



1 24 May 2012
2 EMA/274183/2012
3 Committee for Medicinal Products for Human Use (CHMP)

4 **Position paper on potential medication errors in the**
5 **context of benefit risk balance and risk minimisation**
6 **measures**
7 Draft

8 Focus on medication errors caused by confusion of a newly introduced
9 medicinal product with an existing one, similar in active substance but
10 different in some aspects.

Adoption by CHMP for release for consultation	24 May 2012
Start of public consultation	1 June 2012
End of consultation (deadline for comments)	30 November 2012
Adoption by CHMP	<DD Month YYYY>
Date of coming into effect	<DD Month YYYY>

Comments should be provided using this [template](#). The completed comments form should be sent to thomas.goedecke@ema.europa.eu.



1. Introduction

11 During the life-cycle of a medicinal product a number of changes may be introduced that have an
12 impact on the use of the product in clinical practice. These changes can be the result of variations,
13 extensions to the MA or extensions of indications of the existing product resulting in a different
14 formulation, presentation, route of administration, strength or composition, as well as a different
15 indication or target patient population. Changes in clinical practice may also arise from the introduction
16 of products referring to a reference medicinal product but differing from the reference product already
17 on the market (with regards to strengths, indication, etc.).

18 Regardless of the type of regulatory procedure, the introduction of a medicinal product that contains
19 the same active substance but otherwise differs from products previously authorised and subsequently
20 established in clinical use, bears a potential risk of medication errors. The assessment of such changes
21 should include a comparison with existing products on the market in view of the potential risk of
22 medication errors.

23 In general, medication errors can occur for a variety of reasons. Whether attributable primarily to
24 either the user, be it professional or patient, or to product-related aspects such as presentation or
25 instructions for use, in many cases a combination of unfavourable circumstances will be the cause for
26 erroneous drug administration.

27 The topic of medication errors has been addressed in the draft Guideline on Good Pharmacovigilance
28 Practices (GVP): Module V – Risk management systems (EMA/838713/2011), in general terms. The
29 purpose of this position paper is to specifically address the risk of medication error that arises where a
30 newly introduced medicinal product could potentially be mistaken for an already established one
31 containing the same active substance and similar in some other attributes such as appearance and/or
32 name but different in strength, dosing, route of administration, etc..

33 The aim of this position paper is to provide guidance on how the benefits and risks of such products
34 should be weighed and how the risk of medication errors can be adequately addressed.

35 2. Scope

36 This position paper focuses on the impact of potential medication errors on the benefit/risk balance of
37 medicinal products introducing changes vis-à-vis an already authorised product containing the same
38 active substance. In these situations an important potential risk of medication error may exist that
39 needs to be evaluated and balanced against any potential advantages the product under evaluation
40 might have over the product which is already established in clinical practice.

41 From a public health perspective, the following scientific arguments are relevant and emphasise the
42 need for a thorough consideration and a harmonised approach. Factors which may critically increase
43 the risk of medication error as well as criteria specifically underlining the benefit of the products in
44 question need to be carefully reflected and weighed against each other.

45 The various aspects of benefit and risk as well as measures intended for risk minimisation and
46 monitoring will be addressed in the subsequent chapters.

47 **3. Benefit/Risk discussion**

48 **3.1 Potential benefits**

49 Introduction of a product that differs from an established product as regards its concentration or
50 strength, that is presented in a different pharmaceutical form, a new administration device or has a
51 different composition or is intended to be used in a different patient population or indication, etc. may
52 in general be seen as a valuable addition to the therapeutic armamentarium since it may satisfy a
53 justified medical need. On the other hand, such products may carry an inherent potential risk for
54 incorrect use leading to medication errors. Medication errors may in some cases result in serious
55 and/or life-threatening events caused for example by over- or under-dosing, incorrect application via
56 the wrong route of administration or administration to the wrong patient population.

57 It has to be kept in mind that drug therapy is generally prescribed and administered by well-trained
58 experienced personnel, based on expert decision for treatment and – if drug not intended for self-
59 administration - usually administered according to standardised working procedures. This will help
60 reduce the risk of medication errors, but cannot always prevent them

61 The benefit-risk ratio has to be carefully considered for each individual product in question. In many
62 cases the benefits of such differing products will outweigh the associated above-mentioned risks of
63 medication errors. Examples of possible benefits may be:

- 64 • If excipients such as preservatives and/or antioxidants can be avoided or reduced, patients might
65 benefit from reduced undesirable effects possibly caused by these excipients.
- 66 • A different strength or composition may help to improve stability and/or in-use stability of the drug
67 product. Hence patients might benefit from reduced undesirable effects caused by degradation
68 products (due to a more stable medicinal product).
- 69 • Another reasoning to justify a different concentration or formulation may be to avoid necessary
70 dilution or at least facilitate preparation (e.g. dilution of a concentrate is easier to handle compared
71 to the multiple steps required to dissolve a powder, prepare a concentrate and further dilute to
72 prepare a ready-to-use solution) to allow for a more accurate dosing. This may not only lead to
73 enhanced safety of the pharmacist/healthcare professional by reducing manipulation steps but also
74 confer indirect benefit for patients because of a reduction of the potential preparation errors. A
75 more appropriate concentration/strength could also provide required flexibility that the original
76 concentration did not allow.
- 77 • Different formulations that offer advantages to patients, for example liposomal or other
78 formulations that improve the benefit/risk of the product compared to the original formulation,
79 extended release formulations that improve compliance, or formulations that are easier to
80 administer for patients with dysphagia.
- 81 • New types or sizes of primary packages or medical administration devices that facilitate
82 preparation and/or administration. More patient-friendly packaging, adherence-facilitating
83 formulation (e.g. ease of opening, ease of tracking, capsules with pH-meter inserted) or a
84 formulation improving palatability/acceptability.
- 85 • Use in specific populations, e.g. children or older people, and/or in additional indications which
86 were not covered by the already existing products.
- 87 • Further benefits regarding economic (multi-use instead of single-use preparations might be more
88 economic in use) and/or environmental (multi-use instead of single-use preparations might help to

89 reduce toxic wastage) advantages might also occur. However, these aspects lie outside the scope
90 of benefit/risk assessment for market approval and will not be further discussed.

91 **3.2 Evaluation of Risks**

92 In all situations similar but not limited to the examples described above, the potential advantages need
93 to be balanced against the additional inherent risk and effects of medication errors, which in turn are
94 dependent on the extent of deviation from the established product, the therapeutic window of the
95 active substance, the severity of adverse effects caused by the individual components of the medicinal
96 product and the measures taken to avoid medication errors. Justification should be provided in the
97 Pharmaceutical Development (3.2.P.2) of the application file as well as in other sections where
98 appropriate (e.g. clinical data, benefit/risk discussion, RMP, etc.). It is important to note that these
99 considerations are complementary to the already known safety profile of an established product.

100 The following aspects should be considered when evaluating the benefit-risk ratio from a clinical point
101 of view:

- 102 • A detailed discussion should be provided on the potential occurrence or increased incidence and/or
103 severity of adverse events as well as a loss of efficacy due to incorrect dosing caused by a
104 medication error. All studies using dosage regimes different to those recommended in the SPC
105 should be taken into account.
- 106 • All relevant information should be used to assess whether the medicinal product in question should
107 be regarded as a narrow therapeutic index drug. The judgement should be made following a case-
108 by-case assessment based on clinical considerations. Serious consequences of medication errors
109 are more likely in case of a narrow therapeutic index drug (e.g. cytotoxic drugs) and/or if given to
110 a particularly vulnerable patient population (e.g. immunocompromised patients, paediatric
111 population, pregnant women, elderly, etc.).
- 112 • Risks have to be seen in the context of the extent of possible over- or underexposure due to
113 incorrect dosing, incorrect administration route, etc. For example, if the product features double
114 the strength compared to the already approved product, a two times higher dosage might be
115 administered erroneously. The risks of such an incorrect dosage need to be evaluated. Similarly,
116 the risk of potential under-dosing has to be evaluated in case of a lower strength. If a new dosage
117 results in a lack of efficacy this may also have serious consequences.
- 118 • The applicant's proposals in the Risk Management Plan to clearly differentiate between the product
119 under evaluation and the established one – e.g. vial size, packaging warnings on vials, etc.

120 In general, the risk of a medication error due to a product differing from the product established in
121 clinical use cannot be accurately quantified a priori. Nevertheless, certain circumstances that may
122 potentially increase the probability of medication error warrant consideration, such as:

- 123 • Is the medicinal product administered by a health care professional or self-administered by the
124 patient?
- 125 • Has the healthcare professional/patient undergone some kind of special training in correctly
126 administering the medicinal product?
- 127 • Is the product intended for emergency use and does it have to be prepared under time pressure or
128 otherwise stressful situations?

- 129 • Is this product intended for children or is it presented in a new way that seems more suitable for
130 children?

131 The introduction into the market of a product differing from an already established one used routinely
132 in clinical practice may result in an increased risk of medication error. Therefore, the applicant has to
133 justify that the benefits outweigh the potential risks linked with this new product. In addition, when the
134 benefit is well known, specific rules should be applied to reduce the risk.

135 **4. Risk minimisation and monitoring**

136 Routine risk minimisation activities generally identified for any new product to reduce the risk to
137 patients include the provision of product information (SPC, Package Leaflet and labelling), i.e.
138 contraindications, warnings, etc. Additional risk minimisation activities are those which go beyond this
139 and may include controlled distribution, specific physician, pharmacist or patient educational material,
140 patient alert cards, alerts on/in the packaging, etc.

141 If a specific potential risk is identified for a new product with significant advantages (e.g. such as
142 outlined in section 3) relative to the established product, the following risk minimisation strategies
143 should be discussed on a case-by-case basis:

- 144 • Whenever new concentrations/strengths, formulations, new appearance of a dosage form,
145 preparations, addition of excipients, new target populations, etc. are introduced, this has to be
146 highlighted very clearly in SPC, PIL and labelling and if necessary also in a name of a medicinal
147 product as the one most important routine risk minimisation measure. Other measures such as
148 different vial sizes, design of packaging, etc. should also be considered. Proposals for pack design
149 and for new (invented) names should be submitted by the Applicant and agreed prior to approval.
- 150 • A user testing, which is able to prove that the instructions how to handle the product are clear and
151 understandable, should be performed and submitted before approval.
- 152 • Training pharmacists/healthcare professionals, based on approved educational material, should be
153 offered by the MAH, if there is no possibility to implement all information needed for safe use of
154 the product within SPC, PIL and labelling. A proposal for educational material should be submitted
155 by the Applicant and its key elements should be agreed prior to approval as part of the EU-RMP
156 which is to be submitted and approved prior to the Opinion. The content and format of the
157 educational material will need to be agreed with the National Competent Authority prior to launch
158 within each member state.

159 If additional risk minimisation measures are required, they should be agreed as conditions for
160 marketing authorisation with the key elements specified as appropriate.

161 Monitoring of the effectiveness of risk minimisation measures can, for example, be achieved by (see
162 also GVP Module XVI of the new PhV legislation):

- 163 • monitoring of medication errors resulting in adverse reactions, e.g. with methods of signal
164 detection.
- 165 • and/or commitment to submit PSURs in accordance with the regular periodicity for PSUR
166 submission, starting with every 6 months after authorisation, which should be continued until at
167 least two full years of marketing experience in the EU have been gained.

168 • shortening of PSUR cycles might also be an approach in regard to monitoring a specific risk.

169 The effectiveness of all the risk minimisation measures (change of name, product information,
170 educational material, user testing) in place should be re-evaluated in accordance with defined time-
171 intervals, e.g. in PSURs, milestones or updates of the RMP, etc.

172 **5. Recommendations**

173 For new presentations of existing medicinal products, including new indications, patient populations
174 etc., the potential for an increase in risk of medication errors as compared with the original product,
175 should be considered in the development and presentation of the product. With regard to the
176 potentially serious and/or fatal consequences of medication errors the CHMP particularly accentuates
177 the need for a critical assessment of medicines with a narrow therapeutic index and/or destined for a
178 special population (such as paediatric, neonates as well as elderly) in which medication errors are
179 known to occur more frequently and/or in which the consequences of a medication error are generally
180 expected to be more serious.

181 Following this principle, it will be important that the applicant is able to justify such an application by
182 demonstrating a prevailing benefit to counterbalance the potential product-associated increased risk of
183 medication error. All risk reducing measures (e.g. very clear and prominent labelling in the product
184 information, packaging/vial size difference, etc.) have to be implemented.

185 Whether the potential advantages compensate for the additional risk of medication errors and a
186 positive benefit-risk balance can eventually be confirmed needs to be based on a comprehensive case-
187 by-case benefit-risk evaluation.

188 The applicant is advised to engage in collaboration with the regulatory authorities at an early time
189 point when considering the development and submission of an application involving a product that
190 introduces changes to the already established clinical practice.