

Renal Impairment
In patients with impaired renal function, the serum half-life of gadobutrol is prolonged and correlated with the reduction in creatinine clearance.

After intravenous injection of 0.1 mmol gadobutrol/kg body weight, the elimination half-life was 5.8 ± 2.4 hours in mild to moderately impaired patients (80 > CLCR > 30 mL/min) and 17.6 ± 6.2 hours in severely impaired patients not on dialysis (CLCR < 30 mL/min). The mean AUC of gadobutrol in patients with normal renal function was 1.1 ± 0.1 mmol•h/L, compared to 4.0 ± 1.8 mmol•h/L in patients with mild to moderate renal impairment and 11.5 ± 4.3 mmol•h/L in patients with severe renal impairment.

Complete recovery in the urine was seen in patients with mild or moderate renal impairment within 72 hours. In patients with severely impaired renal function about 80% of the administered dose was recovered in the urine within 5 days.

For patients receiving hemodialysis, physicians may consider the prompt initiation of hemodialysis following the administration of gadobutrol in order to enhance the contrast agent's elimination. Sixty-eight percent (68%) of gadobutrol is removed from the body after the first dialysis, 94% after the second dialysis, and 98% after the third dialysis session. [see Warnings and Precautions (5.2) and Use in Specific Populations (8.6).]

13 **NONCLINICAL TOXICOLOGY**

13.1 **Carcinogenesis, Mutagenesis, Impairment of Fertility**
No carcinogenicity studies of gadobutrol have been conducted.

Gadobutrol was not mutagenic in *in vitro* reverse mutation tests in bacteria, in the HGPRT (hypoxanthine-guanine phosphoribosyl transferase) test using cultured Chinese hamster V79 cells, or in chromosome aberration tests in human peripheral blood lymphocytes, and was negative in an *in vivo* micronucleus test in mice after intravenous injection of 0.5 mmol/kg.

Gadobutrol had no effect on fertility and general reproductive performance of male and female rats when given in doses 12.2 times the human equivalent dose (based on body surface area).

13.2 **Animal Toxicology and/or Pharmacology**

Local intolerance reactions, including moderate irritation associated with infiltration of inflammatory cells was observed after paravenous administration to rabbits, suggesting the possibility of occurrence of local irritation if the contrast medium leaks around veins in a clinical setting [see Warnings and Precautions (5.7)].

14 **CLINICAL STUDIES**

14.1 **MRI of the CNS**

Patients referred for MRI of the central nervous system with contrast were enrolled in two clinical trials that evaluated the visualization characteristics of lesions. In both studies, patients underwent a baseline, pre-contrast MRI prior to administration of gadobutrol at a dose of 0.1 mmol/kg, followed by a post-contrast MRI. In Study A, patients also underwent an MRI before and after the administration of gadoteridol. The studies were designed to demonstrate superiority of gadobutrol MRI to non-contrast MRI for lesion visualization. For both studies, pre-contrast and pre-plus-post-contrast images (paired images) were independently evaluated by three readers for contrast enhancement and border delineation using a scale of 1 to 4, and for internal morphology using a scale of 1 to 3 (Table 5). Lesion counting was also performed to demonstrate non-inferiority of paired gadobutrol image sets to pre-contrast MRI. Readers were blinded to clinical information.

Table 5: Primary Endpoint Visualization Scoring System

Score	Visualization Characteristics		
	Contrast Enhancement	Border Delineation	Internal Morphology
1	None	None	Poorly visible
2	Weak	Moderate	Moderately visible
3	Clear	Clear but incomplete	Sufficiently visible
4	Clear and bright	Clear and complete	N/A

Efficacy was determined in 657 subjects. The average age was 49 years (range 18 to 85 years) and 42% were male. The ethnic representations were 58% Caucasian, 4% Black, 16% Hispanic, 38% Asian, and 3% of other ethnic groups.

Table 6 shows a comparison of visualization results between paired images and pre-contrast images. Gadobutrol provided a statistically significant improvement for each of the three lesion visualization parameters when averaged across three independent readers for each study.

Table 6: Visualization Endpoint Results of Central Nervous System Adult MRI Studies with 0.1 mmol/kg Gadobutrol

Endpoint	Study A N=336			Study B N=321		
	Pre-contrast	Paired	Difference ¹	Pre-contrast	Paired	Difference
Contrast Enhancement	0.97	2.26	1.29 ²	0.93	2.86	1.94 ²
Border Delineation	1.98	2.58	0.60 ²	1.92	2.94	1.02 ²
Internal Morphology	1.32	1.93	0.60 ²	1.57	2.35	0.78 ²
Average # Lesions Detected	8.08	8.25	0.17 ⁴	2.65	2.97	0.32 ³

¹ Difference of means = (paired mean) – (pre-contrast mean)

² p<0.001

³ Met noninferiority margin of -0.35

⁴ Did not meet noninferiority margin of -0.35

Performances of gadobutrol and gadoteridol for visualization parameters were similar. Regarding the number of lesions detected, Study B met the prespecified noninferiority margin of -0.35 for paired read versus pre-contrast read while in Study A, gadobutrol and gadoteridol did not.

For the visualization endpoints contrast enhancement, border delineation, and internal morphology, the percentage of patients scoring higher for paired images compared to pre-contrast images ranged from 53% to 89% for Study A, and 56% to 97% for Study B. For both studies, the mean number of lesions detected on paired images exceeded that of the pre-contrast images; 37% for Study A and 24% for Study B. There were 29% and 11% of subjects in which the pre-contrast images detected more lesions for Study A and Study B, respectively.

The percentage of patients whose average reader mean score changed by ≤ 0, up to 1, up to 2, and ≥ 2 scoring categories presented in Table 5 is shown in Table 7. The categorical improvement of (≤ 0) represents higher (< 0) or identical (= 0) scores for the pre-contrast read, the categories with scores > 0 represent the magnitude of improvement seen for the paired read.

Table 7: Primary Endpoint Visualization Categorical Improvement for Average Reader

Endpoint	Study A N=336				Study B N=321			
	Categorical Improvement (Paired – Pre-Contrast) %				Categorical Improvement (Paired – Pre-Contrast) %			
	≤ 0	> 0 to < 1	1 to < 2	≥ 2	≤ 0	> 0 to < 1	1 to < 2	≥ 2
Contrast Enhancement	1	30	55	13	3	6	34	57
Border Delineation	7	73	18	1	5	38	51	5
Internal Morphology	4	79	17	0	5	61	33	1

For both studies, the improvement of visualization endpoints in paired gadobutrol images compared to pre-contrast images resulted in improved assessment of normal and abnormal CNS anatomy.

Pediatric Patients

Two studies in 44 pediatric patients age younger than 2 years and 135 pediatric patients age 2 to less than 18 years with CNS and non-CNS lesions supported extrapolation of adult CNS efficacy findings. For example, comparing pre vs paired pre- and post-contrast images, investigators selected the best of four descriptors under the heading, "Visualization of lesion-internal morphology (lesion characterization) or homogeneity of vessel enhancement" for 27/44 (62% = pre) vs 43/44 (98% = paired) MR images from patients age 0 to less than 2 years and 106/135 (78% = pre) vs 108/135 (80% = paired) MR images from patients age 2 to less than 18 years.

14.2 **MRI of the Breast**

Patients with recently diagnosed breast cancer were enrolled in two identical clinical trials to evaluate the ability of gadobutrol to assess the presence and extent of malignant breast disease prior to surgery. Patients underwent non-contrast breast MRI (BMR) prior to gadobutrol (0.1 mmol/kg) breast MRI. BMR images and gadobutrol BMR (combined contrast plus non-contrast) images were independently evaluated in each study by three readers blinded to clinical information. In separate reading sessions the BMR images and gadobutrol BMR images were also interpreted together with X-ray mammography images (XRM).

The studies evaluated 787 patients: Study 1 enrolled 390 women with an average age of 56 years, 74% were white, 25% Asian, 0.5% black, and 0.5% other; Study 2 enrolled 396 women and 1 man with an average age of 57 years, 71% were white, 24% Asian, 3% black, and 2% other.

The readers assessed 5 regions per breast for the presence of malignancy using each reading modality. The readings were compared to an independent standard of truth (SoT) consisting of histopathology for all regions where excisions were made and tissue evaluated. XRM plus ultrasound was used for all other regions.

The assessment of malignant disease was performed using a region based within-subject sensitivity. Sensitivity for each reading modality was defined as the mean of the percentage of malignant breast regions correctly interpreted for each subject. The within-subject sensitivity of gadobutrol BMR was superior to that of BMR. The lower bound of the 95% Confidence Interval (CI) for the difference in within-subject sensitivity ranged from 19% to 42% for Study 1 and from 12% to 27% for Study 2. The within-subject sensitivity for gadobutrol BMR and BMR as well as for gadobutrol BMR plus XRM and BMR plus XRM is presented in Table 8.

Table 8: Sensitivity of Gadobutrol BMR for Detection of Malignant Breast Disease

Study 1					Study 2				
Sensitivity (%) N=388 Patients					Sensitivity (%) N=390 Patients				
Reader	BMR	BMR + XRM	Gadobutrol BMR	Gadobutrol BMR +XRM	Reader	BMR	BMR + XRM	Gadobutrol BMR	Gadobutrol BMR +XRM
1	37	71	83	84	4	73	83	87	90
2	49	76	80	83	5	57	81	89	90
3	63	75	87	87	6	55	80	86	88

Specificity was defined as the percentage of non-malignant breasts correctly identified as non-malignant. The lower limit of the 95% confidence interval for specificity of gadobutrol BMR was greater than 80% for 5 of 6 readers. (Table 9)

Table 9: Specificity of Gadobutrol BMR in Non-Malignant Breasts

Study 1			Study 2		
Specificity (%) N=372 Patients			Specificity (%) N=367 Patients		
Reader	Gadobutrol BMR	Lower Limit 95% CI	Reader	Gadobutrol BMR	Lower Limit 95% CI
1	86	92	4	92	93
2	95	93	5	84	80
3	89	85	6	83	79

Three additional readers in each study read XRM alone. For these readers over both studies, sensitivity ranged from 68% to 73% and specificity in non-malignant breasts ranged from 86% to 94%.

In breasts with malignancy, a false positive detection rate was calculated as the percentage of subjects for which the readers assessed a region as malignant which could not be verified by SoT. The false positive detection rates for gadobutrol BMR ranged from 39% to 53% (95% CI Upper Bounds ranged from 44% to 58%).

14.3 **MRA**

Patients with known or suspected disease of the supra-aortic arteries (for evaluation up to but excluding the basilar artery) were enrolled in Study C, and patients with known or suspected disease of the renal arteries were enrolled in Study D. In both studies, non-contrast, 2D time-of-flight (ToF) magnetic resonance angiography (MRA) was performed prior to gadobutrol MRA using a single intravenous injection of 0.1 mmol/kg. The injection rate of 1.5 mL/second was selected to extend the injection duration to at least half of the imaging duration. Imaging was performed with parallel-channel, 1.5 T MRI devices and an automatic bolus tracking technique to trigger the image acquisition following gadobutrol administration using elliptically encoded, T1-weighted, 3D gradient-echo image acquisition and single breath hold. Three central readers blinded to clinical information interpreted the ToF and gadobutrol MRA images. Three additional central readers interpreted separately acquired computed tomographic angiography (CTA) images, which were used as the standard of reference (SoR) in each study.

The studies included 749 subjects: 457 were evaluated in Study C, with an average age of 68 (range 25 to 93); 64% were male; 80% white, 28% black, and 16% Asian. An additional 292 subjects were evaluated in Study D, with an average age of 55 (range 18 to 88); 54% were male; 68% white, 7% black, and 22% Asian.

Efficacy was evaluated based on anatomical visualization and performance for distinguishing between normal and abnormal anatomy. The visualization metric depended on whether readers selected, "Yes, it can be visualized along its entire length," "No, this segment assessable," or "This segment is not assessable." Twenty-one segments in Study C and six segments in Study D were presented per subject to each reader. The performance metrics, sensitivity and specificity, depended on digital caliper-based quantitation of arterial narrowing in visualized, non-occluded, abnormal-appearing segments. Significant stenosis was defined as at least 70% in Study C and 50% in Study D. Performance of gadobutrol MRA compared to ToF MRA was calculated using an imputation method for non-visualized segments by assuming a 50% match with SoR and a 50% mismatch. Performance of gadobutrol MRA compared to a pre-specified threshold of 50% was calculated after excluding non-visualized segments. Measurement variability and visualization of accessory renal arteries was also evaluated.

Results were analyzed for each of the three central readers.

Table 10: Visualization, Sensitivity, Specificity

STUDY C: SUPRA-AORTIC ARTERIES (457 patients)									
Performance at the segment level									
9597 ¹ segments of which 158 ² were positive for stenosis by SoR ²									
READER	VISUALIZATION (%)			SENSITIVITY (%)			SPECIFICITY (%)		
	GAD MRA	ToF MRA	GAD – ToF (CI) ³	GAD MRA	ToF MRA	GAD – ToF (CI) ³	GAD MRA	ToF MRA	GAD – ToF (CI) ³
1	88	24	64 (61, 67)	60	54	6 (-4, 14)	92	62	30 (29, 32)
2	95	75	20 (18, 21)	60	54	6 (-3, 14)	95	85	10 (9, 11)
3	97	82	15 (13, 17)	58	55	3 (-4, 11)	97	89	8 (7, 9)
STUDY D: RENAL ARTERIES (292 patients)									
Performance at the segment level									
1752 ² segments of which 133 ² were positive for stenosis by SoR ²									
4	98	82	16 (13, 20)	52	51	1 (-9, 11)	94	83	11 (9, 14)
5	96	72	24 (21, 28)	54	39	15 (6, 24)	95	85	10 (8, 12)
6	96	78	17 (14, 21)	53	50	3 (-6, 12)	94	81	13 (11, 16)

¹Number of segments varied between readers; number for majority-reader shown.

²Standard of Reference based on aggregate interpretation of three central CTA readers.

³95.1/95% (Study C/D) confidence interval for two-sided comparison.

⁴90.1/90% (Study C/D) confidence interval for one-sided comparison against non-inferiority margin of -7.5.

GAD MRA = Post-contrast Gadobutrol Magnetic Resonance Angiography, ToF = Non-contrast 2D-Time of Flight.

For all three supra-aortic artery readers in Study C, the lower bound of confidence for the sensitivity of gadobutrol MRA did not exceed 54%. For all three renal artery readers in Study D, the lower bound of confidence for the sensitivity of gadobutrol MRA did not exceed 46%.

Measurement Variability

For both MRA and CTA, readers varied in the quantity of narrowing they assigned to the same arterial segments. Table 11 shows the percentage of patients in whom the measurement range was 30% or greater for the left or right internal carotid and proximal renal artery segments. There were approximately four measurements per patient segment, one from the site and three from the central readers. Measurement variability was high for both CTA and MRA, but numerically lower for gadobutrol compared to non-contrast ToF MRA.

Table 11: Percent of Patients with Range ≥ 30%, ≥ 50%, ≥ 70% for Measurement of Stenoses and Normal Vessel Diameters

	Internal Carotid				Proximal Main Renal			
	N	≥ 30%	≥ 50%	≥ 70%	N	≥ 30%	≥ 50%	≥ 70%
CTA	456	40	11	4	292	59	33	9
ToF MRA	443	55	22	9	270	44	22	9
Gadobutrol MRA	454	47	13	4	286	34	14	4

Visualization of Accessory Renal Arteries for Surgical Planning and Renal Donor Evaluation (Study D only)

Of 1752 main arteries visualized by the central CTA readers, 266 (15%) were also associated with positive visualization of at least one accessory (duplicate) artery. With the central MRA readers, the comparable rates were 232 of 1752 (13%) for gadobutrol MRA compared to 53 of 1752 (3%) for ToF MRA.

14.4 **Cardiac MRI**

Two studies similar in design, Study E and Study F, evaluated the sensitivity and specificity of gadobutrol cardiac MRI (CMRI) for detection of coronary artery disease (CAD) in adult patients with known or suspected CAD. Patients were excluded from study if they had a history of coronary artery bypass grafting, or if it was known in advance that they were unable to hold their breath, or had atrial fibrillation or other arrhythmia likely to prevent electrocardiogram-gated CMRI. The studies were multi-center, open-label, and evaluated 764 subjects for efficacy: 376 in Study E, with an average age of 59 (range 20 to 84); 89% male; 74% white, 1% black, and 25% Asian; and 388 subjects in Study F, with an average age of 59 (range 23 to 82), 61% male, 67% white, 17% black, and 12% Asian.

All subjects underwent dynamic first-pass gadobutrol imaging during vasodilator stress, followed ~10 minutes later by dynamic first-pass gadobutrol imaging at rest, followed ~5 minutes later with imaging during a period of gradual gadobutrol washout from the myocardium (late gadolinium enhancement, LGE). Imaging was performed on 1.5 T or 3.0 T MRI devices equipped with multichannel surface coils to support accelerated acquisitions with parallel imaging, T1-weighted, 2D gradient-echo, dynamic acquisition of perfusion with at least 3 slices per heartbeat. Gadobutrol was administered intravenously at a rate of ~4 mL/second as two separate bolus injections (0.05 mmol/kg each), the first at peak pharmacologic stress (~3 minutes after start of ongoing adenosine infusion, or immediately after completion of regadenoson administration, at approved doses). No additional gadobutrol was administered for LGE imaging.

Images were read by three independent readers blinded to clinical information. Reader detection of CAD depended on visually detecting defective perfusion or scar on gadobutrol CMRI (stress, rest, LGE) imaging. Quantitative coronary angiography (QCA) was used to measure intraluminal narrowing and served as the standard of reference (SoR).

Computed tomographic angiography (CTA) was used as the SoR if disease could be unequivocally excluded, and no coronary angiography (CA) was available. The left ventricular myocardium was divided into six regions. Readers provided per-region (CMRI, CTA) and per-artery (QCA) interpretations for each subject. Subject-level endpoints reflected each subject's most abnormal localized finding.

The sensitivity results for gadobutrol CMRI to detect CAD defined as either maximum stenosis ≥ 50% or ≥ 70% by QCA are presented in Table 12. For each reader, sensitivity of gadobutrol CMRI larger than 60% can be concluded if the lower 95% confidence limit of the sensitivity estimate exceeds the pre-specified threshold of 60%.

Table 12: Sensitivity (%) of Gadobutrol CMRI for Detection of CAD in Patients with Maximum Stenosis* of ≥ 50% and ≥ 70%

Study E					Study F				
Sensitivity (%) N=141					Sensitivity (%) N=105				
Reader 1**	77 (69, 83)***		90 (83, 95)		65 (57, 72)		77 (68, 85)		
Reader 2**	65 (57, 73)		80 (71, 87)		56 (48, 64)		71 (62, 80)		
Reader 3**	65 (56, 72)		79 (70, 86)		61 (53, 69)		76 (67, 84)		

* Stenosis determined by Quantitative Coronary Angiography (QCA)

** CMRI images were assessed by six independent blinded readers, three in each study.

*** The bolded value represents the lower limit of the 95% confidence interval, which is compared to a pre-specified threshold of 60% for evaluation of sensitivity.

The specificity results for gadobutrol CMRI to detect CAD defined as either maximum stenosis ≥ 50% or ≥ 70% by QCA are presented in Table 13. For each reader, specificity of gadobutrol CMRI larger than 55% can be concluded if the lower 95% confidence limit of the specificity estimate exceeds the pre-specified threshold of 55%.

Table 13: Specificity (%) of Gadobutrol CMRI for Exclusion of CAD in Patients with Maximum Stenosis* of ≥ 50% and ≥ 70%

Study E			Study F		
Sensitivity (%) N=235			Sensitivity (%) N=238		
Reader 1**	85 (80, 89)***		83 (78, 87)		85 (80, 90)
Reader 2**	92 (88, 95)		91 (87, 94)		89 (84, 92)
Reader 3**	92 (88, 95)		91 (87, 94)		90 (85, 93)

* Stenosis determined by Quantitative Coronary Angiography (QCA)

** CMRI images were assessed by six independent blinded readers, three in each study.

*** The bolded value represents the lower limit of the 95% confidence interval, which is compared to a pre-specified threshold of 55% for evaluation of specificity.

In Study E, among the 33 patients with maximum stenosis by QCA between 50% and <70%, the proportion of gadobutrol-CMRI positive detections of CAD ranged from 15% to 33%. In Study F, among the 45 patients with maximum stenosis by QCA between 50% and < 70%, the proportion of gadobutrol-CMRI positive detections of CAD ranged from 20% to 35%. The results of gadobutrol-CMRI reads to detect CAD in patients with maximum stenosis between 50% and < 70% are summarized in Table 14.

Table 14: Gadobutrol-CMRI Detection of CAD in Patients with Maximum Stenosis* between 50% and < 70%

		Study E (n=33)	Study F (n=45)
		Gadobutrol-CMRI positive	Gadobutrol-CMRI positive
Reader 1**		11 (33%)	16 (35%)
Reader 2**		5(15%)	9 (20%)
Reader 3**		6(18%)	12 (26%)

* Stenosis determined by Quantitative Coronary Angiography (QCA).

** CMRI images were assessed by six independent blinded readers, three in each study.

Left Mainstem Stenosis (LMS)

The studies did not include sufficient numbers of subjects to characterize the performance of gadobutrol CMRI for detection of LMS, a subgroup at high risk from false negative reads. In Studies E and F, only three subjects had isolated LMS stenosis > 50%. In two of the three cases, the CMRI was interpreted as normal by at least two of the three readers (false negative). Sixteen subjects had LMS stenosis > 50% (including subjects with isolated LMS stenosis and subjects with LMS stenosis in addition to stenoses elsewhere). In five of these sixteen cases, the CMR was interpreted as normal by at least two of the three readers (false negative).

16 **HOW SUPPLIED/STORAGE AND HANDLING**

16.1 **How Supplied**

Gadobutrol injection is a sterile, clear and colorless to pale yellow solution containing 604.72 mg gadobutrol per mL (equivalent to 1 mmol gadobutrol per mL). Gadobutrol injection is supplied in the following Multiple-Dose container sizes: