fertility”
3. ICH Topic S1A Document “Guideline on the Need for Carcinogenicity Studies for Pharmaceuticals”
4. ICH Topic M3(R2) Document “Guideline on Nonclinical Safety Studies for the Conduct of Human Clinical Trials and Marketing Authorisation for Pharmaceuticals”
5. ICH Topic S9 Document “Nonclinical Evaluation for Anticancer Pharmaceuticals”
6. Pentsuk N, Van der Laan JW. An Interspecies Comparison of Placental Antibody Transfer: New Insights Into Developmental Toxicity Testing of Monoclonal Antibodies. *Birth Defects Research (Part B)* 2009; 86: 328-344
7. Jarvis P et al, abstract European Teratology Society Meeting, 2009