

#### **CDA-AMC REIMBURSEMENT REVIEW**

# Feedback on Draft Recommendation

#### trametinib

(non-sponsored review)

Indication: For recurrent low-grade serous ovarian cancer

Mar 6, 2025

**Disclaimer:** The views expressed in this submission are those of the submitting organization or individual. As such, they are independent of CDA-AMC and do not necessarily represent or reflect the view of CDA-AMC. No endorsement by CDA-AMC is intended or should be inferred.

By filing with CDA-AMC, the submitting organization or individual agrees to the full disclosure of the information. CDA-AMC does not edit the content of the submissions.

CDA-AMC does use reasonable care to prevent disclosure of personal information in posted material; however, it is ultimately the submitter's responsibility to ensure no identifying personal information or personal health information is included in the submission. The name of the submitting stakeholder group and all conflicts of interest information from individuals who contributed to the content are included in the posted submission.



## **CADTH Reimbursement Review Feedback on Draft Recommendation**

Stakeholder information

CADTH project number					
CAD ITT project number	PX0372				
Brand name (generic)	Trametinib				
Indication(s)	For the treatment of recurrent low-grade serous ovarian cancer				
Organization	Ontario Health (Cancer Care Ontario) Gynecological Cancers Drug				
	Advisory Committee ("OH(CCO) Gyne DAC")				
Contact information <sup>a</sup>	Name: Dr. Rachel Kupets				
Stakeholder agreement w	rith the draft recommendation				
1. Does the stakeholder a	gree with the committee's recommendation.	Yes No			
	keholder agrees or disagrees with the draft recommendation. We specific text from the recommendation and rationale.	/henev	er		
	able to all comers in view of limited treatment options. Objective utation positive cohort but the difference was not stat. significan and crossed 1.				
Measurable disease should be a requirement based on the study.					
Expert committee consid	eration of the stakeholder input				
Expert committee consid	oralion or the otalionoral input				
<u> </u>	ion demonstrate that the committee has considered the	Yes	$\boxtimes$		
2. Does the recommendat	<u> </u>	Yes No			
2. Does the recommendat stakeholder input that y	ion demonstrate that the committee has considered the	-			
2. Does the recommendat stakeholder input that y	ion demonstrate that the committee has considered the our organization provided to CADTH?	-			
2. Does the recommendat stakeholder input that y If not, what aspects are mis	ion demonstrate that the committee has considered the your organization provided to CADTH? ssing from the draft recommendation?	-			
2. Does the recommendat stakeholder input that y If not, what aspects are mis	ion demonstrate that the committee has considered the your organization provided to CADTH? ssing from the draft recommendation? mendation	-			
2. Does the recommendat stakeholder input that y If not, what aspects are mis	ion demonstrate that the committee has considered the your organization provided to CADTH? ssing from the draft recommendation?	No			
2. Does the recommendat stakeholder input that y If not, what aspects are mis Clarity of the draft recom  3. Are the reasons for the	ion demonstrate that the committee has considered the your organization provided to CADTH? ssing from the draft recommendation? mendation	No Yes			
2. Does the recommendat stakeholder input that y If not, what aspects are mis Clarity of the draft recom 3. Are the reasons for the If not, please provide detail	ion demonstrate that the committee has considered the your organization provided to CADTH? ssing from the draft recommendation?  mendation  recommendation clearly stated? s regarding the information that requires clarification.	No Yes			
2. Does the recommendat stakeholder input that y If not, what aspects are mis Clarity of the draft recom 3. Are the reasons for the If not, please provide detail	cion demonstrate that the committee has considered the your organization provided to CADTH?  Essing from the draft recommendation?  mendation  recommendation clearly stated?  s regarding the information that requires clarification.  on issues been clearly articulated and adequately	Yes No			
2. Does the recommendat stakeholder input that y If not, what aspects are mis Clarity of the draft recom 3. Are the reasons for the If not, please provide detail 4. Have the implementation addressed in the recommendation	cion demonstrate that the committee has considered the your organization provided to CADTH?  Essing from the draft recommendation?  mendation  recommendation clearly stated?  s regarding the information that requires clarification.  on issues been clearly articulated and adequately	Yes No			
2. Does the recommendat stakeholder input that y If not, what aspects are mis  Clarity of the draft recom  3. Are the reasons for the If not, please provide detail  4. Have the implementatic addressed in the recom If not, please provide detail	cion demonstrate that the committee has considered the your organization provided to CADTH?  Issing from the draft recommendation?  Interpretation  Interpretation that requires clarification.  In issues been clearly articulated and adequately amendation?  Interpretation that requires clarification.  In issues been clearly articulated and adequately amendation?  Interpretation that requires clarification.	Yes No			
2. Does the recommendat stakeholder input that y If not, what aspects are mis Clarity of the draft recom 3. Are the reasons for the If not, please provide detail 4. Have the implementation addressed in the recom If not, please provide detail 5. If applicable, are the rei	cion demonstrate that the committee has considered the your organization provided to CADTH?  ssing from the draft recommendation?  mendation  recommendation clearly stated?  s regarding the information that requires clarification.  on issues been clearly articulated and adequately mendation?	Yes No Yes No			

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>a</sup> CADTH may contact this person if comments require clarification.

#### **Appendix 2. Conflict of Interest Declarations for Clinician Groups**

- To maintain the objectivity and credibility of the CADTH drug review programs, all participants in the drug review processes must disclose any real, potential, or perceived conflicts of interest.
- This conflict of interest declaration is required for participation. Declarations made do not negate or preclude the use of the feedback from patient groups and clinician groups.
- CADTH may contact your group with further questions, as needed.
- Please see the Procedures for CADTH Drug Reimbursement Reviews for further details.
- For conflict of interest declarations:
  - Please list any companies or organizations that have provided your group with financial payment over the past two years AND who may have direct or indirect interest in the drug under review.
  - Please note that declarations are required for each clinician that contributed to the input.
  - If your clinician group provided input at the outset of the review, only conflict of interest declarations that are new or require updating need to be reported in this form. For all others, please list the clinicians who provided input are unchanged
  - Please add more tables as needed (copy and paste).
  - All new and updated declarations must be included in a single document.

A. Assistance with Providing the Feedback				
1. Did you receive help from outside your clinician group to complete this submission?	No			
	Yes	$\boxtimes$		
OH-CCO provided secretariat function to the group.				
2. Did you receive help from outside your clinician group to collect or analyze any	No	$\boxtimes$		
information used in this submission?				
If yes, please detail the help and who provided it.				
B. Previously Disclosed Conflict of Interest				
3. Were conflict of interest declarations provided in clinician group input that was	No			
3. Were conflict of interest declarations provided in clinician group input that was submitted at the outset of the CADTH review and have those declarations remained	No Yes			
3. Were conflict of interest declarations provided in clinician group input that was				
3. Were conflict of interest declarations provided in clinician group input that was submitted at the outset of the CADTH review and have those declarations remained				
3. Were conflict of interest declarations provided in clinician group input that was submitted at the outset of the CADTH review and have those declarations remained unchanged? If no, please complete section C below.				
3. Were conflict of interest declarations provided in clinician group input that was submitted at the outset of the CADTH review and have those declarations remained unchanged? If no, please complete section C below.  If yes, please list the clinicians who contributed input and whose declarations have not changed:				
<ul> <li>Were conflict of interest declarations provided in clinician group input that was submitted at the outset of the CADTH review and have those declarations remained unchanged? If no, please complete section C below.</li> <li>If yes, please list the clinicians who contributed input and whose declarations have not changed:         <ul> <li>Dr. Orit Freedman</li> </ul> </li> </ul>				
<ul> <li>Were conflict of interest declarations provided in clinician group input that was submitted at the outset of the CADTH review and have those declarations remained unchanged? If no, please complete section C below.</li> <li>If yes, please list the clinicians who contributed input and whose declarations have not changed:         <ul> <li>Dr. Orit Freedman</li> <li>Dr. Tiffany Zigras</li> </ul> </li> </ul>				

#### C. New or Updated Conflict of Interest Declarations

New or Updated Declaration for Clinician 1			
Name	Dr. Rachel Kupets		
Position	Lead, Ontario Health (Cancer Care Ontario) Gynecologic Cancer Drug Advisory Committee		
Date	21-02-2025		
$\boxtimes$	I hereby certify that I have the authority to disclose all relevant information with respect to any matter involving this clinician or clinician group with a company, organization, or entity that may place this clinician or clinician group in a real, potential, or perceived conflict of interest situation.		
Conflict of Interest Declaration			

Company		Check Appropriate Dollar Range				
		\$0 to 5,000	\$5,001 to 10,000	\$10,001 to 50,000	In Excess of \$50,000	
Add company name						
Add company name						
Add or rem	ove rows as required					
New or Un	dated Declaration for Clinician	2				
New or Updated Declaration for Clinician 2  Name Please state full name						
Position	Please state run name  Please state currently held position					
Date	Please add the date form was completed (DD-MM-YYYY)					
	I hereby certify that I have the authority to disclose all relevant information with respect to any					
	matter involving this clinician or	-			•	
	place this clinician or clinician g			-	•	
Conflict of	Interest Declaration					
	mpanies or organizations that ha	ve provided voi	ır group with final	ncial navment ove	er the nast two	
	who may have direct or indirect i				i the past two	
			Check Approp	riate Dollar Rang	ge	
Company		\$0 to 5,000	\$5,001 to 10,000	\$10,001 to 50,000	In Excess of \$50,000	
Add compa	any name					
Add compa	any name					
Add or remove rows as required						
New or Up	dated Declaration for Clinician	3				
Name						
Position						
Date	Please add the date form was completed (DD-MM-YYYY)					
$\boxtimes$	I hereby certify that I have the authority to disclose all relevant information with respect to any					
	matter involving this clinician or clinician group with a company, organization, or entity that may place this clinician or clinician group in a real, potential, or perceived conflict of interest situation.					
Conflict of Interest Declaration						
List any co	mpanies or organizations that ha	ve provided you	ur group with fina	ncial payment ove	er the past two	
	who may have direct or indirect i				•	
		Check Appropriate Dollar Range				
Company		\$0 to 5,000	\$5,001 to 10,000	\$10,001 to 50,000	In Excess of \$50,000	
Add compa	any name					
Add compa	any name					
Add or remove rows as required						

List any companies or organizations that have provided your group with financial payment over the past two years AND who may have direct or indirect interest in the drug under review.

## CADTH Reimbursement Review Drug Program Input on Implementation Issues

#### **Section 1: General Information**

1.1 Drug Product Information:				
Drug name (generic): trametinib	Sponsor: BC Gynecology Tumour Group			
Indication: Recurrent low grade serous ovarian cancer followin serous carcinoma or serous borderline tumour.  Reimbursement Request: Recurrent low grade serous ovarian cancer	g initial diagnosis of ovarian or peritoneal low grade			

### 1.2 Lead Jurisdiction Jurisdiction: BC

#### **Section 2: Jurisdictional Implementation Issues**

#### **Table 1: Jurisdictional Context**

# 2.1 RELEVANT COMPARATORS Check (type "X") whether you have identified potential or current issues and provide brief details a) Issues with the choice of comparator in the submitted trial(s) X GOG 281/LOGS study compared trametinib to standard of care options (paclitaxel, pegylated liposomal doxorubicin, topotecan, letrozole or tamoxifen).

# Table 2: Policy Considerations for Reimbursing the Drug 2.2 CONSIDERATIONS FOR INITIATION OF THERAPY Check any category where you have identified potential or current issues and provide brief details a) Disease diagnosis, scoring or staging for eligibility X Clinical trial requires measurable disease, as defined by RECIST criteria. Should this be a requirement for initiation of therapy if trametinib is recommended for reimbursement? 2.3 CONSIDERATIONS FOR CONTINUATION OR RENEWAL OF THERAPY Check any category where you have identified potential or current issues and provide brief details a) Challenges related to assessment and monitoring of therapeutic response Clinical trial measured efficacy by contrast CT or MRI lesion assessment every 8 weeks for 15 months and then every 3 months thereafter. Access to that frequency may be a concern.

2.4 CONSIDERATIONS FOR DISCONTINUATION OF THERAPY
 Check any category where you have identified potential or current issues and provide brief details
 2.5 CONSIDERATIONS FOR PRESCRIBING OF THERAPY

Check any category where you have identified potential or current issues and provide brief details

#### Table 3: Special Implementation Issues

#### 2.6 GENERALIZABILITY

Check any category where you have identified potential or current issues and provide brief details

X

b) Patients on active treatment with a time-limited opportunity to switch to the drug(s) under review

Example: Potential need to allow switching patients currently receiving a comparator, if the drug under review is recommended and deemed superior.

Should patient receiving treatment with existing options be eligible to switch to trametinib?

#### 2.7 FUNDING ALGORITHM (ONCOLOGY ONLY)

Check any aspect that may require the development of a provisional funding algorithm by CADTH Refer to the <u>CADTH Drug Reimbursement Review Procedures pdf (cda-amc.ca)</u> for the explanation of rapid versus panel provisional funding algorithm. In general, we aim to deliver a rapid provisional funding algorithm shortly after the final posting of the reimbursement recommendations. For panel provisional funding algorithm, timelines may be extended due to coordination of panel members. All timelines will be posted on the website.

May refer to the sponsor's submission for Place in Therapy to support the discussion

#### 2.8 CARE PROVISION ISSUES

Check any category where you have identified potential or current **issues** and provide brief details **2.9 SYSTEM AND ECONOMIC ISSUES** 

Check any category where you have identified potential or current issues and provide brief details