



**COMMITTEE FOR MEDICINAL PRODUCTS FOR HUMAN USE
(CHMP)**

DRAFT

**NOTE FOR GUIDANCE ON PLASMA DERIVED MEDICINAL PRODUCTS
(CPMP/BWP/269/05 rev. 3)**

**ADDENDUM ON THE REPLACEMENT OF RABBIT PYROGEN TESTING BY AN
ALTERNATIVE TEST FOR PLASMA DERIVED MEDICINAL PRODUCTS
(EMEA/CHMP/BWP/452081/2007)**

DRAFT AGREED BY BIOLOGICS WORKING PARTY (BWP)	December 2007
ADOPTION BY CHMP FOR RELEASE FOR CONSULTATION	18 th December 2007
END OF CONSULTATION (DEADLINE FOR COMMENTS)	30 th June 2008

Comments should be provided using this [template](#) to alberto.ganan@emea.europa.eu
Fax +44 20 7418 8545

KEYWORDS	<i>Plasma-derived medicinal products, Rabbit pyrogen testing, bacterial endotoxin test, LAL test, Monocyte activation test</i>
-----------------	--

Note: This addendum will be incorporated as a part of the Note for Guidance on plasma derived medicinal products which is currently under revision. This addendum has been released independently to the guideline in order to coordinate with complementary work that is being undertaken by the European Pharmacopoeia group 6B.

26
27

<p style="text-align: center;">ADDENDUM ON THE REPLACEMENT OF RABBIT PYROGEN TESTING BY AN ALTERNATIVE TEST FOR PLASMA DERIVED MEDICINAL PRODUCTS</p>
--

28
29

INTRODUCTION

30
31 Parenteral preparations have to be pyrogen-free because administration of pyrogens may induce fever,
32 shock or even death. The severity of the adverse reaction depends on the concentration and biological
33 activity of the respective pyrogen. There is a broad spectrum of pyrogens which are classified into
34 endotoxin and non-endotoxin pyrogens.

35
36 Endotoxins, representing the lipopolysaccharides (LPS) of the cell wall of Gram-negative bacteria, are
37 the best characterised and the most potent pyrogens. The structural identity of most non-endotoxin
38 pyrogens has not yet been clarified. Examples of pyrogens from Gram-positive bacteria are the
39 lipoteichoic acids and peptidoglycans which are constituents of the bacterial cell wall.

40
41 Currently, there are two tests described in the European Pharmacopoeia which are related to pyrogen
42 testing of parenteral medicinal products:

- 43 • the rabbit pyrogen test (RPT) which is considered to detect most of the pyrogens, i.e.
44 endotoxins and non-endotoxin pyrogens,
- 45 • and the bacterial endotoxin test, i.e. Limulus polyphemus amoebocyte Lysate- test (LAL-test)
46 which is used to detect or quantify endotoxins of Gram-negative bacteria.

47 Because endotoxins are the most common and potent pyrogens the LAL testing has successfully
48 replaced the rabbit pyrogen test for many products.

49
50 A revision of the European Pharmacopoeia monographs for plasma derived-medicinal products (e.g.
51 human albumin, human normal immunoglobulin, human immunoglobulin for intravenous
52 administration and human blood coagulation factor VIII) is currently on-going to encourage use of
53 alternative tests to the rabbit pyrogen test. The proposed text for the revision is:

54 “It complies with the text for pyrogens or, preferably and where justified and authorised, a validated *in*
55 *vitro* test, such as the bacterial endotoxins test. When the bacterial endotoxins test is used, the
56 preparation to be examined contains less than ... IU/ml (or IU/IU).”

57
58 The purpose of this guidance is to highlight points to be addressed in any justification for use of a test
59 for bacterial endotoxins as an alternative to a test for pyrogens for plasma-derived medicinal products.
60 It should be read in conjunction with the Ph. Eur. method of analysis for Bacterial Endotoxins (2.6.14)
61 and the accompanying guidance.

62
63

LAL-TEST RELATED ISSUES

64
65

Interference with endotoxin detection

66
67 Several plasma proteins, e.g. lipopolysaccharide binding protein (LBP), soluble CD14, high density
68 lipoproteins (HDL), low density lipoproteins (LDL) and human serum albumin are able to bind
69 endotoxins. This can lead to masking of endotoxins and impairment of their detection in the LAL-test.
70 In addition, these endotoxins may detach from the carrier-protein *in vivo* and may induce adverse
71 reactions. Given the seriousness of this issue, validation of the LAL test should take it into
72 consideration as indicated in Chapter 2.6.14 of the European Pharmacopoeia.

73
74
75 Plasma fractions or plasma derived medicinal products may inherently contain constituents which may
76 interfere with different LAL methods. Therefore, manufacturers should carefully validate the LAL test
77 for a specific product according to Ph. Eur. 2.6.14.

79 **PROCESS RELATED CONSIDERATIONS**

80

81 *Fever inducing cytokines in plasma derivatives*

82

83 The main fever inducing cytokines interleukin-1 β (IL-1 β), interleukin-6 (IL-6) and tumour necrosis
84 factor alpha (TNF α) are natural constituents of human plasma and therefore also of plasma pools for
85 fractionation. These cytokines are not detected by the endotoxin test. During plasma fractionation
86 process, the fever inducing cytokines could be enriched in certain fractions and injection of these
87 cytokines as part of a medicinal product may cause pyrogenic adverse reactions in the recipient.
88 Therefore, the content of plasma fractions and finished products for pro-inflammatory cytokines,
89 especially of IL-1, IL-6 and TNF α , should be followed. It should be validated that the finished
90 products consistently contain non-pathophysiologically relevant concentrations of fever inducing
91 cytokines.

92

93 For marketed products, where there is extensive clinical experience with no indications of pyrogenic
94 adverse events, an investigation for pro-inflammatory cytokines would not be required as part of the
95 justification to move to LAL testing.

96

97 *Role of contamination of manufacturing process by Gram-positive bacteria*

98

99 Plasma derived medicinal products manufacture presents specific features with regard to
100 microbiological contamination, due to the possibility of initial contamination of plasma units and due
101 to the risk of introducing bacterial contaminations during the early steps of processing. In order to
102 keep contamination as low as possible, and to identify possible steps which could contribute to
103 contaminations, the manufacturer should demonstrate that the microbiological contamination level at
104 different critical steps of the process is under control. For the purpose of process validation
105 identification of bacteria species should be performed for relevant manufacturing steps. Bioburden
106 limits should be set, using actual manufacturing data. These bioburden limits are part of the validation
107 that should be performed in order to allow the switch from pyrogen testing to bacterial endotoxin
108 testing.

109

110 In the case that bioburden action limits are exceeded after implementation of the LAL testing, a
111 thorough root cause analysis should be carried out by the manufacturer. The microorganisms should
112 be identified at the species level. In the case that gram-positive bacterial contaminations are identified,
113 and after a careful risk assessment, if the manufacturer still considers the release of the batch, it should
114 also be based on the RPT.

115

116 If bioburden action limits are exceeded and gram-positive bacterial contaminations are identified on
117 more than one occasion, the applicability of the LAL-test as the replacement of the pyrogen test may
118 not be possible any longer and it may be necessary to re-validate the process with respect to microbial
119 contaminations. In this latter case, the Competent Authority should be informed.

120

121

122 **CLINICAL CONSIDERATIONS**

123

124 The manufacturer should review the adverse events reported with the product for any indications of
125 clinical problems that could possibly be related to the presence of pyrogens in some batches that have
126 not been detected by the LAL test. If there are indications of possible bacterial contamination, the root
127 cause and the causative agent should be identified in order to avoid the contamination of future
128 batches and to select appropriate testing for routine batch monitoring.

129

130

131 **REGULATORY ISSUES**

132

133 Beside showing suitability of the LAL test and appropriate validation of the assay according to Ph.
134 Eur. (chapter 2.6.14) the additional points discussed above should be considered for each product and
135 process separately. The endotoxin limit depends on the product and the route of administration. A

136 specification should be established for each product considering the calculation provided in Ph. Eur.
137 2.6.14, the results from LAL testing of a large number of batches and minimal requirements given in
138 the product specific Ph. Eur. monographs.
139

140 If a manufacturer of an already licensed plasma derived medicinal product intends to change from the
141 rabbit pyrogen test to an endotoxin test, a variation should be provided including the microbiological
142 evaluation of the manufacturing process and specifications for in-process controls for bioburden at
143 critical steps, validation of the LAL test in compliance with Ph. Eur. 2.6.14 together with data on
144 parallel testing of the product with the RPT and the LAL-test. The product tested in parallel should
145 reflect the current manufacturing process. Historical data may support the safety history of the
146 manufacturing process (manufacturing site). If a batch was positive by the RPT but not tested by LAL
147 and samples are still available, the manufacturer should test these samples by the LAL test to verify if
148 the LAL is positive or not. The number of batches of a given product to be tested in parallel depends
149 on the product's safety history, e.g. historical number of pyrogenic batches, number of RPT positive
150 but LAL negative batches and reports on adverse drug reactions which might be related to pyrogens.
151 Further parallel testing may be required after approval of the variation in cases where data on parallel
152 testing on a significant number of batches cannot be obtained in an adequate time due to the small
153 number of batches manufactured over a year (e.g. products for rare indications). In these cases the
154 testing schedule should cover additional 2 to 3 years of manufacture.
155

156 A manufacturer developing a new medicinal product should be working towards use of an alternative
157 to the pyrogen test from the beginning of its development. The manufacturer should establish a
158 validated manufacturing process under special consideration of a bioburden programme. Considering
159 product specific issues and the manufacturing consistency as well as information received from
160 pyrogen testing and clinical studies, an appropriate endotoxin limit should be introduced and justified.
161 Data on release testing of the finished product with the RPT and LAL tests on as many as possible
162 batches should be provided with the application. After licensing, the manufacturer should perform
163 parallel testing on a significant number of batches or for another 2 to 3 years depending on the data
164 provided with the application, the number of batches manufactured over a year and the risk
165 assessment.
166

167 All applications should provide a risk assessment for the respective plasma-derived medicinal product
168 considering the potential of a non-endotoxin pyrogen burden of the final product. A product which
169 failed validated bacterial endotoxin testing should not be released based on the rabbit pyrogen test.
170

171 **ALTERNATIVE TEST**

172
173
174 In the past ten years, a new principle in pyrogen testing has been developed, the so called Monocyte
175 Activation Tests (MAT). These tests utilise human monocytes from different sources (human whole
176 blood, human peripheral mononuclear cells, monocytic cell lines from human origin). All of them
177 mimic the human fever reaction in vitro, i.e. the sample to be analysed is incubated with monocytes
178 followed by determination of fever inducing cytokines (usually in ELISA). These tests are potentially
179 able to detect both endotoxins and non-endotoxin pyrogens. In some cases, their application allowed
180 detection of pyrogenicity in preparations which produced fever in patients although the RPT as well
181 the LAL-test were negative.
182

183 Several Monocyte Activation Tests have been successfully examined in an international validation
184 study organised by the European Centre for the Validation of Alternative Methods (ECVAM, Italy).
185 This study included parenteralia for intravenous administration which have been artificially
186 contaminated with endotoxin. Analysing the validation study, the ECVAM Scientific Advisory Board
187 (ESAC) gave a positive assessment regarding the applicability of the involved MAT in endotoxin
188 testing. The EDQM installed an Expert Group with the aim to prepare a monograph "Monocyte
189 Activation Test" for the European Pharmacopoeia. Furthermore, the Interagency Coordinating
190 Committee on Validation of Alternative Methods (ICCVAM, USA) is preparing a respective guideline
191 for the application of MAT in USA. Due to the intrinsic variability of the biological reagents involved

192 in MAT, its application may require the same type of intra assay validation as in previous assays such
193 as LAL.

194
195 This guidance does not specifically address justification needed for use of MAT tests as an alternative
196 to a test for pyrogens for plasma-derived medicinal products. Nevertheless, a number of aspects of this
197 guidance would also be relevant for such a justification (e.g. appropriate validation of the assay,
198 parallel testing of the product).
199