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Industry case study: 100% CCI Inspection

- QC vials of a lyo product identified that had lost vacuum (headspace pressure should have been 0.2 atm nitrogen)
- Decision taken to run 100% inspection in short timeframe

Project schedule:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Week</th>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Week</th>
<th>Activity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>Receipt of Purchase Order</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>Crate and ship system</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Machine parts manufactured</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>Install system and IQ, OQ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Test and debug machine parts</td>
<td>10-11</td>
<td>PQ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Completion of Factory Acceptance Testing</td>
<td>12-13</td>
<td>Perform inspection on product</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Inspection machine configured to make analytical measurement of headspace oxygen content
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Total batch size: 29048
Number rejected: 16
Reject rate: 0.06%
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Total batch size: 29156
Number rejected: 568
Reject rate: 1.95%
Industry case study:
100% CCI Inspection

Results of 6 consecutive batches
Questions

• What is a ‘typical’ container closure integrity failure rate for a batch of commercial freeze-dried product?

• How can a validated process (regularly) produce a batch having a high failure rate for a critical quality parameter?
Presentation Outline

• Container closure integrity: current regulations

• Industry 100% lyo vial CCI inspection results

• Risk assessment framework
117. Containers should be closed by appropriately validated methods. Containers closed by fusion, e.g. glass or plastic ampoules should be subject to 100% integrity testing.

Samples of other containers should be checked for integrity according to appropriate procedures.

123. Containers sealed under vacuum should be tested for maintenance of that vacuum after an appropriate, pre-determined period.
A container closure system that permits penetration of microorganisms is unsuitable for a sterile product. **Any damaged or defective units should be detected, and removed, during inspection of the final sealed product.**


**... If damage that is not readily detected leads to loss of container closure integrity, improved procedures should be rapidly implemented to prevent and detect such defects.**
Sources: WHO recommendations
Annex 1, WHO TRS 963 (revised 2007)

Containers of freeze-dried vaccine should be hermetically sealed under vacuum or after filling with pure, dry, oxygen-free nitrogen or any other gas not deleterious to the vaccine. All containers sealed under vacuum should be tested for leaks and all defective containers should be discarded.
Revised USP <1207> on CCIT

- **USP <1207> revised** (released September 2014 for comment):
  - The informational chapter on container closure integrity testing in the US Pharmacopeia has been radically updated:

  "Extensive revisions to general information chapter *Sterile Product Packaging—Integrity Evaluation 1207* are presented for public comment in this issue of the *Pharmacopeial Forum*. The original content of chapter *1207 has been revised and also subdivided into four related chapters (1207, 1207.1, 1207.2, and 1207.3) and represents the combined efforts of the USP Microbiology Expert Committee and the USP Packaging, Storage, and Distribution Expert Committee."

- Distinguishes between PROBABILISTIC vs. DETERMINISTIC methods for CCIT
• Microbial challenge tests
• Bubble emission tests
• Tracer liquid tests (either qualitative or quantitative measurement) *i.e. blue dye ingress*
• Tracer gas tests by sniffer probe

- **Leakage event: Stochastic in nature**
  - Relies on a series of sequential and/or simultaneous events each associated with uncertainties

- **Results:**
  - Associated with random outcomes (probability distributions)
  - Some uncertainty in findings

Source reference: PDA CCI workshop, Dana Guazzo
Deterministic CCIT methods

- Electrical conductivity and capacitance *i.e. HVLD*
- Laser-based gas headspace analysis
- Mass extraction
- Vacuum decay
- Pressure decay
- Tracer gas detection (vacuum mode) *i.e. helium leak test*

- **Leakage event:** Follows a predictable sequence
  - Monitoring gas movement through an open leak path (at specific delta pressure or partial pressure)
  - Based on liquid presence near or in a leak path
  - Objective, quantitative data

Source reference: Dana Guazzo
Questions

• What is a ‘typical’ container closure integrity failure rate for a batch of commercial freeze-dried product?

➢ What is the quality of the vial sealing process during freeze drying?
CCI Inspection Data Overview

Data analyzed so far to answer the question “What is a typical CCI failure rate for commercial sterile vial product?”:

- 15.3 million vials manufactured 2008-2013
- 5 sterile product manufacturers
  - 2 U.S.
  - 3 EU.
- Lyo and liquid product under vacuum or partial pressure of nitrogen
### Overall Results

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total no. vials inspected</th>
<th>15,305,883</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total no. vials rejected as leakers</td>
<td>99,430</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage</td>
<td>0.65%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Results per Product Type

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Liquid</th>
<th>Lyo</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total no. vials</td>
<td>723,036</td>
<td>14,582,847</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total no. rejects</td>
<td>1,801</td>
<td>97,629</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage</td>
<td>0.25%</td>
<td>0.67%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taking out estimated N2 purge rejects</td>
<td>&lt;0.08% CCI rejects</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In this data set, the freeze drying process produces CCI failures at a rate an order of magnitude higher than the liquid process.
### Results per company

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Company</th>
<th>Liquid</th>
<th>Lyo</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total no. vials</strong></td>
<td>723,036</td>
<td>327,178</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total no. rejects</strong></td>
<td>1801</td>
<td>2754</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Leaker Percentage</strong></td>
<td>est. &lt;0.08%</td>
<td>0.84%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- All lyo CCI failures in the tenths of a percent.

- Everyone is facing the same process challenges
‘Zero leak’ batches

Data overview
Overall results
Results per product type
Results per company
  Company C
  Company E

Company C
Total No. of batches: 156
Batches without rejected vials: 44
Percentage: 28.2%

Company C: Batches without rejected vials

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Q3 2012</th>
<th>Q4 2012</th>
<th>Q1 2013</th>
<th>Q2 2013</th>
<th>Q3 2013</th>
<th>Q4 2013</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>% of batches without rejects</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
‘Zero leak’ batches

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total No. of batches</th>
<th>Company C</th>
<th>Company E</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>156</td>
<td>906</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Batches without rejected vials</th>
<th>Company C</th>
<th>Company E</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>44</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Percentage</th>
<th>Company C</th>
<th>Company E</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>28.2%</td>
<td>6.3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Company E: Batches without rejected vials

- Company C
- Company E
Inspection data conclusions

• CCI failure rates for lyo vials are similar to the sealing failure rate of ampoules: tenths of a %

• A validated process can still produce a batch with a high CCI failure rate

• It is difficult to produce a ‘zero leak’ batch

• The commercial freeze drying process contributes to a relatively high risk for CCI failure
Questions

• How can a validated process (regularly) produce a batch having a high failure rate for a critical quality parameter?

➢ How robustly is the vial sealing process being controlled during freeze drying?
CCI failure risks in the freeze drying process

- **Stoppering process in the lyo chamber, sticking stoppers**
  - Joe Brouwer, IMA, ISL-Freeze Drying 2013, Sao Paolo

- **Mismatch of packaging components, especially coated stopper / vial combinations, leading to stopper pop-up**
  - Renaud Janssen, Datwyler, PDA Freeze Drying 2011, Barcelona
  - Sascha Karhoefer, West, PDA Freeze Drying 2011, Barcelona

- **Extended time before vial is capped and crimped**

  **EU Annex 1:**
  - **118.** The container closure system for aseptically filled vials is not fully integral until the aluminium cap has been crimped into place on the stoppered vial. Crimping of the cap should therefore be performed as soon as possible after stopper insertion.
  - **120.** Vial capping can be undertaken as an aseptic process using sterilised caps or as a clean process outside the aseptic core. Where this latter approach is adopted, vials should be protected by Grade A conditions up to the point of leaving the aseptic processing area, and thereafter stoppered vials should be protected with a Grade A air supply until the cap has been crimped.
Risks associated with CCI failure

- Potential loss of sterility
  - Temp leaks: low/medium
  - Permanent: medium/high

- Loss of closure integrity
  - Loss of vacuum affecting reconstitution of lyo products

- Product, excipient degradation
  - Oxidation
  - Hydrolysis

- Customer complaints
  - Loss of vacuum
  - Discolouration of product
Managing the risk of CCI failure for sterile lyo product

- Thorough container closure integrity validation in packaging development

- **Generate statistical CCI data whenever possible** from samples produced with the actual process: clinical batches, scale-up placebo batches, validation batches

  *(QbD approach; 2011 FDA guidance on Process Validation)*

- Statistical inspection/monitoring of commercial batches

- CCI quality monitoring in stability program
Managing the risk of CCI failure for sterile lyo product

- Zero failures in CCI validation studies
- Zero failures over product shelf life
- When package is introduced into process, is closure maintained?
- Is process kept under control well enough to robustly maintain CCI?

Packaging components CCI validation
Generate CCI data during scale up, process validation
CCI monitoring over the product shelf life
Statistical CCI inspection of commercial product samples
PAT, QbD, new FDA Process Validation guidance…

- Identify process parameters critical to freeze dried vial seal integrity
- Identify parameter range for achieving/maintaining CCI through generation of statistical ‘proof data’
- Monitor the process to assure critical parameters are in acceptable range
Discussion

• How to gain a statistical confidence that the freeze drying process is properly sealing sterile freeze dried product vials?

• How much risk to container closure integrity is acceptable?

• Can (parts of) Annex 1 be revised to give clearer guidance for ensuring good seal integrity of freeze dried product vials?
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