

United Kingdom
Veterinary Medicines Directorate
Woodham Lane
New Haw
Addlestone
Surrey KT15 3LS

NATIONAL PROCEDURE

PUBLICLY AVAILABLE ASSESSMENT REPORT FOR A VETERINARY MEDICINAL PRODUCT

Ectostop 50 mg Spot-on Solution for Cats



PRODUCT SUMMARY

Name, strength and pharmaceutical form	Ectostop 50 mg Spot-on Solution for Cats
Applicant	Alfamed, 13' eme rue- L.I.D, Carros Cedex, 06517, France
Active substance(s)	Fipronil
ATC Vetcode	QP53AX15
Target species	Cats
Indication for use	Treatment of flea (Ctenocephalides spp.) and tick (Dermacentor reticulatus) infestations. The product has a persistent insecticidal efficacy for up to 5 weeks against fleas (Ctenocephalides felis). The product has a persistent acaricidal efficacy for up to 2 weeks against ticks (Rhipicephalus sanguineus, Ixodes ricinus, Dermacentor reticulatus). If ticks of some species (Rhipicephalus sanguineus and Ixodes ricinus) are present when the product is applied, all the ticks may not be killed within the first 48 hours but they may be killed within a week.

VMD/L4/GAT/014/C 2/14

MODULE 2

The Summary of Product Characteristics (SPC) for this product is available on the Veterinary Medicines Directorate website (www.vmd.defra.gov.uk)

VMD/L4/GAT/014/C 3/14

MODULE 3

PUBLIC ASSESSMENT REPORT

Legal basis of original application	Generic hybrid application in accordance with Article 13 (3) of Directive 2001/82/EC as amended.
-------------------------------------	--

I. SCIENTIFIC OVERVIEW

The product is a spot-on solution, developed as a generic of Frontline Spot-On Cat. However, bioequivalence with the reference product could not be demonstrated by appropriate studies, and therefore the products were deemed to be generic hybrids, whereby it is necessary for clinical endpoints to be produced.

The product is applied topically to cats in a solution containing 100 mg/ml fipronil, where 1 pipette of 0.5 ml (50 mg fipronil) is required per animal. The indication for use in cats is to treat and prevent infestations of flea (*Ctenocephalides* spp.) and tick (*Dermacentor reticulatus*). The products are available in blister cards or boxes of 1, 2, 3, 4 or 6 pipettes, and are contraindicated for use in kittens less than 2 months old or weighing less than 1 kg, in sick and convalescent animals, as well as in other species, particularly rabbits.

The product is produced and controlled using validated methods and tests which ensure the consistency of the product released on the market. It has been shown that the product can be safely used in the target species; the slight reactions observed are indicated in the SPC¹.

The product is safe for the user, and for the environment, when used as recommended. Suitable warnings and precautions are indicated in the SPC. The efficacy of the product was demonstrated according to the claims made in the SPC. The overall benefit/risk analysis is in favour of granting a marketing authorisation.

II. QUALITY ASPECTS

A. Composition

The product contains fipronil as active substance and butylhdroxyanisole (E320), butylhydroxytoluene (E321), benzyl alcohol and diethylene glycol monoethyl ether as excipients.

VMD/L4/GAT/014/C 4/14

¹ SPC- Summary of Product Characteristics

The container/closure system consists of 0.5 ml of solution in white single-dose polypropylene or thermoformed plastic pipettes closed by aluminium heat sealing and packaged in boxes or blister cards containing 1, 2, 3, 4 or 6 pipettes. The particulars of the containers and controls performed are provided and conform to the regulation. The choice of formulation is justified.

The product is an established pharmaceutical form and its development is not described in accordance with the relevant European guidelines.

B. Method of Preparation of the Product

The product is manufactured fully in accordance with the principles of good manufacturing practice from a licensed manufacturing site. Process validation data on the product have been presented in accordance with the relevant European guidelines. The product is manufactured by mixing the active substance and excipients to produce the final solution which is then used to fill the pipettes by weight.

C. Control of Starting Materials

The active substance is fipronil, an established active substance not described in the European Pharmacopoeia (Ph. Eur). Data on the active substance was provided in the form of an in-house monograph. The active substance is manufactured in accordance with the principles of good manufacturing practice.

The active substance specification is considered adequate to control the quality of the material. Batch analytical data demonstrating compliance with this specification have been provided.

All excipients comply with their respective Ph. Eur monographs. Certificates of analysis were received from each manufacturer, and testing of the excipients is performed on receipt.

D. Specific Measures concerning the Prevention of the Transmission of Animal Spongiform Encephalopathies

There are no substances within the scope of the TSE Guideline present or used in the manufacture of this product.

E. Control on intermediate products

Not applicable.

F. Control Tests on the Finished Product

The finished product specification controls the relevant parameters for the pharmaceutical form. The tests in the specification, and their limits, have been justified and are considered appropriate to adequately control the quality of the product. The tests include identification of active substance and excipients, identification of impurities, uniformity of dosage units and microbial purity. Batch

VMD/L4/GAT/014/C 5/14

analytical data from the proposed production sites have been provided demonstrating compliance with the specification.

G. Stability

Stability data on the active substance has been provided in accordance with applicable European guidelines, demonstrating the stability of the active substance when stored under the approved conditions. Stability data on the finished product have been provided in accordance with applicable European guidelines, demonstrating the stability of the product throughout its shelf life when stored under the approved conditions. A retest period of 12 months is supported for the active substance, the shelf life of the product as packaged for sale is 2 years.

H. Genetically Modified Organisms

Not applicable.

J. Other Information

- Shelf life of product as packaged for sale: 2 years.
- Store below 30°C.
- Store in a dry place.
- Store in original package.

III. SAFETY AND RESIDUES ASSESSMENT (PHARMACO-TOXICOLOGICAL)

III.A Safety Testing

Pharmacological Studies

Following topical application fipronil spreads over the surface of the skin and is stored in sebaceous glands. Fipronil is then slowly eliminated with hair and sebum. It is poorly absorbed through the skin.

Toxicological Studies

The applicant has submitted toxicological studies using fipronil. The studies looked at the effect of single dose and repeat dose toxicity, reproductive toxicity, genotoxicity and carcinogenicity.

The applicant concluded that via the dermal route of administration fipronil is not acutely toxic to rats (LD_{50} of >2000 mg/kg bodyweight) and is only slightly toxic to rabbits. Oral repeat dose studies were conducted and a NOEL² of 0.07 mg/kg bodyweight per day was established following oral administration to rats for 90 days. Similar studies were conducted in dogs over a period of 1 year and the

VMD/L4/GAT/014/C 6/14

² NOEL – No observable effect level

NOEL was established as 0.3 mg/kg bodyweight per day. These repeat dose studies of fipronil also showed evidence of neurotoxicity.

Mutagenic and teratogenic studies were also submitted. In these studies fipronil tested negative and no evidence has been seen that would suggest fipronil could cause birth defects. In addition fipronil is not carcinogenic and has no genotoxic potential.

Other Studies

The applicant has provided additional studies using the final formulation of the product. Studies were conducted to investigate if the product can cause skin and eye irritation. These studies were conducted on rabbits using single dose topical application and a guinea pig skin sensitisation study was also summarised. It was observed that the formula has a low acute toxicity and does not sensitise skin, however fipronil is a moderate eye irritant.

User Safety

The applicant has provided a user safety assessment in compliance with the relevant guideline which describes the possible routes of exposure and the risk posed by oral, dermal and ocular contact with fipronil. Dermal exposure through petting the animal is deemed to be likely whilst oral ingestion through spillage of the product or hand to mouth transfer is low risk. Warnings and precautions as listed on the product literature are adequate to ensure safety to users of the product:-

- This product can cause mucous membrane and eye irritation. Therefore, contact between the product and the mouth or eyes should be avoided.
- In the case of accidental eye contact, immediately rinse the eyes with clean water. If eye irritation persists seek medical advice and show the package leaflet or the label to the physician.
- Avoid contents coming into contact with the fingers. If this occurs, wash hands with soap and water. Wash hands after use.
- Do not smoke, drink or eat during application.
- People with a known hypersensitivity to fipronil or excipients (see section 6.1.) should avoid contact with the veterinary medicinal product.
- Treated animals should not be handled until the application site is dry, and children should not be allowed to play with treated animals until the application site is dry. It is therefore recommended that animals are not treated during the day, but should be treated during the early evening, and that recently treated animals should not be allowed to sleep with owners, especially children.

Ecotoxicity

The applicant provided a first phase environmental risk assessment in compliance with the relevant guideline which showed that no further assessment is required. The assessment concluded that the product will be used in cats and exposure to aquatic organisms, which may be adversely affected by the product,

VMD/L4/GAT/014/C 7/14

is not considered relevant. Warnings and precautions as listed on the product literature are adequate to ensure safety to the environment when the product is used as directed:-

• Fipronil may adversely affect aquatic organisms. Dogs should not be allowed to swim in water courses for 2 days after application.

IV CLINICAL ASSESSMENT (EFFICACY)

IV.A Pre-Clinical Studies

Pharmacology

Pharmacodynamics

As this is a generic application submitted according to Article 13 (3) of Directive 2001/82/EC as amended, and the pharmacodynamic properties are considered the same as for the reference product no additional data are required.

Pharmacokinetics

As this is a generic application submitted according to Article 13 (3) of Directive 2001/82/EC as amended, and the pharmacokinetic properties are considered the same as for the reference product no additional data are required.

Tolerance in the Target Species of Animals

The applicant has provided a target animal tolerance study using multiples of the recommended dose in the target species. A group receiving no treatment were included as a control. Doses were applied topically to the skin between the shoulder blades, at 1, 3 or 5 times the recommended dose and administered three times over a period of two and a half months.

Parameters evaluated included bodyweight, food consumption, clinical signs and blood samples were taken pre and post treatment to observe any effects on haematology, biochemistry and specific hormones, thyroxine and TSH. At the end of the procedure pathology investigated any effects on the organs, including weight, if there were any macroscopic lesions and histological differences. M adverse effects were seen following doses up to 5 times the recommended dose and the studies demonstrate local and systemic tolerance to the product.

Data from the clinical trials have also been provided which show that no adverse reactions have been linked to use of the product. The product literature accurately reflects the type and incidence of adverse effects which might be expected.

Resistance

As these were applications for a 'generic antiparasitic product' as submitted under Article 13 (3) of Directive 2001/82/EC as amended, the potential for

VMD/L4/GAT/014/C 8/14

resistance was considered to be the same as that of the reference products, and no further data were required.

IV.B Clinical Studies

Laboratory Trials

The applicant provided appropriate information on dose determination studies.

Dose confirmation studies:

Study 1 (A second study using the same parameters provided additional information)

Study title Comparative immediate efficacy of Frontline spot-on and 104.07³ a generic fipronil spot-on formulation against fleas (Ctenocephalides felis) in cats To evaluate the efficacy of a topically applied spot-on formulation of fipronil against fleas (Ctenocephalides felis) on cats under laboratory conditions. Test site(s) Compliance with Regulatory guidelines Test Product Formulation 104.7 (10% fipronil), synonymous with the product to be authorised. Product delivered at 0.5 ml. Control Control Product, Frontline Spot On 10% w/v topical solution, at 0.5. Reference product Frontline Spot-On for Cats. Negative control group (no treatment). Healthy cats, 8 animals each group. Outcomes/endpoints Determine the efficacy of a generic spot-on formulation against fleas on cats. Efficacy of the test product was compared to the negative control and reference product upon weekly infestation of fleas, up to Day 2. Randomisation Blinding Blinded. Method This was a parallel-grouped study. After acclimatisation, animals were infested as appropriate (approximately 40 fleas per cat), at various time points, and given treatment according to their respective groups. Flea counts were performed after treatment. Statistical method All tests were two-sided. Statistical analysis was performed using appropriate software. Level of significance was set at 5% (p<0.05). Primary calculations for efficacy were based on mean flea counts. Comparisons were made by ANOVA.		
formulation of fipronil against fleas (Ctenocephalides felis) on cats under laboratory conditions. Test site(s) Compliance with Regulatory guidelines Test Product Formulation 104.7 (10% fipronil), synonymous with the product to be authorised. Product delivered at 0.5 ml. Control product/placebo Control product, Frontline Spot On 10% w/v topical solution, at 0.5. Reference product Frontline Spot-On for Cats. Negative control group (no treatment). Animals Healthy cats, 8 animals each group. Outcomes/endpoints Determine the efficacy of a generic spot-on formulation against fleas on cats. Efficacy of the test product was compared to the negative control and reference product upon weekly infestation of fleas, up to Day 2. Randomisation Blinded Method This was a parallel-grouped study. After acclimatisation, animals were infested as appropriate (approximately 40 fleas per cat), at various time points, and given treatment according to their respective groups. Flea counts were performed after treatment. Statistical method All tests were two-sided. Statistical analysis was performed using appropriate software. Level of significance was set at 5% (p<0.05). Primary calculations for efficacy were based on mean flea counts. Comparisons were made by ANOVA.	Study title	and 104.07³ a generic fipronil spot-on formulation
Compliance with Regulatory guidelines Test Product Formulation 104.7 (10% fipronil), synonymous with the product to be authorised. Product delivered at 0.5 ml. Control Control Control product, Frontline Spot On 10% w/v topical solution, at 0.5. Reference product Frontline Spot-On for Cats. Negative control group (no treatment). Animals Healthy cats, 8 animals each group. Outcomes/endpoints Determine the efficacy of a generic spot-on formulation against fleas on cats. Efficacy of the test product was compared to the negative control and reference product upon weekly infestation of fleas, up to Day 2. Randomisation Blinding Blinded. Method This was a parallel-grouped study. After acclimatisation, animals were infested as appropriate (approximately 40 fleas per cat), at various time points, and given treatment according to their respective groups. Flea counts were performed after treatment. Statistical method All tests were two-sided. Statistical analysis was performed using appropriate software. Level of significance was set at 5% (p<0.05). Primary calculations for efficacy were based on mean flea counts. Comparisons were made by ANOVA.	Objectives	formulation of fipronil against fleas (Ctenocephalides
Regulatory guidelines Test Product Formulation 104.7 (10% fipronil), synonymous with the product to be authorised. Product delivered at 0.5 ml. Control product/placebo Control product, Frontline Spot On 10% w/v topical solution, at 0.5. Reference product Frontline Spot-On for Cats. Negative control group (no treatment). Animals Healthy cats, 8 animals each group. Outcomes/endpoints Determine the efficacy of a generic spot-on formulation against fleas on cats. Efficacy of the test product was compared to the negative control and reference product upon weekly infestation of fleas, up to Day 2. Randomisation Blinding Blinded. Method This was a parallel-grouped study. After acclimatisation, animals were infested as appropriate (approximately 40 fleas per cat), at various time points, and given treatment according to their respective groups. Flea counts were performed after treatment. Statistical method All tests were two-sided. Statistical analysis was performed using appropriate software. Level of significance was set at 5% (p<0.05). Primary calculations for efficacy were based on mean flea counts. Comparisons were made by ANOVA.	Test site(s)	Laboratory environment. Single centre.
product to be authorised. Product delivered at 0.5 ml. Control product/placebo Control product, Frontline Spot On 10% w/v topical solution, at 0.5. Reference product Frontline Spot-On for Cats. Negative control group (no treatment). Healthy cats, 8 animals each group. Outcomes/endpoints Determine the efficacy of a generic spot-on formulation against fleas on cats. Efficacy of the test product was compared to the negative control and reference product upon weekly infestation of fleas, up to Day 2. Randomisation Blinding Blinded. Method This was a parallel-grouped study. After acclimatisation, animals were infested as appropriate (approximately 40 fleas per cat), at various time points, and given treatment according to their respective groups. Flea counts were performed after treatment. Statistical method All tests were two-sided. Statistical analysis was performed using appropriate software. Level of significance was set at 5% (p<0.05). Primary calculations for efficacy were based on mean flea counts. Comparisons were made by ANOVA.		Good Clinical Practice (GCP)
solution, at 0.5. Reference product Frontline Spot-On for Cats. Negative control group (no treatment). Animals Healthy cats, 8 animals each group. Outcomes/endpoints Determine the efficacy of a generic spot-on formulation against fleas on cats. Efficacy of the test product was compared to the negative control and reference product upon weekly infestation of fleas, up to Day 2. Randomisation Blinding Blinded. Method This was a parallel-grouped study. After acclimatisation, animals were infested as appropriate (approximately 40 fleas per cat), at various time points, and given treatment according to their respective groups. Flea counts were performed after treatment. Statistical method All tests were two-sided. Statistical analysis was performed using appropriate software. Level of significance was set at 5% (p<0.05). Primary calculations for efficacy were based on mean flea counts. Comparisons were made by ANOVA.	Test Product	
Animals Outcomes/endpoints Determine the efficacy of a generic spot-on formulation against fleas on cats. Efficacy of the test product was compared to the negative control and reference product upon weekly infestation of fleas, up to Day 2. Randomisation Blinding Blinded. Method This was a parallel-grouped study. After acclimatisation, animals were infested as appropriate (approximately 40 fleas per cat), at various time points, and given treatment according to their respective groups. Flea counts were performed after treatment. Statistical method All tests were two-sided. Statistical analysis was performed using appropriate software. Level of significance was set at 5% (p<0.05). Primary calculations for efficacy were based on mean flea counts. Comparisons were made by ANOVA.	_	solution, at 0.5. Reference product Frontline Spot-On
Outcomes/endpoints Determine the efficacy of a generic spot-on formulation against fleas on cats. Efficacy of the test product was compared to the negative control and reference product upon weekly infestation of fleas, up to Day 2. Randomisation Randomised. Blinding Blinded. This was a parallel-grouped study. After acclimatisation, animals were infested as appropriate (approximately 40 fleas per cat), at various time points, and given treatment according to their respective groups. Flea counts were performed after treatment. Statistical method All tests were two-sided. Statistical analysis was performed using appropriate software. Level of significance was set at 5% (p<0.05). Primary calculations for efficacy were based on mean flea counts. Comparisons were made by ANOVA.		Negative control group (no treatment).
against fleas on cats. Efficacy of the test product was compared to the negative control and reference product upon weekly infestation of fleas, up to Day 2. Randomisation Blinded. Method This was a parallel-grouped study. After acclimatisation, animals were infested as appropriate (approximately 40 fleas per cat), at various time points, and given treatment according to their respective groups. Flea counts were performed after treatment. Statistical method All tests were two-sided. Statistical analysis was performed using appropriate software. Level of significance was set at 5% (p<0.05). Primary calculations for efficacy were based on mean flea counts. Comparisons were made by ANOVA.	Animals	Healthy cats, 8 animals each group.
Blinding Blinded. This was a parallel-grouped study. After acclimatisation, animals were infested as appropriate (approximately 40 fleas per cat), at various time points, and given treatment according to their respective groups. Flea counts were performed after treatment. Statistical method All tests were two-sided. Statistical analysis was performed using appropriate software. Level of significance was set at 5% (p<0.05). Primary calculations for efficacy were based on mean flea counts. Comparisons were made by ANOVA.	Outcomes/endpoints	against fleas on cats. Efficacy of the test product was compared to the negative control and reference product
Method This was a parallel-grouped study. After acclimatisation, animals were infested as appropriate (approximately 40 fleas per cat), at various time points, and given treatment according to their respective groups. Flea counts were performed after treatment. Statistical method All tests were two-sided. Statistical analysis was performed using appropriate software. Level of significance was set at 5% (p<0.05). Primary calculations for efficacy were based on mean flea counts. Comparisons were made by ANOVA.	Randomisation	Randomised.
animals were infested as appropriate (approximately 40 fleas per cat), at various time points, and given treatment according to their respective groups. Flea counts were performed after treatment. Statistical method All tests were two-sided. Statistical analysis was performed using appropriate software. Level of significance was set at 5% (p<0.05). Primary calculations for efficacy were based on mean flea counts. Comparisons were made by ANOVA.	Blinding	Blinded.
performed using appropriate software. Level of significance was set at 5% (p<0.05). Primary calculations for efficacy were based on mean flea counts. Comparisons were made by ANOVA.	Method	animals were infested as appropriate (approximately 40 fleas per cat), at various time points, and given treatment according to their respective groups. Flea
RESULTS The product was seen to be effective, and no adverse	Statistical method	All tests were two-sided. Statistical analysis was performed using appropriate software. Level of significance was set at 5% (p<0.05). Primary calculations for efficacy were based on mean flea
	RESULTS	The product was seen to be effective, and no adverse

³ Equivalent to Ectostop 50 mg Spot-On Solution for Cats.

VMD/L4/GAT/014/C 9/14

	events were observed during the study
Outcomes for	After 48 hours, the therapeutic efficacies of the products
endpoints	were comparable. Efficacy was demonstrated as being
	more then 95% for the appropriate time spans.
DISCUSSION	The product was shown to be effective against the
	target parasites.

Study 2

Study title	Comparative study on the efficacy of a generic fipronil spot-on formulation (104.07) and Frontline Top Spot against fleas (Ctenocephalides felis) on cats
Objectives	To determine and compare the persistent efficacy of a fipronil spot-on formulation (104.07) with that of Frontline spot-on against fleas (Ctenocephalides felis) on cats.
Test site(s)	Laboratory environment. Single centre.
Compliance with Regulatory guidelines	Good Clinical Practice (GCP)
Test Product	Formulation 104.7 (10% fipronil), synonymous with the product to be authorised. Product delivered at 0.5 ml.
Control product/placebo	Control product, Frontline Top Spot, at 0.5ml Negative control group (no treatment).
Animals	Healthy cats, 8 animals each group.
Outcomes/endpoints	Determine the efficacy of a generic spot-on formulation against fleas on cats. Efficacy of the test product was compared to the negative control and reference product upon weekly infestation of fleas, up to Day 2.
Randomisation	Randomised.
Blinding	Blinded.
Method	This was a parallel-grouped study. After acclimatisation, animals were infested as appropriate (approximately 100 fleas per cat), at various time points, and given treatment according to their respective groups. Flea counts were performed after treatment.
Statistical method	All tests were two-sided. Statistical analysis was performed using appropriate software. Level of significance was set at 5% (p<0.05). Primary calculations for efficacy were based on mean flea counts. Comparisons were made by ANOVA.
RESULTS	The product was seen to be effective, and no adverse events were observed during the study
Outcomes for endpoints	After 48 hours, the therapeutic efficacies of the products were comparable. Efficacy was demonstrated as being more then 95% for the appropriate time spans.
DISCUSSION	The product was shown to be effective against the target parasites.

VMD/L4/GAT/014/C 10/14

Study 3

Study title	The efficacy of a single application of the spot-on 104.07 (Fipronil) compared to Frontline Spot On Cat and a no treatment control against artificially induced infestations of ticks (<i>Ixodes ricinus</i>) on cats
Objectives	To confirm the efficacy of a fipronil spot-on formulation (104.07) against the tick <i>Ixodes ricinus</i> on cats compared to Frontline Spot On Cat and a no treatment control when applied once topically at a rate of 0.5 ml per cat.
Test site(s)	Laboratory environment. Single centre.
Compliance with Regulatory guidelines	Good Clinical Practice (GCP)
Test Product	Formulation 104.7 (10% fipronil), synonymous with the product to be authorised. Product delivered at 0.5 ml.
Control	Control product, Frontline Spot-On Cat, at 0.5ml
product/placebo	Negative control group (no treatment).
Animals	Healthy cats, 6 animals each group.
Outcomes/endpoints	Determine the efficacy of a generic spot-on formulation against ticks on cats. Efficacy of the test product was compared to the negative control and reference product upon weekly infestation of fleas, up to Day 2.
Randomisation	Randomised.
Blinding	Blinded.
Method	This was a parallel-grouped study. After acclimatisation, animals were infested as appropriate (approximately 100 fleas per cat), at various time points, and given treatment according to their respective groups. Flea counts were performed after treatment.
Statistical method	All tests were two-sided. Statistical analysis was performed using appropriate software. Level of significance was set at 5% (p<0.05). Primary calculations for efficacy were based on mean flea counts. Comparisons were made by ANOVA.
RESULTS	The product was seen to be effective, and no adverse events were observed during the study
Outcomes for endpoints	After 48 hours, the therapeutic efficacies of the products were comparable. Efficacy was demonstrated as being more then 90% for the appropriate time spans.
DISCUSSION	The product was shown to be effective against the target parasites.

Study 4 (Dog Study)

Study title	The effect of shampooing on the efficacy of a generic
	fipronil spot-on formulation (104.07) against flea
	(Ctenocephalides felis) on dogs.
Objectives	To evaluate the efficacy of a topically applied spot-on

VMD/L4/GAT/014/C 11/14

	formulation of fipronil against fleas (<i>Ctenocephalides felis</i>) on dogs under laboratory conditions.
Test site(s)	Laboratory environment. Single centre.
Compliance with	Good Clinical Practice (GCP)
Regulatory guidelines	,
Test Product	Formulation 104.7 (10% fipronil), synonymous with the
	product to be authorised. Product delivered at either
	0.67 ml or 1.34 ml. (Depending on size of dog).
Control	No additional positive control product.
product/placebo	Negative control group (no treatment).
Animals	Healthy dogs, 8 animals each group.
Outcomes/endpoints	Determine the efficacy of a generic spot-on formulation
	against fleas on dogs. Efficacy of the test product was
	compared to the negative control upon weekly
	infestation of fleas, up to Day 65.
Randomisation	Randomised.
Blinding	Blinded.
Method	This was a parallel-grouped study. After acclimatisation,
	animals were infested as appropriate (approximately
	100 fleas per dog), at various time points, and given
	treatment according to their respective groups. Flea
	counts were performed on several occasions after
	treatment.
Statistical method	All tests were two-sided. Statistical analysis was
	performed using appropriate software. Level of
	significance was set at 5% (p<0.05). Primary
	calculations for efficacy were based on mean flea
DECLUTO	counts. Comparisons were made by ANOVA.
RESULTS	The product was seen to be effective, and no adverse
Outcomes for	events were observed during the study
Outcomes for	After 48 hours, the therapeutic efficacies of the products
endpoints	were comparable. Efficacy was demonstrated as being
DISCUSSION	more then 95% for the appropriate time spans. The product was shown to be effective against the
DISCUSSION	target parasites. No effect on the product was observed
	after repeated shampooing with 3% chlorhexidine, on
	weekly infestation of fleas, with shampooing occurring
	within an hour of application.
	т минит ан носи от аррисацон.

Study 5 (Dog Study)

Study title	'The effect of weekly water immersions on the efficacy
	of a generic fipronil spot-on formulation (104.07) against
	flea (Ctenocephalides felis) on dogs
Objectives	To evaluate the efficacy of a topically applied spot-on
	formulation of fipronil against fleas (Ctenocephalides
	felis) on dogs under laboratory conditions.
Test site(s)	Laboratory environment. Single centre.
Compliance with	Good Clinical Practice (GCP)

VMD/L4/GAT/014/C 12/14

Regulatory guidelines	
Test Product	Formulation 104.7 (10% fipronil), synonymous with the product to be authorised. Product delivered at either 0.67 ml or 1.34 ml. (Depending on size of dog).
Control product/placebo	Control product, Frontline Spot On Dog 10% w/v topical solution, at 0.67 ml or 1.34 ml. (Depending on dog size).
	Negative control group (no treatment).
Animals	Healthy dogs, 8 animals each group.
Outcomes/endpoints	Determine the efficacy of a generic spot-on formulation against fleas on dogs. Efficacy of the test product was compared to the negative control and reference product upon weekly infestation of fleas, up to Day 65.
Randomisation	Randomised.
Blinding	Blinded.
Method	This was a parallel-grouped study. After acclimatisation, animals were infested as appropriate (approximately 100 fleas per dog), at various time points, and given treatment according to their respective groups. Flea counts were performed on several occasions after treatment.
Statistical method	All tests were two-sided. Statistical analysis was performed using appropriate software. Level of significance was set at 5% (p<0.05). Primary calculations for efficacy were based on mean flea counts. Comparisons were made by ANOVA.
RESULTS	The product was seen to be effective, and no adverse events were observed during the study
Outcomes for	After 48 hours, the therapeutic efficacies of the products
endpoints	were comparable. Efficacy was demonstrated as being more then 95% for the appropriate time spans.
DISCUSSION	The product was shown to be effective against the target parasites, in dogs immersed on a weekly basis in water. The SPC carries appropriate efficacy information.

Field Trials

As these were generic 'hybrid' applications, there was no requirement for data in this section.

V OVERALL CONCLUSION AND BENEFIT- RISK ASSESSMENT

The data submitted in the dossier demonstrate that when the product is used in accordance with the Summary of Product Characteristics, the benefit/risk profile for the target species is favourable and the quality and safety of the product for humans and the environment is acceptable.

VMD/L4/GAT/014/C 13/14



POST-AUTHORISATION ASSESSMENTS

The SPC and package leaflet may be updated to include new information on the quality, safety and efficacy of the veterinary medicinal product. The current SPC is available on the Product Information Database of the Veterinary Medicines Directorate website.

(www.gov.uk/check-animal-medicine-licensed)

The post-authorisation assessment (PAA) contains information on significant changes which have been made after the original procedure which are important for the quality, safety or efficacy of the product.

The PAA for this product is available on the Product Information Database of the Veterinary Medicines Directorate website.

(www.gov.uk/check-animal-medicine-licensed)

VMD/L4/GAT/014/C 14/14