

pan-Canadian Oncology Drug Review Stakeholder Feedback on a pCODR Expert Review Committee Initial Recommendation (Provincial Advisory Group [PAG])

Venetoclax (Venclexta) Rituximab for Chronic Lymphocytic Leukemia

May 31, 2019

## 3 Feedback on pERC Initial Recommendation

| Name        | CLL   |   |   |  |   |                          |  |  |
|-------------|---|---|---|--|---|--------------------------|--|--|
| (Subn       | nitter and  | older Role in Review<br>/or Manufacturer, Pat<br>roviding Feedback          | tient PA  | G  |   |                          |  |  |
|             |   | gram may contact thi:<br>I not be included in ar                            |   |  |   |                          |  |  |
| 3.1         | Commer  | ts on the Initial Recor   | nmendation  |  |   |                          |  |  |
|             | a) Please indicate if the eligible stakeholder agrees, agrees in part, or disagrees with the Initial Recommendation:  |   |   |  |   |                          |  |  |
| $\boxtimes$ |   | agrees  | □ agr   | ees in part $\square$ disagree           |   | disagree                 |  |  |
|             | b) Pleathe  | implementation quest<br>use provide editorial for<br>Initial Recommendation | the Initial Recommendation. PAG would like clarification of pERC response ntation questions noted below.  e editorial feedback on the Initial Recommendation to aid in clarity. Is commendation or are the components of the recommendation (e.g., conomic evidence) clearly worded? Is the intent clear? Are the reasons |  |   |                          |  |  |
|             | Page<br>Numbe   | r Section Title   | Paragraph,<br>Line<br>Number  |  | ents and Sugges   | sted Changes to          |  |  |
|             | 1   | pERC<br>Recommendation  |   | (budget<br>include<br>that pE<br>potenti | t impact) being and as the recomm<br>TRC noted that the | t of venetoclax plus     |  |  |
| 3.2 C       | 2 Comments Related to Eligible Stakeholder Provided Information   |   |   |  |   |                          |  |  |
|             | Notwithstanding the feedback provided in part a) above, please indicate if the Stakeholder would support this Initial Recommendation proceeding to Final pERC Recommendation ("early conversion"), which would occur two (2) Business Days after the end of the feedback deadline date. |   |   |  |   |                          |  |  |
|             |   | Support conversion to Recommendation.                                       | Final   | $\boxtimes$                              | Do not support<br>Recommendat                           | conversion to Final ion. |  |  |
|             | Recommendation does not requireconsideration by pERC.   |   |   |  | Recommendati<br>reconsidered b                          |                          |  |  |

If the eligible stakeholder does not support conversion to a Final Recommendation, please provide feedback on any issues not adequately addressed in the Initial Recommendation based on any information provided by the Stakeholder in the submission or as additional information during the review.

Please note that new evidence will be not considered at this part of the review process, however, it may be eligible for a Resubmission. If you are unclear as to whether the information you are providing is eligible for a Resubmission, please contact the pCODR program.

Additionally, if the eligible stakeholder supports early conversion to a Final Recommendation; however, the stakeholder has included substantive comments that requires further interpretation of the evidence, the criteria for early conversion will be deemed to have not been met and the Initial Recommendation will be returned to pERC for further deliberation and reconsideration at the next possible pERC meeting.

| Page<br>Number | Section<br>Title  | Paragraph,<br>Line<br>Number | Comments related to Stakeholder Information  |
|----------------|---|------------------------------|--|
| 1 / 2          | pERC Recommenda tion/ Potential Next Steps for Stakeholders  Row 3, 2 <sup>nd</sup> column, 1 <sup>st</sup> |                              | It was noted that the "EGP elected to not place upper bound ICERS on the comparisons", could this statement be included in the last paragraph of the pERC recommendation (or in the Potential Next Steps for Stakeholders - Pricing Arrangements to Improve Cost-Effectiveness and Decrease Budget Impact)?  With respect to "it would be reasonable to add rituximab at any point at the discretion of the treating physician", please add "provided the patient's disease is not |
| 15             | Row 1, 2 <sup>nd</sup> column   |                              | progressing or has not progressed on venetoclax".  Can pERC clarify if there is a minimum time interval for re-treatment (i.e., 12 month treatment free interval as per pERC recommendation for patients treated with a first-line rituximab containing regimen)? Did the trial allow re-treatment? If yes, what criteria were applied?  Also, what proportion of patients require re-treatment?   |

#### 1 About Stakeholder Feedback

pCODR invites eligible stakeholders to provide feedback and comments on the Initial Recommendation made by the pCODR Expert Review Committee (pERC). (See <a href="https://www.cadth.ca/pcodr">www.cadth.ca/pcodr</a> for information regarding review status and feedback deadlines.)

As part of the pCODR review process, pERC makes an Initial Recommendation based on its review of the clinical benefit, patient values, economic evaluation and adoption feasibility for a drug. (See <a href="www.cadth.ca/pcodr">www.cadth.ca/pcodr</a> for a description of the pCODR process.) The Initial Recommendation is then posted for feedback from eligible stakeholders. All eligible stakeholders have 10 (ten) business days within which to provide their feedback on the initial recommendation. It should be noted that the Initial Recommendation may or may not change following a review of the feedback from stakeholders.

pERC welcomes comments and feedback from all eligible stakeholders with the expectation that even the most critical feedback be delivered respectfully and with civility.

#### A. Application of Early Conversion

The Stakeholder Feedback document poses two key guestions:

#### Does the stakeholder agree, agree in part, or disagree with the Initial Recommendation?

All eligible stakeholders are requested to indicate whether they agree, agree in part or disagrees with the Initial Recommendation, and to provide a rational for their response.

Please note that if a stakeholder agrees, agrees in part or disagrees with the Initial Recommendation, the stakeholder can still support the recommendation proceeding to a Final Recommendation (i.e. early conversion).

# 2. Does the stakeholder support the recommendation proceeding to a Final Recommendation ("early conversion")?

An efficient review process is one of pCODR's key guiding principles. If all eligible stakeholders support the Initial Recommendation proceeding to a Final Recommendation and that the criteria for early conversion as set out in the pCODR Procedures are met, the Final Recommendation will be posted on the CADTH website two (2) Business Days after the end of the feedback deadline date. This is called an "early conversion" of an Initial Recommendation to a Final Recommendation.

For stakeholders who support early conversion, please note that if there are substantive comments on any of the key quadrants of the deliberative framework (e.g., differences in the interpretation of the evidence), the criteria for early conversion will be deemed to have <u>not</u> been met and the Initial Recommendation will be returned to pERC for further deliberation and reconsideration at the next possible pERC meeting. Please note that if any one of the eligible stakeholders does not support the Initial Recommendation proceeding to a Final pERC Recommendation, pERC will review all feedback and comments received at a subsequent pERC meeting and reconsider the Initial Recommendation.

#### B. Guidance on Scope of Feedback for Early Conversion

Information that is within scope of feedback for early conversion includes the identification of errors in the reporting or a lack of clarity in the information provided in the review documents. Based on the feedback received, pERC will consider revising the recommendation document, as appropriate and to provide clarity.

If a lack of clarity is noted, please provide suggestions to improve the clarity of the information in the Initial Recommendation. If the feedback can be addressed editorially this will done by the pCODR staff, in consultation with the pERC chair and pERC members, and may not require reconsideration at a subsequent pERC meeting.

The Final pERC Recommendation will be made available to the participating federal, provincial and territorial ministries of health and provincial cancer agencies for their use in guiding their funding decisions and will also be made publicly available once it has been finalized.

### 2 Instructions for Providing Feedback

- a) The following stakeholders are eligible to submit Feedback on the Initial Recommendation:
  - The Submitter making the pCODR Submission, or the Manufacturer of the drug under review;
  - Patient groups who have provided input on the drug submission;
  - Registered clinician(s) who have provided input on the drug submission; and
  - The Provincial Advisory Group (PAG)
- b) Feedback or comments must be based on the evidence that was considered by pERC in making the Initial Recommendation. No new evidence will be considered at this part of the review process, however, it may be eligible for a Resubmission.
- c) The template for providing *Stakeholder Feedback on pERC Initial Recommendation* can be downloaded from the pCODR section of the CADTH website. (See <a href="www.cadth.ca/pcodr">www.cadth.ca/pcodr</a> for a description of the pCODR process and supporting materials and templates.)
- d) At this time, the template must be completed in English. The Stakeholder should complete those sections of the template where they have substantive comments and should not feel obligated to complete every section, if that section does not apply.
- e) Feedback on the pERC Initial Recommendation should not exceed three (3) pages in length, using a minimum 11 point font on 8 ½" by 11" paper. If comments submitted exceed three pages, only the first three pages of feedback will be provided to the pERC for their consideration.
- f) Feedback should be presented clearly and succinctly in point form, whenever possible. The issue(s) should be clearly stated and specific reference must be made to the section of the recommendation document under discussion (i.e., page number, section title, and paragraph). Opinions from experts and testimonials should not be provided. Comments should be restricted to the content of the Initial Recommendation.
- References to support comments may be provided separately; however, these cannot be related to new evidence. New evidence is not considered at this part of the review process, however, it may be eligible for a Resubmission. If you are unclear as to whether the information you are considering to provide is eligible for a Resubmission, please contact the pCODR program.
- h) The comments must be submitted via a Microsoft Word (not PDF) document to pCODR by the posted deadline date.
- i) If you have any questions about the feedback process, please e-mail pcodrsubmissions@cadth.ca

Note: CADTH is committed to providing an open and transparent cancer drug review process and to the need to be accountable for its recommendations to patients and the public. Submitted feedback will be posted on the CADTH website (<a href="www.cadth.ca/pcodr">www.cadth.ca/pcodr</a>). The submitted information in the feedback template will be made fully disclosable.