
Guidance for Industry and FDA Staff

Dear Health Care Provider Letters: Improving Communication of Important Safety Information

DRAFT GUIDANCE

This guidance document is being distributed for comment purposes only.

Comments and suggestions regarding this draft document should be submitted within 60 days of publication in the *Federal Register* of the notice announcing the availability of the draft guidance. Submit comments to the Division of Dockets Management (HFA-305), Food and Drug Administration, 5630 Fishers Lane, rm. 1061, Rockville, MD 20852. All comments should be identified with the docket number listed in the notice of availability that publishes in the *Federal Register*.

For questions regarding this draft document contact (CDER) Sandy Benton, 301-796-7270, or (CBER) Office of Communication, Outreach, and Development at 301-827-1800.

**U.S. Department of Health and Human Services
Food and Drug Administration
Center for Drug Evaluation and Research (CDER)
Center for Biologics Evaluation and Research (CBER)**

**November 2010
Procedural**

Guidance for Industry and FDA Staff

Dear Health Care Provider Letters: Improving Communication of Important Safety Information

*Additional copies are available from:
Office of Training and Communication
Division of Drug Information
Center for Drug Evaluation and Research
Food and Drug Administration
10903 New Hampshire Avenue
Silver Spring, MD 20993-0002
(Tel) 301-796-3400*

<http://www.fda.gov/Drugs/GuidanceComplianceRegulatoryInformation/Guidances/default.htm>

and/or

*Office of Communication, Outreach, and Development
Center for Biologics Evaluation and Research
Food and Drug Administration
1401 Rockville Pike, Rockville, MD 20852-1448*

<http://www.fda.gov/BiologicsBloodVaccines/GuidanceComplianceRegulatoryInformation/Guidances/default.htm>

(Tel) 800-835-4709 or 301-827-1800

**U.S. Department of Health and Human Services
Food and Drug Administration
Center for Drug Evaluation and Research (CDER)
Center for Biologics Evaluation and Research (CBER)**

**November 2010
Procedural**

Contains Nonbinding Recommendations

Draft — Not for Implementation

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I.	INTRODUCTION	1
II.	BACKGROUND	1
III.	FDA CONSULTATION ON DEVELOPMENT OF DHCP LETTERS	2
IV.	WHEN TO USE A DHCP LETTER/WHICH TYPES OF DHCP LETTER TO USE	3
	A. Important Drug Warning Letter	3
	B. Important Prescribing Information Letter	3
	C. Important Correction of Drug Information Letter	4
V.	CONTENT AND FORMAT OF DHCP LETTERS	4
	A. Content Recommendations	4
	B. Format Recommendations	9
VI.	ASSESSMENT OF THE DHCP LETTER IMPACT	9

Contains Nonbinding Recommendations

Draft — Not for Implementation

Guidance for Industry and FDA Staff¹

**Dear Health Care Provider Letters:
Improving Communication of Important Information**

This draft guidance, when finalized, will represent the Food and Drug Administration's (FDA's) current thinking on this topic. It does not create or confer any rights for or on any person and does not operate to bind FDA or the public. You can use an alternative approach if the approach satisfies the requirements of the applicable statutes and regulations. If you want to discuss an alternative approach, contact the FDA staff responsible for implementing this guidance. If you cannot identify the appropriate FDA staff, call the appropriate number listed on the title page of this guidance.

I. INTRODUCTION

This guidance provides recommendations to industry and FDA staff on the content and format of Dear Health Care Provider (DHCP) Letters.² DHCP letters are correspondence — usually in the form of a mass mailing from the manufacturer or distributor of a human drug or biologic, or from FDA — intended to alert physicians and other health care providers responsible for patient care about important new information regarding a human drug or biologic (hereafter “drug” also refers to biologic and small molecule drug products). These recommendations are also intended to apply to DHCP letters distributed by electronic means (e.g., email) to the extent practical for the type of electronic communication used. This guidance provides recommendations on when to use a DHCP letter, the types of information to include in a DHCP letter, how to organize that information so that it is communicated effectively to health care practitioners, and formatting techniques to make the information more accessible.

FDA’s guidance documents, including this guidance, do not establish legally enforceable responsibilities. Instead, guidances describe the Agency’s current thinking on a topic and should be viewed only as recommendations, unless specific regulatory or statutory requirements are cited. The use of the word *should* in Agency guidances means that something is suggested or recommended, but not required.

II. BACKGROUND

¹ This guidance has been prepared by the Office of Medical Policy in the Center for Drug Evaluation and Research (CDER) in cooperation with the Center for Biologics Evaluation and Research (CBER) at the Food and Drug Administration.

² Although not specifically intended for this purpose, the guidance may be used, in appropriate circumstances, to help develop correspondence to meet certain of the communication plan requirements for Risk Evaluation and Mitigation Strategies (REMS) under section 501-1(a)(3) of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act.

Contains Nonbinding Recommendations

Draft — Not for Implementation

40 New information about prescription drug products emerges throughout a product’s lifecycle. For
41 marketed products, there are occasions when it is important to communicate new information
42 promptly to health care practitioners involved in prescribing or dispensing a drug, or in caring for
43 patients who receive a drug. The DHCP letter is one of the mechanisms used to communicate
44 important new information about a marketed product. FDA regulations describe the process for
45 mailing important new information about drug products (21 CFR 200.5), but do not provide
46 criteria for the format and content of the actual letter.

47
48 Formal and informal evaluations of DHCP letters have shown that the communication quality of
49 DHCP letters — the extent to which the information is accessible and can be understood —
50 varies widely. A 2005 study (the Mazor study) evaluated the quality of a group of DHCP letters
51 sent during 2000 and 2001 that were intended to communicate important new drug safety
52 information.³ The Mazor study found a correlation between the quality or perceived quality of a
53 DHCP letter and the extent to which physicians perceive the new information as important.
54 Letters that were evaluated as clearer, more concise, better organized and formatted, and focused
55 on the most important aspects of the new safety information were also considered to be more
56 effective in communicating the new information.

57
58 Therefore, FDA believes guidance on the format and content of the DHCP letter would help
59 improve the effectiveness of DHCP letters in communicating drug information. Based on some
60 of the findings and recommendations from the Mazor study, FDA’s own experience in
61 evaluating DHCP letters, and the Agency’s risk communication experience generally, this
62 guidance provides recommendations to help improve the quality of DHCP letters and their
63 ability to effectively communicate important drug information.

64
65

III. FDA CONSULTATION ON DEVELOPMENT OF DHCP LETTERS

66
67

68 FDA believes that effective communication of important new information in DHCP letters can
69 best be accomplished if FDA and the manufacturer work together to determine:

70

- 71 • Whether a DHCP letter should be used to convey new information
- 72 • How to present the new information in the letter
- 73 • The target audience for the information in the letter

74

75 Therefore, FDA encourages manufacturers to consult with the appropriate review division in the
76 development of a DHCP letter to ensure that the letter clearly and accurately reflects both the
77 manufacturer’s and FDA’s understanding of the issue and the action required to address the
78 issue. In addition to providing a broader range of input into the content of the letter, such
79 consultation could potentially avoid the need to send a corrective letter in the event that FDA
80 determines, after a DHCP letter has been sent, that the content of the letter was somehow false or
81 misleading.

82

83

³ Mazor K, Andrade S, Auger J, et al., “Communicating Safety Information to Physicians: An Examination of Dear Doctor Letters,” *Pharmacoepidemiol Drug Safety* 2005;14:869-875.

Contains Nonbinding Recommendations

Draft — Not for Implementation

84 **IV. WHEN TO USE A DHCP LETTER/WHICH TYPES OF DHCP LETTER TO USE**

85

86 **When is a DHCP Letter Needed?**

87

88 In general, a DHCP letter is used to inform health care practitioners about important new
89 information about a drug. In most cases, the new information is about an important new safety
90 concern that could affect the decision to use a drug or require some change in behavior by health
91 care practitioners, patients, or caregivers to reduce the potential for harm from a drug. In some
92 cases, the new information is about how to improve the effectiveness of a drug. A DHCP letter
93 may also be needed to correct misinformation in advertising or other types of prescription drug
94 promotion. There are three types of DHCP letters described in FDA regulations (21 CFR 200.5):

95

96 **A. Important Drug Warning Letter**

97

98 Important Drug Warning DHCP letters should be used to convey important new safety
99 information that “concerns a significant hazard to health” (21 CFR 200.5) and, therefore, could
100 affect the decision to use a drug or require a change in behavior concerning use of the drug (e.g.,
101 a specific type of monitoring). This type of DHCP letter should be used for information that is to
102 be incorporated into one or more of the following labeling sections: **BOXED WARNINGS**,
103 **CONTRAINDICATIONS**, or **WARNINGS AND PRECAUTIONS**. Examples of the types of
104 safety concerns that should be communicated in Important Drug Warning DHCP letters include,
105 but are not limited to:

106

- 107 • Previously unknown serious or life-threatening adverse reactions
- 108 • Clinically important new information about a known adverse reaction
- 109 • Identification of a subpopulation at greater risk in whom the drug should be used
110 with added caution (e.g., patients with renal or hepatic failure, HIV+ patients)
- 111 • Identification of a subpopulation in whom the drug is contraindicated
- 112 • Drug interaction or medication error that may result in a serious or life-
113 threatening adverse reaction

114

115 **B. Important Prescribing Information Letter**

116

117 Important Prescribing Information DHCP letters should be used to convey important changes to
118 the prescribing information other than those changes that should be described in an Important
119 Drug Warning letter (section IV.A). An Important Prescribing Information DHCP letter should
120 ordinarily be used to convey substantive changes to the **INDICATIONS AND USAGE** and
121 **DOSAGE AND ADMINISTRATION** sections. The types of information that should be
122 communicated in Important Prescribing Information DHCP letters include the following:

123

- 124 • A change in the **INDICATIONS** section intended to minimize risk or improve
125 effectiveness
- 126 • A change to the dose or dosage regimen intended to minimize risk or improve
127 effectiveness

128

Contains Nonbinding Recommendations

Draft — Not for Implementation

129 If the new information results in the addition of warning information to the BOXED
130 WARNINGS, CONTRAINDICATIONS, or WARNINGS AND PRECAUTIONS section and a
131 change to the INDICATIONS or DOSAGE AND ADMINISTRATION section, the letter should
132 be an Important Drug Warning letter. A DHCP letter should not be used merely to announce a
133 new indication.

C. Important Correction of Drug Information Letter

137 Important Correction of Drug Information DHCP letters are intended to correct false or
138 misleading information or other misinformation in prescription drug promotional labeling and
139 advertising that is the subject of a Warning Letter or other Agency action. Although the
140 circumstances in which FDA would seek to have a manufacturer disseminate corrective
141 information using a DHCP letter are outside the scope of this guidance, this guidance provides
142 recommendations for the format and content of such letters (see, in particular, section V.A.4.b of
143 this document).

V. CONTENT AND FORMAT OF DHCP LETTERS

A. Content Recommendations

149 In general, to most effectively communicate new information, FDA believes a DHCP letter
150 should clearly state the following at or near the beginning of the letter:

- 152 • The purpose of the letter (e.g., to inform prescribers about a specific new drug safety issue)
- 153 • The new information
- 154 • Existing information that has changed, if any (e.g., information that is no longer valid in
155 light of the new information)
- 156 • The action, if any, a health care provider should take in response to the new information

157
158 The letter should be clear, concise, and contain sufficient detail to meaningfully inform the target
159 audience. We recommend the letter not exceed two pages. It should also avoid discussion of
160 non-critical information that could obscure the more important information. The letter should
161 contain the appropriate contact information. For example, if the letter concerns an adverse
162 reaction, it should provide manufacturer and FDA contact information for reporting new cases of
163 the reaction. Ordinarily, it will not be sufficient to merely state that the labeling for Drug X has
164 changed and what the new labeling language says. The new information should be summarized,
165 highlighted, and presented as described below, using language from the new labeling, as
166 appropriate.

167
168 The content recommendations below are also intended to apply to DHCP letters distributed
169 electronically to the extent practical for the type of communication used. Those intending to
170 distribute a DHCP letter electronically should also consult FDA guidance on using electronic

Contains Nonbinding Recommendations

Draft — Not for Implementation

171 means to distribute certain product information for additional recommendations specific to
172 electronic distribution.⁴

173

174 *1. Letter Heading*

175

176 Depending on the nature of the information contained in the DHCP letter, one of the following
177 statements (corresponding to the three types of DHCP letters) should appear on the envelope (21
178 CFR 200.5, see section IV). The electronic distribution guidance referenced above contains
179 recommendations on how to make electronically distributed DHCP letters similarly distinctive.

180

181 • IMPORTANT DRUG WARNING

182

183 • IMPORTANT PRESCRIBING INFORMATION

184

185 • IMPORTANT CORRECTION OF DRUG INFORMATION

186

187 The letter heading should repeat whichever statement appears on the envelope in the same format
188 (a smaller font may be used, as needed). For a DHCP letter distributed electronically, the letter
189 heading should be the statement that would have appeared on the envelope if paper distribution
190 had been used. Manufacturers whose letters have been reviewed by FDA may also include a
191 statement in the heading indicating that FDA has reviewed the letter and agrees with its contents.
192 Alternatively, FDA's concurrence can be mentioned in the text of the letter.

193

194 *2. Addressees (Target Audience)*

195

196 A DHCP letter should be directed to all health care providers who are likely to prescribe,
197 dispense, or administer the drug and others who would have a need to know the information
198 being disseminated. Ordinarily, potential prescribers — the gatekeepers to access to the drug —
199 would be the most important audience for a DHCP letter. Therefore, a manufacturer should
200 make certain to direct the letter to the full range of health care providers who would have
201 occasion to prescribe the drug, including nurse practitioners and physician assistants who have
202 prescribing authority. A DHCP letter should also be directed to other health care providers who
203 may not have occasion to prescribe the drug, but for whom it would otherwise be important to
204 know the information in the letter. For example, the letter should be directed to emergency
205 department or primary care physicians who might not have occasion to prescribe the drug that is
206 the subject of a DHCP letter, but could be providing care for patients with a drug-induced
207 adverse reaction described in the letter. Similarly, a DHCP letter that announces the introduction
208 of a new Medication Guide should be directed to pharmacists who would be required to
209 distribute the Medication Guide to patients.

210

211

212

213

⁴ Guidance for industry on *Using Electronic Means to Distribute Certain Product Information*
<http://www.fda.gov/RegulatoryInformation/Guidances/ucm125164.htm>.

Contains Nonbinding Recommendations

Draft — Not for Implementation

214 3. *Subject Line*

215
216 Immediately following the heading, a DHCP letter should have a subject line that includes the
217 drug name (proprietary and generic) and a concise description of the issue (e.g., drug safety
218 concern) that is addressed in the body of the letter. The subject line may also include
219 characterization of the relative seriousness of the problem (e.g., serious, life-threatening, or fatal
220 adverse reactions) and the population at risk. Numerical estimates of incidence rate and
221 imprecise terms intended to characterize the incidence of a reaction (e.g., rare, infrequent) should
222 be avoided in the subject line. However, a well-defined increase in the magnitude of risk or rate
223 of a reaction (e.g., rate of reaction X is doubled) might be appropriate. It may also be useful to
224 place the subject line within a border or box, or in bold type, to further draw attention to the
225 information. See the following examples:

226
227 Subject: Severe, Life-Threatening, and Fatal Cases of Hepatotoxicity Reported with DRUG
228 NAME

229
230 Subject: Limitations on Use of DRUG NAME in Patients with Decreased Renal Function
231 Because of Risk of Worsening Renal Function and Increased Mortality

232
233 Subject: Threefold Increase in Risk of Macular Edema in Elderly Taking DRUG NAME

234 4. *The Body of the Letter*

235
236
237 The beginning of the body of the DHCP letter should briefly summarize only the information
238 essential to a practitioner's understanding of the nature of the problem and how to manage it.
239 This guidance describes a two-paragraph format, but in some cases a single paragraph will be
240 adequate to convey the most important information.

241 (a) Important Drug Warning or Important Prescribing Information Letters

242
243
244 For letters intended to convey an important drug warning or important new prescribing
245 information, the beginning of the body of the letter should generally be limited to the following
246 types of information to the extent known and relevant to the issue that is subject of the letter:

247 **First Paragraph – Concise Description of the Issue**

- 248
249
- 250 • The name of the affected product(s) and brief description of what it is used for (more
251 detail about indications can be included in subsequent paragraphs if warranted)
 - 252
 - 253 • A brief description of the issue that is cause for the new warning or other change in the
254 prescribing information, including the nature and severity of the issue (e.g., adverse
255 reaction or other potential harm)
 - 256
 - 257 • The population or populations at risk, if narrower than the population for whom the drug
258 is indicated
 - 259

Contains Nonbinding Recommendations

Draft — Not for Implementation

- 260 • The degree of risk, if known. If there are reliable rate data from a controlled trial,
261 observational study, or other source, the rate can be included. If the new information is
262 based on spontaneous reports, the number of reports over a specified time period may be
263 included if that number is an important factor in explaining why the Agency is taking
264 regulatory action (even though spontaneous report numbers quickly become outdated).
265
- 266 • Whether the issue is associated with use of the drug for an unlabeled use or population
267
- 268 • Rationale for change in indication or dose
269
- 270 • Why a Medication Guide is needed
271

Second Paragraph – How Practitioners Should Address the Issue

- 272
- 273
- 274 • Recommended action. Examples include, but are not limited to:
275
 - 276 ○ Discontinue use
 - 277 ○ Monitor patient for specific clinical findings or laboratory results
 - 278 ○ Perform additional testing before prescribing
 - 279 ○ Reduce dose
 - 280 ○ Limit use to patients with certain characteristics or clinical features (e.g.,
281 treatment failures on another drug, patients who do not have a concomitant
282 condition)
- 283
- 284 • What to tell patients who may be at risk. Examples include, but are not limited to:
285
 - 286 ○ Patients should be advised to contact their doctor if they experience a specific
287 clinical sign or symptom
 - 288 ○ Patients should be advised to stop the drug immediately if they experience a
289 specific clinical sign or symptom
 - 290 ○ Patients who experience a specific clinical sign or symptom should be advised to
291 consult with their doctor before discontinuing the drug
- 292

(b) Correction of Drug Information Letters

293
294
295 For letters intended to correct information in prescription drug advertising or promotional
296 labeling, the first paragraph should specify the following:

- 297
- 298 • That the purpose of the letter is to correct false or misleading claims or other
299 misinformation
- 300 • The information that is false or misleading and why it is incorrect
- 301 • The correct information
- 302 • Where and in what format the incorrect information was conveyed to health care
303 practitioners
- 304 • That the incorrect information was the subject of a Warning Letter or other
305 regulatory action by FDA, if applicable

Contains Nonbinding Recommendations

Draft — Not for Implementation

306
307
308
309
310
311
312
313
314
315
316
317
318
319
320
321
322
323
324
325
326
327
328
329
330
331
332
333
334
335
336
337
338
339
340
341
342
343
344
345
346
347
348
349
350

The remainder of the correction of information letter should be modeled on the general organization and content described in this section.

5. The Interior Paragraphs

Interior paragraphs should be used to provide additional detail that would be helpful in understanding the issue, such as:

- Attributes of affected patient populations or subsets
- Summary of the data or other information that is the basis for a new safety warning (e.g., summary information about a controlled clinical trial, epidemiologic study, or spontaneous adverse event reporting)
- The limitations of that data and information (e.g., what is known and what is not known)
- The mechanism of the adverse reaction
- Whether the event is common to a drug class
- Discussion of additional research being done to better understand an adverse reaction
- Why a promotional claim was false or misleading
- Broader discussion of a drug's indication(s)

6. The Final Paragraph

The final paragraph should include the following information, to the extent relevant:

- Information on how to report new cases of the adverse reaction described in the letter including (1) FDA contact information for reporting events, and (2) company contact information for reporting events and obtaining additional information (this should be a health care provider who can respond directly to inquiries)
- Reference to the full prescribing information (which must be enclosed in the letter) and a Medication Guide or other approved Patient Information, if any

7. Types of Information That Should Generally Not Be in a DHCP Letter

Additional detail that could obscure more important information should generally be omitted from a DHCP letter or placed in a location that would not cause it to divert attention from more important information. Examples of such information include, but are not limited to:

- Information about the worldwide market for the drug or device, including numbers of prescriptions, patient exposures, approvals, and pending approvals
- Extensive details about the design of a clinical study
- Information about a safety review panel convened to assess a safety issue

Contains Nonbinding Recommendations

Draft — Not for Implementation

- 351 • A sponsor’s plans to further investigate the problem
352 • Promotional language or claims
353

B. Format Recommendations

354
355
356 The letter should be formatted in a way that will help make the information in the letter easily
357 accessible to the reader. We recommend use of typographic and formatting techniques to
358 maximize readability, including:
359

- 360 • Informative paragraph headings
361 • Vertical lists with bullets or numbering, where appropriate
362 • Text emphasis techniques to draw attention to major points (e.g., bold font, larger
363 font, italics)
364 • Minimum 12 point font size
365 • Easily readable font
366 • Upper and lowercase letters (e.g., avoid all caps)
367 • Adequate kerning and leading (i.e., letters should not touch within lines, lines of
368 text should not touch one another)
369 • Use of white space to delineate paragraphs and organize text⁵
370

371 These format recommendations are also intended to apply to DHCP letters distributed
372 electronically to the extent practical for the type of communication used (see footnote #4).
373

VI. ASSESSMENT OF THE DHCP LETTER IMPACT

374
375
376 To determine whether a DHCP letter has had its intended effect, we recommend that
377 manufacturers conduct an evaluation of the extent to which the target audience received the
378 DHCP letter and is aware of the information that was communicated in the letter. For letters that
379 are intended to modify behavior in the target audience, ideally there would also be an evaluation
380 of the extent to which the DHCP letter changed behavior in the manner described in the letter.
381
382
383

⁵ See, for example, Chapparro, B, Baker, JR, Shaikh, AD, Hull, S, and Brady, L, “Reading Online Text: A Comparison of Four White Space Layouts,” *Usability News*, 2004. 6(2). Available at <http://psychology.wichita.edu/surl/usabilitynews/62/whitespace.htm>.