



Technical Report No. 57-2

Analytical Method Development and Qualification for Biotechnology Products



PDA Analytical Method Development and Qualification of Biotechnology Products Technical Report Team

Authors

Melissa J. Smith, MJ Quality Solutions, (Chair)

Florence Baudoux, GlaxoSmithKline Biologicals

Marta Germano, Janssen Pharmaceutical Companies of Johnson & Johnson

Joachim Leube, Ph.D., Crucell

Sheila Magil, Ph.D., BioProcess Technology Consultants, Inc.

Carl Gustav-Millinger, Quality & Qualimetrics Consultancy QQC AB

Dwayne Neal, Emergent BioSolutions

Phillip Ramsey, Emergent BioSolutions

Michael Rooney, Ph.D., Jazz Pharmaceuticals

Rebecca Sendak, Ph.D., Sanofi

Zoran Susic, Biogen Idec

Earl K. Zablackis, Ph.D., Sanofi Pasteur

Contributors

Raphael Bar, Ph.D., BR Consulting

DaoTian Fu, Ph.D., Livzon Mabpharm, Inc.

Kenji Furuya, Boehringer Ingelheim

Stephan O. Krause, Ph.D., MedImmune

Nadine M. Ritter, Global Biotech Experts, LLC

Jane Weitzel, Quality Analysis Consultants

DISCLAIMER: The content and views expressed in this technical report are the result of a consensus achieved by the authorizing task force and are not necessarily the views of the organizations they represent.

Analytical Method Development and Qualification for Biotechnology Products

Technical Report No. 57-2

ISBN: 978-0-939459-74-2

© 2015 Parenteral Drug Association, Inc.

All rights reserved.



Table of Contents

| | | | |
|---|-----------|---|-----------|
| 1.0 INTRODUCTION | 1 | 4.2.5 Readiness to Proceed | 30 |
| 1.1 Method Lifecycle | 2 | 4.3 Method Qualification Plan or Protocols..... | 30 |
| 1.2 Purpose and Scope..... | 2 | 4.3.1 Qualification Approach | 30 |
| 2.0 GLOSSARY OF TERMS | 4 | 4.3.2 Qualification Characteristics | 31 |
| 2.1 Abbreviations | 6 | 4.3.2.1 Reference Standards | 31 |
| 3.0 METHOD DEVELOPMENT | 7 | 4.3.2.2 Specificity | 31 |
| 3.1 Method Definition..... | 7 | 4.3.2.3 Spiked Samples..... | 32 |
| 3.1.1 Analytical Target Profile | 9 | 4.3.2.4 Linearity and Range..... | 32 |
| 3.2 Method Selection | 11 | 4.3.2.5 Accuracy | 32 |
| 3.2.1 Risk Assessment..... | 12 | 4.3.2.6 Repeatability and Intermediate | |
| 3.2.2 Selection of Platform-Based Technologies .. | 12 | Precision..... | 32 |
| 3.2.3 Conclusion of the Selection Process..... | 13 | 4.3.2.7 Detection Limits and Quantitation | |
| 3.3 Method Development and Optimization..... | 13 | Limits | 34 |
| 3.3.1 Phased Approach | 13 | 4.3.2.8 Robustness..... | 34 |
| 3.3.2 Risk Considerations | 13 | 4.3.2.9 Stability-Indicating Assessment | 34 |
| 3.3.3 Design of Experiment..... | 14 | 4.4 Execution | 35 |
| 3.3.3.1 List and Description of Experiments ... | 15 | 4.5 Qualification Evaluation | 35 |
| 3.3.4 Execution of Development Activities | 16 | 4.5.1 Specificity..... | 35 |
| 3.3.4.1 Samples and Standards..... | 16 | 4.5.2 Accuracy, Precision, Linearity, and Range... 35 | |
| 3.3.4.2 Known or Expected Impurities..... | 17 | 4.5.3 Detection Limits and Quantitation Limits . | 36 |
| 3.3.4.3 Forced-Degradation Samples..... | 18 | 4.5.4 Statistical Assessments and Practical vs. | |
| 3.3.4.4 Equipment | 18 | Statistical Differences..... | 36 |
| 3.3.4.5 System Suitability | 18 | 4.5.5 Qualification Excursions..... | 36 |
| 3.3.4.6 Robustness..... | 19 | 4.6 Method Qualification Report | 37 |
| 3.3.5 Evaluation of Development Activities | 20 | 4.6.1 Standard Operating Procedure..... | 37 |
| 3.4 Method Deliverables..... | 20 | 4.6.2 Supportive Procedures | 37 |
| 3.4.1 Baseline and Best-Practice Deliverables.. | 21 | 4.6.3 Data..... | 38 |
| 3.4.2 Documentation Deliverables | 23 | 4.6.4 System Suitability and Sample | |
| 3.4.3 Physical Deliverables..... | 24 | Validity Criteria | 38 |
| 4.0 METHOD QUALIFICATION | 26 | 4.7 Conclusions and Deliverables | 38 |
| 4.1 Overview | 26 | 5.0 ANALYTICAL METHOD COMPARABILITY AND | |
| 4.2 Method Development Package Assessment .. | 29 | ANALYTICAL METHOD TRANSFER | 45 |
| 4.2.1 Intended Use and Performance..... | 29 | 6.0 METHOD LIFECYCLE MANAGEMENT | |
| 4.2.2 Standard Operating Procedure | 29 | CONTINUUM | 46 |
| 4.2.3 Physical Deliverables: Material and | | 7.0 CONCLUSION | 48 |
| Equipment | 30 | 8.0 REFERENCES | 49 |
| 4.2.4 Robustness..... | 30 | | |

FIGURES AND TABLES INDEX

| | | | | | |
|-------------------------|--|----|-------------------------|--|----|
| Figure 1.1-1 | Method Lifecycle and its Links to Product Development | 2 | Table 3.4.1-1 | Baseline and Best Practices for Deliverables of a Developed Method .. | 22 |
| Figure 1.2-1 | Table of Contents Map..... | 3 | Figure 3.4.2.1-1 | Documentation Deliverables | 24 |
| Figure 3.0-1 | Method Development Process..... | 7 | Figure 3.4.3-1 | Physical Materials Deliverables | 25 |
| Table 3.1-1 | Overview of Method Definition Process... | 8 | Figure 4.1-1 | Models of Qualification..... | 27 |
| Table 3.1-2 | Points to Consider for Method Definition... | 9 | Table 4.3.2.6-1 | Sample IP Matrix..... | 33 |
| Table 3.2-1 | Inputs and Outputs of Method Selection Process..... | 11 | Figure 4.3.2.6-1 | Sample Nested Design for IP for Day 1..... | 33 |
| Figure 3.3.2-1 | Risk Assessment Process Map | 14 | Table 4.3.2.6-2 | Sample Restricted Maximum Likelihood Variance Component Estimates for IP Matrix..... | 34 |
| Figure 3.3.3.1-1 | Iterative Method Development Process | 15 | Table 4.7-1 | Evaluations and Deliverables for AMD and AMQ..... | 39 |
| Table 3.3.4.6-1 | Fractional Factorial Design: Factors, Levels with Result from Each Run, and Factor Effect p-values | 19 | Figure 6.0-1 | Development and Qualification Lifecycle Deliverables | 46 |
| Figure 3.3.4.6-1 | Normal Plot Robustness Factor Assessment | 20 | | | |

1.0 Introduction

This technical report provides practical, risk-based guidance for the development and qualification portions of the analytical method lifecycle for biotechnology products. It is a companion report to PDA *Technical Report No. 57: Analytical Method Validation and Transfer for Biotechnology Products*.

Method development begins with defining the requirements for the analytical method. Based on the intended use and related requirements of the method, an analytical platform is selected in concert with the appropriate materials and equipment. A method is defined through method optimization, with consideration of the final requirements of the method (e.g., sensitivity and specificity). The development of a method typically leads to, but does not necessarily finish with, its qualification, which is a documented assessment of method performance (1). This process is one means to help ensure that the method is scientifically sound (specific, sensitive, accurate, and reproducible) and is suitable and reliable for the specified purpose (2-4). Method performance may also be assessed by other means, including trending of assay controls during routine method use.

The development process depends on the use of appropriately detailed documents that describe the analytical method. Operational and maintenance procedures for equipment should be available to ensure proper functioning with respect to the intended use and phase of product development (4-7).

Analytical method development (AMD) and analytical method qualification (AMQ) are typically iterative processes whereby the method is optimized, tested for its suitability (i.e., ability to meet target criteria for performance characteristics, such as precision and accuracy) through qualification studies, and potentially further optimized based on the qualification results.

The analytical target profile (ATP) is discussed in further detail in the body of this technical report as a potential means to manage AMD and AMQ. The ATP is comprised of the concepts of intended use, expected performance; measured critical quality attributes (CQAs), identified critical performance parameters, and completed iterative performance assessments. It can, therefore, be considered the structural framework for the method development and qualification process as well as for the rest of the method lifecycle continuum, including validation and routine use (8).

Qualification of an analytical method typically proceeds in a phase-appropriate manner commensurate with the intended use of the method. In other words, a more extensive evaluation of method performance or qualification may be performed to support a Phase II clinical study than was used for a Phase I study, with both qualification activities being broadly based on the elements of ICH Q2(R1) guidance (6). The phase-appropriate guidance documents describe the qualification and validation activities recommended for release and stability methods in support of a particular clinical phase (2,3). For other methods, such as characterization methods, qualification can be the end goal in the method lifecycle. Formal method qualification is not a regulatory requirement prior to method validation, but it offers one means of ensuring method suitability and ability to satisfy the defined requirements (e.g., in the ATP) and to support a successful validation.

The intended use of analytical methods may change during the product development process and may affect the ATP, method requirements, and method performance expectations. AMQ provides an option to ensure the suitability of a method's use for the release of early-phase or midphase clinical trial material without generating formal and prospective analytical method validation (AMV) studies.