



HAL
open science

Chapter X: From fluoxetine to Prozac® How the Pharmaceutical Industry Builds Brand Identity through Prescription Drugs Naming

Pascaline Faure

► **To cite this version:**

Pascaline Faure. Chapter X: From fluoxetine to Prozac® How the Pharmaceutical Industry Builds Brand Identity through Prescription Drugs Naming. Routledge. Names, Naming, and the Law, 2023, 9781032556413. hal-04245952v1

HAL Id: hal-04245952

<https://hal.sorbonne-universite.fr/hal-04245952v1>

Submitted on 17 Oct 2023 (v1), last revised 18 Oct 2023 (v2)

HAL is a multi-disciplinary open access archive for the deposit and dissemination of scientific research documents, whether they are published or not. The documents may come from teaching and research institutions in France or abroad, or from public or private research centers.

L'archive ouverte pluridisciplinaire **HAL**, est destinée au dépôt et à la diffusion de documents scientifiques de niveau recherche, publiés ou non, émanant des établissements d'enseignement et de recherche français ou étrangers, des laboratoires publics ou privés.

Chapter X: From fluoxetine to Prozac®

How the Pharmaceutical Industry Builds Brand Identity through Prescription Drugs Naming

Pascaline Faure

The purpose of this chapter is to explore how the pharmaceutical companies manage to create strong brand identities for their prescription drugs using creative names, despite the many rules and regulations imposed upon them by governmental agencies. After providing a concise history of prescription drug naming, this chapter will present the basic types of product drug names used by pharmaceutical companies. To illustrate these types, detailed information about the naming history of several prescription drugs are offered. Then a detailed overview is given of the governmental policies and regulations that are imposed to control consumer health and welfare and protect company's financial interest. Finally, a discussion is provided on the ways in which the international pharmaceutical industry navigates these regulatory best practices to devise drug names that have the potential to facilitate the formation of powerful and profitable ties between the identity of the prescription brand and the consumer.

1. Introduction

In 2020, there were more than 20,000 prescription drugs on the US market. In such a highly competitive market, the name given to a pharmaceutical drug must do more than simply designate or denote. According to Dutchen (2009), pharmaceutical companies spend anywhere from \$250,000 to \$2.5 million to develop names for their drug products. For most companies, this money is more than well invested. A memorable name can make or break a pharmaceutical product. Stepney (2010) reports that, in the late 1980s, the British pharmaceutical company Zeneca marketed the angiotensin-converting enzyme inhibitor, lisinopril, as a treatment against high blood pressure. The pharmaceutical product was marketed under the name *Zestril*®. At the same time, Zeneca's competitor Merck marketed the same molecule under the name *Carace*®. The name *Zestril*® was made up by combining three elements: (1) "zest", a word selected to convey enthusiasm and underscored the company's promotional campaign promise that patient-consumers would regain their "zest for life"; (2) the letter "Z" which harkened to the company name, *Zeneca*; and (3) the suffix "-ril", taken from the final three letters of the molecule, lisinopril. This name creation was a clear success. *Zestril* was a hit. In 1997, it was Zeneca's highest selling product worldwide, with sales reaching 1.05 billion U.S. dollars¹. By comparison, *Carace*® had a very different trajectory which began with a completely different naming strategy. Putting function before flash, the product name was made up of the first three letters of "care" and the abbreviation ACE which stands for angiotensin-converting enzyme (Paling 2001). Of course, it would be incorrect to infer that the name alone was responsible for *Zestril*'s success story. Clearly, many other factors came into play as well (e.g. the reputation of the company, the promotional campaign, the packaging, etc.). Still, as considerable research has shown, the name a product is given can have a significant effect on its consumer marketability (Room

Commenté [P1]: I am not sure the abstract still matches your newly edited version.

Commenté [EIC2]: Please insert a fact about how much profit *Carace* made for the company in 1997.

Commenté [P3R2]: Impossible to find the info, sorry.

¹ IMS Health, <https://www.iqvia.com/>

1982; Keller et al. 1998; Blackett and Robins 2001; Lowrey et al. 2003; Gangwal and Gangwal 2011).

To ensure that their products are powerfully positioned on the legal drug market, pharmaceutical companies go to great lengths to devise names that are both attractive and distinctive (Faure 2014, 2018, 2022). However, the importance of distinctive naming is not only a question of commercial success. It is also an issue of consumer safety. To minimize medication errors related to look-alike and sound-alike proprietary names, since 2014, the US Food and Drug Administration (FDA) has issued a set of recommendations for developing proprietary names in the pharmaceutical industry (FDA 2014, 2016, 2020). While the guidance focuses primarily on safety-related aspects, the FDA also gives recommendations to avoid misbranding products by making “misrepresentations with respect to safety or efficacy” (FDA 2020: 15) and warns against names that would be considered too “fanciful” (FDA 2020: 3). This chapter presents detailed information about governmental recommendations for prescription drug names (PDNs) in the US. It demonstrates how the names devised by pharmaceutical companies are used to create brand identities for PDNs. Beforehand, however, the chapter gives a brief history of PDNs and reviews the different types of PDNs used in the US market today.

2. A Brief History of Prescription Drug Names (PDNs)

The beginnings of contemporary drug science can be traced back to the first quarter of the 19th century and are marked by the emergence of the “clinico-anatomical method” in European hospitals. The clinico-anatomical method was based on a deep understanding of human anatomy, physiology, and nosology which is the branch of medicine devoted to the classification of diseases. Using prolonged observations, thorough physical examinations, and detailed autopsies, the popularity of this approach was spread by prominent medical experts in Paris—the leading medical center in 19th century Europe. The aim of this method was to make diagnoses using not only clinical signs, but also quantifiable disruptions in the body’s biological functions.

As early as 1809, French physiologist François Magendie (1783-1855) ushered in the era of experimental pharmacology by exploring the effects of recently isolated chemical drugs on various parts of the body (Dachez 2012: 548). Following in his footsteps, Magendie’s student Claude Bernard (1813-1818) studied the muscle relaxant effects of a paralyzing poison called curare (Dachez 2012: 552). The name of the toxin was derived from “urari” an indigenous term from the Carib language spoken by the Macusi of Guyana.

A major milestone in the establishment of pharmacology as an independent science came when the first chair for pharmacology was established at the University of Dorpat, and German pharmacologist Rudolf Buchheim (1820-1879) was appointed for the prestigious position (Scheindlin 2010). It was under Buchheim’s tutelage that one of the greatest pharmacologists in the modern age received his start. German chemist Oswald Schmiedeberg (1838-1921) served as an assistant to Buchheim at the University of Dorpat. Afterwards, he went on to publish over 200 articles and books in pharmaceutical science; and he trained more than 150 pharmacologists. His accomplishments played a major role in the success of the German pharmaceutical industry prior to World War II. Today, he is often considered the founder of modern pharmacology².

In the US, one of Schmiedeberg’s students, the biochemist John Jacob Abel (1857-1938) also enjoyed an illustrious career. In 1890, he was appointed to serve as the first chair in pharmacology. It is thanks to his pioneering research that, in 1883, epinephrine was isolated

² International Society for the Study of Xenobiotics, <https://www.issx.org/page/Schmiedeberg>.

from the adrenal medulla of a kidney³. The name *epinephrine* is made up of the prefix *epi-* “upon” and Greek *nephros* “kidney”⁴. Thousands of kilometers away, Japanese chemist Jokichi Takamine (1853-1922) was busy isolating the same hormone. In 1901, Takamine trademarked his discovery under the name *Adrenalin* (Yamashima 2016). The name was based on *adrenal*, the Latin name for the gland located atop the kidney which he used to harvest the hormone: *adrenal*, meaning at or near the kidney (ad- + renal).

At that time, many of the newly isolated substances which needed names were alkaloids, a class of naturally occurring organic compounds that contain at least one nitrogen atom (Hosztafi 1997). The onomastic trend was to name the discoveries after the plants the scientists had extracted the substances from. For example, the malaria treatment *cinchonine* was discovered in 1811. Its name was formed by adding the suffix *-ine* to the plant used to harvest the pharmaceutical, the *Cinchona officinalis*. The plant itself was named after the Countess of Chinchon, who is credited as having been one of the first Europeans to be treated with quinine and to have introduced the drug into Europe. The name given to the malaria treatment *quinine* (1820) was derived from the Quechua term *kina* which the Spanish called *quina* “bark”. The name *nicotine* (1828) was coined from the tobacco plant *Nicotiana tabacum*. The plant itself was named after the French ambassador in Portugal, Jean Nicot de Villemain, who sent tobacco to Paris in 1560. The extract from the bark of willows tree fall into the genus *Salix* and served as the name-sake for *salicin* (1828). The antispasmodic agent, *atropine* (1833), takes its name from New Latin *Atropa*, the genus name of the belladonna plant which was named after the Greek *Atropos*, one of the three Fates. The name-sake of the stimulant *cocaine* (1856) was the coca plant which was originally called *cuca* in Quechua. And finally, the opiate *codeine* (1832) was derived from the Greek term *kodeia* meaning “poppy head”.

Botanical names were not the only source of inspiration for naming newly discovered pharmaceuticals in the 19th century. *Morphine* was isolated from the opium poppy in 1803 by the German pharmacist Friedrich Sertürner (1783-1841). Sertürner named his discovery *Morphium* after *Morpheus*, Ovid’s name for the God of Dreams. The name was inspired by the drug’s sleep-inducing properties. Almost one century later, in 1898, its derivative, *heroin*, was refined in 1874 by the English chemist named Alder Wright (1844-1894) as the drug and its name were registered trademark of the Friedrich Bayer & Company. The drug was named after the Greek term *hērōs* “hero” and was sold as a cough suppressant for children. The substance *narcotine* was also isolated from the opium poppy in 1803 by French chemist Charles Louis Derosne (1780-1846). Later on, in 1832, its name was coined by the French chemist Pierre Robiquet (1780-1840). Derosne coined the term “narcotic” from the Medieval Latin term *narcoticum* (orig. Greek *narkōtikon*) which means to “make numb or stiff”. Narcotine is still used as a cough suppressant today and is sold under the name *noscopine*, which is the Latinized spelling of *gnoscopine*, from the Greek term *gnosis* meaning “knowledge” and *op-* from “opium”. The name *emetine* was coined from Greek term *emetikos* which means to cause vomiting because of its emetic properties. The drug itself was originally extracted from the root of *Carapichea ipecacuanha* plant. The original name of this plant was derived from the Tupi term *ipega'kwāi* which translates into “road-side sick-making plant”.

In the 20th century, the botanical names of pharmaceuticals began to increasingly use the suffix *-in(e)*. For example, the name *penicillin* was coined by Alexander Fleming (1881-1955) in 1929 (Brown 2023). Fleming named the substance after the scientific name of the mold from which it was first obtained, *Penicillium rubens*. The Latin term *penicillus* refers to the “paintbrush” structure of the fungus. The immunosuppressant medication *cyclosporine* (1969) has a similar genesis. Also isolated from a fungus (*Tolypocladium inflatum*), its

³ <https://www.worldofchemicals.com/273/chemistry-articles/john-jacob-abel-father-of-american-pharmacology.html>.

⁴ Etymological data in this section are all extracted from lalanguefrancaise.com, cnrtl.fr and etymonline.com.

pharmaceutical name indicates its botanical origin and morphology: the word “cyclosporine” is a combination of the Greek term *cyclo* meaning “round” and the Latin term *spora* meaning “spore”. A few years later, *vincristine* (1962) was extracted from and named after the flowering *Vinca rosea*, a species of periwinkle. The suffix *-in(e)* was not only used to create names of plant-based substances. The drug named *imipramine* (1957), for instance, was inspired by its chemical composition; and is made up of the first letters of “**i**mine” and “**p**ropyl”, and the suffix *-amine*.

The pharmacopeia of plant-based extracts was further enriched by physiological products such as *pepsin* (1836), which was found in the gastric juices. Its name was coined by the German physician Theodor Schwann (1810-1882) from the Greek term *pepsis* meaning “digestion”. In 1848, *pancreatin* was isolated from the pancreas. Today, it is better known as “pancreatic lipase enzyme”. A digestive hormone produced by the wall of the upper small intestine was isolated in 1902 and named *secretin* after it was found to **increase in the secretion of pancreas**. Two other pharmaceutical names that were inspired from bodily organs are *heparin* (1918) named after the Greek term *hepar*, meaning “liver”; and *insulin* (1922) which is produced by the pancreatic islets of Langerhans and was therefore named after the Latin word *insula* meaning “island”. At the same time that these and other physiologically-based products were being discovered, harvested, named, and marketed, a breakthrough in pharmacology would lead the way to a new generation of synthesized drugs.

In 1828, the German chemist Friedrich Wöhler (1800-1882) successfully synthesized urea from inorganic precursors. This innovation marked a revolutionary turning point in the history of clinical chemistry and pharmacology. Until then, in-vitro synthesis—that is to say the synthetic production of physiologically-occurring compounds in the laboratory through the use of various chemical processes such as oxidation—had been considered impossible. Indeed, the processes that took place within living organisms were believed to involve a unique existential force that could not be duplicated in the laboratory (Wilkinson 2002). Wöhler’s success demonstrated that the complex processes that occurred in a living body were simply the result of chemical reactions; and as such they could be replicated to synthesize new pharmaceutical products on an industrial-scale.

According to Jones (2011), the first pharmaceutical companies **were based on the factory model of the textile and synthetic dye industry**; and owed much to the rich source of organic chemicals derived from the distillation of coal. An excellent example here is the world-famous pharmaceutical company Bayer which was founded in the German city of Wuppertal-Barmen in 1863 by dye salesman Friedrich Bayer and dyer Johann Friedrich Weskott. Using their chemical expertise, the two began to investigate the medicinal use of tar, a substance which had long been used as both a coloring agent and a medicinal ingredient. In particular, they and others investigated tar-derived compounds such as acetanilide, which turned out to have fever-reducing properties and was marketed as *Antifebrin* in 1886. The Bayer company forest its sights on exploring the acetylation of tar-derived compounds in hopes of producing other pharmaceutical products. In 1897, one of their chemists, Felix Hoffman (1868-1946), produced a pure, stable, substance called “acetylsalicylic acid” (ASA). Soon thereafter, pharmacologist Heinrich Dreser (1860-1924) discovered ASA’s pain-relieving effects, and the substance was formally registered under the name *Aspirin* in 1899. The name was inspired by its synthesis (*acetylation*) and *-spir*, from *Spirea ulmaria*, the botanical source of salicylic acid. The product became a huge commercial success.

Inspired by the great potential wealth to be had, the late 19th century saw the establishment of many of today’s pharmaceutical powerhouses. Just a few include Pfizer which was founded in 1849; Squibb in 1858; Glaxo, 1873; Lilly, 1876; Johnson & Johnson, 1886; Abbot, 1888; and Merck, 1891. With the discovery and mass-production of antibiotics such as penicillin at the end of World War II, the pharmaceutical industry exploded. By the second half of the 20th century, industry-sponsored research had helped to discover more than a hundred essential

Commenté [P4]: why “in”?

Commenté [P5]: No! They actually derived directly from dye companies!

molecules. It was at this time that a change began to occur in the strategy used to name new pharmaceuticals. As more drug products began to reach the market, the drug companies began to devise more distinctive, chemical-based names to distinguish their products. One example of this evolution can be seen in the development of barbituric acid. The name was coined in 1863 by German chemist Adolf von Baeyer (1835-1917) allegedly after St. Barbara's Day, the day von Baeyer discovered the drug. The name *barbituric acid* became the basis for naming many derivative products like the potent sleeping pill barbital, which was synthesized by German chemists Josef von Mering (1849-1908) and Emil Fischer (1852-1919). A similar substance was marketed in 1904 by Bayer under the trade name *Veronal*®: the name is alleged to have been inspired by the Italian city of Verona which was known as a peaceful tourist attraction. Phenobarbital, another profitable derivative of barbituric acid, was sold as a hypnotic by Bayer, under the trade name *Luminal*®, based on the Latin term *lumen*, meaning "light". In 1923, Abbot launched another barbiturate by the name *Neonal*®, which combined *neo*- "new" with the familiar suffix *-al*. Within a few years of the discovery of barbituric acid, almost all of the major pharmaceutical companies had their own barbiturate—each with its own distinctive name.

Along with the chemical composition, pharmaceutical products were also given names to commemorate the research sponsors. One example here is the famous blood thinner warfarin. In the 1920s, the northern states of the US and Canada were struck by an outbreak of hemorrhagic disease among cattle that were grazing moldy sweet clover hay. In 1941, the US American biochemist and renowned expert in plant carbohydrate chemistry, Karl Paul Link (1901-1978), and his students managed to isolate a substance that reduced clotting in lab animals. They called it *dicoumarol* because of its structural similarity to coumarin. The name *coumarin* was derived from *kumar*, the name for "tree" in the South American indigenous language Kari'nja. In 1820, French pharmacist Nicolas Guibourt (1790–1867) got the extract from the now outdated genus name, *Courmarouma* (Wardrop and Keeling 2008). Link and his students went on to develop a method for synthesizing dicoumarol in the laboratory. Link realized that some variants of dicoumarol might have many other uses. Link's research was funded by the Wisconsin Alumni Research Foundation (WARF). With their financial support, in 1945, Link developed a type of dicoumarol that was particularly effective as a rat poison. To recognize WARF's assistance in filing the necessary patent, Link named the compound *warfarin* (WARF + *-arin* from *coumarin*). Link, later successfully developed a clinical-grade warfarin for human testing as a blood-thinner. In 1954, Warfarin received FDA-approval for use in the prevention of blood clots and was sold under the brand name *Coumadin*®. Today, warfarin is the most widely used anticoagulant in the world. According to financial estimates, in 2021, the market-size of Warfarin globally was valued at USD 535.66 million and is expected to exceed 550 million by 2027 (Marketwatch 2023).

With profit sizes this large, it is no surprise that pharmaceutical companies continue to invest heavily in expanding their product selection for the global market. Many of these new products are, however, simply variation of a previously released substance. Indeed, by the end of the 1990s, truly novel discoveries had become relatively rare. Instead, the market has been flooded by nearly identical copies of original molecules which allow manufacturers to maximize their profits. According to Angell (2004), from 1998 through 2003, out of the 487 drugs that were approved by the FDA, 68% fell into this category, that is to say "drugs that contain minor variations of pharmaceuticals already on the market". The similarity between products has also come with corporate risks. Chief among them is the fierce financial competition which cuts the potential profits to be earned by single companies. To circumvent this problem, recent years have seen several rival pharmaceutical companies decide to join forces to form mega-conglomerates. GlaxoSmithKline (GSK), for example, is the product of a merger between Glaxo Wellcome and SmithKline Beecham. Even so, competition on the pharmaceutical market remains tough as manufacturers battle for consumer loyalty using

Commenté [EIC6]: I have deleted the phrase « me too » as this term is used in English now as apart of the global protest against the sexual harassment of women. Using me-too risk deeply offending a large number of readers and would not be accepted by the publisher.

Commenté [P7R6]: There are hundreds of references to "me-too" pharmaceutical products in the medical world!!! If you choose not to use it, with the definition, they risk being confused with "generics", which is a totally different issue.

nearly identical chemical substances. In the face of this rivalry, drug names are often the key to making one drug stand out on the market against its competitors. Given the terrific financial stakes involved, pharmaceutical companies therefore invest heavily to hire specialist agencies to help them find and register winning brand to names sometimes even before a suitable drug product has been released for manufacture (Dutchen 2009).

Commenté [P8]: You have repeated "find". I opted for « hire ».

Commenté [P9]: I do not understand the construction of the sentence.

3. The Basic Types of PDNs

Drugs often have at least four names. When it is first discovered, it is given a CHEMICAL NAME by the International Union of Pure and Applied Chemistry (IUPAC). This name describes its atomic or molecular structure. For instance, the chemical name of the so-called "abortion pill" is *(dimethylamino)phenyl]-17 α -(1-propynyl)estra-4,9-dien-17 β -ol-3-one*. Of course, such names are too complicated for general use (Karet 2019). For that reason, it is common for a shorthand version of the chemical name or a CODE NAME to be developed. In this case, the code name *RU 486* is used for this pharmaceutical product. The name is derived from the abbreviation for the pharmaceutical company that marketed it, **Roussel-Uclaf (RU)**, and the product serial number, *486*.

When drugs undergo clinical trials, they are given a GENERIC NAME, an **INN**, which is proposed by the WHO. INNs are not subject to proprietary trademark rights but are entirely in the public domain. An INN is made up of stems, which can be prefixes, infixes, and more generally suffixes. These stems typically give information about a drug's composition and class. The INN naming system has been standardized for consistency (e.g. names ending with *-adol* like *tramadol* belong to analgesics; *-caine* like *lidocaine* to local anesthetics; *-tinib* like *imatinib* to tyrosine kinase inhibitors; names starting with *gli-* like *glimepiride* belong to antihyperglycemics, sulfonamide derivatives; *som-* like *somatropin* to growth hormone derivatives; *rifa-*, like *rifadine* to antibiotic rifamycin derivatives, etc.)⁵.

Commenté [P10]: With your revisions, I cannot find the full letter word any more: International Nonproprietary Name

This specification policies there help identify the pharmaceutical uses. Consider, for example, the INNs used for monoclonal antibodies. They all follow a fixed pattern (prefix + target + source + *mab* for "monoclonal antibody"). Several abbreviated codes are also available for each of these constituents: target (**ba** for "bacterium", **fu** for "fungus", **tu** for "tumor", **ci** for "cardio", **ki** for "interleukin", **ne** for "neural", **so** for "bone", **toxa** for "toxin", **vi** for "viral" and **li** for "immuno"); and source (**u** for "human", **a** for "rat", **xi** for "chimeric", **i** for "primate", **o** for "mouse", **zu** for "humanized", **xizu** for "chimeric human" and **e** for "hamster"). Thanks to this system, it is possible to decipher that the INN *alemtuzumab* is humanized (zu) and used for cancer (tu); *abciximab* is identifiable as a chimeric (xi) that is used for heart problems (ci); and *adalimumab* is fully human (u) and indicated for treatment of diseases of the immune system (li).

Once a drug has been assigned an INN, it may also be given a country-specific identifier, depending on the nation in question. There are many country-specific different systems (e.g. the British Approved Name (BAN), French Dénomination Commune Française (DCF), Japanese Accepted Name (JAN), or United States Adopted Name (USAN)). These different national naming schemes may yield differing names for the same substances. For example, N-acetyl-para-aminophenol is called *acetaminophen* (**acetyl** + **amino-** + **phenol**) in the US and *paracetamol* (**para-acetyl** + **amino** + **phenol**) in the European Union (EU).

In the United States, unique nonproprietary names to medication to be marketed domestically are assigned by the United States Adopted Names Council (USANC). The USANC is an FDA-recognized nomenclature agency responsible for the selection of

⁵ World Health Organization, <https://www.who.int>.

nonproprietary (generic) names for all chemical and biologic single-entity drugs marketed in the nation. It was established in 1961 as the result of a partnership between three organizations involved in the standardization of drug nomenclature (the American Medical Association, the American Pharmacists Association, and the United States Pharmacopeial Convention) after several major concerns had been raised: (1) the existing system did not require selection of a nonproprietary name for each drug; (2) there was no central list of names; and (3) there was no legal requirement that all firms use the same name for an identical substance.

USANC's role is to systematize drug nomenclature and create useful and conflict-free generic names. The Council works in conjunction with the WHO INN Expert Committee, which is why names rarely differ: for instance, the INN/USAN name of RU 486 is *mifepristone*: its suffix *-pristone* indicates that the drug is a progesterone receptor antagonist. The USAN assignment is a necessary step in drug development before pharmaceutical products can be brought to the US market. Assignment of a USAN is required for any new drug before patients can have access to it. According to Karet (2019), over 10,000 drugs have received nonproprietary names since the WHO, the American Medical Association, the American Pharmacists Association, and the United States Pharmacopeial Convention began assigning names to drugs. In 2018, the USAN program named 198 substances. Since then, the number has grown steadily. The USANC mostly bases its assignments on INN stems, however, some variation does occur. By contrast, the European Commission requires all member states to use recommended INNs for all drugs.

Alongside these names, the pharmaceutical companies also develop a PROPRIETARY NAME for each product. These names are subject to regulatory approval. For example, mifepristone was trademarked as *Mifegyne*®. This name must be approved by the FDA before the pharmaceutical product can be put on the market in the US. Once a pharmaceutical patent has expired, companies that make the drug are free to choose other names for their generic versions. As a result, mifepristone has been marketed as *Medabon*, *Mifabon*, *Mifeprex*, *Mifepirin*, *Korlym*, *Termipil*, etc. As this example shows, the prescription drug market is characterized by a constant introduction of new brands at the expense of existing brands.

This onomastic dynamism is in stark contrast to the time it takes to bring a product to market. Launching a new drug takes an average of 12 years. In addition, only five in 5,000, or 10%, of the drugs that begin preclinical testing ever make it to human testing. And, only one of these five will ever receive **approvable** for human usage. In the US, once the preclinical research is complete, a pharmaceutical company must file an Investigational New Drug Application (IND) with the FDA to begin to test the potential new drug in humans. The FDA mandates a 3-phase clinical trial testing with a single phase clinical trial costing upwards of \$100 million. After all three phases of clinical testing have been completed successfully, a pharmaceutical company must then file a New Drug Application (NDA) with the FDA. Once the FDA approves the drug, it can then be made available for physicians to prescribe to patients⁶. In 2020, the median cost of getting a new drug onto the market was estimated to be \$985 million⁷.

Drug patents are internationally recognized and regulated by the World Intellectual Property Organization (WIPO). Created in 1970, the WIPO helps to ensure that intellectual property (IP) is protected around the world. Patents issued by the WIPO last 20 years and may be extended a maximum of 7 years under certain special conditions (e.g. to help ensure the continued production of so-called "orphan drugs" for statistically rare diseases⁸). To help make sure their financial stake in a product is secure, drug manufacturers often patent new

⁶ FDA, <https://www.fda.gov/drugs/development-approval-process-drugs/how-drugs-are-developed-and-approved>.

⁷ London School of Economics and Political Science, <https://www.lse.ac.uk>.

⁸ WIPO, <https://www.wipo.int>.

Commenté [P11]: approval ?

compounds early in the drug research process to protect their IP. This strategy means that by the time their drug actually obtains approval, their WIPO patent may only last a few years. This is why some companies go to great lengths to have their patents prolonged. To extend their IP ownership, drug companies may invest considerable funds in hopes of finding new indications, new formulations, or new routes of administration which can be used as an argument for prolonging their patent (Gupta et al 2010). Once a drug patent fully expires, the way is paved for generic competitors to profit from the product. Therefore, the period of patent protection is crucial to maintaining a corner on the market and garnering maximum financial return. Pharmaceutical companies make about 80% of their overall revenue for a product during this period. This time is not only crucial to helping a company recoup its drug development costs. It also provides a unique opportunity for them to strengthen a brand's identity to secure consumer loyalty before generic competitors reach the market. In this way, pharmaceutical companies can extend a drug's life or profit long after a patent has expired.

4. An Overview of the FDA's Best Practices in Developing Proprietary Names for Prescriptions (PNPs)

The FDA was established in 1906 with the Pure Food and Drugs Act (PFDA) that sought to give consumers more information to help them identify effective medicines. According to Donohue (2006), it was only after more than 100 people had died after taking a drug called *elixir sulfanilamide* that the US Congress passed the 1938 Food Drug and Cosmetic Act (FDCA). With this regulation, for the first time in US history, only drugs that had been proven safe were eligible to receive the FDA approval required for entering the market.

Today, once a PNP is found, company laboratories may apply for marketing authorization with the FDA. The Division of Medication Error Prevention and Analysis (DMEPA) is responsible for PNPs⁹. It reviews proposed names prior to their approval by putting them through a battery of tests. For example, the orthographic and phonetic similarity of a proposed PNP to other names is assessed by using the Phonetic and Orthographic Computer Analysis (POCA) software¹⁰. Proposed PNPs may be handwritten and presented to healthcare professionals to determine their decipherability. It is also common to test how understandable PNPs are when pronounced in different languages and across various settings such as on the phone or in a noisy environment. Using these and other procedures, the FDA evaluate approximately 500 names per year and ultimately rejects four out of 10 (Scutti 2016).

In May 2014, in response to about 126,000 drug-related incidents, some of which were due to consumers confusing drugs with similar names, the FDA issued recommendations for naming of newly branded prescription drugs (FDA 2014). The guidelines were subsequently revised in April 2016 (FDA 2016) and in December 2020 (FDA 2020). In the latest version, the FDA recommends sponsors avoid proposed PNPs that are similar in either spelling or pronunciation to existing PNPs, established names, proper names, names of ingredients, or other consumer products. The Institute for Safe Medication Practices (ISMP), a nonprofit organization, publishes a list of confused drug names that contains look-alike and/or sound-alike names. For example, *Aldara*®, which is used to treat superficial basal cell carcinoma, is reported as being unacceptably close to *Alora*® which is used to treat the symptoms of vulvar and vaginal atrophy in menopause (ISMP 2017). The ISMP's list is published to inform the public and the industry about medications that require special safeguards in hopes of reducing

⁹ FDA, <https://www.fda.gov/drugs/drug-safety-and-availability/medication-errors-related-cder-regulated-drug-products>.

¹⁰ FDA, <https://www.fda.gov/drugs/information-industry-drugs/phonetic-and-orthographic-computer-analysis-poca-program>.

the risk of potentially dangerous errors. However, adherence to ISMP's recommendations is not mandatory.

Generally speaking, when the FDA receives a medication error report, they make recommended changes to product labelling to avoid consumer confusion. For example, the FDA may suggest that a PNP utilize a mixture of upper and lower case lettering, employ different font sizes, alter layouts, or change the colors. In rare cases, the FDA may exercise its regulatory authority and require companies to completely change a PNP to eradicate medication errors resulting from name confusion. For example, in July 2005, the maker of the Alzheimer drug *Reminyl*® had to change the brand name to *Razadyne*® to help avoid consumer confusion with the diabetes drug *Amaryl*®. Another example is the blockbuster arthritis drug originally named *Celebra*®. After a pharmacy professor complained that it sounded too similar to the antidepressant *Celexa*®, the FDA required the pharmaceutical company to change the PN, and the replacement name *Celebex*® was selected (Hoffman and Proulx 2003).

The FDA recommends that proposed PNs refrain from incorporating any reference to inert or inactive ingredients contained in the pharmaceutical compound such as aspartame or sulfites, as doing so may mislead consumers into thinking that their functional importance to the product is greater than it actually is (FDA 2020: 5). For example, giving the analgesic *Percocet*® the name *Percocet Povidone* simply because it contains povidone—a synthetic polymer vehicle used for dispersing and suspending drugs—would in all likelihood make consumers wrongly believe that povidone has a therapeutic value in the product.

The FDA also recommends avoiding PNs that include or suggest the name of one or more, but not all, of its active ingredients (FDA 2020: 5). Such names can mislead the end-user by implying that the product contains only that ingredient. For example, naming COVID-19 treatment *Paxlovid*® which contains the two antivirals nirmatrelvir and ritonavir, *Paxlovid ritonavir* would be misleading as this name makes no mention of nirmatrelvir and could lead consumers to believe that the treatment contains only one anti-viral agent.

The FDA further states that proposed PNs may not contain an INN/USAN stem (FDA 2020: 5). Using these stems could erroneously suggest that a product has a pharmacological or chemical trait that it does not. For example, the name of the antimalarial drug *Malarone*®, contains the stem *-arone* which is normally reserved for anti-arrhythmic drugs (e.g. *amiodarone*, *dronedarone*, etc.). This name might mislead some into thinking that it is also used to regulate cardiac dysrhythmia. This potential confusion is not the only reason why using INN/USAN stems is discouraged in PNs. The use of these regulatory onomastic elements for brand names could challenge the power of the USAN and INN to select names in the same series.

Another FDA guideline for devising new drug product names is the avoidance of “brand name extension” (FDA 2020: 6). This naming strategy involves basing a new name on a PNP that is already associated with one or more marketed drug products for a new product that does not share any active ingredient(s) with the pre-existing drug product(s). At the same time, sponsors are also warned to take special onomastic precautions when devising PNs for products that contain the same active ingredient(s) as a pre-existing product already on the market. When products that contain the same molecule are given entirely different PNs, consumers may be at risk of either overdosing or experiencing dose-related adverse events when they unwittingly consume the two products. If matters were not complex enough, the FDA also advises against devising PNs that are identical or nearly identical to foreign products on the market that contain an entirely different active ingredient. This warning stands even if the proposed product is to be marketed exclusively in the United States; or when the foreign product is solely sold outside of the United States.

Moreover, the FDA also recommends that drug-makers refrain from using the PNs that are reminiscent of or identical to a different product that is no longer marketed to name a

different drug product. This onomastic warning is given to avoid risking end-users continuing to associate the name with the original discontinued product (FDA 2020: 7). For example, using the name *Myolastan* for a new drug to help with, for example, weight control after the muscle relaxant *Myolastan*® was withdrawn from the market in 2013 might risk some patients to wrongly believe that the old product was back on the market and could be used in the same way.

PNPs, according to the FDA directives, should also be readily pronounceable (FDA 2020: 38). This guideline is to help ensure drug products are easily and correctly communicated by health care professionals when prescribing, ordering, transcribing, dispensing, and/or administering drugs. It also helps to avoid misunderstandings when healthcare specialists counsel patients on their medications. For those very same reasons, the FDA also discourages sponsors from proposing PNPs that consist of a string of letters or numbers (FDA 2020: 8). A PNP with digits might be misconstrued by consumers as an indicator of recommended dosage. For much the same reason, sponsors are generally discouraged from incorporating symbols, dose designations, and medical abbreviations commonly used for prescription communication into their proposed PNPs because their inclusion could inadvertently introduce a source of consumer error.

The FDA recommends that sponsors avoid incorporating product-specific attributes, such as manufacturing characteristics, dosage form or route of administration into the proposed root of a PNP (FDA 2020: 8). This recommendation is for a very pragmatic reason: it is not uncommon for a product's attributes to change during a drug's life cycle. Such changes could render the root PNP inaccurate and thus unusable. For the same reason, sponsors are generally discouraged from incorporating symbols, dose designations, and medical abbreviations commonly used for prescription communication in their proposed proprietary name because their inclusion could inadvertently precipitate consumer misunderstandings.

Proposed PNPs that incorporate the sponsor's name in its entirety or in part are also to be avoided, according to the FDA guidelines (FDA 2020: 15). Some companies find this recommendation particularly annoying as the incorporation of a company name into a series of PNPs can help to create a link to a series of other products, already successfully marketed by the company. However, this marketing strategy also risks consumers becoming confused over which product is used for what health problem. The naming practice could pose safety risks when healthcare professionals who distribute or sell drug products store or list them alphabetically.

And finally, the FDA strongly discourages the use of any PNP that can convey false or misleading information (FDA 2020: 15). For instance, a proposed PNP that risks misrepresenting the safety or efficacy of a product must be avoided. Companies are to refrain from creating fanciful misleading PNPs, for instance, that falsely suggest that a pharmaceutical product has a degree of effectiveness which it does not or that it contains an unusual composition which it has not. To help protect consumers against such names, in March 2021, the FDA announced that it would be conducting an investigation, together with the Office of Prescription Drug Promotion (formerly the Division of Drug Marketing, Advertising, and Communications), to investigate misleading drug names that overstate their product efficacy or understate their risks. The goal of the study was to determine how drug names influence consumers and healthcare providers. The agency has suggested that, depending on the findings, it may update its drug-naming guidelines. As of the writing of this chapter, the research results had not yet been published.

While the FDA is principally in charge of reviewing PNPs in the United States, in the EU, the EMA (European Medicines Agency) is responsible for the scientific evaluation of medicines. There are two routes pharmaceutical companies may take to apply for drug marketing authorization: the "mutual recognition" procedure; and the "centralized"

procedure¹¹. The mutual recognition route involves a medication in one EU Member State receiving authorization by being recognized by another EU Member State. The “centralized” procedure allows a drug to be marketed after it has successfully undergone EU-wide evaluation. Within the EMA, it is the Name Review Group that is responsible for assessing PNPs. In 2021, the EMA released a 7th revised version of its guidelines on the acceptability of PNPs for drugs (EMA 2021). Originally published in 2007, the 2021 version introduces several new requirements based on the FDA’s recommendations. Generally speaking, though, the EMA regulations are still not as far-reaching as those used by the FDA.

5. Conclusion: How Big Pharmaceutical Companies Use PNPs to Connect Brand Identity and Consumer Identity

As indicated in section 4, today, the FDA reviews and approves new medicines at record pace, despite the fact that regulations for the approval of a PN are still rather stringent. However, obtaining FDA approval is not the only hurdle drug companies face when devising new names for their products. In the United States and New Zealand, pharmaceutical companies are allowed to use broadcast advertising to extol the merits of their prescription drugs. This strategy is called “direct-to-consumer advertising” (DTCA). This “mixed” marketing strategy must not only effectively reach doctors, but also patients. Ferrier (2001) has this to say about large-scale DTCA to promote prescription purchasing:

the permitted use [...] has dramatically changed the landscape of brands, in terms of their levels of consumer awareness and the claimed level of prescriptions that have been made out by doctors as a result of branded consumer requests (69).

In recent years, potential effectiveness of DTCA has been increased by the incorporation of internet-based ads. This medium has provided another powerful (often unregulated) for advertising prescriptions directly to consumers. To reach e-audiences, some pharmaceutical companies have begun to target patient advocacy groups to help promote their medications to treat their diseases. The rationale behind developing campaigns to reach this new, consumer group is that patients are now more actively engaged in their care. This phenomenon of “patient empowerment” is defined by the WHO as “a process through which people gain greater control over decisions and actions affecting their health”¹². Such empowered patients, when targeted by DTCA campaigns, may ask their doctors for particular brands. To help ensure that these patients ask for their product when they speak with their healthcare providers, pharmaceutical companies work very hard to come up with names that are memorable and positive. The ultimate goal then is to create a unique name that will avoid regulatory and safety pitfalls of the government guidelines, while still being appealing to both practitioners and patients. According to Scutti (2016), names are crafted as per four distinct dimensions: visual distinctiveness, melodic contrast, verbal velocity and language neutrality (absence of negative or offensive connotations in foreign languages). Government-sanctioned PNPs that successfully meet each one of these criteria have an optimal chance of not only attracting consumer attention, but also creating a strong bond between a brand identity and the consumer’s identity. When this match occurs, the resulting relationship can be enormously profitable and remarkably long-lasting.

Commenté [P12]: powerful what ?

Commenté [P13]: I think it is important to add: Other aspects such as the logo, the slogan, the shape and color of the galenic form (e.g. Viagra’s famous blue diamond-shaped tablet, registered as a non-traditional trademark), or the packaging are also key in making a brand unique.

¹¹ European Commission, <https://health.ec.europa.eu/medicinal-products/legal-framework-governing-medicinal-products-human-use-eu/authorisation-procedures-centralised-procedure>.

¹² World Health Organization, <https://www.who.int/teams/health-promotion/enhanced-wellbeing/seventh-global-conference/community-empowerment>.

References

- Angell, Marcia. "Excess in the pharmaceutical industry." *Canadian Medical Association Journal* (December 2004): 1451-1453. doi: 10.1503/cmaj.1041594
- Blackett, Tom and Rebecca Robins, *Brand Medicine, the Role of Branding in the Pharmaceutical Industry*. New York: Palgrave, 2001.
- Brown, Kevin. "Alexander Fleming." *Encyclopedia Britannica*. <https://www.britannica.com/biography/Alexander-Fleming>. Accessed 26 January 2023.
- Dachez, Roger. *Histoire de la médecine*. Paris : Taillandier, 2012.
- Donohue, Julie. "A History of Drug Advertising: The Evolving Roles of Consumers and Consumer Protection." *Milbank Quarterly* 84, no.4. (December 2006): 659-699. doi: 10.1111/j.1468-0009.2006.00464.x
- Dutchen, Stephanie. "A drug by any other name." *Scope* (2009). <http://classic.scopeweb.mit.edu/articles/a-drug-by-any-other-name/> (accessed 15/02/2018)
- EMA. *Guideline on the acceptability of names for human medicinal products processed through the centralised procedure*, 2021. https://www.ema.europa.eu/en/documents/scientific-guideline/draft-guideline-acceptability-names-human-medicinal-products-processed-through-centralised-procedure_en.pdf
- Faure, Pascaline. "Du sildénafil citrate au Viagra® ou l'art délicat de nommer les médicaments." [From sildenafil citrate to Viagra® or the delicate art of naming drugs]. *Terminology*, Volume 20, no. 1 (January 2014): 74-91. doi: <https://doi.org/10.1075/term.20.1.04fau>
- Faure, Pascaline. "Natesto®. What else? New trends in drug naming." *Names* 66, no. 2 (January 2018): 65-74. doi: 10.1080/00277738.2017.1415532
- Faure, Pascaline. "Le marketing des médicaments ou l'art de transformer les bien-portants en malades : analyse multimodale des noms et des logos de dix médicaments de marque sur ordonnance." [Drug marketing or the art of turning the healthy into the sick: a multimodal analysis of the names and logos of ten branded prescription drugs]. *ELAD-SILDA*, n°7 (November 2022). doi: 10.35562/elad-silda.1182
- FDA. *Guidance for Industry. Best Practices in Developing Proprietary Names for Drugs.* , 2014. <http://www.fda.gov/downloads/drugs/guidancecomplianceregulatoryinformation/guidances/ucm398997.pdf>
- FDA. *Contents of a Complete Submission for the Evaluation of Proprietary Names. Guidance for Industry*, 2016. <https://www.fda.gov/downloads/Drugs/GuidanceComplianceRegulatoryInformation/Guidances/ucm075068.pdf>
- FDA. *Best Practices in Developing Proprietary Names for Human Prescription Drug Products, Guidance for Industry*, 2020. <https://www.fda.gov/regulatory-information/search-fda-guidance-documents/best-practices-developing-proprietary-names-human-prescription-drug-products-guidance-industry>.
- Ferrier, Hugh. "Successful switch strategies." In *Brand Medicine, the Role of Branding in the Pharmaceutical Industry*, edited by Tom Blackett and Rebecca Robins, 61-81. New York: Palgrave, 2001.

Commenté [EIC14]: Nearly every entry in the list of citations is incorrect. Please look carefully at the *Chicago Manual of Style*.

Commenté [P15R14]: I did my best....

- Gangwal, Amit and Ankit Gangwal. "Naming of Drug Molecules and Pharmaceutical Brands." *Journal of Current Pharmaceutical Research* 7, no. 1 (2011): 01-05. <https://lawpunditsglobal.com/media/uploads/2013/10/Branding-of-Pharma-Products.pdf>
- Gupta, Himanshu et al. "Patent protection strategies." *Journal of pharmacy & bioallied sciences* 2, no. 1 (2010): 2-7. doi:10.4103/0975-7406.62694
- Hoffman, James M and Susan M Proulx. "Medication errors caused by confusion of drug names." *Drug safety* 26, no. 7 (2003): 445-52. doi: 10.2165/00002018-200326070-00001
- Hosztafi, Sandor. "The discovery of alkaloids." *Die Pharmazie* 52, no.7 (1997): 546-550.
- ISMP. *List of Confused Drug Names*, 2017. <https://www.ismp.org/sites/default/files/attachments/2017-11/confuseddrugnames%2802.2015%29.pdf>
- Jones, Alan. "Early drug discovery and the rise of pharmaceutical chemistry." *Drug Test and Analysis* (June 2011): 337-44. doi: 10.1002/dta.301
- Karet, Gail. "How Do Drugs Get Named?" *AMA Journal of Ethics* 21, n°8 (2019): 686-696. doi: 10.1001/amajethics.2019.686
- Keller, Kevin, Susan Heckler and Michael Houston. "The effects of brand name suggestiveness on advertising recall," *Journal of Marketing* 62 (1998):48-57.
- Lowrey, Tina M., L. J. Shrum and Tony M. Dubitsky. "The Relation between Brand-Name Linguistic Characteristics and Brand-Name Memory." *Journal of Advertising* 32, no. 3 (2003): 7-17. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/4622164>. MarketWatch.com. "Warfarin Market Insights 2023." <https://www.marketwatch.com/press-release/warfarin-market-insights-2023-key-dynamics-significant-growth-rate-revenue-expectations-and-size-forecast-to-2027-2023-01-05>.
- Paling, Mike. "The role of advertising in branding pharmaceuticals." In *Brand Medicine, the Role of Branding in the Pharmaceutical Industry*, edited by Tom Blackett and Rebecca Robins, 113-129. New York: Palgrave, 2001.
- Room, Adrian. *Dictionary of Trade Name Origins*. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul Ltd, 1982.
- Scheindlin Stanley. "Our Man in Dorpat: Rudolf Buchheim and the Birth of Pharmacology." *Molecular Interventions* 10, no.6 (December 2010): 331-335. doi: 10.1124/mi.10.6.1
- Scutti, Susan. "'Creation engineering': The art and science of naming drugs." *CNN* (2016). Accessed May 14, 2020. <https://edition.cnn.com/2016/11/25/health/art-of-drug-naming>.
- Stepney, Rob. "A Dose by any Other Name would not Sell as Sweet." *The British Medical Journal*, no. 341 (December 2010): 6895. doi: <https://doi.org/10.1136/bmj.c6895>
- Wardrop, Douglas and David Keeling. "The story of the discovery of heparin and warfarin." *British Journal of Haematology*, 141 (2008): 757-763.
- Wilkinson, Ian. "History of Clinical Chemistry." *The Journal of the International Federation of Clinical Chemistry and Laboratory Medicine* 13, no 4 (June 2002): 114-118.
- Tetsumori, Yamashima. "Jokichi Takamine (1854-1922), The Samurai Chemist, and His Work on Adrenalin." *Journal of Medical Biography* 11, no.2 (June 2016): 95-102. doi: 10.1177/096777200301100211