



# **Technical Report No. 82**

## **Low Endotoxin Recovery**



## **PDA Low Endotoxin Recovery Technical Report Team**

---

**Dayue Chen**, PhD, Eli Lilly and Company, Co-leader

**Friedrich von Wintzingerode**, PhD, Genentech, A Member of the Roche Group, Co-leader

**Julie Barlasov-Brown**, Merck & Co.

**Lindsey Brown**, PhD, U.S. Food and Drug Administration

**Allen Burgenson**, Lonza Group Ltd.

**Joseph Chen**, PhD, Ultragenix Pharmaceutical, Inc.

**Monica Commerford**, PhD, U.S. Food and Drug Administration

**Gregory Devulder**, PhD, bioMerieux, Inc.

**Jennifer Farrington**, PhD, Associates of Cape Cod, Inc.

**Jessica Hankins**, PhD, U.S. Food and Drug Administration

**Patricia Hughes**, PhD, U.S. Food and Drug Administration

**Stefan Ishak**, Novartis

**Chris Knutsen**, PhD, Bristol-Myers Squibb Inc.

**Jack Levin**, MD, University of California, San Francisco, School of Medicine

**Jeanne Mateffy**, Amgen Inc.

**Ned Mozier**, PhD, Pfizer Inc.

**Scott Nichols**, PhD, U.S. Food and Drug Administration

**Cheryl Platco**, Merck & Co. (retired)

**Johannes Reich**, PhD, Microcoat Biotechnologie GmbH

**Stijn Seels**, Sanofi

**Anders Thorn**, Novo Nordisk A/S

**Masakazu Tsuchiya**, PhD, Charles River Laboratories, Inc.

**René Ørving**, Biogen

# Foreword

PDA is at its heart a science-based organization. Our activities and processes have been implemented to promote the free exchange of ideas and promote inclusion in participation, regardless of the organization to which a member may belong. We also strive to achieve consensus among the subject matter experts and to inform our members (and others) of the best practice (and in some cases, the regulatory requirements). Our aim is always to make recommendations that advance patient safety.

PDA has also implemented a multistage review process for technical reports and position papers, which includes not only the task force itself and the relevant advisory board, but also peer reviewers who offer independent input on the subject matter. Finally, of course, the Board of Directors reviews and approves all these documents. In every step, we document the resolution of all comments, and that resolution is communicated to the next level of review. This process, although cumbersome, is how we are working to ensure that we are exercising due diligence in positions adopted by the PDA.

Specifically, regarding this Technical Report, low endotoxin recovery (LER) has been discussed in open fora many times over the last several years. The task force includes subject matter experts from several organizations, as well as U.S. FDA. We increased the number of peer reviewers on this draft report to 30 individuals from 23 different industry, academic, and regulatory authority organizations.

The reliable and sensitive detection of bacterial endotoxin is a key test underpinning patient safety in the manufacturing of parenteral drugs. The globally harmonized compendial tests linked to well-characterized reference standards have provided this assurance to industry and regulators for decades despite the complex nature of both the assays and the reference materials being. This complexity has been demonstrated each time new assay approaches or reference materials have been proposed. Over the past decade, biologics manufacturing has exploded, and new products, formulations, and delivery systems continue to push the boundaries of modern manufacturing. In this context, it should not be surprising that a phenomenon like LER arises to once again challenge our current understanding of assay systems, reagents, and our own manufacturing process.

To that end, the PDA task force commissioned with this technical report went to the greatest lengths possible to present as complete a picture of the current LER situation. This includes the historical and mechanistic aspects of the endotoxin measurement challenges, as well as a standard protocol for developing product-specific hold studies, supported and informed by actual industry case studies. Both the technical report team and the approving Biopharmaceutical Advisory Board understand that this is a very complex and still evolving area of science that is not without controversy. Extensive peer review comments were addressed, and the findings were widely presented in public fora before the completion of this report. PDA believes it is vitally important to make this information available to further the scientific dialog and progress in this area and remains committed to revising and updating this material as new discoveries and conclusions are made.

Richard M. Johnson  
President & CEO, PDA

# Low Endotoxin Recovery

**Technical Report No. 82**

ISBN: 978-1-945584-07-7

© 2019 Parenteral Drug Association, Inc.

All rights reserved.



# Table of Contents

<b>1.0 Introduction.....</b>	<b>1</b>	6.2 Microbial Control During Manufacturing and Product Quality .....	21
1.1 Purpose .....	1	6.3 Endotoxin Structure .....	21
1.2 Scope .....	1	6.4 <i>Limulus</i> Amebocyte Lysate (LAL) Assay .....	22
<b>2.0 Glossary of Terms.....</b>	<b>2</b>	6.5 Endotoxin Reference Standards.....	24
2.1 Abbreviations.....	3	6.5.1 U.S. FDA Development of Reference Standard Endotoxins.....	24
<b>3.0 LER Hold-Time Studies .....</b>	<b>3</b>	6.5.2 Harmonization of International Reference Standard Endotoxins .....	26
3.1 Test Method .....	4	6.6 Natural Occurring Endotoxins (NOEs) .....	27
3.1.1 Reagents and Materials .....	4	6.7 Immune Response .....	27
3.1.2 Spiking of Undiluted Sample .....	4	<b>7.0 References .....</b>	<b>30</b>
3.1.3 Storage Containers.....	5	<b>8.0 Appendix: Case Studies of LER Occurrences .....</b>	<b>37</b>
3.1.4 Batch Requirements.....	5	8.1 Case Study 1: Low Concentration PS20 Caused LER Reaction in the Presence of Monoclonal Antibody Product .....	37
3.1.5 Storage Time and Temperature .....	5	8.1.1 Introduction.....	37
3.1.6 Controls .....	6	8.1.2 Materials and Methods .....	37
3.1.7 Equipment.....	6	8.1.3 Results and Discussion .....	38
3.1.8 Personnel.....	6	8.1.4 Conclusion .....	39
3.1.9 Data Analysis and Interpretation.....	6	8.1.5 References .....	40
<b>4.0 Proposed Mechanisms of LER .....</b>	<b>7</b>	8.2 Case Study 2: Mapping LER Effect in In-Process Stages of Purification .....	41
4.1 Differentiation of LER and Test Interference.....	8	8.2.1 Introduction.....	41
4.2 Investigation of LER Causes .....	8	8.2.2 Materials and Methods .....	42
4.3 Proposed Two-Step Reaction Model of LER.....	9	8.2.3 Results and Discussion .....	42
4.4 Factors Influencing Reaction Kinetics .....	10	8.2.4 Discussion.....	44
4.4.1 Energy Input (Extrinsic) .....	10	8.2.5 Key Lessons Learned .....	44
4.4.2 Masking Capability of a Sample .....	11	8.2.6 Conclusion .....	44
4.4.3 Masking Susceptibility of Endotoxins.....	12	8.2.7 Recommendations.....	45
4.5 Potential Aggregation States of Detectable and Non-detectable Endotoxin .....	13	8.3 Case Study 3: Use of Purified and Nonpurified Endotoxins in Hold-time Studies .....	46
4.5.1 LER and Limited LPS Interaction with Factor C.....	14	8.3.1 Introduction.....	46
4.5.2 Activity of Monomeric and Aggregated LPS..	14	8.3.2 Materials and Methods .....	47
4.6 Summary .....	15	8.3.3 Results and Discussion .....	47
<b>5.0 Mitigation of LER .....</b>	<b>15</b>	8.3.4 Molecular Basis of LER Susceptibility .....	52
5.1 Mitigation through Sample Treatment .....	15	8.3.5 Conclusion .....	54
5.1.1 Evaluation of the Product.....	16	8.3.6 References .....	54
5.1.2 Addition of Dispersants to Samples .....	16	8.4 Case Study 4: Factors Affecting Low Endotoxin Recovery.....	55
5.1.3 Addition of Excess Divalent Cations.....	16	8.4.1 Introduction.....	55
5.1.4 Other Sample Treatments .....	16	8.4.2 Materials and Methods .....	55
5.1.5 Evaluation of LAL Assay Reagents .....	16	8.4.3 Results and Discussion .....	57
5.1.6 Non-LAL Endotoxin Testing .....	17	8.4.4 Effects of Temperature, pH, and Salt Concentration on LER.....	58
5.2 Evaluation through a Biological System .....	17	8.4.5 Effects of Matrix Components on LER at Relevant Concentrations .....	60
5.2.1 Endotoxin Dosage.....	17	8.4.6 Effects of Dilution Methods on Recovery of RSE in LER Solutions.....	61
5.2.2 Product Dosage.....	18	8.4.7 Conditions for Magnesium Dilution Method ...	62
5.2.3 Monocyte Activation Test .....	19	8.4.8 Conclusion .....	63
5.3 Interpretation of Results .....	20		
5.4 Summary .....	20		
<b>6.0 History and Rationale for LER Studies .....</b>	<b>20</b>		
6.1 Regulatory Framework.....	20		

8.4.9	References .....	63	8.8.5	Conclusion .....	93
8.5	Case Study 5: Comparison of Different Methods Used for Calculation of Percentile Endotoxin Recovery from LPS-Spiked Biological Therapeutic Products .....	65	8.8.6	References .....	93
8.5.1	Introduction.....	65	8.9	Case Study 9: LER Case Study for a Monoclonal Antibody.....	94
8.5.2	Materials and Methods .....	65	8.9.1	Introduction.....	94
8.5.3	Results.....	66	8.9.2	Materials and Methods.....	94
8.5.4	Discussion.....	68	8.9.3	Results and Discussion .....	97
8.5.5	Conclusion .....	70	8.9.4	Conclusion .....	100
8.5.6	References .....	71	8.9.5	References .....	102
8.6	Case Study 6: Lipopolysaccharide Masking and Resolution of Low Endotoxin/Lipopolysaccharide Recovery (LER/LLR) in a Citrate Buffer Monoclonal Antibody containing Polysorbate and Chelating Agent .....	72	8.10	Case Study 10: Endotoxin Recovery Studies with a Biologic Formulated with Citrate and Polysorbate 20 .....	103
8.6.1	Introduction.....	72	8.10.1	Introduction.....	103
8.6.2	Materials and Methods .....	72	8.10.2	Materials.....	103
8.6.3	Results and Discussion .....	74	8.10.3	Methods .....	104
8.6.4	Conclusion .....	78	8.10.4	Results and Discussion .....	105
8.6.5	References .....	78	8.10.5	Conclusion .....	108
8.7	Case Study 7: Evaluation of an Endotoxin Demasking Protocol .....	79	8.10.6	References .....	109
8.7.1	Introduction.....	79	8.11	Case Study 11: No LER Effect in a Sodium Phosphate, Polysorbate 80 Formulation Matrix ..	110
8.7.2	Materials .....	79	8.11.1	Introduction.....	110
8.7.3	Methods .....	80	8.11.2	Materials and Methods .....	110
8.7.4	Results and Discussion .....	80	8.11.3	Results and Discussion .....	111
8.7.5	Conclusion .....	84	8.11.4	Conclusion .....	112
8.7.6	References .....	84	8.11.5	References .....	112
8.8	Case Study 8: Strategy to Investigate and Overcome LER Driven by Protein .....	86	8.12	Case Study 12: Lack of LER Phenomenon in A Therapeutic Protein Biologic with Known LER-Causing Ingredients .....	113
8.8.1	Introduction.....	86	8.12.1	Introduction.....	113
8.8.2	Materials and Methods .....	87	8.12.2	Materials.....	113
8.8.3	Results.....	88	8.12.3	Methods .....	114
8.8.4	Discussion.....	92	8.12.4	Results and Discussion .....	114
			8.12.5	Conclusion .....	117
			8.12.6	References .....	117

## Figures and Tables Index

<b>Table 3.1.5.1-1</b>	Example for Identification of LER Process-Relevant Steps.....	6	<b>Table 6.5.2-1</b>	Endotoxin standards and their assigned potency .....	26
<b>Table 4.2-1</b>	Investigation of LER Driving Forces in Biopharmaceutical Drug Products .....	9	<b>Figure 6.7-1</b>	Structural Basis of Lipopolysaccharide Recognition by TLR4-MD-2 Complex... ..	28
<b>Figure 4.3-1</b>	Schematic of Masking/Demasking Phenomenon.....	10	<b>Figure 6.7-2</b>	TLR Recognition of Microbial Components .....	29
<b>Figure 4.4.3-1</b>	Covalent Modifications of Kdo2-lipid A in <i>E. coli</i> K-12 and <i>Salmonella</i> .....	13	<b>Table 8.1.3-1</b>	Recovery of CSE from Spiked DS and DP Samples .....	38
<b>Figure 6.3-1</b>	<i>E. coli</i> K-12 Kdo-Lipid A Structure ....	22	<b>Table 8.1.3-2</b>	Recovery of NOE from Spiked DS and DP Samples .....	39
<b>Figure 6.3-2</b>	Degree of Lipid A Acylation Impacts IL-1 Response .....	23	<b>Table 8.1.3-3</b>	Recovery of CSE from Spiked DP Samples Stored at Below-freezing Temperatures (-30 °C) .....	39
<b>Table 6.5.1-1</b>	U.S. Reference Standard Endotoxins development history .....	25			

<b>Figure 8.2.1-1</b>	Testing Setup Overview.....	41	<b>Figure 8.4.6-3</b>	Effects of Sorts of Chelating Agents and Detergents on LER .....	62
<b>Figure 8.3.3.1-1</b>	Masking of Four Model Bacterial NOEs in LER solutions at Room Temperature .....	48	<b>Table 8.5.3-1</b>	Endotoxin Activity Detected from LPS-spiked BTP-1 Over Time .....	66
<b>Figure 8.3.3.1-2</b>	Masking of Different Bacterial NOE in LER Solutions at Room Temperature..	48	<b>Table 8.5.3-2</b>	Comparison of Recovery % Calculated by Different Methods for BTP-1 .....	66
<b>Figure 8.3.3.2-1</b>	Masking of Bacterial NOE and Purified Endotoxin in LER Solutions at Room Temperature.....	49	<b>Table 8.5.3-3</b>	Endotoxin Activity Detected from LPS-Spiked BTP-2 Over Time.....	67
<b>Figure 8.3.3.3-1</b>	Recovery of <i>P. aeruginosa</i> NOE as a Function of Nutrient Supply and Temperature.....	50	<b>Table 8.5.3-4</b>	Comparison of Recovery % Calculated by Different Methods for BTP-2 .....	67
<b>Figure 8.3.3.4-1</b>	Recovery of <i>E. coli</i> O113:H10 NOE as a Function of Bivalent Cation Supply a pH .....	51	<b>Table 8.5.3-5</b>	Endotoxin Activity Detected from LPS-Spiked BTP-3 Over Time.....	67
<b>Table 8.3.3.4-1</b>	Varied Growth Conditions for <i>E. coli</i> .	51	<b>Table 8.5.3-6</b>	Comparison of Recovery% Calculated by Different Methods for BTP-3 .....	68
<b>Table 8.3.3.4-2</b>	Varied Growth Conditions for <i>P. aeruginosa</i> .....	51	<b>Table 8.5.3-7</b>	Endotoxin Activity Detected from LPS-Spiked BTP-4 Over Time.....	68
<b>Figure 8.3.3.4-2</b>	Recovery of <i>P. aeruginosa</i> NOE as a Function of Bivalent Cation Supply and pH.....	52	<b>Table 8.5.3-8</b>	Comparison of Recovery% Calculated by Different Methods for BTP-4 .....	68
<b>Figure 8.3.4-1</b>	Lipid A Modifications in <i>E. coli</i> .....	53	<b>Table 8.5.4-1</b>	Effect of Pyrospense™ on LPS Activities by USP <85> BET Method .....	69
<b>Figure 8.3.4-2</b>	Comparison of MALDI-TOF MS Spectra from NOE and Purified Endotoxin.....	53	<b>Table 8.5.5-1</b>	Endotoxin Activities Recovered from LPS Spiked LRW Controls Over Time.	71
<b>Table 8.4.3.1-1</b>	Kinetic Parameters for RSE Activity Change in LER Solutions Containing Citrate .....	57	<b>Figure 8.6.2.1-1</b>	Schematic of test vial preparations for conducting the hold study .....	73
<b>Table 8.4.3.1-2</b>	Kinetic parameters for RSE activity change in LER solutions containing phosphate .....	58	<b>Figure 8.6.3.1-1</b>	Pyrogen-Free Water (PFW) with Control Standard Endotoxin (CSE) Charles River Endosafe® Kinetic Turbidimetric Control after 3 days at 2-8 °C diluted with PFW and 100 mM Tris, 50 mM MgSO4 (1/10 Strength Cation Buffer) .....	75
<b>Figure 8.4.4-1</b>	Effect of Temperature on Half-Life of RSE Activity in LER Solutions .....	59	<b>Figure 8.6.3.1-2</b>	Drug product with Control Standard Endotoxin (CSE) Charles River Endosafe® Kinetic Turbidimetric Control after 3 days at 2-8 °C diluted with PFW and 100mM TRIS, 50mM MgSO4 (1/10 strength Cation buffer) .....	75
<b>Figure 8.4.4-2</b>	Effect of pH on Half-Life of RSE Activity in LER Solutions.....	59	<b>Figure 8.6.3.1-3</b>	Pyrogen-Free Water (PFW) with Control Standard Endotoxin (CSE) Lonza KQCL Kinetic Chromogenic Control after 3 days at 2-8 °C diluted with PFW and 25 mM Tris, 12.5 mM MgSO4 (1/40 Strength Cation Buffer).....	75
<b>Figure 8.4.4-3</b>	Effect of Salt Concentrations on Half-Life of RSE Activity in LER Solutions.	59	<b>Figure 8.6.3.1-4</b>	Drug Product with CSE Lonza KQCL Kinetic Chromogenic Control after 3 days at 2-8 °C diluted with PFW and 25 mM Tris, 12.5 mM MgSO4 (1/40 Strength Cation Buffer) .....	75
<b>Figure 8.4.5-1</b>	Effect of Citrate Concentrations on Half-Life of RSE Activity in LER Solutions.....	60	<b>Figure 8.6.3.1-5</b>	Reactivation of CSE (LPS) Contaminated into mAb/Citrate/PS Product 10 EU/mL After 3 Days at 2-8°C Charles River Endosafe® Kinetic Turbidimetric.....	76
<b>Figure 8.4.5-2</b>	Effect of Phosphate Concentrations on Half-Life of RSE Activity in LER Solutions .....	60			
<b>Figure 8.4.5-3</b>	Effect of Polysorbate 20 Concentrations on Half-Life of RSE Activity in LER Solutions .....	60			
<b>Figure 8.4.6-1</b>	RSE Activity Change in LER Solution at 25 °C with 3 Different Dilution Methods.....	61			
<b>Figure 8.4.6-2</b>	RSE Activity Change in LER Solution at 2 °C–5 °C with 3 Different Dilution Methods.....	61			

<b>Figure 8.6.3.1-6</b>	Kinetic turbidimetric testing of <i>E. cloacae</i> NOE ..... 76	<b>Figure 8.9.3-1</b>	Percent Recovery of Six Preparations of LPS in LRW or Protein Sample at Room Temperature ..... 98
<b>Figure 8.6.3.1-7</b>	Kinetic chromogenic testing of <i>E. cloacae</i> NOE ..... 76	<b>Table 8.9.3-2</b>	Recovery of CSE in Various Levels of PS80 in 20 mM Histidine buffer, pH 5.5 ..... 99
<b>Figure 8.6.3.1-8</b>	Monoclonal Antibody in PFW and 100 mM Tris, 50 mM MgSO <sub>4</sub> (1/10 Strength Cation Buffer) Kinetic Turbidimetric (CRE) with CSE on Day 7 ..... 76	<b>Figure 8.9.3-2</b>	Recovery of CSE Spiked into Protein vs. LRW Held for 3 days at Ambient Temperature ..... 99
<b>Figure 8.6.3.1-9</b>	Monoclonal Antibody in PFW and 100 mM Tris, 50 mM MgSO <sub>4</sub> (1/10 Strength Cation Buffer) Kinetic Turbidimetric (CRE) with NOE on Day 7 ..... 77	<b>Table 8.9.3-3</b>	CSE Spiked at 1700 EU/mL in ~150 mg/mL Product ..... 100
<b>Figure 8.6.3.1-10</b>	Monoclonal Antibody in PFW and 25 mM Tris, 12.5 mM MgSO <sub>4</sub> (1/40 Strength Cation Buffer) Kinetic Chromogenic (Lonza) with CSE on Day 7 ..... 77	<b>Figure 8.9.3-3</b>	LER Hold Time Spiked Protein Sample Study Calculated vs LRW and vs Theoretical ..... 101
<b>Figure 8.6.3.1-11</b>	Monoclonal Antibody in PFW and 25 mM Tris, 12.5 mM MgSO <sub>4</sub> (1/40 Strength Cation Buffer) Kinetic Chromogenic (Lonza) with NOE on Day 7 ..... 77	<b>Figure 8.9.3-4</b>	Comparison of Endotoxin Assay Kits in a Hold Time LER Study at Ambient Temperature ..... 101
<b>Figure 8.7.4.2-1</b>	Reverse Hold/Time Study and Demasking Study of Endotoxin ..... 82	<b>Figure 8.10.2.1-1</b>	Manufacturing Steps for Biotech Product X Drug Substance ..... 103
<b>Figure 8.7.4.4-1</b>	Reproducibility and Robustness of the Developed Demasking Protocol ..... 83	<b>Table 8.10.3.1-1</b>	Endotoxin Spiking and Container Types ..... 104
<b>Figure 8.7.4.4-2</b>	Robustness of Sample Preparation Protocol ..... 84	<b>Table 8.10.4.1-1</b>	Product X DS Spiked with 5 EU/mL CSE, BET with Dilution 1:8 ..... 106
<b>Figure 8.7.4.4-3</b>	Comparison of Different lots of LAL Reagent, Endo-RS Components, and Sample Tested ..... 85	<b>Table 8.10.4.1-2</b>	Product X DS Spiked with 5 EU/mL CSE, BET with Dilution 1:16 ..... 106
<b>Figure 8.7.4.6-1</b>	Detection of Endotoxins from Different Species and Sensitivity ..... 85	<b>Table 8.10.4.1-3</b>	Product X DS Spiked with 5 EU/mL <i>R. pickettii</i> , BET with Dilution 1:8... 106
<b>Figure 8.8.1-1</b>	Reverse Hold Time Study Setup ..... 87	<b>Table 8.10.4.1-4</b>	Product X DS spiked with 5 EU/mL <i>R. pickettii</i> , BET with Dilution 1:16. 107
<b>Figure 8.8.3.1-1</b>	14-Day Hold Time Study for Drug Product at 2-8 °C with RSE ..... 89	<b>Table 8.10.4.3-1</b>	Formulation Buffer Spiked with 5 EU/mL CSE, BET with Dilution 1:8.. 107
<b>Figure 8.8.3.1-2</b>	7/3-Day Hold Time Study for Drug Product at 20-25 °C with RSE ..... 90	<b>Table 8.10.4.3-2</b>	Formulation Buffer Spiked with 5 EU/mL CSE, BET with Dilution 1:16..... 108
<b>Figure 8.8.3.2-1</b>	8-Day Hold Time Study for a Drug Product at 2-8 °C with High-Potency Endotoxin, O55:B5 (Lonza) ..... 91	<b>Table 8.10.4.5-1</b>	Unconditioned Bulk Spiked with 5 EU/mL CSE, BET with Dilution 1:8 ..... 108
<b>Figure 8.8.3.2-2</b>	14-Day Hold Time Study for Intermediate of a Drug Substance at 2-8 °C with High-Potency Endotoxin, O55:B5 (Lonza) ..... 91	<b>Figure 8.11.3-1</b>	Endotoxin Recovery ..... 112
<b>Table 8.9.3-1</b>	Recovery of CSE Spiked into 20 mM Histidine +/- 83 mg/mL Trehalose, pH 5.5 ..... 97	<b>Figure 8.11.3-2</b>	Average Relative Endotoxin Recovery Results ..... 112
		<b>Table 8.12.4.1-1</b>	LAL Assay Validity Criteria Summary . 115
		<b>Table 8.12.4.2-1</b>	Endotoxin Recovery Results from the Drug Product and LRW Control ..... 115
		<b>Figure 8.12.4.2-1</b>	Endotoxin Recovery Curves from the Test Article and LRW Control ..... 116
		<b>Table 8.12.4.2-2</b>	Endotoxin Recovery Results from Two Additional Drug Product Lots..... 116
		<b>Figure 8.12.4.2-2</b>	Endotoxin Recovery Curves from Two Test Articles and LRW Control ..... 116





Bethesda Towers  
4350 East West Highway  
Suite 600  
Bethesda, MD 20814 USA  
Tel: +1 (301) 656-5900  
Fax: +1 (301) 986-0296  
E-mail: [info@pda.org](mailto:info@pda.org)  
Web site: [www.pda.org](http://www.pda.org)