

BRIEFING

⟨1382⟩ Assessment of Elastomeric Component Functional Suitability in Parenteral Product Packaging/Delivery Systems, PF 43(3) [May–June 2017]. The previous proposal for this chapter, published in *PF 43(3)* under a different title, *Assessment of Elastomeric Closure Functionality in Injectable Pharmaceutical Packaging/Delivery Systems* was canceled and an updated version is being proposed. This new general chapter contains information and guidance to assist users in the functional suitability assessment of elastomeric components as part of packaging/delivery systems intended for parenteral dosage forms described in *Elastomeric Component Functional Suitability in Parenteral Product Packaging/Delivery Systems* (382). Such components include primary packaging/delivery system components that are partially or completely made of elastomeric material. The proper selection and design of functional suitability assessment studies is based on sound scientific principles that are consistent with:

1. The packaging/delivery system design and mechanics
2. The nature of the pharmaceutical dosage form contained and delivered by the packaging/delivery system
3. The physical environment to which the finished drug product will be exposed during the product life cycle
4. The clinical setting and the manner in which the product dosage form is to be administered
5. The safety risks assessed to those using and/or exposed to the contents of the packaging/delivery system during patient administration.

Alternative testing strategies for functional suitability assessment may be appropriate in certain circumstances with proper justification. In all cases, when reporting functional suitability assessment findings, the drug product applicant is advised to offer justification for the testing program chosen.

(GCPD: D. Hunt.)

Correspondence Number—C198224

Add the following:

**^⟨1382⟩ ASSESSMENT OF ELASTOMERIC COMPONENT
FUNCTIONAL SUITABILITY IN PARENTERAL PRODUCT
PACKAGING/DELIVERY SYSTEMS**

1. INTRODUCTION

6 [2. EARLY PACKAGING/DELIVERY SYSTEM SELECTION AND DEVELOPMENT:](#)
7 [FUNCTIONAL SUITABILITY ASSESSMENT CONSIDERATIONS](#)

8 [3. FINAL PRODUCT PACKAGING/DELIVERY SYSTEM FITNESS-FOR-](#)
9 [INTENDED-USE SUITABILITY ASSESSMENT](#)

10 [4. GENERAL CHAPTER \(382\) BACKGROUND AND GUIDANCE](#)

11 [4.1 Test Samples](#)

12 [4.2 Test Sample Population Size](#)

13 [4.3 Packaging/Delivery System Integrity Tests](#)

14 [4.4 Needle and Spike Access Functionality Tests](#)

15 [4.5 Plunger Functional Suitability Tests](#)

16 [4.6 Tip Cap and Needle Shield Functional Suitability Tests](#)

17 [5. CONCLUSION](#)

18 **1. INTRODUCTION**

19 This chapter contains information and guidance to assist in the functional
20 suitability assessment of elastomeric components as part of
21 packaging/delivery systems intended for parenteral dosage forms contained
22 in *Elastomeric Component Functional Suitability in Parenteral Product*
23 *Packaging/Delivery Systems* (382). Such components include primary
24 packaging/delivery system components that are partially or completely
25 made of elastomeric material. The proper selection and design of functional
26 suitability assessment studies is based on sound and justifiable scientific
27 principles provided in (382), *1. Introduction*.

28 **2. EARLY PACKAGING/DELIVERY SYSTEM SELECTION AND DEVELOPMENT: FUNCTIONAL SUITABILITY ASSESSMENT**
29 **CONSIDERATIONS**

30 Early in the packaging/delivery system selection and development process,
31 the final packaging/delivery system and its components may not be fully
32 defined and functional suitability requirements may not be established. This
33 is especially true if the packaging/delivery system or the drug product is
34 novel to the drug product applicant. At this phase of the product life cycle,
35 functional suitability assessments are performed to better understand
36 packaging/delivery system performance and/or to screen potential
37 elastomeric component and container candidates. To that end, [Table 1](#) lists
38 elastomeric component functional suitability tests in standards published by
39 the International Organization for Standardization (ISO). The list should not
40 be considered all-inclusive. The most recent standards should be referenced.

41 The terms "standards" and "recognized standards" used throughout this
42 chapter and (382) refer to those published by ISO.

43 Although not mandated, testing components and/or closure
44 packaging/delivery systems according to such standards may provide useful
45 information, especially during early product packaging/delivery system

46 development. Other relevant internationally recognized standards deemed
47 scientifically appropriate may be used instead of, or in addition to, those
48 listed in [Table 1](#). Standard test data may be made available by elastomeric
49 component or packaging/delivery system suppliers.

50 **Table 1. ISO Standards: Functional Suitability Tests for Elastomeric**
51 **Components**

ISO Standard (listed in numeric order)	Functional Suitability Tests
Sterile hypodermic syringes for single use	7886-1 Syringes for manual use <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Freedom from air and liquid leakage past plunger stopper• Force to operate the piston• Fit of plunger stopper/plunger in barrel
	7886-2 Syringes for use with power-driven syringe pumps <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Freedom from air and liquid leakage past piston• Flow characteristics• Plunger movement forces
	7886-3 Auto-disable syringes for fixed-dose immunization <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Freedom from air and liquid leakage past piston• Auto-disable feature• Performance after shipping
	7886-4 Syringes with re-use prevention feature <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Freedom from air and liquid leakage past piston• Re-use prevention feature• Performance after shipping
Injection containers and accessories	8362-2 Closures for injection vials <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Penetrability• Fragmentation

**ISO Standard
(listed in numeric order)**

Functional Suitability Tests

- Self-sealing and aqueous solution tightness test
- Dye solution tightness test

8362-5 Freeze-drying closures for injection vials

- Penetrability
- Fragmentation
- Self-sealing and aqueous solution tightness test
- Aqueous solution tightness test

Infusion equipment for medical use (closures used in combination with bottles and intended to be pierced with an injection needle or spike)

8536-2 Closures for infusion (glass) bottles

- Fragmentation
- Spike penetration force
- Spike retention/sealability

8536-6 Freeze-drying closures for infusion bottles

- Fragmentation
- Spike penetration force
- Spike penetration/sealability

Sterile single-use syringes, with or without needle, for insulin

8537

- Fit of plunger stopper in barrel (forces to operate piston)
- Freedom from leakage at needle
- Freedom from leakage past plunger stopper

Elastomeric parts for parenterals and for devices for pharmaceutical use (used in combination with vials and intended to be pierced with an injection needle)

8871-5 Functional requirements and testing

- Penetrability
- Fragmentation
- Self-sealing and aqueous solution tightness

**ISO Standard
(listed in numeric order)**

Functional Suitability Tests

- Aqueous solution tightness

Prefilled syringes

**11040- Plunger stoppers for dental local
2 anesthetic cartridges**

- Freedom from leakage
- Sliding characteristics

**11040- Seals for dental local anesthetic
3 cartridges**

- Fragmentation
- Freedom from leakage

**11040- Glass barrels for injectables and
4 sterilized subassembled syringes
ready for filling**

- Closure system allowance for sterilization
- Glide force
- Closure system liquid leakage past needle shield or tip cap
- Luer lock rigid tip cap unscrewing torque
- Pull-off force of tip cap or needle shield
- Closure system barrel integrity (dye solution tightness test)

**11040- Requirements and test methods for
8 finished prefilled syringes**

- Break-loose and extrusion forces
- Liquid leakage beyond plunger
- Pull-off force of tip cap or needle shield
- Luer lock rigid tip cap unscrewing torque

**ISO Standard
(listed in numeric order)**

Functional Suitability Tests

- Container closure integrity

Needle-based injection systems for medical use (cartridges for dental use not included)

11608- **Finished containers**
3

- Plunger force
- Freedom from leakage
- Resealability
- Coring

Pen systems

13926- **Plunger stoppers for pen injectors for medical use**
2

- Freedom from leakage past plunger stopper under axial pressure
- Initiating and sustaining forces (break force and extrusion force)

13926- **Seals for pen injectors for medical use**
3

- Fragmentation
- Freedom from leakage past seals under axial pressure
- Resealability

Plastic containers for intravenous injections (blow-molded bottles, film bags)

15747

- Resistance to temperature stability, pressure, and leakage
- Penetration ability
- Adhesion strength of the infusion device and impermeability of the insertion point
- Tightness of the injection point

Medical infusion equipment— Plastic caps with inserted elastomeric liners for containers manufactured by

15759 **Physical requirements and testing for liners**

- Fragmentation
- Penetration force

**ISO Standard
(listed in numeric order)**

the blow-fill-seal (BFS)
process

Functional Suitability Tests

- Dynamic spike-retention capability
- Static spike-retention capability of the liner and leak resistance of the piercing area
- Resealability

52

53 **3. FINAL PRODUCT PACKAGING/DELIVERY SYSTEM FITNESS-FOR-INTENDED-USE SUITABILITY ASSESSMENT**

54 Evidence of the elastomeric component's ability to satisfactorily function as
55 part of the final packaging/delivery system according to its intended product
56 use is required to support commercial market approval of a finished drug
57 product. Internationally recognized standards, such as those listed in [Table](#)
58 [1](#), can provide a useful benchmark when designing appropriate elastomeric
59 component functional suitability assessment studies. However, the drug
60 product applicant is advised to exercise caution before prescriptively
61 adopting standardized tests. Such tests may not provide a complete or
62 adequate assessment of the elastomeric component's ability to meet the
63 final packaging/delivery system's product-specific functional demands.
64 Standardized tests may not be adequate or appropriate in specific situations
65 for many reasons, for example:

- 66 •The final packaging/delivery system components may differ in design
67 or dimension from the description in the standard.
- 68 •The manner in which the final packaging/delivery system's
69 components are processed, reprocessed, and/or assembled may
70 differ from the description in the standard.
- 71 •The manner in which a liquid, such as a diluent, must be added to the
72 packaging/delivery system for final dosage form preparation (such
73 as for lyophilized product reconstitution, powdered product
74 constitution, product dilution, or admixture) may differ from the
75 description in the standard.
- 76 •The manner in which the packaged product is to be accessed at the
77 time of use may differ from the description in the standard.
78 Differences may include needle or spike design, material, or
79 lubricity; needle puncture speed; and the number of penetrations
80 per closure.

- 81 •The standard's test procedure or analysis method may provide an
82 inadequate measure of packaging/delivery system functional
83 suitability given the specific rigorous demands placed on the final
84 packaging system. For instance, bench test conditions may not
85 sufficiently mirror the rigors imposed on the marketed product
86 during actual storage, distribution, and usage conditions.
- 87 •The test method may lack sufficient sensitivity or precision to provide
88 an adequate measure of packaging/delivery system functional
89 suitability. For example, a container-closure seal integrity test that
90 relies on dye ingress observation may be too insensitive to provide
91 an accurate picture of a lyophilized dosage form package's ability to
92 meet the maximum allowable leakage limit demanded by the
93 finished product packaging/delivery system.
- 94 •The standard test's acceptance criterion may not reflect the functional
95 performance demanded of the final packaging/delivery system. For
96 example, the maximum allowable needle penetration force for a
97 closure dictated by a standard may result in damage to the
98 penetration needle supplied with the intended delivery device.

99 Therefore, the drug product applicant is tasked with developing a body of
100 elastomeric component functional suitability assessment tests that logically
101 and most appropriately assess the final packaging/delivery system.
102 Challenges placed on the final product's packaging/delivery system during
103 testing should mimic challenges the product is likely to encounter through
104 storage/distribution, product expiry, and final use. These testing challenges
105 should provide clear and definitive measures of packaging/delivery system
106 performance.

107 4. GENERAL CHAPTER (382) BACKGROUND AND GUIDANCE

108 Chapter (382) offers drug product packaging/delivery system fitness-for-
109 intended-use functional suitability assessment procedures and acceptance
110 criteria that are reflective of current best practices. These best practices take
111 into consideration all the recognized ISO standards in [Table 1](#) as well as USP
112 tests and guidances. Specific sources for the various tests are detailed in the
113 following sections. These tests are not intended to be exhaustive. The drug
114 product applicant may require additional tests to adequately assess the
115 component's functional suitability as part of a particular packaging/delivery
116 system.

117 Re-evaluation of functional suitability may be required when changes occur
118 in components, processes, or even the commercialized product itself during
119 its life cycle. The functional suitability of a drug product packaging/delivery
120 system is the responsibility of the drug product applicant.

121 The following sections contain guidance and background information
122 relevant to tests in (382).

123

4.1 Test Samples

124 The following relates to [Elastomeric Component Functional Suitability in](#)
125 [Parenteral Product Packaging/Delivery Systems \(382\), 3. General Test](#)
126 [Requirements, 3.1 Test Samples](#). Functional suitability of elastomeric
127 components cannot be tested for in isolation from the intended
128 packaging/delivery system. Furthermore, a component's functional
129 performance assessment outcome can be affected by the design, processing,
130 and assembly of that packaging/delivery system. For example, closure
131 processing parameters and vial package sealing forces directly impact
132 parenteral vial packaging integrity results. Plunger break loose and glide
133 forces are directly related to the design, material of construction, and
134 lubricity of the syringe barrel.

135 Test samples employed for each functional suitability test are to mirror the
136 components and packaging/delivery system of the intended product as
137 closely as possible, because component functionality is connected to the
138 packaging/delivery system. Components are to be prepared, processed, and
139 assembled as defined for the final product packaging/delivery system,
140 especially if such steps are believed to have a potential impact on
141 component functionality.

142 The following examples are offered as illustration:

- 143 •Components are to be washed, lubricated, and sterilized according to
144 intended product protocol.
- 145 •Components are to be laminated or coated according to the
146 requirements of the intended product packaging/delivery system.
- 147 •Vial and bottle closures are to be optimally capped onto vials in a
148 manner reflective of the intended finished product
149 packaging/delivery system.
- 150 •Syringe/cartridge barrels are to be prepared and lubricated according
151 to the requirements of the intended pharmaceutical product.
- 152 •Syringe/cartridge plungers are to be inserted into syringe barrels
153 according to production practices (e.g., by use of a vent tube or
154 vacuum insertion).

155 Some tests, such as [Elastomeric Component Functional Suitability in](#)
156 [Parenteral Product Packaging/Delivery Systems \(382\), 5. Needle and Spike](#)
157 [Access Functional Suitability Tests, 5.1 Fragmentation](#), state that the test
158 sample areas are to be filled with water. However, in cases where package
159 contents can influence test outcome, such as (382), [6. Plunger Functional](#)

160 *Suitability Tests, 6.1 Plunger Break-Loose and Glide Forces* tests, it is
161 recommended that test samples be filled with product or a product proxy so
162 that the test outcome better reflects packaging/delivery system intended
163 use. Alternatively, content material that brackets the characteristics of
164 multiple products may be chosen.

165 Some flexibility in test sample preparation and content is permitted if the
166 variation is judged to have little or no impact on test outcome. With
167 appropriate justification, test samples may bracket relevant parameters of
168 packaging/delivery system design and dimension, component processing,
169 package assembly, and product contents. Bracketing may be employed to
170 allow a functional suitability assessment program that addresses a wider
171 spectrum of packaging/delivery systems and/or products.

172 The selection, design, preparation, assembly, and contents of test samples
173 should follow sound scientific principles so that the final product
174 packaging/delivery system can be comprehensively evaluated for functional
175 suitability.

176 4.2 Test Sample Population Size

177 As described in [Elastomeric Component Functional Suitability in Parenteral](#)
178 [Product Packaging/Delivery Systems \(382\) 3. General Test Requirements,](#)
179 [3.2 Test Sample Population Size](#), test sample quantity should provide a
180 reasonable measure of confidence of the packaging/delivery system
181 elastomeric component functionality. Current recognized standards inform
182 the test sample population sizes specified in chapter tests. For this reason,
183 sample sizes vary across test categories and even among package types
184 within a test category. For example, (382), *5. Needle and Spike Access*
185 *Functional Suitability Tests, 5.1 Fragmentation* vial system tests require 12
186 test samples (as per ISO 8362-2, 8362-5, and 8871-5), whereas bottle
187 system tests require 10 test samples (as per ISO 8536-2 and -6). In the
188 case of fragmentation tests, it was deemed important to respect the
189 historical particulate findings generated using these varied sample
190 population sizes. On the other hand, (382), *5. Needle and Spike Access*
191 *Functional Suitability Tests, 5.3 Needle Self-Sealing Capacity* tests require
192 30 test samples regardless of the packaging/delivery system to ensure more
193 meaningful leakage findings even though recognized standards require fewer
194 samples.

195 Test sample population sizes cited in chapter test methods represent
196 minimal test sample population size requirements. Sample population sizes
197 that are larger than those specified in test procedures are encouraged to
198 provide greater assurance of packaging/delivery system performance and to
199 minimize the risk of product failure during commercial use.

200

4.3 Packaging/Delivery System Integrity Tests

201 The verification of packaging/delivery system integrity is required
202 according to *Elastomeric Component Functional Suitability in Parenteral*
203 *Product Packaging/Delivery Systems* (382), 4. *Packaging/Delivery System*
204 *Integrity Tests*. All components that are intended to seal or affect container
205 closure must adequately protect and contain the packaging/delivery system
206 contents. In this context, all such components are termed closures. All
207 closures are required to ensure adequate system integrity; therefore, all
208 packaging/delivery systems within the scope of the chapter are required to
209 meet an appropriate system integrity functional suitability assessment. This
210 section does not apply to closures after they have been breached by a
211 needle, spike, or other access device.

212 Packaging/delivery system integrity refers to the ability of a
213 packaging/delivery system to keep product contents in, and to keep
214 detrimental environmental contaminants out. All packaging/delivery systems
215 for parenteral products closed with elastomeric components are required to
216 demonstrate integrity, as defined by the level of protection necessary for
217 product quality maintenance. All systems with elastomeric closures
218 mechanically fitted to the container demonstrate some gaseous leakage past
219 the seal interface, even when optimally assembled. Leaks of concern for
220 sterile product packaging/delivery systems are those that pose an
221 unacceptable level of risk to relevant product physicochemical and
222 microbiological quality attributes.

223 Specifically, all parenteral product packaging/delivery systems must: 1)
224 prevent microbiological ingress to ensure that product sterility is met; and 2)
225 prevent product escape or entry of external liquid or solid matter to ensure
226 that relevant product physicochemical quality attributes are met. In addition,
227 some products require the maintenance of package headspace content in a
228 manner that ensures relevant product physicochemical quality attributes are
229 met and/or allows for ease of product access by the end user. As some
230 packaging/delivery systems employ more than one closure, and each closure
231 may provide a different level of product protection, different integrity tests
232 may be required to effectively evaluate the inherent integrity of the various
233 closure types.

234 See *Package Integrity Evaluation—Sterile Products* (1207), as well as its
235 subchapters, for further guidance on the concepts of inherent package
236 integrity and maximum allowable leakage limit, and for guidance on the
237 proper selection, development, validation, and utilization of appropriate leak
238 test methods.

239

4.4 Needle and Spike Access Functionality Tests

240 Information in *Elastomeric Component Functional Suitability in Parenteral*
241 *Product Packaging/Delivery Systems* (382), 5. *Needle and Spike Access*
242 *Functional Suitability Tests* applies to packaging/delivery system closures
243 that allow for drug product access by hypodermic needle, spike, or other
244 closure penetration device. Packaging/delivery systems intended for
245 parenteral products that permit dosage form access by insertion of a closure
246 piercing device are required to allow for safe and effective product access,
247 without damaging the packaging/delivery system or the drug product and
248 without risking harm to either the patient receiving the medication or the
249 individual accessing and/or administering the product.

250 Traditionally, needle and spike access functionality tests have not
251 accounted for the possibility of an additional closure penetration commonly
252 performed to introduce liquids into the product packaging/delivery system
253 for lyophilized product reconstitution, powdered product constitution,
254 product admixture, or product dilution. Closure penetration practices for
255 dosage form preparation vary widely. The piercing device employed for
256 dosage form preparation may be very different in size or design from the
257 needle or spike used for subsequent product access and withdrawal. There is
258 little published information on the impact of such initial closure penetrations
259 on closure performance or product quality. To address this gap, needle and
260 spike access functional suitability tests have been expanded to incorporate a
261 first closure piercing for products requiring final dosage form preparation in
262 addition to the closure piercing(s) for product access and withdrawal.

263 Tests dictate that all piercings be performed using the dosage form
264 preparation piercing device(s) and/or the product access piercing device(s)
265 intended or recommended by the drug product applicant. For example, if the
266 intent is to provide or to specify a needle or other piercing device with the
267 marketed product for a given purpose, then this same item or a facsimile is
268 to be used. If a piercing device will neither be specified nor provided (i.e.,
269 not designated), the procedures cite dosage form preparation and drug
270 product access devices to be used for the tests. Drug product access
271 needles/spikes cited align with current reference standards. Dosage form
272 preparation needles cited in the procedures are unique to USP.

273 The following tests are included in this functional suitability assessment
274 category.

275 FRAGMENTATION

276 See *Elastomeric Component Functional Suitability in Parenteral Product*
277 *Packaging/Delivery Systems* (382), 5. *Needle and Spike Access Functional*
278 *Suitability Tests, 5.1 Fragmentation*. Also called coring, fragmentation is a
279 measure of the packaging/delivery system's tendency to fragment or core
280 when penetrated by a dosage form preparation piercing device (if applicable)

281 and by a product access piercing device. If injected, such closure fragments
282 may pose a health risk to the patient.

283 The penetration tests largely align with fragmentation tests in ISO
284 standards in the piercing devices used and the number of piercings per test
285 sample. Specifically, *Procedure A* in *Elastomeric Component Functional*
286 *Suitability in Parenteral Product Packaging/Delivery Systems* (382), 5.
287 *Needle and Spike Access Functional Suitability Tests, 5.1 Fragmentation, Vial*
288 *and bottle systems* was informed by ISO 8362-5 and 8871-5. *Procedure*
289 *B* was informed by ISO 8536-2 and -6. The (382), 5. *Needle and Spike*
290 *Access Functional Suitability Tests, 5.1 Fragmentation, BFS systems* test
291 method was informed by ISO 15759. *Procedure A* of (382), 5. *Needle and*
292 *Spike Access Functional Suitability Tests, 5.1 Fragmentation, Cartridge*
293 *systems* was informed by ISO 13926-3 and *Procedure B* was informed by ISO
294 11608-3.

295 Unlike ISO tests, an extra initial piercing option representing a dosage
296 form preparation piercing is included in the vial and bottle systems as well
297 as the BFS systems test procedures.

298 Also unlike ISO tests, fragmentation count analysis is to be performed
299 according to *Particulate Matter in Injections* (788), *Method 2 Microscopic*
300 *Particle Count Test*, with noted modifications. Modifications include
301 allowances for microscope magnification range adjustment and the use of
302 the linear graticule for particle sizing. Test procedures require particle sizing
303 based on the longest linear dimension of the particle.

304 Acceptance criteria are defined according to the quantity of detected
305 particles $\geq 150 \mu\text{m}$ in the longest linear dimension. Smaller particles are not
306 reported. Recognized standards define fragmentation acceptance criteria
307 according to the number of particles visibly detected, i.e., particles $\geq 50 \mu\text{m}$
308 (e.g., ISO 8871-5). *Elastomeric Component Functional Suitability in*
309 *Parenteral Product Packaging/Delivery Systems* (382), 5. *Needle and Spike*
310 *Access Functional Suitability Tests, 5.1 Fragmentation* has adopted the same
311 particle quantity limits, as per the recognized standards, but counted
312 particles are $\geq 150 \mu\text{m}$, sized microscopically, defined by the longest linear
313 dimension. This change was based on more recent data suggesting visibly
314 detected particles are closer to $150 \mu\text{m}$ in size, as per *Visible Particulates in*
315 *Injections* (790).

316 PENETRATION FORCE

317 See *Elastomeric Component Functional Suitability in Parenteral Product*
318 *Packaging/Delivery Systems* (382), 5. *Needle and Spike Access Functional*
319 *Suitability Tests, 5.2 Penetration Force*. Also called penetrability, penetration
320 force is the maximum force necessary to penetrate the closure using a
321 dosage form preparation piercing device (if applicable) and a product access

322 piercing device. Penetration force tests also confirm the ability of the closure
323 to remain in place without being forced into the container during piercing.

324 Test procedures and acceptance criteria were informed by current
325 reference standards. In some cases details were modified so all
326 packaging/delivery systems could be tested similarly. Details are included
327 below.

328 *Procedure A and Procedure B of Elastomeric Component Functional*
329 *Suitability in Parenteral Product Packaging/Delivery Systems (382), 5.*
330 *Needle and Spike Access Functional Suitability Tests, 5.2 Penetration Force,*
331 *Vial and bottle systems* evaluate the penetration force required for a dosage
332 form preparation hypodermic needle and for a dosage form access
333 hypodermic needle, respectively. *Procedure C* evaluates the penetration
334 force required for spike access. ISO standard vial package closure
335 penetration tests do not specify the needle insertion rate or the use of a
336 mechanical testing machine (ISO 8362-2, 8362-5, 8871-5). Standard bottle
337 spike penetration force tests specify use of a mechanical testing machine,
338 operated at an insertion rate of 200 mm/min with a load cell accuracy of ± 2
339 Newtons (N) (ISO 8536-2 and -6). For consistency among chapter tests, the
340 vial and bottle systems tests specify use of a mechanical testing machine
341 operated at the penetration rate of 200 mm/min for both vials and bottles
342 penetrated by either needles or spikes.

343 *Procedure A and Procedure B*, which use a needle for penetration, require
344 a load cell accuracy of ± 0.25 N in anticipation of results less than 10
345 N. *Procedure C*, which uses a spike, anticipates higher penetration forces,
346 therefore, a load cell accuracy of ± 2 N is specified, similar to the
347 corresponding ISO standards.

348 There exists no published data or ISO standard for dosage form
349 preparation penetration force for vial and bottle systems;
350 therefore *Procedure A* does not include quantitative acceptance limits. The
351 end user is responsible for establishing a limit appropriate for the system
352 and its intended use.

353 The penetration force acceptance limit for BFS systems is also not
354 specified. The penetration force limit in ISO 15759 only evaluates the
355 penetration force through the closure, not the force required to penetrate
356 the closure combined with the underlying plastic layer in a fully assembled
357 BFS system. For this reason, the end user is responsible for establishing a
358 limit that is appropriate for the system and its intended use.

359 The penetration force acceptance limit for plastic systems of no more than
360 200 N is the highest for all package types. This high value is informed by
361 ISO 15747 and includes the friction force between the spike and the access
362 port tube.

363
364
365
366
367
368
369
370
371
372
373
374
375
376
377
378
379
380
381
382
383
384
385
386
387
388
389
390
391
392
393
394
395
396
397
398
399
400
401
402
403

NEEDLE SELF-SEALING CAPACITY

See *Elastomeric Component Functional Suitability in Parenteral Product Packaging/Delivery Systems* (382), 5. *Needle and Spike Access Functional Suitability Tests*, 5.3 *Needle Self-Sealing Capacity*. Also called reseal capacity, injection port tightness, or in-use leakage tests, this term applies to product packaging/delivery system closures required to ensure adequate package integrity during in-use conditions of multiple breaches by a needle(s). Such systems include multiple-dose product packaging/delivery systems, as well as systems with closures that must be penetrated more than once to permit dosage form preparation followed by penetration(s) for product access and administration.

Test samples are challenged prior to packaging/delivery system in-use integrity verification by exposing the closures to worst case (i.e., the most challenging) piercing conditions anticipated for the intended product. In cases where the largest gauge piercing device(s) and/or the maximum penetration quantity conditions are undefined, (382) lists challenge conditions to be employed, similar to self-sealing test requirements corresponding to recognized standards.

The (382) test requires a minimum of 30 test samples for all packaging/delivery system types. This quantity is greater than the specification in ISO's standards for resealability tests. However, the requirement for 30 test samples does align with the requirements of (382), 4. *Packaging/Delivery System Integrity Tests*. A smaller quantity was viewed to be less likely to yield meaningful leakage information.

No leak test procedure is mandated for self-sealing capacity. Tests described in corresponding recognized standards may be consulted. However, such tests may not accurately or appropriately measure the integrity of the compromised closure for the intended product and its use. Therefore, the reader is referred to *Package Integrity Evaluation—Sterile Products* (1207) and its subchapters for guidance in test method selection, development, validation, and utilization.

SPIKE RETENTION AND SEALABILITY CAPACITY

See *Elastomeric Component Functional Suitability in Parenteral Product Packaging/Delivery Systems* (382), 5. *Needle and Spike Access Functional Suitability Tests*, 5.4 *Spike Retention and Sealability Capacity*. This test is a measure of a closure system's ability to be fully penetrated by a spike (without pushing the closure into the container); to block visible evidence of liquid product leakage between the spike and the closure during the product-dosing time period; and to retain the spike during this time period.

Test samples are to be challenged by exposing the closures to worst case (i.e., the most challenging) piercing conditions anticipated for the intended

404 product. In cases where the spike piercing device is undefined, utilize the
405 device described in the corresponding ISO standards. Note that
406 the (382) test sample size and test conditions are similarly based on
407 recognized standard procedures for the respective packaging/delivery
408 system categories.

409 4.5 Plunger Functional Suitability Tests

410 Information in *Elastomeric Component Functional Suitability in Parenteral*
411 *Product Packaging/Delivery Systems (382)*, 6. *Plunger Functional Suitability*
412 *Tests* applies to packaging/delivery systems that incorporate a plunger (also
413 called a piston), namely cartridge systems and syringe systems. This section
414 include tests to evaluate plunger break-loose and glide forces as well as
415 plunger seal integrity.

416 Packaging/delivery systems designed to allow for product elution via a
417 plunger are required to allow for complete, safe, and effective product
418 delivery without damaging the system and without risking harm to either the
419 patient receiving the medication or the individual accessing and/or
420 administering the product. The plunger is also required to ensure adequate
421 product containment from the time the product is filled until product delivery
422 to the patient is complete.

423 PLUNGER BREAK LOOSE AND GLIDE FORCES

424 See *Elastomeric Component Functional Suitability in Parenteral Product*
425 *Packaging/Delivery Systems (382)*, 6. *Plunger Functional Suitability Tests*,
426 *6.1 Plunger Break-Loose and Glide Forces*. This test evaluates plunger
427 break-loose force (also known as the initiating force), which is the force
428 required to initiate the movement of the plunger. It also evaluates plunger
429 glide force (also known as the sustaining force), which is the force required
430 to sustain the movement of the plunger to expel the content of the syringe
431 or cartridge. This test allows an analysis of the ease with which product
432 delivery may be performed.

433 Many variables can affect these forces. For example, product
434 characteristics of viscosity and density can directly impact break-loose and
435 glide forces. These forces are also influenced by the interference fit between
436 the plunger and the barrel, the lubrication of the plunger and the inner
437 surface of the barrel, and the fit of the plunger rod into the threaded
438 plunger. The use of connecting devices with the test sample can influence
439 the findings.

440 Furthermore, it is noteworthy that break-loose force can increase over
441 time to an unacceptable level at which point it is difficult to initiate plunger
442 movement by hand. If the plunger is operated by a spring, the break-loose
443 force required may be greater than the capability of the spring. The drug
444 product applicant is advised to consider this possibility when designing drug

445 product shelf-life stability assessment studies. Finally, component processing
446 can also impact plunger function. For example, an irregular glide force, or
447 one that rises significantly towards the syringe nozzle, can indicate non-
448 homogeneous lubrication of the barrel.

449 The performance requirements of the packaging/delivery system should
450 consider the intended use of the syringe or cartridge. For example, if the
451 product is to be manually delivered, break-loose and glide forces should
452 accommodate the skill set of the population responsible for product
453 administration. If the product is to be delivered using an automatic pen
454 injector, forces must be appropriate for the delivery system hardware.

455 In conclusion, a wide number of variables can impact break-loose and
456 glide force results. The many combinations of products, packaging/delivery
457 systems, and intended uses influence acceptable functional performance
458 criteria. Therefore, a single test method cannot be defined, nor can
459 acceptance criteria be specified, for all relevant packaging/delivery systems,
460 products, and intended-use applications. The user is responsible for following
461 the generic test method outlined in <382> and for establishing meaningful
462 quantitative acceptance criteria that best represent the demands of the
463 specific product packaging/delivery system.

464 PLUNGER SEAL INTEGRITY

465 See *Elastomeric Component Functional Suitability in Parenteral Product*
466 *Packaging/Delivery Systems <382>, 6. Plunger Functional Suitability Tests,*
467 *6.2 Plunger Seal Integrity.* This test is designed to apply a fixed force to the
468 plunger of a sealed syringe or cartridge containing liquid product in order to
469 detect leakage past the plunger. *Procedure A* applies to manually operated
470 prefilled and single-use syringe systems. This procedure and acceptance
471 criteria were informed by ISO 7886-1. *Procedure B* applies to non-manually
472 operated prefilled syringe systems that function as part of an auto-injector
473 system such as a spring-driven or power-driven delivery device. This
474 procedure and acceptance criteria were informed by ISO 11040-8. *Procedure*
475 *C* is specifically for cartridge systems used for dental local anesthesia
476 products and was informed by ISO 11040-2 and -3. *Procedure D* is for all
477 cartridge systems, excluding those for dental local anesthesia products. The
478 procedure and acceptance criteria were informed by ISO 13926-2 and -3.
479 For all procedures, satisfactory plunger seal tightness will not permit visible
480 leakage of liquid product past the rear rib or final seal of the plunger when
481 forces simulating product delivery are applied. For cartridge containers that
482 are also closed with a stopper or septum (without a needle), acceptance
483 criteria also require the absence of visible leakage past this closure.

484

4.6 Tip Cap and Needle Shield Functional Suitability Tests

485 *Elastomeric Component Functional Suitability in Parenteral Product*
486 *Packaging/Delivery Systems* (382), 7. *Tip Cap and Needle Shield Functional*
487 *Suitability* tests examine the functional suitability of tip caps and needle
488 shields. These components are intended to protect the needle or nozzle
489 (Luer end) of the syringe, allow for nozzle/needle sterilization, and maintain
490 the sterility of the contents of the syringe container. The functional
491 suitability tests examine the forces required to remove the tip cap or needle
492 shield prior to dose administration. *Procedure A* measures the axial force
493 used to pull off needle shields and tip caps. *Procedure B* is a torque test that
494 measures the force use to unscrew and remove the Luer lock rigid tip caps.
495 A packaging/delivery system is satisfactory if the force needed to remove
496 the component allows for the manual removal of the tip cap or needle shield
497 with relative ease but prevents the accidental loss of these components
498 during storage or transit.

499 When selecting acceptance criteria, the user should consider the various
500 factors that can influence removal forces. For example, processes applied to
501 the components pre- and post- assembly, such as lubrication and
502 sterilization, can impact test results. Other factors include elastomeric
503 component age, age of the assembled system, and possibly finished product
504 storage conditions.

505 The procedures and acceptance criteria in *Elastomeric Component*
506 *Functional Suitability in Parenteral Product Packaging/Delivery*
507 *Systems* (382), 7. *Tip Cap and Needle Shield Functional Suitability* were
508 influenced by ISO 11040-4 and -8.

509 5. CONCLUSION

510 In summary, the functional performance of elastomeric components is to
511 be evaluated in a manner that ensures the final packaging/delivery system is
512 fit for its intended use of safely and effectively providing the patient with the
513 highest quality parenteral medication. Although this chapter's scope does not
514 include functional suitability tests relevant to other components of the
515 packaging/delivery system, or to all aspects of the system itself, such tests
516 are nevertheless important. Consideration should be given to the full scope
517 of packaging/delivery system functional demands inherent in the
518 manufacture, safety, use, and marketability of the intended product. To this
519 end, the applicant may seek direction in other relevant packaging/delivery
520 system guidances and standards. This process requires that the applicant
521 employ a science- and risk-based approach to accomplish a thorough and
522 complete functional suitability assessment verifying the entire
523 packaging/delivery system's fitness for intended use.▲ (USP 1-Dec-2020)