

pan-Canadian Oncology Drug Review Stakeholder Feedback on a pCODR Expert Review Committee Initial Recommendation (Patient Advocacy Group)

Atezolizumab & Bevacizumab for Non-Squamous Non-Small Cell Lung Cancer

Lung Cancer Canada

July 3, 2020

3 Feedback on pERC Initial Recommendation

Name of the Drug and Indication(s):				Atezolizumab in combination with bevacizumab and platinum-based chemotherapy for the treatment of metastatic epidermal growth factor receptor (EGFR) and/or anaplastic lymphoma kinase (ALK)-positive non-squamous non-small cell lung cancer (NSCLC).			
•		keholder Role in Review (nufacturer, Patient Group,	•	Patient Group			
		on Providing Feedback	ctimeat	Lung Cancer Canada	à		
		R program may contact th n will not be included in a			rification. Contact nt by the pCODR program.		
3.1		nments on the Initial Reco					
	a)	Please indicate if the eliginitial Recommendation:	ible stakeho	lder agrees, agrees in	part, or disagrees with the		
		agrees	\boxtimes a	igrees in part	\square disagree		
	 While Lung Cancer Canada recognizes the challenges inherent within the data and acknowledges that the Health Canada indication does not include the EGFR and ALK subgroups, we believe that this submission is worthy of reconsideration. 						
			here the ev	idence is strongest.	GFR subgroup was a planned Recent AACR data suggests		
 There is a high unmet need in this population - espect on their oral therapies. This submission demonstrates of patients who have had mixed benefit from immuno bevacizumab is not currently funded, there are a num approved. This helps to improve treatment cost effect noted in the Initial Clinical Guidance Report. 					s clear benefit in this group otherapy alone. While mber of biosimilars that are		

c	the Initial Re	ecommendati	ion or are the co	mponen	ts of the r		
	the Initial Recommendation or are the components of the recommendation (e.g., clinical and economic evidence or provisional algorithm) clearly worded? Is the interclear? Are the reasons clear?						
	Page Sec Number Tit		Paragraph, Line Number		ents and S e Clarity	uggested Changes to	
	3					suggested Changes to	
<u> </u>	Number Tit	le I	Line Number	Improv	e Clarity	Suggested Changes to	
Cor	Number Tit	le I	Line Number Stakeholder Prov	Improv	ve Clarity		
Cor	number Tit mments Related Notwithstanding would support th	d to Eligible Some the feedbace is Initial Reconn'), which we	Stakeholder Provick provided in parcommendation pro	ided Info	ormation ove, please g to Final	e indicate if the Stakeholder pERC Recommendation after the end of the	•
Cor	mments Related Notwithstanding would support th "early conversion eedback deadling Support of	the feedbachis Initial Recon"), which whe date.	Stakeholder Provided in particular provided in particular provided would occur two	ided Info	ormation ove, please g to Final ness Days Do not su	e indicate if the Stakeholder pERC Recommendation after the end of the apport conversion to Final	·
Cor	number Tit mments Related Notwithstanding would support th "early conversion eedback deadling Support of Recomme	the feedbace is Initial Recom"), which we date.	Stakeholder Provided in particular provided in particular provided would occur two	ided Information ideal Information ideal Information ideal Information ideal i	ormation ove, please g to Final ness Days Do not su Recomme	e indicate if the Stakeholder pERC Recommendation after the end of the apport conversion to Final	-

3.2

 One of the strengths of this submission that was not highlighted was the planned and organized collection of real world data on patients treated with the combination in the Canadian context. Having robust, post-approval programs to collect real world data will allow re-evaluation of the true benefit of these novel combinations in the Canadian context while still allowing patients to potentially benefit from this type of novel treatment approach.

Page Number	Section Title	Paragraph, Line Number	Comments related to Stakeholder Information

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), including the provisional algorithm. (See www.cadth.ca/pcodr 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 www.cadth.ca/pcodr 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, including the provisional algorithm 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 questions:

1. 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), including the provisional algorithm as part of the feasibility of adoption into the health system, 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. If the substantive comments relate specifically to the provisional algorithm, it will be shared with PAG for a reconsideration. 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. Please also note that substantive comments on the provisional algorithm will preclude early conversion of the initial recommendation to a final 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 CADTH staff, in consultation with the pERC chair and pERC members, and may not require reconsideration at a subsequent pERC meeting. Similarly if the feedback relates specifically to the provisional algorithm and can be addressed editorially, CADTH staff will consult with the PAG chair and PAG members.

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 Sponsor 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) The following stakeholders are eligible to submit Feedback on the provisional algorithm:
 - The Sponsor 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 Board of Directors of the Canadian Provincial Cancer Agencies
- c) 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.
- d) The template for providing *Stakeholder Feedback on pERC Initial Recommendation* can be downloaded from the pCODR section of the CADTH website. (See www.cadth.ca/pcodr for a description of the pCODR process and supporting materials and templates.)
- e) 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.
- f) 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.
- g) 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, and should not contain any language that could be considered disrespectful, inflammatory or could be found to violate applicable defamation law.

- h) 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.
- i) The comments must be submitted via a Microsoft Word (not PDF) document to pCODR by the posted deadline date.
- j) 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 (www.cadth.ca/pcodr). The submitted information in the feedback template will be made fully disclosable.