ARTICLE 45 & 46

Question 1
Do Articles 45 and 46 apply to medicinal products irrespective of the route of authorisation?

Yes. Articles 45 and 46 apply to medicinal products irrespective of the route of authorisation, i.e. centralised procedure, mutual recognition procedure, decentralised procedure and purely national procedure.

Question 2
Do the obligations laid down in Articles 45 and 46 apply also to generics, well-established use products, authorised homeopathic medicinal products and traditional herbal products?

The requirement laid down in Articles 45 and 46 relate to all authorised medicinal products without exception.

Question 3
Should all completed paediatric studies (regardless of their place of conduct) be submitted to each competent Authority or does it apply only to studies conducted in the territory of the MS concerned?

The submission of all completed paediatric studies is regardless of their place of conduct of the trial. They should be submitted to each competent Authority where the product is authorised. The assessment however will be carried out through the work-sharing exercise for medicinal products authorised through mutual recognition/decentralised procedure and purely national procedure and by the CHMP for centrally authorised products.

The Competent Authority which has authorised the product in question, is in the case of centrally authorised products the EMEA, for MRP/DCP the RMS and CMS(s) and for purely national authorisations the National Competent Authority of the relevant MS.

Question 4
For the purpose of this Regulation, shall paediatric studies mean only studies conducted in the paediatric population (under Art. 2) or also studies conducted simultaneously in the paediatric and adult population (e.g. enrolment criteria for subjects 12 to 65 years of age)?

Paediatric studies means any studies including patients aged < 18 years, including those with both adult and paediatric patients.
Question 5
For the purpose of this requirement, shall paediatric studies mean also studies performed by other sponsors than MAH, e.g. scientific associations?

Article 45 refers to any studies for an authorised product, whereas article 46 refers to marketing authorisation holder-sponsored studies only.

Question 6
How should Marketing Authorisation Holders comply with the requirements of Article 45 of the Paediatric Regulation?

Please refer to the Procedural guidance concerning submission of information about medicinal products, pursuant to the Paediatric Regulation, produced jointly by the CMD(h) and the EMEA, which can be found on the CMD(h) and EMEA websites.

Marketing Authorisation Holders should identify the potential regulatory consequences and include proposals to amend the product information with the submission of the paediatric studies, if appropriate.
A short critical expert overview should be added, clarifying the context of the data overall.

Question 7 (December 2007)
Do Marketing Authorisation Holders have to submit proposals to amend the product information together with the line listings by 26 January 2008?

The process is divided in the following three steps:
1) Submission of the line listings for all authorised medicinal products by 26 January 2008;
2) For MRP/DCP and purely nationally authorised medicinal products, submission, upon request of the CMD(h)-EMEA, of paediatric studies not yet submitted to the Rapporteur for assessment in the framework of the Worksharing procedure;
3) Formal variation procedure, if applicable.
The proposals to amend the product information should be submitted together with the paediatric studies (step 2) at time of work sharing and for the formal variation procedure.

Question 8
In the procedural guidance concerning submission of information about medicinal products, pursuant to the Paediatric Regulation, Marketing Authorisation Holders are requested to submit the line listings together with a declaration (Annex I) and, for medicinal products with paediatric use, the respective wording of sections 4.1 and/or 4.2 of the SmPC (Annex II). Does the deadline of 26 January 2008 also apply to the submission of the Annex II?

The line listing together with the declaration (Annex I) has to be submitted to the respective Competent Authority(ies) by 26 January 2008.
The CMD(h) and the EMEA would welcome receipt also of the wording of the SmPC (4.1 and/or 4.2) for medicinal products with authorised paediatric use (Annex II), as a one-off exercise by 26 January 2008.

However, the CMD(h) and the EMEA agreed with the request from Interested Parties to extend the deadline for submission of information on the wording of the SmPC (4.1 and/or 4.2) (Annex II) for medicinal products with authorised paediatric use by a period of 3 months, i.e. until 26 April 2008.
**Question 9 (December 2007)**

In the procedural guidance concerning submission of information about medicinal products, pursuant to the Paediatric Regulation, Marketing Authorisation Holders are requested to submit the line listings for all their authorised medicinal products, irrespective of whether they have paediatric studies/paediatric indications or not. 

Do Marketing Authorisation Holders also need to submit a declaration (Annex I) in the cases that no paediatric studies have been performed for their medicinal products?

No, a declaration (Annex I) should only be submitted if the Marketing Authorisation Holder is aware of paediatric studies performed for their medicinal products. However, even if no paediatric studies have been performed for medicinal products with authorised paediatric ‘indication’, the respective wording of sections 4.1 and/or 4.2 of the SmPC (Annex II) has to be submitted.

**Question 10 (December 2007)**

Should medicinal products which are used in children but have no specific information in the SmPC (4.1 and/or 4.2) be included in the line listing and Annex II?

All authorised medicinal products regardless of a paediatric indication should be included in the line listing. However, if the medicinal product is not authorised for paediatric use (see Q&A 16), Annex II should not be submitted.

(http://hma.eu/fileadmin/dateien/Human_Medicines/CMD_h_/PaediatricData/PaedReg_template_line_listing_MAH_to_NCA.xls)

**Question 11 (December 2007)**

For medicinal products with several active substances, do Marketing Authorisation Holders need to include in the line listing, in connection with Article 45, the different paediatric studies on the individual active substances or only the paediatric studies for the medicinal product?

In case of medicinal products with several active substances it is normally the product related paediatric studies that are of interest, not the ones on individual active substances. However, it could be valuable to receive paediatric studies on individual active substances, if these are considered relevant for the medicinal product.

**Question 12 (Update – November 2008)**

How should Marketing Authorisation Holders comply with the requirements of Article 46 of the Paediatric Regulation?

- Within 6 months of completion of the study, any marketing authorisation holder-sponsored trial involving the use in the paediatric population of a medicinal product covered by a marketing authorisation, should be submitted to the Competent Authority(ies), i.e. NCA(s) or EMEA. Completion of a trial is defined in the Commission guideline on Paediatric Investigation Plan as the last visit of the last patient, as foreseen in the latest version of the protocol (as submitted to competent authorities).
- Marketing Authorisation Holders do not need to resubmit safety data (as opposed to studies), submitted as part of Periodic Safety Update Reports (PSURs) in the context of article 46.
- The procedure described in the amended CMD(h) Best Practice Guide - EU work sharing procedure in the assessment of Paediatric data by National Competent Authorities will be followed with regard to timelines for the assessment of the paediatric studies submitted according to Article 46 of the Paediatric Regulation. In this procedure it is foreseen to work with a single rapporteur. A CMD(h) Best Practice Guide on assessment of data in accordance with Article 46 will be published at a later stage.
Question 13

According to Article 46, marketing authorisation holder-sponsored studies involving the use in the paediatric population of a medicinal product covered by a marketing authorisation should be submitted to the competent authority within 6 months of completion of the study. In case a variation is intended to be submitted, e.g. to extend the indication of the product based on the results of the study, is it still necessary to submit the study according to Article 46? If yes, will the assessment of the study be done at the time of the submission of the variation?

Marketing authorisation holder-sponsored studies which involve the use in the paediatric population of a medicinal product covered by a marketing authorisation have to be submitted to the competent authority within 6 months of completion of the study, regardless of the intention to submit a variation. However, in the situation described above, Marketing Authorisation Holders are advised to clearly indicate their intention to submit a variation and whether it covers exactly the same set of data as the one being submitted. Marketing Authorisation Holders should identify the potential regulatory consequences and include proposals to amend the product information with the submission of the paediatric studies, if appropriate. A short critical expert overview should be added, clarifying the context of the data.

Question 14 (Update – November 2008)

Which data are to be submitted?

Studies or trials mean here those not yet submitted to Competent Authorities, involving the paediatric use of medicinal products authorised in the Community. Article 45 refers to any studies for an authorised product, whereas article 46 refers to marketing authorisation holder-sponsored studies only (Please refer to Q&A 5).

- Clinical studies and trials (phase I to IV)
- Non clinical studies (e.g. juvenile toxicology studies) not previously submitted, and relevant to the benefit/risk assessment of the paediatric studies submitted. (not applicable for Article 46).
- Completed or discontinued studies;
- Published or not;
- Trials should be submitted regardless of the region where they were performed, the aim, outcome, population studied and indication.
- For paediatric trials, information on the pharmaceutical formulation(s) used in the trials, the existence of a formulation suitable for paediatric use, or on conditions for extemporaneous preparations should be submitted, if available.

Question 15

Which format should the Marketing Authorisation Holders use?

Study reports should preferably follow the CTD format and be submitted either as Word or PDF documents. Electronic submission of information via CD-ROM is acceptable. In the case of older studies it may be necessary to submit an extended synopsis instead of a clinical study report when this is not available.
For studies not in English, an English extended synopsis will be acceptable, to accompany the report in its original language.

Question 16
What else should the Marketing Authorisation Holders submit?

If the medicinal product is authorised for paediatric use [i.e. with either an indication in children (0 to 17 years inclusive) in 4.1, OR dosing information in children in 4.2 of the SmPC], the adequate information has to be stated in the line listing and the relevant wording as stated in the SmPC 4.1 and/or 4.2 has to be given in Annex II (see Best practice guide) in the relevant national language (for nationally authorised medicinal products) or in English for medicinal products authorised via MRP/DCP or centralised procedure (Please refer to Q&A 8).

ARTICLE 7 & 8

According to Article 7 of the Paediatric Regulation an application for marketing authorisation of a medicinal product which is not authorised in the Community shall be regarded as valid only if it includes either the results of all studies performed and details of all information collected in compliance with an agreed paediatric investigation plan (PIP) OR a decision of the EMEA granting a product-specific or a class waiver OR a decision of the EMEA granting a deferral.

Question 17
When is my medicinal product considered “not authorised in the Community?”

As of 26 July 2008, applications for a marketing authorisation in respect of a medicinal product for human use which is not authorised in the Community at the time of entry into force of Regulation (EC) No 1901/2006 shall comply with the requirements of Article 7 of Regulation (EC) No 1901/2006.

A medicinal product is considered not to be authorised in the Community, if there is no marketing authorisation granted in one of the Member States of the EU in the context of the Global Marketing Authorisation.

For the application of the Global Marketing Authorisation concept in this regard, please refer to Question 21.

Question 18 (April 2008)
Will Article 7 apply to a Mutual Recognition Procedure (MRP) or a repeat-use MRP submitted as of 26 July 2008, for a medicinal product approved in the RMS before 26 July 2008?

No. Article 7 will only apply to medicinal products which have not been authorised in any Member State by 26 July 2008. Therefore, in the situation of an MRP or repeat-use MRP, if the medicinal product has been authorised in the RMS before 26 July 2008, it will not fall under Article 7.

In case of a MRP or repeat-use MRP, where the initial marketing authorisation application for the medicinal product has been pending on 26 July 2008, Article 7 will not apply.

Question 19 (April 2008)
What are the consequences of the Paediatric Regulation for applications for new indications, including paediatric indications, new pharmaceutical forms and new routes of administration after 26 January 2009?
According to Article 8, the documents referred to in Article 7 (see Q&A 17) shall be required for applications for new indications, new pharmaceutical forms and new routes of administration submitted as of 26 January 2009, regardless of the route or the date of authorisation of the medicinal product as long as it is protected either by a supplementary protection certificate or by a patent which qualified for the granting of the supplementary protection certificate.

From 26 January 2009, any of the above mentioned applications shall only be considered valid if it includes the results of a PIP or a decision of the EMEA granting a product-specific or class waiver or granting a deferral.

A PIP (or a decision of the EMEA granting a product-specific or class waiver or granting a deferral) is not required in the case of an application for a new strength of the medicinal product, unless such application also concerns a new indication, new pharmaceutical form or new route of administration.

The PIP shall cover all existing and new indications, pharmaceutical forms and routes of administration of the medicinal product.

**Question 20 (April 2008)**

*Are there any exemptions to the application of Articles 7 and 8?*

Yes. Articles 7 and 8 of the Paediatric Regulation do not apply to medicinal products authorised or applied for under the following Articles of Directive 2001/83/EC:

- Article 10 - Generics (10.1), Hybrids (10.3), Similar biologicals (10.4);
- Article 10a - Well-established use;
- Articles 13 to 16 – Homeopathic medicinal products;
- Articles 16a to 16i – Traditional herbal medicinal products.

**Question 21 (Update – November 2008)**

*Does Article 7 or Article 8 of the Paediatric Regulation take into account the Global Marketing Authorisation concept?*

Yes, in the context of Article 7 and 8, the Global Marketing Authorisation concept, as defined in Article 6(1), 2nd subparagraph of Directive 2001/83/EC, as amended, applies to define whether a medicinal product is authorised or not.

The Global Marketing Authorisation contains the initial authorisation and all variations and extensions thereof, as well as any additional strengths, pharmaceutical forms, administration routes or presentations authorised through separate procedures and under a different name, granted to the marketing authorisation holder of the initial authorisation. For further reference, see NTA, chapter 1, section 2.3.

Thus, the Global Marketing Authorisation concept applies to medicinal products belonging to the same marketing authorisation holder. According to the Commission Communication on the Community marketing authorisation procedures for medicinal products (98/C 229/03), applicants belonging to the same mother company or group of companies or which are “licencess” have to be taken as one.

If an applicant holds more than one marketing authorisation of the same substance or combination of substances (independently of the procedure of authorisation), the medicinal product subject of the application, will be considered as “already authorised” in keeping up with the Global Marketing Authorisation concept. Consequently Article 7 will not apply for new applications. If the medicinal product is protected by a Supplementary Protection Certificate (SPC, or a patent which qualifies for a SPC, Article 8 shall apply for that application. In this case, the PIP/Waiver decision shall cover the existing and any new indication, pharmaceutical form or route of administration of the medicinal product concerned by the Global Marketing Authorisation.
For instance:

Company A holds a marketing authorisation in indication A for a medicinal product containing substance x (still patented).

Company B (subsidiary of company A) intends to apply for a new stand-alone marketing authorisation for substance x in a new indication B.

--> the medicinal product will be considered as ‘already authorised’ based on the GMA concept, and company B will be required to cover also indication A in its PIP (i.e. Article 8 applies).

The Global Marketing Authorisation approach applies to PIP or Waiver applications as well as to variations, extension and new marketing authorisation applications falling under the requirements of Article 7 and 8. Where relevant, applicants should also consider whether any modification to an agreed or ongoing PIP/Waiver decision may be required in case the GMA concept had not been applied, in order to avoid difficulties at validation of the subsequent regulatory submission.